

0000 0000 1441

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2008

~~MICROFILMED~~

~~DEC 05 1961~~

VIA COURIER

DISPATCH NO. EGLA-21969

DOCUMENT MICROFILM SERVICE

**SECRET**  
CLASSIFICATION

TO : Chief, ES  
FROM : Chief of Base, Pullach

DATE 10 January 1957

INFO: COS

SUBJECT **GENERAL:** Operational/UPSWING/CART  
**SPECIFIC:** Fall ANEKDOTE

REF: EGLA-3029

ACTION REQUIRED: For your information

MICROFILMED  
JUN 22 1967  
DOC. MICRO. SER.

1. Reference points out an error in EGLA-21431. Paragraph 11 of that dispatch said that the StB contact of both V-22354 of Fall ANEKDOTE and V-22356 of Fall AKTIOE apparently was the same person. Headquarters' natural confusion arises from the fact that the undersigned had not reported in September the latest information on Subject case. It is correct that the latest dispatch covering the "progress" of the case was EGLA-19354. The present dispatch will outline developments from June to the time when UPSWING transferred its responsibility in the matter to the Davarian LfV. The fact that UPSWING no longer considers the case within their jurisdiction means that we will probably hear nothing more of it at POB. As a matter of fact, it is quite likely that there will be no more action in the case, either from a German or a Czech point of view for reasons given in para 11 below.

2. PULL 3277 requested among others MOB for traces on V-22356. EGMA-21211 was MOB's reply, which, it will be recalled, contained derogatory information. The source of the information was Hans NEUWIRTH who had been listed as an old acquaintance of V-22354 (the latter's list of friends, fellow prisoners, etc. was attached to EGLA-18644). In discussing the matter with MOB it was learned that NEUWIRTH had given that Base the data during the short period in the Spring of 1956 when he was their agent. When it was subsequently learned that he was also an agent of [redacted]'s, MOB dropped its contact with NEUWIRTH. Nevertheless, we felt it pertinent to discuss with them the wisdom of passing to UPSWING MOB's information, particularly since MOB indicated they might want to recontact NEUWIRTH after [redacted]'s interest in him had ceased. We also felt that we could not, without prior approval of [redacted] pass UPSWING information which by its nature could possibly pinpoint a BSMPLIE agent. It was decided, therefore, to inform UPSWING in a general way only, at least until we could learn [redacted]'s position.

Distribution:

✓ 3 - EE  
2 - COS

**SECRET**  
CLASSIFICATION

SECRET

EGLA-21969  
Page 2

on the matter.

3. Accordingly, I informed SKUTZBACH on 7 June that we had received derogatory reports on V-22354 indicating that he had talked of his UPSWING mission. I stated our position that this fact must have significant bearing on the case and that although I was not able to reveal the source of the information at that date I felt the matter sufficiently serious to bring to his immediate attention. SKUTZBACH's reaction was quick in coming, and he asked pointblank if the source was NEUWIRTH or ULLMANN. I replied that although I could not say for sure who the source was, perhaps it could be assumed that it was one of those persons listed by V-22354 as old friends or fellow prisoners. When asked why he had picked on the names of NEUWIRTH and ULLMANN he answered mainly in terms of the letter, explaining that ULLMANN is a V-Kamm in their case "Archimedes". Although SKUTZBACH has never explained any details regarding this case, he did say that in giving security instructions to ULLMANN, the agent was told that under no circumstances was he ever to mention his UPSWING status, even to the best of his friends. ULLMANN allegedly replied: "Not even to (V-22354) or NEUWIRTH, assuming they should work for you?" The negative answer bothered ULLMANN considerably. Hence, since SKUTZBACH had mentioned NEUWIRTH's name in the same breath as ULLMANN's, it seemed barely possible that NEUWIRTH was then in contact with UPSWING.

4. SKUTZBACH said that he regarded it as extremely important that we find out and tell him the identity of the source of information on V-22354. He said that this breach of security on the agent's part could mean the end of the operation. I replied that I could not state definitely whether or not I could ascertain the name of the person concerned, but that I would make every reasonable effort on his behalf.

5. On 29 June, we asked [ ] for a conference on the subject of NEUWIRTH, stating that LOB had obtained information from him which pertained to an UPSWING agent. We further stated that we wished to use this information, but would not do so if in their opinion it would jeopardize the usefulness of NEUWIRTH as their agent. On 2 July, [ ] of MOB and I met with [ ]'s chief of Operations and the case officer assigned to NEUWIRTH. I outlined the reasons why we wished to have their permission to pass NEUWIRTH's information to UPSWING, stating in general terms that it seemed conceivable to me that NEUWIRTH could be an UPSWING'er. The [ ] representatives readily admitted that this was a possibility, even though they said that NEUWIRTH had told them that he had turned down an UPSWING recruitment pitch made in about April, 1956, by a (fnu) SCHWARTZ and a Dr. (fnu) GLOCKE. These were described as good friends of NEUWIRTH; yet oddly enough [ ] had obtained no details concerning them. They added further that they had no objection to our passing on NEUWIRTH's information to UPSWING, and even that they had no objection in our stating that he was an agent of [ ] We replied that we thought this itself was not necessary, or even advisable, that I would merely state that NEUWIRTH had been a short-term agent for another PBPRILE intelligence agency. They agreed with this, stating that they intended to drop contact with NEUWIRTH, probably no later than by the end of July.

SECRET

SECRET

EOLA-21969

Page 3

6. Immediately after this meeting with [redacted] I informed SKUTZBACH that it was, in fact, NEUWIRTH who had been the source of the derogatory information on V-22354. Further efforts on my part to elicit from SKUTZBACH a confirmation of my suspicion that NEUWIRTH was already an UPSWINGER were unsuccessful. At no time, however, did he specifically deny any such veiled suggestion on my part, but he volunteered the information that it was SCHWARTZ and GLOCKER, otherwise unidentified, who had approached NEUWIRTH as described above.

7. The whole nature of NEUWIRTH's involvement in this case could never be cleared up. We attempted to ascertain the degree of relationship between NEUWIRTH and V-22354 by obtaining intercept coverage on both men. Although we have not ruled out the possibility that there is some contact between the two, none of the letters that we have been able to obtain indicate anything more than the fact that V-22354's name has been mentioned two or three times in various letters. This was always in connection with NEUWIRTH's wide circle of friends who are active in Sudeten Landsmannschaft activities; nor have we been successful in attempting to get a full and adequate picture of the possible StB activities on the part of many of those persons listed by V-22354 as being friends, fellow prisoners, etc. It appears more than just a matter of idle interest to us, however, that from a list of approximately 60 names, at least 11 have received in some form or other StB assignments, or have been listed as StB targets, or are regarded by UPSWING and/or KUBARK as being persons of intelligence interest. (These persons are: Dr. Walter NEUHL, Werner TUTTER, Franz KRAUTZBERGER [see paragraph 13 of EOLA 18644]; Joseph KOJ and (Dr.) Walter HORNSCHILD [see EOLA 19879]; Robert ULFMAN and NEUWIRTH [see above, etc.]; Arthur SOERNEL [V-22356]; Heinz LABEHL [see paragraph 15 of EOLA 18644 and EOLA 20345]; (Dr.) Walter FRANK [see PULL 4975 etc.]; and (Dr.) Heinz ROCHLITZER [see EOLA 20345]. EOLA 20345 was a trace request answered negatively by EOLA 18743.) Apparently V-22354's list had not been carded at the time POB asked UPSWING for traces; otherwise the results would have been very different. When this situation came to light, we informed POB of the matter and discovered that the source of information for EOLA 20345 was NEUWIRTH (not DIO/uh as cited incorrectly in that dispatch). This, plus NEUWIRTH's data on V-22354, shows NEUWIRTH as a person with a rather keen scent for detecting StB agents. His motivation for fingering such types is not known. The source of information on which EOLA 19879 was based was [redacted] and we did not further pursue these leads. We had originally hoped that through Subject case we could obtain a good view of a large segment of StB espionage in the Federal Republic.

8. As it has been noted previously, V-22354 and many of his friends and associates are persons of above-average ability and importance. The StB obviously appreciated this fact and attempted to exploit it. In the same manner, UPSWING has made a considerable effort to develop the cases into a broad CART picture. Unfortunately, not very much has come of this effort as far as we know. In fact, as SKUTZBACH has recently told me, most of the Czech cases which came to light in 1956 either are petering out, are dormant, or have been discontinued. The most recent case to be reported, however, is a clear-cut exception. This has been reported in PULL-6157 and further details will be reported in EOLA-21969

SECRET

0000 0000 1444

SECRET

EOLA-21969

Page 4

9. The reasons for this lack of activity in the Czech cases will be described in separate dispatches, as they pertain to the individual cases. However, it should be said here that although we may not know of all of UPSWING's Czech cases, probably a reason accounting for the seeming lethargy we have noted is a series of events over which the StB has no more effective control than does UPSWING: illness of agents, case officers unsuitable for handling respective agents, job problems of the agents, etc.

10. I spoke with @KUTZBACH again on the 6th of August to ascertain what plans there were for further development of Subject case. He stated that the case had been discussed with @KUEHNE, @WINTERSTEIN, @DREESKE, and @REITER, not to mention his own CART section superiors. He stated that @KUEHNE took the position that UPSWING should not exert any efforts to direct the agent's activities in the Federal Republic within Sudeten Landsmannschaft groups. Apparently, @KUEHNE felt that such efforts would be improper and that little or no control could be exerted over the agent in this field of private activity. Under active consideration at that time was a proposal made by @REITER, designed to clear up, once and for all, the doubts regarding the agent's bona fides. This plan called for the inserting into the operation a fluent, Czech-speaking UPSWINGer who would pose as a substitute for V-22354's Czech contact. When I asked how such details as communications, recognition signals, etc., would be worked out so as not to tip the agent to the fact that this was a double-play on UPSWING's part, @KUTZBACH replied that such details had not as yet been devised, but that if the plan were put into practice and UPSWING felt convinced that the agent was on the level with them, they would frankly tell him that he had been subjected to a test. On the other hand, if it were clear that V-22354 was under Czech control, a decision would then have been made whether to redouble him under pressure or terminate the case. This interesting, if questionable plan of action never got off the ground, no doubt due in part to @KUTZBACH's illness and his departure for the U.S. almost immediately after his recovery.

11. At any rate, the agent met his Czech contact in Salzburg on 16 September, as noted in EOLA-211431. Also as noted therein, he received no new missions, and he and his Czech case officer merely engaged in general political discussion. He was told to attend a meeting again in Salzburg in December of 1956. This meeting never transpired and so far as is known, contact with the StB through V-22354 has been discontinued. The reason for this is the fact that the agent has obtained a job as Referent for atomic energy affairs within the Bavarian Arbeitsministerium. Clearly, it was not regarded as being within the interests of the Federal Republic for the agent to maintain contact with the StB and have to supply information to them on a matter of such delicacy. Therefore, the case was turned over to the Bavarian LfV for such action as they consider appropriate. Presumably, they have instructed the agent to drop contact with the StB.

12. Only one final item in the last stage of the operation remains in doubt. @KUTZBACH stated that V-22354 was instructed to drop all contact, including mail contact. Presumably, therefore, the agent did not inform

SECRET

0000 0000 1445

**SECRET**

ECLA-21969  
Page 5

his StB handler, one way or the other, that he would not attend the meeting in Salzburg in December. Nevertheless, it may be noteworthy that the latter did not himself appear for the meeting as ascertained by UPSWING surveillance. It may be that the agent wrote to an StB cover address informing them of the latest turn of events; or it may simply be a case of error on the part of the StB or even their desire to drop the case.

13. As far as we know, the Czech contact of V-22354 and V-22356 is the same person. However, we have no confirmation of the possibility that he is identical with V-22355's contact. Although the physical descriptions compare in many instances (except most notably in the case of the ears), UPSWING headquarters has never taken the position that the StB is using the same handler for all three agents.

*Handwritten note:* 2.12.20.21

*Handwritten:* - removed here

*Handwritten:* [ ]  
[ ]  
[ ]

**SECRET**