

22 January 1954

SUBJECT: 12 January 1954 Contact and Discussion with AECAMBISTA 2.

1. In discussing the overall W/T traffic with AECAMBISTA 2, he immediately broached the issue of posing the questions which he submitted to us. Instead of attempting to justify the need for posing the questions, he began to attack [redacted] for having side-tracked the suggestions which he, as the representative of the BSR, has made in the past. This attack upon [redacted] was made notwithstanding the fact that the undersigned had only met AECAMBISTA 2 for the first time and that this transpired within the first ten minutes of the conversation (in Russian, but in [redacted] presence). The undersigned attempted to placate AECAMBISTA 2 and preclude continuation of this outbreak by stating that at no time has there been any attempt to ignore any suggestion made by AECAMBISTA 2. An attempt was then made to determine the reasoning behind the questions. AECAMBISTA 2 was made aware of the fact that some of the questions were particularly invalid and that one had to keep in mind what the answer would be in preparing questions to be posed. AECAMBISTA 2 was unable to give any justification for wanting to have the questions posed except that "he had an equal right to submit questions to the boys". He felt that some of the questions might evoke answers which would give him some basis for the preparation of scripts and propaganda which could be transmitted to the Byelorussian people via TPLINOO.

After the undersigned reiterated the explanation previously given to AECAMBISTA 2 that the questions submitted by him could not be posed indiscriminantly without waiting for opportune moments and that the questions could not be interspersed into any of the messages individually unless they appeared to conform to the established pattern. This appeared to subdue his emotional outbreak but he nonetheless concluded by blaming [redacted] for not having given him this type of an explanation heretofore.

2. Although the entire conversation with AECAMBISTA 2 during this initial encounter did not last more than one-half of an hour, he did not seem to hesitate in jumping into accusations and recriminations. However, when he was confronted with the proposal that he make certain constructive suggestions, he was unable to offer a single concrete idea. His entire conversation was plaintive and defensively critical. He insisted on closer cooperation in the future in all aspects of our collaboration. When queried whether he had anything specific which he felt should have been coordinated with, he was again unable to name any concrete items. The undersigned could not help but conclude that AECAMBISTA 2 was wholly unjustified in his attacks upon [redacted] inasmuch as each point, when pursued to its logical conclusion, was conceded by AECAMBISTA 2.

3. On the basis of the above brief discussion, the undersigned chided AECAMBISTA 2 for his apparently unreasonable demands and for risking the rupture of our relationship by his pettiness and childishness. He dismissed the entire incident, more or less, with a mental shrug of the shoulders. He re-emphasized his desire to discuss with the undersigned the details and possible ramifications of the pattern established in the W/T traffic.

4. The undersigned next undertook to discuss the security aspects of our relationship with AECAMBISTA 1. AECAMBISTA 2 was enlightened with the fact that

it had come to our knowledge that persons, unauthorized to possess information about operational details, appeared to display considerable familiarity with certain aspects of the dispatch and activities of Team 2. When the undersigned requested AECAMBISTA 2 to prepare a list of those individuals with whom he may have discussed details on the composition of, dispatch, and activities of the team on the inside, AECAMBISTA 2 stated with a matter-of-course attitude "that the entire emigration knew the four boys". When pressed further he stated that he would attempt to prepare the requested list of individuals with whom he had discussed items of operational detail. Throughout this entire security briefing, AECAMBISTA 2 expressed an attitude of unconcern and evident disinterest in an attempt to minimize our concerns in this regard.

5. The topic discussed immediately prior to adjourning was broached by AECAMBISTA 2 but appeared to have been thrown out in passing only. He alleged that one of the Byelorussians in Louvain, Belgium, Evgeniy SMARTSEK aka SMARCOK, received a letter from an undisclosed source in Poland. This undisclosed source (name not given although requested) had previously received a letter from one ZHELEZOWSKA, sister of SMARTSEK's wife, living near Novogradok, BSSR. From ZHELEZOWSKA, according to AECAMBISTA 2's supposition, had been contacted by his father-in-law (CAVADOR 1) who had requested that ZHELEZOWSKA write to the West via the established channels and inquire concerning the whereabouts of his daughter (AECAMBISTA 2's wife). The original letter written by ZHELEZOWSKA had not been sent to SMARTSEK but rather another written by the undisclosed source. Within the letter received there were only two or so questions about AECAMBISTA 2's wife. When queried as to the date that the letter had been received in Belgium, AECAMBISTA 2 stated that it was during the latter part of December 1953. After some hesitation he added that it was received on 31 December. When queried further as to the date that it had been posted in Poland, he appeared to be evading the issue by stating that he would not be able to know when ZHELEZOWSKA's letter had been posted. When pressed further and asked specifically, he stated that the letter received by SMARTSEK was posted "approximately a week" before its receipt. After some further hesitation, he stated that it was the 25th but changed that to the 23rd. AECAMBISTA 2 was asked if he could produce the letter for our examination (as it was of interest to us in view of the fact that ZHELEZOWSKA was located in an operational area of interest to us) but he immediately replied that he could not "because what would SMARTSEK think if I asked to keep it for a while". The entire subject was not pressed further inasmuch as the entire narration appeared somewhat incomprehensible. Particularly difficult to understand is the portion about his inability to produce the letter. SMARTSEK has been a subordinate of AECAMBISTA 2 in the emigration, owes an obligation of sorts to AECAMBISTA 2 because of his status as student with the Byelorussian group, and had also been employed by AECAMBISTA 2 as an assistant in conducting the census in Belgium. AECAMBISTA 2, although querying the case officers as to the desirable course of action re this letter, stated that he had decided to send in a photograph of his children; this photograph, already taken for this purpose, will be enclosed in SMARTSEK's next letter to the undisclosed source for transmittal to []

The entire incident about the receipt of this letter may bear a further check, CE-wise, in view of the fact that CAVADOR 1 has been contacted several times by AECAMBISTA 2 who was able to relate to CAVADOR 1 re his daughter's whereabouts and personal safety. If the letter were actually received and if AECAMBISTA 2 did not concoct the entire incident (which is not to be excluded in view of his hesitancy and apparent manufacturing of details during the course of the conversation), it is difficult to understand why CAVADOR 1 would be attempting to make queries of his daughter's safety and whereabouts. If the UCC Team 2 is uncontrolled, []

knows that any untoward action on his part may compromise not only himself, although sending messages through cut-outs, but the team as well. Possibility also exists that [] was attempting to establish contact with AEGAMBISTA 2 (and his wife) at the urging of the Team 2 members. If controlled, however, the entire incident if true may have an even greater number of meanings.

[]