

AMA

OSB-A-6131

JUL 24 1953

Chief of Base, Pullach

Chief, Berlin Operations Case

LEPO: 208, BOMM, SAKHAIN

CALL/Operational

CASLET-3

Ref: GILL-0066 Para 2

1. In order to preclude any crossing of wires with CASLET-3 I questioned CASLET-2 on 29 July 1953 along the lines indicated in reference. I pointed out to him that I considered this a strictly personal matter, which I would not under any circumstances divulge to CASLET-3. I further stressed that I appreciated his position and that - as far as I was concerned - he was free to affiliate himself with any bona fide intelligence agency of his choosing. However, I could not afford to be placed in the position laying myself open to the charge of proselytizing. Should he therefore intimate to me that he considered himself a victim of conflicting loyalties, I would withdraw immediately and without cavil. After all - I pointed out to him - our relationship was a strictly derivative one, in the sense that I was primarily dealing with his superior, CASLET-3, and only for convenience sake had been placed in touch with him.

2. CASLET-2 replied that he had nothing whatsoever to hide. It was news to him that he should be considered a purveyor of political intelligence to the ~~RAF~~ organization. He was not aware of ever having, known to him as such, engaged in any direct intelligence dealings with a RAF representative nor had his cooperation along intelligence lines ever been asked for. He had known HOELZ, whom he knew to be a RAF man, but his contacts with that individual had been strictly within the purview of his duties as a journalist. Source "HOELZ", (Ref. OSB-5299), on the other hand, should be turned out to be a RAF operative, could hardly claim to have recruited him as an agent. After all, CASLET-3 was paying "HOELZ" and not the other way round. (In evidence of this fact CASLET-2 produced two receipts, the last one dated 29 July 1953, in the amount of ~~£~~20.00).

3. I vainly pressed CASLET-2 to divulge any facts that could possibly be construed as supporting the contention that he is a RAF co-worker. I asked him whether he considered it possible that someone else on his employer's staff was passing information to RAF, e.g. someone named

Date of origin: 29 July 1953

gipibjt

Distribution:

2-OSB: 1-CAS: 1-AM

1-AM: 1-CAS: 1-AM

*Zippner has had this numbered  
Add to this CASLET-2 P ( )*

NEULAND?

"NEULAND". CARLIT, without displaying symptoms of discomfort, denied that there was anyone of that name on that staff. I asked whether the "FRIGOL" report on the meeting of the IIP with SEMENOV could possibly have been passed thru any channels other than CARF and myself, which he denied. (This, of course, is at variance with the established fact that IIPSA got hold of that particular report and disseminated it). In this connection CARLIT-2 mentioned that approximately six months ago CARLIT-2 had told him that he had an outlet for military information. Could CARLIT-2 let him have material of that type. CARLIT-2 at the time reported this occurrence to CARLIT. In the retrospect he deems it possible that CARLIT-2 has a direct channel to IIPSA.

4. Speaking up by my own impressions, I would not go as far as stating that CARLIT-2 is not a co-worker of the IIPSA organization. He is not a man known for a passionate adhesion to truth and there of course always remains the possibility that someone is capitalizing on his sexual propensities. Possibly his relations with NEULAND had been much closer than he is making them out to have been. Conceivably NEULAND did consider CARLIT-2 a political source and reported accordingly, assigning him a pseudonym. For all this I cannot vouch. However, I would be inclined to credit his protestations that he is not NEULAND in any way connected with IIPSA, if it weren't for the appearance of the "FRIGOL" report on IIPSA dissemination channels.

5. I would greatly appreciate if you could pursue this matter further. In fashioning my own relationship with CARLIT-2 I am naturally curious to establish whether he has been telling me the truth. I specifically warned CARLIT-2 not to broadcast the allegations which I had brought to his notice. If he is in fact a IIPSA man, he will undoubtedly speak to his case officer and you are bound to find out it sooner or later. In that case I suggest that you tell your IIPSA contacts that the American case officer involved, as soon as he heard about a possibility of conflicting jurisdictions, faced CARLIT-2 with the evidence and offered to withdraw, but that in the face of CARLIT-2's strong denials of any IIPSA affiliation such action appeared unwarranted.

6. Ref. BU 1-6066, Para 3: May I request that you abstain from taking the proposed action? I have thus far been fairly successful in ferretting out CARLIT-2's sources.

Approved by: