

***SWEDISH ASPECTS OF THE  
RAOUL WALLENBERG CASE***

***Susanne Berger***

Susanne Berger  
4793 Williamsburg Blvd  
Arlington, VA 22207  
Tel/Fax: 703 237 0946  
sberger@prodigy.net

**Preface**

**Acknowledgments**

## **A. GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

1. Project Description

## **B. BEYOND THE GROMYKO MEMORANDUM**

1. Introduction
2. Russian Archive Documentation
3. Witness Testimonies after 1947
  - a. Moscow Prisons
  - b. Transit Points
  - c. Special Camps
  - d. Isolator Prisons
  - e. Psychiatric Hospitals
  - f. Other
4. Informal Contacts and Possible Offers of Exchange
  - a. Barck-Holst/Soederblom
  - b. Kindermann
  - c. Erzine-Frey-Vladimirov
  - d. Svartz/Myasnikov
  - e. Svingel

## **C. THE HUMANITARIAN MISSION TO BUDAPEST, 1944 - 1945**

1. Introduction
2. Preparation of the Mission
  - a. Business Contacts
  - b. Intelligence Contacts
3. Raoul Wallenberg's Activities and Contacts in Budapest
  - a. The Hungarian Resistance/Allied Intelligence
  - b. German Contacts

## **D. RESPONSES TO RAOUL WALLENBERG'S DISAPPEARANCE**

1. Introduction
2. Staffan Soederblom
3. The Swedish Foreign Office/Swedish Intelligence
4. The Soviet Union
5. The United States
6. The Wallenberg Family

## **E. CONCLUSIONS**

1. Summary and Conclusions

### **Preface**

This is an abridged version of the original research report "Swedish Aspects of the Raoul Wallenberg Case". Appendix, the Archive List, all Endnotes, as well as sections under each sub-heading which include suggestions for future research, have been omitted. In addition, some sections have been edited in order to provide the most comprehensive information. The full research report is on file at the archives of the Swedish Security Police and Swedish Foreign Office.

### **Acknowledgements**

Anyone who has ever been involved in the Raoul Wallenberg question knows how much energy it takes to move an issue forward. That is why I would like to begin this report with a heartfelt thanks to all the people who helped me with my research.

My special thanks go to Guy and Matilda von Dardel, as well as Louise von Dardel and Marie and Patrick Dupuy for their dedication to finding the truth about Raoul Wallenberg's fate has never wavered and who offered me their support; and to my fellow independent consultants in the Working Group, Susan Ellen Mesinai, Dr. Marvin Mak and Ari Kaplan.

I am very grateful to Dr. Vadim Birstein who allowed access to his vast archive and still unpublished manuscript who provided much needed assistance with Russian materials.

I thank both Chairmen of the Swedish-Russian Working Group, the members on both sides, as well as all administrative staff.

I am especially grateful to the following individuals who have helped me in numerous ways:

Gerard Aalders, Gun-Britt Agard, Daniel Backman, George Barany, Vladimir Berzon, Greg Bradsher, Broniatowski, Julie Cartwright, Shraga Elam, Kenne Fant, Mats Foyer, Christoph Gann, Patricia Grimsted, Steffen Gullgren, Alexander Gurianov, Erik and Vanja Hammerfeldt, Horace Heafner, Sven-Fredrik Hedin, Sven Holtsma, Yngve Horndahl, Mai-Brit Jarnevall, Sven Johansson, Agata Karolak, Ingemar Karlsson, Amy Knight, Kuzovkin, Leonore Kius, Stefan Lindgren, Gunnar Linnander, Therese Mattson, Guillermina Medrano-Supervia, Tom Nagler, Alla Oganova, Dick Ohman, Lage Olson, Pentti Peltoniemi, Nikita Petrov, Anatoli Prokopenko,

Rehberg, Arne Ruth, J.Rythven and Elizabeth Ryan, Natalya Samsonova, Helen Soos, Maureen Sundin, Eva Toj Gluckman, Gunvor Svartz-Malmberg, Eva-Britta Wallberg, John Taylor, Johan Wallqvist.

The same gratitude goes to those individuals who spoke to me on the condition of anonymity.

## A. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

### 1. Project Description

Fifty-six years have passed since Raoul Wallenberg disappeared into Soviet captivity and still there is no answer to the central question: What happened to Raoul Wallenberg? But an even larger mystery remains: Why, after so many years, do we still have no information which would clarify Wallenberg's fate?

Experts are divided about the reasons for this lack of information. In its research, the Swedish-Russian Work Group has taken three possibilities into account:

1. *No additional material exists in Russian archives today*, except for the materials that were handed over to the government and representatives of Raoul Wallenberg's family over the years. All relevant material is either lost or destroyed by individuals with personal connections to the case who wished to avoid embarrassment and/or possible punishment in later years.
2. *Some documentation exists, but simply cannot be located*. This means Russian archivists are left to search for proverbial needle in a haystack, with very limited prospects for success.
3. *Relevant documentation survives, some of it as a special, secret collection under direct control of the government or the Russian Security Services*. In addition, there are a number of individuals with firsthand knowledge of the case who have not shared what they know. Knowledge about and access to the relevant material is limited to a small circle of individuals.

In view of the scarcity of material which relates directly to Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish-Russian Work Group over the last three years has focused its attention on the study of materials which can provide indirect clues to Raoul Wallenberg's captivity. This includes, for example, the prisoner files of his cellmates and other prisoners, as well as Soviet administrative records. This piecing together of a 'Paper Trail' chronicling Raoul Wallenberg's movement through the GULAG was initiated by Susan E. Mesinai, a special independent consultant to the Work Group. A quantitative analysis of cell occupancy and prisoner movements in and out of Vladimir prison, the facility where witnesses most frequently report of having met or heard about Raoul Wallenberg, was conducted by Dr. M. Makinen and Ari Kaplan. In addition, the Working Group continued with interviewing individuals with knowledge about the case or the system that handled a special prisoner such as Raoul Wallenberg.

There are several advantages to pursuing the Raoul Wallenberg question through indirect inquiry. Most important is the fact that such an inquiry touches on documentary material which would not have been subject to withdrawal or destruction by Soviet and later Russian authorities. Indirect clues are much harder to eradicate consistently and are therefore, much more likely to remain in the files. One important disadvantage is that the indirect approach requires piecing together hidden connections and clues from files which remain restricted, to a large extent. Such an undertaking, then, is extremely difficult and time consuming, but definitely worth the effort.

As outlined above, aside from possibly lost or destroyed material, we must also consider the possibility that relevant material has been intentionally withheld. In other words, it should be investigated if the failure to clarify Wallenberg's fate is in some form linked to the wish to keep other issues surrounding his captivity a secret. As to the nature of this link, there exist several possibilities. The reasons behind Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance could be confined strictly to internal Soviet-Russian social and political conditions;

personal or inner political rivalries, for example, or fear of present day accountability, should the truth differ significantly from the official Soviet claim that Raoul Wallenberg died in 1947, i.e., different cause of death and/or a different death. On the other hand, the revelation of what happened to Raoul Wallenberg might touch upon external political issues, i.e., the truth might affect relations with other countries.

If we consider the second scenario, we need to examine more closely the fundamental aspects of the Wallenberg case, especially the possible socio-political ramifications of his disappearance over time. To do that, we need to slightly broaden the focus of our investigation to include the possible reasons behind his fate, not only in Russia but also in Sweden. Why was Raoul Wallenberg arrested? Who were his cellmates and why was he placed with them? What was known about him at the time of his arrest? Did Raoul Wallenberg's background affect how his case was handled in both Russia and Sweden? Why was the Swedish government unable to secure his release? In addition to internal Russian conditions, clues to the reasons behind Wallenberg's fate may also be found in the further study and analysis of Raoul Wallenberg's personal and professional background, his contacts and activities in Budapest in 1944-45, and a thorough review of political realities at the time of Raoul Wallenberg's arrest and subsequent years. This should include a close look at private and official Swedish-Russian contacts in the question, as well as related matters which may have influenced the handling of the case, such as Cold War political concerns, strategic and economic interests and Swedish neutrality policy. Analysis of the Raoul Wallenberg case as it relates to these issues could prove of central importance to the ongoing efforts to pose truly pertinent questions to Russia.

Our main challenge, therefore, was to effectively supplement the Working Group's research strategy, especially the projects by Ms. Mesinai and Dr. Makinen, by providing additional avenues of research while keeping the central focus of their research intact. The goal was to maximize these new areas of inquiry in order to identify additional documentation. As outlined earlier, such an approach is all the more needed in the Wallenberg case, where critical documentation has been lost or destroyed. In our research, we made use of two types of records:

- a) Swedish archival documentation
- b) "Captured Records" and related materials

[Note: The term "Captured Records" refers to materials that were captured by Russian frontline troops in occupied territories during WWII. A copy of the research proposal for these and related records is on file at the Swedish Foreign Ministry.]

As concerns Swedish materials, Dr. Guy von Dardel and I proposed that the Working Group conduct a full review of all available Swedish materials in the Raoul Wallenberg case. The intention was twofold:

- a) To study and extract all information from currently available material, especially the Raoul Wallenberg collection at the Swedish Foreign Office Archive, for details which would assist the ongoing investigation in Russia, particularly a review of prisoner files.
- b) To search for additional relevant material from other Swedish agencies, including the Swedish Security Service [SAEPO] and the Intelligence Services, which so far has not been part of the official Raoul Wallenberg collection. This is again, to serve primarily the inquiry in Russia but also to provide important information for questions remaining in Sweden.

This request was rejected by the Swedish side. We, therefore, conducted our research in a private capacity, although, by necessity, the scope of the project became much smaller than what would have been possible with official support. We decided, from the beginning, not to withhold from the Working Group any information which might potentially advance the investigation in Russia; and as a result, findings have been shared throughout with both Dr. Mesinai and Dr. Makinen and vice versa.

An Interim Report on the Review of Swedish Materials was presented to the Working Group in January 1999.

After months of discussions and delays, Swedish and Russian approval was finally granted for a review of the so-called "Trophy" [captured] records and related materials in Russian archives. Due to the drawn out approval process and resulting scheduling difficulties, only one two week research trip has been made in May of 2000. Therefore, the documentation and findings discussed here emerge from the study of Swedish materials as well as relevant Russian archival material that has been available through the Working Group.

Consistent with the chosen research approach, this report develops in two separate parts: First, the question of what may have happened to Raoul Wallenberg after 1947 is addressed. Subsequently, this is supplemented with a review of material that might be helpful in addressing the reasons behind his fate. This is an investigative report, not a historical study or analysis. The Working Group has considered two options as a starting point for its research: That Raoul Wallenberg died in 1947, or that he disappeared. Since the official Soviet/Russian claim is that Wallenberg died in 1947, the report focuses in some detail on alternative scenarios that have not received adequate attention. This report, however, draws no final conclusions.

## **B. BEYOND THE GROMYKO MEMORANDUM**

### 1. Introduction

On July 17, 1997, Swedish Foreign Minister Lena Hjelm-Wallen received a message from her counterpart, then Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeni Primakov, which began with the following sentence: “*If the authorities can be believed*, today marks fifty years after Raoul Wallenberg’s death... [my italics].”

The evasive language bore strange similarity to the vague formulations that had marked a key document in Raoul Wallenberg case, the so called ‘Gromyko Memorandum’, presented by Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on February 6, 1957. The memorandum included a note supposedly written by Lubyanka prison doctor A.L. Smoltskov which stated that Raoul Wallenberg had died of a heart attack on July 17, 1947 in Moscow. Remarkably, four decades and the fall of the Soviet Union had failed to erase either the ambiguity of language used in official communications or the uncertainty about Raoul Wallenberg’s true fate.

It appeared that Yevgeni Primakov, just like his Soviet predecessors in 1957, wanted to leave the door slightly ajar, in case new and conflicting information would emerge, such as that Raoul Wallenberg had suffered a different kind of death or had died on a different date. Privately, Russian archivists and historians have long suggested Smoltskov report was true, if not in word, then in meaning. That is, Raoul Wallenberg definitely died in 1947, but not by a heart attack.

Making this line of argument public for the first time did not fall to the Russian experts of the Swedish-R Working Group, but to Alexander Yakovlev, Chief of the Russian President's Commission on Rehabilitation of Victims of Repression. On December 6, 2000, Yakovlev essentially invalidated the Smoltsov report by revealing Russian archival documents show that the doctor had in fact been dismissed from his services already on March 2, 1947. Therefore, he could not have authored the document on July 17, 1947. Yakovlev then took his argument a step further: If Raoul Wallenberg did not die of a heart attack, he *must* have been shot and Smoltsov was later brought retroactively cover up the fact. He added that it was futile to look for documentation that such an execution had in fact taken place, because all materials on Raoul Wallenberg's fate had been destroyed long ago.

As further support for his argument that Raoul Wallenberg died on July 17, 1947, Yakovlev cited the statement of a witness who supposedly met a man who had heard another person confess to Raoul Wallenberg's execution. In his final argument that Raoul Wallenberg must have been killed in 1947, Russian officials claim that Raoul Wallenberg could not be released or exchanged, because as a result of various interrogations he knew too much about the area of interests of the Soviet Intelligence Services.

What follows below, then, is an examination of the issues raised by the standard line of argumentation which asserts that Raoul Wallenberg must have died in 1947: 2. Russian Archive Documentation, 3. Witness Reports of 1947 and 4. Possible Exchange Opportunities.

## 2. Russian Archive Documentation

All sides in the Wallenberg investigation agree that something significant happened or some key decision about Raoul Wallenberg's fate was made on or around July 17, 1947. On that date, Minister of State Security Nikolai Shchepetilnikov sent a letter to Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov, shortly after Deputy Foreign Minister A. Vishinsky asked for "a solution" ["liquidatsiya"] of the Raoul Wallenberg case. Around the same time, mostly between July 1947, many of Raoul Wallenberg's cellmates were interrogated and isolated. In addition, all 'serious' contacts and sightings of Raoul Wallenberg supposedly end with this date.

After Swedish Minister Staffan Soederblom's disastrous meetings with J.V. Stalin June 15 1946, Swedish government's failure to react to Soviet signals of a possible exchange later that year, Stalin had to decide to do with Raoul Wallenberg. The central question was: Had Wallenberg become useless or was Stalin not yet ready to make a final decision?

The question: 'What happened on July 17, 1947?' is clearly the central issue in Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance. The Russian position, however, ignores the idea that if Raoul Wallenberg did not die of a heart attack at execution is not the only alternative. All of the currently available documentation in the case is entirely consistent with both scenarios: a) that Raoul Wallenberg died on July 17, 1947, and b) that Raoul Wallenberg disappeared. None of the material contradicts any of the established procedures in the Soviet administrative system for turning a 'regular' prisoner into a 'secret/isolated' one [see Susan E. Mesina's report 'Liquidatsia: Death or Disappearance?']. So far, the Russian side has offered not one convincing piece of documentation in support of its claim that Raoul Wallenberg was executed.

Realistically, in July 1947 Stalin had only three options: He could execute Raoul Wallenberg, he could exchange him or he could make him an isolated prisoner. When an execution took place in the Soviet system, a record was kept at all times, even though the method of record keeping may have varied over time. Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov explained this procedure in his "Memoirs": "...*The Soviet authorities have maintained that Raoul Wallenberg died in Moscow's Lubyanka Prison in 1947 and the file of his case was destroyed. The latter assertion is almost certainly untrue: ... I learned about all this from G., a KGB officer who'd had the job of sorting files from the 1930's and 1940's. In every case the first page of the [investigative] file was retained. If a person had been executed, an affidavit that the death sentence had been carried out was included, with a record of the serial number of the pistol used.*" At a press conference in September 1989 Sakharov also stressed the importance for Soviet authorities of preserving documentation for the sake of future accountability: "... *The file of a Foreign Diplomat isn't likely to be destroyed as it might one day prove very important for the reputation of the country and its leadership. ...*"

In evaluating the scenario of a possible execution, it is important to consider *what does not happen*. For example, in Raoul Wallenberg's case no false medical history and death certificate were produced as were for the Communist spy Isaac [Isaac] Oggins who was executed in 1947. Then there is the surprising vagueness of the Gromyko memorandum, with the misspelling of Raoul Wallenberg's

[“Wallenberg”] and its careful language, i.e., that the discovered Smoltsov note “appears” to refer to Wallenberg, e

If the Soviets had wanted to close the case once and for all, they could have produced an impressive array of documentation that would have let Raoul Wallenberg’s death appear much more certain and, more importantly, less binding. Either the Soviet government wanted to leave the door open in the case, or it was not sure that it had covered all people who may have had contact with Raoul Wallenberg after 1947 and wanted to guard against witnesses.

It is also useful to look at *what in fact did happen*. On July 17, 1947, the day Raoul Wallenberg had died, Abakumov sent Stalin a ten page memorandum entitled: “*Report about the practices in the organs of MGB conducting investigations on the affairs of spies, saboteurs, terrorists and members of the anti-Soviet underground*” [see Document 1, Appendix] The report outlines in great detail the methods used by the Soviet Secret Services to identify and eradicate various intelligence networks that had existed during World War II and beyond. The document illustrates how obsessed the Soviet leadership was with this question and, more importantly, what Stalin’s focus was the summer of 1947. Abakumov’s memo also describes in detail how information is to be extracted from prisoners through intensive interrogation and, if necessary, by torture.

At the same time, the work of MGB and MVD was undergoing a detailed review and reorganization. Since 1946, the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers had issued a number of decisions concerning MGB and MVD work. In February 1947 MGB issued order 0048 “On the Improvement of the Counterintelligence Work against American and British Intelligence.” Wallenberg, as a prominent foreigner with relatively recent experiences in Hungary where he had had contact with a wide variety of intelligence networks, may have been an extremely valuable captive in this connection. From the testimonies of Wallenberg’s fellow prisoners, it is known that Soviet authorities had accused Raoul Wallenberg of espionage on behalf of the United States and/or Nazi Germany. Immediately after Wallenberg’s arrest in 1945, rumors began to circulate that he would be used as a witness in show trials against Czech and Hungarian collaborators. A former Hungarian official AVO/AVH [Hungarian Secret Intelligence] has testified [1984] that in January 1953 Soviet liaison officials had told him that Raoul Wallenberg was to be used as a witness in an upcoming show trial. After Stalin’s death in March 1953, plans for the trial were abandoned. No documentation from either Russian or Hungarian archives has been provided to clarify if there were ever serious considerations about using Raoul Wallenberg as a possible witness, and if he was to appear in person.

In July 1947, Raoul Wallenberg’s case, compared with other cases, was still at an early stage of processing. The research of both Ms Mesina and Dr. Vadim Birstein shows, prisoners were sentenced largely in groups. Foreign diplomats, like Raoul Wallenberg, were sentenced mostly in 1948. Some of the prisoners who had shared a cell with Vilmos Langfelder were processed even later, some as late as 1951/52. According to the available interrogation registers from Lefortovo and Lubianka prisons, Raoul Wallenberg had not been interrogated intensively up until July 1947, which appears to indicate that the investigative phase of his case had not yet begun in earnest. Some prisoners sat in captivity for years without being interrogated more than a few times. Then, suddenly, their cases entered the stage of active processing and they would be interrogated intensively over several months. It needs to be examined further whether or not the Soviet leadership would have killed Raoul Wallenberg if they had attempted to extract from him the important information he undoubtedly possessed.

The July 17, 1947 letter from Abakumov to Stalin is important in two other respects. According to a reference in the private archival collection of Soviet Military Historian, General D. Volkogonov, this particular letter was found in the Russian Presidential Archives. The document was never presented to the Swedish side because it does not refer to Wallenberg directly, which means that Raoul Wallenberg’s name is not mentioned in the text. Yet the document is clearly relevant for the investigation of Raoul Wallenberg’s fate, since it helps to establish the bureaucratic and political realities that existed during the critical time of the spring and summer 1947. This illustrates the problem in conducting a search of archives through intermediaries.

Even with the best intentions, valuable documentation may not be recognized simply because the individuals who carry out the research may not be sufficiently familiar with the background of the case. Abakumov’s letter to Stalin further establishes the use of torture during interrogation as a means of obtaining ‘confessions’ from prisoners. Soviet officials have claimed that strict rules existed against such practices. The documented use of torture in interrogations becomes relevant for the evaluation of the veracity of witness testimonies, for example. [See below, 2. Testimonies after 1947]

In the assessment of Y. P. Pitovranov, former Chief of the 2nd Main Directorate MGB, Stalin would not have executed Raoul Wallenberg. In an interview with Swedish Television in 1992, Pitovranov stated, that “*Stalin would not have killed him. He needed him for the political game.*” Pitovranov further states that he did not see Raoul Wallenberg in captivity, but in his mind Raoul Wallenberg’s death “*was a mistake.*” When asked to elaborate, Pitovranov said, “*Some analysts have suggested that men like Pitovranov simply push away the idea that Stalin could have ordered the execution of an innocent man. Such examples of blind loyalty are not uncommon among the older members of the*



Soviet Intelligence circles. Yet, Pitovranov's statement deserves closer scrutiny, including his indirect suggestion Raoul Wallenberg's death may have been the result of an overzealous interrogation or similar 'mistake.'

As the letter from Deputy Foreign Minister A.J. Vishinsky to Molotov from May 13 1947, shows, the Soviet Foreign Ministry clearly felt pressure in 1947 to give Sweden a definite answer about Raoul Wallenberg. Abakur note to Molotov on July 17, 1947 almost certainly reflects this decision. Instead of executing Raoul Wallenberg, may have decided to charge and sentence him in order to quickly process him further. In order to guard any witness reports about Raoul Wallenberg in Soviet captivity, Stalin could have ordered to make him a secret and to try to control through isolation the witnesses who had seen or heard of Wallenberg up until July 1947. One interrogator/interpreters of the Third Main Directorate [MGB] has testified that some time in 1947 he saw one of draw up an elaborate diagram of prisoners who had had contact with Wallenberg in captivity. The purpose of the supposedly was to be able to carefully monitor the movements of these prisoners in the future.

And indeed, as the official Swedish Report makes clear, none of the prisoners who see either Vilmos Langi Raoul Wallenberg before July 1947 ever meet them again. This, however, is no proof that both men definitely did. Instead, the fact that there are no more witness reports after 1947 might well have been the result of the strict isolation that would have been imposed on secret prisoners.

It is also consistent with the fact that all testimonies from Vladimir prison come not from foreigners [who released and could tell about Raoul Wallenberg] but from Soviet citizens or citizens of Soviet satellite countries, from V. Shulgin in 1947 to J. Terelya in 1970.

If Raoul Wallenberg was made a secret prisoner, he may have been kept under a different name or he may have been assigned a number. Susan Mesinai's prisoner file analysis shows how from currently existing records it may be possible to identify which number Raoul Wallenberg may have received around July 1947. As for keeping him under a different name, a hint of that possibility emerges from a response by the Deputy Head of the First Main Directorate [KGB], A. Sakharovsky, to an inquiry by the Head of the Scandinavian Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry [MID], M. G. Gribanov, on how to answer official Swedish inquiries about Raoul Wallenberg in December 1955 *better to mention, probably, that the reason for the lack of information about Wallenberg was caused by the fact that he might have been kept in the Soviet Union from the first days after the war until his death under another last name.* According to experts, Sakharovsky would have had to base his reply on written documentation, most likely Raoul Wallenberg's file. This document also clearly indicates that key information about Raoul Wallenberg existed with the Foreign Intelligence Section of the KGB, today's SVR, in the mid-fifties. A former employee of the First Directorate [then Committee of Information], S.A. Stepanov, has testified that in late 1950 he was requested by his superior, then head of the First Directorate, Kukin, to retrieve Raoul Wallenberg's file from the archives. [see also, Section Witness Testimonies after 1947.]

The witness further states that according to one of his colleagues who had worked in the archives of the First Directorate and who had also seen Raoul Wallenberg file, the material consisted of the so-called Lefortovo file, in which it was noted that Raoul Wallenberg died on July 17, 1947, as well as other papers which refer to Raoul Wallenberg under a different name. According to the witness, the papers showed that despite the note in the Lefortovo file and the Soviet claim that Raoul Wallenberg had died in 1947, Raoul Wallenberg had in fact lived well beyond 1947. Since July 17, 1947, Wallenberg had supposedly been registered under a different name and the request for his file in 1950 was made in the connection with an attempt by Soviet authorities to recruit him as an agent. If these two witnesses had access to the documentation, other former employees of Soviet Foreign Intelligence may have also seen the papers and learned more about the case than has been revealed so far.

There is some evidence that critical documentation may have been destroyed, especially in the mid-fifties or perhaps before. But aside from the difficulties of eradicating all documentary material due to the intricacies of the system, there remains important material that so far has not been accessible and/or has not been studied thoroughly enough. If Raoul Wallenberg was sentenced some time after 1947, his case would have moved over to the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], which -with a few important exceptions - administered the vast system of camps and prisons throughout the Soviet Union. While we have been assured by the Russian side that they have taken into account that MVD took over the Raoul Wallenberg case some time in July 1947, there are some lingering questions as to how the documentation would have been checked, especially for later years. As can be seen in the following section, '3.W. Reports after 1947,' it is possible to find traces of prisoners in the most obscure archival categories, even if the easily identifiable documentation is removed. Of the 4,904 NKVD-MVD files from 1944-1960 at GARF [State Archive Russian Federation], only a handful are currently available to researchers.

The Operational Committee's Fond 451 of the NKVD/MVD's Executive Committee for Questions concerning Prisoners of War and the Interned, [GUPVI], located at the Russian State Military Archives, contains its correspondence files which include reports from both central and local prison administrations about special prisons including in some cases excerpts from interrogations, and special letters to the highest levels of the Soviet government [Instantsi]. Certain sections of Fond 451, and related Fonds, were open to researchers in 1991, but since then have been completely closed. Russian officials have allowed the Swedish-Russian Working Group access to some of the cla

material, especially prisoner files, but it needs to be explored in much greater detail. A Russian Military Group studied Fond 451 on the Working Group's behalf during an eleven months period, but with close to 100,000 documents in the collection questions remain how thoroughly the material was in fact reviewed.

Critical correspondence material also exists for MGB and its successor organization, KGB [now FSB/SVR]. In important cases like Raoul Wallenberg's it appears that control of the case may have remained with MGB/KGB, and when it was formally under the administration of MVD. MGB/KGB would, for example, have had attempts to recruit Raoul Wallenberg as a Soviet agent. The Russian side did not permit any direct access to what was considered operational correspondence in any archive.

It is clear that the Soviet decision to arrest Raoul Wallenberg was made at the highest level of the Government. Deputy Defense Minister N. Bulganin himself signed the order for Wallenberg's arrest, which must have been issued with the knowledge or on direct order of Stalin. An aide to M. Gorbachev, V. Boldin, has stated that after Stalin's safe was opened after his death in 1953, Raoul Wallenberg's interrogation protocols were supposedly found there. If true, this would indicate that critical documentation was available in the case at least until then. Some of this documentation appears to have been withdrawn already before this time, as is indicated by a report from an official in the Soviet Foreign Ministry, A. Plakhin, in 1952, who notes that the letter from Abakumov to Molotov from July 1, 1947, can already not be located. It may have been destroyed, or the documentation may have been removed to another file.

Perhaps the file Stepanov claims he saw in the fall of 1950 in the archives of the First Directorate could have been such a file. This raises one of the central questions for the scenario that Raoul Wallenberg survived past 1947 perhaps lived past 1953: Who had control of Wallenberg's case after Stalin's death? The main responsibility would have rested with the Politbureau [Presidium]. Unfortunately, we have never seen the full Politbureau records for this period, and, more importantly, for the spring and summer 1947, when some of the critical decisions in the Raoul Wallenberg case were taken. As P. Sudoplatov points out in his book Special Tasks, if there would have been a decision to release Raoul Wallenberg, there should exist, as part of the record of the decisive meeting a written summary of his case.

The work of the Swedish Russian Working Group started its activity under KGB Chairman V. Kryuchkov, was replaced in 1991 after the August Putsch by V. V. Bakatin. Bakatin, in the German edition of his book Inside the KGB describes his disappointment that no material from the Intelligence Services, especially the KGB, were found that would shed light on the genesis of the notes which were sent via the Soviet Foreign Ministry to the Swedish government.

Aside from the file on Soviet agent M. P. Tolstoy-Kutusov who reported on Raoul Wallenberg's activities in Budapest in 1944, other important records clearly exist in both FSB and SVR archives that could be of great importance for the case. The protocols of the interrogations of the members of the Swedish Legation, Budapest, by Soviet agents in Hungary from early 1944, have been frequently requested but have yet to be shown. There are strong indications that the records have survived but are for some reason not made accessible. The Soviet 'rezidentura' in Stockholm has reported both on the Humanitarian Mission to Budapest, as well as on Raoul Wallenberg personally, before and after his disappearance. None of those records have been available for review. Also, P. Sudoplatov in Special Tasks mentions an important relationship between the Soviet Union and the Wallenberg family during World War II. Other former Soviet Intelligence officials have stated that one reason for Raoul Wallenberg's arrest was his direct connection to the Family. Sudoplatov specifically refers to the Wallenberg Family file in the archives of SVR, yet the Working Group has not been allowed to see any of the documentation. No representative from SVR was a member of the Swedish-Russian Working Group.

Even if critical documentation has been destroyed, there are many other records that may provide helpful avenues for inquiry. A nurse who had served in the Lefortovo Prison for decades, indicated in her testimony that journals on sick patients were kept diligently and were filed in the archives. She is convinced that these medical records survive in the archives of [KGB successor] FSB. Such a view is echoed by Michael Neumann, a former prisoner who was allowed to observe the Soviet prison medical service first hand and who testified in 1957: "*Medical journals are kept at least on another day and those papers are filed away.*" Neumann testified that he thought it was entirely impossible that the highest Soviet leadership should have the "*pure administrative capability to remove all documentation concerning Raoul Wallenberg in all archives.*"

Even though the Presidential Archives have been partially explored, masses of materials reportedly remain that have not been looked through and packages that have not even been opened. Although some special collections for prominent members of the Soviet Leadership such as Molotov, Stalin and Khrushchev are now available to researchers, many of their important papers remain classified. Some of the special papers of A. Mikoyan, have not been released. In the Special Archives of the Ministry of Defense the Fond where Bulganin's order for Wallenberg's arrest was found, is inaccessible. Concerning the archives of Soviet Security Chief L. P. Beria, the American expert on Soviet archives, Patricia Kennedy-Grimsted, has pointed out that in 1998 only 700 of about 20,000 files had been declassified. In addition, regional archives of the Security Services remain entirely off limits.

### 3. Witness Reports after 1947

Raoul Wallenberg's presence in either Lefortovo or Lubyanka after 1947 is consistent as an alternative to execution. There are examples of long term isolated prisoners in both Lubyanka and Lefortovo. B. G. Menshagin, mayor of Smolensk and a witness to the massacre at Katyn, was held in Lubyanka for six years before he was transferred to Vladimir prison in 1951. Menshagin was held in extreme secrecy, whereas Raoul Wallenberg was placed with other prisoners, cellmates and in an environment that made communication possible. If Raoul Wallenberg became a secret prisoner, isolation from other prisoners may have become just as extreme. But complete isolation of prisoners is rarely possible because of isolation's devastating psychological effects.

If Raoul Wallenberg was sentenced in or around July 1947 and he was sent to, for example, Vladimir prison, nothing would have prevented Soviet prison authorities from bringing him back some time later to Moscow to finish further investigations and interrogations. If, instead, in July 1947, he was still a prisoner under investigation, he may have been made a secret prisoner, to be sentenced later, and was assigned either a false name or a number.

There exist scattered testimonies for Raoul Wallenberg's presence in Lubyanka and Lefortovo from 1947 - 1954. These accounts are of a much sketchier nature than the earlier reports from Lubyanka and Lefortovo during 1945-47. Researchers have mostly ignored them because it was generally assumed that Raoul Wallenberg died in 1947 or he survived, he would not have been held in either one of these prisons. Also, many investigators simply thought these witness accounts were based on knowledge or hearsay of Raoul Wallenberg's previous stays in both Lubyanka and Lefortovo before 1947. Russian officials have tended to categorically dismiss witness testimonies for the time after 1947 out of hand, without serious analysis.

Looking at the results emerging from the prisoner file analysis and studies of the witness testimonies in the Swedish Foreign Office Archive carefully, two points emerge:

a. Under the strict bureaucratic guidelines governing the handling of special prisoners, there are only very limited options for what to do with such a prisoner. He has to be kept separate from other prisoners, under close observation by special authorities. That is, he can essentially only stay at special prisons, perhaps even at a special camp. If Raoul Wallenberg remained in the prison system [as opposed to his being released into exile], one of the possibilities is that he could have been sentenced and sent out to one of the special isolation prisons, a special psychiatric hospital and/or a 'special camp', or a special camp. The special camp system was in its preparatory phase in 1947 and was formally instituted in March 1948.

b. The testimonies after 1947 that are available are not chaotic or isolated. Even without a systematic framework, examination of witness testimonies reveals that a large number of witness statements fit a very general pattern: 1945-1949: Moscow prisons; 1949/1950-1953: Taishet and Far Eastern Russia; 1952-1954: Inta/Vorkuta; 1954-1955: Vladimir. There are also repeated testimonies for Verkhne Uralsk for the year 1952/53 and Kazan in 1953. It should be stressed that this constitutes a very rough breakdown of witness accounts. Future research will have to show whether or not this observation is confirmed.

In the evaluation of witness testimonies, one has to consider certain general aspects

1. Witnesses often provide only a few bits and pieces of information because they see only a very small part of the picture behind the person they meet. Often meetings are by chance, or there is little opportunity to speak.

2. One often finds that there is an element of time distortion. A witness hears, for example, that a certain person was held in a particular prison. By the time the information reaches the person, the prisoner may in fact have already moved on. Witnesses tend to testify according to their own experience. A testimony may, therefore, include a lot of ambiguous information, outright contradictions and still be an honest statement. More importantly, despite such problems, it may contain valuable information or detail.

3. For most witnesses testifying is a matter of honor. It is an unwritten code of the camps and prisons to lead a double life. There is information about all fellow prisoners a witness has met in captivity. Therefore, the motive of most witnesses is to protect their own honor. There are, of course, exceptions but they are in the minority.

4. No testimony can or should be dismissed out of hand but only after it has been evaluated according to a set of criteria. It is impossible to list here all possible points of evaluation, but it begins with a few very basic considerations. Can it be confirmed that the witness has indeed been held prisoner in the Soviet Union? What were the dates of his

and release? In which facilities was he held and at what times was he there?, and so on.

With these guidelines in mind, what follows are summaries of a number of witness testimonies which mention encounters after 1947 with persons the witnesses thought to have been Raoul Wallenberg, at the type of prison facilities in which a prisoner like Raoul Wallenberg may have been held.

a. Moscow prisons

**Lubianka/Lefortovo:** Two testimonies shall be touched upon in brief. The first statement was initially brought to closer attention by Swedish historian Rolf Karlbom. **Friedrich Bayer**, a German Corporal who after his arrest in 1944 had been sentenced to ten years forced labor for anti-Soviet agitation and sabotage, spent time in Lefortovo from December 1948 until May 1, 1949. During this time, he shared for a while a cell with a Lieutenant of the German Wehrmacht whose first name Bayer remembers as 'Helmut'. Bayer was unable to remember his last name. The Lieutenant supposedly had worked after the war for both the American Counterintelligence Corps (CIC) and a French Intelligence organization. He was supposedly associated with a 'Gruppe Bendix.' He had been arrested during a trip to Leipzig in 1947 and had been sentenced to 25 years in prison. 'Helmut' told Bayer that during the end of 1947/beginning of 1948, a "Legationsrat Wallenberg" had been his cellmate. 'Helmut' referred to his cellmate also as "[Count] Wallenberg." The prisoner in question had been subjected to numerous interrogations. He had refused to provide any information and demanded instead an opportunity to learn the Russian language. The man subsequently had provided with the necessary study materials and he had learned to read, write and speak Russian so "*that he was able to make himself understood.*"

Some time in 1948 the man was sentenced to twenty-five years "*although the Soviets were unable to prove wrongdoing on his part.*" When the prisoner refused to accept the sentence, he was beaten until he was unconscious. After a few days, he was taken out of the cell and moved to an unknown destination. Bayer spent about five days with 'Helmut' in Lefortovo. It is not clear when 'Helmut' left Lefortovo. The report from the Swedish Foreign Ministry reads May 1, 1949. That, however, is also stated as Bayer's departure and an error may have occurred. Bayer is described by the Swedish Foreign Office officials who interviewed him "*intelligent, steady and honest.*"

The CIA material on the Raoul Wallenberg case which was released in 1993, contains an interesting document which remains heavily censored. It appears to be an inquiry from Sweden concerning the identity of a 'Schneider', associated with 'Gruppe Bendix'. The CIA document lists various German soldiers with that name. The name is so common in Germany that even with the additional information available, an identification is extremely difficult. It remains unclear how the Swedish Foreign Office or the Swedish Security Police [SAEPO] came to see the last name 'Schneider' - there is no document in the Foreign Ministry's papers clarifying this. [Correspondence in SAEPO with the U.S. is not accessible. A copy of this correspondence should have been placed in the Raoul Wallenberg case file.] A request for the prisoner file of a German Tank Lieutenant, born approximately 1920-25, arrested in Leipzig in 1947, by the name of Helmut Schneider, has been made to the Russian side but such a file has not been presented. This obviously presupposes that the last name 'Schneider' is indeed correct.

Since the testimony of 'Helmut' comes through another person it is hard to assess. Especially hard to evaluate is the remark 'Graf [Count] Wallenberg'. 'Helmut' may have encountered an impostor, a prisoner who pretended to be Raoul Wallenberg. Prisoners were quite keen on picking up on these individuals, but the possibility cannot be excluded. The most notorious among the known impostors was Erik Arvid Andersson, who according to Swedish historian Rolf Karlbom had been a professional in the Swedish Military Service. In 1947, he was stationed in Berlin from where he was kidnapped on July 20-21. He was taken to Moscow, where he first sat in Lubianka prison, the villa outside of Moscow, then again in Lubianka. According to various witness testimonies gathered by Rolf Andersson did not face hardship in prison. He was assigned a special cell in Lubianka, although every once in a while he was put in a regular prison cell. Prisoners remember him as "Baron" Andersson. A possibility of confusion exists with the prisoners Heinrich Grossheim-Krysko who worked at the Swedish Legation, Budapest in 1944, and German Count Ernst Wallenstein. However, neither Grossheim-Krysko nor Wallenstein mention a 'Helmut' in their witness statements after their return from the Soviet Union.

\*\*\*\*

In 1982 the witness **Gerhard Schmidt** asserted that he had been kept prisoner together with Raoul Wallenberg in Lefortovo prison for about three weeks at the end of 1949. As can be seen from the interview report, there are some questions about the year, whether it was 1948 or 1949, although Schmidt appears to be quite certain that it was the fall of 1949.

He reports that his fellow prisoner was emaciated, subject to constant interrogations, and in bad shape both mentally and physical. The prisoner seemed to be obsessed with the King of Sweden. He said that the King was very old, that he knew where the King lives, where the Royal Family lives, and that there was an appalling lack of security surrounding the King. The prisoner also talked extensively about Swedish history, in particular King Karl XII, as if as the city of Berlin, a city the man appeared to know well. Schmidt and the man in question were kept alone in a cell that normally housed 30 people.

One Swede known to have been in Lefortovo roughly at the time Gerhard Schmidt mentions was a Karl-Mauritz Leuvenhaupt, according to the testimony of Victor de Latry. Nothing is known about Leuvenhaupt except what de Latry has reported. Leuvenhaupt supposedly told de Latry through knocking on the cell wall that he had been arrested in Berlin in 1945 on his way to the Swedish Legation. He apparently had been carrying out some type of courier service.

Schmidt's testimony contains one interesting detail. The man he met supposedly mentioned a painter named Guy von Dardel's wife, Matilda von Dardel, has stated that her father, the artist Kurt Jungstedt, had rented an apartment from his widow, Emma, since the 1930's. As she remembers, Raoul Wallenberg might have been very well aware of that fact. Gerhard Schmidt describes the man he met in Lefortovo as speaking German with an accent and communicating in "Prison Russian." He indicates clearly that the man had not been sentenced. If Schmidt is correct, the estimate of the year when he met his fellow prisoner, confusion with German prisoner of war Ernst Wallenstein is possible since Wallenstein had been in INTA since June 1948. Schmidt claims that every day the guard called out the name of each inmate in the cell and that that is the way he learned the name Wallenberg. This stands in contrast to Friedrich Bayer's testimony who testified that he did not know the name of his cellmate called 'Helmut,' after having spent about five days with him.

\*\*\*\*

At least five other testimonies mention encounters with a prisoner thought to have been Raoul Wallenberg in Lubianka/Lefortovo after 1947. Those as well as the two testimonies described above need to be examined further to see if they have some important aspects in common. The witnesses all describe meeting a man who is at the time, after 1947, undergoing difficult and repeated interrogations and who is clearly in the process of being sentenced. The treatment the person in question supposedly receives is described consistently as very rough and all witnesses describe his physical condition as poor.

The sentence that is allegedly handed down is in all cases twenty-five years. [see also other testimonies below, especially Baj and von Dufving.]

\*\*\*\*

**Butyrka:** In March 1950 a large number of foreign prisoners were transferred from Lubianka and Lefortovo to Butyrka. In one of these statements *Heinrich Grossheim-Krisko* states that he was "firmly convinced" that Raoul Wallenberg was among the group. The German *Erhard Hille* also stated that in 1953 during the regular proceedings after his arrival in Butyrka in March 1950 he thought he had heard the guard call out the name "Wallenberg" at a neighbouring cell. Arrival and departure registries for Butyrka prison for 1950 have not been shown, despite requests. Russian officials argue that these registries have been destroyed, although numerous experts have expressed skepticism.

\*\*\*\*

Of some interest is the May 1957 testimony by *Victor de Latry* about his experiences in Butyrka prison, where he was moved in February 1952. After a particularly rough interrogation concerning his wartime activities in the German Wehrmacht, de Latry filed an official complaint about the abuse he had suffered. He received as an answer that he should not bother. After all, his situation was not so grave. What would he say, the prison authorities stated, if he was told "do you have a Swedish Ambassador here?" According to de Latry, this was the first time that he had heard about a Swedish diplomat. [de Latry emphasized that he did not take the word "Ambassador" literally.] De Latry previously had had contact with Karl-Mauritz Leuvenhaupt, who he thought was Swedish but who was definitely not a diplomat in Lubianka prison in 1948.

It was clear to de Latry that Leuvenhaupt had been arrested on the way to the Swedish Legation, Berlin, in 1945 when he worked as a special courier. De Latry's testimony raises several questions. Is the reference by the Soviet official to 'here' Butyrka prison or a general reference to the prison system? The remark as de Latry relates it, would appear to have been made in the then-present tense, which means reference to 1952. At that time, there is no known Swedish diplomat in Soviet captivity, as far as we know. The diplomat Ernst Wallenstein is German and is not in Soviet custody.

Butyrka at the time.

The only other known option is that the “Swedish Ambassador” refers to Heinrich Grossheim-Krisko who mentioned earlier, was associated with the Swedish Legation, Budapest, in 1944, and who by 1952 is back in B prison. Grossheim-Krisko had, however, already moved to Vladimir prison by March 1952.

\*\*\*\*

De Latry’s testimony, as well as the witness statements outlined earlier, illustrate among other things the need for an authoritative list of all Swedish citizens in the Soviet prison system from 1945 - present. Only with s list, can possible confusion of Raoul Wallenberg with other Swedish prisoners in the Soviet Union be established excluded. Despite repeated requests, the Swedish Foreign Ministry has never provided such a compilation.

b. Transit points

The former German prisoner of war **Theodor von Dufving**, described in his 1982 testimony his meeting person he thought could have been Raoul Wallenberg, at a transit point in Kotlas [Archangelsk area] or Kirov [K area] in early 1949. Von Dufving was told by fellow prisoners that a Swedish diplomat was among them. Von D was immediately interested because a Swedish diplomat would surely be released quickly. When von Dufving ask man why he was imprisoned he only said that he was there “*because of a grave mistake.*“ When von Dufving in whether he had been with the Swedish Legation, Berlin, the man denied this and instead stated that he had been i Eastern Europe. He spoke excellent, almost accent free German, and he also had a basic knowledge of Russian. W Dufving met the prisoner in question in the mealtime queue, he was supposedly reading a Russian newspaper. T informed von Dufving that he actually did not know Russian very well, and that he could only translate written t Von Dufving further stated that the man was well dressed and traveled with a special guard or companion.

\*\*\*\*\*

The witness **Hermann Platz** describes a similar encounter. Hermann Platz stated that he had met a Swed diplomat named “Vandenberg” in a transit camp in Orscha [Byelorussia], in September or October 1949. Platz ha arrived in Orscha in December 1948, where he stayed for about 5-10 months. The report of his testimony taken c December 11, 1957, says that Platz underscored that the name was ‘Vandenberg,’ which he believed to be Dutcl which is why he was surprised when ‘Vandenberg’ told him that he was a Swedish diplomat. The man was suppe somewhat less tall than Platz who was about 185 cm. Platz estimated that the man to be about 45-48 years old.

Platz indicated that the man he met spoke very good German, although with a certain accent. He told Plat had been arrested in either Hungary or Rumania [Platz is unsure] and that he had been sentenced to 25 years labor Platz reported further that ‘Vandenberg’ was standing together with a man who was somewhat smaller in stature, round face, who was apparently neither Swedish nor German but who, according to Platz, may have been Ruman Vandenberg and his companion had been arrested together and had both been sent on the same transport to Orscha Swedish protocol notes that Platz “*makes an alert although not entirely reliable impression.*” He was arrested o 1947 and may have heard of the Wallenberg case in some form before his arrest. He also stated a wish to emigrate Sweden.

Marvin Makinen mentions, in his report to the Swedish-Russian Working Group, that a fellow prisoner h him during his own imprisonment in the Soviet Union that the Latvian Zigurd Kruminsh, a suspected c supposedly had sat with most of the important foreign prisoners in Vladimir, including ‘Vandenberg.’ The quest ‘Vandenberg’ is not Raoul Wallenberg, what foreign prisoner by that name is in Soviet captivity in the time from ? A person with that name could have been very easily a source of confusion with Raoul Wallenberg. No prisoner available for a person by that name in Vladimir prison. Both Platz and von Dufving stress that the person they en is Swedish, not Dutch, as the name would suggest. A Dutch national by the name of Van der Waals was arrested in Budapest. According to Soviet authorities, he died in 1948 in Moscow.

\*\*\*\*

Another testimony for a transit point comes from **Jozef Markuczewski**, a Polish national, who saw a pr thought to be Raoul Wallenberg at a transfer point in Kirov [area of Kirov, north of Kazan], in 1949. In addition, at least two other testimonies for the time 1947-1949 mention encounters with a person who could ha Raoul Wallenberg, in Moscow prisons, namely Lubianka and Lefortovo, as well as the transit prison Krasnaya Pr [Testimonies of Stein and Babko].

### c. Camps

**Special Camp No.7, Bratsk/Ozerlag:** In 1988 **Boguslav Baj**, a Polish national, contacted the Swedish Embassy in Warsaw with the news that he had met Raoul Wallenberg in a Special Camp in the Soviet Union at the end of the war. Baj's story became public when he participated in a Polish Television Program about former prisoners of war in the Soviet Union. Baj had fought in the Polish Home Army and had been arrested in January 1945. He had been imprisoned in Lubianka prison, then a number of camps, including Taishet [Irkutsk oblast]. In 1949 he arrived in Bratsk [Ozerlag, Irkutsk oblast]. Baj stated that in late 1949, a foreign prisoner had arrived in Bratsk, looking emaciated and weak. Baj related how he initially had not been particularly interested in this man until he heard from him news about Leopold Okulicki, a prominent leader of the Polish Home Army. From the newly arrived prisoner, Baj learned that Okulicki had a second trial and had been in the Lubianka prison. Baj felt sorry for the man and tried to help him. He was able to communicate with him in German. In his report, he indicated that two fellow prisoners, Josef Kowalski and Jerzy Cichocki, could confirm his story. Cichocki had worked in the camp kitchen and through him Baj procured small portions of food.

Baj's letter of January 29, 1988, was answered by the Swedish Ambassador to Warsaw only in September 1989. Kowalski and Cichocki were never interviewed. Following the Polish TV program, Baj finally testified in Sweden at the Swedish Embassy in May 1992. The Swedish Foreign Ministry's sense of urgency to follow-up what Baj reported is made clear by a letter from September 1995: "*I have had here for three years in Polish two letters in which 'things to do.'* Now, before I leave, I would like to state briefly what the letters say ..."<sup>1</sup> One of the letters was from Boguslav Baj's follow-up letter from his 1992 visit. By the time the Foreign Ministry showed any interest, Baj had already left in 1994.

On January 27, 1992, Baj wrote a letter to Raoul Wallenberg's family which he sent to Nina Lagergren. Baj explained that he had learned from the fellow prisoner, whom he believed to be Raoul Wallenberg, that he had been in Lubianka prison where he was 'read' his sentence in his cell. [Note: this means he was sentenced by Special Tribunal (OSO)] The man told Baj that after the Red Army had occupied Hungary, he had been invited to a conversation with Soviet General Serov. However, when he arrived at the Soviet headquarters there was no General Serov and he was arrested instead and was kept three weeks in Budapest, where he was also interrogated. After that, he was taken to Krestni prison in Leningrad. In 1947 he was taken to Moscow, where the investigative phase continued. He was sentenced in absentia [OSO] to 25 years in prison, special regime. In Moscow, he was held in a few prisons and was transferred in 1949, from Lubianka prison to Taishet. After a few weeks in Taishet, he was taken to Bratsk. Baj reported to Baj that he had been mistreated during interrogations and had received some type of drugs. Baj stated that the man talked about having received injections without having been ill.

An analysis of what Baj states after more than forty years, deserves careful analysis. The first objection raised against this testimony from both the Swedish and the Russian side of the Working Group was that Raoul Wallenberg would never have been sent into the Soviet camp system. While it is true that Wallenberg would have undoubtedly required special handling, there are two points to consider: The camp to which he was supposedly sent was a Special Camp. The Special Camp system was introduced by USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 416-159 cc on February 19, 1948. It provided for the organization of so-called Special Camps for about 145,000 prisoners. The camp Boguslav mentions, Bratsk, known as Ozerlag, converted to special camp status on March 24, 1949. It was comprised of a number of separate camp sections and was registered as Special Camp No. 7.

From Baj's description and the later testimonies of Cichocki and Kowalski, only political prisoners were held there. Life in Bratsk was very difficult. Prisoners were not allowed to associate in groups of three or more. They were only allowed to address each other only by the number sewn onto their clothes and were only allowed to speak about matters related to work. The men were divided into different work brigades. Their main task was to build a bridge over the Angara river. Baj and his friends were in the so-called Polish work brigade. Baj states in his 1992 letter to Raoul Wallenberg's family, that the man he knew as Wallenberg was in the Russian Brigade. Baj and his friends petitioned Camp Commander at Bratsk to have the man who spoke only German and very little Russian transferred to the Polish brigade, but the request was refused. In a conversation with Jerzy Cichocki in September 1995, Cichocki confirmed that the camp commander had rejected the request and had indicated that "*even though the prisoner in question had received a twenty-five year sentence, it was entirely unclear what would happen with him in the meantime or afterward.*"<sup>2</sup>

Kowalski and Cichocki had little contact with the prisoner but confirm Baj's story on all aspects they can. The Russian side has produced Kowalski and Cichocki's file but not the one for Baj. In the spring of 1950, Kowalski was taken East by train transport first to Bukhta Vanina and then on to Magadan [North Eastern Siberia]. He testified

Baj's friend was on the transport with him but that he fell ill and was removed at Chabarovsk.

Studying the Russian files from the Bratsk camp, it becomes clear that although the system was strict, it always worked perfectly. This is made clear by a letter from the Deputy Commander of the Department of [Special Camp No.7, Marin, to Deputy Commander of the GULAG, Colonel Bulanov, dated December 3 "Isolation of especially dangerous state criminals from the general group of the prisoners has not been fully carried out as of now, for reasons I mentioned earlier in my memo." Another letter, this time by Colonel Bulanov, Commander of Special Camp Number 7, Yevstigneev, dated March 23, 1950: states: "It is evident from the minutes of the meetings held in Special Camp No.7 that isolation and regime of keeping specially dangerous state criminals meet the requirements of the orders of MVD SSSR. ... Until now the contacts between the special contingent of unguarded prisoners have not been stopped." These letters are written right around the time Baj estimates he met Raoul Wallenberg. It shows that special categories of prisoners were found at Bratsk, including "Important State Criminals" and so-called "Special Contingents."

We do not know if Raoul Wallenberg was ever categorized in this way, but other prisoners whose cases could have been considered analogous to Wallenberg's were assigned such status. [For further information on these categories of prisoners see Mesinaï's report.] In his testimony Baj mentioned that he had also met the Czech party leader Oskar Glasowski at Bratsk. We have asked for Glasowski's file but have not seen it. If it can be confirmed Glasowski was held at Bratsk, it would confirm that MVD authorities sent important foreign prisoners to Special No.7. It has been confirmed that other prominent Polish prisoners were held at Bratsk, such as the Polish resistance leader Alfred Fries [also Fryes]. Documentation in the Russian State Archive [GARF] indicates that certain camps, including Camp No.7, comprised special sections which housed special category prisoners. Very little is known about the organizational structure of this camp-within-a-camp. If Raoul Wallenberg was sentenced in 1947 and sent out to serve his sentence, Soviet authorities may have considered Bratsk a suitable location, since it belonged to the special camp category and because it made provisions for special prisoners. Bratsk/Ozerlag housed mostly foreign prisoners who belonged to countries under Soviet control. Therefore, individuals who would be less likely to provide testimony about Raoul Wallenberg after returning home.

Furthermore, the records indicate that documentation about top secret matters was kept in a special department within the camp administration. Each year MVD conducted a strict review and a report was sent to Moscow. Other reports including one entitled "Report on the Progress of the Organization and Activities of Camp No. 7," from April 1947, contain sections called: "Keeping of Secret Documents and Office Management." So far, it has not been possible to review these materials.

The second objection raised against Baj's account was that Baj's story deviated from the "known" course of Raoul Wallenberg's imprisonment. In his letter to Raoul Wallenberg's family, Baj states that he is trying to remember what he thought to be Raoul Wallenberg had told him "... as best as he can." The possibility exists, of course, that the person Baj met was not Raoul Wallenberg. It is also possible, however, that Baj remembered certain details of the personal history of the prisoner he encountered incorrectly or that he confused some of the information with the circumstances of other prisoners in captivity.

As for other aspects of Baj's account, they also offer important details to consider. Krestni prison was a place for special prisoners, on par with Vladimir. P. Sudoplatov recalls the physical abuse he suffered there after his own arrest and also relates how other prisoners were abused by injections and administration of drugs. It is entirely possible that fellow prisoner suffered similar treatment, if he indeed was taken to Krestni prison. There is no evidence in Russian archives that Raoul Wallenberg was ever transferred to Leningrad or Kiev. However, no such evidence exists for Vladimir prison either. The only witness testimony that refers to Raoul Wallenberg in Vladimir for the time 1947, which is the time relevant for Baj's testimony, is that of V. Shulgin, whose statement was received through another prisoner [The Swiss national Hoechli].

At the end of his letter to Raoul Wallenberg's family Baj added a postscript: "*He very often mentioned his mother. He must have loved her very much.*" It is well known how very close Raoul Wallenberg was to his mother, von Dardel. Although undoubtedly many men revere their mothers, Baj's special emphasis on this point is noteworthy.

As for possible knowledge Baj could have had of Raoul Wallenberg, one has to consider that information about the Wallenberg case was still very limited in Poland in the late 1980's. The abuse Polish prisoners had suffered in Soviet jails was not yet an open subject of discussion. From the correspondence Baj's widow shared with Makinen who visited her in 1995, it becomes clear how Baj took up the case after all those years. The newspaper "Politika" had on October 17, 1987 published a short article which mentioned a dedication to Raoul Wallenberg. It also mentioned that, according to official Soviet sources, Raoul Wallenberg had died in 1947 in Soviet prison. Baj wrote a short letter to the editor, indicating that the information had to be false, considering he met Raoul Wallenberg in captivity.

An important issue to pursue in connection with this testimony is the reports of the presence in Tashkent of



'Raoul Wilborg.' An article in "Newsweek" from April 16, 1956, stated that "*Last fall, German ex-prisoners rec seeing a Raoul Wilborg, a Swedish Red Cross officer, an emaciated TB case, in a camp at Taishet, Central Asi*

We have requested repeatedly, from the Russian side, a list of prisoners with the name of "Raoul Wallenberg" or similar sounding versions, such as 'Paul Wallberg,' 'Raoul Wilborg,' etc., starting in 1945. Even with millions of prisoners in the Soviet prison system, such a list could and should be compiled. It would then have to be determined where these individuals were imprisoned in order to see if any of them could be a possible source of confusion with Raoul Wallenberg. An effort should also be made to identify some of the secret documentation from Special Camp No. 1 in the records of the MVD Central Administration in Moscow. Were there special category prisoners held at Bratsk suggested by some of the surviving administrative correspondence? And if so, who were they? A thorough review of transport and convoy records to determine which prisoners arrived at or left from Bratsk in the years 1949/50 could provide another way of possibly determining if the man Baj met was Raoul Wallenberg or another prisoner. Importantly, these records would offer valuable clues how a special prisoner like this was handled in the Soviet Special Camp system.

\*\*\*\*

**Special Camp No.1 INTA/Vorkuta:** Altogether, there are about 15 -20 sightings which place Raoul Wallenberg in or near Vorkuta in the time of 1952-1954. It is highly unlikely that all the witnesses are simply fabricating the Part of the reason for such a high number of statements is that it is known that a number of Swedes were held in Vorkuta. There exists again the possibility of prisoners with a similar name or even the same name having been held in that general area. Interesting in this respect, are three testimonies [Shinkarenko Kostenko and Zissner] about a "Raoul Wallenberg" who was supposedly Swedish. All three testimonies state that he was a member of a camp orchestra.

#### d. Psychiatric facilities

**Kazan Special Psychiatric Hospital:** At least two witnesses state that they saw Raoul Wallenberg at Kazan Special Psychiatric Hospital in the early 1950's. Kazan was known as a facility where important prisoners were sent to Moscow. Kazan has been pointed out by several Russian experts as one of the most likely places where Wallenberg may have been taken, if he survived beyond 1947.

\*\*\*\*

**Psycho-Neurological Dispensary Nr. 13 [for associated hospital]:** In 1981, **Albert Hollosy**, a Hungarian, testified that in 1979 he had been arrested in the Soviet Union and that he had been sentenced to 22 months in prison. In July 1981, Hollosy was told by Soviet officials that he would soon be released.

At the end of March 1981 Hollosy was taken to a hospital which turned out to be a Psychiatric Hospital. By accident he was able to read what he thought was the hospital's address on a writing block of one of his physicians: Sevastopol Prospekt 26-28. One day, Hollosy asked the nurse who attended him whether there were any other foreigners at the facility. The nurse indicated that there was one. She further stated that he was Swedish and his name was Wallenberg. She also indicated that the man had been there for at least three years. A few days later, Hollosy passed another prisoner on the way to the treatment room. Hollosy described the man, who was sitting in a wheelchair, as being bald, with white hair. According to Hollosy, he had an oval face and a strong nose. The man showed no sign of reaction. Hollosy passed. His nurse nodded towards him and indicated that this was 'Wallenberg' whom she had mentioned earlier.

Hollosy was released in February 1981 to Hungary and from there he fled, via Yugoslavia, to Spain, where he testified at the Swedish Consulate in Barcelona. When officials from the Swedish Embassy, Moscow, checked the address Hollosy had provided, they found a facility called Psycho-Neurological Dispensary Nr. 13. The noticeable absence of security, no guards, which matched Hollosy's testimony. The officials, however, described the building they saw as "*a small house*" which they considered not to conform with the type of facility Hollosy had mentioned, which included an elevator, etc. As an outpatient clinic, the facility did not appear to be the kind that housed prisoners like Hollosy or Wallenberg. Swedish authorities placed a request to the CIA for further information. The CIA visited Dispensary Nr. 13 and received the answer in February 1982 that outpatient clinics, such as the one at Sevastopol

Prospect 26-28, "have been used to detain and 'assess' Soviet political dissidents on a short term (days or week basis)." Beyond that, "longterm isolation of secret prisoners normally takes place at other facilities, so-called or Ordinary Pshychiatric Hospitals, SPHs and OPHs." The CIA analyst further stated, that due to Wall's notoriety, it was highly doubtful that he would have been kept at Dispensary 13 on a long term basis but added, "we would not rule out the possibility that Raoul Wallenberg was held briefly in Dispensary Nr. 13 - e. assessment or transit." According to former prisoner Avraham Shifrin's book about prisons and punitive camps Soviet Union "Department 4 of Psycho - Neurological Dispensary No.13 houses special cells for political priso

When Susan Mesinai and I checked on the address in May of 2000, instead of a "small house" we found a story building with an elevator and no visible security. This testimony is currently under further review. It appears, at first glance, unlikely that a person like Raoul Wallenberg would have been held in an outpatient facility. I have to evaluate the testimony in terms of what *could* be possible. If Raoul Wallenberg survived until 1981, where he have been kept? The way Hollosy describes the man he met, he was completely apathetic. If, indeed, in this case he either induced through medication or due to illness, a prisoner/patient like that had no requirements for the strictest security. He could have easily been housed for a long period of time in the type of special section of the facility mentioned by Hollosy. It is also possible that the address Hollosy saw on the writing pad was not the address of the facility in which he and the man he was told to be Wallenberg were actually imprisoned. In that case, it is necessary to check which hospitals or clinics that fit the description Hollosy gave were associated with Neurological Dispensary Nr. 13 in the early 1980's, and/or to identify which medical personnel from that Dispensary worked in associated clinics.

e. Isolator Prisons

**Verkhne Uralsk:** There are a number of sightings for the period 1952-1955 for Verkhne Uralsk prison which are not described in detail due to space limitation.

\*\*\*\*

**Vladimir:** The witness testimonies from Vladimir prison are described in detail in Makinen's and Kaplan's reports to the Swedish-Russian Working Group.

\*\*\*\*

f. Other

In 1984 **Karoly Remenyi**, a former Hungarian official with AVO/AVH [Hungarian Secret Intelligence], testified that in January 1953 he been asked to review material for an upcoming show trial in Hungary [date unspecified]. Soviet liaison officials supposedly told him that Raoul Wallenberg was to serve as an important witness in this trial. It is unclear if the trial was to take place in Moscow or Budapest and if Raoul Wallenberg was to testify in person. When Stalin died in March 1953, the trial was not pursued. This statement needs to be examined further, especially in connection with the testimony by **Stepanov** [see below].

\*\*\*\*

A document in the Russian Foreign Ministry collection deals with a testimony of a man called '**Shiryagin**' which is a remarkable document because it is the only indication of post-1947 information on Raoul Wallenberg available in the Russian archives so far.

The letter is addressed to the Committee of State Security [KGB], and dated April 13, 1956: "*The Foreign Ministry received a letter written probably by Shiryagin [hard to read] who lives in the village of Vodenino, Charkov region which there is some information about the Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg. Probably Comrade Shiryagin, in a sincere motive to help search for Wallenberg, will reveal the context of his letters to some other people and, finally, the Swedish Embassy would hear about this matter. Probably, you will come to the conclusion that it will be necessary to advise Shiryagin - in a very careful manner - through your channels - not to spread the news about Wallenberg.*"

The Working Group has made attempts to trace the original letter from Shiryagin in the archives of the Russian Foreign Ministry as well as in SVR, and/or the man himself, but without success. The Russian Foreign Ministry registers for incoming/outgoing correspondence for the 1950's have been destroyed.

\*\*\*\*

If Raoul Wallenberg survived into the 1980's, the testimony from 1985 by retired Swedish judge

**Linnander** also deserves a second look. Linnander reported that in February 1983 he had met an Englishman in C who reported that Raoul Wallenberg had died just a few months earlier. As a source for this information, he named a Norwegian businessman and arms dealer by the name of Erik Bjertnes.

During a meeting between the three men, Bjertnes explained that he had recently been told by an old acquaintance from wartime Stockholm, Alexander Pavlov, that Raoul Wallenberg had died in early 1983 in a dacha outside Moscow. According to Bjertnes, Alexander Pavlov was the son of the famous translator Pavlov who had translated high-ranking Soviet officials, including Stalin. Despite repeated requests to identify Pavlov and to provide information about him, the Russian side has provided no details. Bjertnes, a Norwegian by birth, had good contacts with American and Soviet Intelligence Services in Stockholm during the war. An Alexander Pavlov had been stationed in Stockholm during the war where he had worked for the Soviet news agency TASS. He was a known GRU agent.

According to documentation in the archives of the Swedish Security Police [SAEPO], Bjertnes had close contact with wartime Soviet Ambassador Alexandra Kollontai. The possible transfer of information about Raoul Wallenberg through these old established channels as well as the timing of the news is something that should be researched further. The early 1980's saw greatly renewed interest in the question of Wallenberg's fate and the news of Wallenberg's death delivered through Pavlov may have been intended to cut short this interest.

\*\*\*\*

Another witness statement of interest is that **Sergei Antonovic Stepanov**. His testimony dates from 1993. Stepanov, a retired jurist and a former employee of the Soviet Foreign and Interior Ministries, had contacted the Swedish Embassy, Moscow, partly in order to obtain the address of a Swedish author with whom he wanted to establish contact and partly to provide information about the Raoul Wallenberg case.

Stepanov reported that in the time from March 1950 until June 1953 he had been employed with the First Directorate, Fifth Department [MGB/Kommittee of Information]. His superior and Chief of the Archives was supposed to be a certain 'Kukin,' who was also Chief of the [later] KGB's USSR Higher Intelligence School. In October or November of 1950, Stepanov stated, Kukin asked him to fetch Raoul Wallenberg's file from the archive. He retrieved the file and supposedly showed the words "[The] Swede Wallenberg" on the cover. After one or two weeks, Stepanov received the file back without any new materials having been added. The last notation was a stamp: "KM-nyet": "Kompromittant material - no." Stepanov further indicated that he understood that Raoul Wallenberg had been arrested in Vienna and had saved a great number of people from Nazi persecution. After his arrest, he had been taken to Lubyanka. According to official information, Raoul Wallenberg supposedly died as a result of an illness; but in reality, he was entirely well when taken to Lubyanka, he was first taken to a hospital and then was taken away, while it was officially claimed that he had been killed. After that, he was supposedly moved to Vladimir prison. In the autumn of 1950, Wallenberg was taken to a house in Izmailova Park in Moscow, near the building that housed the Intelligence School, where an attempt was made to recruit him as a Soviet agent. This effort at recruitment happened supposedly on the personal orders of Beria. After this failed recruitment attempt, Wallenberg was supposedly not killed but was kept at a succession of secret facilities including Vladimir, Smolensk and Tobolsk.

In support of his testimony, Stepanov provided a copy of his official workbook, which included a record of his employment history, and he went in search of individuals who might be able to corroborate his story. During a second interview with the Swedish Embassy, Moscow, in March 1993, he provided the name of a Georgian national by the name of "Dzhirkvelov", who supposedly had been "Starshi Referent" in the rank of captain at the First Main Directorate, Fifth Department in the time that Stepanov had worked there. Dzhirkvelov had worked in the archives and supposedly remembered seeing Raoul Wallenberg's file.

According to Stepanov, Dzhirkvelov remembered in particular that the Raoul Wallenberg material consisted of his file called "Lefortovo File" as well as other documents. The "Lefortovo File" reportedly included a note that Raoul Wallenberg had died on July 17, 1947. The other documents showed that, instead, Raoul Wallenberg had survived beyond that date and that he was referred to in these documents by another name.

The Swedish side presented some of Stepanov's information to their Russian counterparts and was told that the information was in parts unreliable. More importantly, Kukin, most likely identical with Konstantin Michailovitch Kukin, famous Soviet *resident* in London, was supposedly not even in Moscow during the time Stepanov specified. After some discussion, it was decided that Stepanov should be formally interviewed for the Working Group. Stepanov declined to testify and the issue was dropped. Stepanov was not heard again and died in 1994.

What made this testimony unusual from the start is that Stepanov had worked with the Security Services in an official capacity. He was one of the few individuals from those organizations who did not insist that Raoul Wallenberg

had died in 1947. A closer examination of K. M. Kukin's whereabouts reveals that he remained Chief of the Kon of Information's First Main Directorate until late 1950 and, therefore, he could well have been the person who ask Raoul Wallenberg's file. As far as the record shows, no attempt was made from the Swedish side to either identify or contact the other person Stepanov names, the Georgian 'Dzhirkvelov.' [Both the name of S. and D. had been not handed over to the Russian side, in order to protect the witness' identity]. 'Dzhirkvelov' is most likely identical to Ilya Dzhirkvelov, a Georgian national, who defected in the early 1980's.

In his book Secret Servant, Dzhirkvelov describes his employment in the archives of the Security Services about nine months in 1950. He explains that he had access to a number of interesting case files. He does not mention Raoul Wallenberg's file or his case. This brings up an interesting question: Did Stepanov talk about his own experience or was he relating Dzhirkvelov's memories? Dzhirkvelov's defection is unusual because he split with the regime "personal reasons," not due to ideological reasons. He makes it clear in his book that in many respects he remained a supporter of the former Soviet system. If the Swedish side recognized Dzhirkvelov's name, the consultants were made aware of this fact. In his official report, Swedish Working Group Chairman Hans Magnusson mentions that the Swedish side interviewed an unnamed former Soviet archivist who stated that he had seen Raoul Wallenberg's file and stated that Raoul Wallenberg had died in 1947. The interview remains classified in the Swedish Foreign Minister's Archive.

Dzhirkvelov's involvement in the matter makes it perhaps somewhat more understandable why Stepanov did not want to testify for the Russian side of the Working Group, because the Russian members surely would have recognized Dzhirkvelov's name. In terms of Stepanov's account of Raoul Wallenberg's supposed fate after 1947, his account on the surface is consistent with the only alternative to execution, which would be some type of secret existence as a hidden prisoner. Vladimir as an isolator would qualify as a possible prison for such an inmate. As mentioned already under Point 2. 'Documentation,' the supposed attempt to recruit Raoul Wallenberg actually fits the general time line that Dr. Vadim Birstein and Susan Mesina have outlined in their respective analyses of how prisoners' cases were dealt with in certain groups. Important prisoners like Schmidt, alias Gflorener, were sentenced around this time. Even if Raoul Wallenberg had already received his sentence in 1947, he may have been brought back for an attempt at winning intelligence agent work.

The most intriguing aspect of Stepanov's testimony is his reference to Dzhirkvelov's account of the Wallenberg documentation he saw in 1950. If there was indeed a "Lefortovo File" that contained a note that Raoul Wallenberg died in 1947, this may have been the Smoltsov note from July 17, 1947, or a similar note to that effect. Stepanov, however, clearly indicates that there is no doubt that Raoul Wallenberg survived beyond 1947 and that the documentation he saw in 1950 clearly proves this point. If true, this raises the question whether or not the so-called "Lefortovo File" was the one used in preparation of the Gromyko memorandum from 1957. It is unclear what documentation Soviet officials had available in 1956-57, when the memorandum was drafted.

Did they, for example, find the Smoltsov note in the "Lefortovo File," or did they construct the Smoltsov note on the basis of the information contained in the material? Did Soviet officials know of the additional documentation that Stepanov and/or Dzhirkvelov describe? If so, did they simply ignore it? Or, did only certain individuals know the 'full' story and did others get to see only parts of the documentation? Was the note about Raoul Wallenberg's alleged death in 1947 placed in the "Lefortovo File" to hide his true fate from certain individuals in the Soviet administration?

When Deputy Foreign Minister A. Gromyko on October 1954 asks I.A. Serov, the Chairman of the KGB, "when and under what circumstances Raoul Wallenberg died," Serov gives an evasive reply: "The Committee of State Security does not have anything to add to the information by the Minister of State Security [S.D. Ignatiev] ... of March 1952 ...." In this letter, Ignatiev had answered a different inquiry from Gromyko by pointing to A. Vishinsky's report from August 18, 1947, to Sweden, which stated that Raoul Wallenberg was not in the Soviet Union. In 1954, Gromyko was not yet a member of the Politburo. This exchange of communication illustrates that information about Raoul Wallenberg was available with the Security Services and that knowledge about the full truth about Wallenberg's fate rested with a very small group of individuals. The fact that Molotov and Serov, together, were in charge of reviewing the Raoul Wallenberg case in 1956, as can be seen from their joint report presented to the Central Committee of the CPSU on April 28, 1956, is further proof that Molotov was one of the individuals with detailed knowledge of the case.

At the same time, Dr. Vadim Birstein and other experts have pointed out that Soviet written documentation should be considered with extreme caution. For example, even though Gromyko formally asks Serov for information, Birstein's assessment is that one cannot draw any conclusions about how much Gromyko personally knew about Wallenberg's fate. Gromyko makes his request in his formal role as a member of the Foreign Ministry and the purpose is to establish a written record of some kind. Who guided this process is the truly interesting question. That is why the records that reflect the true decision making level of Soviet leadership, such as the records of the Politbureau, are critical.

If Stepanov and Dzhirkvelov had access to Raoul Wallenberg's case file in the archives of the Fifth Directorate, there may be a chance that other individuals with similar access in other years may still be alive today; could testify about what they saw. Stepanov's testimony also is of interest in connection with the statements made in 1984 by a former Hungarian AVO/AVH official [see above] who described plans to use Raoul Wallenberg as a witness in a showtrial in 1953.

According to Stepanov, Dzhirkvelov indicated to him that he last saw the Raoul Wallenberg case material when it may have been removed to a regional KGB archive in Tobolsk. The communication between the Deputy Director of the KGB's First Main Directorate, Sakharovsky, and Gribanov from the Soviet Foreign Ministry in 1956 [referred to earlier under Section 2 "Documentation"], would indicate that information either returned to or remained with the Directorate at least until that time.

#### 4. Informal Discussions and Possible Offers of Exchange

In a report from 1986, Ambassador Rune Nystroem concludes possibly for the first time that Sweden had the opportunity to win Raoul Wallenberg's release if it had taken advantage of the Soviet offers that were made. *"The Wallenberg could have been exchanged for persons in Sweden was a question that came up, or at least was suggested by the Soviets at a very early stage in the Raoul Wallenberg case. On the Swedish side however, it appears that the suggestion was either not understood or it was felt that it was not possible to agree to an exchange."*

Over the decades, there were several instances when the Russian government approached the Swedish side to discuss informal discussions in the Raoul Wallenberg case. The documentary record on these contacts is sparse due to the deliberate vagueness of such discussions and the great caution shown by both sides not to violate official boundaries. Some opportunities appear to have developed by chance, such as the famous meeting between physicians Nanna Sjöstrand and Alexander Myasnikov, others clearly were carefully planned and guided by the highest Soviet leadership in Moscow. The little documentation that is available chronicles the discussions 'on the ground', and mostly on the Swedish side. It does not include any material from the responsible Soviet agencies or individuals, such as the MGB/KGB, Stalin Secretariat or the Politbureau.

Some of the talks are described here in greater detail than would ordinarily be the case to show the tentative nature of the discussions, the contradictions, and the general difficulties these discussions entailed.

##### a. Barck-Holst/ Soederblom:

In 1946, both the Swedish Minister in Stockholm, Staffan Soederblom, and the Charge d'Affaires, Ulf Barck-Holst, received signals from their Soviet counterparts that the Soviet Union may be interested in offering Raoul Wallenberg for an exchange. Outlined below is a chronology of the discussions between Swedish and Soviet officials during the year 1946 which illustrates how relatively clear the signals were from the Soviet side and how surprisingly open the conversation remained.

09.03.1946 Staffan Soederblom meets with Head of the Fifth European Department [Scandinavia] of the Soviet Foreign Ministry [MID] A.N. Abramov and Abramov raises the still pending repatriation of 16-year old girl Makarova. Soederblom meets Abramov and says: *"Now I am convinced that Wallenberg is not alive anymore."*

24.03.1946 There is a hint in the Russian material that the planned Swedish-Soviet Credit and Trade Agreement weighed heavily on the mind of Soviet officials. Abramov in a letter to Molotov points out the necessity of a new agreement towards Sweden and that it should be more favorable, based on the future trade agreement, with the acceptance of 1 billion crown credit from Sweden.

30.4.1946 Soederblom meets with Abramov where Abramov raises the issue of Swedish journalist Sandberg who has been found in the Soviet Union and who is being sent back to Sweden. In his report to Under Secretary Soederblom adds: *"That could be interpreted as a hint that Wallenberg despite everything is still alive and has been identified in some type of camp or similar. In the meantime I would like to stress that no hint in this direction was made ..."* In the conversation, Abramov also directly links the Raoul Wallenberg investigation with the Makarova: *"I responded that the search for Wallenberg continued and I reminded him in this connection"*

*Makarova's fate. ...*"

15.06.1946 Soederblom's meeting with Stalin. Barck-Holst is present as well. [For an in-depth discussion of these meetings, see the Swedish Working Group Report]. During the meeting Soederblom again suggests that Ra Wallenberg most likely was killed in early 1945 on his way to Debrecen.

As Ambassador Jan Lundvik has explained, the stating of personal opinion in diplomatic parlance was simply a tactic in negotiations, to be easily withdrawn if the bait was not taken. Stalin surely must have wondered what message the Swedish government was trying to convey. The question is what consequence Soederblom's gaffe had on Wallenberg's case. What may have saved Wallenberg is that the handling of his case remained apparently still in early stages.[see also Section 2, "Documentation"].

7.10.1946 Sweden and the Soviet Union sign the Swedish-Soviet Credit and Trade Agreement.

15.11.1946 Rudolph Philipp publishes a book about Raoul Wallenberg in which he outlines American O agent Iver Olsen's involvement in Raoul Wallenberg's activities.

27.11.1946 The Swedish Embassy, Moscow, especially Staffan Soederblom and later his successor, Gur Haegloeff, are publicly criticized in the Swedish Parliament for their handling of the Wallenberg case in 1945/1946 [Interpellationsvar]. This is significant because such an open rebuke sent a clear signal to the Soviet side that Sweden not consider Soederblom's approach the 'correct' form of handling the Raoul Wallenberg inquiry.

12.12.1946 Barck-Holst informs Uden about his conversation with I.G. Sysojev, Deputy Chief of the First European Department, MID: " ... . To Sysojev's question whether or not I had something favorable to say concerning the case of Makarova, Granovski and the Internees in Sweden, I immediately posed a counter question where I pretended to take his inquiry in that connection as a confirmation that Raoul Wallenberg was alive and this now raised the issue of an exchange."

Sysojev, who did not expect this turn of the conversation, "*categorically denied that there was any connection between the case of Wallenberg and the three cases named earlier.*" Barck-Holst then outlines what has been done regarding Makarova and adds "that the same openness now has to be shown to me in the case of Wallenberg" continues: "*Surely Sysojev in his time in Stockholm had met with members of the [Wallenberg] family and was familiar with their circumstances. In response to Sysojev's question I replied that Raoul Wallenberg was Marcu Jacob Wallenberg's cousin. After that I repeated in some varied form my personal hope that the Russian side would cause further upheaval in Swedish public opinion ... Sysojev said that the handling of the case actually rested with another department which had caused problems. In answer to my question whether he meant with this Secretariat or the Ministry of Interior he did not answer but only raised his arms.*"

13.12.1946 Barck-Holst meets with S. A. Losovski, Deputy Foreign Minister. He explains to him that Swedish public opinion is upset about Soederblom and Haegloeff's behavior. "*I expected that Losovski as Chief of the Information Department was aware of this.*" Barck-Holst stresses that "*relations between the two countries should be strained due to the Wallenberg case, especially now that relations have improved.*" Losovski takes notes and states "*that he very well remembers the conversation Soederblom had with Stalin and what transpired there concerning the Wallenberg case. Losovski promised now in the first instance to inform Stalin but also Dekanosov about what was stated to Losovski.*"

In Losovski's report about the same conversation he quotes Barck-Holst as saying that "*he does not want to raise the question of Wallenberg raised in the Swedish press or parliament after the [recent] conclusion of the Swedish-Soviet Trade Agreement.*" There is no mentioning of the ongoing discussions about the planned Trade Agreement. Swedish records of the communications between the Swedish Embassy, Moscow, and the Swedish Foreign Office in Stockholm.

22.12.1946 Barck-Holst writes to Uden about his meeting with Kotchetkov, the NKVD's representative to the Soviet Foreign Ministry [MID]. "*During the conversation Kotchetkov in reference to the Wallenberg case said in a very friendly tone 'I understand you are in a very difficult position? [sic] I said only: 'Yes, I am and you are the ones who can help me out of it.[sic]''*" Barck-Holst notes that it was Kotchetkov himself who raised the issue and this showed that there was now considerable interest in MID. Barck-Holst also stresses the importance of the shift in Swedish public opinion [as a result of the inquiry in the Swedish Parliament] "*... as well as the continued absence from Moscow of Swedish Minister Gunnar Haeggloeff which is seen in Moscow in direct connection with the Wallenberg case, due to the public criticism leveled against him in the Swedish press. Dekanosov had raised the issue which was an indication that he was aware what had been written in the Swedish newspapers.*"

Barck-Holst is apparently trying to get across to his superiors in Stockholm that the atmosphere has changed in 1946 and that the Soviets are now showing clear signs of wanting to discuss the Raoul Wallenberg case.

30.12.1946 Barck-Holst points out to Stockholm that the Soviet Ambassador in Stockholm, Tchenychev stated that the Wallenberg case has not had a negative effect on Swedish-Soviet relations and that, in fact, these relations are *"better than ever ..."* Barck-Holst, in another message, stresses that the outlook for progress in the Wallenberg case is nevertheless dim if there is no weight attached to his demarches.

Most notably in these discussions is the complete silence from the Swedish Foreign Office in response to Holst's cables. There is no indication that the release in early 1945 of the two Swiss diplomats, Max Meier and Feller, who had been arrested together with Raoul Wallenberg in Budapest, spurred the Swedish Foreign Office to similar negotiations with the Soviet side to gain Raoul Wallenberg's release.

And nowhere is there any hint at all that Swedish officials in any way considered linking the successful conclusion of the Trade Agreement with obtaining information about Raoul Wallenberg's fate. The reasons for these failures deserve to be investigated thoroughly. [See also the Swedish Working Group Report. For a more detailed analysis of the behavior of Swedish Minister Staffan Soederblom see Section D. 'Reactions to Raoul Wallenberg's Arrest', Point 1. 'Staffan Soederblom'.] It also becomes clear that no later than December 1946 the Soviet leadership was officially informing the public criticism both Soederblom and Haegloeff had received in Sweden for their handling of the early Wallenberg inquiry. This was well before the spring and summer of 1947 when Stalin and the Politburo are believed to have made the critical decisions about Raoul Wallenberg's fate.

#### b. Kindermann

The CIA material about the Raoul Wallenberg case released in December 1993 contains a document from January 1953 which makes reference to a proposal of a possible exchange of Wallenberg for Soviet spy Stig Enbom. The proposal was through whom this offer was apparently relayed was a Dr. Karl Kindermann, from "the Black Forest region" in Germany. According to the document, Kindermann wanted to approach the American Ambassador in Stockholm, Butterworth, to discuss with him *"the possibility of persuading the Swedish [sic] to exchange Ekblom [sic] for Raoul Wallenberg"*. The document further states that *"there is a possibility that this is a Soviet attempt to get Enbom, since Kindermann never knew Wallenberg and his explanations do not hold up."* The document also indicates that Kindermann was in contact with 'Capote' and almost certainly was acting for "Capote" in the Wallenberg matter.

As becomes clear from Rudolph Philipp's papers, Kindermann had approached him in a letter dated the 24th of January 1952. In this letter, Kindermann claims that about two months before he had, during a visit with friends in Zurich, gotten to know the Swedish Baroness Adelskoeld who had told him of the "desperate attempts" of Wallenberg's efforts to resolve what had happened to Raoul Wallenberg. Kindermann explains about his own background that in 1925 he had been sentenced to death in Moscow in the so-called "German Student Trials" and that he had been exchanged "for Tschekist Skoblewski-Gorew." Since that time he had dealt with "official problems" with the Soviet Union. In 1946 he supposedly secured the release of Fridtjof Nansen's secretary, Waldemar Brunowski. After checking on the Wallenberg matter thoroughly in Soviet emigre circles and elsewhere, he had decided to tell Baroness Adelskoeld that he saw no way to proceed successfully in the question.

Philipp asked a friend to check on Kindermann with German authorities. The reply came on January 14, 1952 from Erich Wollberg. He indicates that Kindermann works for the German domestic Intelligence Service 'Verfassungsschutz.' He confirms Kindermann's arrest in 1925 in the Soviet Union, and subsequent exchange. Kindermann apparently had once been a loyal supporter of Soviet ideology, but after his personal experience with the Soviet system he had changed his views. After his return to Germany, Kindermann supposedly became an agent of the German Ministry of Interior. Under the Nazis, Kindermann worked as an 'Antikomintern specialist' and was in charge of hiring Jews as Nazi agents abroad. Kindermann also worked as a translator for German, Soviet and Japanese officials in Japan. At the end of the war, he was arrested by the Americans as a war criminal. According to Wollberg, Kindermann suffered no negative consequences from that arrest and he instead "somehow" ended up in his position with 'Verfassungsschutz.' On the other hand, in an official response to an inquiry from the Swedish Foreign Ministry in 1954, Kindermann, the 'Auswaertiges Amt' emphasized that Kindermann should not be considered an official representative and was not considered a "persona grata."

Kindermann traveled to Sweden in January 1954 and tried to win support for his unspecified proposals to

about Raoul Wallenberg's release. In a newspaper article from November 25, 1955 in "Rheinischer Merkur," Kindermann summarizes his approach to the Wallenberg question: "*To the outsider*, he writes, "*it will be almost incomprehensible that almost nothing was done for Raoul Wallenberg.*" He talks about the rumors circulating in Sweden that "*Raoul Wallenberg had been sacrificed due to state-political considerations.*" He confirms that he tried to contact the American Ambassador Patterson in Bern to ask for support in the rescue of Raoul Wallenberg. However, his attempts to talk the matter with the Swedish government came to nothing. Kindermann describes how he got the impression that Swedish officials were not interested in seriously pursuing the question of Raoul Wallenberg's fate.

He apparently succeeded in procuring official Swedish assurance that he would be allowed to meet with the King of Sweden "*but when I learned that any request for a diplomatic intervention on the part of the Swedish government was sure to be refused because certain influences did not wish an intervention at that time, I left.*" He states that by 1955 - surely enough "*large and small Bertias have bit the dust so that one can blame all crimes on their mistakes*

American and German archives have been approached for further documentation about Kindermann's activities. The CIA does not confirm or deny that it has material on Kindermann. This means that there is material that it is classified. The archives of the 'Verfassungsschutz' did not respond to a request for documentation and the German Foreign Intelligence Service, the 'Bundesnachrichtendienst' [BND] replied that it had no material. No file on Kindermann exists in the archives of the Swedish Security Police [SAEPO]. Up until now, Russian archives have not been checked for any information on Kindermann.

It is almost impossible to assess Kindermann's involvement in the Raoul Wallenberg case without further information. It needs to be determined if he acted solely on his own initiative and if he represented only his own interests or if he in any way acted in official capacity. It is unclear what American officials refer to when they say that Kindermann may be acting on behalf of "Capote." Also, there is no further information that would clarify what Kindermann has in mind when he speaks of "certain influences" who do not wish to pursue the Raoul Wallenberg case in 1954 and what led Kindermann to make the remark.

#### c. Erzine-Frey-Vladimirov

The time period of 1955-1957 marked a critical period in the Wallenberg case. With the return of German prisoners of war in that year, including Raoul Wallenberg's cellmate in Lubyanka prison in 1947, Gustav Richter, Sweden first time received critical information which left almost no doubt that Raoul Wallenberg had been imprisoned in the Soviet Union and that all previous statements by the Soviet government had been, in fact, lies. As a result of the Erlander's official state visit to the Soviet Union became of central importance, since the Swedish government now had information that would make it impossible for the Soviet government to maintain its position expressed in the so-called Vishinsky memorandum of August 8, 1947 that Raoul Wallenberg was not on the territory of the Soviet Union.

Parallel to these official preparations and discussions, informal contacts on the Raoul Wallenberg case developed between Ake Frey, an official of the Finnish Embassy in Ankara, Turkey, and Pavel Erzine of the Soviet Embassy there. These were first described in detail by Finnish journalist Pentti Peltoniemi. A number of memoranda in the Swedish Foreign Office archives detail the discussions between Frey and Erzine, but only a few are included in the official Raoul Wallenberg collection. Permanent Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, Arne Lundberg, summarized the discussions in a memo dated March 21, 1956: In August 1955 Frey and Erzine had discussed informally the issue of relations between the Soviet Union and the Scandinavian countries and Erzine had repeatedly stressed the Soviet Union's friendly attitude toward Scandinavia. For his part, Frey had indicated that if the Soviet Union wanted to have good relations with Sweden, it would have to solve the Raoul Wallenberg case. In fact, Wallenberg would have to be sent back to Sweden. Frey stated that at first Erzine appeared taken back by his comments but on the whole his reaction was "*surprisingly positive and he asked me to provide him with as much information as possible.*"

Erzine came back to the issue in the fall of 1955, and told Frey that he was interested in what Frey had told him and that he had informed his Ambassador, Boris Podtserob, who in turn also had shown a positive attitude. On March 15, 1955, Erzine reported to Frey that he had taken up the issue on a visit to Moscow "*with the authorities*" who he stated that they "*would do their best to find Raoul Wallenberg and to hand him back.*" Erzine asked Frey to pass on the information to the Finnish government which in turn should inform Swedish Prime Minister Tage Erlander personally. They should, however, not inform the Swedish Foreign Ministry. Erzine further stated that Erlander should take up the question during his visit to Moscow. "*Erzine repeated this message no less than four times.*" In the course of the conversation Erzine had not denied that Raoul Wallenberg could be present in the Soviet Union. He did, however, state at one point: "*It can of course be that he is dead.*" Erzine mentioned that he himself had seen the Raoul Wallenberg dossier and that he could assure Frey that in Moscow everything possible was being done to find Raoul Wallenberg with the intention of handing him over in the course of Prime Minister Erlander's visit to Moscow.

With that, Sweden had its first official confirmation from a Soviet official that Raoul Wallenberg was indeed in the Soviet Union. On March 15, 1956, Erzine summarizes his message to Frey in a formal letter in which he stressed



that *"in case he [RW] will be found there would be no obstacle to deliver him to the Swedish authorities."* Mea a letter from the Finnish Ambassador in Ankara to the Finnish Foreign Office formally stressed that all information provided by Erzine should definitely only be told to Erlander. Finnish Foreign Minister Toerngren then raised the issue with Goesta Engzell, the Swedish Ambassador to Finland, who was told that the Russian contact had explicitly stated that only Erlander was to be informed. Frey later explained to Arne Lundberg that this was a misunderstanding but Erzine had certainly been concerned about keeping the information in as small a circle of people as possible. After Erlander's visit in Moscow in April 1956, Frey informed Erzine that Sweden was not satisfied with what the Swedish government had been told by the Russians. Erzine assured Frey that *the "matter was now in good hands in Moscow."*

In June 1956 Frey received instructions from the Finnish Foreign Ministry to raise the issue with Erzine very cautiously again. Erzine and his colleague, V. Fjodorov, actually brought up the issue themselves by pointing to an article in the "Newsweek" magazine which supposedly stated that Raoul Wallenberg was dead after 1953 and that the Russians had found the body of it. [Note: The article from April 16, 1956 does not explicitly state that Raoul Wallenberg died but refers to the remains from the fall of 1955 of a prisoner of war in the eastern area of the Soviet Union by the name of *"Raoul Wilborg, Swedish Red Cross officer, an emaciated TB case."* Erzine may have misspoken about the year or the Swedish name in the conversation may have cited the wrong date, 1953 instead of 1955] Frey again stressed the inadequacy of the information in his reply to Erlander's visit. Frey added: *"Are we going to continue this secrecy, or can we expect a specific answer?"* Erzine emphasized in reply that it was difficult for him to raise the issue again, without any specific cause. When Frey asked what he meant by that, Erzine answered: *"If the Finnish or Swedish government would hint that their patience is finished,"* then he could try a third time. In his report Frey indicated that he more and more had the impression that *"Raoul Wallenberg - in all likelihood - is dead."*

On September 26, 1956, Frey left Ankara. Erzine declared that the very same day he had received a telegram from Moscow that the investigations were continuing. Frey would be given a new contact man in Helsinki. On November 1, 1956, V. Vladimirov from the Soviet Legation in Helsinki approached Frey.

He informed Frey that the Soviet government will give Sweden an answer even if Raoul Wallenberg has disappeared or has died. All details would be made available. In Moscow, a special staff had the task of only dealing with the Wallenberg question. Arne Lundberg informed Frey that Vladimirov should be informed that Sweden was convinced that Raoul Wallenberg was in the Soviet Union and that it is surely interested in receiving an answer.

On December 20, Vladimirov met Frey again and had nothing particular to say but was, as Frey describes it, *"unusually positive."* When Frey tells him outright that it looks like he - Vladimirov - believes that Raoul Wallenberg is no longer alive, Vladimirov does not directly agree. He also does not contradict the statement. He stresses instead *"humanitarian aspects do not have much meaning for Moscow."* That Wallenberg belonged to a well known family *"was more to the point."* Vladimirov adds that he would be grateful for some new arguments from Sweden. Frey wondered if it would be possible to discuss *"off the record"* a Russian draft answer before the official answer was given. Frey answered that he believed this to be possible. Vladimirov had stressed that the Russians were interested in maintaining unofficial contacts in the question. However, on January 18, 1956, the head of the Swedish Ministry's Political Department, Sverker Astroem, informs Frey that from the Swedish side it would hardly be possible to conduct secret negotiations with the Russians concerning the Soviet Union's official response [given in 1956]. Astroem stresses that Sweden hoped to receive a truthful and complete answer as soon as possible. Eighteen days after Frey's departure, on February 6, 1957, the Soviet Union presented the Gromyko memorandum.

In a handwritten P.M. from 1964, Frey is quoted as stating that in his mind the negotiations in 1955-57 had become very serious and that at its most critical stage, the Chief of the Finnish Political Department, Enckell, had ordered him to break off the contact. It is not clear if Enckell acted in coordination with or in response to a request from the Swedish government. Frey also says that the Russians simply were unable to locate Raoul Wallenberg and that it seemed at some point *"he had 'simply disappeared'."*

Only the highest level of the Soviet leadership could have authorized secret contacts with the Swedish government. Erzine was head of the KGB in Turkey and later became head of P. Lumumba University in Moscow. The Swedish Ambassador Boris Podtserob earlier had been head of Molotov's Secretariat and his name appears on the distribution list of some of the Raoul Wallenberg documentation in the 1950's. Molotov himself resigned as Foreign Minister while the talks were in progress, in June 1956, but he remained a member of the Politbureau. Erzine's colleague, V. Fjodorov, so far not been identified.

The Russian side has handed over three documents concerning the Erzine-Frey issue none of which sheds light on the critical question of who controlled the talks in Moscow. A request to the FSB and SVR archives for additional documentation has yielded no results. Soviet Foreign Ministry officials have searched Podtserob's papers but have not found any information concerning Raoul Wallenberg. A request for direct access to the documentation was refused. The Erzine-Frey contacts may have been nothing more than a provocation, an attempt to find out what Sweden knew about Raoul Wallenberg's fate. On the other hand, surely the Russians were quite well informed from various sources in Stockholm about the state of the Wallenberg investigation. Of some interest is Erzine's reference to the fact that

“Newsweek” from April 16, 1956. Erzine points out that Wallenberg appears to be dead, although *after* 1953 [19 is highly unlikely that Erzine could have done so without specific instructions from Moscow.

P. Sudoplatov mentions in the Russian edition of his memoirs that V. Vladimirov was specifically instructed to seek informal contacts with the Swedish government to “*deliver the message that Raoul Wallenberg had died*” in Helsinki. Sudoplatov does not clarify whether this is his personal interpretation or if he bases himself on factual information. Sudoplatov states that before his departure for Helsinki, Vladimirov had come to him to ask how Raoul Wallenberg died. According to Sudoplatov, one key goal of Vladimirov’s mission was the reestablishment of contacts with the Wallenberg family which had been suspended in 1945. Sudoplatov’s version of events has to be treated with extreme caution since his account is riddled with factual errors large and small. A few points, nevertheless, stand out. It is clear from his book that documentation about the Erzine-Frey-Vladimirov discussions remain in the Russian Intelligence Archives. Also, Vladimirov’s rather plain hint to Frey in December 1956 that the truth about Raoul Wallenberg’s disappearance is in some way linked to unspecified contact with or concession from the Wallenberg family echoes certain aspects of Sudoplatov’s account. It is also noteworthy that the talks between Frey and Vladimirov collapse at this stage.

Swedish informal contacts with the Soviet Union through Finland may not have ended with the Cold War memorandum, however. A former Finnish official of the Finnish Security Police has indicated that in July 1957, he was instructed to deliver a confidential letter from the Swedish government to N. A. Bulganin and N. Khrushchev who were on official visit to Helsinki. He has tried to obtain a copy of the letter as well as his own written communication: the Finnish Archives, but without success. No such letter is included in the Raoul Wallenberg collection of the Swedish Foreign Office. However, in a P.M. from July 2, 1957 Foreign Ministry official Sven Fredrik Hedin reports that he was asked by a Secretary Slabov of the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm about whether or not Sweden intended to invite Bulganin and Khrushchev to Sweden. Hedin responded that in his personal view such a meeting should take place if it best suited the possibility of promoting relations between the two countries. The events in Hungary were still very much in memory as was, of course, the unsatisfactory answer in the Wallenberg question. Under these circumstances it was not good to seek an invitation, Hedin explained.

The question if the Swedish government instead tried to establish contact with Soviet representatives in Helsinki in the summer of 1957, as is alleged by the official from the Finnish Security Police, will have to be studied further.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Timeline of the Erzine-Frey discussions

1950 ‘s	Swedish officials interview former prisoners of war returning from the Soviet Union
August 1955	Ake Frey and Pavel Erzine establish contact
March 8, 1956	Erzine indicates to Frey that Raoul Wallenberg has been in the Soviet Union and that he will be sent home if he can be found
March 29 -April 5, 1956	Swedish Prime Minister Tage Erlander’s official visit to Moscow
November 7, 1956	Frey continues contacts with Vladimirov in Helsinki
January 18, 1957	Head of the Swedish Foreign Ministry’s Political Department, Sverker Astroem officially declines to enter into informal discussions with the Soviet side.
February 6, 1957	Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko announces in a statement that Raoul Wallenberg died in Soviet captivity on July 17, 1947.

#### d. Svartz/Myasnikov

In January 1961, Swedish physician Dr. Nanna Svartz attended a medical congress in Moscow. On January 1961, during a visit with a Russian colleague, Dr. A. L. Myasnikov at the (USSR) Institute of Therapy, Dr. Svartz inquired whether or not Dr. Myasnikov could provide any information in the case of missing Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg. According to Svartz, Myasnikov not only indicated his familiarity with the case but also stated that he personally had seen Wallenberg a short time before. Dr. Myasnikov then called in a colleague, Dr. G. Danishevskii who suggested to Dr. Svartz that she turn with her request directly to the Deputy Foreign Minister V. S. Semenov. Dr. Myasnikov later contradicted Dr. Svartz’s account of their discussion and the issue was left unresolved.

From the beginning, the analysis of the Svartz - Myasnikov discussion faced difficult obstacles due to the :

of documentation. There are, however, some details which should be examined with great care. There appears to be a chance that Myasnikov and Svartz misunderstood each other due to language difficulties, since they knew each other well from numerous previous meetings. A number of witnesses confirm that both spoke fluent German and communication between the two had never been hampered by language problems. If either of the two misunderstood the other it would more likely have been Myasnikov, since for him the subject of the conversation was truly a surprise. A review of Nanna Svartz's personal papers shows that she had planned to raise the issue of Raoul Wallenberg with Myasnikov weeks in advance, if the opportunity arose.

According to documentation in the Swedish Foreign Ministry archives, the only uncertainty Nanna Svartz expressed about her conversation with Myasnikov was whether or not Myasnikov had stated that Raoul Wallenberg was in a "Mentalkrankenhaus" [psychiatric hospital] or whether he was "mental krank." [mentally ill]. Otherwise, she was completely sure of what had transpired. In a P.M. from February 7, 1957 written by Leif Belfrage, Nanna describes that Myasnikov's statement "came spontaneously. He went pale as soon as he had said it. and appeared to understand that he now had said too much." According to Svartz, it was not clear from her conversation with the physician, Dr. Danishevsky, how much Myasnikov had in fact told him about his statements to Nanna. "Therefore, it is entirely possible," Belfrage wrote, "that the Russians do not know how much Professor Myasnikov told her." In her P.M. from February 1, 1961, however, Svartz indicates that once Danishevsky had entered the room she asked him "if Professor Myasnikov had informed him what was at issue and he confirmed that." This would indicate that Myasnikov had understood quite well what Nanna Svartz had discussed with him. According to Nanna Svartz's letters, Danishevsky had the reputation of an informer. She had been warned about him as early as 1936 during a medical congress in Malmö.

Interestingly, at the beginning of the conversation with Myasnikov, another physician was present, a Dr. G. Speransky. It is somewhat unclear when exactly Speransky left the room. When Nanna Svartz returned to Moscow in March 1961 she had a second meeting with both Speransky and Myasnikov. A chifftelegram from March 23 signed by Rolf Sohlman, the Swedish Ambassador in Moscow, relates the content and the context of the conversation which took place on March 21: Nanna Svartz is taken back by how "pale and nervous" Speransky and Myasnikov look when they receive her. Myasnikov emphasizes that "in the Soviet Union no one is authorized to speak about other things than politics and science," at which Speransky apparently suffers a major coughing fit. Svartz asks both doctors what wrongdoing Raoul Wallenberg could have been guilty of, but she does not receive an answer. When Svartz asks whether she should see Raoul Wallenberg, Myasnikov answers that that had to be decided at a higher place, adding "if he is not dead."

A third conversation between Myasnikov and Svartz took place two days later, on March 23, 1961. Only the two of them were present as Svartz recounts in her report. Myasnikov asks how things have developed since the two last spoke and Svartz states that she so far has been unsuccessful in arranging a meeting with Semenov. Myasnikov indicates that Semenov had visited him a few days before "for a few hours. He knows everything." In her report Nanna Svartz adds in parentheses that Myasnikov continued "... (He has even spoken with Mikoyan, but he said no. This statement is confidential.)" It is unclear whether Myasnikov tells Svartz that what he said about Semenov is confidential, or if Svartz is trying to indicate to the Swedish Embassy, Moscow, that this statement should be treated confidentially. Myasnikov then tells Svartz: "Call yourself tomorrow from the Embassy, I know that Semenov will receive you. I can do more and I cannot speak to Khrushchev who is furious. Beyond that, I do not know where Wallenberg is found. Perhaps he is dead." Svartz replies: "Then he must have died quite recently, since you told me in January that he was in a psychiatric facility and you asked whether I wanted to see him." "Did I say that?" Myasnikov asks, "That must be a misunderstanding based on my bad German. I know nothing of Wallenberg." Nanna Svartz: "But that I can believe after our conversation in January, where you knew the case well and talked about that Wallenberg was not ill." Myasnikov: "I said 'perhaps' - here you come, a highly esteemed colleague, and we had a private conversation. That was very inappropriate of you not to consider the matter confidentially. There should not have been a letter to Khrushchev. That makes matters more difficult and he took the matter, as I said, badly."

Svartz points out that things have been held confidential. Myasnikov gets upset: "I know nothing in this is. I cannot do more. I have talked to Semenov and he will receive you but to him you shall say the same things as to me. That the family's investigations have shown that it makes it very likely that Wallenberg lives, but I do not believe anyone here knows anything." Nanna Svartz: "That we do not believe and you yourself said that you knew of the case and said that he was seriously ill." M: "I said 'perhaps' and I was quite unsure about all that." Svartz: "Can it be possible that in the Soviet Union one does not know of foreign diplomats in captivity but perhaps intentionally it was early on a confusion of names and it is first the latest search that clears up the matter?" Myasnikov: "Yes, not unlikely. Ask Semenov that." Svartz: "Will you help us?" Myasnikov: "Why should I involve myself in this? Wallenberg is like 0 [zero] and I do know nothing. I am a scientist and a doctor who has never ever anything to do with politics. Why do I need to be involved in this story, but nevertheless, I shall talk with Semenov again." Svartz: "Can I come back and see you?" Myasnikov: "Yes, of course."

The beginning of this conversation is interesting. One would expect Myasnikov to clear the air from the start with a categorical denial that he ever said what Svartz claims he stated. Instead it appears like Myasnikov is keeping the conversation going but perhaps Myasnikov simply did not want to appear rude. Under the circumstances, Myasnikov's conversations were probably closely monitored. It appears that official approval had been given for the second conversation with Nanna Svartz and then a third one. A careful reading of the text shows that Myasnikov did not explicitly deny having told Nanna Svartz that he had knowledge of the Raoul Wallenberg case. He qualifies his statement that he supposedly claimed that Raoul Wallenberg was ill. He twice states that he said "*perhaps*" Raoul Wallenberg was ill. Instead of forcefully rejecting Svartz' statement, Myasnikov counters only with a rather weak *say that?*"

When Nanna Svartz suggests that maybe Raoul Wallenberg had only been recently discovered to be held in captivity because he had been known under a different name Myasnikov encourages this interpretation and urges her to take up this point with Semenov. Equally interesting is Myasnikov's statement that Semenov has visited him and he has discussed the matter with him in detail. The Russian side has indicated that it has checked Semenov's papers and has found nothing about either Myasnikov, Nanna Svartz or Raoul Wallenberg. Semenov was well acquainted with Nanna Svartz from his time at the Soviet Legation, Stockholm, in the 1940's.

In a formal statement taken by Fredrik von Dardel, Raoul Wallenberg's stepfather, Nanna Svartz on September 27, 1972, that she and Myasnikov some times resorted to writing notes to each other in order not to be overheard by Soviet listening devices. Unfortunately it is not clear what parts of their conversations were conducted this way. Perhaps the information that Semenov has seen Mikoyan in the Raoul Wallenberg question was due to a confidential exchange, since Svartz specifically notes that the information is to be treated separately from the official account. Mikoyan's papers have not been reviewed. A request to study relevant papers in the archives of the Russian Academy of Medical Science was denied by the Russian side.

Another point that stands out is that Myasnikov emphasizes that he considered the conversation with Nanna Svartz confidential in some way, an exchange between two colleagues. He reasserts this point also in the meeting with Semenov in 1965, in the presence of Swedish Ambassador Gunnar Jarring.

He stresses that Erlander's letter to Khrushchev was a mistake. Experts are divided on how to assess Myasnikov's behavior. Some, including a prominent Soviet physician who worked in the same field as Myasnikov in the 1960s, expressed their doubts that Myasnikov would have ever made such a careless remark to Nanna Svartz. Others are sure that a remark like that may not have slipped out accidentally. All agree that meetings with visiting foreigners were carefully monitored. A former member of Myasnikov's secretarial staff has explained that for each conversation a report had to be filed with the Institute's Communist Party Office, which then passed on these reports to the relevant authorities. These reports were to remain on file for decades. Aside from Myasnikov, both Danishevsky and Speranzin would have had to file such reports. So far, none of the reports have been recovered. For unknown reasons, Swedish officials never followed up on Danishevsky's role in the Myasnikov/Svartz conversation. From the little information available about him, it nevertheless appears that he was the Soviet Intelligence Representative at the Institute of Technology and that his report about the conversations from January 27, 1961, may be of particular interest.

The Swedish Security Police Archive contains a protocol of a conversation between Swedish journalist Harald Wigforss and Ilya Shapiro, a well known Russian cancer researcher. Myasnikov had been Shapiro's teacher and he also knew Myasnikov's son well. Shapiro makes it clear that if Myasnikov did not have direct knowledge of the case, he nevertheless would have been in a position to learn about it in some way. "*Myasnikov was on the top*" In Shapiro's view, Myasnikov was a man who "*did not hesitate to take advantage of his position.*" According to Shapiro, one cannot exclude that his conversation with Nanna Svartz "*he gave in to a temptation to make himself important, but it is also without doubt that he knew persons who in turn could have had direct knowledge of Wallenberg's stay in a mental facility. That he should not have understood Nanna Svartz's German is a lie. ... Myasnikov traveled, as can be seen from his curriculum vitae, to the West for all those International Congresses, and the circumstances of his conversation with Nanna Svartz are such that it is impossible that he can have misunderstood ...*" Shapiro also stated that Myasnikov's character was such that he should not hesitate one moment to take back or deny an earlier statement if that should be an opportune: "*His political superiors could trust that this was a man who willingly followed their wishes.*"

Myasnikov had several important colleagues with whom he held close contact. Most important among them was A.V. Snezhnevsky. He had been for some years, although definitely not yet in 1961, head psychiatrist in the Soviet Ministry of Health. Shapiro describes him as "*a terrible man.*" Snezhnevsky was clearly one of the central persons in the Soviet Union's infamous political psychiatry. "Prominent Personalities in the USSR" from 1968 shows that Snezhnevsky was with the Serbsky Forensic Psychiatry Research Institute since 1950.

Myasnikov's private residence was located at Novoslobodskaya 57-65, which is in direct proximity to Butyrka prison. In addition, the so-called "Special Reception Room Nr. 2", a registration facility for prisoners who arrive in Moscow from the provinces, is located there. If Raoul Wallenberg had fallen seriously ill, and he had been held in a facility in close proximity to Moscow, such as Vladimir prison, he would have been taken to Butyrka hospital for evaluation and treatment. If he had any psychological problems, he may have been sent to or attended by a physician from Serbski Psychiatric Hospital. Nanna Svartz clearly remembers Myasnikov as asking her the question: "*Woll*

*ihn [RW] sehen?*” [German for “Do you want to see him?”] Svartz said that this question took her by such surprise she could not answer it and said instead that what mattered most was that Raoul Wallenberg would be returned to Sweden. It is unclear what time frame Myasnikov had in mind, or how the rather intricate bureaucratic procedure for such a visit would have been handled. Nanna Svartz was sure, however, that the remark implied that Raoul Wallenberg was in the Moscow region.

As Leif Belfrage’s P.M. from February 7, 1961, shows, Swedish officials, including Oesten Unden, Sverker Astroem and Rolf Sohlman fully believed Nanna Svartz and stated as much: *”Sohlman is quite convinced that no truth has been revealed and that Dr. Myasnikov shot off his mouth.”* Arne Lundberg, after reading Svartz’s P.M., stated that he is convinced that the truth has now come forward through an *“unreflected indiscretion”* by Myasnikov. When Sohlman reports on March 23, 1961, that according to Myasnikov, Semenov has consulted with Mikoyan about Wallenberg, a cable from Stockholm signed ‘Cabinet’ asks two days later: *“The fact that Mikoyan says that he can do anything, does that mean he acknowledges that Wallenberg is alive?”* Prime Minister Tage Erlander was completely convinced that Svartz’s account was correct and even suggested that Myasnikov may have been authorized to make a statement to Svartz. On February 9, 1961, he wrote a letter to Khrushchev asking him to make arrangements for Wallenberg to be examined by Swedish physicians and to arrange for his transfer home.

Shortly afterwards, however, the enthusiasm dies down. Sohlman reports from Moscow that an acquaintance of his who knows Myasnikov through the Academy of Medical Science has told him that Nanna Svartz had misunderstood Myasnikov. Semenov never meets with Nanna Svartz and Khrushchev personally expresses his doubts to Sohlman over the whole affair when he meets the Swedish Ambassador on February 26, 1961. In a P.M. dated September 24, 1972, signed by Fredrik von Dardel and Nanna Svartz, Svartz describes how before her meeting with Myasnikov in 1965, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring told her that she could of course take back her statements. She asked him: *“How can I do that? That would be against my better knowledge. I am completely sure of this.”* Jarring replied: *“You know that you can. You can of course blame it on a misunderstanding.”*

Everyone who knew Nanna Svartz personally agrees that she would never have pursued the matter the way she did if she had felt uncertain in any way about what Myasnikov had told her.

Nanna Svartz’s testimony was held secret for more than four years. But as Swedish Foreign Ministry records clearly show, by 1964/65 the Raoul Wallenberg case mattered primarily as an irritant and a potential problem source; it occasionally it was bound to generate negative publicity in the Swedish press. In June 1963, Swedish Air Force Captain Stig Wennerstroem was arrested as a Russian agent in Stockholm and Swedish-Soviet relations were strained further. In May 1964, in anticipation of Nikita Khrushchev’s official state visit to Sweden, the Raoul Wallenberg issue threatened once again to rear its head.

On May 26, 1964, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring met Kovalyov, head of the Scandinavian Department of MI, to discuss the preparations for the Khrushchev trip. Two accounts of this meeting exist - one Jarring’s report to Stockholm from May 26, 1964, and the other from Kovalyov’s ‘diary’, addressed to the members of the Presidium of CPSU. The two documents show the subtleties of diplomatic language and how both sides are trying to send signals that may not be entirely in line with the official position of their countries.

At the beginning of the conversation, Jarring points out that in light of Khrushchev’s upcoming visit to Sweden *“[RW’s] Family and the press will never tolerate a missed opportunity for inquiry but it should cause no unpleasant publicity.”* Jarring suggests that if Khrushchev could give a promise to Erlander that the Soviet side would make a renewed effort, it should have a positive effect on *“Swedish public opinion and the press.”* If an announcement was already made a few days before the visit, Jarring continued, *“irritating press criticism”* could be avoided.

Kovalyov in turn starts out by saying that in his view Sweden and the Soviet Union could now solve the Wallenberg question. Myasnikov had told the absolute truth and nothing else. Kovalyov also refers to the Soviet position in 1957 and asks whether the Swedish side does not trust the Soviet government? Jarring replies that an indication of mutual trust was of course the fact that they now were conducting an entirely open discussion about the Wallenberg case, the only issue that stood in the way of making the Khrushchev visit a success. *“We do not doubt the note that was presented in 1957,”* Jarring adds, *“but now ... Nanna Svartz’s testimony has come forth and it would certainly be inappropriate if .... one took this as a cause for a check, or put differently, a completing check.”* In response Kovalyov reverts to a question he had posed in the beginning: How could the Soviet government conduct an investigation if there was nothing to investigate? The question becomes more and more direct: What can one investigate? Jarring replies that a mere promise about a new investigation could be valuable and give a positive impression. In his report from Stockholm Jarring writes: *“I was convinced that one [Russia] was aware how such an investigation could be conducted appropriately. We [Jarring and Kovalyov] pretended to await the results and we understood fully well that it could be ready before Khrushchev’s visit.”*

Shortly after, the conversation takes a completely unexpected turn. Jarring continues: *“Ten minutes later I*

*lunch next to Kovalyov. We did not touch upon our discussion ... Towards the end of the lunch, Kovalyov stated suddenly: "When will Wennerstroem be sentenced?" "I had not touched upon Wennerstroem during our long talk to, after he now had brought him [Wennerstroem] up, I could of course say so much that that very name certainly has a certain influence on the delicate situation in which we find ourselves in the Wallenberg question. We in the mean time do not link these two issues and do not have any intention of doing so. But a solution of the Wallenberg question of course only have a positive influence on all sides of the Swedish-Soviet relations... That is the first time I mentioned his name in a conversation with me ... One can ask why Wennerstroem was mentioned. My interpretation is that Kovalyov will ensure himself that we are not considering to use him as instrument of pressure."*

Comparison with Kovalyov's account shows some striking differences. While Jarring's report focuses mainly on the issue of Nanna Svartz and Myasnikov and the ensuing discussions, Kovalyov stresses Jarring's supposed proposal for how to forestall negative publicity in the Nanna Svartz question. Kovalyov's account also makes suggestions appear much more direct. *"Jarring emphasized that the proposals put forward by the Swedish side should be regarded as a new demarche ... If the Svartz' version is publicized, the Swedish press will make an anti-Soviet sensation out of Svartz' statement. ... The Swedish government only wants to make the Khrushchev success and thinks that the promise of the Soviet side to once again research the question of Wallenberg will make it possible to forget this question during the time of the visit. Investigation, Jarring added, which the Soviet government would promise, could bring the same results as the investigation in 1957. On my question what additional investigations the Swedes are talking about, if they were already informed about the death of RW and that Professor Myasnikov contradicted Nanna Svartz's version, Jarring could not answer. Jarring said that he personally understood the difficulties involved but, in this particular case, he must take the position as an official representative of Sweden."*

The two accounts demonstrate that Jarring comes dangerously close to signaling to the Russian side that the Soviet note from 1957 - which states that Raoul Wallenberg died of a heart attack in July 1947 - is more acceptable to the Swedish side, and that all that is needed is a *"completing check."* If Kovalyov's account of the case is correct, Jarring's message may have been even more suggestive. Although one must always keep in mind the fact that the conversation took place in the midst of the Cold War, the exchange is somewhat reminiscent of Staffan Soederberg's behavior in 1946. Far from seizing the opportunity of either Wennerstroem's arrest, Nanna Svartz's testimony or Khrushchev's visit to press for answers about Raoul Wallenberg, Jarring instead goes out of his way to inform the Russians that the Wallenberg case as such is no longer a Swedish priority.

In his official account, Kovalyov does not mention that he raised the issue of Stig Wennerstroem with Jarring. No documentation has been found in Swedish archives that would shed light on the question how the Swedish government arrived at the position Jarring outlines in the Wennerstroem question, which is to keep the two cases, Wennerstroem and Wallenberg entirely separate and not to use Wennerstroem's arrest as a means to demand answers about Raoul Wallenberg's fate from the Russian side.

#### e. Svingel

The story of how the discussions developed in the question of a possible exchange of Russian prisoners of war : Wennerstroem can be pieced together from different documentation, namely Otto Danielsson's P.M. in the arch SAEPD, Carl Persson's account in his book *Utan Omsvep*, as well as the newly discovered material in the Swedish Foreign Ministry files. The beginning of the story is basically the same in all accounts. At the beginning of February 1966, Consul Sven Backlund of the Swedish Consulate in West Berlin wrote to Foreign Minister Torsten Nilsson that he had been visited by Carl-Gustav Svingel, a Swedish citizen, who was formally associated with the Lutheran Church Committee. Backlund recommended that Nilsson receive Svingel in Stockholm. On February 22, 1966, Backlund reported to Nilsson that in December 1965 he had been approached by a Mr. X. with the question: *"Do you believe the Swedish government would be interested in releasing Wennerstroem, against some form of 'compensation'?"* Svingel indicated that the person who had approached him was a reliable individual with very good contacts to both German as well as Soviet authorities. When Svingel indicated to his contact man that Sweden was of course interested to learn the true facts of Raoul Wallenberg's fate, the answer was *"But he does not exist."*

The next meeting brought no progress, except that this time Svingel's contact man did not state that Wallenberg did not exist. Mr. X did not clarify further what type of compensation was considered in exchange for Wennerstroem.

In the days following his conversation with Svingel, Nilsson discussed the matter with other Foreign Office officials and called in Otto Danielsson and Carl Persson from the Swedish Security Police. Danielsson drew up a report outlining what previous Soviet attempts to negotiate an exchange had looked like, most notably the Powers/Abel case. Danielsson also emphasized that Wennerstroem was an important symbol for the Soviet Union. If they did not manage to exchange him, it would not be a very encouraging sign for future Soviet recruits. Wennerstroem would

some real value in terms of propaganda use in public appearances and interviews, etc.

On March 15, 1966, a number of high ranking government officials, including Prime Minister Tage Erila and Cabinet Secretary Leif Belfrage, met together with Swedish Police Chief Carl Persson and Otto Danielsson discuss possible options on how to proceed. Both Persson and Danielsson emphasized that even though the contact man had stated that Wallenberg *'does not exist,'* this did not mean that Raoul Wallenberg was dead. Unclear and vague formulations were part of the game. Otto Danielsson also stressed that Mr. X could not be expected to get out more information than he had done. In the murky world of exchange negotiations, nothing else could be expected.

And, as Carl Persson points out in Utan Omsvep, the situation was somewhat reminiscent of earlier discussions with the Swedish Charge D'Affaires in Moscow, Barck-Holst, and Deputy Head of the Northern European Department at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Sysoyev, where Sysoyev had vigorously denied any knowledge of Wallenberg. Meanwhile Barck-Holst had clearly sensed that he was receiving some possible signals for an offer of exchange.

Torsten Nilsson, however, voiced fears that the Soviets might simply kidnap a suitable exchange object, if it did not already have someone particular in mind. Danielsson and Persson made the suggestion that someone independent of official Swedish authorities should perhaps be asked to continue contact with Svingel. This was rejected by them. Instead, it was decided that nothing should be done. Danielsson argued that Svingel may try to contact Wallenberg's mother and if the family found out that the government had refused to act on Svingel's offer, a storm of publicity could break out. Erlander admitted that that possibility existed, but the decision had been made: There would be no follow-up. Both Danielsson and Persson were shocked, as Otto Danielsson noted in his P.M.: *"Nobody appears to be troubled that, as the RPC[Carl Persson] put it, an innocent man is languishing in jail already for 21 years."*

Both Persson and Danielsson realized that government representatives had already, before the meeting, made their minds not to pursue the offer. As Leif Belfrage's P.M. from March 19, 1965 shows, that assessment was correct. Belfrage describes a number of discussions, including the one that took place on March 15. He quotes Backlund stating that the Svingel contact may simply be a Soviet provocation and should be answered with a *"determined no."* Backlund was not present at the meeting on March 15, 1966, and this remark must have been made at a discussion at the Foreign Office. At that same meeting, it became clear that neither one of the government representatives thought that *"there was the slightest chance"* that the Soviets would hand Raoul Wallenberg over. Erlander declared succinctly: *"That would be the greatest sensation in my life!"* It is important to note that just a few months earlier, in the summer of 1965, the Swedish government had decided to formally close the Raoul Wallenberg case. This decision had come after a summit meeting between Erlander and Kossygin in May 1965 had yielded no progress in the question.

After the government failed to pursue the contact with Svingel, Otto Danielsson decided that the matter was still important and he kept contact with Svingel in his role as an official of the Swedish Security Police. Over the next few years, contacts between the parties continued on a regular basis. In July 1966, Svingel has a meeting with Mr. X and at the end of the discussion he asks: *"What about Wallenberg?"* The contact man answers: *"I do not believe that he is alive."* Svingel supposedly replies: *"But that does not mean that he is dead."* The contact man answers shrugging his shoulders and then adds: *"You have to make an offer."* In September 1966 the contact man asks for personal data of the person in question. Again he states: *"If he is still alive - I do not believe that."*

By October 1967, communications with Svingel's contact man had become more difficult and he asked the contact man stated that Svingel should not be surprised: *"After all you have involved the East German Foreign Office in the matter - or at least you have not kept quiet."* According to Otto Danielsson's P.M. from October 27, 1967, he told Svingel how he had been called up to the Ministry and had received *"violent criticism"* for having mishandled the case. He had also received sharp criticism from the Soviet side. Obviously, the talks had been divulged through an indiscretion. Svingel explained that of course he had turned initially to the Swedish Foreign Office in order to establish communication in the question. According to Mr. X now a Swedish representative had during a meeting at the East German Foreign Ministry stated, among other things: *"Yes, and we also have this business with Raoul Wallenberg and Carl-Gustav Svingel."* Svingel told Otto Danielsson that it had been very hard to convince the contact man that it had not been through him that word had leaked out. As Danielsson notes in his P.M., Svingel on this occasion revealed for the first time his contact man by name. It is Wolfgang Vogel, East German lawyer who was the key figure in East German exchanges in the 1960's.

In a P.M. from 1972, in which Otto Danielsson summarizes his contacts with Svingel, he explains that in the long years Vogel had worked with Svingel, before the Wennerstroem issue was ever raised, Svingel had experienced that Vogel tried to obtain freedom for one of his "charges" without having anything to offer in return. *"I had to assume,"* Danielsson writes, *"that it could have been Raoul Wallenberg whom Vogel had in mind as an exchange object. Vogel has, however, never stated that the exchange object was Raoul Wallenberg but instead he pointed out that Raoul Wallenberg is supposedly dead. Whether or not Vogel really knows which exchange object the Russians had in mind when they came via Vogel with a proposal about Wennerstroem's clemency or release, I cannot judge. It is very likely that the KGB representative was not authorized to release information about the exchange to Vogel..."*

The last contact between Danielsson and Svingel came in June 1971, when Svingel left a message through Backlund: "*Luebeck approved, time still unclear.*" According to a note in the Raoul Wallenberg case file in SAE Svingel tried to make contact again with Danielsson in 1974, but he did not reach him. Instead, Carl Persson returned the phone call. Persson asked Svingel about the reference to 'Luebeck' from 1971, but Svingel avoided the question.

In the one P.M. that Svingel wrote in which he recounts his various meetings with Vogel, he mentions one meeting with his contact man in the end of 1968 or beginning of 1969. This was the first contact after a long silence. According to Svingel, Vogel told him to ask the Swedish government if they are willing to negotiate clemency for Wennerstroem for an exchange "*of the man you have an interest in to go free.*" When Svingel replied in surprise "*lebt also!*", the reply came: "*Ja, wir verhandeln nicht ueber Tote.*" [Yes, we do not negotiate about dead people.

Svingel says he passed on the message but did not receive an answer. According to Otto Danielsson's P.M. 1972, it does not appear that he ever received Svingel's message. One question is whether or not a meeting between Svingel and Vogel in 1968 took place at all. The other is if and to whom Svingel delivered the message. There is a note among Otto Danielsson's papers indicating that he had a quick conversation with Svingel in 1974 by phone that appears to have been the last contact.

In 1992 Svingel gave an interview to the German magazine "Der Spiegel" in which he revealed his failed contact with the Swedish government. He did not publicly reveal his contact man, however. In 1994, Marvin Makinen and von Dardel met with Wolfgang Vogel and Carl Gustav Svingel to discuss Svingel's discussions from 1966. Svingel explained how he had been contacted by a KGB representative in Berlin and the discussions developed accordingly. During the meeting with von Dardel and Makinen, Vogel asked why Svingel had never mentioned the contacts to Svingel replied that he could not because he was bound by requirements of Swedish government secrecy. When he left the table for a moment, Vogel said to Makinen and von Dardel that he was astounded that Svingel had not told him about the whole affair, but that he did not doubt Svingel's honesty and that he was convinced that Svingel had in fact had contact with a KGB representative. All this completely contradicted what Svingel had told Otto Danielsson of the two men was clearly lying.

Most observers felt that Svingel most likely was the one who had not told the truth. There was a sense that Svingel simply craved attention, that one of his goals was to obtain a diplomatic passport and that he had used the Wennerstroem/Wallenberg issue to get it. But there are some considerations that speak for Svingel's veracity as compared to Vogel's. A high-ranking official from the Swedish Security Police has stated that Vogel came to Stockholm in 1967 or 67 to meet and to discuss the Wennerstroem case, not in detail but in general terms. Apparently no specific issues were raised and no further meetings took place.

In his P.M. from 1989, Svingel stated that his discussions with the Foreign Ministry had been assigned the name 'Jacobsson-Jensen'. This has now been confirmed by the new Foreign Ministry material. In terms of Svingel's role as Vogel's contact person, a person who has worked closely with Vogel during the 1960's confirmed that Svingel during those years was trusted "implicitly." This appears to be confirmed by Sven Backlund's initial letter to Torsten Nilsson in which he states that he believes Svingel's proposal to be "*genuine.*" Questions about Svingel's credibility were raised in the early 1990's when his health and his mental capacities deteriorated. Still, if Svingel told the truth, why would he play along in the charade in 1994, when Svingel claimed that he had not informed Vogel of his contacts with a KGB official?

One possible reason could be that Vogel was at the time still under investigation by German authorities, charged with extorting money from those individuals he had helped escape from the East. Vogel's legal troubles had started in July 1993 and lasted until 1996. It is also quite clear that if the Soviet authorities wanted to pursue the release of Wennerstroem in 1965/66, Wolfgang Vogel was undoubtedly the man who would pass on such a proposal to Sweden.

It is possible that Svingel mentioned Vogel's name to Danielsson in order to cast his efforts into the appropriate light. At the same time, one has to ask what Svingel could have gained from inventing the whole affair. In the quiet of the East-West exchanges, discretion and reputation meant everything. If Svingel had simply issued a trial balloon and pursued the matter to derive another benefit, he would have run a very great risk of losing all credibility he had spent years building up. A CIA memo from the 1970 confirms that Svingel was extremely well connected to leading German politicians, including Herbert Wehner and Willi Brandt.

In the appendix to his P.M. from 1989, Svingel summarizes his assessment of the failure of the negotiations: "*They [the Soviets] knew that there was only one person in whom Sweden had a great interest - Wallenberg. No one has managed to get a main spy free and they had to give nothing in return.*" [Wennerstroem had been pardoned in 1976].

The documentation in the Svingel case was handled entirely outside of regular procedures. The communication from the German Consulate in Berlin as well as a P.M. summarizing Svingel's message and the resulting discussion



to the decisive meeting on March 15, 1966 were neither registered in accordance with regulations nor stamped 'se'. Instead, they were placed in the so-called "Gula Skapet" - Golden Safe - of the Head of the Political Department. In 1986, were the papers transferred to the regular Foreign Office archives, where they were placed in the file "German General File." There are two ways for identifying material that has been withdrawn or moved to special files in the Foreign Office Archives. One is a so-called "Haenvisning", a withdrawal slip, which indicates which document has been taken away and to which folder it has been moved.

The other was a "Blankett", a form that carries a stamp which says: *"Form is only to be used [in cases] where the confidential character of the correspondence of the respective documentation absolutely prevents its placement in the archive dossier."* Since none of the existing rules were followed in the handling of the Svingel material, it cannot be determined if all information has been preserved or if some documentation has been lost or destroyed.

In the Archives of the Security Police, the original P.M. Otto Danielsson wrote and that were quoted in Persson's book on the Svingel question and other related materials have been withdrawn from the Raoul Wallenberg file. The file includes a note, however, dated November 11, 1974, which reads: *"Svingel, Carl-Gustav, was working and living in West Berlin....he left information in the Wallenberg case. Documents are with RPC [Riksarkivet, Chef] ..."* When asked about this, Carl Persson refused to return the borrowed documentation.

Both Guy von Dardel and I explained to SAEPO officials that we would be satisfied with photocopies of the documentation, as long as we could be sure that the material was complete. SAEPO officials approached Persson and asked him to return the material he had borrowed. In January 1998, Carl Persson returned one letter Svingel had written in 1967 but not the other documents. Instead, he made the following statement: *"Contacts with Svingel were conducted by Otto Danielsson. After the government, in March 1966, said no to a possible exchange of Wennerstroem, the Security Police was no longer able to act. The government had said no to the continuation of contacts. Otto Danielsson was by then retired - had certain contacts with Svingel and the documentation you are requesting can perhaps be found in an enclosed personal letter from Svingel to Otto Danielsson. The letter had been earlier handed over to me since it is a private letter which does not belong in the archives of the Security Police."*

At the beginning stages of the contacts with Svingel, Otto Danielsson had not been a private person. Also, when he stayed active after his official retirement on October 10, 1967, he filed all material in the Swedish archives. SAEPO agreed that Persson's argument was invalid but could not intercede further. The issue remains unresolved.

## C. THE HUMANITARIAN MISSION TO BUDAPEST, 1944 -1945

### 1. Introduction

Among the many issues that have never been clarified in the Raoul Wallenberg case are the reasons for Raoul Wallenberg's arrest and the possible charges against him. There is an important difference between reason for arrest and formal charges. Years can go by between an arrest and the formal filing of charges. In Raoul Wallenberg's case, Russian authorities have claimed that he was never tried or charged, and that, therefore, he was never sentenced. The recent decision to rehabilitate Raoul Wallenberg clears him of all charges and states that he was innocent. As outlined in the appendix to the 'Trophy' request, there may have been various reasons for Soviet authorities to order Raoul Wallenberg's

- a. Jewish rescue activities in Hungary and the Balkans, through neutral nations
- b. Contacts and cooperation with Hungarian and Nazi authorities, as well as German Intelligence
- c. Contacts and cooperation with the various Hungarian resistance movements
- d. Contacts and cooperation with Allied sponsored rescue organizations and Allied Intelligence
- e. Active participation in various Allied or German sponsored Separate Peace initiatives
- f. Establishing a formal record of atrocities
- g. Member of a wealthy capitalist family [Wallenberg]

Even if only one of these points had applied, Raoul Wallenberg would most likely have been detained.

Aside from who Raoul Wallenberg was and what he did in real terms, the critical question to answer is how he was perceived by the Soviet authorities. When they arrested Raoul Wallenberg - whom did they detain? For the Swedish side, the realities of both Raoul Wallenberg's task and his life matter in terms of how Swedish officials defined and implemented their efforts to rescue him. Both sides were confined to act in the socio-political realities of the time, of which Swedish neutrality and Russia's superpower status were the most defining aspects.

When the Swedish-Russian Working Group began its work in 1991, the Soviet official in charge of preparing for the search for documentation on the Russian side was a KGB representative named Igor Prelin. In an interview with German Television in April 1997, Prelin explained which materials had been reviewed as a starting point for research: *"Above all we consulted the archives of the Security Organs, especially the materials of our 'rezidentura' in Sweden and other Scandinavian 'rezidenturas', as well as the Hungarian materials from wartime. Because there was no active resistance movement, there were our groups for intelligence gathering, spies of the [predecessors of the] KGB. There certain information came forward. ... In the course of our review we found out that the Wallenberg Family was very well known ...."*

We have now begun to review some of this wartime material. Prelin's statement also confirms not only the existence but also the importance of operational material that remains inaccessible.

### 2. The Preparation of the Mission

#### a. Business contacts

The preparation of the Budapest Mission involved various individuals and organizations. Kalman Hungarian Jew and Raoul Wallenberg's business partner, appears to have been a driving force, coinciding with various efforts from the Jewish community in Stockholm, the World Jewish Congress, and the War Refugee Representative in Budapest, Iver Olsen. The Swedish government also had considered "... *sending food to those in concentration camps [in Hungary] to be distributed under supervision.*" This proposal, about which Cabinet Secretary Erik Bohner informed the U.S. Legation in Stockholm in June 1944, may have been the reason why Raoul Wallenberg, already on June 15, 1944, requested a six months leave from his post with the Swedish Home Guard. As he wrote in his request, the reason was to "*to buy foodstuffs, partially for export to Sweden, partially for the distribution among Hungary's Jews through the Committee that shall be formed for this purpose ...*" This was about one month before Wallenberg's first meeting with Iver Olsen.

While the central focus of the mission was entirely humanitarian and remained so throughout, two other areas were definitely associated with it, one political and one economic: a. Protection of Swedish business interests in Hungary, as well as the rescue of important businessmen and skilled technical workers. These business interests included in particular, those of two leading Hungarian industrialists, Manfred Weiss and Leopold Aschner; and b. The intention of delivering Hungary into the hands of the Western Allies and not the Soviet Union. Point a. involved to a large extent Raoul Wallenberg's connections with the Swedish business community, including Sven Salen and the Wallenberg Family. Point b. involved the members of various Intelligence Services active in Stockholm and Budapest in 1944.

Very little is known about Raoul Wallenberg's personal and private activities before 1944. During his 1936-1937 stay in Palestine he had had an opportunity to listen to first hand accounts of Jewish suffering under the Nazis. Documents in the archives of the Swedish Secret Police indicate that in 1937 the former Purchasing Director of the AEG Electrical Concern, Erich Philippi, was allowed to leave Germany for Sweden after spending two years in a Concentration Camp. At his arrival in Sweden, Philippi gave as formal reference the name and address of Raoul Wallenberg. In January 1944 Wallenberg founded a business [Special-Metall Foereningen] together with Philippi who could not do so by himself since he was not a Swedish citizen. It is unclear if Raoul Wallenberg, at age twenty-five, acted on his own initiative to support Philippi or if he was acting on behalf of other individuals.

Raoul Wallenberg may also have been quite familiar with the problems Jewish business owners faced in Europe after the introduction of the so-called 'Race Laws,' beginning in 1938. In November 1940, Ivar Rooth, the Head of the Swedish National Bank, forwarded a letter to Jacob Wallenberg from Per Jacobsson, the Head of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Settlements [BIS], which stated that he had been approached on a recent trip to Hungary by businessman Phillip Weiss who indicated that he was anxious about making sure that his companies were not caught unprepared if even strict laws were to be introduced. Jacobsson writes that he was told by Weiss "*that in Hungary there is an excellent paper mill in Jewish hands [plus contact with Aschner's bulb factory TUNGSRAM, third largest in Europe]. He wondered whether the Swedish capitalist group would not be willing to take over a dominating interest in the paper factory, the transaction to be made for the purpose of aryanisation. ... The shares should be acquired 'with a return ticket,' Weiss said, but did not specifically indicate the nature of the transaction.*" Should Jacob Wallenberg be interested, Jacobsson added, he should send a representative to Budapest to talk to Weiss.

Something apparently came out of that original contact between Weiss and Jacob Wallenberg. In July 1944 Mellaneuropeiska Handelskompaniet was founded, formed out of a company held formally by Sven Salen, which was originally called 'Bananlinjen.' According to its articles of incorporation, Mellaneuropeiska Handelskompaniet's area of activity was Import-Export trade between Sweden and Hungary and "*whatever other activities are compatible with that.*" Mellaneuropeiska Handelskompaniet was formally a Salen company, but operated completely in the Wallenberg Family orbit. In addition, Rudolph Philipp on one occasion indicates in a letter that Raoul Wallenberg in 1943 traveled to both Bukarest and Budapest to deal with "*Industrial paper*" [Kraftpapier]. Weiss family businesses, their employees, as well as close business associates of Markus and Jacob feature repeatedly in the correspondence between Lauer and Wallenberg during the autumn of 1944. Alfons Weiss is listed on Raoul Wallenberg's private list as one of his key contacts and 'Henrik de Wahl' [the name appears to be a pseudonym], one of the Manfred Works' Managing Director who had fled to Sweden in the spring of 1944, participated in the preparatory discussions of the Budapest mission together with Iver Olsen.

Furthermore, it is clear from the documentation collected by the Swedish Commission on Jewish Assets in 1945 that Marcus Wallenberg had extensive business contacts in Hungary and that some of the names in Raoul Wallenberg's appointment calendar are Marcus Wallenberg's business friends from at least as early as 1942. Peter Tenbrunsel, Intelligence Man at the British Legation in Stockholm, commented on this aspect of Raoul Wallenberg's selectivity on July 3, 1944: "*Marcus Wallenberg has an eye towards business with Russia after the war ... The Swedes have an opportunity for furthering their business interests and I doubt very much whether this appointment [of Raoul Wallenberg] was entirely disinterested.*"

Many of Raoul Wallenberg's key aides in Budapest came from Leopold Aschner's TUNGSRAM concerns

of the GE conglomerate, and thereby connected with Swedish ASEA concern, a Wallenberg firm. This includes n Hugo Wohl, who according to information in the files of the Swedish Security Police was suspected of working t British Intelligence. When Himmler's Special representative, Kurt Becher, kidnapped Aschner in 1944 and dema exorbitant ransom of one million Swiss francs, the head of the U.S. War Refugee Board, John Pehle instructed I Olsen in Stockholm to determine through Raoul Wallenberg more information about the specifics of the ransom o The War Refugee Board, the Swedish Foreign Office, together with the leadership of G.E., representatives from A and TUNGSRAM's Swedish subsidiary Svenska Orion, negotiated to save Aschner's life. A much reduced sum ultimately paid through from Sweden through TUNGSRAM's subsidiary in Switzerland and Aschner was release Raoul Wallenberg's colleague at the Swedish Legation, Yngve Ekmark, had earlier been Director of the Wallenber Family's Swedish Match concern, while also serving as the Swedish Konsul in Zagreb.

All this indicates that the relationship between Raoul Wallenberg and the Wallenberg family appears to be closer than has so far been understood. According to a letter from Swedish section of the World Jewish Congress: Tage Erlander from November 11, 1946, Jacob Wallenberg's approval for Raoul Wallenberg's mission to Budapest requested and obtained: "*On the initiative of Director Lauer, .. we at the time negotiated [1944] with the Swedish Foreign Ministry and the American Legation concerning an active contribution for the rescue of Hungary's Jews whereby, in the course of negotiations with Foreign Secretary Engzell it was proposed that Raoul Wallenberg should be authorized to depart for Hungary to conduct rescue work. For this, the Foreign Ministry showed the greatest interest. Director Jacob Wallenberg has been consulted concerning Raoul Wallenberg's trip. It was clear for Wallenberg that the trip would carry a risk, but in view that one could make a real contribution for Hungary's Jews, Director Wallenberg supported it.*" [signed World Jewish Congress, Swedish Section] Jacob Wallenberg's name also as reference in the applications for Raoul Wallenberg's Kabinettspass in 1941 [a special passport that authorized travel during the war] as well as for his diplomatic passport issued in 1944 [see Document 2 a-c, Appendix]. In addition, Raoul Wallenberg is careful to list Jacob's name separately in his June 19, 1944 letter of resignation commercial activities during the duration of the Budapest assignment. Most notably, Raoul Wallenberg's letters to Jacob Wallenberg asking for employment in the Wallenberg Family business end in September 1939, after he ren Jacob that "*at our last meeting you mentioned that the war would perhaps bring a number of problems and that possibly would want to use me for their solution ...*" This might be an indication that from 1939 on Raoul Wallenberg was working for the Wallenberg family in particular Jacob Wallenberg, in still unspecified capacity. In his personal papers Kalman Lauer states that Jacob Wallenberg had been Raoul Wallenberg's "*idol*" and that during his time at Mellaneuropeiska, Raoul Wallenberg had worked as "*Jacob Wallenberg's Private Secretary*." A former employee of Jacob Wallenberg at Enskilda Bank has testified that Raoul Wallenberg had an office at the Bank's headquarters on Blasieholmen in the early 1940's. Among other things, Raoul Wallenberg dealt with business for a company called 'Baltiska Oljebolaget' which was located in Tallin, Estonia and which was owned by the Wallenbergs. According to a witness, Raoul Wallenberg traveled repeatedly to Estonia on behalf of 'Baltiska Oljebolaget.' Documentation from the Swedish Patent and Trademark Office confirm Wallenberg ownership of 'Baltiska' in the 1940's.

The collection of documents just published by the Wallenberg Family Archive, "Raoul Wallenberg in Documents 1927-1947," contains a very interesting note from Jacob Wallenberg, written towards the end of his life. He indicates that when he heard that Raoul Wallenberg was ready to go to Budapest, he asked his old acquaintance, German Intelligence Chief Walter Schellenberg, to protect Raoul Wallenberg from Nazi thugs in Budapest. Jacob had had close contact with Schellenberg, especially during the negotiations for the lives of the 'Warsaw Swedes,' seven businessmen from America who had been arrested by the Gestapo in Poland. Also, a memo from the Swedish Minister to Germany, Arvid Ribbing dated 17 December 1944 describes how Schellenberg apparently personally ordered the German representative in Hungary to stop their personal threats against Wallenberg and that he had also informed Himmler of the Schellenberg stated in his postwar testimony that on several occasions he had helped both "*Wallenberg and Masur*" should be examined whether he refers to Jacob or Raoul Wallenberg. Russian officials have hinted that the Wallenberg's case is in some way connected with Schellenberg.

According to Jacob Wallenberg's testimony at the Nuernberg trials in 1946, he had once asked Walter Schellenberg to intervene for another relative, Count Ferdinand Arco-Valley, the husband of his sister Margareta Wallenberg. Arco-Valley had been arrested by the Gestapo in March 1940 and spent 19 months in prison. He was released in September 1941, only to be re-arrested a few months later. Arco was finally released for good at the end of the war, in May 1945. According to Jacob Wallenberg's affidavit, Schellenberg's intervention had resulted in improvement of Count Arco's treatment in captivity. In December 1941 Raoul Wallenberg suddenly traveled on his own to Paris where he spent close to two months. His aunt, Countess Arco lived there by herself, since she was formally separated from her husband. The official reason for Raoul Wallenberg's trip, as stated on the application for his Kabinettspass, was the sale of a number of horses from Sweden to [Vichy] France, through the Swedish Government's Horse Export Commission, in exchange for a consignment of [rubber] tires. It has not been confirmed that this trade was actually executed. Under the Swedish-British War Trade Agreement Sweden was forbidden to export horses to Germany or associated countries. It also forbids the importation of rubber.

We have asked the Russian side for the file on Schellenberg but have not been allowed to see it. In connection with the question of Schellenberg's possible involvement, the notification from Gerhard Feine of the German Legation in Stockholm is of interest.

Budapest from February 1945 is perhaps of renewed interest. Feine informs the German Foreign Office that Wallenberg has supposedly placed himself “..under the protection of the SS.” The file for Walter Schellenberg at the Swedish Security Police is quite obviously incomplete. It is possible that some material has been withheld because it remains classified. Notations in the file reveal that some documentation has been destroyed, in accordance with official ru

## b. Intelligence Contacts

In a dispatch from Washington to Stockholm on March 16, 1944, the Office of Strategic Service [OSS] explains its motives for its participation in the missions of the War Refugee Board: “*The reason that we are taking part in this matter is to some extent the assurance that it will be possible for us to provide rapid and efficient communication which we believe we will gain important benefits in return.*” As far as the last part of the message it is quite clear to the key objectives of OSS activities in Europe, as they had been outlined in a memo entitled “OSS Program A Germany”. Under “*Objectives - Intelligence*” it states “...*a. Military - order of battle, defense installations, military plans ... b. Political and Economic - production, political groupings, their strengths and objectives .... c. Counter Measures ...- Information and Plans for moving Nazi resistance underground ... and organized action against it underground.*”

A message from August 27, 1944 between OSS headquarters to Stockholm states explicitly why the OSS is interested in developing its Hungarian connections: “*Hope some closer contacts can be worked out between Stockholm and other points, Bari [Italy] in particular, to make more effective use of Hungarian Intelligence efforts. This is necessary in view of complete lack to date any understandable policy on part our State Department or British cooperation towards Hungary and toward mobilization any Hungarian Anti-Nazi Effort.*” Taylor Cole, the OSS chief in Stockholm recalls in his memoirs that one of the key projects during 1944 were the contacts with the Hungarian Legation in Stockholm. Francis Cunningham, a Second Secretary at the U.S. Legation in Stockholm, introduced Andor Gelley, a Hungarian journalist and politician, who had excellent connections to the Hungarian Resistance. The Hungarian Member of Parliament Ulllein-Revicky also participated in the ensuing discussions. Efforts were focused on ensuring that Hungary would, at the end of the war, fall into the Hands of the Western Allies and not the Soviet Union. To that end, U.S. Intelligence cooperated closely with the British.

Iver Olsen, who had formally joined the OSS in October 1943, completed the picture in his role as Financial Attaché and former Treasury Agent. In a memorandum to Deputy Treasury Secretary Harry Dexter White from January 19, 1944 he outlined his interests and responsibilities. Among others he listed: “...[Under point I.] ... *c. Any matters in which the Legation is involved in financing of underground movement in occupied countries ... [under point III.] a. Trade and capital movements in Axis and occupied countries .... c. Flow of Axis capital from Axis or occupied countries for safekeeping purposes. ... e. Information concerning whereabouts of important bankers, industrialists and other persons of significance in Axis or occupied countries. A specific information regarding Axis looting in occupied countries...*”

When he had worked for Foreign Funds Control in the 1940's, Olsen as well as John Pehle, his former boss and the Head of the War Refugee Board, had closely investigated the war time business activities of the Wallenberg family. In the instructions from the War Refugee Board to its representative in Turkey, Ira Hirschmann, from February 1944, Pehle specifically states that the War Refugee Board and its representatives are authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the orders of the Trading with the Enemy Act. It is, therefore, quite likely that Iver Olsen had received through Raoul Wallenberg and his contacts information concerning these issues.

## 3. Raoul Wallenberg's Activities and Contacts in Hungary

### a. The Hungarian Resistance and Allied Intelligence

As stated at the beginning of this section, the central focus of the Humanitarian Mission was saving lives. At the beginning, however, the scope of the mission was limited to the repatriation of about 630 people, mostly individuals connected with Swedish businesses. In a letter to Kalman Lauer Raoul Wallenberg signals already on July 24, 1944, that this is not enough: “*It would be mistaken to believe that Sweden's role was finished with its intention of bringing help to the Jews as soon as the repatriation action has been carried out.*” While Raoul Wallenberg's attention focused clearly on the issue of rescue, the two other aspects of his mission overlapped into his activities. Many pe

who helped Raoul Wallenberg in his rescue work were deeply involved in the resistance movement and in sponsored by Allied Intelligence. One of the former was Geza Soos, leader of the MFM [Magyar Fuegg Mozgalom], and a Hungarian Foreign Ministry Official. Raoul Wallenberg went to see him on his first day in Bu Entries in Raoul Wallenberg's appointment calendar show, that he also had contact with EX [Etelkozi Szovetseg EKSZ, a resistance group comprised of aristocrats and other nationalist leaders around Admiral Miklas Horthy w most prominent member was former Prime Minister Count Istvan Bethlen. After the German occupation in Marc Bethlen had gone underground and remained in hiding until he contacted Soviet occupation troops on December Bethlen was arrested and taken to Moscow where he died on October 7, 1946.

How closely all the different contacts intertwined is shown by a secret OSS cable dated November 7, 19 Stockholm to Caserta, Italy. [See Document 3, Appendix] It mentions that Soos can be contacted only through P Anger and that Raoul Wallenberg will know if he is not in Budapest [unclear if this refers to Per Anger or Geza S At the same time, it indicates the involvement of Swedish Intelligence, including C-Bureau and its chief, Ternberg, in the administration of the so-called 'Swedish Signal Plan' [designed to signal to MFM supporters moment of the national uprising] that is outlined in the document. Iver Olsen states clearly that "*the whole affair administered by the Swedes.*" Swedish archival records indicate that Helmut Ternberg traveled to Hungary at least in the time from 1943-1944. Beyond that, only very little information is available.

As Taylor Cole reports, Lieutenant Akrell, an assistant to Swedish Counterintelligence Chief Carl Bonde, carried under diplomatic cover a radio receiver into Hungary on a Nazi plane. Akrell had the codename "The Kid. OSS cable from October 4, 1944 states: "*The Kid returned safe today. Delivered both packages to Csomoss, Mi. Csomoss, who together with Hungary's former Prime Minister, Count Istvan Bethlen, was one of Andor Gellert resistance contacts, had also close ties with Raphael Rupert, who operated together with British Warrant Officer F Barratt. Gellert's other associate, Paul Mariassy, carried another radio receiver into Hungary. He is listed in Raou Wallenberg's addressbook. Rupert was arrested by the Soviets in 1945 and was released to Britain. His debriefing British Intelligence remain classified. Sweden has not presented any documentation about the activities of its For Military Intelligence representatives in Hungary. Count Carl Bonde, the head of Swedish Counter Intelligence in was the stepson of Ebba Bonde, sister of Marcus and Jacob Wallenberg, and herself active during the war in huma and intelligence related activities. Raoul Wallenberg had frequent contact with her in Stockholm. The question of connections Raoul Wallenberg had to Swedish Intelligence, as well as who handled Swedish Intelligence contacts Swedish Legation, Budapest, after the departure of Military Attache Harry Wester in early October 1944, needs to studied further. Neither Sweden, the United States nor Britain has released transcripts of the full cable traffic betw Hungary, Stockholm, Bari and Caserta. Most surprisingly, Sweden has not produced a single Foreign Intelligen document concerning the dealings of its Intelligence Services with Hungary during WWII.*

The Swedish-Russian Working Group has received testimony from a former AVO/AVH official in [Hungarian Security Police] who stated that AVO had received information some time in the late 1940's that Cou Bethlen had at one point been interrogated together with Raoul Wallenberg personally by Abakumov. There is a evidence that Raoul Wallenberg aided in the rescue of Allied soldiers who had been caught behind ener [Testimony of Les Banos] and that he collected information on Soviet wartime atrocities, including the massacre Katyn [Testimony of Vilmos Bondor]. While Raoul Wallenberg does not appear to have been an agent of OSS, t closeness of his connections with Allied Intelligence Groups and the Hungarian resistance movement clearly mad highly suspicious in the eyes of the Russians. The Hungarian Intelligence Chief, Istvan Ujszaszy went ove Russians at the end of 1944. Ujszaszy, a Horthy loyalist, had been in hiding since the fascist coup in Hu October 1944. Valdemar Langlet, the Swedish Red Cross representative in Budapest, hid Ujszaszy for a while in home. Ujszaszy provided the Soviets with valuable information concerning his fellow Hungarian officers. It should studied further if Ujszaszy reported about the activities of the Swedish Legation, Budapest and Raoul W: personally.

#### b. German contacts

The nature of Raoul Wallenberg's work required that he had close contact to the Nazi leadership in Budap Raoul Wallenberg had some contact with Himmler's Special Representative in Budapest, Kurt Becher. He negoti with him for the lives of about 100 workers of the Manfred Weiss Works on Csepel island, where the main aircra production facilities were located. Here, again, two aspects of his mission overlap. While it has been claimed that workers were simply ordinary men, a U.S. State Department document explains that "*the Manfred Weiss firm w only one in Hungary which manufactured airplanes and .. her technical staff was one of the finest in the world* Raoul Wallenberg's and his business associates' close connections to the Weiss family also may have nec additional contacts with Becher, who had taken over the Manfred Weiss Works in Budapest shortly after the Gern occupation in March 1944.

Lars Berg, Attache at the Swedish Legation, Budapest in 1944, in a letter to the Swedish Foreign Office of January 16, 1956, confirms that both Becher and the Weiss family played an important role in Raoul Wallenberg's activities: "...Wallenberg received considerable support from the wealthy industrial family Weiss - the counterparty German Family Krupp. Even Himmler's special man in control of the Weiss family [Becher - S.B.] has apparently helped Wallenberg in critical situations." Interestingly enough, neither Kurt Becher nor the Weiss family ever mentioned their involvement with Raoul Wallenberg. This is especially surprising for Becher, who during interrogations with Allied officials after the war lost no opportunity to portray his efforts to save Hungarian Jews in the best possible light. When I interviewed Kurt Becher in 1995 at this home in Bremen, Germany, he stated that he had not met Raoul Wallenberg as a Swedish diplomat but only "as a businessman." This is indirectly confirmed by Rudolf Kasztner's account of Becher's dealings with Wallenberg. German author Christoph Gann cites in his book about Raoul Wallenberg Kasztner's assertion that Wallenberg offered to deposit one million dollars abroad, if Becher would arrange for the conduct of a certain number of individuals to Sweden. Hungarian author Andreas Biss puts the figure at about \$1 million for 400 persons. Becher's personal papers were seized from his headquarters after the Soviet occupation of Hungary and have so far not been located in either Hungarian or Russian archives. After Becher's arrest by the members of the U.S. Counter Intelligence Corps in 1945, Becher was loaned out for a few months period to the Soviet Allies in Budapest. While in Soviet captivity, Becher was interrogated by Hungarian and Soviet Secret Service representatives. The protocols from Becher's interrogations in Hungary are only partially available and remain heavily edited.

What negotiations, in detail, Raoul Wallenberg may have had with other German and Hungarian Nazi officials and perhaps German Intelligence officials needs to be examined further. Of foremost interest would be to determine what extent, if at all, Raoul Wallenberg or the Swedish Legation, Budapest figured in the various initial negotiations for a Separate Peace between Germany and the Western Allies. In this context a number of unidentified individuals who appear in the correspondence between Raoul Wallenberg and Kalman Lauer may be of interest. In a letter from July 1944 Lauer informs Raoul Wallenberg about a man called "Ludo" who will be coming to Budapest to assist in the Jewish question and who has some sort of "special [German] authority." "Ludo" was obviously not a Swedish official, since on July 19, 1944 Raoul Wallenberg takes it upon himself to inform the Swedish Foreign Office of the man's arrival. Sudoplatov states in Special Tasks that A. Belkin, the former Deputy head of SMERSH supposedly had access to Raoul Wallenberg's dossier. According to Belkin, SMERSH received in early 1945 an briefing [orientirovka] with instructions "to assess and study [Wallenberg's] contacts with German authorities, national and local," since Wallenberg was "an established asset of German, American and British Intelligence." Raoul Wallenberg arrived in Lubyanka prison in February 1944, he was placed with German Abwehr officials who served in Rumania and Hungary in the 1940's.

## **D. RESPONSES TO RAOUL WALLENBERG'S DISAPPEARANCE**

### 1. Introduction

What follows is an attempt to summarize and analyze the responses of certain individuals and/or governments to Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance over time. Special attention has been paid to those aspects that have not received much attention, such as Staffan Soederblom's sudden shift in attitude towards the Raoul Wallenberg case in April 1945 compared to his earlier views; the Swedish Foreign Office's widely perceived passivity in the search for Raoul Wallenberg's fate; the U.S.'s failure to coordinate research efforts with Sweden; the Soviet Union's often ambiguous signals in the case; as well as the Wallenberg family's lack of active participation in the Raoul Wallenberg investigation.

## 2. Staffan Soederblom

As Guy von Dardel's review of early Foreign Office communication shows, Staffan Soederblom's first reaction to the news that Raoul Wallenberg is missing stands in stark contrast to his later assertions in his official discussions with the Soviet leadership that Raoul Wallenberg must have been killed on his way to Debrecen. In fact, it appears that he was the one who initially urged the Swedish Foreign Office to take decisive action in clarifying and confirming Wallenberg's status as an official Swedish representative in Hungary. On December 31, 1944, Soederblom petitioned Deputy Foreign Minister W. Dekanosov to aid the members of the Swedish Legation, Budapest after their occupation. Dekanosov, on January 1, 1945, confirms receipt of Soederblom's message and adds *"that the authorities have been informed."* On January 16, 1945, Dekanosov notifies Soederblom that the military authorities have now located Wallenberg and that they have taken action *"to protect him and his property."* After reconfirming Dekanosov's note on February 3, Soederblom grows impatient, as can be seen from his telegram Nr. 74, dated February 8, 1945: *"Question whether Wallenberg in Budapest. - who is registered as Secretary of Legation ... ought to get instructions concerning his status."* The response, numbered 89, from the Foreign Office is short: *"What is your referring to which appears murky."* Soederblom becomes explicit: *"My thought - your 89 - was that Wallenberg instructed to take up contact with the new Hungarian government, which seems to us should be regarded as the legal in the country, in his capacity as official representative. ... Some information of this kind seems even more suitable since Wallenberg probably has not gotten the least sign of life from home."*

Clearly, Soederblom realizes that Raoul Wallenberg's diplomatic status, and therefore his protective diplomatic immunity, is vital to ensure his safety vis-a-vis the Soviet authorities. The reply from the Foreign Office on February 17, 1945 makes it clear that Swedish officials do not realize the seriousness of the situation: *"If you can establish connection with Wallenberg - your 85 - transmit our thanks and best wishes from the family and the informant's instructions will be given when Danielsson has been found."* A handwritten note says: *"The relations to the Swedish government cannot at present be specified."* By the time this message is sent a full month has passed since Dekanosov's information that Raoul Wallenberg has been placed under Soviet protection. In fact, by February 15, 1945, Wallenberg has spent already one week in Lubianka prison. On March 8, Soviet-controlled Kossuth Radio reports that Raoul Wallenberg has disappeared since January 17: *"All signs indicate that Gestapo agents murdered him."*

By the beginning of March 1945, Swedish Minister Ivar Danielsson and the other members of the Legation are finally located in Budapest and by the end of March they have made their way to Bukarest, Rumania, under 'protection'.

On March 26, Soederblom informs the Soviet Foreign Ministry that according to information received from Rumania *"Wallenberg has been missing since January 17 when he left Budapest by car."* On April 13, 1945, the Swedish Legation arrives in Moscow at 11:00 am in the morning and departs again for its trip home to Sweden at 11:00 pm. Danielsson has a private meeting with Soederblom. On the station platform, before their departure for Stockholm, Soederblom whispers to Anger: *"When you get home, not a bad word about the Russians!"*

On April 14, Soederblom sends a new message to Stockholm and this time his tone as well as his message changed dramatically: *"Six. Wallenberg, who had been sentenced to death by the Arrow Cross and the German own initiative sneaked over to the Russians. As soon as they met him I was officially informed. Thereafter it appears that Raoul Wallenberg departed by car to Debrecen and it is feared that he died on the trip. There are other theories: Car accident (very likely), murder as a result of a robbery, an ambush by the Arrow Cross, etc. I am afraid that these will never attain clarity. Seven: It is recommended that Anger immediately author a detailed report and brief the Foreign Ministry on what has occurred."*

Soederblom, who had been so concerned to ensure that Raoul Wallenberg received proper official status from the Swedish government now insinuates that Wallenberg contacted the Russians without prior authorization. He makes no reference to Dekanosov's note that Raoul Wallenberg is under Soviet authority and instead implies that Raoul Wallenberg was killed in Debrecen and was killed. Most shocking is his assertion that the true circumstances of Wallenberg's fate will never be learned. Also of interest is the fact that even though Anger was specifically asked to brief the Swedish Foreign Ministry on the events, no official record of such a briefing has been found in the Foreign Ministry archive. Guy von Dardel, however, located a document in his own papers which indicates that Anger did indeed brief some officials after his return on April 20, 1945. The document is, unfortunately, undated and it is not clear who wrote it or to whom it is addressed. It is important, however, since it makes clear that Raoul Wallenberg had, in fact, requested and received permission from Minister Danielsson for his intention of contacting the Russian authorities. *"Secretary of the Legation, Per Anger, has during his visit on April 20, 1945 reported the following: ... Some days immediately before January 17, 1945, the day on which Pest was completely occupied by the Russians, Wallenberg had informed the Minister that the fighting had reached such a scale that he could no longer do anything useful and that he therefore thought of going over to the Russian lines. The Minister let him know that if he considered his position untenable, he should go c*



*the Russian side.*”

The supposed uncertainty about Raoul Wallenberg’s intention of why he contacted the Russians that has the air ever since Soederblom’s telegram is clearly not justified. Even after Anger’s and Danielsson’s return to Stockholm, nobody bothered to correct the false impression that had been created. In Soviet eyes, from beginning Raoul Wallenberg’s authority as an official Swedish representative was put into question: He received no official task from his government and stood accused of having acted without official authorization. All this reinforced the Soviet impression that Raoul Wallenberg was not a real diplomat.

As Guy von Dardel notes in his analysis, when the Swedish Budapest Legation arrives back home in Stockholm all of a sudden the roles of Soederblom and the Foreign Ministry are reversed: Soederblom justifies his failure to act more by writing on April 19, 1945 that he wanted to wait “... until you in Stockholm have had opportunity to contact and explore all the information that the returned Budapest - Swedes have available.”

It is in the same telegram that he reports about how he responded to an offer of assistance by the American Embassy, Moscow. Soederblom, without asking for prior instructions from Stockholm, recommends that the Americans make an official request through their Legation in Hungary and states that the Swedish Embassy, Moscow does not know how the Americans can be of help. He adds that “...I am afraid that the Russians with the best intentions in the world will not be able to clarify what has happened.”

The Swedish Foreign Ministry finally gives Soederblom, on April 21, 1945, “definite instructions” to prepare to see Dekanosov and to remind him of his note from January 17, 1945. Soederblom’s response on April 30 makes it clear that he has gotten the message but that this changes nothing about his basic attitude or assessment of Raoul Wallenberg’s situation: “As I have indicated earlier is it, unfortunately, possible that the matter will remain an unsolved mystery. All this cumulates in Soederblom’s disastrous meetings with the Head of the Fifth European Department [Scandinavia] of the Soviet Foreign Ministry [MID], Abramov on March 9, 1946 and later Stalin on June 15, 1946. As can be seen from Abramov’s notes, Soederblom emphasizes repeatedly his personal belief that RW has been killed on the way to Debrecen. [For a full discussion and relevant documentation, see the Swedish Working Group Report].

Aside from the possible implications that Soederblom’s meeting with Stalin may have had, the question is why? Why did Soederblom’s behavior change so dramatically? and 2. Why, as an experienced diplomat, did Soederblom act in this manner? The shift in Soederblom’s position clearly takes place between the end of March 1945 and April 14, 1945. From Soederblom’s communications, it is clear that the meeting with the members of the Swedish Legation, Budapest, is one critical factor. In a letter from December 18, 1945, Soederblom refers to a newspaper article written by Valda Langlet, in which Langlet asserts that Wallenberg died on his way to Debrecen. Soederblom adds: “It is of interest to me to know if either before or after even the slightest communication with Langlet.” During her last visit to Moscow, Susan M. Branson was shown a document that had been handed over by the Russian side to Sweden years ago, but that had not been available to researchers. When Minister Danielsson and his staff are detained by Soviet authorities on March 9, 1945, Soviet Commander, General Pavlov: “As you are most probably aware, the Swedish Embassy in Budapest in 1945 was on the protection of Russian interests in Hungary and in connection with this I would like to present information that I have which might be of interest to the Russian government. Apart from this, there are a number of questions regarding the activities of this very Embassy in relation to which I would like to consult you ...” It is known what Danielsson reported.

The fact that this document was discovered in a still classified file in the Russian Intelligence archives makes it likely that related documentation most likely survives as well. All members of the Swedish Legation were interrogated by Soviet authorities. Despite repeated requests we have not seen records of these interrogations. The message on the Kossuth radio that Raoul Wallenberg had most likely been murdered aired on March 8, 1945. Did Danielsson know about the broadcast? And did it have anything to do with offering information to General Pavlov? It would be important to determine what Danielsson reported and if what he had to say in any way could have been damaging to Raoul Wallenberg. The fact that no debriefings exist from the Swedish Legation personnel after their return from Stockholm exacerbates the situation.

Danielsson’s behavior raises questions in another matter. He leaves M. Tolstoy-Kutusov, a Russian national who worked with Valdemar Langlet and known Soviet agent, officially in charge of the Swedish Legation by handing him the Legation’s official seal. When the Russians arrive in Budapest, Tolstoy-Kutusov has proof of his legitimacy while Raoul Wallenberg, an official Secretary of the Legation, is left unprotected. As mentioned earlier, the Swedish side has so far not been able to study Tolstoy-Kutusov’s file. The Russian side has confirmed that he was a Soviet agent about the 1920’s and that he reported extensively about the Swedish Legation activities. The true circumstances of Tolstoy-Kutusov’s association with the Swedish Legation, and especially his contacts with both Minister Danielsson and the head of the Foreign Interest Section, Lars Berg, remain poorly understood.

Another factor that may have influenced Soederblom's behavior is the fact that at the very beginning of , Soederblom receives instructions from Stockholm to request from the Soviet government protection for Swedish [Swedish] Match factories in Hungary. In three telegrams to Head of the Political Department of the Swedish Foreign Office, Erik von Post, from April 6, 12 and 17 respectively, Soederblom outlines the difficult problems businesses are faced with in Soviet occupied territories. Particularly the danger of confiscation and nationalization loomed heavily and the matter is discussed with both Ivar Danielsson and Consul Yngve Ekmark, a Swedish Foreign Office official, when they came through Moscow on April 13. A key priority in Swedish Foreign Policy becomes the quick normalization of political and particular economic relations with Hungary and the rest of Eastern Europe. In an unclassified note addressed to Swedish Foreign Ministry official K. Westman Soederblom writes: "... *It is clear that from the side our attempts to as soon as possible normalize the diplomatic relations between Sweden and the new Hungary looked upon with approval. In this respect our country is [a] pioneer.*" It needs to be investigated more thoroughly the type of instructions Soederblom received in this matter and from whom.

### 3. The Swedish Foreign Office/Swedish Intelligence

From the moment of Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance, the Foreign Office had quite a few indications that Wallenberg had not died in the fighting in Budapest or on his way to Debrecen, but that, instead, he had been taken to Moscow. In September 1945, the Swedish Foreign Office received a report through Kalman Lauer, who had gone to Hungary as a member of a Red Cross Delegation to Hungary. In a report to the President of the Swedish Committee for International Relief, Birger Ekeberg, Lauer writes:

*"... Director Takacsy, deputy director for foreign countries of the Hungarian National Bank and present Director Manfred Weiss Works reported the following: Raoul Wallenberg lives.*

*He is in Russian hands, and the Russians need him for a trial, which the Hungarian government shall conduct with leading persons in trade and finance, persons who over five years are German friendly. Furthermore he indicates an official intervention from the Swedish government would not bring a result, possibly a private initiative could use."*

This information was relayed immediately to the American Legation in Stockholm, from where it was forwarded directly to the U.S. State Department. When the State Department, through acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson, was about to inform its Embassy in Moscow, the initial draft of the message included an interesting caveat: '*FONOFF (sic) hopes foregoing may assist you in making further inquiries about Wallenberg [but it feels that even if the info is true the Soviet will never produce Wallenberg alive.]*' The last line of this communication is crossed out in the final version, the one that was sent, and a notation in the margin of the document reads: *Mr Clattenberg agrees to omission.* Albert Clattenberg was at the time head of the Special War Problems Office in the Department of State and handled special cases such as missing persons abroad, including diplomats, and related issues. [see Document Appendix.]

The document raises a number of questions: Who in the normally so cautious Swedish Foreign Office would make such a remark? It has not been possible to trace the remark in the Foreign Office files. According to Swedish Foreign Ministry records, the communication on this issue took place between Erik von Post and C.M. Ravndal of the U.S. Legation, Stockholm, as well as Deputy Chief of the Political Department, Sven Graftstroem, Deputy Cabinet Secretary Per Vilhelm Assarsson, and the American Minister in Stockholm. More importantly, no one appears to pick up on Takacsy's hint that "*possibly a private initiative could be of use.*" Takacsy served at the time at the discretion of the occupation authorities and clearly did not speak as a private individual. His remark can be interpreted as a possible hint that the Soviet side may be interested in some type of compensation for the return of Raoul Wallenberg. Only a few papers of the Special War Problem's office are accessible in the U.S. National Archives. They do not contain information about Raoul Wallenberg.

As has been discussed under the previous point, the most grievous mistake the Swedish Foreign Ministry in the period of 1945-47 was the failure to provide Raoul Wallenberg with an official status that would have had weight in the eyes of the Russians. Early on, there is not only an evident lack of interest in Wallenberg's personal well-being but also hints of an official distancing from Raoul Wallenberg's mission. This showed itself in subtle ways, such as the Swedish Foreign Office's refusal to reimburse claims from individuals who had incurred expenses while working for Wallenberg in Budapest. A letter from Head of the Legal Department, Goesta Engzell, to the Swedish Minister in Budapest, Arfwedson on June 14, 1946, in response to a request from one of Raoul Wallenberg's helpers, business manager Bela Szabo states: "*You should especially point out to Szabo that the Wallenberg Action did not take place as a mission assignment by the Swedish state, by which the state cannot be held responsible for fulfillment of agreements the*

*made in Hungary.”*

Raoul Wallenberg's official task, according to Sven Grafstroem's letter to Per Anger from July 6, 1944, was to *"follow the developments in the Jewish question and to report to Stockholm."* Grafstroem stresses to Anger that Wallenberg's task is *"extremely delicate"* and that *"any intermezzos with the authorities"* are to be avoided. During his time in Budapest, Wallenberg angered many of his colleagues who felt that he simply had gone too far in his efforts to protect the Jewish population. They later complained that his actions had often endangered their own lives. At that time, one wonders how it happened that towards the end of 1944 Raoul Wallenberg essentially had taken over the duties of the Legation. In his last letter to his mother, Wallenberg writes: *"I have now met about ten times with the Foreign Minister, twice with the Acting Prime Minister, once with the Finance Minister ..."*

Several Historians have called for a more thorough review of Raoul Wallenberg's activities in Budapest. A review with that will come a much needed examination of the work and behavior of the members of the Swedish Legation and its associated staff. As outlined in part under the previous and the following points, many important questions remain unexplored. What has happened to the questionnaires that were given by the Swedish Legation staff to Soviet prisoners of war? Did any of the information gathered end up in German hands? How did Mikhail Tolstoy-Kutusov come to play such an important role with the Swedish Legation? What were Grossheim-Krisko's and Evald Engestrom's activities? Where is the documentation concerning the Swedish Legation's contacts with the Hungarian resistance, especially Soos' MFM? And finally, what, in fact, were the attitudes of some of the members of the Legation towards the horrors they were witnessing and the work Raoul Wallenberg was carrying out? If the "poem" Lars Berg composed on the occasion of the Budapest Legation's return to Stockholm is any indication of "real" attitudes, then what shines through is an appalling lack of sincerity and engagement.

Raoul Wallenberg's family, especially Maj von Dardel, were very unhappy with the attitude displayed by Swedish Foreign Ministry officials in the early years. She had made it known that she thought that Staffan Soederstrom and Gunnar Haeggloeff had operated under the assumption that Raoul Wallenberg was dead already in 1945. It appears that she had reason to question the sincerity of the Foreign Ministry's early approach to her son's case. At one point Ambassador Rolf Sohlman phrased his request for instructions from Stockholm this way: *Is he to pursue the question in a serious manner,"* Sohlman asks? Or is he to raise the issue [in Russia] only *"as matter of tactical considerations vis the family and therefore not drive the question more energetically?"*

Shortly before Prime Minister Tage Erlander's visit to Moscow in April 1956 Fredrik von Dardel, notes in his diary a meeting he has had with the Prime Minister: *"... Our meeting took place right before Erlander's departure to Moscow. Erlander showed himself to be surprisingly uninformed about Raoul's case, but listened with increased interest.. He makes in all his wellmeaning a rather weak impression and it appeared to us very unlikely that he will be able to get anywhere with the Russian gangsters he has to deal with. ... Mai was very depressed and disillusioned, which she also told him when we said farewell. ..."*

Erlander could of course not be expected to be an expert on the Wallenberg case and he had to rely on aides: Arne Lundberg to prepare the issue and to brief him appropriately. Even if Erlander was fully prepared to press the matter vigorously, questions about certain individuals around him are raised by a document that is included in the documentation handed over by the Russian government in 1991. The document is not dated, nor is it clear who the author is or to whom it is addressed. The content makes it clear that it was written some time before Erlander's visit to Moscow in 1956: *"Many times Erlander spoke of his intention to raise in Moscow the question of Wallenberg, a former Secretary of the Swedish Mission in Budapest who, as Swedish authorities claim, is presumably in the USSR. Some people who are close to Erlander told the members of the Soviet Embassy in Sweden that Erlander would raise the question in Moscow but he was forced to discuss this in order to prevent the bourgeois parties from losing the Swedish government in the forthcoming Parliamentary Elections in the fall of this year for not being active enough ... in their research in the Wallenberg case ..."* One has to be cautious, of course, how to interpret this document which, after all, is the subjective account of a Soviet official reporting home. It should be explored, however, whether expectations were somehow intentionally lowered before the Erlander visit and who said what exactly.

The Swedish Foreign Office readily admits that its early handling of the Raoul Wallenberg case left much to be desired. But even though matters did improve in later years, particularly when Arne Lundberg and Otto Danielsson coordinated their efforts, there appeared to be no willingness to energetically push for Raoul Wallenberg's return. The reasons for this failure have never been sufficiently examined.

With the presentation of the Gromyko memorandum in February 1957, the latent passivity that had marked the actions of the Foreign Office in the Wallenberg case in the early years and that had remained present in some form since, raised its head again. Only three weeks after the Gromyko memorandum was presented, Foreign Minister Carl Gustaf Udden issued his assessment: *"It appears that Wallenberg is dead... One can of course speculate about*

*possibilities that, for example, Wallenberg has disappeared or is in such condition that he cannot be shown. The theoretical possibilities but very unlikely. To maintain or to build up a relationship with the Soviet Union in a way that can happen without sacrificing more important values, belongs to our most important tasks in Foreign Policy. In my opinion we have no reason to hold a continuous grudge against the Soviet Union...*"

With that, the Raoul Wallenberg case was essentially closed, at least as far as efforts to secure his release were concerned. How sensitive Udden's memo was shows an attached note by Head of the Political Department, Sverker Astroem Rolf Sohlman in Moscow: *"I would be grateful if you would burn the document immediately after reading."* Notes like this are very rare in Foreign Ministry correspondence [One P.M. in the Erzine Frey discussions carried out]. Burning papers was against the rules that guided handling of official documentation. Udden's memo implies that Raoul Wallenberg survived in the Soviet Union, it was neither pragmatic nor politically feasible for Sweden to insist on his return.

Newly released material from the FBI shows that Udden indicated to the United States that he was now ready to accept the Soviet version of Raoul Wallenberg's supposed death: In a confidential note the American Embassy in Stockholm, informs the U.S. State Department on February 8, 1957 that *"the Foreign Office indicated to the Ambassador that since it had no proof that Wallenberg was alive after 1947, it was inclined to believe the Soviet story."* In other words, Sweden signaled that it was ready to settle for the most likely outcome - that Raoul Wallenberg was dead - and decided not to insist on the true circumstances of his fate. This willingness to compromise, to set aside the question short of the truth, is largely responsible for the public's perception of Sweden's "passivity" in the Wallenberg question.

If Udden's attitude was not the majority view, it clearly represented a mindset that has left an indelible mark on the UD's handling of the case. Pragmatism became policy, and while numerous Foreign Office officials did not agree with that policy and valiantly struggled to pursue every trace of Raoul Wallenberg, they could not overcome the hurdle that pragmatism imposed. With the exception of the Nanna Svartz case, where Swedish officials, at the beginning, tried to pursue the matter, the Raoul Wallenberg case lay dormant from 1965 -1979. In 1972, at a press conference in Vienna, Swedish Foreign Minister Krister Wickman in reply to a question concerning the status of the Raoul Wallenberg case stated that *"the Raoul Wallenberg case, as far as the Swedish government is concerned, is a closed chapter."*

Over the years, Swedish diplomacy repeatedly incurred the irritation of the Soviet government by maintaining inquiries about Raoul Wallenberg but there is no evidence in the Swedish files which show that Sweden at any time willingly staked anything on Raoul Wallenberg's return. When in 1981 a Soviet U-Boat surfaced in Swedish territorial waters, many urged the Swedish government to use the incident to request the truth about Raoul Wallenberg from the Soviet government. Sweden refused, as State Secretary Leif Leifland explained in a television interview in April 1981 because *"we thought - and I am still today of this opinion - that a civilized government should have nothing to do with extortion. It's as simple as that."*

As time went by, it became ever more difficult to pursue the case, especially in light of new political challenges like the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and other crises. A secret internal memo from February 1985 outlines the difficulties of some Swedish Foreign Office officials:

*"The point in time had to arrive some time where we had to tell ourselves that the likelihood that Raoul Wallenberg lives is so little that it costs too much to continue to drive the question - if we do not do it on the basis of new material. ... Is Raoul Wallenberg still alive (and then 72 years old)? I cannot, dare not claim that he could not be alive. But I think that after all years have gone without us receiving new certain information, the likelihood that he still continues to live has to appear so little that we cannot longer allow that the question will burden - sometimes poison our relations with the Soviets. These relations are complicated enough as a result of Soviet violations of borders, spy affairs, etc. ... All that does not mean that we should stop our research work - it has to be our goal to gain definite clarity about what happened to RW. All new traces have to be checked ... But I have difficulty seeing it should be in our long term interest to take up the questions again with the Soviet government if we do not have absolutely reliable information."*

Whether consciously or not, the Udden-mindset affected the Foreign Office's official handling of the Wallenberg case and it has been especially evident in the question of pursuing witness testimonies. There existed no common standard for formalizing testimonies. In our research, we have only seen the final reports based on conversations officials had had with witnesses. Many important witness interviews were taped, even in the 1950's but many have not heard the tapes or seen the full transcripts. In some cases, witness testimonies were abridged, for the purpose of publication [of the various White Books, for example]. In some instances, the abridged versions have become the standard account known for that witness.

While dedicated Swedish Foreign Office staff diligently recorded every witness statement and tried valiantly to pursue many of them, the collected information was never related to each other or evaluated in a systematic manner. In addition the prevailing assumption that Raoul Wallenberg most likely died in 1947 caused many testimonies to

essentially ignored. A good example are the witness statements for Lubianka and Lefortovo prison after 1947. Equally ignored were the witness accounts for the years 1970-present. The consultants to the Working Group have specifically asked to examine all statements covering the period after 1947, yet the Swedish Foreign Ministry has provided adequate access to most of the documentation from 1970-present. Swedish officials argue that they have reviewed the material and that it contains no new useful information. Even if that were true, the argument is completely incompatible with accepted standards of historical research.

The reaction to Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance by the Swedish Foreign Intelligence Services is unknown. Remarkably, Sweden has not produced a single Foreign Intelligence document in the case. As shown earlier, Swedish Intelligence did play a role in certain events while Raoul Wallenberg was in Budapest, and documentation should exist in the files. Even if documentation was destroyed in the 1960's as part of the IB affair, for example, it should have been possible to reconstruct certain files with help from other agencies. In addition, there should be material covering the last thirty-five years. Other Swedish Intelligence documentation that is available and that is in some way related to the Raoul Wallenberg case, such as the material from the Stig Wennerstroem spy case, needs to be thoroughly examined. Numerous aspects in the Wennerstroem matter are of great potential interest for the Wallenberg investigation. For example, did the Russians ever consider Raoul Wallenberg as an insurance policy for a rainy day, for use in an emergency situation, such as the one brought on by Wennerstroem's arrest in 1963? And if Wennerstroem did not die alone, if there was indeed a "second" and perhaps a "third" man - as has been suggested, for instance, in the book *Stig Wennerstroem* by Swedish author Anders Sundelin's - how did the need to protect that network affect the peace negotiations in the Wallenberg case, in Moscow and in Sweden?

Surprisingly few materials exist which shed light on the question of how Swedish decision makers evaluated the Raoul Wallenberg case and what considerations guided the decision making process. Documentation from the Intelligence Services is needed to clarify how the Raoul Wallenberg case was perceived at the highest levels of the government and how it fit into the larger context of Swedish post-war history, especially as it concerns the specific requirements of Swedish neutrality policy. Although Sweden was nominally neutral, it secretly favored U.S. interests. [Former Cabinet Secretary Erik Boheman referred to this once as "*deals we cannot talk about.*"] The Russians were aware of this through a variety of sources, including Stig Wennerstroem. One of the questions that has not been explored is whether or not Russia, ever exacted a price from Sweden for this indiscretion. It should also be studied, if and how the wish to avoid negative fallout and spillover from the Raoul Wallenberg case into related issues influenced Swedish handling of the case.

At the Swedish Security Police, Otto Danielsson handled the Wallenberg question until his retirement in 1981. Aside from the Raoul Wallenberg dossier, there are a number of subject and personal files that are of interest for the investigation. No file supposedly exists for Iver Olsen. Almost all of the known American Intelligence agents in Stockholm had had at one time their own dossier. It is very unusual that no dossier exists for one of the most prominent members of the OSS in Scandinavia. The Wennerstroem file in SAEPO remains classified.

Swedish Laws and guidelines on Secrecy stipulate that documentation which is considered sensitive to the national interest can be classified according to the 30 year, 70 year or 150 year rule. The 150 year category contains materials that are so sensitive as to be 'unreleasable' anytime in the foreseeable future. This supposedly concerns material related to issues of National Security, such as location of military installations, etc. According to experts consulted these materials fall under a special deniability clause: They are so secret that inquiries concerning such materials are routinely turned away denying the existence of the material.

Within Swedish agencies, such as the Swedish Foreign Office, documentation is assigned to various levels of confidentiality: 'Förtroligt' [confidential]; 'strengt förtroligt' [strictly confidential]. There are generally two categories of classification: 'Hemligt' [secret]; and 'Kvalificerat Hemligt' [Top Secret]. As far as we can tell, we have been allowed to see material that was previously considered 'secret'. We have not had access to 'top secret' information or beyond 'top secret.'

#### 4. The Soviet authorities

The decision to detain Raoul Wallenberg was apparently made by Stalin himself. It would be important to determine what exact reasons led to his arrest and whether or not Stalin's original intent about what to do with Wallenberg changed over time. Equally important is the question of who had control of the Raoul Wallenberg case at the time of Stalin's death in 1953.

The Soviet government had plenty of information about Raoul Wallenberg at its disposal from a variety of sources, including M. Tolstoy-Kutusov at the Swedish Legation, Budapest. Unfortunately, nothing is known about the information he provided, how the information flowed from the field to Moscow, and how it was processed there. The flow of information was apparently quite well organized. In his memoirs, "A Hidden World" Raphael Ruzhnikov worked for Allied Headquarters [Vienna] in Budapest, describes that when he was first interrogated by the Russian official in charge "*appeared to have the most detailed knowledge and was clearly anxious to impress me with the efficiency of the Russian security system.*" The interrogators responsible for questioning Raoul Wallenberg received instructions from their Department Heads which in Raoul Wallenberg's case was S. Kartashov, the Head of Department Four [Investigations] of the Third Main Directorate MGB [Military Intelligence]. Important information received from interrogation was in some cases forwarded directly to the so-called "Higher Authorities" [Instantsi], the highest level of the Soviet Leadership. So far, this documentation has not been presented.

In February 1945, the Swedish Legation, Budapest, was looted by Soviet troops. A letter to the Soviet Foreign Ministry by G.M. Pushkin, the Soviet Envoy to Hungary, from May 25, 1945, confirms the story. The Swedish Legation has asked for the confiscated records but has not received any. There are indications that some records at least still exist. One of the drivers at the Legation, Otto Prade, was questioned at length by Soviet officials in the building in March 1945. He was asked about the Legation's activities as well as its personnel. According to Prade the Russians wanted to know to what extent "*the Swedes had collaborated with the Hungarians and with the Germans and especially what the British had been doing at the Legation.*" Prade was told that there was documentary evidence that foreign agents had worked at the Legation. When Prade stated that he had noticed no active Swedish support for either Hungary or Germany, he was not believed.

Prade testified that his interrogation was led by a Russian officer whom he had noticed at the Legation a few days earlier, and who had, in Prade's view, come to the Legation with a definite purpose. Prade observed how the officer noted down serial numbers of foreign bank notes kept at the Legation. The same man also asked him about Raoul Wallenberg. When Prade explained that he personally did not know Wallenberg, but that he knew that Wallenberg had helped Jews escape Nazi persecution, his statement was greeted with "howls of laughter." Prade was told that he would be killed if he did not tell the truth about Wallenberg. After a while, the Russian officer in charge asked if he could at least name the sum that Wallenberg had received from [Heinrich] Himmler for his work. It was, after all, clear that Wallenberg had sent people into the hands of the Gestapo. As evidence was offered that the building of the Legation had been observed for months and the phone lines had been monitored. He added that this "bird" [Wallenberg] had been well taken care of that he would not issue any more passports and that "*he would not see Hungary or Sweden again.*" By the time of Prade's interrogation, Raoul Wallenberg had already spent about two months in Lubianka prison.

It is not clear on what information Prade's Soviet interrogator based his accusation that Wallenberg "*delivered people into the hands of the Gestapo.*" It needs to be determined why the Soviets specifically singled out Raoul Wallenberg in this regard. There is one incident which indirectly involved the Swedish Legation, Budapest: In November 1944 almost the entire leadership of Geza Soos' MFM resistance movement was arrested by the Gestapo. It had been betrayed by a man who claimed to be a Soviet liaison official. On October 23, 1944 the MFM had attempted to forward a message to Moscow via the Swedish Legation, Budapest - in its capacity as representative of Soviet interests in Hungary - in order to keep the Soviets informed of its plans. It is not clear whether or not the Swedish Legation, Budapest ever forwarded this communication.

No records of Prade's interrogation or those of the other members of the Swedish Legation, Budapest, as well as related records [such as, for example, the Swedish Legation's communications with Moscow on behalf of the MFM] have been presented by the Russians side. It is known, that aside from Raoul Wallenberg, the Russians were particularly focused on Attaché Lars Berg, the head of the Legation's Foreign Interest Section. Berg and Margareta Bauer had been detained separately from the other members of the Legation. In the incomplete account of Per Anger's debriefing on his return to Stockholm on April 20, 1945, he states that they were allowed to join the other Legation members "*after certain negotiations.*" It has not been specified, either from Swedish or Russian side, what these "certain negotiations" were about, what agreements were reached, and with whom.

Immediately after Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance, the Soviets gave a number of mixed signals about his possible fate. First came the note from Dekanosov on January 16, 1945, that Raoul Wallenberg had been placed under Soviet protection. At the same time, Russian documentation shows that the Soviet authorities who arrested Raoul Wallenberg had instructions to completely isolate him and his colleague Vilmos Langfelder from the outside world. Meanwhile, Soviet sources in Budapest relayed the message, although in veiled form, that Raoul Wallenberg had been taken to Moscow. At the Hungarian show trials in 1948, an official finding alleged that Raoul Wallenberg had been killed in Budapest in 1945. Other sources, however, like the Director of the Hungarian National Bank, Takacsy, hinted that Raoul Wallenberg was alive and that there were ways to win his freedom.

In this context it is interesting that in 1948 S. Kartashov, head of the Fourth Department [Investigations] of the Third Main Directorate [MGB] which handled Raoul Wallenberg's case, was sent to Hungary as an advisor to Hungarian Security in preparation. It needs to be researched further if Kartashov's activities were connected in any way with

information Kartashov and his investigators had obtained from the prisoners of war, including Raoul Wallenberg, they had interrogated at length in Moscow.

Information that Raoul Wallenberg had been taken to Moscow was also received by the American Section of the Allied Control Commission [ACC], Hungary, in May 1945. On request from the U.S. Department State, General William S. Key on May 7, 1945, raised the issue of Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance and those of Swiss diplomats with General I.I. Levushkin of the Soviet Section of the ACC: *"I then presented the matter of location of the Swedish diplomat Wallenberg and the Swiss diplomats Meier and Feller, suggesting that perhaps Germans took them because of their activities in helping the Jews. General Levushkin immediately replied that I do not think that the Germans took them at all, but that they had been interned by the Russians. I explained that our government was most anxious to learn of their status...."* [This document is contained in the collection of ACC in the United States National Archive. Unfortunately, only page 1 is available. ]

On May 8, 1945, General Key's office informs the United States Mission, Budapest: *"Soviet authorities have been asked by General Key for information re whereabouts of Meier, Feller and Wallenberg. ... effort will be made to comply with instructions in telegram under reference, but Department might like to know Soviet Military authorities may well have conclusive proof of pro-Nazi collaboration of Feller and possibly of Meier and Wallenberg. Feller's Swiss associates hinted that his probable arrest was not undeserved and that his activities were "foolish." ... It was implied at meeting with member of Pushkin's staff, namely Oroschkin [sic], that Russian authorities had conclusive proof of Feller and his staff's pro-Nazi alignment. Continued interest in their behalf led to believe would be interpreted as unjustified intervention on behalf of pro-German personalities and Russia indicated this covered case of Lutz."*

Nevertheless, on May 11 and May 21, 1945, the Americans again stress the importance of Meier, Feller and Wallenberg to their Soviet counterparts. An aide to General Key, Colonel Henry Simmonite, reports that in the of May 22, 1945, General Levushkin *"made notes of their names in writing and asked for more information in as he said these men were very likely in a large camp with many other prisoners and further data would be needed if they were to be located. I promised to send this to him and Mr. Squires [of the United States Mission, Budapest] compiling this data now."* In the formal memorandum of the meeting Simmonite notes that Levushkin told him many letters had been written to various Soviet agencies to determine the location of the diplomats, *"who he stated were, he believed, being held by the Russians and as soon as any information was received, we would be informed."*

The Russian side has stated that the ACC documentation has been checked and that no documentation concerning Wallenberg has been found. At the very least, the official memoranda of the formal conferences and meetings of the ACC should reflect what is stated in U.S. records. It would be important to determine on what information G. M. Pushelev, the Political Counselor of the Soviet section of the ACC, [and from 1945-1949 the Soviet Envoy, later Ambassador to Hungary], based his statements about possibly *"conclusive proof of Nazi collaboration of Feller and possibly Meier and Wallenberg."* What instructions did he receive and from whom? And to whom did Pushkin report?

Other Russian archive collections should contain additional material about Raoul Wallenberg as well. So far, researchers have seen only very few documents related to Raoul Wallenberg from the Soviet Legation, Stockholm. Importantly, researchers have had no access to the material from the Stockholm 'rezidentura', particularly the communications of Soviet Intelligence representatives with Moscow.

An excerpt from the recollections of V. Roshin, alias Razin, a 'rezident' in Stockholm in the 1940's illustrates the humanitarian mission to Budapest looked upon in Soviet eyes: *"In general, during the years of the war various separate peace negotiations took place in Sweden. It seems that secret consultations between the World Zionist Organization and American Zionist Centers on one side, and the representatives of Fascist Germany on the other side bringing wealthy Jews to Sweden, is the most interesting."* Without mentioning Raoul Wallenberg's name, Razin essentially defines the humanitarian mission as one of the many efforts to forge a separate peace between Nazi Germany and the Western Allies, leaving the Soviet Union to fend for itself. Such a definition of the rescue work that Wallenberg had conducted would mean that, in the Soviet view, his efforts were aimed directly against the Soviet Union.

That the Russians may have had some knowledge about Raoul Wallenberg before 1944 is apparent from the collection of Kalman Lauer's letters. For one, it is clear that Soviet representatives, specifically the Soviet Delegation had been informed about Raoul Wallenberg's mission before he left for Budapest. In a letter to Mark Wallenberg from April 1945 Kalman Lauer states that *"the Russians should not let anything happen to him [Raoul Wallenberg] since he personally as well as his mission enjoyed their strongest sympathies."*

Raoul Wallenberg appears to have been expected back in Stockholm at the end of 1944 to participate in unspecified trade talks at the Soviet Trade Delegation, and may in fact have been planning to travel to Moscow on business. On October 24, 1944, Lauer writes to Wallenberg *"If you cannot come back here in time, you will have to travel via Russia to Moscow, and that would be good if you could conduct some research there. I am enclosing copies of our conversations with the Russian Trade Delegation."* We have requested to see the files of the Soviet

Delegation. We were told by the Russian side that no documents relating to Raoul Wallenberg or Kalman Lauer had been discovered.

Another, indirect link exists between Raoul Wallenberg and the Soviet Legation, Stockholm. One representative in the early 1940's, I.M. Volfine, was later arrested by Soviet authorities and spent ten years in prison. A prisoner card at Vladimir carried the notation "Swedish Spy". The Soviet interrogation registers show that he was interrogated in August 1946, immediately before Raoul Wallenberg. We have asked the Swedish government for documentation about Volfine to see, if he was ever recruited as an agent for Sweden. We did not receive any documentation. The Russian side has provided some information about Volfine but has not allowed access to his prisoner file. It is not known what either Volfine or Raoul Wallenberg was interrogated about.

Russian officials have emphasized publicly that in their view the Raoul Wallenberg case is closed. Yet, as we have seen, certain ambiguities in the Russian position are clearly evident throughout the years. The vague language in Gromyko's memorandum from 1957 is the most well known example. But even later on, after the Raoul Wallenberg case had not been officially raised by Sweden for more than fourteen years, the documentation shows that the Russians, at least in private conversation, did not categorically insist that Raoul Wallenberg was definitely dead. A good example is the discussion between a Swedish official and his Soviet contact in 1979, immediately after the Swedish government reopened the Raoul Wallenberg case. In an assessment of the Soviet reaction to the latest news in the Wallenberg question the Swedish official writes: *"The official position that the case is once and for all closed and that no new information can appear because Raoul Wallenberg died in 1947 was not expressed ... In fact he admitted implicitly that there could in fact come information of such a type that it may cast new light on the case."*

## 5. The United States

Over the years, Sweden and the United States kept each other informed on the Raoul Wallenberg matter and the records of the American Legation, Stockholm, show that there was a steady flow of information back and forth on the issue. There is no evidence, however, of a joint approach or a coordinated policy in the Raoul Wallenberg case between the United States and Sweden.

It appears that in the first years after Wallenberg's disappearance, Swedish authorities did not seek the assistance of the CIA and other US Intelligence agencies to determine Raoul Wallenberg's fate. Only in 1951, when Arne Linder had taken over the case and worked closely with Otto Danielsson of the Swedish Security Police, did Sweden finally place formal requests for help. As for the American side, it appears that the CIA, by 1951, was not at all familiar with the details of the Raoul Wallenberg case. In an official dispatch from June 12, 1951, an unnamed CIA official expressed the following views: *"... 1. Despite the prominence of the Wallenberg case in Sweden, there is great lack of information at Headquarters concerning the subject. It is felt that there is not sufficient information available in Headquarters' files at present to warrant compilation of the material for distribution to other stations. 2. Headquarters would appreciate receiving information which is being compiled by ... in the Wallenberg case. ... 3. You are also requested to determine if there is any reason, other than political pressure, for the great interest in the case. It seems rather strange that the ... request for aid and information should come more than six years after the disappearance of the subject."*

That the Wallenberg case possibly involved issues both countries rather wished to avoid is made clear by a document from 1955. The document refers to an inquiry by British Intelligence concerning the testimony of Niclas von Maasburg who had left information concerning British Warrant Officer Reginald Barratt. Barratt had been active in Budapest for British Intelligence, and had been imprisoned in the Soviet Union at the end of the war. Maasburg testified that Wallenberg may have been held at the same camp as Barratt in the late 1940's. In a dispatch dated July 1955, a CIA official remarks on the fact that a local British Intelligence representative and not a Swedish official requested to check on the matter. He adds that the Swedish official *"to date .... has not mentioned the Wallenberg case or any of its ramifications and we have likewise kept mum on the subject ..."*

The precise role of American Intelligence operations in Hungary and how these affected Raoul Wallenberg's activities remains only partially understood. In an interview with CIA officials in 1955, Iver Olsen, Wallenberg's American contact, stressed that Wallenberg had not been recruited as an OSS agent. In a rare public interview with the "Palestine Post" from 1947, Olsen suggests that the Russians may have arrested Raoul Wallenberg by mistake: *"I must remember," he says, "that in trying to save Jews from slaughter Wallenberg had to deal with the worst elements. His operations during the last months of the war could have easily given the NKVD officers the impression that he was some sort of spy. The Russians were unwilling to believe that anyone could have come to Budapest on a humanitarian mission."* In the same interview, John Pehle, head of the War Refugee Board in 1944, agrees with Olsen's assessment: *"The Russians never understood our interest in the refugee problem or approved of our rescue activities. They would have found it hard to believe that Wallenberg's only interest was humanitarian."*



Another American official, First Secretary of the American Legation, Stockholm, Joseph Sweeney, in an of summary of the Wallenberg case from February 25, 1957 expresses himself more cautiously: *"In any event, there concrete evidence available so far to clarify whether or not Wallenberg was engaged in espionage activities or a or confidential mission for any foreign power."*

Even with the recent release of OSS and CIA documentation in the case, some critical documentation remains unavailable in U.S. archives. This includes the a large part of OSS communications between Budapest, Stockholm and Caserta, as well as secret contacts between American, British and Swedish Intelligence in Stockholm. Some cable traffic between OSS Stockholm and London has been released, although not in full. While some of the Cas OSS cables are listed on the list of released documents, researchers who request the relevant boxes find them to be empty. Also not available are certain reports by Iver Olsen to Harry Dexter White, Deputy Treasury Secretary. Olsen reported to White directly on many occasions. Dexter White was a known Soviet agent and it may be of some interest to check in Russian archives what, if anything, he reported about his exchanges with Iver Olsen. The U.S. also has not presented any of its documentation on the Stig Wennerstrom case or any documentation concerning its secret negotiations with Sweden. That documentation may provide valuable information on what considerations guided the Swedish decision makers in their handling of the Raoul Wallenberg case.

In the 1950's and 60's the U.S. considered the Wallenberg case mostly an important tool in the Cold War. Swedish Foreign Minister Osten Unden informed the Americans in February 1957, that he was ready to accept the version of Raoul Wallenberg's fate, a highly placed CIA official responded immediately. In a strongly worded telegram he informed the Swedish government that it simply could not allow to let the Wallenberg matter slide and *"let the Russians get away with an obviously false claim that conveniently lays the blame at the door of officials who are dead."* In light of the 1956 squashed uprising in Hungary, it was absolutely necessary to counter "Soviet talk about coexistence" and to wake up the Swedish public *"to the true nature of the Soviet threat."*

There were also other strains between Sweden and the U.S. in the Wallenberg matter. In 1964, the U.S. State Department released documentation on the Raoul Wallenberg case, in response to a request by Swedish author F Vilius. The material included the telegram of April 12, 1945, from the American Embassy in Moscow, which reported Sweden's refusal of the US's offer assistance in the search for Wallenberg. Vilius used the document in a Swedish documentary and it apparently took the Swedish government by surprise. Due to the public criticism of the behavior of the Swedish Legation, Moscow in 1945, the Swedish Foreign Office was forced to issue an explanatory press release. The press release raised eyebrows in the State Department because it *"blandly ignored the criticism leveled against [Swedish] Legation's actions."*

In addition, State Department officials noted that *"the Foreign Office tells .. that it is still unclear just how Swedish rejection of the American offer ... was made and whether the rejection did at all come from Swedish quarters."* This was, of course, absurd. State Department officials were even more bewildered when in a follow-up conversation with Swedish Ambassador to the U.S., Hichens-Bergstrom, claimed that Sweden had not been aware of the documentation question. While Soederblom had not asked for or received instructions before replying to the U.S. offer of assistance in the matter is referred to repeatedly in Swedish archive documentation. Bergstrom added that the Swedish government wanted both U.S. government and the American Legation, Stockholm *"out of the [Wallenberg] matter."*

A Swedish Foreign Office document from 1979 confirms that in the Raoul Wallenberg question the two countries for the most part, acted separately rather than jointly. The document describes how a Swedish official could be accused by his Russian counterpart that Sweden and certain other countries like the U.S. are using the Wallenberg case for anti-Soviet propaganda. The Swedish official stresses emphatically that *"the Swedish government acting on its own and does not request the support from other governments. We consider it positive that the American government and the American public is interested in Wallenberg, but Washington acts entirely on its own matter."* Although one needs to consider that the Swedish official's main intent is to assuage Russian fears, the document nevertheless makes a point.

Currently still classified documentation shows that in the early 1990's the Swedish government asked the U.S. to press the Wallenberg case too hard, since it was satisfied with Soviet cooperation.

## 6. The Wallenberg Family

The response of the Wallenberg family to Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance deserves attention because of its

prominent position the family held in 1945, both in the area of economy and finance, and in the political arena. At the time of Raoul Wallenberg's arrest by Soviet forces in Budapest, Markus and Jacob Wallenberg were among the most powerful decision makers in Sweden. Soviet officials have repeatedly referred to Raoul Wallenberg's connection to the Wallenberg family as a possibly decisive reason for his detention.

Throughout the war Marcus and Jacob Wallenberg had acted in formal capacity on behalf of the government. They had exerted great influence on major foreign policy issues, most notably the successful conclusion of the Soviet-Finnish Peace Agreement in late 1944. The Wallenbergs enjoyed close contacts with the Foreign Office; there were regular exchanges on a wide variety of issues. [In the early 1940's Staffan Soederblom frequently handled these contacts.] Markus also had close ties to the Soviet Legation in Stockholm, to Ambassador, A. Kollontai, as well as to Rybkina, the wife of the Soviet 'resident' B. Rybkin. According to British Intelligence documentation Wallenberg had explored post-war development opportunities in the Soviet Union and its satellites well before the war. How close the working relationship with the Soviet Legation was right at the time of Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance, shows an excerpt from a letter dated December 23, 1944 from Sven Norrman of ASEA to Wallenberg. The letter discusses an unspecified project under consideration and the contacts in this connection with Nikitin, Trade Attache of the Soviet Legation, Stockholm [and a close aide to Ambassador Kollontai]: "*In discussion I had with Nikitin before he left for Moscow he told me that he shall take up our proposal as his own discussion in Moscow ...*"

In early 1945 Staffan Soederblom suggested that Marcus write a personal letter to Kollontai, which he did on April 19, 1945. Kollontai, by that time, had left Stockholm and the letter was taken to Moscow personally by the Military Attache, Akerren. Kollontai's response came only more than one year later, on June 7, 1946. In the letter she explains that she has no longer any influence in Soviet affairs. [It should be checked, if there is any correspondence between these two exchanges, because Soederblom states on June 11, 1946, when he forwards Kollontai's letter to Stockholm, that "*in the matter concerning Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance I carried with me after my visit home a letter from Marcus Wallenberg, Jr., written on my suggestion, to Mrs. Kollontai.*" It had been Ake Soederblom, who carried the letter, [as Soederblom confirms in his letter to Erik von Post of April 30, 1945.] Ake Soederblom definitely visited Sweden after April 23, 1945 [when Marcus Wallenberg wrote his letter]. It is possible, however, that Soederblom is confusing both the issue and the date.]

Markus Wallenberg's letter to Ambassador Kollontai appears to be the only written intervention on Wallenberg's behalf by the Wallenberg family. Over the years the Wallenberg family has been noticeably absent from active efforts to clarify Raoul Wallenberg's fate, with some minor exceptions. For example, in the 1970's the Wallenberg family gave a small sum to Maj and Fredrik von Dardel [administered jointly by Otto Danielsson and Wallenberg Secretary Jacob Palmstierna] to help defray some of the cost of continuing investigation. Otto Danielsson had arranged an application for assistance to the official Wallenberg Foundation, Knut och Alice Wallenberg Stiftelse.

No documentation exists that would show what consultations took place between the Foreign Office and the Wallenberg Family representatives regarding efforts to win Raoul Wallenberg's release. Due to the fact that Wallenberg's disappearance, as a member of one of the most powerful families in Sweden, had a serious impact on Swedish Foreign Policy, it would appear highly unlikely that there were no discussions at all. It appears unlikely that the Foreign Office would settle on a course of action concerning Raoul Wallenberg before consulting the Wallenberg Family, or at least attempting to do so. A witness has testified that there may have been some contacts in the Raoul Wallenberg questions between Soviet authorities and the Wallenberg Family through the years. This testimony is currently under investigation.

Arne Lundberg has reported that in 1951, when he formally took over the Raoul Wallenberg case, one of the first things he did was to meet with Markus Wallenberg. According to Lundberg, Marcus was quite blunt in his assessment that he thought for sure that Raoul Wallenberg was dead. In his memoirs Simon Wiesenthal relates the often quoted remark that Marcus Wallenberg already in 1947 rejected an offer by U.S. President Harry S. Truman to help in the search for Raoul Wallenberg with the words: "*He is probably dead by now*". No such exchange has ever been documented, however it has been hinted by sources in the CIA that a document detailing a conversation with just that content remains classified in the CIA archives.

The question why the Wallenberg Family apparently chose not to negotiate on Raoul Wallenberg's behalf is an important one and deserves further scrutiny. The question is all the more interesting because the Wallenbergs during the war did negotiate on behalf of seven employees of the ASEA concern who had been arrested by the Gestapo in Poland for aiding the Polish underground. In the time from 1942-1944 ASEA's representatives, on instruction of Marcus and Jacob, negotiated with German authorities in Berlin. Walter Schellenberg intervened in the matter as a favor to Jacob Wallenberg. Whatever Markus or Jacob's true attitude toward Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance may have been, there is no documentary or other evidence that the Wallenberg brothers ever signaled to the Swedish government or

Russians that Raoul Wallenberg's return was a key priority.

There have been some suggestions that the Wallenberg family could not pursue a vigorous campaign for Raoul Wallenberg's release because after the war the Americans exerted pressure on the Wallenberg brothers to abandon ties with the Soviet Union. Already during the war, the Americans had launched an investigation into the Family activity of cloaking assets for Nazi Germany. The Americans were said to be particularly upset about the Swedish Trade agreement which provided credit of 1 billion Swedish Crowns to the Soviet Union. A close look reveals that on the American side, there existed rather a plurality of views both on the benefits and the dangers of the agreement. As far as the Wallenberg brothers were concerned, the investigation into their wartime business deals had cooled considerably already by 1945, when it became apparent that the two former Allies, the U.S. and the Soviet Union, were headed for a confrontational course. Several documents in the U.S. State Department Archives emphasize the importance of the Wallenberg brothers and Sweden for the developing crisis which later turned into the Cold War. In addition, it appears that the ultimate failure of the Trade Agreement was due to a number of factors, one being the fact that the anticipated downturn in demand due to the weakness of the war damaged economies in Europe never materialized. Nevertheless, Wallenberg companies were heavily represented in the Agreement, and it should be investigated if and why the failure of the anticipated economic benefits influenced Soviet decision making concerning its relations with Sweden as well as its attitude towards the Wallenberg case.

Perhaps just as critical is the fact that the Swedish-Soviet Trade Agreement was concluded without any preconditions posed to the Soviet Union concerning the clarification of Wallenberg's fate. It should be studied further if the private discussions took place as part of the official negotiations between the Soviet and Swedish delegations. The Swedish delegation included, for example, A. Mikoyan, Commissar of Foreign Trade and member of the Politbureau since 1946.

The Wallenberg Family's network of connections in banking and politics were and are among the best in the world. They could have pursued a variety of avenues to receive information about Raoul Wallenberg. It is important to know if the family's apparent decision not to actively pursue Raoul Wallenberg's release was based on information they had received through private or semi-private channels, which convinced them that Raoul Wallenberg was dead. As David Bartal points out in his book, "The Empire", Marcus Wallenberg also had excellent connections with Swedish Foreign and Military Intelligence Services. He quotes head of Military Intelligence, Stig Synnergren, who regularly shared political and economic intelligence with Marcus: "*One usually says that next to the Vatican and the banks the military has the best intelligence service. We [M.Wallenberg and S. Synnergren] exchanged information from our various sources and we mutually benefited from the exchange.*" Another possibility is that the Family made a conscious choice not to press Raoul Wallenberg's case for purely practical considerations.

The Wallenberg Family has also shown a tendency to distance itself from Raoul Wallenberg. As shown in Ulf Olsson's book about Marcus Wallenberg does not mention Raoul Wallenberg with one word, even though the Wallenberg Family records show, Marcus appears to have had regular contact with him. It can be shown that Kal Lauer forged Raoul Wallenberg's letters for the publication of Jenoe Levai's book in 1947, omitting references to Raoul Wallenberg and Raoul Wallenberg's mentioning of work he did for Enskilda Bank. The reasons for this censorship are not known. In a written summary of Wallenberg's activities, Lauer further states that while Raoul worked for Mellaneuropeiska, he also served as Jacob's Private Secretary. Perhaps Lauer overstates the case but the issue deserves to be examined more closely.

If Raoul Wallenberg worked for the family in some capacity in Budapest, it would raise the question if and why these activities played a role in the Soviet's decision to arrest Raoul Wallenberg and the failure to release him. It also raises the issue why the Wallenbergs made such an effort to distance themselves from one of their own instead of vigorously pursuing his disappearance. While the Wallenberg Family has released some documentation about Raoul Wallenberg, its archive remains closed to researchers. The current generation of the Wallenberg Family may be simply not aware of the extent of the contacts that existed in the late 1930's and early 1940's between Marcus and Raoul Wallenberg. That's why it is all the more important for the Family to allow direct access to the Wallenberg collections, so researchers can examine relevant documentation which could clarify many of the pending questions.

## E. CONCLUSIONS

Looking over the research in the Raoul Wallenberg case in the last fifty years, three reasons stand out why the case has remained unresolved:

- a. The enormous difficulties caused by the political realities of the Cold War.
- b. The prevalence of numerous assumptions, especially that Raoul Wallenberg died in 1947.
- c. The reluctance, for various reasons, to release critical information or to follow up information appropriately.

The central issue that emerges from the material is the question of the possible abandonment of Raoul Wallenberg. The Cold War climate made it extremely difficult for the Swedish government to pursue the case successfully. It appears, however, that Sweden early on chose a highly pragmatic approach to the search for Wallenberg's fate. Equally problematic has been Sweden's unwillingness over the years to stake anything on Raoul Wallenberg's return. The reasons for this choice need to be examined more thoroughly. Was Raoul Wallenberg saved out of real necessity or for simple expedience? We still do not know the answer. However, there are some indications that Sweden's decision to limit the inquiry into Raoul Wallenberg's fate may have seriously jeopardized his chances of survival and return.

The reason that Raoul Wallenberg's fate remains of such great interest today is not due to an exaggeration of his accomplishments in Budapest, as some historians have argued. It is the unresolved questions *behind* Raoul Wallenberg's fate that have kept public attention focused on the issue. Aside from the wish to determine what happened to Raoul Wallenberg, the question *why* the case was never solved and what factors influenced his fate remain of critical importance. While it is extremely important to place Raoul Wallenberg's accomplishments in the correct historical context, that is not what fundamentally ails this case. The key problem is the inability to shatter the myths that surround the investigation of his fate. The biggest myth that has grown around the Wallenberg case is that the truth about his fate can never be known. Equally problematic is the persistent adherence to longheld assumptions, most notably that Raoul Wallenberg must have died in 1947. With this mindset in place, witness testimonies and other indications for Raoul Wallenberg's survival beyond 1947 have often not been reviewed properly.

The Swedish Foreign Ministry's basic approach to the Raoul Wallenberg investigation poses an inherent problem: By nature, diplomats seek compromise, not confrontation. If future progress in the Raoul Wallenberg case is to be made, this inherent conflict in diplomacy will have to be overcome. Adding to the problem is the fact that the status quo in the Raoul Wallenberg question is more than acceptable to all sides. Aside from pursuing the Wallenberg case as a matter of principle, both Sweden and Russia stand little to gain from a complete resolution of the question. Instead, all sorts of collateral damage that may result from or accompany the truth can be imagined. For example, in Russia, the sufferings of millions of people in Stalinist prison and labor camps remains an issue that has only been partially confronted. With former slave laborers under the German Nazis seeking financial compensation for their suffering, the resolution of Raoul Wallenberg's fate could prove to be the watershed event for the same issue in Russia. Also, should Raoul Wallenberg have lived beyond 1947, the possible involvement of still living former Soviet leaders may pose important obstacles to a resolution. In Sweden, on the other hand, both public and private entities have not adequately explained the role they played in World War II and its aftermath. Their interests and concerns may directly impacted the Swedish governments handling of the Raoul Wallenberg case. Unless a political need is created either in Sweden or Russia to know the full truth about Raoul Wallenberg's fate, the issue will remain unresolved in the near future.

The most important finding of the Swedish-Russian Working Group and its consultants in the last ten years is that progress in the Raoul Wallenberg case is possible when both Sweden and Russian cooperate closely, and when direct access to documentation is granted. Even though important documentation may have been destroyed, much information can be extracted from the material that remains. In addition, there are strong indications that some key documents have been preserved but has not been presented.

At the same time there is an urgent need for future commissions to set clear investigative parameters. It can be expected that researchers work in an atmosphere where the goalposts of the investigation are so poorly marked as to render them invisible. For example, despite repeated requests, the consultants were never told what official mandate the Swedish-Russian Working Group had received from their respective governments. There is also a critical need for closer adherence to accepted standards of historical inquiry. All witness testimonies have to be considered and evaluated systematically. There can be no selective use of material. Direct access to documentation has to be sought whenever and wherever possible. And just as importantly, provisions have to be made to see all documentation in the original and in the appropriate context. In addition, critical research materials have to be made available to a wider circle of researchers. Equally important is that key documentation in the case finally is made accessible in both Russia and Sweden, as well as in other countries like Britain, the United States, Hungary and Israel. Most importantly, the new findings of the Swedish-Russian Working Group will have to be followed up quickly and decisively.

## APPENDIX

Document 1: First and last page of the report by the Soviet Minister of State Security, Viktor Abakumov to Stalin from July 17, 1947, the very day Raoul Wallenberg supposedly died in Lubyanka prison. The report is entitled “*about ... Conducting Investigations on the Affairs of Spies, Saboteurs, Terrorists and Members of the Anti-Soviet Underground.*”

Document 2: a. Raoul Wallenberg’s Application Form for his diplomatic passport from June 1944. Under point 1 names as reference for his application Jacob Wallenberg.

b. On the invitation list for a Cocktail Party at his house in December 1943 Raoul Wallenberg included both Max and Jacob Wallenberg, as well as the Hungarian Minister in Stockholm, Ullein-Reviczky.

c. In his letter of resignation from commercial activities for the duration of his Budapest assignment, Raoul Wallenberg lists two entities aside from Mellaneuropeiska: The Pacific Trading Company and Jacob Wallenberg. This is another indication for the existence of some form of official business relationship with Jacob Wallenberg.

Document 3: Telegram from November 7, 1944 from Iver Olsen [“Crispin” ] to OSS Caserta

Document 4: Telegram from the U.S. Department of State, signed by Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, to the American Embassy, Moscow from September 20, 1945. The last line of the text is crossed out. As the note in the margin shows, the omission is approved by “Mister Clattenburg,” head of the State Department’s Special War Plans Office.

