

What Happened to Raoul Wallenberg?

A report by David Matas
8 September 1998

Table of Contents

Page	
I. Introduction	1
II. Raoul Wallenberg in Hungary	4
III. Soviet Coverup and Russian cooperation	
A. The Soviets	7
B. The Russians	15
IV. Swedish diligence	25
V. Archival Research	
A. The United States	31
B. The United Kingdom	32
VI. 1947 Death Hypothesis	40
VII. 1947 Survival Hypothesis	44
VIII. The Law	52
IX. Follow up Process	56
X. The Canadian Connection	62
XI. Conclusions	65
XII. Summary of Recommendations	69

What Happened to Raoul Wallenberg?

by David Matas

I. Introduction

The Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Government of Canada on September 5, 1996 announced that the Government would assist in defraying the cost of my research activities to be conducted to determine the fate and whereabouts of Raoul Wallenberg. The amount granted was \$5000.00. In pursuit of that research, I have travelled to Riga, Latvia; London, England; Stockholm, Sweden; Moscow, Russia; Geneva, Switzerland; and Washington, District of Columbia, United States of America. I was in Riga on November 15, 1996; in Stockholm the week of January 12 to 19, 1997; in London the week February 11 to 17; in Moscow the week of March 3 to 9, 1997; in Geneva the week of March 26 to April 4, 1997; and in Washington, D.C. from May 17 to 21, 1997.

Both the Swedish and Russian governments, in September 1991, appointed working groups to investigate and report on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg. I went to Riga to meet Hans Magnusson, the head of the Swedish working group on Raoul Wallenberg, who is also the Swedish ambassador to Latvia. In Washington, D.C. I met with Susanne Berger, an independent Wallenberg researcher. In Geneva, Switzerland, I met with Guy Von Dardel, Raoul Wallenberg's brother. In both London and Washington, I attempted to get access to archival documents. The details of these efforts, as well as information about my contacts in Stockholm and Moscow are in the body of the report.

Because of the existence of the Swedish and Russian working groups, I originally intended to delay the release of my report till those groups released their reports. The reason for that was twofold. One is that those groups have done a considerable body of work. Their reports contain substantial information to which a reader could usefully refer when considering this report. There was no point in my duplicating the work those groups have done. That was, in any case, beyond my capacity. My own work is an attempt to both complement and supplement the Russian and Swedish working group reports rather than an attempt to replace them.

Second, this report proposes a program of action to complete the work of investigation beyond the Swedish and Russian working group reports. There seemed to be little point in suggesting what comes after the working groups while the work of those groups was still in progress. Because their work was still in progress while I was writing my report, I made suggestions for further work on Raoul Wallenberg directly to the working groups.

From the time I began my work, the release of the Swedish and Russian working group reports at all times appeared imminent. Release dates, though constantly changing, were never more than a few months away. In the fall of 1997, I was told that the reports of the working groups would be released in December 1997 or January 1998.

Even though I still think that the release of my report would have best followed the release of the reports of the Swedish and Russian working groups, I have always believed that the Raoul Wallenberg case was one of the utmost urgency. It seems to me incompatible with that sense of urgency for me to just sit around waiting. So, I have decided to release my report now. After the two groups release their reports, I will comment on those reports.

My own involvement in the Raoul Wallenberg dossier dates from 1989. Irwin Cotler of

the Faculty of Law at the University of McGill chaired an International Commission of Inquiry and a Soviet International Joint Commission both on the fate and whereabouts of Raoul Wallenberg. Professor Cotler asked me to assist him with the two commissions. The commissions were entirely non-governmental. The first commission began its work in February 1989 and released its report in May 1990. The second commission began its work in August 1990 and announced findings in September 1990.

My work for those two commissions made me realize that the full story about Raoul Wallenberg had not yet been told, and convinced me that much of the story was available in archives behind closed doors. I approached the Government of Canada to assist in this work because I felt that the backing of the Government was necessary in order for me to get behind those doors.

Although this report is my own and not a report of the Government of Canada, the Government backing was indeed helpful, not just financially, but as well by giving me access and status with government officials in other countries that I might not otherwise have had. In particular, the meetings I had with Russian government officials when I was in Moscow were arranged by the Canadian embassy in Moscow. I doubt I could have met with those people without the assistance of the Canadian embassy.

3 September 1998

II. Raoul Wallenberg in Hungary

Given his fame, surprisingly little is known about the life of Raoul Wallenberg. Much has been written about the six months of Raoul Wallenberg's time in Hungary, from July 1944 to January 1945. Aside from those six months, there is almost nothing that one can say with certainty about him.

This report focuses on the little that is known about the fate of Raoul Wallenberg from the date of his disappearance into the Soviet gulag. It is understandable that little would be known about the fate of a disappeared person. What is surprising is that almost as little is known about the life of Raoul Wallenberg prior to the time he went to Hungary.

Books about Raoul Wallenberg to date have been more hagiographies than biographies. According to those hagiographies, President Roosevelt asked the American Government War Refugee Board to help save the Jews of Hungary from the Holocaust. The War Refugee Board asked its representative in Sweden to find a person for that task. The Swedish representative of the War Refugee Board, Iver Olsen, had his offices in the same building as an import export firm where Raoul Wallenberg worked, the Central European Trading Company Inc. Wallenberg's boss, Kalman Lauer, recommended Wallenberg and off he went to Budapest.

This version jars with other known facts. Before it was ever decided that Raoul Wallenberg would go to Hungary on his heroic mission, he had been given a special passport issued by authority of the Swedish cabinet. The passport stamps show he used the passport extensively to travel throughout Central and Eastern Europe. Why was this passport issued? What was the purpose of these trips?

The date book Raoul Wallenberg kept before the war was stolen after the war from storage. The crime was never solved and the date book never recovered. What was Raoul Wallenberg doing before he went to Hungary?

Why was he chosen and not someone else? How was he chosen, by what process? What was he asked to do? Was he sent over to save Jews, or sent over to save associates in Hungary of Swedish business interests? Were his efforts to save Jews his own initiative using the techniques he had learned to save others?

The answer to these questions are now as much a mystery as the answer to the question what happened to him. Indeed, part of the answer to the question of his fate in the Soviet gulag may well be wrapped in the answers to these other questions. Swedes both in private and public life, including some members of his own family, did much too little to help rescue him in the first years of his capture, when he was without doubt alive. Was Swedish lethargy a consequence of the fact that Raoul Wallenberg went beyond his original mission and ended up hurting rather than helping Swedish interests?

What is known is that between July 9, 1944 when Raoul Wallenberg arrived in Budapest and January 14, 1945, when he was arrested by the Soviets, in the space of six months, he saved up to 100,000 Hungarian Jews from the Holocaust by using protective Swedish passports and every other means he could. Wallenberg was arrested by the advancing Soviet troops and taken to Moscow on the order of Deputy Defence Minister Nikolai Bulganin. He arrived in Lubyanka prison in Moscow on February 6, 1945. He was never heard from again.

Wallenberg has been much honoured for his heroic efforts during those last six months of 1944. There are statues of him, memorials, buildings and parks named after him. He is the great hero of the twentieth century, a person who showed us what one individual could do in the face of evil. He is an honorary citizen of Israel, the United States and Canada. He was made an honorary citizen of Canada in 1985 by Act of Parliament.

Wallenberg was much honoured, but little helped. It is an irony and a tragedy that he who helped so many was so little helped himself; that he who rescued so many was not himself rescued. Now, even if he is still alive, he will have spent over fifty years in Soviet and Russian prisons and hospitals. When he was arrested he was 33. Now, even if alive, he would be 86.

III. Soviet Coverup and Russian Cooperation

i) The Soviets

The Soviets were involved in fabrications, document destruction and obstruction that began with Raoul Wallenberg's arrest and continued to almost the end of the Soviet period. Furthermore, the Russians, to this day, have been less than fully cooperative in uncovering the truth about Raoul Wallenberg.

In March 1945, Kossuth radio, the Moscow based Communist radio station beamed into Hungary a broadcast that "all signs indicate that" Raoul Wallenberg had been murdered by Gestapo agents. This disinformation was broadcast after Raoul Wallenberg had been in Soviet hands for two months.

In February 1947, Peter Fedotov, chief of counterintelligence of the Ministry of Security, the MGB, a predecessor of the KGB, told K. I. Novikov, chief of the Second European Division of the Soviet Foreign Ministry (MID), that Raoul Wallenberg was being held by the MGB. Different documents available today note this conversation.

Fedotov worked for Viktor Abakumov, Minister of Security. Novikov worked for Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Vyshinsky. Between 1945 and 1947, the Swedish government made repeated requests to the Soviets about Raoul Wallenberg. These requests, coupled with the knowledge that the Soviet Foreign Ministry had from the Soviet Ministry of Security that Raoul Wallenberg was in MGB hands, led to a number of communications about Raoul Wallenberg.

Vyshinsky wrote to Vyacheslav Molotov, then Vice Chair of the Council of Ministers and Deputy Prime Minister, by memorandum dated May 13, 1947: "We several times in oral and written form channelled our requests in 1945 and 1946 to SMERSH and later to the Ministry of State Security for clarification on the fate and whereabouts of Wallenberg. As a result of this, only in February of this year in his talk with Comrade Novikov did

Comrade Fedotov inform us that Wallenberg was now at the disposal of the Ministry of State Security and promise to report to you personally on further undertakings of the Ministry of State Security in this case."

Vychinsky wrote to Abakumov on July 7, 1947: "In order to solve the question of a reply (to the Swedes) and its contents, it would be important to have information about the place where Wallenberg was taken into the protection of the Soviet military forces, his whereabouts at this time, the places to which he was moved and whether any fighting or bombing occurred at these places, whether Wallenberg had freedom of movement or (was) under constant surveillance and whether at this point in time he was in contact with or met members of the Swedish Embassy in Vienna (presumably this should be Budapest) or other foreigners."

In August 1947, one month later, Vyshinsky wrote to Swedish ambassador Rolf Sohlman: Raoul Wallenberg "was not and never had been in the Soviet Union.... There remains only the supposition that Wallenberg died during the battle in the city of Budapest (in 1945) or that he was captured by the Arrow Cross (the Nazi puppet fighting force in Hungary)". The contrasting documents, one set of documents internal to the Soviet system, and another document external, to a Swedish government representative shows graphically something that crops up again and again in the Wallenberg history: unequivocal and blatant attempts by senior members of the Soviet government to lie about Raoul Wallenberg, to state publicly what Soviet officials knew for a fact not to be true. About Raoul Wallenberg there was lying as a government policy, and a policy established at the highest levels.

Of course, lies in 1945 and 1947 were lies of many years ago. But lying has occurred more recently. In February 1957, then Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko released a memorandum which said that after a page by page search of the archival documents from all wards in certain prisons there was a document found which there was good reason to consider as referring to Raoul Wallenberg. The document was a 1947 report from A.L. Smoltsov, health service director of Lubyanka Prison to Abakumov. The note said that "Wallenberg" died suddenly the previous night, probably as a result of a heart attack. The note was dated July 17, 1947. Smoltsov asked Abakumov for permission to do an autopsy. A further note was added saying: "It has been ordered that the body be cremated without an autopsy." Nikita Khrushchev in 1957 announced that Raoul Wallenberg had been arrested by Abakumov and that Abakumov had been executed for committing this crime, amongst others.

Abakumov had indeed been executed, but not for the arrest of Raoul Wallenberg. The indictment of Abakumov has now been published and the arrest of Raoul Wallenberg is nowhere mentioned amongst the charges. Moreover, the person responsible for the transfer of Raoul Wallenberg to Moscow from Budapest, far from having been executed, was honoured and promoted. He was, as I wrote earlier, Bulganin, who at the time of the release of the Gromyko memorandum, was Nikita Khrushchev's Prime Minister.

The 1957 Gromyko memorandum went through several drafts. A draft of April 1956 attached as an appendix to a memorandum from Vyacheslav Molotov, then Vice Chair of the Council of Ministers and Deputy Prime Minister and Ivan Serov, head of the KGB, to the Central Committee stated that Raoul Wallenberg had been held in Lefortovo prison, that he died in the Lefortovo prison hospital in July 1947 and that his body was cremated.

Soviet Foreign Minister Sjepilov, in October 1956, sent a memorandum to the Central Committee, enclosing a later draft of what became the Gromyko memorandum. This draft maintained that Raoul Wallenberg was held in Lefortovo and Butyrka prisons and that he suddenly died on July 17, 1947, and the body cremated.

These earlier drafts are noteworthy in that they present more or less the same explanation as the Smoltsov note, even though the Smoltsov note had not surfaced at that time. In other words, the appearance of the Smoltsov note in 1957 could not have led the Soviet leadership to report that Raoul Wallenberg died suddenly in 1947 and his body cremated, since even before the Soviet leadership had the Smoltsov note in hand, there were drafts floating around internally stating Wallenberg died suddenly in 1947 and his body cremated.

It is also worth noting that these 1956 drafts had Raoul Wallenberg dying at an entirely different prison from the one he is alleged to have died in according to the Smoltsov note. The 1956 drafts have Raoul Wallenberg dying in either Lefortovo or Butyrka prison. The Gromyko memorandum as finally released has Raoul Wallenberg dying in Lubyanka prison.

The April 1956 draft gave as the source of its information the records of Abakumov, the former commander for counter espionage. The October 1956 draft said that its information came from several persons. The Gromyko memorandum as released in February 1957, however, said that its sole source of information was the Smoltsov note, and that "no data were found containing information on Wallenberg's stay in the Soviet Union" aside from the Smoltsov note.

According to the Gromyko memorandum, a thorough search was made in the archives relating to prisoners and the investigation files of the prisons of Lefortovo, Lubyanka and Vladimir prisons for information about Raoul Wallenberg. Yet, a visit by researchers to Vladimir prison in September 1990 established that no such search was ever made. Prison archives had not been previously examined; prison officials had not been previously interviewed; witnesses had not been previously questioned.

The Gromyko memorandum talks of the Smoltsov note having been found in the medical service archive at Lubyanka prison. Yet, according to Konstantin Vinogradov, the present deputy head of archives of the FSB, the Federal Security Service, the successor organization to the KGB, no such archive exists or ever existed. Furthermore, a KGB official whom the Swedish working group interviewed told the working group that he was given the job of searching Lubyanka prison records in 1956 for evidence that Raoul Wallenberg suffered from some illness, but did not find the Smoltsov report.

It should be obvious that the Gromyko memorandum was not generated as a result of discovery of the Smoltsov note. Indeed, there is much to suggest that the Smoltsov note was itself a fabrication. But why did the Soviets in 1957 produce a new lie, that Wallenberg died of a heart attack in 1947, rather than just stick with their old lie that he died in 1945?

Indeed, there were Soviet adherents to the position that the old lie should be maintained. Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko wrote to the KGB chief Serov in 1954 asking for a report on the date and circumstance of the death of Raoul Wallenberg. Serov answered that it was not suitable to deviate from the reply used since 1947.

However, by 1957 the Soviets had released a number of German prisoners of war, and their evidence showed unequivocally that Raoul Wallenberg was alive and in Lubyanka and Lefortovo prisons at least between 1945 and 1947. This German prisoner of war evidence led to renewed Swedish government pressure on the Soviets to explain Raoul Wallenberg's fate. The Soviets decided to respond to this pressure by producing something that fit with the evidence of the released prisoners.

It was not unusual for the Soviets to fabricate death stories about prisoners. Maksim Litvinov, Soviet ambassador to the United States, on authorization from Vyacheslav Molotov, chair of the council of People's Commissars, told Americans in February 1943 who had been inquiring about Soviet prisoners Henry Ehrlich and Victor Alter that on

December 23, 1941, the prisoners had been executed for treason. In fact, Ehrlich committed suicide on May 14, 1942. Alter was not executed till February 17, 1943.

The Vyshinsky note and the Gromyko memorandum were not each one off lies, one in 1947 and one in 1957. They became the basis for continuing and repeated lies by the whole Soviet apparatus until the arrival of Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin on the scene in 1991. For instance, the Soviet Ambassador to Stockholm, Rodionov, by report of August 5, 1953, stated that earlier information in the case was confirmed and that all suggestions that Raoul Wallenberg had ever been in the Soviet Union were "baseless". There were many such statements by Soviet officials between 1947 and 1957, standing behind the Vyshinsky note, and from 1957 to 1991, endorsing the Gromyko memorandum.

In Soviet drafting that preceded both the Vyshinsky note and the Gromyko memorandum, there is no attempt to set out the truth. Both the Vyshinsky note and the Gromyko memorandum are exercises in fabrication, attempts to spin stories with three objectives: The invented stories had to conform as closely as possible to what the Swedes at that time knew; Raoul Wallenberg had no longer to be alive; and the Soviets, at least those then living, had to be entirely blameless.

Aside from the invented stories of 1947 and 1957, there are the history of removal from sight of traces of Raoul Wallenberg's stay in prison and the intimidation of witnesses. References in prison interrogation or transfer records and KGB entries in a registration ledger have been thickly inked out. The ink was manufactured after 1948. It is possible with the use of modern techniques to read what is written underneath the ink. Personal files have disappeared.

Raoul Wallenberg's cell mates from 1945 were interrogated in late July 1947. They were asked for the names of people to whom they had spoken about Wallenberg. They were subsequently jailed in isolation or together with each other.

The Soviets in October 1989 handed over to the Wallenberg family Raoul Wallenberg's personal effects, his diplomatic passport, prison register card, foreign currency and date book. The explanation at the time was that they were discovered in the basement of the KGB headquarters in Lubyanka prison shortly before, during a refurbishment of the KGB records, replacing wooden filing cabinets with metal ones. The articles were contained in a parcel that fell down from the top shelves when the shelves were being cleared up.

It is difficult to accept this story of discovery. It is hard to believe that information about Raoul Wallenberg, one of the most important prisoner the gulag ever had, and about whom so many inquiries had been made over the years, would have been stored in such an off hand way, that archivists would not have know about its whereabouts at all times. This form of storage was contrary to rules and regulations of the Soviet system. It was also contrary to the practice of storage and filing the Soviets systematically followed.

The Soviets kept separate files for a prisoner's passport, registration card, money and personal belongings. Raoul Wallenberg's diplomatic passport, prison register card, foreign currency and date book that were returned to his family in 1989 would have most likely have come not from one file that tumbled off a top shelf, but from four separate files that had been shelved according to category.

Yet, if the explanation of discovery cannot be accepted, it pushes forward the active dissimulation by decades. Those who presented the personal effects of Raoul Wallenberg in 1989 are, many of them, the people that remain in charge of the Russian Raoul Wallenberg dossier to this day. It is hard to give credence to Russians saying today that they have done all they can to uncover the truth about Raoul Wallenberg

when they maintain that just stumbled across Raoul Wallenberg's personal effects in 1989.

ii) The Russians

I visited Russia in pursuit of the Wallenberg project from March 3 to March 9, 1997. During that time, I met Russian government officials, Russian non-government researchers, and foreign researchers.

The Russian officials I met were Konstantin Kosatchev, head of the Finnish and Swedish section, and Andrew Zikeyev, attaché, second European Department, both of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in one meeting, and Teimouraz Ramishvili, Head of the Department of International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Foreign Ministry, in another meeting. The non-government Russian researchers I met were the historian Dr. Lev Besymenski, Vyacheslav Nikinov, who at one time worked for Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin on Wallenberg, Yuri and Ljuba Savienko of the Independent Psychiatric Association of Moscow, and Elena Kudriakova, an independent researcher on migration issues. As well, I had telephone meetings with Alexi Kartsev, a Russian journalist who had written on Wallenberg, and Nikita Petrov, a member of Memorial and a former member of the presidential commission on Soviet archives headed by the late Dmitri Volkogonov. The non-Russians researchers I contacted were Swedish Ambassador Martin Hallqvist, with whom I met, and Guy von Dardel, Marvin Makinen and Susan Mesinai, to whom I spoke by phone while they were at Vladimir.

Mr. Kosatchev informed me that the former Russian head of the working group, Viktor Tatarintsev, had been posted as Russian ambassador to Sweden and had ceased to be head of the working group. No one had been appointed to replace him. He, Mr. Kosatchev, was coordinating matters until a replacement was named. The Russian working group consisted of four people, the person who would replace Mr. Tatarintsev, and three others who held their positions on the working group because of their functions. These were Mr. Vinogradov of the Archives of the Federal Security Agency (FSB), Mr. Nikishkin of the Ministry of Interior Archives, and Mr. Filipov of the Ministry of Defence Archives. Mr. Kosatchev did not believe that I should meet with these other people and in fact I was not able to meet them, though the Canadian embassy in Moscow tried to arrange meetings for me with them. Mr. Kosatchev viewed my meeting with them as inappropriate because, he said, they were in possession in confidential information which it would be inappropriate for them to disclose to me.

Mr. Kosatchev further stated that he viewed the Wallenberg investigation as essentially a bilateral matter between Sweden and Russia. He contrasted the time of Bakatin, who was Minister of the Interior between the aborted coup against Gorbachev in August 1991 and the break up of the Soviet Union in December 1991, when documents flowed freely from the Soviet archives, to the present time. To Mr. Kosatchev the reason for the difference was that the 1991 period was a period of lawlessness. The present time was a legal period. In particular, there were laws now about privacy and security which meant that legally documents could not flow as freely as they once had.

Mr. Ramishvili monologued me at length on why present Wallenberg research efforts were a wild goose chase. He enthused that the few tentative opinions I expressed were not serious and unprofessional. His attitude was that the whole Wallenberg search was a make work project fabricated by researchers with nothing better to do with their time. Furthermore, he soliloqued that this effort that he considered so pointless had nonetheless been allowed to go ahead because of his good graces, his indulgence, which, all the same, had its limits.

All of the non-governmental Russian researchers with whom I spoke gave me the same message. They had got no cooperation from Russian archival officials, and I could expect none.

Elena Kudriakova suggested to me that it was simply impossible for an independent researcher to walk into the FSB archives and expect access to anything. Staff would not give independent researchers even the time of day. There are some researchers working with FSB archives, but they all had approved programs of work authorized by established Russian institutes. Even these researchers did not have access to the archives. The archives were kept in closed stacks. Instead, researchers told the FSB archivists what they wanted, and the archivists might produce the materials requested.

Elena Kudriakova is not a Wallenberg researcher, but Lev Besymenski is. The roadblocks the Russian FSB archivists put in the way of independent researchers he personally experienced. He suggested that there might be some FSB cooperation in an archival search for Wallenberg materials if the Government of Canada made a formal request. When and if the request was approved, Canada could then designate who its researchers would be.

For every foreign prisoner held at Vladimir prison, the Soviets kept three parallel files: a personal file, an operative file and an investigative file. Researchers who went to Vladimir prison in September 1990 found that by then all these foreign prisoner files had been transferred to the KGB archives in Moscow. So getting access to these archives is crucial for Wallenberg research.

Vyacheslav Nikinov who produced so much about Wallenberg and others at the time of Bakatin explained to me the techniques he and Bakatin used to get information they wanted. A story he told me that illustrates their manner of operation is that of Alexander Solzhenitsyn about whom Bakatin also wanted to release information. The chief KGB archivist at the time said that the KGB had nothing about Solzhenitsyn in their files. So Bakatin fired the archivist. The second in command said the same thing. So he too was fired. It was only after these two dismissals that Bakatin got information from the third in the chain of authority that there was indeed information in the archives about Solzhenitsyn.

What was distinctive about those days was that Nikinov and Bakatin were not just researchers, but people in authority, and they used that authority to seek out material aggressively rather than to hide it or just do nothing. It was clear to Nikinov that there was no comparable situation today, and he had two explanations for the shift.

One was the deconsolidation of power. Ambassador Hallqvist had pointed out to me that President Boris Yeltsin himself had promised Russian cooperation in the search for Wallenberg. I reminded Nikinov of that promise. Nikinov observed that Yeltsin says all sorts of things that just disappear into thin air, not because of hypocrisy on his part, but because the institutional mechanisms to translate the will of the President into action have disintegrated. Each bureaucracy has become a power into itself, doing what it wants, rather than what the President wants.

The second was the backlash against Bakatin. Within the FSB, Bakatin is now widely seen as a traitor. Recent published KGB memoirs all denounce Bakatin. The main sticking point was not the revelations about Wallenberg, but rather the disclosure of the bugging of the American embassy, something spy officials believe should never have been disclosed. The backlash means that the aggressive search for information in security files and their disclosure which Bakatin led are actively discouraged.

Research into psychiatric institutions was left to private researchers who ran into a Russian brick wall. Yet, that research may well bear fruit. For instance, the Swedish doctor Nana Swartz understood the Soviet cardiologist Alexander Miasnikov to have told her that Raoul Wallenberg was in a mental hospital in Moscow. There was information from other witnesses to the same effect.

Yuri and Ljuba Savienko of the Independent Psychiatric Association of Moscow informed me that their association had formed a committee to look for Raoul Wallenberg. This search was at the request of Guy Von Dardel, and financed by a grant from Tetra Pak, a Swedish firm.

The Psychiatric Association committee had visited a number of psychiatric institutions which had housed political prisoners in the days of the Soviet Union. The committee had gone through the records of these institutions looking for an indication that Raoul Wallenberg might have been there. However, access was barred to the records of Kazan mental hospital in Tartarstan, the psychiatric hospital with the largest number of political prisoner, the hospital which was most likely to have housed Wallenberg. They had received permission to access the records from the Chief Psychiatrist of the Ministry of Health, but for the head of the Kazan mental institute, that authority was not sufficient. He wanted authority from someone higher up in the chain before he would allow access.

The Savienkos traced the decline from the days of Bakatin in cooperation of Russian officials with the search for Wallenberg to the war in Chechnya. The violations of human rights committed by the Russian government during the war in Chechnya were roundly condemned by human rights organizations both inside and outside Russia. The result was a breakdown in relations between the Russian government and human rights organizations. Since the war, the Russian government has been less willing to cooperate with human rights organizations across the board, including in archival research on Wallenberg.

Alexander Kartsev said that figuring out what is in FSB archives is difficult. There are no published indexes. When archivists do not wish to disclose something, they do not say that they have it and will not disclose it, but rather that they do not have it. One can surmise that certain documents must exist, but there have been periods of document destruction and it becomes difficult to be sure which documents that must have existed at one time survived these various destruction binges. The document destructions are themselves not properly documented. Kartsev surmised that at the very least there would be undisclosed records in FSB archives from the period when Wallenberg was in Hungary, since the KGB would have had agents in Hungary at the time reporting to them. These documents would not likely have been destroyed. Yet they have not been disclosed.

The dissimulating behaviour of archivists was confirmed by Anatoly Prokopienko, former Director, Special Archives of Moscow in an article in Izvestia of September 25, 1997. Prokopienko wrote in Isvestia that some of the files that the Swedish Working Group had asked for and been told by Russian archivists could not be found he personally had seen. One example he gave was the file of Count Tolstoy-Kutusov.

Count Tolstoy-Kutusov worked at the Swedish legation at Budapest when Raoul Wallenberg was there. The Count was later identified as a Soviet agent. After publication of the Prokopienko article, the Swedish Working Group again asked for the file of Count Tolstoy-Kutusov. This time it was made available.

Nikita Petrov told me that the presidential commission on Soviet archives headed by the late Dmitri Volkogonov of which he was part had in 1992 made a tentative recommendation that the KGB archives and the Presidential archives be transferred to the state archives where they would be organized and accessible to researchers. However, after lobbying from FSB officials, the recommendation was dropped. The issue of what to do with the Presidential and KGB archives was left unresolved. His practical experience as a member of Memorial seeking access to the archives for work about Wallenberg was that officials gave him absolutely no cooperation.

From the foreign researchers in Moscow, Ambassador Hallqvist, Guy von Dardel, Marvin Makinen and Susan Mesinai, I heard about the Vladimir saga. Vladimir is a place

Raoul Wallenberg is likely to have been detained if he survived 1947 because Vladimir was the prison in the Soviet gulag where foreign political prisoners were kept. Furthermore, if Wallenberg was in Vladimir from 1947, he would have been detained in a cell without another prisoner, a single cell, and not under his own name. Marvin Makinen had proposed going through all the records of Vladimir from 1947 to 1972 to identify those cells where there were only one prisoner. Prison officials had agreed in writing in September 1996 to allow this to happen.

However, when the group arrived in Vladimir, access was denied. Apparently, there had been a change in personnel somewhere up the chain of command since the original permission had been granted, and prison officials wanted a new written permission before they would grant access. As a result of representations Ambassador Hallqvist made to the Foreign Ministry, prison officials relented, to an extent. Access would be allowed, but photocopying of prison cards, for which there had also previously been permission, would be forbidden. Photocopying was necessary because the research team wished to enter the data from the cards into a computer for the purpose of analyzing the data. The number of relevant cards was in the order of 100,000. It was impossible, within the time the research team had available in Vladimir to enter all that information on computers. Photocopies of the cards were necessary so that the data could be entered into computers over time.

The reason Russian officials gave to forbid photocopying was privacy concerns, that the permission of all those named in the cards, or their relatives, if dead, had to be sought before photocopying could be permitted. In protest against the refusal to allow photocopying, the foreign research group and their Russian Memorial colleagues left Vladimir with the work undone, on Sunday March 9.

In advance of the March 1997 trip to Vladimir, Marvin Makinen and Susan Mesinai had requested the files of 83 gulag prisoners who had given testimony about Raoul Wallenberg, to assist in verifying their testimony. Of the 83 files requested, only 15 were handed over in March 1997, and some of those 15 had been previously handed over already in September 1996.

In January 1998, the Russians relented, allowing photocopying of records and giving access to some 100 files. The analysis of the photocopied records and the investigation of the accessed files is now under way.

These incidents illustrate that the cooperation of the Russians with even the Swedish working group has been less than fulsome. When it comes to independent researchers operating outside of the umbrella of the Swedish working group, there has been systematic stonewalling. Dr. Lev Besymenski, Yuri and Ljuba Savienko of the Independent Psychiatric Association of Moscow, Arseni Roginsky of Memorial, journalist Nikita Petrov, and Vadim Birstein, to name a few, have had their work on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg totally frustrated by Russian officials.

Marvin Makinen, although he was obviously not pleased with these developments, had an explanation for them. It was not that long ago that officials could be executed for revealing the information that his working group had sought. Even today, officials can be fired for indiscretions. Especially at the lower levels, many of the officials who were saying no to everyone at the time of the Soviet Union remain in place. The Soviet tradition was secrecy, not openness. It takes a good deal of procedural legwork to overcome, if it can be overcome at all, the inclination to coverup learned over decades.

Ambassador Hallqvist had his own explanation for the change from the days of Bakatin, the shift in Russian politics. This was also the explanation the late Lars-Åke Nilsson, then Swedish ambassador to London, gave me when I saw him there. Wallenberg research is seen by the Russians as basically a facet of diplomatic relations with the West. Disclosure of Wallenberg documents flourished at a time when Russian relations with the

West were warm. The eagerness to cooperate on Wallenberg research waned as Russian relations with the West cooled. Now, politically, in Russia it is not considered astute, not in Russia's best interests, to be too friendly with the West. This cooling of relations has impacted every corner of Western Russian relations, including Wallenberg research.

Since the days of Bakatin, there has not been any independent effort or initiative of the Russians to find out what happened to Wallenberg. Russian officials today are far from being the driving force in Wallenberg research. The recent Russian official effort has been one of going along, less than wholeheartedly, with the Swedish effort. And that is all.

The Russian working group appeared willing to cooperate with the Swedish working group only and no one else. As I wrote, I could not even meet with any of its members. The chair had resigned and the others were inaccessible.

If the Russian working group was not totally passive, its activity paled in comparison with the activity of the Swedish working group. The Vladimir incident was telling. The Vladimir research taking place the week I was there brought together three of the five members of the Swedish working group, as well as a number of independent researchers associated with that group. Though the research was on Russian soil, none of the members of the Russian working group was participating in it.

Russian official cooperation will be satisfactory only when every qualified researcher who is doing work on Wallenberg whether associated with the Swedish working group or not, is satisfied. For now, that is far from being the case.

In one sense, it may not matter with whom Russian officials cooperate, as long as they cooperate with someone. The truth about Wallenberg, even if told to only one person, can, through that one person, be spread round the world.

In another sense, it matters very much who it is Russian officials decide to help. Despite all the time and effort the Swedish working group spent on the Wallenberg file, which is substantial, they do not have the final answers. More work, other work, has to be done. Russian cooperation with the Swedish working group has not necessarily meant cooperation with this other work.

Furthermore, any research benefits from a variety of approaches. The truth in any area of research is best found by different researchers trying different techniques to get at the truth. Russian officials, by providing cooperation with only those researchers working through the Swedish working group, closed off this variety of approaches.

As well, any research to be convincing must be verifiable. That means not only producing the documents on which the Swedish working group relied, but also replicating the access that it has had.

IV. Swedish Diligence

The Swedish government has failed to do all that it could do to help Raoul Wallenberg. There was the continued insistence of the Swedish ambassador to Moscow in 1945 and 1946, Staffan Söderblom, when dealing with the Soviet authorities about Raoul Wallenberg, that Raoul Wallenberg died of an auto accident in 1945, even though Söderblom had received information to the contrary from the very start.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Dekanozov sent a message to the Swedish embassy in Moscow on January 16, 1945 that Raoul Wallenberg had been found and was in the care of the Russian troops in Budapest. Ambassador Söderblom seemed aware of the detention of Raoul Wallenberg in February 1945 since he sent a telegram on February 14 to the Swedish Foreign office, suggesting that Raoul Wallenberg and

other members of the legation be instructed to take up contact with the new (Communist) Hungarian government. He wrote "some information of this kind seems even more suitable (for Wallenberg) since Wallenberg probably has not gotten the least sign of life from home."

The Swedish Foreign Office rejected the suggestion, stating by return telegram of February 17, 1945: "If you can get connection with Wallenberg...transmit our thanks and best wishes from the family and the information that instructions will be given when Danielsson has been found." Carl Ivan Danielsson had been the Swedish minister to Hungary.

Alexandra Kollontay, the Soviet ambassador Sweden, told Ingrid Günther, the wife of Swedish foreign minister Christian Günther, shortly after Raoul Wallenberg's arrest that Raoul was safe in Moscow and would be back. She added that it were best if no fuss were made about the matter.

Despite all this information, Ambassador Söderblom reported to Stockholm on April 19, 1945 that "the Russians will be unable to discover what happened to Raoul Wallenberg, that it was possible, "in the event of his having been involved in a fatal car accident or murdered...that Raoul Wallenberg has disappeared without a trace." In response, the Foreign Ministry in Stockholm instructed Ambassador Söderblom to call on Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Dekanozov to ask the Soviets to take urgent action to find Raoul Wallenberg. Ambassador Söderblom did so, on April 24, 1945, but in handing over the letter of request to Dekanozov, Söderblom stated that he presumed that Raoul Wallenberg died in a car accident.

An American telegram sent September 20, 1945 to the embassy in Moscow from Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State in Washington states that the Swedish Foreign Office "has obtained from reliable Hungarian source information Raoul Wallenberg still alive." The telegram says further, in a portion that has a line through it, that the Swedish Foreign Office "feels that even if the info is true the Soviets will never produce Wallenberg alive."

Ambassador Söderblom met Josef Stalin about Raoul Wallenberg on June 13, 1946. Despite what the Swedish Foreign Office told the Americans they thought they knew, at the meeting between Söderblom and Stalin, Söderblom expressed his personal conviction that Raoul Wallenberg had fallen victim to an accident or had been kidnapped. He said that he accepted that the Soviet authorities had no information on Raoul Wallenberg's fate.

The Swedish legation in Moscow in 1945 actively discouraged the American legation in Moscow from helping to find out what happened to Raoul Wallenberg. The then American ambassador to Moscow, Averell Harriman, sent a telegram to the Secretary of State in Washington D.C. on April 12, 1945 stating "The Swedes say that they have no reason to think that the Russians are not doing what they can (about Raoul Wallenberg) and they do not feel that an approach to the Soviet Foreign Office on our part would be desirable."

Ulf Barck-Holst, who as chargé d'affaires in the Swedish embassy in Moscow after Söderblom left, found that whenever he raised the question of Raoul Wallenberg with Soviet officials, the Soviets continually raised the names of those they wanted from Sweden. The Swiss, the Italians and the Danes had all got back diplomats simply by giving Russians in exchange. The Swedes had Russian spies in their control and did return them eventually to the Soviets, but asked for nothing in return.

Östen Undén was then Swedish Foreign Minister. When Per Anger, one of Raoul Wallenberg's colleagues at the Swedish legation in Budapest, asked Undén_ why Sweden did not ask for Wallenberg in return for the Russian spies the Swedes gave to

the Soviets, Undé_ replied only that "The Swedish government does not do such things."

Bernhard Rensinghoff, one of the German prisoners of war imprisoned with Raoul Wallenberg in Lubianka, on his release testified that Raoul Wallenberg discussed with Rensinghoff, Wallenberg's interrogations. At one interrogation session in Lefortovo prison just before Wallenberg was moved back to Lubianka, the interrogating commissar said to Wallenberg that the best proof of his guilt was the fact that neither the Swedish embassy in Moscow nor the Swedish government had done anything on his behalf. If the Swedish government had been at all interested, they would have been in contact a long time ago. While this statement of the interrogating commissar is no proof of what the Swedes did or did not do, it illustrates the use to which Swedish inactivity was put, and the value that Swedish activity would have had in that period in freeing Wallenberg.

The Soviet embassy counsellor in Ankara, Turkey, Pavel Erzine, attempted, in the summer of 1955, to arrange discussions between the Soviet leadership and the Swedish Prime Minister Tage Erlander about the possibility that "they (the Soviets) will repatriate him (Raoul Wallenberg) if he is still alive". Erzine used the Finnish diplomat Åke Frey, also stationed in Ankara, as an intermediary. When Frey returned to Helsinki, Finland, in November 1956, the Soviet contacts continued through Viktor Vladimirov, a second secretary at the Soviet embassy in Helsinki. Sverker Aström for the Swedish Foreign Office refused to have the Swedish government enter into the informal discussions.

The Soviets suggested in 1964 a prisoner exchange of Raoul Wallenberg for Soviet spy detained by Sweden, Swedish Air Force Colonel Stig Wennerström. The Swedish government rejected the idea of an exchange. The capture of Wennerström was an opportunity thrown away. Nothing was requested from the Soviets. There were no negotiations. There was total inactivity; complete disinterest in using this opportunity to pursue the fate of Raoul Wallenberg.

Susanne Berger, a German independent researcher on the Raoul Wallenberg case who lives in Washington D.C, in an article published in a Swedish newspaper in the fall of 1997, wrote, in a translation she has provided me: "Sweden also essentially ignored many of the witness testimonies which indicate that Raoul Wallenberg might have survived beyond 1947. In many cases testimonies sat on official's desks for years without actions being taken until the witness died. The examples are too numerous to cite here in detail..."

I was in Riga on November 15, 1996 to meet Hans Magnusson, the head of the Swedish working group on Raoul Wallenberg, who is also the Swedish ambassador to Latvia. I was in Stockholm the week of January 12 to 19th, 1997 and met with the colleagues of Hans Magnusson in the Swedish working group, Martin Hallqvist, Lage Olsen and Guy von Dardel. Martin Hallqvist is an Ambassador in the Division for Central and Eastern Europe of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in the Government of Sweden. Lage Olson is a Counsellor for Strategic Export Control also in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Guy Von Dardel is Raoul Wallenberg's brother. He lives in Geneva, but was in Stockholm the same week. I also saw in Stockholm that week Susanne Berger; Per Anger, one of Raoul Wallenberg's colleagues at the Swedish legation in Budapest; Sonja Sonnenfeld of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute and Daniel Backman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs archives; and Pentti Peltoniemi, a Finnish journalist doing research on the Finnish connection through diplomat Frey to the Wallenberg case.

Every member of the Swedish working group I found to be personally open and accessible. The same cannot be said for Swedish archives. While many Swedish archival documents about Raoul Wallenberg are available, not all are. The Swedish government has major collections of Raoul Wallenberg material in its Foreign Office (UD)

archives and in its Security Police (SÄPO) archives. The Foreign Office archives have been mostly, but not completely disclosed. The Security Police archives were off limits to researchers till September 1997. A study of those archives in September 1997 shows them to be incomplete, with several crucial omissions. The omitted material is presumably elsewhere in files not disclosed to researchers.

Swedish Cabinet level documents, as a rule, are disclosed after forty years. However, some documents are considered so sensitive that they are not disclosed even after the forty year period has passed. For instance, Swedish government cabinet documents refusing the 1964 proposed Wallenberg/Wennerström exchange are up to now undisclosed.

The Swedish working group fell victim to inordinate delay caused by exaggerated deference to Russian non-disclosures or lags in disclosure. Other than conducting interviews, the group neither engaged in research nor contracted research. In particular, the group members did not themselves conduct archival research nor arrange for it to be done by anyone else.

At the end of the day, the work of the Swedish working group has to be judged both on content and on process. In terms of process, while their personal openness was commendable, archival restrictions were not. As well, seven years is far too long to complete their work. The work has not been given the urgency nor the priority Raoul Wallenberg deserved.

V. Archival Research

There is need for further archival disclosure not only in Sweden and Russia, but also in the United Kingdom, the United States, Hungary, Germany, Israel and the United Nations in New York. Generally, security service information in all countries about Raoul Wallenberg has been accessible with difficulty, if at all. All of the security services suffer from an institutional bias to secrecy that hinders research into the fate of Raoul Wallenberg.

i) The United States

For the United States, there is an outstanding Freedom of Information Act request made for blacked out sections of Central Intelligence Agency documents released in December 1993. Answers to US Freedom of Information act requests have been known to take up to six years.

The Central Intelligence Agency has, as well, information yet to be disclosed about the American War Refugee Board, about Iver Olsen, the Swedish representative of the War Refugee Board, and the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in Hungary. Olsen was an agent of the OSS in Hungary attached to the US embassy.

The U.S. government has refused a Freedom of Information Act request made by Susanne Berger for documents about Greville Wynne. Greville Wynne was a British spy sentenced by the Soviets in 1963 to eight years in prison, but then exchanged a year later for a Soviet spy, Konon Molody. John Bierman recounts that Wynne recalled in 1980 (presumably to Bierman) an exchange in Lubianka prison in 1963 with a prisoner who identified himself as Swedish. Once Wynne returned from the USSR in 1964, he would have been debriefed by the British government and that debriefing information presumably would have been passed on to the United States government. That debriefing may contain more detailed information about the Wynne/Swedish prisoner conversations. Susanne Berger has appealed the Freedom of Information Act refusal.

ii) United Kingdom

I wrote to the United Kingdom Office of the Public Service in December 1996 under the U.K. Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. I asked for information in

their records about Raoul Wallenberg; the impact of the activities of the Wallenberg companies during World War II on the mission of Raoul Wallenberg in Budapest, Hungary; any link between Raoul Wallenberg and the Wallenberg companies on behalf of the Allies; British discretionary oversight related to the activities of the Wallenberg companies during World War II; World War II Ministry of Economic Warfare files related to Sweden; World War II Ministry of Economic Warfare files related to Hungary; files about either Hungary or Sweden under the classification "Safe Haven: Neutral Trade Department"; debriefings of Greville Wynne; records of conversations and memoranda between Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt that relate to Raoul Wallenberg or to the mission of Raoul Wallenberg in Budapest; the C Bureau Allied Swedish network during World War II involving Lieutenant William Denham; an Allied mission to Hungary involving a separate peace with the Allies that mention either Raoul Wallenberg or Per Anger; and a "liquidatsia" request for Raoul Wallenberg in files relating to KGB defector Oleg Gordievsky.

The reason why some of the information was requested is self evident. Other requests may need explanation.

There was a request about Wallenberg in 1947 for what was called a "liquidatsia". Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Vyshinsky wrote to Vyacheslav Molotov, then Vice Chair of the Council of Ministers and Deputy Prime Minister, by memorandum dated May 13, 1947 to prevail upon Viktor Abakumov, chief of the Smersh military counter espionage, to report on the substance of the case and propose its settlement. The Russian word used for "settlement" was "liquidatsia".

This request has been interpreted variously as a request to liquidate Wallenberg, a request to obliterate all traces of Wallenberg in the Soviet records, or a request to clear up the case of Raoul Wallenberg by answering Swedish government requests about him. Information the British obtained from KGB defector Gordievsky may include details of this "liquidatsia".

There is, of course, no end of theories about Wallenberg, what happened to him and why. The only answer to all of the theories is hard facts. Because some of the theories revolve around what Wallenberg was doing and for whom before he was captured, the facts that must be ascertained include those about his activities before he was captured.

Some of the information requested was directed to ascertaining these sorts of facts. Raoul Wallenberg's disappearance and what I consider to be the half hearted efforts of the West to have him released are a downward trajectory which can only be explained by his upward trajectory before his capture.

The US News and World Report published an article on May 13, 1996 suggesting that Raoul Wallenberg was operating as an American spy in Budapest under Swedish consulate cover. In one sense, whether Wallenberg was a spy or not may not matter, since the paranoid Stalinist system of the Soviet Union after the War would have thought of him as a spy, even if he was not.

In another sense, it may matter a good deal. If he was indeed a spy, the West may not have put every effort it could have done into releasing Wallenberg because exerting that effort would have resulted in acknowledging the extent of Wallenberg's complicity in the West's intelligence activities.

Lieutenant William Denham was part of an Allied Swedish intelligence network during World War II. Denham, himself, left Sweden before Raoul Wallenberg went to Budapest. Nonetheless, if Wallenberg was doing intelligence work for the Allies, his name and his work would presumably show up in the network files.

The Wallenberg family companies were involved in supplying the Nazi war effort. An

obvious line of inquiry is the connection between Raoul Wallenberg's involvement with the Allies and the involvement of other family members with the Axis. Was Raoul's involvement with the Allies some form of quid pro quo from the family?

After the War broke out Marcus Wallenberg, cousin to Raoul, became head of the Swedish trade mission to Great Britain. Jacob Wallenberg, brother of Marcus, became head of the Swedish trade mission to Nazi Germany. Was Raoul's involvement in Hungary part of a Wallenberg family effort to maintain overall neutrality by helping all sides at once?

The Swedish government in general and the Wallenberg cousins in particular had economic interests in Hungary which the mission of Raoul Wallenberg, by attempting to save Swedish associates in Hungary, initially supported. However, Raoul Wallenberg went far beyond protecting Swedish business associates in Hungary. By, from the Swedish and cousins' perspective, going overboard, did Raoul Wallenberg hurt rather than help the Swedish and the cousins' business interests? Was it potential harm to business interests that made the cousins and the government of Sweden so unassertive in attempting to determine Raoul Wallenberg's fate and whereabouts? Several of the records requested try to get at information that would answer these questions.

British intelligence in Europe during the War was sophisticated and detailed. Although the position of Raoul Wallenberg in Budapest was financed by the War Refugee Board, an American entity set up by executive order of President Roosevelt to save potential victims of Nazi persecution, the functioning of Wallenberg in Budapest must have inevitably appeared in British war time records. Those records needs to be made public if we are to explain fully the fate and whereabouts of Raoul Wallenberg.

Kate Crowe, Open Government Enquiry Unit, Foreign & Commonwealth Office, United Kingdom, by letter dated February 1997 wrote to tell me that security and intelligence agencies had searched their records in response to previous requests for information about Raoul Wallenberg and the records contain nothing that is not already known about his fate. The implication of the letter from Ms. Crowe is that the records do contain information about Raoul Wallenberg, but in the judgment of the security and intelligence agencies, that information is already known. The statement prompts three responses.

This first is to ask what possible objection there could be from the security and intelligence agencies to the release of information in their possession if that information is already known? Presumably, the reason why security and intelligence agencies refuse to disclose information is so that secrets can be kept. However, if there is no secret to be kept, there is no justification for the refusal to disclose.

The second is to request the opportunity to allow independent Wallenberg researchers to make their own judgment whether or not the information about Raoul Wallenberg in the possession of British security and intelligence agencies is already known. Two different documents containing superficially the same information may have slight variations which to a trained researcher would be fraught with significance. It is unreasonable to ask the public simply to accept an official judgment that information behind closed doors is already known, and not allow independent researchers to make that judgment themselves.

The third is to point out the difficult nature of Wallenberg research. The activities of Raoul Wallenberg in Budapest during World War II, and his fate immediately after the War are generally of greater interest now than they were at the time. In retrospect one can say that Raoul Wallenberg was one of the great heroes of the twentieth century, the paradigmatic human rights activist, and his disappearance one of the great crimes of this century.

However, at the time, his feats were not public. Even the Holocaust itself, while it was being perpetrated, was little known, covered up or wilfully ignored throughout the globe. An awareness of the heroics of Wallenberg at the time he was accomplishing them would have meant a full awareness of the Holocaust at the time it was happening. Given the blind eye the world turned to the Holocaust while it was being inflicted, the efforts of Wallenberg to save people from the Holocaust made no contemporaneous general impression.

Refusal to confront the horrors of the Holocaust did not end with the end of the War. It was years before the full scope of the tragedy sunk into public consciousness. Indeed, one can say that even today we have not fully grasped the enormity of the evil of the Holocaust and are still attempting to do so. Confronting the Holocaust has been a gargantuan effort, a work of years, even decades.

Furthermore, the anti-Semitism that led to the Holocaust, while it manifested itself in its most virulent form in Nazi Germany, was part of the then global popular culture. That global anti-Semitism did not end with the defeat of Nazi Germany. It continued in mitigated form and only slowly dissipated as older people with fixed anti-Semitic biases were replaced by a new generation, and as the awful, lethal consequences of anti-Semitism became fully known. Post war anti-Semitism and the Holocaust were in a tug of war, the anti-Semitism generating resistance to facing the Holocaust or minimizing its significance while knowledge of the Holocaust was generating opposition to anti-Semitism and racism and promoting respect for human rights values. From today's perspective one can say that it is knowledge of the Holocaust that won this tug of war. However, in the early years after the War, it was polite, vestigial anti-Semitism that had the upper hand.

It was in Nazi Germany that eliminationist anti-Semitism, the notion that Jews must be killed, was the most prevalent. But elsewhere, including amongst the Allies, social anti-Semitism, the notion that the Jews were different from the rest of us, that their fate was not as important to us as the fate of others, was pervasive.

What that meant for Raoul Wallenberg was that not only his feats during the War at the time he accomplished them passed with little notice. After the war, his disappearance seemed to the public at large in general and Allied officials in particular of little consequence. The enormity of the crime against him, the enormity of the crime against humanity by his enforced disappearance, only became apparent years after the War when the full shock and horror of the Holocaust registered.

In consequence, it is unreasonable to expect to find in British security and intelligence archives a Raoul Wallenberg file that would set out what he was doing during the War and what may have happened to him during the War. As surprising as it may seem from today's perspective, the efforts of Wallenberg during the War and his fate after the War, to all appearances, did not seem important enough to British security and intelligence at the time to justify separate tracking of his activities and fate.

The result is that there is, in all probability, no separate Raoul Wallenberg file that one can pull off the shelves of British security and intelligence services. What information there would be in security and intelligence files about Raoul Wallenberg would likely be buried in other files, files about British Russian relations, British Hungarian relations, trading with the enemy files, Swedish undercover operative files and so on. Doing a thorough and proper search of British security and intelligence files for information about Raoul Wallenberg would be a time consuming task requiring the attention and knowledge of experts in the field.

I have no reason to believe that mammoth task has ever been undertaken. My impression is that British security and intelligence archivists have cast a cursory glance at the most obvious sources of information, found little or nothing, and left it at that.

What needs to be done is more than garner the bland assurances of professional security and intelligence archivists. Expert Wallenberg researchers need access to security and intelligence files to comb through them for relevant information. This to my mind can be done in one of two ways.

One is for the British government to commission research in its security and intelligence files on the activities and fate of Raoul Wallenberg. The commissioned researchers would have access to all security and intelligence files without restriction, with authority to release all Wallenberg information publicly.

The other is to allow unrestricted, open stack access of security and intelligence files to any qualified Wallenberg private researcher, subject only to a confidentiality undertaking. The undertaking would be not to disclose any information obtained through this research that was irrelevant to the Wallenberg case.

This was all communicated to the United Kingdom government. The government simply stated in a letter of reply dated May 6, 1997 that it is the long standing policy of the government not to grant access of this sort to their records.

Though responsibility for the disappearance of Raoul Wallenberg must rest squarely on the shoulders of the Soviet Union, responsibility for discovering what happened to him rests on the whole global community. The governments of other countries are ill placed to press the Russian government to disclose information in Russian files about Raoul Wallenberg if these other countries do not disclose information in their files about Raoul Wallenberg.

The Russian excuses for non-disclosure based on security or private concerns can hardly be countered as long as other governments refuse to disclose what they have in their files about Raoul Wallenberg, based on security or privacy concerns. Other governments' full disclosure of information in their files about Raoul Wallenberg is necessary not only to shed full light on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg. It is necessary also in order to maintain credibility when pressing the Russians to disclose all.

VI. The 1947 Death Hypothesis

Given the incomplete access to information that now exists, it is impossible to come to any firm conclusion about what happened to Raoul Wallenberg. There are two hypotheses. One is that he died in 1947. The other is that he survived 1947 and lived in the Soviet gulag for many years after. There is no conclusive evidence to support either hypothesis.

The 1947 death theory is in fact three theories. One theory is that Raoul Wallenberg was shot and buried. Another theory is that he was poisoned and cremated. A third theory is that he died of a heart attack during interrogation.

All these theories cannot be true. The fact that all three theories have currency raises questions whether any one of them is true. The shooting theory, the poisoning theory and the heart attack theory rather than reinforcing each other, cancel each other out. The shooting theory puts in doubt the poisoning theory and the heart attack theory; the poisoning theory puts in doubt the shooting theory and heart attack theory; and the heart attack theory puts in doubt the poisoning theory and the shooting theory.

The shooting theory is that Raoul Wallenberg was shot at Kommunarka near Moscow and buried in the woods there. There is the evidence of Sasovsky, the commander of a prison camp near Moscow, who, when drunk in 1950 or 51, boasted of taking part in the shooting of a Jewish swine from Sweden. However, this sort of evidence, from a drunk who does not mention Raoul Wallenberg specifically, is of no better quality, and, indeed of far worse quality, than the evidence that Raoul Wallenberg survived 1947.

There was a conversation Alexander Jakovlev had in 1989 with Kruytchkov after a Politbureau meeting. According to Jakovlev, Kruytchkov told Jakovlev Raoul Wallenberg was shot. However, this conversation, forty two years after Raoul Wallenberg's alleged shooting, is not evidence of anything, but is rather mere rumour mongering.

Indeed, virtually all of the evidence about the death of Raoul Wallenberg is of this nature. It does not come from anyone who has direct knowledge of the case from personal experience. It is guesses and speculations passed on from one person to another which, through enough repetition, acquire the status of fact. Former KGB official Kondrashov in the spring of 1947 interpreted at the interrogation of a prisoner dressed in a suit. The lead interrogator was Kuzmishin. Some months after the interrogation, Kondrashov asked a colleague what had happened to the person interrogated and was told that he had been shot. Kondrashov did not understand at the time that the person in question was Raoul Wallenberg, but found it out later the same year.

However, this story raises more questions than it answers. How did Kondrashov find out that the person concerned was Raoul Wallenberg? When? From whom? Who told Kondrashov that the person concerned was shot? How did the teller come to know that information?

In support of the poisoning theory is the evidence of a former intelligence officer who alleges he saw a file on Raoul Wallenberg that was created at the time of his death. Death was from a heart attack induced by mental torture and medical experiments. The source speculated that Pavel Sudoplatov's unit, the Administration for Special Tasks, was involved, including the laboratory run by Grigori Moiseyevich Mayranovsky, which undertook toxicological research and also executed important victims by poison.

Where is this file the source saw? What was the archive in which the file was kept? What has happened to the documents in that archive?

Sudoplatov himself maintained that Raoul Wallenberg may have been killed in Mayranovsky's laboratory and suggested where documents could be found that would establish this murder. These documents have not been located.

One could argue that the interrogation of Raoul Wallenberg's cell mates in late July 1947 and their subsequent isolation support a conclusion that Raoul Wallenberg died in July 1947. However, this treatment of Raoul Wallenberg's cell mates is equally consistent with a Soviet decision that, in future, the identity of Raoul Wallenberg would be disguised within the prison system, that he would become a numbered rather than named prisoner, and that he would be kept in isolation.

Alternatively, the interrogations may not have signalled any decision about Raoul Wallenberg at all. The Vyshinsky note of 1947 stated that Raoul Wallenberg is "not known to have been on Soviet territory". The interrogations may have served only the purpose of ensuring that this bald faced lie could be told without fear of immediate contradiction.

Soviet archival record show there to have been a letter dated July 17, 1947, from Viktor Abakumov, chief of the Smersh military counter espionage, to Vyacheslav Molotov, then Vice Chair of the Council of Ministers and Deputy Prime Minister about Raoul Wallenberg. The letter itself is missing. July 17, 1947 was also the date of the Smoltsov note which said that Raoul Wallenberg had died of a heart attack the previous night.

Obviously what is in a missing letter can be only a matter of speculation. It is an indication of the flimsiness of the evidence in support of the 1947 death conclusion that

this mere coincidence of dates, in the absence of the Abakumov letter, is used to argue that Raoul Wallenberg was murdered in 1947.

As mentioned earlier in this report, Vyshinsky wrote to Abakumov on July 7, 1947 asking Abakumov give him the information already known to foreigners about the fate of Raoul Wallenberg. That information was to be used to prepare a reply to the Swedish government which had been pressing the Foreign Ministry about Raoul Wallenberg.

The most obvious possibility is that in the July 17 letter Abakumov was only responding to that request. The reply from Abakumov went to Molotov rather than Vyshinsky because Vyshinsky was operating under Molotov and on Molotov's behalf. It most likely contained exactly what Vyshinsky asked it to contain and nothing else.

As long as there are unanswered questions about the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, as long as there is research to be done, archives to be searched, files to be disclosed, a 1947 death conclusion operates at cross purposes with this research. A 1947 death conclusion takes the wind out of the sails of the effort to answer unanswered questions. As well, the unanswered questions make the 1947 death conclusion implausible.

VII. 1947 Survival Hypothesis

The evidence that Raoul Wallenberg survived July, 1947 is compelling. It is as persuasive as the evidence that he died in July, 1947. It is a mistake, based on the present state of evidence, to prefer the hypothesis that Wallenberg died in 1947 over the hypothesis that he survived 1947.

Witness testimony supporting the survival of Raoul Wallenberg beyond 1947 has been rejected on the grounds that Raoul Wallenberg was known and discussed among foreign prisoners during the 1950s, giving rise to second hand, distorted reports; that Raoul Wallenberg may have been confused with others of Swedish nationality; that there were other prisoners called Wallenberg in the gulag system; and that there have been false sightings of other celebrated gulag prisoners. In my view, the testimony of each Raoul Wallenberg witness must be examined and assessed separately. Rejecting witness testimony in a generalized fashion supports a conclusion already formed, that Wallenberg died in 1947, but cannot itself justify the conclusion.

Although no card was found in Vladimir prison relating to Raoul Wallenberg, the testimony of several of those who claimed to have seen or heard or heard about Raoul Wallenberg's being in Vladimir, mainly from the 1950s, is largely correct with regard to details about their cells and dates of their imprisonment. The information Vladimir witnesses from the early 1950s gave about their fellow witnesses was also on the whole correct.

It has been suggested that the Vladimir prisoners may have been mistaken because Raoul Wallenberg was a well known person in prison; that several Vladimir prisoners had met Raoul Wallenberg in Moscow prisons between 1945 and 1947; and that Vladimir prisoner Henry Thomsen, alias Grossheim-Krisko, was a possible source of error. Henry Thomsen had been an employee at the Swedish Legation in Budapest. He communicated with other prisoners at Vladimir by knocking and, in so doing, had described himself as a secretary at the Swedish legation. However, the suggested confusion and mistakes of the Vladimir prisoners about Raoul Wallenberg have to be contrasted with their error free testimony about all other matters not related to Raoul Wallenberg.

There are evidentiary statements by witnesses that cannot be discounted. Among these are the testimony of Theodor von Dufving, Zigurds Kruminsh, the Polish prisoners, Varvara Ivanovna Larina, and Alexander Timofeevich Kukin.

Theodor von Dufving recounted how he had encountered in a transit camp in February

1949 on the route to Vorkuta a prisoner dressed in civilian clothes and with his own special accompanying guard. The prisoner was stated to be a Swedish diplomat. The Swede stated: "I have become prisoner due to a great mistake."

Zigurds Kruminsh in 1962 told Marvin Makinen in Cell 2-31 in Vladimir prison in 1962 that Kruminsh had met in the prison a Swedish prisoner who was allegedly arrested "for some kind of intelligence work" and who was "certain" that he would "be well rewarded for his work upon his return home." This statement must be considered in conjunction with that made later to Makinen in a labour camp that "Kruminsh sat (in Vladimir) with "the Swedish prisoner van den Berg."

A number of Polish prisoners, Boguslaw Baj, Jozef Kowalski, Jerzy Cichocki and Josef Markujewski, all held in the Soviet gulag have identified Raoul Wallenberg as a fellow prisoner in the early 50s. All made statements separately and independently of each other. The testimony of these prisoners about their detention and camp conditions is supported by their personal files.

Evidence that Raoul Wallenberg had been sentenced, with a sentence to expire after 1947, would have been some evidence that he survived 1947. Two of the Polish witnesses testified that Wallenberg was sentenced. Boguslaw Baj testified that Raoul Wallenberg was given 25 years for espionage. Jerzy Cichocki, another Polish prisoner, testified he, Cichocki, had asked to have Raoul Wallenberg moved to Cichocki's work brigade. Bratsk camp commanders refused the request because Raoul Wallenberg had "a special sentence."

It has been argued that keeping Raoul Wallenberg in a camp would be extremely illogical because of the risk of his coming into contact with other prisoners. However, the Polish witnesses state that they were held in a strict regime, which meant that prisoners could only associate with each other in groups of three or less, that the only topic for discussion was to have been work, and that they were to address each other by the number listed on a patch sewed on to their clothes. If Raoul Wallenberg was indeed in camp with these prisoners, it would not have just been any camp, but a very restricted place.

A person who was a cleaner at the prison hospital recently identified Raoul Wallenberg as a prisoner in an isolation cell in the 1950s. The name of the cleaner is Varvara Ivanova Larina. Her testimony is that a foreign non-German prisoner had been held for a lengthy period in solitary confinement. Although Larina did not know the name of the prisoner, she described his physical features. The person she described has features similar to those of Raoul Wallenberg. She, as well, identified Raoul Wallenberg by selected a photograph of him that had never been in the international press. In any case, at the time she was first interviewed, in 1992, by Marvin Makinen and Nikita Petrov in the office of the chief doctor of Vladimir Prison hospital, Dr. Polinina, Larina knew nothing of the case of Raoul Wallenberg. She remembered the prisoner primarily because of his complaining attitude to prison authorities.

Alexander Timofeevich Kukin, a retired former head guard at Vladimir, as well admitted that a foreign non-German prisoner had been held in Vladimir for a lengthy period in solitary confinement, in appearance like a photo of Raoul Wallenberg.

The testimony of Abraham Kalinski, a Polish Jew who had spent a number of years in Soviet prisons and camps, including Vladimir prison, was that Raoul Wallenberg was imprisoned in the Soviet Union until 1975. Kalinski claimed to have seen Raoul Wallenberg for the last time in 1959. Kalinski further passed on testimony of Soviet Jewish prisoner Jan Kaplan, prison medical officer Butova and Soviet General Gennadij Kuprianov.

Some of the testimony of Kalinski is undoubtedly false, for instance, that Kuprianov died

in prison of torture at the hands of the KGB. Kuprianov in fact died a natural death twenty three years after his release from prison. However, other parts of Kalinski's testimony are correct, in terms of places and dates. The Kalinski testimony is not reliable enough to justify on its own a conclusion of any sort, but it does deserve investigation.

If Wallenberg survived July 19 1947, it is highly likely that his identity would have been disguised within the Soviet system. He would have been given a false name or a number to hide his identity from the prison staff. Numbered prisoners existed to a limited extent especially in the Moscow prisons and Vladimir prison. Stalin's son Vasily was one such prisoner. Another example is the prisoner Boris Menshagin.

An important decision may have been taken in July 1947 about Raoul Wallenberg. The decision may have been to kill him. However, the decision may equally have been to move him from Lubyanka, where he was an identified prisoner, to another prison where he would be a numbered and otherwise unidentified prisoner.

A number of witnesses place Raoul Wallenberg in Lefortovo prison in late 1947 and 1948. Finnish citizen Richard Dahm in 1955 told the then Swedish ambassador to Helsinki that in 1948 he was a Soviet prisoner in Vladimir held in a cell with Germans Joachim Vorwerk and Heinz-Helmuth von Hinckeldey. Vorwerk and Hinckeldey told Dahm that they had met Raoul Wallenberg in Lefortovo in September 1947.

Roland Gottlieb, consul at the German embassy in Sofia during the War, was captured by the Soviets in 1944 and held in Lefortovo. At the end of 1947, a co-prisoner advised Gottlieb that Raoul Wallenberg was in Lefortovo. There is substantial additional testimony from other prisoners to the same effect.

A defecting Jewish AVO official (AVO was the acronym for the Hungarian security service) stated in 1984 that he had been given a special assignment in January 1983 as an analyst of some investigative material prior to a planned anti-Zionist trial. A Soviet adviser told him that Raoul Wallenberg was to be used as an important witness.

Igor Prelin, a former KGB press officer, stated that he reviewed materials which indicated that Raoul Wallenberg was to have been used as a Soviet witness in the Nuernberg war crimes trials. He further explained that there existed an agreement between the former Allies: Russians at Nuernberg were not going to reveal American and British support for Nazi Germany; in turn, the British and Americans would not reveal details of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact or the Katyn massacre. Raoul Wallenberg and others served as guarantees that the deal would be kept.

In 1956, when the Soviets were in the process of concocting what became the Gromyko memorandum, there were active discussions about what the Swedes knew in order to tailor the memorandum to that knowledge. In discussing what the Swedes knew, they considered what Mäntynen knew. Mäntynen was a Finn imprisoned in the Soviet Union between 1948 and 1955. One Soviet Foreign Ministry memorandum dated April 5, 1956 states "According to information from the USSR Minister of the Interior and the KGB, Mäntynen did not meet Raoul Wallenberg while imprisoned in the USSR between 1948 and 1955 and was therefore unable to provide Swedish representatives with any material deserving any attention at all about Raoul Wallenberg." Why would the Soviets be concerned about whether Mäntynen had met or had not met Raoul Wallenberg between 1948 and 1955 if Raoul Wallenberg was already dead in 1947?

I mentioned earlier, in the section on Swedish diligence, the Soviet proposal in 1964 for an exchange of Raoul Wallenberg for a Soviet spy detained by the Swedes, Swedish Air Force Colonel Stig Wennerström. Soviet contact was made through a KGB resident at the Soviet embassy in East Berlin to Carl-Gustaf Swengel, a Swedish businessman living in Berlin at the time.

A 1960 Swedish report put out by two judges of the Swedish Supreme Court concluded that it was probable that Wallenberg was alive and held in Vladimir prison at least in the early 1950's. The judges were Ragner Gyllensward and Per Santessen.

After a conversation in German between the Swedish psychiatrist Nana Swartz and the Soviet cardiologist Alexander Miasnikov in 1961, Nana Swartz understood Alexander Miasnikov to have told her that Raoul Wallenberg was in a mental hospital in Moscow. The then Prime Minister Erlander wrote to Communist Party chair Nikita Khrushchev about the conversation and asked for the return of Raoul Wallenberg. Rolf Sohlman, the then Swedish ambassador to the Soviet Union, at a meeting on February 25, 1961, handed over the letter to Khrushchev, who responded with a verbal harangue. Dr. Miasnikov subsequently wrote to Dr. Swartz insisting that Dr. Swartz had misunderstood him. The two met again on July 10, 1965 and each maintained his/her own version. Dr. Swartz remained "unwaveringly convinced" of the correctness of her version.

Dr. Miasnikov had an interest in changing his story, if Dr. Swartz's version is correct, since Dr. Miasnikov's original admission contradicted official Soviet policy, the policy of his masters. Dr. Miasnikov was not just an ordinary Soviet doctor, but one with close ties to the police and the KGB. If Raoul Wallenberg were alive, there is every chance that Dr. Miasnikov would have met him, and every reason for him to parade the official Soviet line about Raoul Wallenberg when told to do so.

Dr. Swartz, on the other hand, had nothing to gain from her version of the story being correct. As well, a 1986 letter from the daughter of Nana Swartz to Swedish researcher Kenne Fant recounts that she met Dr. Miasnikov when she was a child and she remember him as speaking good German.

If Wallenberg was kept alive, why was he kept alive? Answering this sort of question is difficult, not so much intellectually as morally. The very suggestion that the killing of anyone might somehow make sense is repulsive, reprehensible. It is difficult to try to imagine how people who were murderers and liars would have behaved towards Raoul Wallenberg. We are ill placed to put ourselves in the shoes of murderers and liars.

Despite that limitation, it is possible to say that there are several good reasons why the Soviets would have kept Raoul Wallenberg alive. One is that evil has its limits. The killing of Raoul Wallenberg would have been such a dastardly act that it must have given even the most bloodthirsty killers pause.

Second, Raoul Wallenberg alive remained a valuable asset to the Soviets. He was always someone who could potentially be exchanged for a person the Soviets wanted abroad.

Third, Raoul Wallenberg could have potentially given testimony in various trials relating to World War II. Indeed, some of the evidence about his survival after 1947 revolves around potential exchanges and potential testimony.

A fourth reason why the Soviets would have kept Raoul Wallenberg alive was the nature of the gulag. Admittedly, in the Soviet Union, people were killed senselessly. As well, they were arrested and kept in prison, simply to keep the gulag going. The gulag and the whole state security apparatus of the Soviet Union depended on the arrest and detention of spies, traitors, and saboteurs to justify its existence. If there were no spies, traitors and saboteurs, they had to be invented. Raoul Wallenberg could have been kept alive in the gulag for no other reason than that the gulag needed people like him, or like the Soviets pretended he was, on order to give the gulag its *raison d'être*.

This report does not conclude that logically Raoul Wallenberg must have been kept

alive or that the present evidence leads to the unequivocal conclusion that Raoul Wallenberg survived 1947, but rather that logic leads us nowhere and that the present evidence is equivocal. The present evidence that Raoul Wallenberg survived 1947 is substantial and cannot be dismissed.

VIII. The Law

A. Burden of Proof

There are two possibilities. Either Raoul Wallenberg is alive. Or he is dead. There are two propositions at play. One is the proposition that he is alive. The other is the proposition that he is dead. It is my view that the burden of proof should be on the proposition that he is dead. The burden of proof should not be on the proposition that he is alive.

If we assume that Wallenberg is alive, when in fact he is dead, then all we have lost is our own time and effort in attempting to locate him when he is nowhere to be found. If, on the other hand, we assume that he is dead, when in fact he is alive, then we will be perpetrating a cruel injustice on Raoul Wallenberg himself. In view of all that he has done for others, our own assumptions should be structured to do as much as possible for him.

B. Standard of Proof

For standard of proof, our choices are prima facie proof, reasonable possibility, balanced of probabilities, clear and convincing evidence, and proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Prima facie proof is proof that is established after examining only the evidence in favour of a proposition, without examining any of the contrary evidence. Proof on a reasonable possibility is proof that establishes a proposition is more than a mere or hypothetical possibility, but goes no further. In terms of percentages, proof that establishes a proposition has one in ten chances to be true is considered to be proof on a reasonable possibility.

Proof on a balance of probabilities means proving that a proposition is more likely than not to be true. In terms of percentages, proof on a balance of probabilities must establish that a proposition has more than a 50% chance of being true.

Clear and convincing evidence of truth is a standard that is higher than a mere balance of probabilities. It approaches the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, with quite reaching it. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is the highest standard of proof. Demanding proof beyond this standard becomes unreasonable. In addition to the burden of proof being on the proposition that Raoul Wallenberg is dead, the standard of proof should be proof beyond a reasonable doubt. A burden of proof on the proposition that Raoul Wallenberg is dead, with a standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, is most likely to spur further inquiries and to answer all unanswered questions. Any other burden or standard is likely to leave matters hanging.

C. The Law of Disappearances

The United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance applies to the case of Raoul Wallenberg and it has been violated. The Declaration was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 18, 1992 and Raoul Wallenberg disappeared long before that. Nonetheless, he remains a disappeared person to this day, and the Declaration applies to his case today.

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances began its work in 1980, before the adoption of the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. When it began its work it took within its mandate persons who had disappeared prior to the creation of the Working Group and indeed, persons who had disappeared and been found dead prior to the creation of the Working Group. The Working Group did not feel constrained to deal with only those cases of persons who had disappeared after the

Working Group had been created.

If one examines the Declaration, virtually every provision, except for those about children and asylum applies to the case of Raoul Wallenberg. Furthermore, Russia is in violation of every one of those duties under the Declaration to which the Raoul Wallenberg case is relevant.

To say that Russia is in violation of the Declaration does not necessarily mean that Russian officials are now actively hiding Raoul Wallenberg in their prison or hospital system. Inadequate investigation, a failure to release relevant documents, denying to the Wallenberg case the priority and attention it deserves can all amount to violations of the Declaration.

The Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance imposes duties on all states to investigate the fate of a disappeared person, not just on the state in whose territory the disappearance occurred. The Declaration imposes duties on Sweden and Canada as well as on Russia to account for the fate of Raoul Wallenberg. It provides that an investigation into the fate of a disappeared person should be able to be conducted for as long as the fate of the victim of the enforced disappearance remains unclarified. Cutting off investigation into the fate of Raoul Wallenberg prematurely would violate this provision.

D. Privacy

Russian officials denied photocopying of Vladimir prison records by citing privacy concerns, by stating that the permission of all those named in the cards, or their relatives, if dead, had to be sought before photocopying could be permitted. Denying access to records on this basis is a violation of international law.

The Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance states that an official up to date register of all persons deprived of their liberty shall be maintained in every place of detention. Additionally, each state shall take steps to maintain similar centralized registers. The information contained in these registers shall be made available to family members, their counsel or to any other persons having a legitimate interest in the information, unless a wish to the contrary has been manifested by the persons concerned. Further, the information contained in the registers shall be made available to any judicial or other competent and independent national authority and to any other competent authority entitled under the law of the state concerned or any international legal instrument to which the state concerned is a party, seeking to trace the whereabouts of a detained person.

IX. Follow Up Process

There needs to be a follow up process to this report and the reports of the Swedish and Russian working groups. The follow up process should not just be a watered down version of the present process. It needs to be international in nature and not just bilateral as the Swedish Russian process is. It needs to have an even higher status and authority than the present process if it is to answer questions the present process can not answer.

It is difficult to disentangle the search for the truth about Wallenberg from the general opacity of the old Soviet system. The search for Wallenberg is a conundrum precisely because the Russians have done so little to clarify the Soviet past. Wallenberg research tells us of the difficulty of explaining the fate of any disappeared person victim of a system whose abuses have not been fully and thoroughly confronted.

The Wallenberg case was a coverup within a coverup. The Soviet gulag was the antithesis of an open accessible system. Even within the more general secrecy of Soviet repression, the Wallenberg case was a separate more tightly held secret. Documents in Soviet archives that would otherwise have been classified as top secret,

were, in the case of Wallenberg, relocated to central archives, obliterated or destroyed. Witnesses who would otherwise have been sworn to secrecy were, in the case of Wallenberg, terrorized into saying absolutely nothing about him. Finding out what happened to Wallenberg becomes a matter of not just pulling the Wallenberg file from the shelves, but rather going through many records to piece together from what remains the information about what happened to him.

The Russians, in their wisdom, have decided neither to prosecute those who committed human rights violations during the Soviet regime, nor even to have a truth commission to bring those violations to light. Wallenberg investigations have to throw light throughout the gulag from 1945 till its end. It is a light thrown on a history that is otherwise pretty much in darkness.

This mammoth task can only be accomplished with the full throated cooperation we saw at the time of Bakatin and have not seen since. Because so much Russian archival material is behind closed doors, Wallenberg research must be led by those on the other side of those doors.

What could the Russian authorities be doing to produce more in the way of documentation about Wallenberg than they have done? There are five possibilities. Three of these possibilities are general in nature. Two are specific to the case of Raoul Wallenberg.

The three general possibilities are various ways of exploring all the wrongs of the old Soviet system. If the full truth about the gulag becomes known, then we will know all there is to know about Wallenberg. There are many reasons why the full truth about the history of Soviet oppression should be known, going far beyond the Wallenberg case. But surely shedding light on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg is one reason, amongst many.

Because these possibilities are general, the reasons why they should be done, and the obstacles to their not being done are also general. It would take me far beyond the intended scope of any focused Wallenberg investigation to argue for these general possibilities and attempt to deal with the obstacles to their realization. I would only say that all of these general possibilities are meritorious, and the fact that none of them has yet been realized is regrettable.

The first general possibility is systematic prosecution of all those involved in the human rights violations associated with the years of Soviet repression. While prosecution of human rights violators is not at bottom a documentation effort, one beneficial effect of such prosecutions is a public accounting of the crimes being prosecuted. If indeed any of the perpetrators of the enforced disappearance of Raoul Wallenberg were still alive and were now prosecuted for that enforced disappearance, that prosecution would produce evidence about Wallenberg that would form part of the public record about him.

The second general possibility is a truth commission. In many countries that have moved from a violator regime to a democratic regime, truth commissions have taken the place of systematic prosecutions, because prosecutions would be destabilizing. As well, prosecutions are nowhere near as systematic as truth commissions in their exposure of violations. Truth commissions may be limited in identifying perpetrators, but they are effective in providing information about victimization. A Russian truth commission whose mandate would be to tell the truth of human rights violations in the Soviet era would inevitably have the Wallenberg saga front and centre on its agenda.

The third general possibility is transfer of the KGB archives and the Presidential archives of the Soviet era to the state archives where they would be indexed and accessible to researchers on the same basis as all other state archives. That, as I had written earlier, was proposed, tentatively by the presidential commission on Soviet archives headed

by the late Dmitri Volkogonov in 1992, but the proposal was dropped after lobbying from FSB officials. The proposal, in my own view, remains a viable one.

These three possible solutions go much beyond the Wallenberg dossier. However, it is difficult to disentangle the search for the truth about Wallenberg from the general opacity of the old Soviet system. The search for Wallenberg is a conundrum precisely because the Russians have done so little to clarify the Soviet past. How can we know the truth about Wallenberg without knowing the truth about the whole gulag, all political prisoners, all abuses of psychiatry? Wallenberg was sighted, or claimed to have been sighted, in many different places in the Soviet prison and psychiatric system. Furthermore, if he was kept alive after 1947, it would have been as a prisoner whose identity was disguised even within the system. To be fully confident that we have traced down every Wallenberg lead, we would have to know who was in every cell, in every psychiatric hospital bed throughout all the years of Soviet oppression from 1947 to its end. Wallenberg research tells us of the difficulty of explaining the fate of any disappeared person victim of a system whose abuses have not been fully and thoroughly confronted.

The two possibilities particular to the case of Raoul Wallenberg are a presidential commission on his fate, and access of authorized researchers to previously closed archives subject to a confidentiality undertaking. The advantage of a presidential commission on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg is that it would have the authority and especially the drive that the present Russian working group, at least in my estimation, seems not to have.

If the reports of both the Swedish and Russian working groups conclude that the question of what happened to Raoul Wallenberg remains unanswered, then the appropriate response would be to escalate the level of investigation. It would be inappropriate to respond to a conclusion of both the Swedish and Russian working groups that the question of what happened to Raoul Wallenberg remains unanswered with a follow up that has less intensity and less authority than the groups had which produced inconclusive reports. If at first you do not succeed, then try harder. It is a recipe for failure to decide to try less hard if your first effort does not meet with success.

All archives, Russian, Swedish, German, Hungarian, United Nations, British, American, should allow unrestricted, open stack access to qualified Wallenberg researchers, subject only to a confidentiality undertaking. The undertaking would be not to disclose any information obtained through this research that was irrelevant to the Wallenberg case. That sort of access would leave research in the hands of those interested in the fate of Wallenberg, rather than in the hands of professional archivists whose time, energy and commitment to getting to the bottom of the Wallenberg case are not as great.

Since the creation of the Swedish and Russian working groups, seven years have passed. From the time I began working on my report, in September 1996, I heard virtually every month that the Swedish working group report would be coming out in the next month or two, to be released jointly with the Russian working group report. The release of the two reports became a mirage, moving a step further away with each step towards it. The delay in the release of the reports of these two working groups is appallingly long.

The blame for the delay in release falls on both sides. The Russian counterparts claim to have their report ready and waiting for the Swedish release. Nonetheless, the Swedish delays and the Russian readiness were explained by the greater thoroughness and seriousness with which the Swedish working group approached its task. The Swedish working group was never quite ready to release its report, because the Russian side was so lethargic in answering requests for information. The Russian lethargy was met with Swedish politeness. Swedish officials have done little to press Russian officials who did not provide information that was requested of them, who denied direct access

to archives or who provided the information only after lengthy delays.

It now looks like at least seven years will pass from the creation of the Russian and Swedish working groups to the release of their reports. It took Raoul Wallenberg only six months to save up to 100,000 lives from the Nazi death maw. A seven year process makes a mockery of the urgency that Raoul Wallenberg and his family deserve.

It may seem idle to talk about what should follow the release of the Swedish and Russian working group reports, when the release of those reports is not in sight. This current Swedish/Russian process should be completed urgently.

Those involved in the Swedish and Russian working groups must face up to the limitations of the process in which they are mired. Instead of remaining stuck indefinitely in inquiries without answer, they must end their work and recommend a process that will give the answers.

X. The Canadian Connection

Raoul Wallenberg is Canada's only honorary citizen. Roland de Corneille, then a Liberal Member of Parliament for Eglinton-Lawrence, and Mr. Ricard, then a Progressive Conservative Member of Parliament for Laval, in 1985 presented a private member's bill proclaiming Raoul Wallenberg to be an honorary citizen of Canada. The bill passed unanimously the House of Commons on December 9, 1985 and the Senate on December 10, 1985.

William Bauer, Head of the Canadian Delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in September 1988 made a statement to the Conference calling for the case of Raoul Wallenberg to be resolved. He urged the Soviet Union to provide full information on his situation, and charged that this has never been done. He said: "few people will be satisfied until the evasions, the ambiguities and obfuscations surrounding his case are removed, once and for all."

A telex from the Canadian embassy in Stockholm to External Affairs in Ottawa dated October 25, 1989 stated: "on the basis of the compelling case built by the Raoul Wallenberg Association over the years, one can say with some certainty that Raoul Wallenberg did not die in Lubyanka in 1947 as the Soviets claim. Hence the case is unresolved. The Soviets know that Raoul Wallenberg is an honorary Canadian citizen. They also know that Canada frequently champions humanitarian causes relating to the USSR. Thus to ignore the Raoul Wallenberg case now that it has been reopened could give inappropriate signals to the Soviets." (I have converted the text from telex to discursive style.) The telex suggested that Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, who was about to visit the Soviet Union, and the senior officials travelling with him raise the Raoul Wallenberg case with their counterparts in the Soviet Union.

This suggestion was taken up. A later telex from the Canadian embassy in Stockholm dated March 1, 1991 said "When Prime Minister Mulroney passed through Stockholm in November 1989 and met Prime Minister Carlsson, Mr. Mulroney raised the Wallenberg issue, underlining his honorary Canadian citizenship and said he would do what he could to help the related investigation in the USSR. The matter was raised with the then Foreign Minister Shevardnadze by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in Moscow the following week."

A House of Commons Briefing note dated May 30, 1990 from A.P. McLaine, Director-General, USSR and Eastern Europe Bureau, Department of External Affairs and International Trade states: "The Government of Canada has in the past made repeated representations to the Soviet authorities, citing dissatisfaction with the unsupported Soviet assertions concerning Wallenberg's fate."

Most recently, there has been the Government of Canada support for this research.

When the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Government of Canada announced that the Government would assist in defraying the cost of my research activities to be conducted to determine the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, the Minister said: "Canadians attach real importance to the extraordinary heroism of Mr. Wallenberg and the inspiration that it offers to champions of human rights who might despair over the huge obstacles they face."

There is at least one person in Canada who asserts that he met Raoul Wallenberg in the Soviet gulag after 1947. Josyp Terelya writes in his 1991 autobiography about coming across Raoul Wallenberg in 1970 at Vladimir prison.

The Government of Canada should participate actively in ongoing efforts to determine the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, including the follow up to the release of the Swedish and Russian working group reports. In particular, the Government of Canada should call on all governments which may have information in their archives about Raoul Wallenberg that has not been disclosed to disclose the information.

An active Canadian government role in Wallenberg research would be consistent with Canada's own history of support for Raoul Wallenberg and those concerned about his fate. It would demonstrate that the investigation is not just a Swedish Russian bilateral matter, that the fate of Raoul Wallenberg is of concern to all humanity. It would show that the questions about the Raoul Wallenberg will not go away until they are answered.

XI. Conclusions

At some time, which is surely not now, we will have to draw a line, say that we know all that reasonably can be known, and draw conclusions based on that knowledge. However, when that happens, conclusions must be drawn based on all the knowledge that is available both inside and outside Russia, and not just some of it.

The basic conclusion of this report is that the fate of Raoul Wallenberg is not yet known, but that it is knowable. There are, I believe, documents in existence in archives in various countries, which, if disclosed, would allow us to know the fate of Raoul Wallenberg.

There is both a legal and moral duty to determine the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, to get at the truth about what happened to him, to follow every evidentiary lead to its conclusion, wherever that lead might take us. That duty rests not just on Russia, but on the whole global community.

The Holocaust showed us the abyss of the human soul, the depths to which humanity could sink. The efforts of Raoul Wallenberg showed what one person could do in the face of tyranny. He demonstrated the heights that humanity could reach. The Holocaust has become the symbol of evil for this century. Raoul Wallenberg has become the symbol for good. What Raoul Wallenberg did he did for humanity. All of humanity owes its gratitude to him.

Many, in the face of the Nazi killing machine, did nothing, asked, what could we have done? The answer to that is: look at what Raoul Wallenberg did.

Nazis viewed World War II as a war against the Jews. It was a one sided war which only the Nazis were fighting. The Jews did not know until it was too late that they were under attack; they were isolated from the rest of humanity, which, for the most part, offered no help. But Raoul Wallenberg helped. He singlehandedly fought the Nazi death machine. And he won.

Edmund Burke has written that all that is necessary for evil to triumph is for the good to do nothing. Raoul Wallenberg showed us the opposite. He showed that all that was necessary for evil to be defeated is for the good to be active.

The activity he showed must be an inspiration to us whenever evil is present, whenever governments attempt to crush humanity. But his work must first of all be an inspiration to us in fighting for him, in finding out, finally, what really happened to him.

The Wallenberg file must not be just a matter of passive curiosity. It must be a matter of active concern. We must show that the investigation into his fate matters to us. The investigation into his fate must not only be done properly, be done thoroughly. It must be given the highest priority.

Raoul Wallenberg research is a matter of urgency because there remains the possibility, however remote, that Raoul Wallenberg is alive today. Whatever else can be concluded or hypothesized about him, this much is certain. His age puts him within the biological life span. Raoul Wallenberg was born on August 4, 1912. If alive today, he would be 86.

I have no doubt that, at some point, all files now in secret archives that shed light on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg will be disclosed. But if that disclosure is fifty or one hundred years from now, there would not remain even the most remote speck of a possibility that he would still be alive. We must expend every effort to determine his fate while the age of Raoul Wallenberg, if alive, remains within the biological life span.

There may be some readers who are satisfied that Raoul Wallenberg is dead, even though the questions how, where and when he died remain unanswered. These readers may wonder, why bother spending effort on finding out when where and how he died? There is of course still a mystery to be solved. But, why should the solving of that puzzle be a matter of priority for the international community? Should not the answering of that mystery be left to the measured pursuits of academic researchers?

There are two answers to that. One is that even if Raoul Wallenberg is dead, those responsible for his death and the coverup for his death remain, some of them, very much alive. Those responsible for the death as well as those responsible for the coverup should be held to account. Indeed, it is very likely that the fear of this being held to account is a reason why full disclosure of his fate is so difficult.

The murder of Raoul Wallenberg and the coverup of that murder, if he was murdered, is one of the great crimes of the twentieth century. Ideally, the perpetrators should be brought to justice. At the very least what they did should be exposed, while they are still alive, before they have had a chance to get away with this crime.

The second answer is that putting aside solving the mystery of the murder of Raoul Wallenberg is killing him twice over. Saying that his murder does not matter is a way of saying that he does not matter. Ignoring the murder of Raoul Wallenberg means murdering his memory. In that murder we would all be complicit. If we are truly to honour and remember Raoul Wallenberg, we must not only remember his life. We must remember his death. However, we cannot remember what we do not know. Only by unlocking the mystery of his death can we truly honour his life.

It would be far too late now to compensate Raoul Wallenberg for what has been done to him, even if he were still alive. But we owe it to ourselves, to the glimpse he gave us of what we all could be, to do what we can even now to find out what happened to him.

XII. Summary of Recommendations

A. There should be full archival disclosure of all information about Raoul Wallenberg wherever that information may be located, whether it is in private or government files; not only in Sweden and Russia, but also in the United Kingdom, the United States, Hungary, Germany, Israel and the United Nations in New York. Neither privacy concerns nor security concerns can justify a refusal to grant full disclosure of

relevant information. In particular:

1. Russian archivists should cooperate fully in providing
 - a. information about detainees in Kazan mental hospital,
 - b. the files transferred to KGB/FSB archives in Moscow of numbered prisoners in Vladimir.
2. Swedish archivists should provide cabinet level documents and security service documents about Raoul Wallenberg, including evidence of the proposed prisoner exchange of Raoul Wallenberg for Stig Wennerström.
3. The United States government should act on Freedom of Information Act requests about Raoul Wallenberg with urgency. The blacked out information in disclosures previously made should be provided.
4. The United Kingdom government should not use a security exception to its Code of Practice on Access to Government Information to justify non-disclosure of information about Raoul Wallenberg. Nor should the reasoning that information in government files is already publicly available in some other form be a justification for withholding that information.

B. All archivists should cooperate fully with independent non-governmental researchers. Research should not just be a governmental matter. Non-governmental researchers should be given direct access to relevant archives.

C. An investigation into the fate of Raoul Wallenberg is not just a Russian Swedish bilateral matter. Given what Raoul Wallenberg did to combat crimes against humanity, his fate concerns all humanity. In particular, countries that have given Raoul Wallenberg honorary citizenship, the United States, Israel and Canada, are entitled to be and have a duty to be involved in the investigation into his fate.

D. The Government of Canada should participate actively in ongoing efforts to determine the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, including the follow up to the release of the Swedish and Russian working group reports. In particular, the Government of Canada should call on all governments that may have information in their archives about Raoul Wallenberg that has not been disclosed to disclose that information.

E. The Swedish and Russian working groups should complete their work and release their reports as a matter of urgency. These reports should recommend a follow up process to their reports that will give the answers that they have been unable to get.

F. There needs to be a follow up process to the Swedish/Russian working group process. In Russia, the follow up process should include the establishment of a Presidential Commission to report on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg. The follow up process should be intergovernmental, involving all interested governments.

G. It is premature on the present state of the evidence, in advance of full disclosure of all relevant documents in archives, to come to any conclusion on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg. In particular, it is premature and unwarranted to come to the conclusion that Raoul Wallenberg died in 1947. A 1947 death conclusion operates at cross purposes with the need for further research. The currently available evidence that Raoul Wallenberg survived 1947 is at least as compelling as the evidence that he was murdered in 1947.

H. A burden of proof on the proposition that Raoul Wallenberg is dead, with a standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, is most likely to spur further inquiries and to answer all unanswered questions. Any argument that Raoul Wallenberg died, whether in 1947 or at any other time, must be proved beyond reasonable doubt.

