

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Officer designations should be used in the "TO" column. Under each comment a line should be drawn across sheet and each comment numbered to correspond with the number in the "TO" column. Each officer should initial (check mark insufficient) before further routing. This Routing and Record Sheet should be returned to Registry.

FROM: **EE/REG** **31 JAN 1956** TELEPHONE NO. **EGMA-18914**
 DATE

TO	ROOM NO.	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	TELEPHONE	COMMENTS
		REC'D	FWD'D			
1. EE/H	LG			[]		<p>KAPOK</p> <p>card x-ref; let cc mail to IO/sec 1cc wld - ROSE, 1cc LISZKA y-ny H1004-1</p> <p>1-6- please return attachments to ES/lt for filing</p> <p>1-3; pls identify whitechart to case</p> <p>DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SOURCES METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2006</p> <p>PUNCHED</p> <p>08 JUN 1960</p> <p>LISZKA, BELA</p> <p>ABSTRACT [X] INDEX [X]</p> <p>DATE</p> <p>KAPOK</p>
2.	mp/w					
3.	PC					
4. EE/G/W		3 FEB 1956	6/2			
5. EE/G/CE		6 FEB 1956	10 FEB 1956			
6. IO/sec						
<p>INDEXED</p> <p>RETURN THIS DOCUMENT TO RID FOR MICROFILMING BEFORE IT IS FILED. IF THIS DOCUMENT IS TO BE RESTRICTED, CHECK HERE RESTRICTED TO _____</p> <p>RID/MI 1935 L Unit Designation</p>						
11. R/f/lt						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

VIA: AIR
(SPECIFY AIR OR SEA POUCH)

DISPATCH NO. EGMA-18914

~~SECRET~~
CLASSIFICATION

TO : Chief, EE
Attn:]
FROM : Chief of Base, Munich

DATE: 2 Jan 1956

INFO: COS
VIEN

SUBJECT: GENERAL— Operational/CART/HIWAY

SPECIFIC— AVH Approach to (Dr.) Bela Kornel Von LISZKA

REF: A. MUNI 2608
B. MUNI 2851
C. DIR 41686

Attachments

1. The following attachments are submitted for EE and COS files:

A. initial report on the visit to Subject by the AVH courier Karoly ROSE on 6 December 1955; the report is based upon information obtained from Subject by Iden 2 of Ref A the same evening of the visit, and contains several points not repeated in Attachment B.

B. detailed report on the visit as obtained from Subject on 7 December by and assistant. A detailed description of ROSE is contained herein.

C. Supplementary information on the visit as obtained by from Subject on 4 January 1956.

AVH Approach to Subject - Summary

2. On 6 December 1955 around 2000 hours Subject was visited at his apartment by an individual who identified himself as "Miklos ROSNER" but stated this was not his true name. Comment: The description Subject gives of "ROSNER" leaves no doubt that "ROSNER" is Karoly ROSE of the [] case. "ROSNER" will therefore henceforth be referred to as ROSE. ROSE stated that he was a Hungarian business man traveling in Germany, who had been assigned the additional task by the Hungarian Foreign Ministry in Budapest of contacting Subject to deliver a letter from Subject's son. The letter urged Subject to return to Hungary. In the course of the ensuing two hour meeting, ROSE attempted to persuade Subject to return to Hungary. He played upon Subject's feelings for his family, promised that Subject had been given full amnesty and would suffer no harsh treatment, and stated that on the contrary Subject would be given a soft job befitting Subject's intellectual level. Almost simultaneously ROSE intimated that if Subject had developed a liaison with a woman here, it would be better for Subject to remain in the West. Subject made clear to ROSE that he would not return to Hungary as he was certain that in the course of time, after the regime had fully exploited the propaganda attaching to his return, the

~~SECRET~~
CLASSIFICATION

SECRET

initial cordiality would be succeeded by much worse treatment. Subject then induced ROSE to state that if Subject stayed in the West he would be asked to carry out a few small favors, and that Subject would be visited again in January or February by another person whom, according to ROSE, Subject "had better not rebuff". ROSE mentioned that his future visitor would probably ask Subject a few questions. Subject believes he made clear to ROSE that he was not about to give them any information. Subject thus believes ROSE has the impression that Subject would neither return to Hungary nor cooperate by carrying out tasks in the West.

[] Discussion, 28 December 1955

3. [] met on 28 December 1955 to discuss the visit to Subject (and also the visit to Iden 3 of Ref A). [] gave a favorable assessment of Subject, whom however he had met personally for the first time on 7 December when Subject reported to [] the full details of the visit. [] was asked what problems would present themselves should Subject be recontacted and a double agent operation develop, i.e. whether Subject had access to sensitive TPFEEELING information which could not be passed to the AVH or whether Subject was in a position to influence TPFEEELING activities or policies. [] stated that Subject was simply an announcer who read broadcast scripts which he himself had little or no part in preparing. For the most part the scripts are read first onto tape. The tapes are then reviewed for effect, accuracy and phrasing, and if approved the tapes are played directly into the microphone for the actual broadcast. Thus Subject would have little opportunity to deliberately or on orders depart from the prepared scripts given him; this only in those few instances where the script was not previously taped but read directly into a broadcast. Subject has no other opportunities for influencing activities or policy, as he was engaged neither in forming policies for his desk nor in assembling its product. His access to information was likewise largely limited to that contained in the scripts prepared for his reading. Otherwise Subject probably saw only the general overt type information circulars distributed amongst all employees. Thus, in []'s opinion, it would be highly unlikely that Subject would come across any information which could not be passed to the AVH. [] however expressed a desire to review beforehand where possible any information which Subject would be passing in any DA operation, which affected TPFEEELING.

a. [] was also asked whether he had heard anything to indicate that word of the visit to Subject was spreading among the TPFEEELING employees. [] stated that as far as he knew the story was not spreading. He added that he had strongly impressed the necessity for silence upon Subject and on John STOMFAY-STITZ. [] Comment: On 14 December 1955 [] asked [] if he had heard of approaches to two other TPFEEELING employees. [] stated he had heard nothing of any such approaches. [] was asked to report anything he might hear. To date he has not mentioned having heard of the approaches. He was last met by [] on 10 January 1956.)

[] Subject Meeting, 4 January 1956

4. By previous arrangement, [] introduced and turned Subject over to [] on 4 January 1956. Subject had been briefed by [] only that he was to meet someone who was interested in the details of ROSE's (i.e. "ROSNER's") visit. Subject was taken to a safehouse and informed that [] was an American intelligence representative. During the ensuing three hour meeting, the following basic points were covered: 1) Subject reviewed the details of ROSE's visit; 2) Subject's feelings for and attitude towards his family were discussed along with Subject's present life plans; 3) Subject agreed to place himself completely under our direction for whatever action we would deem advisable should Subject be recontacted, and Subject was given appropriate preliminary instructions. Summary statements of the main points which emerged follow:

a. Subject recapitulated with exactitude the details of his discussion with ROSE, as Subject initially report them to [] However, it was discovered that Subject had as far as he himself was concerned made abundantly clear to ROSE that the chances of his serving the AVH in the West were nil.

b. Subject stated that he has no hopes of ever seeing his wife and son again. He realizes their fate is completely outside his hands, although he does not deliberately want to take any action which might provoke retaliatory action against them. However he states that in the final analysis what happens to them is probably dependent upon the whims of some minor bureaucrat in the regime. He stated that if for example he felt he could directly affect their treatment in any real sense, he would not today be employed by TPFEELING, but would rather take some more innocuous job such as a common laborer. Subject stated that had he had his family in the West he would of course have attempted long ago to emigrate from Germany. However, the fact that they were still in Hungary and the fact that he was a relatively aged man (60 years) at this time, with no specific qualifications which would insure him of decent employment in any new country, gave him no real recourse other than to remain on in Germany retaining as long as possible his fairly remunerative (800.00 DM per month) TPFEELING employment.

c. Subject's activities since coming to Germany and his present mode of life and associates were run through briefly. These points will be more fully examined in Subject's personal debriefing. In brief, Subject appears to lead a quiet life which Subject shares to a great extent with his friends the Josef REICHARDTs, with whom Subject previously lived in Ingolstadt and with whom Subject moved jointly to Munich in 1952. Professor REICHARDT has taught in local Munich high schools since 1946. REICHARDT is circa 60 years; served in the German Army in both wars, in World War II as a captain. Subject states that he has kept himself completely free of partisan emigre politics and counts as friends persons of every emigre political complexion. []

[] Comment: This does not quite jibe with [] information that Subject was a member of the MHBK until 1953 or 1954. See EGMA-18000, Attachment.) His social life is not considerable, however he sees his friends occasionally and, because of his age and prestige among Hungarian emigres, he is often sought

out by various emigres who either seek fatherly-type advice or other guidance and information. Subject appears in excellent physical health, which he himself claimed.

d. The various possible courses of action should Subject be recontacted were then discussed with Subject. Subject was told that he must expect to be recontacted by ROSE or another AVH agent, since his initial refusal, if ROSE had indeed gotten the impression he was being rebuffed, would probably not suffice to completely dash the hopes of the AVH. It was likely the AVH would make at least one further approach to Subject, if for no other reason than to satisfy themselves that Subject was adamant in his refusal. It was pointed out to Subject that he would probably not have been approached in the first place if the AVH had not felt that they had sufficient cards to convince Subject to cooperate with them. In this case it appeared that the AVH supposed their control over his family an elemental factor. Subject was told that one course of action possible should he be recontacted was for him to forcefully and convincingly rebuff any overtures made to him but that, from Subject's point of view, this might have one serious disadvantage, if indeed the AVH planned to recruit Subject through their physical control over his family, and had in fact refrained from action against his family to date in order to use them for this purpose. In that case the AVH might well consider his family no longer of any particular or potential value to them and might institute repressive measures against them as a form of revenge or to demonstrate to Subject that he had better cooperate or else. Subject agreed that this was what might result if he rebuffed a further approach, or might now happen in view of his reaction to ROSE. Subject was told that the ^{PROFESSIONAL} course was for Subject to appear to accede to the AVH demands and accept any assignments they might want him to carry out. This could induce the AVH to leave his family in peace so as to continue to insure themselves of Subject's cooperation. In effect this would mean playing the game back against the AVH. In addition to perhaps benefiting Subject's family, such an operation could be of great service to the West and TPFEEELING in that, in the course of time, the AVH would be forced to reveal assets and information on their activities and objectives. Subject stated that he was anxious to be of as much service as possible and that the latter prospect appealed to him, however he would have to be given guidance or direction as he could never carry off such an affair himself. Subject was told that of course he would be given very complete directions. However Subject was told that he should consider the following factors before committing himself: 1) His decision must be completely voluntary. No one is obliging him to agree to the operation. Should Subject for any reason not want to become involved, his decision would in no way reflect upon his TPFEEELING employment; 2) the operation would probably be extremely demanding of Subject, both physically and mentally, and we (the AIS) would likely demand as much or more of Subject than the AVH; 3) once such an operation is commenced, Subject would have to go through to the end, i.e. until such time as the AIS decided that the operation would be terminated; 4) in terminating the operation, the AIS would make every attempt to so terminate it that the AVH would not suspect Subject of having deceived them and thus give them no reason to mistreat Subject's family. However, this could not be promised Subject and it was possible that Subject

might even be called upon to testify if executive action is taken which leads to a trial; 5) Subject would have to tell us the complete truth in every instance, to the smallest details, since should we discover that he had not done so, we would naturally be forced to view Subject himself with suspicion and this could considerably alter the action we would take. This also extended to personal details of both Subject's past and present life, about which we would require a considerable amount of information. Subject stated that in full recognition of these factors he reaffirmed his desire to cooperate and place himself fully under our direction.

e. Subject was then instructed should he be recontacted to state that he feared to return home at the present time, however that he hoped his refusal would not jeopardize his family which he wished to protect at all costs. Should he be asked to carry out tasks in the West, he will protest that he really can not see how he could be of use, however he will try to accomplish anything asked of him. If he is asked to meet another representative of the AVH in another country, Subject will state that he is generally willing however such a meeting presents certain difficulties re visas, obtaining leave of absence from TPFEELING, covering the reason for a trip, etc. Further the meeting would have to take place in an area suitable to Subject, as the AVH would understand. Thus he would have to carefully consider the circumstances and location of any meeting place suggested. (Subject was very resistant to the idea that he might have to meet an AVH representative in another country, as he feared, especially in Austria, that it would be a simple matter to kidnap him. [] did not succeed in completely setting Subject's mind at ease on this score.) Subject was to immediately report to us any further approach and abide by our directions. He was to tell no one of the fact that he had met with [] and of the relationship he had established with the AIS, nor was he to inform anyone should he be reapproached except ourselves. This included TPFEELING officials. Should he be asked by anyone whether there had been any subsequent developments to ROSE's visit Subject was to state that he had received no further visitors. []'s service would remain responsible for informing TPFEELING of what TPFEELING needed to know. However, Subject could rest confident that the appropriate people in TPFEELING knew that Subject was cooperating with us and that this had full TPFEELING approval. Subject was told that the REICHARDTs of course might become aware should Subject be revisited. Subject should freely admit such to the REICHARDTs if he knows they know, however he should tell them that it was simply another attempt to persuade him to return home which again he simply rejected. He should ask the REICHARDTs to please not repeat the fact that he had been revisited lest it cause him unnecessary trouble. (Subject comments that the REICHARDTs will do whatever he asks of them and he is certain of their discretion.)

[] -Subject Meeting, 11 January 1956

5. Subject was met to continue his debriefing.

a. Further biographical information was obtained on the REICHARDTs and on Subject's accommodation address Hans HUBER which will be forwarded later.

b. Subject was questioned about how he came to Germany and the fact that his wife and son were still in Hungary. These circumstances will be more fully delineated in Subject's personal debriefing. In brief: Subject and his wife both found themselves in Germany at the end of the war. Subject's wife was working as a Red Cross nurse in a Hungarian Military hospital which had been shifted from Budapest to Ingolstadt, Germany due to the advance of Russian troops. Subject had been assigned to military duty in Germany after the Russians had overrun his hometown. Subject was subsequently taken as a POW by the American troops. Subject's son had also been called to duty with the German Army and sent to Czechoslovakia where he was subsequently taken prisoner by the Russians. Subject and his wife later (January 1946) learned that their son had been released and allowed to return to Hungary. Subject's wife over the protests of Subject decided to return to Hungary in order to look out for the son and also to see whether she could save any of the family property. Subject's wife left in full realization that Subject himself could not return. However she felt that her first duty was to her son who was at the time 17 or 18 years of age.

c. [] then asked Subject whether in fact he had not been approached before. [] was derelict in not asking this question at the first meeting. However he did not expect that Subject would not have mentioned the fact of a previous approach immediately.) Subject replied that an incident occurred in the summer of 1954 which appears to have been an approach. In the summer of 1954 Subject received a letter from his son in which his son wrote that things were going badly with the family, that he wished Subject to be apprised of their situation, that Subject was their only solution, that he (the son) knew of a Hungarian business man traveling to Vienna who could meet Subject in Vienna and brief him in detail. Subject states that he answered his son by letter that it was impossible for him to come to Vienna however Subject said he could probably come to Switzerland. A short time later, Subject relates, he received a letter from Vienna asking whether he could meet the sender on a bridge in front of a certain cafe in Bern on a given date. Subject states that he asked among friends about Bern and about this cafe and received the information that it was known as a Communist espionage center. Subject therefore wrote to the man in Vienna that he could not free himself to come to Switzerland. Subject heard no more of the matter. Subject states that upon receiving the two letters he went to his friend STOMFAY-STITZ and asked his advice. STOMFAY-STITZ told Subject he would bring the matter to the attention of an Intelligence Service if Subject would be discreet enough not to ask STOMFAY-STITZ which office. (Subject got the impression STOMFAY-STITZ meant an American installation.) Subject stated that he only wanted to insure himself that the office was on a sufficiently high level. STOMFAY-STITZ assured Subject the office was on the highest level, and added that it was far above TPFEEELING. STOMFAY-STITZ came back to Subject some time later and told him that the advice of the office he had contacted was that Subject should not go to a meeting. Subject adds that after a considerably longer time he received back one of the letters (that from his son) and a photocopy of the letter from Vienna. Subject states he has no idea which office STOMFAY-STITZ contacted nor whether he maintains current connections with any intelligence office. [] comment: FRAN 5464 reports an unidentified 1950 report stating STOMFAY-STITZ was a

French Intelligence agent; EGMA 9898, 18 February 1954, Attachment B, indicates that STOMFAY-STITZ may have a direct or indirect connection with Gerhard von MENDE.) Subject promised to bring the letter and the photocopy to the next meeting.

Assessment of Subject

6. Any assessment of Subject at this juncture is at best tentative. Subject indicates he will cooperate fully and will follow instructions to the letter. He shows himself quite willing to give us all information we require on his background, his present life and his associates. Subject shows intelligence and seems to grasp situations quickly. However he may be somewhat naive. That Subject did not immediately mention the prior approach to him either to [] or to [] is somewhat surprising, and indicates that Subject does not at this point comprehend intelligence implications and relationships too well. However it is also possible that Subject was somewhat reluctant to mention the incident before directly queried as he may feel guilt in not having reported the matter to the TPFEEELING security officer at the time. We cannot yet assess whether Subject can convincingly carry off a DA role, which may require him to lie to the opposition and hold back certain items of information without indicating he is doing so. Subject's motivations for playing along with any DA operation which should emerge are not yet altogether clear to [] In a sense Subject agreed too readily and quickly to every point. He probably does not realize the hardship such an operation will have on him. He may also feel that his TPFEEELING employment perforce requires him to accept the undertaking.

Assessment of Developments

7. We feel that Subject will probably be recontacted and asked, if he will not return home, to undertake assignments in the West for the AVH. It is our impression that Subject by no means rebuffed ROSE. We also reckon with the possibility ROSE will tend to play up rather than down his success with Subject. Subject's potential for the AVH seems limited to information on fellow TPFEEELING employees and other Hungarian emigres. Whether Subject knows anything that would be of particular value to the AVH is problematical and is probably not ascertainable in advance. However, no long range operation with Subject by the AVH seems very probable, unless the AVH decides to use Subject eventually in some support capacity. The AVH will probably be able to milk Subject of most of his information in a fairly short time. Further Subject's advanced age is against a long range operation by the AVH. We can perhaps better judge what type of operation may emerge, if any, once Subject's debriefing is accomplished. That the AVH is more than casually interested in Subject is at least clear. ROSE's visit was the third attempt to contact Subject in the last year and a half, if ROSE can be believed that the AVH sent a courier to Subject in November 1955 and if the letter exchange in the summer of 1954 was part of an approach, as it seems to have been. The AVH has also asked [] about him and given him as an EEI to UJDROLLERY 305.

~~SECRET~~ -8-Comments

8. a. The first name of the ~~S~~SCHWARTZ in whom ROSE expressed interest (see Attachment B) will be obtained and the information passed laterally to Brussels.

b. Re REF C: In fairness to Subject, should he be recontacted and a DA operation develop, we believe we should be prepared to run the operation until it can be terminated with the minimum of exposure of Subject's DA role, even if this means perpetuating it somewhat beyond the point where we believe we have derived the maximum advantage from the operation. (Naturally, we do not feel this consideration applies if executive action becomes necessary.) It is also at least conceivable that if we are not sufficiently careful on the point of protecting Subject's role and thus his family, that Subject would take some rash action which he believed might save his family. For example he might seize upon the idea of returning to Hungary hoping that in exchange for martyring himself, as it were, the AVH would leave his family alone. It will be noted that despite Subject's apparent realistic attitude towards the fate of his family, [] reports that he is extremely attached to them.

c. Subject brought to the 11 Jan meeting with [] the letter and envelope given to him by ROSE. (Subject will be asked to translate the letter into German so that it can be forwarded to Headquarters in English.) On the face of the envelope was written the roman numeral II, indicating that ROSE had at least one other letter to deliver. [] Comment: Iden 3 of Ref A was met by [] on 5 and 11 Jan. Iden 3 states that he destroyed the envelope containing the letter given to him by ROSE, however he is positive that no number nor anything else was written on his envelope.)

Approved: []

20 January 1956

Attachments: As stated

Distribution:

- 3 - WASH w/1 cc each att.
- 3 - COS w/1 cc each att.
- 1 - VIEN w/1 cc each att.
- 1 - MOB w/1 cc each att.

hvp

~~SECRET~~

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Officer designations should be used in the "TO" column. Under each comment a line should be drawn across sheet and each comment numbered to correspond with the number in the "TO" column. Each officer should initial (check mark insufficient) before further routing. This Routing and Record Sheet should be returned to Registry.

FROM: <i>EE/H</i>	TELEPHONE	NO. <i>EGMA-18914</i> ^{atb} <i>A+B C</i>
		DATE <i>2 FEB 1956</i>

TO	ROOM NO.	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	TELEPHONE	COMMENTS
		REC'D	FWD'D			
1. <i>IO/sec</i>						
2.						
3.						
4. <i>EE/H</i>						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

Dr. LISEKA, Dr. Bela Kormel

7 December 1955

an announcer, Hungarian Program Department, RFE. He resides at Widemannstr. 11.

On 6 December 1955 he rang his doorbell and was confronted by an unknown person who asked to speak to Dr. LISEKA. Subject identified himself and asked what he wanted. The caller stated he was Miklos MIKLOS (listed admitted he was not his true name) and that he had a letter to deliver from Subject's son Gyorgy. Subject then invited MIKLOS into his apartment.

During the initial conversation they spoke in German. When MIKLOS was certain he was speaking to Dr. LISEKA he changed the language to Hungarian. Subject described MIKLOS as about 40 years of age; 175 to 180 cm. in height; medium build, dark brown hair, color of yes unknown, long face, pointed chin, slightly hooked nose, clean shaven; wore a brown overcoat, brown hat, brown trousers, gray jacket with specks blending into the fabric, light shirt and dark tie. MIKLOS stated he came to Munich from Budapest using a Hungarian passport; and that he is a business representative.

Subject's son is a physician. He read part of the letter and then remarked to MIKLOS that it was not an authentic letter and he had no further interest in it. MIKLOS then said he delivered the letter ~~to a civil servant in the Hungarian Foreign Ministry in Budapest.~~ At first he said the envelope was sealed when he received it. However, later he admitted having read the letter himself, while in the Ministry.

MIKLOS asked Subject to return to Hungary and offered him money to pay for all his expenses, including the shipment of his furniture, personal belongings, etc. MIKLOS promised him complete amnesty - basing his promise on direct authority from the Ministry. MIKLOS further stated that Subject could not be given his former position of Lord Mayor but would receive employment in the State Library as Chief Librarian, Asst. Chief Librarian, Chief Bookkeeper or Asst. Chief Bookkeeper. The arrangements for his return are to be made via the Hungarian Consulate in Vienna or Berne.

MIKLOS pointed out that the State would take care of him well, as it had his son who is a practicing physician in a hospital; his wife, and his daughter-in-law who is a medical assistant in the same hospital where the son is employed. MIKLOS indicated Subject would have no trouble in Hungary as long as he did not attempt to become politically active and did not attempt to organize a movement inimical to the best interests of the Hungarian state. MIKLOS went on to build up an optimistic picture of Subject's future in Hungary; pointed out that Hungary had been rebuilt, that the poor people had a much higher living standard and that all classes were now living better than ever before.

MIKLOS also said that another person had been sent in November 1955 to contact Subject. This person, name unknown, was sent by the Foreign Ministry, Budapest; came to Munich and went to Subject's address but observed the building also houses the offices of the Hungarian Refugee Committee and thought it was a CIC cover address so returned to Budapest without delivering the letter, although he reported the letter had been delivered.

Subject told MIKLOS he was not interested in returning to Hungary but that he did not want to do anything to cause trouble for his relatives. Having in mind to contact someone from the RFE office, he left the door open for a future contact. MIKLOS then informed Subject that he would again be contacted in January or February but by a different person. MIKLOS then departed, leaving the impression he was going to the main bahnhof and would leave Munich that night.

Subject then contacted John STOMPAY-STITZ, an old friend and also an RFE employee. STOMPAY-STITZ telephoned me at my house at 2235 saying he had something to discuss involving a friend of his but did not want to talk about it on the telephone. Don BROWN resides a few blocks away from Subject's residence and I instructed him to contact STOMPAY-STITZ at Subject's residence to determine the nature of the trouble.

Subsequently both Subject and STOMPAY-STITZ were instructed not to discuss this affair

17 December 1947

TO: Dr. LISZKA, Dr. Bela Kornel
Address: Wildenmayerstr. 49/111
near Professor Reichardt
Munich, Germany (Liszka)

Fischer: I understand you were contacted last night by an agent from the Hungarian regime.

Dr. Liszka: Yes.

F: Will you please tell us all the details from the moment he contacted you until he left your premises.

Dr. L: At 7:30 yesterday evening a man rang my door bell. Underneath my name it states that you have to ring three times which was done. He addressed me in good German, asking me if he could speak with Dr. Liszka. I told him that I was Dr. Liszka. He immediately began to speak in Hungarian and said, "I am bringing a letter to you from your son."

I said, "Please give me the letter."

He replied: I can only give it to you in your apartment."

I asked, "How do you know that I happen to live here?"

The man answered: "I was told this by the Foreign Minister in Budapest, where they gave me your exact address."

I asked him to come into my room, whereupon he gave me the letter which I opened. After I had read the first few sentences, I saw that it was the handwriting of my son but it appeared to have been written in a very hurried or hasty manner. At this point I asked him to begin giving me some explanation. He asked me, "Do you have some suspicion about my visit here?"

I said, "Yes, I know why you came." Then he began to talk.

When the man asked for me, he introduced himself as Miklos ROSNER. He said, "The living conditions in Hungary have very much improved from what they were ten years ago. The build

att B
EGMA
18914

up along the lines of socialism needs a lot of willing workers, especially those with experience. Your family is living in an unhappy state since you left. Your wife is longing to see you again and your son as well. He will soon marry and would like for you to be present at that time.

"We know that you have not committed any crimes in Hungary and the Foreign Minister assured me you will be granted full amnesty."

At this point I interrupted his statement and said, "But I had been sentenced to five years in absentia - I read this in a Hungarian newspaper - and I had been sentenced as a doctor of medicine whereas I am really a Doctor of Law."

He answered, "Perhaps a mistake was made in classifying you as a doctor of medicine because under the circumstances a doctor is a doctor and things are not that exact at times."

He continued telling me how beautifully Hungary has been rebuilt since the end of the war; the ruins of war have all disappeared; the industrialization of Hungary is being pushed; farming is being further developed; and, for this reason, the government is calling on all Hungarians to return.

He said, "You will not be dependent on your family for support because you would get a position yourself. Naturally, you would not be given the mayorship of your former home town, of which you formerly mayor, and perhaps not in any administrative capacity, but what would you think, for example, if you became chief librarian of a district library, or the chief bookkeeper of a state-owned enterprise. Your son is now an X-ray specialist in GYOENGYOES, and your wife is a doctor's assistant there. Your son finished his university studies, and during this period received support from certain sources. His expenses for study, his books, etc., were paid for by someone." (It was my impression that he was trying to indicate to me that the state financed my son's education.) "You should be thankful for this support that your son received, and show your thanks by returning to your family, and contribute to the socialistic build up. If, however, you may have found a woman here, I would then advise you to stay here."

At this point, I asked, "Are you trying to persuade me to return and in the same breath telling

W B
EGMA
18914

me if I have found a girl friend here to stay here?"

He answered, "Please read the letter through now."

~~D~~
~~X~~ Before I started to read the letter, he mentioned some names to me, "The opera singer, JARAY, also returned and was welcomed back and is now performing again in the opera. Nobody held anything against him, and he is again the favorite of the public. The old restaurant owner, GUNDEL, also returned home. Naturally, he did not get his restaurant back, but he is now the business manager of it."

After these remarks, I read the letter. I noted that my son was using the same type of expressions as the man was using. He talked about the socialistic build up, mentioned the opera singer, JARAY, and was calling upon my patriotism. He said that I was not hated at home, and that he had met former colleagues of mine who still think and speak highly of me. My wife can find no rest and even though she has a better life today than she did formerly, because she is now with him, but without me (her husband) she cannot continue to live. He requested me to return home as soon as possible, preferably before Christmas in order that we could spend the holidays together. He also mentioned that they can use my knowledge and experience and that a job would be found for me. He confirmed that he is now an X-ray specialist, receiving one thousand gulden monthly. He also talked about how beautifully Budapest as well as our home town has been rebuilt.

After reading the letter, I remarked to the man who brought it, "It is strange that my son uses the same expressions that you use. Do these remarks stem from the same source?"

He asked, "What do you mean by that?"

I replied, "The same source pounded the same remarks into both you and my son."

He said, "No, this is not true."

I replied, "Well in any case, the same influence or spirit worked on both you and my son."

He was somewhat embarrassed, whereupon he said, "I must admit that I read the letter."

Strictly Confidential

-4-

Ext B
E6MA
18914

I asked him, "Where?"

He replied, "In the office of the Foreign Minister."

I asked, "Was the letter still open?"

Whereupon he replied, "It was already sealed."

I asked, "You must have been present when the letter was open?"

He was getting embarrassed and did not answer this question.

Then I asked him, "What do you have to say about the letter? It is my opinion that my son must have been very excited when he wrote it. Either he was threatened or he was under some other type of influence."

He remarked, "You may probably think that the Hungarian secret police was standing close to him with a pistol."

I said, "No, it is not necessary to draw the pistol, they might have left it in its holster."

He then said, "What do you mean by saying that he might have been under some other influence?"

He continued, "Were you thinking about what was written by Cardinal MINDSZENTY?"

I remarked, "My son is a lot less important person than Cardinal MINDSZENTY, and probably the influence used was a lot less."

He did not answer, but only smiled.

After a little while, he said, "So you don't want to return home? Are you afraid?"

I said, "Yes, but not of death for death will come to everyone sometime."

He then asked, "Are you afraid that you might be tortured?"

I replied, "Tortures can also be tolerated to some extent, but a person can be completely humiliated, his nerves completely destroyed and in this humiliated state the person will be presented to other persons - this state of humiliation frightens me."

He said, "If I assure you that nothing will happen to you?"

Strictly Confidential

-5-

AT 3
EGMA-18914

I said, "It is possible that this may not happen during the first few weeks or even the first few years, but after that - who knows?"

At this point, he said, "You mean the second year? If you refuse to return now, I will have to inform you that you may again be faced with a visitor sometime in January or February, and I would like to advise you not to refuse to see such a visitor."

I asked, "Does this mean that I will have to suffer because I refuse the opportunity to return at this time?"

He replied, "Not at all."

I asked, "Will the bill as such be presented to me?"

Whereupon he asked, "What do you mean by bill?"

I replied, "For the studies at the University for my son."

He replied, "Probably, something like that."

I asked, "In what form will this bill be presented?"

He replied, "Probably you will be asked to carry out a few small favors."

At this point, I said, "Why don't you come out and tell me exactly what this is all about? Do you mean you want information or do you have other missions you want carried out?"

He said, "I don't know. That is not within the scope of my business. I am only carrying a request of the Foreign Minister in that I had to leave the country on some other matters."

Thereupon, I said, "It would be better for me if you yourself are the person who comes to see again."

He said, "It is impossible for me to come again. However, if you want to see me again tomorrow, I will be able to visit you again, or sometime later before Christmas because I would like to be with my family over the Christmas holidays."

I then said, "Either tomorrow or before Christmas, I could probably give you no other answers than I already have."

Strictly Confidential

att B
EGM/A 18914

-6-

He then said, "If you would rather await a visit in January or February, I would advise you honestly that it would be best if you returned to Hungary before Christmas rather than to await this later visit."

He told me then that he would be glad to take something along to my son.

I said, "I don't know what I could send to my son, but if you would like to take something along, I would like to send him two shirts."

He said, "That is not necessary. The people at home are probably not earning as much as they are in the West and in the US, they do not eat as many oranges or as much chocolate but they are not hungry because they buy as much bread, butter and meat as they wish. They do not have as many clothes as formerly, but what they need they can buy. Therefore, your son does not need the two shirts."

During the conversation with him, he also mentioned that the people at home know that I have some sort of a minor position as an announcer with RFE. Another of his comments was, "Even though you work for RFE and participate in the broadcasting, this does not affect your return because the people at home laugh about the programs that are sent out. The main point that concerns you is that you never got blood on your hands and you didn't carry out any treason. Things in Hungary are more lenient in this connection than they were."

Another question of his was whether or not the assassin of CERNAK had been apprehended. I replied that according to my knowledge he had not been. *W.*

Rinker: Did you ask him why he inquired about CERNAK?

Dr. L: No. Before he left he said, "The authorities know that you communicate with your relatives through some cover name and that you use the name 'Uncle Zigismund'." (He probably wanted me to say that I didn't use the expression 'Uncle Zigismund' but that I actually used the expression 'Uncle Hans'.)

Before he left, I asked him again if he would give me his name so that I could remember it.

Strictly Confidential

EGMA
18914

He asked me, "What year did you
travel to Hungary and how long did you
stay under any circumstances?"

Another question he asked me during our con-
versation was if I knew Prof. D. WILDMAN, and
where he now lives. I said that I believed
he lives in Brussels. (Prof. Wildman was
a professor at the University of Budapest and
belonged to the German minority there.)

The man told me that he had at one time
studied under Prof. SCHWARTZ and also said
that he had finished the Calvinistic Gymna-
sium in Budapest and while there.... "They
often told us about the rich living that
the monks enjoyed, and later when I studied
under Prof. SCHWARTZ he invited me to his
home several times and I could see for myself
that the monks lived very well. However, I
don't wish to insult you by my remarks if
you are a Catholic, but I myself was reared
as a non-Catholic."

Another question he asked before he left was,
"Are you going to discuss my visit and the
request to return to Hungary with your friends?
I recommend that you not do so, and don't say
anything to anyone about my visit."

- Rinker: Did ROSNER speak German with an accent?
- Dr. L: He spoke fluent German with a Hungarian accent.
- R: Did he speak good Hungarian?
- Dr. L: Yes, the Hungarian of an educated person.
- R: Did he show you any documents?
- Dr. L: No.
- R: Did you ask to see any identification?
- Dr. L: No.
- R: Did ROSNER say when he arrived in Munich?
- Dr. L: Just arrived, and intended leaving the same day.
- R: Did ROSNER say what his line of business is when he travels?
- Dr. L: Sales representative in the service of the state.
- R: How old a person is ROSNER:
- Dr. L: About forty years old.

Q13
EGMA-18914

R: How tall?
Dr. L: About five feet - ten inches.
R: How heavy?
Dr. L: About 170 pounds.
R: What color hair?
Dr. L: Dark - more brown.
R: Full head of hair?
Dr. L: Receding on the corners.
R: Combed straight back?
Dr. L: Yes.
R: Hair not too thick?
Dr. L: Thin on sides.
R: Eyebrows?
Dr. L: Very heavy - dark.
R: Color eyes?
Dr. L: Not sure, believe they are brown.
R: Complexion?
Dr. L: Pale
R: Clean shaven?
Dr. L: Yes.
R: Long face - square face?
Dr. L: Oval face - pointed chin.
R: What type nose?
Dr. L: Fairly long nose - slightly hooked.
R: Ears?
Dr. L: Normal.
R: Any scars on face?
Dr. L: Did not see any.

Strictly Confidential

-9-

alt B
EGMA-18914

- R: Teeth?
- Dr. L: Appeared to have own teeth - straight and in fairly good condition.
- R: What kind of hands?
- Dr. L: Nails cut far back - fairly large hands but not the hands of a manual laborer.
- R: Hands sun-tanned or pale?
- Dr. L: Pale - nails not too well manicured.
- R: Did he wear any rings?
- Dr. L: Wore his wedding band on the ring finger of his left hand - a very thin type wedding band.
- R: Did he wear a wrist watch?
- Dr. L: I don't know.
- R: What kind of overcoat did he wear?
- Dr. L: Brand new - medium gray - raglan cut; appeared that he had just bought it because I saw the label 'Pure Wool' on the inside flap - may have bought it right here in Munich.
- R: Suit coat? Trousers?
- Dr. L: He wore a pair of brown trousers and a medium gray jacket which was slightly interwoven with white specks. Wore a brown hat.
- R: What style hat? Did it look well worn?
- Dr. L: It appeared to be a hat that he had been wearing for sometime because the sweat band was greasy.
- R: Was the suit coat double-breasted or single-breasted?
- Dr. L: Single-breasted. The overcoat was also single-breasted with the buttons concealed.
- R: What kind of shoes?
- Dr. L: Don't remember, but do recall that they were pretty well worn.
- R: Could you tell from the style of his suit where it came from?
- Dr. L: From Hungary.

Strictly Confidential

H B
EGMA-18914

-10-

- R: Was there anything outstanding about ROSNER's appearance to identify him?
- Dr. L: Nothing out of the ordinary.
- R: Did he carry a briefcase?
- Dr. L: No, he did not carry anything.
- R: Did he smoke?
- Dr. L: No, I offered him a cigarette, but he refused it.
- R: Do you believe the Hungarian Regime actually wants you to go back, or do you think that this was merely a test to determine whether or not they could recruit you to work for them?
- Dr. L: I have heard that the Hungarian Government is trying to get Hungarian to return to Hungary by using their relatives for this purpose. I actually believe they want me to return because with this propaganda - the former Mayor of KECKESEMET had returned - this might cause other people to return.
- R: Do you believe that ROSNER actually left Munich last night?
- Dr. L: I don't know. He asked me the quickest way to get to the railroad station by street car.
- R: How many people know about ROSNER's visit last night?
- Dr. L: Prof. REICHARDT, his wife, Mr. STOMFAY-STITZ, and Mr. BROWN.
- R: Do Prof. and Mrs. REICHARDT know the purpose of ROSNER's visit?
- Dr. L: During the conversation, I went across to the other room where Prof. and Mrs. REICHARDT live and said to them, "There is an agent in my room right now, trying to convince me to return, but be careful." Prof. REICHARDT wanted to call the police immediately to apprehend ROSNER, but Mrs. REICHARDT told him that it would be better to call Dr. LISZKA's good friend, Mr. STOMFAY-STITZ.

Strictly Confidential

Strictly Confidential

att B
EGMA-18914

-11-

- R: Do you think that ROSNER might return tonight?
- Dr. L: Yes, it is possible.
- R: If he returns, give him some encouragement. Tell him that you are thinking over his request, you haven't made up your mind definitely and want to give it some more thought, and that he should contact you again within several days. Then contact either me or Mr. FISCHER as soon as possible. Under no circumstances mention the second visit to anyone else.

NOTE: Dr. LISZKA actually is in correspondence with his family once or twice a month and uses the following return address:

Hans Huber
Oettingen str. 12, Munich

HUBER is an old friend of Dr. LISKA's - they met in Munich in 1951.

SECRET

~~KAPOK~~

Attachment C to EGMA-18914

SUBJECT: Supplementary Information on the Approach to Dr. Bela Kornel LISZKA
by Karoly ROSE.

DATE OBTAINED: 4 January 1956

SOURCE: Dr. Bela Kornel LISZKA

Subject occupies one room in an apartment that comprises approximately ten rooms beside kitchen and bathing facilities. Four of the other rooms are occupied by the Josef REICHARDTs and the remainder are used during the day as office space by the Hungarian Kanzlei. Subject himself went to the front door of the apartment upon hearing his ring. He opened the door slightly to ascertain who the visitor was. As soon as ROSE established that he was talking to Subject he pushed open the door and in effect forced his entrance. This considerably irritated Subject. After the opening few sentences and after Subject had brought ROSE to his room and suffered the opening strains of ROSE's repatriation pitch, he excused himself stating that he had to turn off the gas burners under his dinner. He states that he immediately proceeded to Professor REICHARDT's room, shutting his own door behind him and on the way to the kitchen informed REICHARDT of the visit. REICHARDT then remained in the kitchen, which is closer to Subject's room and several times came over to Subject's room on various pretexts - for example, to get the newspaper - in order to check that nothing was amiss with Subject. (Both Subject and REICHARDT feared that some action would be taken against Subject.) (Mrs. REICHARDT was not at the time at home, but returned approximately an hour later as Subject subsequently found out. The REICHARDTs discussed between them what action they should take and Mrs. REICHARDT prevailed that they should contact Subject's TPFEELING friend John STOMFAY-STITZ rather than call the police as Professor REICHARDT suggested. They did so and STOMFAY-STITZ.* When Subject finished with ROSE, he learned that he was to call STOMFAY-STITZ, which he then did.) Upon leaving the room, Subject states, ROSE picked up an emigre magazine which was lying on the table. When Subject returned - he was gone approximately two minutes - ROSE was still engrossed in the magazine. ROSE showed no signs of being alarmed by Subject's having left the room, and Subject believes that had ROSE been alarmed he would not have continued to talk with Subject for another two hours. Subject remarks that the longer ROSE attempted to persuade him to return, by describing the tremendous advances in Hungary and the life Subject could expect to lead, the more embarrassed ROSE became, to the point where at the end of his spiel ROSE spoke in a simple monotone looking down at the table and nervously twisting a pencil in his fingers. Subject had the impression that ROSE himself was sick of spinning out what he knew was nonsense. (Subject mentions, which he didn't tell ROSE, that one of the reasons he wouldn't think of returning is that he is actually still under sentence as a war criminal by the Russians dating from World War I. (Details will be described in Subject's personal history debriefing.) Subject confirms that ROSE almost immediately stated that Subject should stay in the West if he had found a woman here. Subject found that very strange and ties it to the subsequent intimations by ROSE that should Subject stay in the West he would be asked to perform small favors. In this regard Subject states that when he asked ROSE whether the "favors" would take the appearance of Subject's having to render information, he added thereto that he was not about to give them any information. As far as Subject remembers he repeated the same thing when ROSE stated that the visitor Subject could expect in January or February

* then called C J L D had Ident 2 of Ref A contact STOMFAY-STITZ

~~KAPOK~~

SECRET

1 hment C to EGMA 18914

-2- ~~SECRET~~

would probably ask Subject some questions. Subject says that at this point ROSE recommended that he not face the prospect of a further visit, but return home before Christmas. Subject understood this to mean that ROSE understood that Subject would not cooperate with them. The talk between ROSE and Subject lasted until approximately 2200 hours. Subject himself accompanied ROSE down in the elevator to the outside door, which he locked after ROSE left. He then returned, and upon learning of the REICHARDT's action, called STOMFAY-STITZ. He was told to proceed to STOMFAY-STITZ's where Iden 2 of Ref A would be present. Subject called a taxi and went to STOMFAY-STITZ's which is near Elisabethpl. - quite some distance from Subject's apartment. Subject says that he noted no one in the street nor was he followed in the taxi. At STOMFAY-STITZ's Subject gave the initial rendering of his story to Iden 2 and STOMFAY-STITZ (cf. Att. A). Subject states that he had repeated the story to no one further, per [] instructions.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~ []