## UNCLASSIFIED

DOCUMENT\_ID: 19660384

DOC7D 00675864 INQNO:

DOCNO: TEL 000047 88

PRODUCER: STUTTGART SOURCE: STATE

DOCTYPE: IN

DOR: 19880112 TOR: 121006

DOCPREC: R

ORIGDATE: 198801121202 MHFNO: 88 7458899

DOCCLASS: U

HEADER

RR RUEAIIB ZNR UUUUU ZOC STATE ZZH UTS3756 RR RUEHC DE RUFHSG #0047/01 0121202 ZNR UUUUU ZZH

R 121202Z JAN 88 FM AMCONSUL STUTTGART

TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 3986

RUEHFB/DIRECTOR FBI WAHSDC

BT

CONTROLS

UNCLAS STUTTGART 0047

VISAS

E.O. 12356: N/A

TEXT

TAGS: CVIS, PGOV, PEPR, GE (MUELLER, KONRAD FRIEDRICH

HEINRICH)

SUBJECT: SAO REQUEST POSSIBLE 212 (A) 33 INELIGIBILITY

REF: (A) 87 STUTTGART 1152 (B) 87 USBERLIN 2493

1. VISAS DONKEY

2. MUELLER, KONRAD FRIEDRICH HEINRICH

GERMAN

SEPTEMBER 1, 1911

MARBURG, GERMANY

**PROFESSOR** 

RETIRED

- 3. IN AN EXTENED INTERVIEW WITH MR. MUELLER, CONOFF ENDEAVORED TO OBTAIN DETAILS TO FACILITATE DEPARTMENT'S INVESTIGATIONS. THESE ATTEMPTS WERE THWARTED BY APPLICANT'S PURSUIT OF A DELIBERATE POLICY OF BLENDING HISTORICAL ANALYSIS WITH A MINIMUM OF FACTUAL INFORMATION.
- 4. MR. MUELLER RESIDED IN THE US, AS A PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIEN (A 18 971 435), FROM 1970 UNTIL 1984, WHEN HE RETURNED

NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT

CIAHAS NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION AND/OR RELEASE OF CIA INFORMATION IN THIS DOCUMENT

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3020 NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2001 2007

ESE COORDINATION WITH

State.

## UNCLASSIFIED

TO GERMANY, TO INITIATE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT FOR DAMAGES SUSTAINED DURING THE NAZI ERA. IN THIS CONNECTION, HE IS SEEKING DOCUMENTS, WHICH HE ALLEGES, WERE REMOVED FROM HIS FILE BY THE MILITARY GOVERNMENT, IN MARBURG, IN 1945. SUBJECT MAINTAINS THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WOULD ASSIST HIM IN FILING HIS DAMAGES' CLAIM AND EXONERATE HIM FROM ANY ASSOCIATION WITH THE HANGING OF TEN POLISH FARM-WORKERS AT KIEFHAUSERBERG, IN 1943. HE IS ALSO INTERESTED IN PRESSING CLAIMS AGAINST U.S. AUTHORITIES FOR MALTREATMENT DURING HIS DETENTION IN KORNWESTHEIM, IN 1945. WHILE ONE GAINED THE IMPRESSION THAT THIS MATTER WAS CENTRAL TO APPLICANT'S EXISTENCE, HE COULD NOT EXPLAIN WHY HE HAD ALLOWED FORTY YEARS TO ELAPSE PRIOR TO INITIATING PROCEEDINGS. IN RESPONSE TO HIS REQUEST FOR OUR ASSISTANCE IN LOCATING THESE DOCUMENTS, WE INDICATED THAT WE IN STUTTGART COULD NOT BE OF ASSISTANCE IN THIS REGARD.

- 5. THROUGHOUT THE INTERVIEW APPLICANT ENDEAVORED TO JUSTIFY HIMSELF AND TO MAKE A POSITIVE IMPRESSION. HE EXPLAINED THAT HE ONLY JOINED THE NSDAP IN 1933 TO AVOID CHALLENGING HIS PROFESSOR, ON WHOM HE RELIED FOR SUPERVISION OF HIS DOCTORAL DISSERTATION AND POSITION AS JUNIOR LECTURER, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARBURG. HIS OWN INITIAL ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SOCIAL POLICIES OF THE NSDAP ABATED AND HE ABANDONED THE PARTY IN 1935. HE CITED HIS MEMBERSHIP IN THE NS-MOTOR-CORPS AS A MERE TOKEN GESTURE OF CONSENSUS. SIMILARLY, HIS APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO THE REICH'S LITERATURE GUILD WAS SOLELY TO ENSURE PUBLICATION OF HIS ACADEMIC AND LITERARY WORKS. HE DESCRIBED HIMSELF AS ESSENTIALLY APOLITICAL, WITH NATIONAL SENTIMENTS FOUNDED IN A LOVE OF GERMAN LITERATURE.
- 6. SUBJECT ACKNOWLEDGED HIS MEMBERSHIP IN THE HITLER YOUTH, WHERE HE SERVED IN THE CAPACITY OF CULTURAL ADVISER, GIVING LECTURES AND POETRY SESSIONS IN SINGEN-HOHENTWIEL. HE ALSO CONFIRMED THAT HE WAS DRAFTED INTO THE WEHRMACHT IN 1940 AND ASSIGNED TO THE FIFTH ARTILLERY REPLACEMENT DIVISION AT PILSEN. IN THE SUMMER OF 1940, HE WAS REGISTERED AS UNFIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF A LETTER FROM THE SS RACE AND SETTLEMENT OFFICE, DETAILING HIM TO THEIR MAIN OFFICE IN BERLIN. APPLICANT ACKNOWLEDGED HAVING BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH THIS OFFICE BUT REFUTED EVER HAVING HELD THE POSITION OF SCIENTIFIC ASSISTANT, CITED IN BDC SUMMARY. IN ADDITION, HE CLAIMS NEVER TO HAVE BEEN IN BERLIN. QUESTIONED AS TO HIS ACTIVITIES FOR THIS OFFICE, APPLICANT RESPONDED THAT HE HAD HAD NO FUNCTION AND PERFORMED NO DUTIES WHATSOEVER. HE WENT UNCLAS SECTION 02 OF 02 STUTTGART 0047

## VISAS

ON, HOWEVER, TO CONTEND THAT HE WAS INSTRUMENTAL, TOGETHER WITH HIS SUPERIOR OTTO HAIDER, FOR AMELIORATING RACIAL POLICIES. ASKED FOR SPECIFIC EXAMPLES, APPLICANT RETREATED TO HIS PREVIOUS POSITION THAT HE HAD NOT BEEN ACTIVE IN ANY CAPACITY FOR THIS OFFICE AND MAINTAINED THAT IT WAS HAIDER'S GOAL TO RELIEVE HIM FROM ALL RESPONSIBILITIES, IN ORDER TO ALLOW HIM TO CONCENTRATE FULLY ON HIS ACADEMIC AND LITERARY WORK. HE VOLUNTEERED THE INFORMATION THAT HIS OWN RACIAL

## UNCLASSIFIED

PHILOSOPHY WAS BASED ON ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH WHICH, ACCORDING TO APPLICANT, DEMONSTRATES THAT QUOTE DIFFERING ETHNIC GROUPS CANNOT MIX SUCCESSFULLY UNQUOTE.

- 7. SUBJECT COULD GIVE NO DETAILS OF HIS ASSIGNMENT AT BUECHENWALD BUT CONFIRMED HIS ASSOCIATION WITH THE WEDDING OFFICE. HERE AGAIN HE DISCLAIMED ANY UNDERSTANDING OF RACIAL POLICIES, MAINTAINING THAT HIS ACTIVITIES WERE CONFINED TO ORGANIZING A HOME-TO-FIELD SYSTEM OF CHAIN LETTERS FOR MORALE SUPPORT.
- 8. APPLICANT VIGOROUSLY DENIED THAT HE HAD ANY KNOWLEDGE OR INVOLVEMENT IN ACTIVITIES WHICH FALL WITHIN THE PURVIEW OF 212 (A) 33. HE INDICATED THAT HE HAD BEEN APPROACHED IN 1939 BY A SENIOR SS OFFICER TO ASSIST A HEIDELBERG PROFESSOR IN DRAFTING A CLASSIFIED NAZI GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT BUT THAT HE HAD REJECTED THIS OFFER. FROM HIS COMMENTS IT WAS CLEAR THAT MR. MUELLER WAS INFORMED OF THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THIS DOCUMENT, WHICH ONE MAY PERSUME WOULD ONLY HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE IF THE GOVERNMENT WERE SURE OF HIS PARTY LINE. HIS ASSOCIATION WITH THE RACE AND MARRIAGE OFFICE ALSO MITIGATES AGAINST HIS CLAIM TO HAVE HAD NO UNDERSTANDING OR KNOWLEDGE OF NAZI RACIAL POLICIES. HIS ATTEMPT TO TURN THIS INTO A PHILOLOGICAL ARGUMENT, USING THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN HAVING WORKED "WITH", AS OPPOSED TO "AT" THIS OFFICE, WAS NOT CONVINCING. IN ADDITION APPLICANT'S INABILITY TO GIVE A PRECISE PICTURE OF THE STATUS OF PENDING INVESTIGATIONS HERE IN GERMANY LEAVES MANY ADDITIONAL OUESTIONS UNANSWERED. WITH HINDSIGHT, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT APPLICANT APPROACHED INTERVIEW WITH A PRE-DETERMINED STRATEGY. HIS RESPONSES WERE AS VAGUE AS THEY WERE CALCULATING. HE USED HIS VIVID AND EXCELLENT MEMORY IN A HIGHLY SELECTIVE MANNER AND WAS DELIBERATE IN FORMULATING HIS RESPONSES. CONOFF IS OF THE OPINION THAT SUBJECT HAS NOT MET THE BURDEN OF PROOF EXONERATING HIM FROM ACTIVITIES OUTLINED IN 212 (A) 33 AND MAKES A NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION IN THIS CASE.

GRIFFIN

ADMIN END OF MESSAGE

UNCLASSIFIED