

SECRET

## Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Chief, CI/OA

DATE: 11 JAN 1960

FROM : Deputy Director of Security (Investigations and Support)

SUBJECT: C-15651  
#19361

1. On 19 and 20 November 1959, Subject was afforded a debriefing and IC Flutter examination at the request of [ ] SR/DOB. The debriefing was based on a requirement submitted by your office, stipulating that prior to renewing Subject's Operational Approval, Subject would have to clarify and explain satisfactorily discrepancies evident in his autobiography. Reference is made to cover memoranda from IRD dated 4 March 1959 and 28 November 1958 to which was attached the results of previous debriefings of the Subject.

2. Your attention is invited to the attached report dated 14 December 1959 wherein the examiner voiced the opinion that on the basis of current debriefing and IC Flutter, Subject is an incorrigible fabricator who is still attempting deception about his past.

3. In view of the Subject's obvious reluctance to clarify discrepancies evident in his background, it is assumed that caution will be exercised in granting approval of Subject's use for future or continued operation.

FOR THE DIRECTOR OF SECURITY:

## Attachments:

IC Flutter report dated 14 December 1959

This data is the property of the Office of Security and should be returned when it has served its purpose. In instances of routine use it may be disclosed except to CIA Staff Officers directly concerned. This information may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without the prior approval of the Office of Security.

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 382B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2004 2005

TO : Chief, Security Support Division DATE: 14 December 1959  
ATTN : [ ]  
FROM : Chief, Interrogation Research Division  
SUBJECT: S.F. #79367 IRD #25817

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Subject of this report is a thirty-five-year-old married male, an alien of Circassian origin, who has been covertly utilized by this Agency since 1952.
2. Subject was previously polygraphed on: 23 February 1953; 25 February 1956; 13 December 1956; 24 August 1957; 17 October 1957 (by two different examiners); and 22 April 1958. After the April 1958 polygraph interview (which was specific in scope and did not touch on questions dealing with Subject's bonafides), IRD recommended a thorough debriefing of Subject at the first opportunity. This recommendation was concurred in by the CI Staff, and consequently, the SR/DOB interrogation specialist [ ] attempted to resolve the discrepancies considered to exist in Subject's autobiography.
3. The result of the SR/DOB debriefing is contained in Attachment "A". A review of this SR/DOB debriefing by IED disclosed vague generalities and certain inconsistencies. Furthermore, some of the given facts were found to be at variance with known Soviet reality. This review was made a matter of record by IED through a memorandum to the CI Staff (see Attachment "B").
4. Subject was currently debriefed and polygraphed at a covert site in Washington, D.C. on 19 and 20 November 1959 at the request of [ ] SR/DOB. The debriefing was based on a requirement, submitted by [ ] CI/OA, stipulating that prior to renewing Subject's OA, Subject would have to clarify and explain satisfactorily discrepancies evident in his autobiography. The entire interview was conducted in the Russian language.

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of the current debriefing was to resolve the discrepancies still apparent in Subject's personal history. Although Subject had previously undergone many interrogations, both with and without the aid of the polygraph, it was still evident, from a review of his files,

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2005

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

including his latest straight debriefing, conducted by SR/DOB in October 1958, that Subject continued to fabricate certain parts of his past. If, at the completion of this debriefing, the examiner obtained new pertinent information about Subject, the latter would then be given a polygraph test to check out the validity of the newly acquired information.

2. At the start of the first day's debriefing, Subject was informed of its (the debriefing's) purpose. He was cautioned that a repetition of his previous attempts at deception would not be beneficial to him or to his future. Subject said that he fully understood the importance of the debriefing session and assured the examiner that "not one single word of untruth" would come from his lips during the current interview.

3. Subject reiterated his previously given reasons for his fabrications and attempts at deception. (Noted in IRD #29817 reports dated: 27 August 1957, paragraph III, sub-paragraph 2h; May 1958, paragraph II, sub-paragraph 1-4; SR/DOB debriefing report, dated 22 October 1958, page 16, last paragraph.) However, he strongly emphasized the fact that his biography, as given to [ ] (SR/DOB debriefing, October 1958) was the absolute truth.

4. In answer to the questions of how he was able, in the past, to be so consistent in giving a deceitful autobiography, Subject stated that he always had an "outline form" where the main points of his false autobiography were recorded. Consequently, whenever he was called upon to submit facts about his personal history, he would always refer to this "outline form" and come up with a consistent (fabricated) autobiography. Subject was asked whether he had in his possession, this "outline form." He replied in the negative.

5. The entire first day, 19 November, was spent debriefing Subject on his past in the Soviet Union and Germany up to 1945. It became evident after the first hour of debriefing that the information Subject was contributing (to the examiner) did not correspond with the information he gave [ ] in the last debriefing. Subject was allowed to give his version of each phase of his life. When he concluded each phase, he would be confronted with and questioned about the discrepancies existing between the information he gave the examiner, and that which he had given [ ]. In some cases he stated that he lied to [ ] and that the current version was the true one; in other instances, when confronted with conflicting versions, he would try to squirm out of the situation by attempting to give an explanation for the conflict. This explanation was usually very weak; at times, completely illogical and unconvincing; and, in other instances, an out-and-out lie.

S.F. #79367  
11 December 1959

6. At the conclusion of the first day's debriefing, after Subject was confronted with numerous facts which reflected that his current autobiographical version was in conflict with information previously given by him, he begged that he be given some time to think and consolidate his thoughts and facts about his past--in fact, he offered to spend the night of 19 November writing his autobiography. The examiner agreed and debriefing was terminated for that day.

7. When Subject came in on 20 November, he referred to some rough notes which he had scribbled the night before (he had not written out a complete autobiography as he had promised) and repeated the same basic autobiographical version, specifically concerning the areas in which he was caught lying the day before. The examiner was convinced beyond all doubt that Subject had again reverted to the use of his "outline form" to refresh his memory. Subject, however, denied that he consulted or made reference to any "form" to refresh his memory.

RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEW

The following additional information, developed during Subject's current debriefing, is set down in synopsis form. An elaboration and the details relating to each of the points noted is contained in the "Details of the Report" section.

- a. Subject admitted that he was recruited by German Intelligence in 1942 to work as their informer against the Circassians (his own people).
- b. Subject said he was instructed by a representative of German Intelligence, in 1942, to "volunteer" for service with the 835th Circassian Battalion so that he could perform his "informer" duties more efficiently.
- c. Subject admitted to current correspondence with his relatives and friends, and with his wife's relatives in USSR (since late 1957).
- d. Subject stated that he was never in Belostok as he previously claimed, but was somewhere in the Vil'nius Oblast' while serving his one-year prison sentence (from 1940 to 1941).
- e. Subject admitted that he falsified the extent of his education.

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

- f. Subject admitted that he was a semi-deserter from the German Army for eleven months after his release from the hospital in the summer of 1943.
- g. Minor unresolved discrepancies noted in the "Details of the Report" section.
- h. Continued unresolved discrepancies regarding his activities while under German jurisdiction (1943-1945).

CONCLUSION

1. On the basis of current debriefing and polygraph testing, as well as from observation of Subject's behavior during this debriefing, it is the examiner's opinion that Subject is an incorrigible fabricator who is still attempting deception about his past.

2. Subject's explanation for initially attempting to falsify and fabricate part of his autobiography to the Americans may have been originally understandable in light of the existing circumstances, as Subject explained them. It was his desire to increase his (Subject's) personal stature and importance in the eyes of those (Germans and Americans) interested in utilizing him. Subject also wished to maintain continuity with his previously given false autobiographical version (to the Americans in Asman) so that he could immigrate to the United States (Reference: SR/DOB debriefing, dated October 1958, page 15, paragraph 4-5, Attach. III). However, the above points cannot be accepted, at this time, as reasons for his continued attempts at deception to the American authorities. At present, there is no one left to impress with Subject's non-existent stature and capability; neither is there any necessity to maintain continuity of a fabricated autobiographical version to facilitate his entrance into the United States. As Subject himself informed this examiner, he now realizes, and is convinced, that American Intelligence is interested more in Subject's capabilities than in what Subject says he can do. Yet, even though Subject is aware of this existing situation—in fact, he has realized it since the August 1957 debriefing—and knows that further fabrication will not help his case, he persists in fabricating and attempting deception about his past during every session spent with him. He lied during his last two debriefing sessions, the SR/DOB debriefing in October 1958, and the first day (19 November 1959) of the current debriefing.

3. If Subject does not have the capacity or the inclination to relate only the unvarnished truth about himself and his past, and if he

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

continues to falsify or fabricate about his past, then possibly a re-appraisal of Subject should be considered prior to utilizing him in the future.

4. The examiner can only draw one final conclusion about Subject and his unceasing deceitful attempts during interrogation. The reason why Subject is continuing deception about his background must be so important and pertinent to Subject's welfare that he cannot afford to tell the complete truth about his past without seriously jeopardizing his future.

5. No further polygraph testing of Subject is recommended. The current polygraph testing was attempted only because Subject gave additional data which heretofore he had not divulged. However, after polygraph testing, it is still evident that Subject is practicing deception.

DETAILS OF THE REPORT

1. Information obtained during the debriefing of Subject is set forth in the same order as received from Subject with particular reference to the discrepancies as they were uncovered. To further underline the extent of Subject's fabrications, these false versions are reported in chronological order, in a side-by-side comparative form--i.e., the current version, which is supposed to be the unvarnished truth, as compared to the former versions (specifically the SR/DOB, October 1958 version), as well as other earlier statements made by Subject to his debriefers.

DEBRIEFING ON 19 NOVEMBER 1959

Subject's Current Version

Name - Techerin \_\_\_\_\_  
Subject has a Jordanian passport  
which lists his name as Abdel Karim  
SHOWABZQA (MR-IRD), K/A Techerin  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Birth - 24 August 1924

Subject's Previous Versions

Same information on all other debriefings.

SR/DOB and August 1957 Debriefings - 24 August 1924.

All debriefings prior to August 1957 - 1 January 1918

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Place of Birth - Takhtamakai Aul  
(village) Takhtamakai Rayon,  
Krasnodarskiy, Kray.

Education - Attended Takhtamakai  
Primary School from 1930 or 1931,  
completing five classes in six  
years by 1936 or 1937.

Attended School of Disinfectors  
six-month course in 1937 or 1938  
in Armavir.

Subject admitted he lied to all previous debriefers about the extent  
of his schooling. He could not give a logical explanation for this lie.

Change of Age - Arranged through a  
friend in 1939 for the record of his  
date of birth to be changed to 1921.  
Purpose of this change of date of  
birth record was so that Subject  
could be drafted into the Army three  
years sooner.

When asked why no question of this age change was raised later, when  
Subject was called by the Army Draft Board, he could give no logical ex-  
planation.

Application for Komsomol Membership  
Submitted application for membership  
three or four times prior to leaving  
class in 1936 or 1937. Rejected each  
time because of bad conduct in school  
and because one of his uncles left  
USSR and lived in Turkey.

Same information in all pre-  
vious debriefings.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Began same  
school in 1930-31 and graduated  
the 8th class in 1939.

August 1957 Debriefing - Finished  
the 9th class.

All debriefings prior to August  
1957 - Graduated from Ordzhonikidze  
Military Academy.

No mention of this schooling at  
any previous debriefings.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Date of  
birth record changed in 1939.

August 1957 Debriefing - Date  
of birth record changed in  
1937 or 1938.

SR/DOB Debriefing - No mention  
of this fact.

August 1957 Debriefing - Applied  
and was rejected more than once  
because of family background--  
because his father and brother  
were politically unreliable.

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Application for Komsomol Membership  
(Cont'd)

October 1957 Debriefing -  
Subject made three applica-  
tions to the Komsomol between  
1936 and 1937.

When questioned as to his age at the time of application for membership to the Komsomol, Subject said he was approximately 12 or 13 years of age. He had not made any efforts as yet to change the record of his date of birth.

Examiner's Note: The minimum age of Komsomol candidates is 14 years. When Subject was confronted with this fact—trying to join the Komsomol at an age when he wouldn't even be considered for membership—Subject was at a loss for words and could give no logical explanation for this discrepancy. Subject's explanation that he was accepted by the local Komsomol unit and rejected by the regional (rayon) unit, reflects that the Regional Komsomol Unit must have had Subject's complete autobiography (true date of birth included) in order to be able to come to a decision regarding Subject's case.

Employment - In 1937 or 1938, when he completed five classes, Subject began working as a clerk assistant to the bookkeeper of the Kolkhoz in Takhtamukai. He worked for six months and then went to Arasvir to attend the Disinfectors' School for six months.

SR/DOB and August 1957 Debriefings - In 1939, he began working as a bookkeeper for one of the Takhtamukai Kolkhozes until he was drafted in October 1940.

All debriefings prior to August 1957 - Military schooling and service.

Examiner's Note: If Subject finished school in May 1936, worked in the Kolkhoz for approximately six months (November 1936), and received additional schooling (six months in Arasvir, June 1937), then the question arises as to what he did from June 1937, or even from the end of 1937, until he was drafted into the Army in autumn (September or October) of 1940. A period of approximately three years (1936-1940) remains unaccounted for. If Subject completed school in May 1937, and we use the same above mentioned activities to fill the gaps of his life (advancing each by one year), a period of two years (1939-40) still remains unaccounted for.

When the above conflicting facts were mentioned to Subject, he could not give a satisfactory explanation other than to agree that he must be omitting something about his past which he cannot recall.



S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Military Service - Subject initially said he was called for the draft by Rayvovankomat in the autumn of 1940. However, when it was pointed out to him that in 1939, he did not yet attain draft age, and therefore, could not have been called (even if the record of DOB was altered), Subject reconsidered and changed the date of his draft call to autumn of 1940. He also stated that he was called by and reported to Takhtamukai Rayvovankomat, Second Section (chast'), and passed through a medical commission, etc. He was told to report to RVK in one or two months, and was called to report one and a half months after the initial call. No documents of any type were demanded of Subject to verify his identity.

Subject was questioned as to why he was not asked for identity documents by the RVK, especially since he resided in Takhtamukai all his life. He was born there, therefore, had a birth certificate; he went to school there, therefore, records of his age were in existence in the school records; he worked there, therefore, indications of his identity and age existed; he submitted applications for Komsomol membership, therefore, evidence of his true age was available both at the Takhtamukai Komsomol Unit level and the Regional Komsomol level. Subject was then asked why there were no questions regarding his true age--no logical explanation could be obtained from Subject.

Arrests - Subject was arrested on a charge of hooliganism a few days before reporting for military duty in October 1940. He was sentenced by the People's Court to one year imprisonment under Criminal Code Statute 74, Part 1 or 2. He was first sent to the Krasnodar Jail where he spent seven days and from there was transferred to the Labor Colony in Krasnodar (for short-termers), where he stayed for two months. He was then transferred to Vil'nius Oblast', and with other prisoners, helped to build an airfield.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Included in draft call of autumn 1940 and was about to be drafted. Subject did not appear before a screening or medical commission, but was arrested instead.

August 1957 Debriefing - In October 1940, Subject was called for military duty by RVK in Takhtamukai--went through two days medical examining and screening--accepted, and was told to report the next day for duty.

All debriefings prior to August 1957 - Subject fabricated his military career in all his pre-1957 debriefings.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Subject was arrested for hooliganism in the fall of 1940 under Criminal Code 74, Part 1. He served one or two weeks of his term in the transient jail and then transferred to Belostek Rayon to build a military airfield. Subject remained there until the beginning of the war.

August 1957 Debriefing - Differs from the current version primarily

SECRET

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Arrests (Cont'd)

Subject mentioned that while he was in the Krasnodar Labor Colony, his brother, Mos (MR-IRD), was also serving a two or three year term, having been sentenced under the 109th Statute of the Criminal Code. Mos was released in 1941. He had been previously imprisoned in 1935 or 1936, and was expelled from the Communist Party at that time.

Time Spent in the Vil'nia Region Labor Colony and Return to Takhtsukal - Subject stated that he spent six months in the Vil'nia Oblast Labor Colony in Lithuania, S.S.R. Subject recently saw M. GUCHEYL (mentioned in IED #25817, dated 27 August 1957 as GUTSCHEYS), and during a discussion of their past, the latter told Subject that the Labor Colony was located 30 or 40 kilometers inside the Vil'nia Oblast', and not in Belostok as Subject formerly indicated.

At the outbreak of the war on 22 June 1941, Subject and other short-termers were allowed to go from Vil'nia Oblast' Labor Colony to a camp four or five kilometers outside of Smolensk. Subject stated that it took him approximately 9 or 10 days to make the trip. He added that he had trouble with his feet (his soles were either blistered or full of sores), and that he barely completed the trip. Upon arrival to the Smolensk area, Subject discovered that his original certificate of premature release from prison was claimed by someone else (Subject found out later that it was GUCHEYL). However, Subject obtained a duplicate certificate and made his way back home via train. He arrived in Takhtsukal in August 1941.

In that Subject stated that he was sent to a region near Belostok, and not Vil'nia.

SR/DCE Debriefing - Regarding his brother, Mos, Subject stated that he (Mos) was imprisoned under the 111th Statute of the Criminal Code, that he was expelled from the Communist Party in 1936, and that, at the same time, was sentenced to two years of hard labor.

In all previous debriefings, Subject said that he spent time in the Belostok Labor Colony and not in Vil'nia Oblast'.

In all previous debriefings, substantially the same information was given in regard to GUCHEYL's use of Subject's identity in order to get his (GUCHEYL's) certificate of premature release from prison.

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Time Spent in the Vil'nius Region Labor  
Colony and Return to Takhtsinskai (Cont'd)

A few days later, Subject met GUCHEYL and found out that it was GUCHEYL who claimed Subject's certificate of release. GUCHEYL, on the basis of Subject's certificate of release, had already received a three or five year passport in Krasnodar under Subject's identity.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Subject met GUCHEYL two weeks after Subject's return home. GUCHEYL promised Subject that he (GUCHEYL) would go to Krasnodar and get a passport there, using Subject's name since he already had a release certificate, also under Subject's name.

August 1957 Debriefing - After the Germans occupied Takhtsinskai, GUCHEYL returned Subject's papers.

Examiner's Note

1. Subject was asked to estimate the daily mileage covered by him during the trip from Vil'nius Oblast' to the Smolensk suburbs. He estimated a minimum average of five miles a day and a maximum of 10 miles a day. Subject was then questioned as to the possibility (physically) of traveling by foot (which he claimed to have done), from the Vil'nius Oblast' region to the Smolensk suburbs, a distance of roughly 300 miles in 9 or 10 days. This would require a minimum average of 30 miles daily, which is quite an undertaking, considering that Subject was on short prison rations for the past nine months, and had no rations except what he picked up during the forced march to Smolensk. Subject could not logically explain how he managed the trip, in this span of time, except to insist that he did.

2. Subject was also asked how GUCHEYL was able to assume Subject's identity and receive Subject's certificate of premature release since each prisoner's file also contained his photograph.

3. Subject could give no logical explanation, and claims that it just happened. Subject could not explain why he allowed another individual (GUCHEYL) to use his identity, especially since the other resided in the same general area as Subject (10 kilometers away, Krasnodar). Subject denied that he gave GUCHEYL permission to use his (Subject's) name when the former was obtaining a passport, as indicated in the SR/DOB Debriefing.

4. Subject was asked to give details of his trip back home from Smolensk—the time it took, etc. He could contribute absolutely nothing regarding this period.

S.F. #1367  
14 December 1959

Documentation - During questioning Subject stated that since he lived in a Kolkhoz area in Takhtamukai, he was not required to have any passport or any identity documents. Consequently, he did not have any such documents prior to August or September 1941.

Subject stated that after returning home from the Sadlensk area, he went to the Takhtamukai Rayvqenkovskiy and, there, on the basis of his certificate of premature release from prison, received his identity card (temporary passport). Subject described this identity card as being blue with water-marked pages, issued for a one-year period.

Examiner's Note:

1. It is this examiner's understanding that when a Soviet citizen has been released, after serving his prison term, he receives only a short-term type passport (if he lives in an area where there is necessity for possessing such a document) or identity card. Subject corroborated this fact by stating that upon his release, he could obtain only a short-term (one-year type) identity document, and that this short-term document was issued on the basis of his certificate of premature release from prison.

2. Subject was asked why he was not required to have a passport prior to September 1941 and why suddenly, upon his return from prison, he was required and received a temporary passport. His answer was that he wanted an identity document. Subject was closely questioned in this regard. He was asked how it was possible for one man (Subject) to receive a short-term identity document on the basis of his prison release certificate, while at the same time another man (GRUCHETL), using a similar document (Subject's original certificate of prison release) and using Subject's identity, was able to receive a three- or five-year permanent type passport—especially when all this transpired within a 15-mile radius of the area where these two individuals resided. Subject's reaction to this question was a shrug of his shoulders, a shaking of his head, and silence. When pressed for a clearer explanation, Subject could not provide one. His only comment was, "This is how it happened."

SE/DOB Debriefing - This aspect of Subject's life was not covered during this debriefing.

October 1957 Debriefing - (Paragraph XIV, sub-paragraph (1)) Subject stated that he had no internal passport in the Soviet Union but did have an identity card, issued for a one-year period. However, no mention is made of when, or on the basis of which qualifying documents this identity card was initially issued to Subject.

S.F. #79367  
11 December 1959

First Marriage - Subject stated that his first wife's name was Dzerizet RIZZH (R-I-N), whom he married in 1942 for a period of three months. Subject stated that she died soon thereafter in 1942, however, he does not know any details about her death.

8 May 1958 Debriefing - Subject previously stated that he was married to his first wife six months prior to going over to the Germans. (The individuals having the same name, spelled RIZZH, were mentioned in this report.)

1942 Debriefing - There is no mention of Subject's first wife.

SA/DOB Debriefing - Same basic information is noted except that Subject stated that he deserted the Labor Battalion in the spring of 1942.

Services in the Soviet Military Labor Battalion - In October or November 1941, Subject was drafted into a Labor Battalion. From that time until July 1942, at which time Subject deserted, he remained with the Labor Battalion, building a Soviet defense installation in the Caucasus.

Services with the German Eisenstein Field Organization (EITFO) - Subject said he gave himself up and offered to serve the German Occupation Troops when they occupied Pankhmal in August 1942.

SA/DOB Debriefing - Same basic information is contained in this debriefing.

SA/DOB Debriefing - Recollects that upon reassignment of a group of elders, Subject was elected as the head of the local militia. Subject stated, in this same debriefing, that he told the Germans that he was born in 1918, in order to appear older and thereby obtain the position of Chief of Militia.

Two days after the arrival of the German Occupation Troops, Subject was elected Deputy to the Chief of the Eisenstein Militia of the Dakhnamet Rayon. Subject was in charge of 35 men in this militia group. Subject stated that he was elected to this position only on the basis of his family background and no other reason. He explained that 70 percent of the Dakhnamet Village was inhabited by his relatives. At the same time, Subject's mother was elected as Mayor of Dakhnamet, also because of the same reason that Subject was elected to his representative position, i.e., strong family influence in the village. Subject was asked whether he gave the Germans any false information about his background at this time (his date of birth, etc.), and he replied in the negative.

S.F. #19367  
14 December 1959

Service with the German Circassian Field  
Gendarmarie (Militia) - (Cont'd)

Subject explained that this would have been a futile attempt on his part since everyone in the village knew about his true biographical facts. If Subject, at this time, falsified information about his background, the Germans would have been able to uncover this without difficulty. Subject added that possibly he did show to the German authorities, a military identity card (Soviet) which may have had his birth date listed as 1921.

Service with the German Army - Subject remained with the Circassian Militia Group from August 1942 until October 1942. He stated that he resigned from the militia and volunteered for duty with the 835th North Circassian Battalion (which was made up of Circassian Prisoners of War). Subject stated, at this time, that the reason for his resignation from the militia was because the Germans wanted Subject to inform on the local population, which he refused to do.

Subject said that he received the rank of a platoon commander in the 835th Battalion solely on the basis of the fact that he was Deputy to the Chief of the Militia. Subject said that the version he gave Rows was incorrect.

Subject's Hospitalization Due to Being Wounded - Subject was wounded in February 1943 and sent to Melitopol Hospital for four or five months to recuperate from a shoulder wound. He left this hospital in July 1943.

August 1957 Debriefing - Subject held his position with the militia from August 1942 until January 1943. Subject volunteered for service with the 835th Battalion in the middle of January 1943.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Subject held this position until January 1943, when he voluntarily joined the German Army.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Subject said that he told the German Battalion company officer that he finished the Military Academy in Ordzhonikidze and, as a result, received the rank of a platoon commander.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Subject was wounded in August 1943 and sent to a German field hospital in Melitopol where he remained until October or November 1943 to recuperate from a shoulder wound.

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Subject's Hospitalization Due to Being Wounded (Cont'd) - After release from this hospital, Subject was sent to the Warsaw area, to the Headquarters of the North Caucasian Legion for reassignment. In September or October 1943, Subject was sent to join the Bergmann Battalion near Nikolaev; however, Subject never reached Nikolaev, but stopped in Odessa instead.

SR/DOB Debriefing - Subject was released from this hospital and sent to join the Caucasian Legion which was being assembled near Warsaw. Subject belonged to this Legion until January 1944 when he was assigned to join the Bergmann Battalion, which was made up of Caucasians and which occupied positions near Nikolaev. However, prior to reaching Nikolaev, Subject stopped in Odessa.

Subject's Participation in the Evacuation of Circassian Refugees from Odessa to Rumania

1. The only similarity between the SR/DOB Debriefing version and the current version that Subject gives about this episode is the fact that he was in charge of an evacuation with a group of Circassian refugees from Odessa to Floesti, Rumania.
2. The description of the events and circumstances leading up to and including Subject's involvement of this fact are inconsistent, vague, full of discrepancies (when his story is challenged), and in this examiner's opinion, a deliberate fabrication. Subject was thoroughly mixed up when he related or tried to explain the details concerning this period of his life. He was caught in deliberate lies about the sequence of events leading up to his being ordered to take charge of the refugees evacuation; he fabricated about the whereabouts of his brother, Mos, at that time; and, about his (Subject's) association with the 836th Battalion, which was stationed in Le Havre, France.
3. In short, this examiner, after reading all the available details Subject originally gave about this episode of his life, SR/DOB Debriefing included, as well as the two different versions he gave this examiner during the 19 and 29 November Debriefing sessions, can arrive only at one conclusion. The fabricated information related by Subject regarding this phase is not worth reporting in this report.
4. Subject summed up his activity (from the time he left the hospital until May 1945) very aptly, on the second day of his current interview. He stated that after release from the hospital, he (Subject) was a semi-deserter from the German Army for 11 months—existing on semi-false and semi-official documents.

S.F. #73267  
14 December 1959

5. Subject's 19 November 1959 version of his activities, from time of his release from the hospital until May 1945, differed from the version he gave on 20 November 1959 after he had a chance (the night before) to rough out an outline, to which he made reference.

DEBRIEFING ON 20 NOVEMBER 1959

1. As previously indicated, Subject, on 20 November 1959, gave a revised version of the story he gave the day before about the period July 1943 to May 1945. Since the examiner felt that it was futile to continue to attempt to get the true version of the above phase of Subject's life, this attempt was discontinued.

2. A review of Subject's file reflects that the following document, Attachment "B" - SJA-4-157 - was issued to Subject by the German authorities in 1942. Following is a reproduction of the document translated into English from German:

The Mayor of the area

date 30.12.1942

TACHTAMULAI

The Oberleutnant and Chief of the Circassian Field Police Techerin

born on 1.1.1918 in Tachtaul, North Caucasus used  
to search all villages in my area.

Authority: Special order from German Field Command No. 548 of 26.12.1942

B/NO. 704/42.

This permit is valid together with soldier's book No. 145763 issued by  
the commanding officer of the SS and SD Bureau in Krasnodar on 15.10.42.

SEAL

The Mayor (signature) /Chatit/  
Secretary (signature) /Schaudjan/



S.P. #79367  
14 December 1959

This document reflects that:

- A) it was issued on 30 December 1942;
- B) it was issued on a basis of a special order from German field commanding No. 548 on 26 December 1942;
- C) it authorizes Subject as a representative of the Circassian field police, to search all villages in his area;
- D) Subject was, on date of issue of this document, a member of the militia (field police);
- E) this document is valid, together with a Soldier's Book No. 145783, issued by the Commanding Officer of the SS and SD Bares in Krasnodar on October 15, 1942; and
- F) Subject was born on 1 January 1918.

Subject was asked to explain in detail everything about the above-mentioned document, the original of which was shown to him without allowing him the opportunity to closely examine the document.

3. Subject stated that this document was issued to him by the German authorities while he (Subject) was still the Deputy Chief of the Circassian Militia in Takhtsukal. It was issued prior to October 1942, and Subject was absolutely positive of this, before he joined the 835th Circassian Battalion. Subject said the document was primarily for the purpose of authorizing him to search all villages in his area. Subject emphasized that at the time he received this document, he was still a member of this militia, and had not yet volunteered for service with the 835th Battalion.

4. When Subject was confronted with the fact that the date of issue of this document was December 1942, approximately two and one half months after he joined the 835th Battalion, he could not understand how this was possible, stating that he probably made a mistake about his date of enlistment in the 835th. Subject was next confronted with the fact that this document reflects that he received his Soldier's Book in Krasnodar on 15 October 1942. Subject immediately stated that he received a temporary Soldier's Book two weeks prior to the time that he actually joined the 835th Battalion. Subject also intimated that 30 December 1942 (date of issue of this document) was, in all probability, a typographical error. Subject was then informed that the authority for this document was based on the German Field Command No. 504, dated 26 December 1942, and that it

SECRET

14 December 1959

was a very remote possibility that typographical mistakes were made throughout the whole document. Subject was asked if he ever indicated to the German authorities if he was born in 1918. He answered in the negative.

5. The examiner proceeded to confront Subject with the fact that the story he gave about his service with the Circassian Field Police did not reflect the true facts, at least not on the basis of the above document. Subject, after various attempts at explaining these discrepancies, stated in desperation, that he could not logically explain why this official document did not coincide with his version, as he gave it previously. When it was pointed out to Subject that the examiner did not accept his explanation, and that the examiner had a responsibility in explaining these discrepancies to his superiors, Subject's only answer was, "Tell them (your superiors) that I'm lying, and that I can't logically explain these discrepancies."

6. After further interrogation, Subject finally admitted that he did lie to the examiner, as well as to his previous debriefers, about his association with German Intelligence. In fact, prior to giving the true story of his association with German Intelligence, Subject requested that the examiner not take notes.

Subject gave the following story about his association with German Intelligence in 1942. After the Germans occupied Takhtamkai in 1942, and after Subject was elected to his position with the militia, he was approached and recruited by a German Intelligence officer, Hans LNU, who was with the SS or SD. Approximately the same time, the Circassian Battalion was being formed by the Germans. Since the bulk of the personnel of this battalion was made up of Circassian Prisoners of War, the Germans were interested in knowing the battalion morale problem, as well as the general feeling the Circassians had towards the German authorities. The Germans did not trust the Circassians who were in the 835th Battalion and recruited Subject to act as informer on his own people (Circassians). Subject agreed, and began observing the actions and the conduct of his fellow Circassians in Takhtamkai area and the 835th Battalion.

8. Subject stated that he often visited the Mayor's (CHATY) office in Takhtamkai, and while there, went to the back office to report to the German Intelligence officer, Hans, regarding anything of importance. Subject added that Hans instructed him to join the 835th Battalion so that he could perform his informant functions about the battalion personnel, with more efficiency and less suspicion. Subject stated that he volunteered for the 835th Battalion on orders given to him by Hans to do so.

9. After Subject joined the 835th Battalion, he still reported to Hans quite often. Subject's frequent visits to Hans, as well as his inquisitiveness about different personalities in his village, caused suspicion among

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1958

the residents of Takhtaukai, and there were rumors that he (Subject) was an informant for the Germans. In order to avert these suspicions and to eliminate rumors, the German Intelligence officer had the document (mentioned above) issued to Subject. With this document, Subject would have an excuse to visit Takhtaukai and to look around without casting any suspicions on himself. Although the document was initiated by the German Intelligence Officer, it was issued by the Circassian Mayor and Secretary, so that to all intents and purposes the authority for this permit or document was of Circassian origin. Subject stated that this document was of help to him, and that there were no further rumors or allegations that he was working as an informant for the Germans. Actually Subject was in the employ of the German Intelligence, as their informant, from the initial German occupation until Subject was wounded and went to the hospital in February 1943.

10. Subject's only other contact with representatives of German Intelligence was in 1944, when he was in Berlin. At that time, a German Intelligence officer (SS or SD) indicated to Subject that he knew of Subject's former SS or SD contacts.

11. Subject was asked if he had ever signed any secrecy agreements for German Intelligence; if he had ever made any written reports to German Intelligence; if he had ever made any oral reports to the German Intelligence; and if, on the basis of his reporting, any Circassian or Soviet was punished. Subject answered in the negative to each of these questions. Subject did, however, say that on one occasion he could not recall specifically when, he was ordered to take charge of an execution of a Soviet partisan. He said that he himself did not fire, but was in charge of the execution detail.

12. Subject further mentioned an incident which occurred while he was an informer for the German Intelligence in 1942. After the 835th Battalion's retreat from Kaluginstaya, some of the Circassian soldiers of the battalion planned to take over TUGUS (mentioned in IRD #25817, dated 27 August 1957) platoon, capture its German officer, and surrender to the advancing Soviet forces. While this conspiracy was being planned, in a hut, TUGUS, with four of his men, unexpectedly entered the hut. The rebels thought their conspiracy was discovered and that the hut was surrounded, therefore, confessed to TUGUS, their plan to capture the German officer to give to the Soviets. TUGUS hit the leader of the conspiracy, cursed him out, and told the rebellious Circassians that if they did as they had planned, the Germans would have undoubtedly executed, as a reprisal measure, all Circassians in the nearby village. TUGUS mentioned nothing of this incident to the German authorities. Subject said he knew nothing of this planned conspiracy until Hans, the German Intelligence officer, went into his office soon

SECRET  
SECRET

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

after the incident, called him a S.O.B., and ordered Subject to find TUEUS. Shortly after this, the whole 835th Battalion was called into formation, the conspirators were lined up before the battalion, accused of their planned revolt, sentenced to death immediately, and executed by a firing squad before the 835th Battalion, as a lesson for any future conspirators. Subject again underlined that he had no part in reporting this incident to the German Intelligence man, Hans.

Correspondence with Individuals in USSR - Subject admitted to currently corresponding with Ibrahim DZHAMIRZE (NR-IRD), his father-in-law, who resides in Pchich Village, Krasnodarsky Krai, USSR. Subject's wife, Goshnasho, and Subject found out, in late 1957, through Circassian friends in Jordan, that Ibrahim was alive in the Soviet Union, and they (Subject and his wife) immediately (in 1957) sent a letter to him. All correspondence with the father-in-law is carried on in the name of Khasav DZHAMIRZE (NR-IRD), not Ibrahim DZHAMIRZE. Khasav is Ibrahim's nickname, given to him by his mother.

The average number of letters going to and from the Soviet Union amounts to one or two letters monthly. There have been some packages, containing clothing, bed spreads, and rugs, as well as streptomycin and anti-T.B. pills, the latter for the mother-in-law, Ghinsed (NR-IRD). Subject stated that the original letter from the father-in-law contained nothing except the fact that the latter was thankful to be in USSR and was alive only because of the intercession of the Soviet authorities.

Subject said that he censors all outgoing mail which his wife writes to make sure it contains nothing of a political nature. Subject also writes to his brother's (Mos) wife, Janto (NR-IRD), and her two

SR/DOB Debriefing - (page 3)  
Subject stated: "I have no other close relatives in the Caucasus. After my evacuation by the Germans, I neither received nor wrote letters to my village."

May 1958 Debriefing - Subject made no admission regarding his correspondence with his father-in-law, although he commenced corresponding with him in late 1957.

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Correspondence with Individuals in USSR  
Cont'd.

sone, Yahya (MR-IRD) and Khalid (MR-IRD). They reside in the Takhtamkai Kolkhos. He first wrote to Mos' wife in early 1958 sending a total of two letters and receiving two in return from her.

On one occasion, Subject inserted a letter for Ramasan (MR-IRD) in Takhtamkai. (Ramasan's father and Subject's father were cousins.) Ramasan wrote back to Subject. Ramasan was outside of the Soviet Union until 1945, at which time he voluntarily repatriated to the Soviet Union.

Subject also corresponds with Kochas TLEPTEBISH (MR-IRD) of Takhtamkai. Subject said Kochas' mother is a sister of Subject's father. Subject exchanged four or five letters with Kochas, receiving the last letter five months ago, and answering it two months ago.

A check of IRD records reflects that TLEPTEBISH is Subject's sister's (Surat's) married name.

SR/DCB Debriefing - Reflects Surat TLEPTEBISH is Subject's sister.

Subject only indicated that this person was a friend and made no mention of his sister. Subject also received and wrote two letters to Ahmed TLIKURAI (MR-IRD) of Takhtamkai. The latter asked Subject about the whereabouts of his wife's brother in the United States. Subject sent the last letter to this man four days ago.

Subject added that he also had correspondence with Rebekha KHATAOCOU (MR-IRD), a woman in Takhtamkai who requested information regarding her relatives in the United States.

13. Subject stated that he has used his true name and address in all correspondence with his relatives and friends in the USSR. When asked why he had not told his Case Officer, or had not mentioned anything about his correspondence during his April 1958 and SR/DCB Debriefings, Subject could not give a logical answer, stating only that he was not asked specifically about this.

14. Subject's memory was refreshed, and he was told of the contents of the SR/DCB and April 1958 Debriefings wherein he specifically denies corresponding with anyone in the Soviet Union. Subject squirmed, and then stated that he was sure that the U.S. postal authorities censored all mail going to and coming from the USSR and, therefore, deduced that the Agency undoubtedly knew of his correspondence, consequently, he did not mention this fact to the American Intelligence authorities. Subject was informed that, to the examiner's knowledge, no such correspondence censorship by U.S. postal authorities exists. It was obvious to the examiner that Subject was lying and that he did not inform the American Intelligence authorities of his correspondence with relatives in the USSR because of deliberate intent to deceive.

#### SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

The following are the pertinent questions which were asked of Subject and his answers:

#### Tests I and II

10. Are you lying about your life story for the period from birth to 1942? No.
12. Are you lying about your life story for the period 1942 to 1945? No.
13. Are you lying about your life story for the period 1945 to 1955? No.
14. Are you lying about your life story for the period 1955 to present? No.

#### Tests III and IV

3. Are you intentionally withholding from me about any part of your autobiography? No.
5. Are you intentionally withholding anything about your past which occurred prior to 1942? No.

S.F. #79367  
14 December 1959

Tests III and IV (Cont'd)

7. Are you intentionally withholding about your past during 1942 to 1945? No.
8. Except those you mentioned, do you have contact with any person in the Soviet Union about whom you have not told me? No.
9. In what year were you really born? Answer: 1924.  
(Subject was instructed to give the year of birth as an answer.)
10. Were you born in some year other than 1924? No.

Tests V, VI, and VII

31. Have you ever worked for American Intelligence? Yes.
32. Have you ever worked for German Intelligence, i.e., SS or SD? Yes.
- 32a. Have you worked for SS or SD more actively than you told me? No.
33. Have you ever worked for any organs of Soviet Intelligence? No.
34. Have you ever had any contacts with representatives of English Intelligence? No.
35. Did you ever inform on any Circassian to the Germans? No.
36. Do you have current association or secret contacts with anyone connected with Soviet Intelligence? No.
37. Were you ever a Saksot for the Soviets? No.
38. Do you have current association or secret contacts with anyone connected with English Intelligence? No.
- 38a. Were you ever recruited by English Intelligence? No.
- 38b. Did you ever get any money or favors from English Intelligence? No.

Test VIII

11. Were you ever a member of the Pioneers? Answer: Don't know.

S.P. #79367  
14 December 1959

Test VIII (Cont'd)

12. Did you submit applications to become a member of the Komsomol? Yes.
13. Were you ever accepted into the Komsomol? No.
14. Was your brother, Mos, a member of the Communist Party? Yes.
15. Were you ever a candidate for or a member of the Communist Party?  
No.
16. Were you ever a member of Gestapo? No.
17. Did you ever engage in underground activities for the Soviet Union? No.
18. Are you withholding any information about your contacts with any Communist type organization? No.

Test IX

100. Have you intentionally withheld any pertinent information about yourself from us? No.
101. Did you tell me the full and complete story about your life in the Soviet Union? Yes.
102. Did you tell any Soviet representative about the AIS training you received at Fort Meade? No.
103. Did you tell me the full truth about your association with British Intelligence? Yes.

CS/IRD/

- Enclosure  
A. SR/DOB Debriefing  
B. Memorandum to C's Staff