

~~APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1992~~
~~CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM~~

23 March 1957

TO : Deputy Director (Plans)
 FROM : Chief, Inspection and Review Staff
 SUBJECT : Alleged indiscretions of [redacted]
 Dominican Republic.

I. Introduction.

1. This is a report of an inquiry into alleged indiscretions of [redacted] Ciudad Trujillo.

2. This inquiry was conducted in Ciudad Trujillo between the dates of 11 and 15 March 1957, by representatives of the IIR Staff and WE Division.

II. Allegations of Mr. William PAWLKY, former U.S. Ambassador.

3. On 25 February 1957, Mr. William PAWLKY, former U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, in conversation with the Director had stated, in part, that [redacted] was "...a busybody and an extremely conceited boy...he wants to be in the middle of everything and he talks to everybody in the world...he is always trying to milk me for information because he sees I am from the government and he is trying to get information out of me...I have seen few people who are less discreet...I believe that he is not a man who can evaluate a situation on its merits...not only the Dominicans are scared to death of him but all the Americans are scared of him, I am scared of him, and I am afraid to talk to the guy and that isn't the type of man you want in CIA".

III. Ambassador PHSIFFER's conversation with Foreign Minister of the Dominican Republic.

D273

II. [redacted]'s discussions with Mr. PANKY.

16. According to [redacted] and other Embassy officials, there are many U.S. citizens who have vested interests in the Dominican Republic, among whom several are mentioned as apologists for the Dominicans for business reasons. Two of those frequently mentioned during the course of this inquiry were a Mr. Robert CHRISTENSEN, a former Foreign Service officer, and Mr. William PANKY, a former U.S. Ambassador. [redacted] is particularly aware of the latter's closeness to General TRUJILLO. [redacted] stated that he had discussed with PANKY on a number of occasions some of the implications of revolutions in Latin America. This was done because [redacted] believed that

PANLEY's long service in the U.S. government and known position justified confidence in him. So far as [redacted] was aware, he believed that he gave no cause for Mr. PANLEY to label him either for

of PANLEY as a former U.S. Ambassador, [redacted] believes he leaned over backwards in not presenting an anti-TEJILLO position because he was aware of PANLEY's close ties with TEJILLO.

17. [redacted] did state that at one time he asked PANLEY for information on the GALINDEZ case. In that particular conversation, when he informally and "quite bluntly" requested this information, Mr. PANLEY stated that he did not mix business and politics, and that in the Dominican Republic he was in business. [redacted] stated that in view of the answer he received he wished he had not asked the question.

18. In the opinion of the CIA and FBI representatives it is a moot question whether or not that question posed to PANLEY was indiscreet. Regarded after the event, it probably was indiscreet. But regarded in the light of Mr. PANLEY's previous sensitive employment and stature in the U.S. government and previous relations with [redacted] it was a question which probably could have been asked by the most discreet U.S. employee in similar circumstances.