

SECRET

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, WH/L

1 February 1961

SUBJECT : Manuel ARTIME Buesa -
 Review of File Initiated on Receipt of
 Derogatory Information on Subject from Pedro DIAZ Lanz

1. Because of the comments made by Pedro Luis DIAZ Lanz on 13 January 1961 to the effect that Manuel ARTIME Buesa may be a Communist agent, ARTIME's file was reviewed for the purpose of uncovering any information which might support DIAZ' allegation.

2. Areas open to question are the following:

- a. Communist Party Affiliation of Subject's Father: As noted by Martha TRAFER, WH/L/FA, Subject stated during his polygraph examination that his father had belonged to the Communist Party during the Spanish Civil War, but had not been a member of the Communist Party since 1939. This subject was not pursued by the polygraph operator. Subject gave somewhat varying accounts for the reasons for his father's quitting the Party: during the polygraph examination, he explained that the Party had intended to send his father to Russia for training, and also had ordered his father to inform on his friends; when his father refused, the Party expelled him. Later, in an autobiography, Subject stated that his father had left the Party because of the "treason which they committed against his intimate friend, FERNANDEZ Martinez. This "treason" was not further detailed. Subject stated that his father's expulsion (or resignation) was reported in Eoy at the time.
- b. Report on the October 1959 INRA Meeting: Subject reported that the open admissions of Communism made by Fidel et al during a closed-door INRA meeting in October 1959 precipitated his defection. Subject could not, however, remember the dates of the meeting. At first he reported that it took place during the last week in October 1959. (His letter to Fidel stating his reasons for defection, which was widely circulated after his exfiltration, was dated 29 October.) He later corrected this to 7-8 October. During the polygraph examination, he stated he could not remember the dates, but that it was a two-day meeting, on a Saturday and Sunday, some time in mid-October.

3. The following actions were taken in an attempt to resolve doubts raised by these points:

a. Communist Affiliation of Father.

(1) Names of parents were traced in RID, with negative results.

(2) Names and/

SECRET

701-267437

DO NOT REPRODUCE
 RETURN TO CIA

- 14-00000
- (2) Names and biographic data on Subject's parents were submitted to the Bureau for tracing in their files. The Bureau reported that these individuals were not identified in Bureau files.
 - (3) Green Lists on Subject's parents were submitted to FI/D. Results were negative.
 - (4) An attempt was made to procure copies of the newspaper (Eco, 1935) which might have carried the story of Subject's father's expulsion from the Party. It was determined that no Cuban newspapers are kept on file in the Agency. (Library Acquisition Branch, OGI/Cuba, FBID, and WH/L/Prop were queried.) Because of time limitations, no attempt was made to procure the papers from another Agency or from the Library of Congress.

b. Actual Dates of the Alleged Secret INRA Meeting.

- (1) As indicated above, back issues of Cuban newspapers are not available within the Agency. It was therefore impossible to check Subject's story about the meeting against news stories in contemporary issues of Revolucion, which he said was given a news release on the second day of the meeting.
- (2) A review of FBID Daily Summaries for October 1959 was requested of FBID for the purpose of unearthing any overt broadcast reporting on the meeting. FBID, Latin American branch, Mr. Rodney Levins, advised that it was not possible for that office to conduct such a review at this time. These summaries are available for review at 1717 H Street, and will be screened if the time and effort involved are considered worthwhile.
- (3) WH/L/PI (Barbara Edmunds) advised that no reporting on this October INRA meeting had been received other than that from ARTIME.
- (4) It is noted that Saturdays and Sundays in October 1959 fell on 3-4, 10-11, 17-18, and 24-25 October, and 31 October - 1 November. Therefore at least one of Subject's accounts of the dates involved is false.

SECRET

4. Conclusions.

Results of this review of Subject's file do not support the allegations made by DIAZ Lanz. Although the two major areas of doubt remain somewhat unresolved, the weight of evidence would seem to be in the Subject's favor.

- a. Agency and Bureau files contain no identifiable record of Subject's father.
- b. ARTIME himself volunteered information concerning both the cited areas open to possible question. The Subject had every reason to believe that the information he volunteered (i.e. that his father's expulsion from the Party was reported in Eoy, and that the INEA meeting was covered by a reporter from Revolucion) could be easily verified.
- c. The record of ARTIME's polygraph examination stated that strong polygraph evidence had been obtained that Subject was a bona fide anti-Castro and anti-Communist defector; that INEA had held a meeting around the middle of October at which Subject was present; and that the letter of resignation addressed to Fidel was written by him and that it was generally accurate in reporting the INEA meeting.
- d. There has been no evidence in FI/D that ARTIME is other than what he claims to be.

5. Comment.

Dave Morales, JMWAVE/CI, has additionally commented that there is no love lost between ARTIME and DIAZ Lanz and that the latter's allegations against the former are probably false. In view of DIAZ Lanz' feelings against ARTIME, it is not unlikely that he is endeavoring to build himself up in the eyes of his case officer by discrediting ARTIME.

23
[Redacted]
Chief, WH/W/CI

Distribution:

Orig & 1 Addressee

- 1 - WH/W/PA
- 1 - WH/W/PM

- 3 -
SECRET

1/90