

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM  
RELEASE AS SANITIZED

2003

SECRET/RYBAT

ROUTING FORM  
Doc No.:

Date:

Indicate title of person to take action and that of the originator. Place comments thereunder by numbered paragraphs. Initial in center of page and draw a line across the page and forward. Each recipient is to repeat above procedure until action is completed and ready for filing. This cover sheet must be retained with enclosure.

TO	FROM	DATE
<p>Exec</p> <p>1)</p> <p>2) DCP</p> <p>CIP</p>	<p>C/P.D.</p> <p>Re 4 a 2, <sup>ack</sup> [ ] made same error.</p> <p>Agree with 5A + C. As for 5B, see little merit in reopening this question—both [ ] and JCS know the difference between overall ops like SUMMIT and specific CALLIGERIS ops like PRONTO. PRONTO standard falls with CALLIGERIS, and this is actually more of a control factor than detailed local supervision. As for 5D, for next 30 days PRONTO has an obvious utility by mere fact that it shows wider scope of CALLIGERIS mechanism. Real review of its utility in another context can be undertaken only when whole PBSUCCESS context changes. [ ]</p> <p>Recommend necessary steps be taken soonest to transfer control to [ ] through letter from Dancho, offering him control so far as editorial content by letter to [ ] to [ ] copy to Linc—our guidance would prevail and [ ] would check for conformity also stimulate to develop distribution in Govt. Let us keep building assets—we do not know how long our row may be. [ ]</p>	<p>1 June</p>

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: PT 19 CEGAM / PRONTO

1. CEGAM is a loosely organized, apparently rather small (presumably less than 20 members) group of Guatemalan exiles in Mexico, led by [redacted] ] It is part of the CALLIGERIS forces in exile. ~~It publishes~~ a periodical, PRONTO.

2. PT 19 was not included in the original PBSUCCESS plan. Authority for our support of subject group and publication is cable DIR 48286, authorizing [redacted] ] to subsidize it. There is no project outline and no detailed report on the group on file. Our latest comprehensive information on subject was contained in a report by [redacted] ] (now at the SHERWOOD safe house at LINCOLN, but then traveling to Mexico on CALLIGERIS' orders), dated 1 May 1954, an English translation of which is in the project file. This report does not contain, however, any information as to the present strength of CEGAM, its current activities or any details concerning PRONTO, its circulation or, especially, its transportation into Guatemala.

3. There seems to have been, from the beginning, a certain competition between [redacted] ] and [redacted] ] as to who should handle and control subject group and publication. As far as the record shows, initial contact was made between NASHWINTER of [redacted] ] and [redacted] ] Nashwinter demanded pre-publication control of PRONTO and reconciliation between CEGAM and the rival LIONIZER group as preliminary conditions for any support. [redacted] ] complained to CALLIGERIS and the above mentioned HQ cable directed [redacted] ] to make all payments, specifically enjoining [redacted] ] from doing so.

4. The two latest developments concerning subject appear to be:

a. [redacted] ] HEGARTY's) control over subject does not seem to function very well - which is only too easily understandable in view of the fact that subject is in another country. In addition, it is questionable to what extent CALLIGERIS controls his followers altogether. This lack of control is shown by two major facts: (1) I have not yet seen any substantial report on either the group or the publication; (2) in at least two cases - the "333" campaign and the atomic bomb article - PRONTO's performance has been rather unsatisfactory.

b. [redacted] ] is still in contact with [redacted] ] they forward regularly PRONTO to us and they have obviously worked with him in connection with SUMMIT. They have, however, apparently not interfered with the editorial

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

work any more - at least there haven't been any more complaints, so far as we know.

5. Recommendations: As soon as we know whether the new time table for PBSUCCESS makes any further action on subject worthwhile and after having received the reports on SUMMIT (which should indicate the degree of cooperation now existing between [ ] and [ ] as well as perhaps shed some light on CEGAM's capabilities in general), we should

a. Instruct HEGARTY to submit within a set time limit a complete report on subject group and publication, including the mechanism of his control and communications, the D-Day potential of the group, the ability of the publication to reach readers inside Guatemala, etc.;

b. If this report is unsatisfactory or unobtainable or shows inadequate control via [ ], we might re-open the question of transferring the project to [ ] - or at least try to obtain the required data through them;

c. We might also debrief [ ] (see para 2 above) in greater detail about subject;

d. Depending upon the information thus obtained, we should decide whether subject project can be developed into a tangible PBSUCCESS/KUGOWN asset: if we cannot be reasonably sure of this possibility, we ought to discontinue it.

[ ]

C/PP

~~SECRET~~