[...appeared at the Embassy, unannounced, at approximately 10:30. I dropped
what I was doing and met with him for the next 90 minutes. During the
conversation but I managed to ask a few questions.

CHARLES HARMAN

According to [...], Harman was seized by Intelligence units acting on
orders provided by Salas, current CNI head. He was taken to the Escuela Militar and
interrogated. From there he was transferred to the National Stadium for additional
questioning. Documents seized from his residence indicated that Harman was an
"extremist". He was therefore considered a foreigner/extremist and the order was
given to execute him. [...]

The record indicating that Harman spoke little Spanish and the
soldiers that had him were unaware that he was an American. Instead, they thought
that he was a Brazilian, Italian, etc... The record indicating that he was an
American arrived at the stadium after the execution. He was forced to change clothes
and then shot three times. The body was dumped on the streets to indicate that he
had been killed in a confrontation. The news of his death got lost in the confusion
of those days and later was suppressed as it was known that he was an American.

[...] said that the person at the stadium who made the decision on who was to
die was Pedro Espinoza, of later DINA fame. He estimated that several hundred
people perished at the stadium. It was worse in Valparaiso, he said, where most
of the bodies were weighted down and dumped at sea.[...]

EMBASSY ROLE

[...] does not feel that the Embassy did very much to help the Harman family.

UNCLASSIFIED
that he was getting the impression that the Embassy still was not very interested. However, he conceded that no one in the Embassy had played a role in what happened to Charles Horman. He was dead before any Embassy official knew he was missing.

WHAT DOES HE WANT?

This is the question I have been asking myself and I asked him, many times and in many ways. He insisted that he only wants justice, that Mr. Horman should know what happened to his son. However, at the end of the conversation, he mentioned going to the U.S. to tell his story since he would have to leave Chile once the truth was out. I deduced that what he seeks is some type of U.S. government protection for himself

In return, he will tell all.

WHAT DOES HE KNOW?

He also claims to know about the Prats case. If he is genuine, he could be a gold mine of information.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

claims that he is non-political but dislikes the extremes of both sides. He said that he was not interested in money nor in his own personal safety but was concerned about
WHAT DO I THINK?

He could be a plant. For one thing, I don't understand his motivation. Why after 14 years has he finally decided to tell his story? On the less-cynical side, it could be a copycat syndrome from Fernandez Larios that has pushed him into our arms. His answers seem too pat, too much what we want to hear, especially his opinions of the present government. He extolled Ambassador Barnes, saying that finally the U.S. had a true Ambassador in Chile. Once again, what he might think we would want to hear. Overall, I lean toward the idea that he is credible, but I have some

WHAT DO WE DO?

I asked him this question. He told me that it was my decision. I, of course, waffled. I told him that I would talk to my immediate superior and that he should call me on Friday morning for a definite answer. Personally, I don't think that I should continue as his Embassy contact. There are others here who can handle the situation in a more proficient manner. If he is a plant, trying to compromise us, someone else could be more adept at determining this. If he is the genuine article, then someone of a higher rank should be handling him. My involvement has been accidental (I happened to answer the phone the first day he came to the Embassy). Now it is time for someone else to carry the ball. FYI: As I escorted him to the elevator, he asked about talking to someone from our intelligence forces.
I asked him if he had tried to contact Mrs. Kobliska. He said that he had gone to the Consulate that morning but was told by an emissary that Mrs. Kobliska could not see him because he did not have an appointment. Rather, he was told to get in touch with me. He then turned up at the Embassy. During the conversation, I asked him if he wanted to talk with Mrs. Kobliska in the future. He did not say no but indicated that he wanted to talk with whomever could take action in the matter. As you can tell from the account, it is difficult to determine what action he wants us to take.