

they were close friends; that is why he did not refuse to talk to him about this topic, but told Alger that he already had made a report on that conference. When Alger whom I had met through "Ernst," as you may remember, kept insisting on the report, "Ernst" was forced to tell him that he needed to consult his "connections."

KGB headquarters, irritated that Massing had met the GRU's Hiss, made its displeasure clear by return cable: "We do not understand 'Ryzhaya's' [Massing's] motives in meeting 'Lawyer' [Alger Hiss]. As we understand, it happened after we gave our last directives about 'Lawyer,' after our instruction that 'Lawyer' is the Neighbors' [GRU] agent and needed to be left alone."<sup>15</sup> In a follow-up, Iskhak Akhmerov, a KGB illegal officer in the United States, reported to Moscow: "'Storm' [J. Peters] let out a secret during one of our conversations: Hiss used to be a member of bratskiy organization [CPUSA underground] who had been implanted into 'Surrogate' [cover name for the State Department] and sent to the Neighbors [GRU] later. He told me about it when I was hunting for Hiss."

But to the determinedly myopic Navasky, the Hungarian material about Field (only summarized here) is "at best, inconclusive." And, he calls Weinstein and Vassiliev's book "methodologically challenged."<sup>16</sup> The former statement is false and the latter is a contrived excuse rather than a real reason to refuse to accept the KGB documents in Weinstein and Vassiliev's book. For this material *not* to incriminate Hiss, Hede Massing and Iskhak Akhmerov, both Soviet agents, had to be *separately* lying about their contacts with Hiss in the 1930s. And Field, the dedicated Communist, had to be lying when explaining himself to his Communist interrogators during his rehabilitation. And the KGB had to be mistaken in identifying Hiss as the agent of Soviet Military Intelligence. What motive would all of them have had to lie to other Communist intelligence officials about Hiss? And why and how could all their accounts coincide in one huge mistake?

Most historians are not as contemptuous about evidence as Reuben or Navasky. Instead, they resort to language that implies the innocence of Hiss (and the Rosenbergs) without actually