

MATERIAL REVIEWED AT CIA HEADQUARTERS BY
HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS STAFF MEMEBERS

FILE TITLE/NUMBER/VOLUME: _____

INCLUSIVE DATES: _____

CUSTODIAL UNIT/LOCATION: _____

ROOM: _____

DELETIONS, IF ANY: _____

DATE RECEIVED	DATE RETURNED	REVIEWED BY (PRINT NAME)	SIGNATURE OF REVIEWING OFFICIAL
6-9-78	6-9-78	Kenneth Klein	<i>Kenneth Klein</i>
6-16-78	6-16-78	Michael Goldsmith	<i>Michael Goldsmith</i>

NO DOCUMENTS MAY BE COPIED OR REMOVED FROM THIS FILE

HSCA COMMENT: MATERIAL NOT RELEVANT _____ RELEVANT _____
REQUEST: SEGREGATED STORAGE _____ PERMANENT RETENTION _____

SECRET

THE MONSTER PLOT

Introduction	1
Chapter I Organizational Background: CIA's Handling of Soviet Positive Intelli- gence and CI Matters	3
Chapter II Biographical Data: 1927-1962	7
Chapter III Chronicle: 1962-1969	12
A. Initial Contacts	12
B. <u>Bona Fides</u>	13
C. The Case Against Nosenko	16
D. Defection	18
E. The Problem of Disposition	27
F. Erratic Behavior and Its Aftermath	28
G. The Decision to Incarcerate	31
H. First Polygraph Examination	32
I. Incarceration and Intefrogation	36
J. Elaboration of the Plot Theory	41
K. Life in a Vault	43
L. Inter-Agency Disagreement	65
M. Voices of Dissent	67
N. Helms Takes Control	73

SECRET

SECRET

-ii-

	O. Resolution of the Case	76
Chapter IV	Nosenko's Contribution: A Summary Evaluation	81
	A. Information on KGB Personnel	81
	B. KGB Recruitment Efforts Against US Citizens	82
	C. Moscow Microphones	84
	D. William John Christopher Vassall	84
	E. Leads to Foreign Nationals	85
	F. Summary Evaluation	85
Chapter V.	The Analytical Foundations of the "Monster Plot"	86
	A. Lack of Systematic Interrogation	86
	B. Faulty Record of Conversations With Nosenko	90
	C. CIA Misapprehensions Regarding Nosenko's Life Story	93
	D. Errors or Omissions in Available CIA Headquarters Records	100
	E. CIA Assumptions about the Second Chief Directorate	101
	F. The A Priori Assumption of Disinformation as Applied to the Popov and Related Cases	106
Chapter VI	<u>Dezinformatsiya</u> : Origins of the Concept and Application in the Nosenko Case	113
Chapter VII	Golitsyn Vs. Nosenko: A Comparison of Their Handling By CIA	123

SECRET

SECRET

-iii-

Chapter VIII	Use of the Polygraph in the Nosenko Case	136
Chapter IX	Psychological and Medical Findings . . .	142
	A. The Role of the Psychologist	142
	B. The Role of the Psychiatrist	149
	C. Conclusions	157-158
Chapter X	Impact of the "Monster Plot" on CIA's Positive Intelligence and CI Missions . .	159
	A. The Case of	159
	B. Effect on Other Potential Operations	173
	C. How CIA Worked to Defeat Itself . . .	175
Chapter XI	Methodology and Leadership	177
	A. Lack of Counterintelligence Methodology	177
	B. Influence of Chief, CI on Methodology	178
	C. Impact of Faulty Counterintelligence on Positive Intelligence Collection	178
	D. What Went Wrong?	179
	E. Summary	181
Chapter XII	Conclusions and Recommendations	182
	A. The Letter of Instructions	182
	B. Recommended Action	184

SECRET

SECRETIntroduction

On 5 June 1962 Yuriy Ivanovich Nosenko, a Soviet official temporarily assigned to Geneva, contacted an American Foreign Service Officer in a move that was eventually to lead to Nosenko's defection. This act was the first in a chain of events that is unequalled in complexity by any other Soviet operation handled by the Central Intelligence Agency since its establishment. Because the case still has important implications for the overall Soviet intelligence effort of the United States, and because it raises many basic questions about the techniques of handling Soviet agents and defectors, a reinvestigation of the case was commissioned by the Agency in June 1976. The results are embodied in this report and its annexes.

Although United States officials of many agencies, up to and including a president of the United States, were briefed on the case and either played some role in making decisions concerning it or actively participated in running the operation, it does not now appear that, between 1962 and 1976, any single individual has ever been fully informed as to all its aspects. The complexity of this investigation therefore stems in large measure from the fact that the case has proceeded along at least two, and often more, compartmented tracks. Thus, the effort to get a total picture of what transpired has involved an unusual amount of research in the files of various components of the Agency, plus personal interviews with a large number of present and former Agency employees.

The actions taken in regard to Nosenko were not the result of decisions made by a unitary Agency acting as a corporate entity; rather, in this case more than in most, decisions were made by a number of senior individuals on the basis of their own strongly-held views, which sometimes conflicted with the equally strongly-held opinions of other senior colleagues. Thus, this report must, if it is to be comprehensible, attempt to depict the decision-making process in all its complexity by referring when necessary to the individual participants.

SECRET

SECRET

-2-

The quintessential quality of a report such as this is that it be objective. We have not, on the other hand, refrained from expressing our opinions. Even to have tried to do so would have been futile for two rather obvious reasons. First, into the reconstruction of events of the complexity herein described there always enters a degree of selectivity and judgment; in this sense, "opinion" provides the essential matrix of our product. Secondly, we have viewed our task as one of constructive criticism.

SECRET

SECRET

-3-

CHAPTER I

Organizational Background: CIA's Handling
Of Soviet Positive Intelligence and CI Matters

The history of the Nosenko case can only be comprehended within the framework of the organization and day-to-day functioning of the Central Intelligence Agency as a whole. In fact, opinions regarding the handling of the Nosenko case may differ substantially according to individual's differing views regarding internal Agency organization and functioning. This being the case, it is useful at the outset to make explicit our understanding of how the Agency actually functioned in the relevant period, the 1960s, as distinct from how it might theoretically have functioned according to Agency organizational charts and regulations.

The two instrumentalities for the conduct of day-to-day operations in the Soviet field were the Soviet Bloc Division (known successively by this and several other names*) and the Counterintelligence Staff. In the nature and interrelationship of these two organizations we find the key to much of what was to happen in the Nosenko case.

Although the SB Division was considered a "line" organization, the CI Staff's name would imply (if the Agency's formal organization were to be taken at face value) that its function was limited to advising a command echelon. In fact, such a distinction was never enforced.

"CI Staff" was actually a misnomer, because the organization carrying this name did not even concern itself to any appreciable extent with the counterintelligence function of the Agency on a worldwide basis. Rather, it concentrated on the USSR and Soviet Bloc countries.

Within the SB Division, there was lodged the so-called Soviet CI Group, which was in many respects a competitor of the CI Staff. It concerned itself, during most of the period to be covered in this report, primarily with information

*This area component during the period of this report was known as Soviet Russia Division (1952-1966) and Soviet Bloc Division (1966-1974). The two names are often used interchangeably.

SECRET

SECRET

-4-

on the intelligence and counterintelligence organs of the USSR, and as such was inevitably somewhat redundant since the same field was the major preoccupation of the CI Staff. Nevertheless, as will emerge later in this report, there was during most of the period with which we are concerned a substantial congruity of views between the SB/CI Group and CI Staff that militated in favor of coherent operational policy, even though the two organizations might disagree on matters of detail.

One curious aspect of the organizational problem should be mentioned at this point because, while seemingly minor, it may have played a significant role. While the SB Division understandably had a number of competent Russian linguists, the CI Staff did not have a single Russian linguist who could be brought to bear on either the Nosenko or Golitsyn case. The staff was therefore dependent for its data on translations of Nosenko material and, in the case of Golitsyn, on information obtained from discussions conducted with him in English, a language in which he was not fully fluent.

A third organizational participant in the Nosenko case was the Office of Security. This office had overlapping jurisdiction with CI Staff and, to a lesser extent, SB Division in any matter that involved a suspected Soviet or Soviet Bloc penetration of the Agency. While not usually a problem, the overlapping jurisdiction was considerable in both the Golitsyn and Nosenko cases because so much of the activity in connection with both operations revolved around allegations that the Soviets had penetrated the Agency at a high level.

Although allegations that the Soviets had recruited Agency staff employees did not first originate with Golitsyn, it was he who lent special force to them by spelling out a complicated theory of Soviet intentions and modus operandi. He thus provided a detailed conceptual framework within which to develop a hypothesis towards which some members of the Agency were already predisposed. Golitsyn thus became the ideologue's ideologue.

Prior to Golitsyn's defection, the Agency as a whole had been hard hit by its dealings with high-level Soviet penetrations of Western governments. There is no need to go into detail on them, since they have been well documented elsewhere, but they included British representatives such as Kim Philby and George Blake. Another important penetration was Heinz Felde, who rose to be Deputy Chief of Soviet

SECRET

SECRET

-5-

Counterintelligence in the Bundesnachrichtendienst (BND). The Felde case is particularly significant because it was believed by a number of counterintelligence specialists in the Agency that Felde's career had been systematically promoted by the Soviets through what came to be known as the "throw-away" technique. According to the theory of this group, a considerable number of valuable and productive Soviet intelligence operations in Germany were made available to Felde so that, by detecting them and signaling their presence to the West German authorities, he could build up his reputation as a counterintelligence specialist. While there is debate about the value of the assets the Soviets made available, there appears to be enough substance to this theory for it to have had a strong impact within the Agency, particularly upon those persons who were members of the former Eastern European (EE) Division of the Plans Directorate.

In the course of time, the continuing record of KGB success in penetrating Western governments made it the more feared of the two principal Soviet intelligence services. Although we had had our successes also in penetrating the Soviets, they were primarily through GRU defectors-in-place such as Popov and Penkovskiy. The defection of Anatoliy Golitsyn on 15 December 1961 was thus a major event.

Once again, it is not necessary here to go into details regarding Golitsyn, because this case has been covered extensively in a recent study. However, two points are worth noting:

1. First, Golitsyn was diagnosed early in 1962 as a "paranoid personality." Although account was taken of this psychological problem, it was considered in the light of a threat to the continuity of the debriefing process rather than as a factor reflecting on the validity of the purported intelligence he gave us. It was apparently felt that, if we could maintain his stability, we could depend not only upon the objectively verifiable facts he gave us but also upon his often very theoretical generalizations.

2. Secondly, Golitsyn presented us right from the beginning, continually elaborated throughout the years, a complicated rationale for believing that the KGB was successfully pursuing a mammoth program of "disinformation" to the detriment of the

SECRET

SECRET

-6-

United States and its Western allies. This rationale is covered in more detail in Chapter VI of this report.

It is against this background that we view the approach to CIA by Nosenko and his subsequent handling. In doing so, we shall for ease of reference from time to time allude to the thesis regarding KGB operations and intentions--elaborated by Golitsyn and others--as the "Monster Plot." In fairness, it must be allowed that this term was in common usage not by the thesis' proponents but rather by its detractors; yet no other name serves so aptly to capsulize what the theorizers envisaged as a major threat to United States' security. If the term carries with it emotive connotations, the latter were certainly shared by both sides to the controversy; and this fact alone is enough to justify including "Monster Plot" in the lexicon of this study.

SECRET

SECRET

-7-

CHAPTER II

Biographical Data: 1927-1962

Yuriy Ivanovich Nosenko was born 30 October 1927 in Nikolayev, Ukrainian SSR, son of Ivan Isidorovich Nosenko and Tamara Georgiyevna Markovskaya. His father was born in 1902 and died on 2 August 1956. At the time of his death, the senior Nosenko was Minister of Shipbuilding, a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU, a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and recipient of a number of the highest Soviet awards and medals. He received a state funeral, and he is commemorated by a plaque on the Kremlin wall. Young Nosenko's brother, Vladimir, born in 1944, was a student at the Institute of International Relations as of 1964.

From his birth until 1934, Nosenko lived in Nikolayev. In 1934 he and his mother joined the senior Nosenko in Leningrad, where the latter was working as chief engineer at the Sudomekh shipbuilding plant. Nosenko continued his schooling in Leningrad until late 1938, at which time he and his mother followed the senior Nosenko to Moscow, where he was to serve as Deputy People's Commissar of the Shipbuilding Industry.

In 1941, shortly after the war broke out, Nosenko and his mother were evacuated to Chelyabinsk in the Urals. Nosenko stated that he and a friend tried to run off to the front, but they were caught and returned home. At age 14 Nosenko entered a Special Naval School that, in August 1942, was relocated to Kuybyshev. Later, this school was forced to relocate again, this time to Achinsk in Siberia. Nosenko did not want to go to Siberia and, through the influence of his father, was accepted at the Frunze Naval Preparatory School in Leningrad (not to be confused with the Frunze Higher Naval School, also in Leningrad), which by this time had been relocated to Baku.

Some time after August 1943, Nosenko tried on two separate occasions to get to the front, but failed. He and a friend did succeed in returning home to Moscow without authorization. These escapades seem to form part of a behavior pattern that was eventually to culminate in defection.

By August 1944, Nosenko had resumed his studies at the Frunze Naval Preparatory School, which had returned to its

SECRET

SECRET

- 8 -

original location in Leningrad. Cadets from this school were sent to a forest (some two hundred kilometers from Leningrad) on a wood-cutting detail. In about November of that year he wounded himself, seemingly accidentally, and was hospitalized. He decided not to return to the Frunze Naval Preparatory School and again, through his father's intervention in about January 1945, entered a shipbuilding college (tekhnikum) in Leningrad.

At the end of World War II, Nosenko returned to Moscow. He had meanwhile obtained a certificate from the director of the shipbuilding college that attested to his study in, and the completion of, the tenth class.

At some time prior to July 1945, Nosenko accompanied his father, who went to East Germany with a group of engineers. For purposes of that trip, Nosenko received temporary rank as an Army senior lieutenant, with appropriate documents and uniform.

Nosenko entered the Institute of International Relations in Moscow in July 1945. Upon completion of the second year at the Institute, and by virtue of his participation in a military training program roughly equivalent to the ROTC, Nosenko received the rank of junior lieutenant in the "administrative service" (sic). (The exact meaning of this term is unclear.)

In 1946, according to Nosenko, he married, against his parents' wishes, a student whom he had gotten pregnant. He obtained a divorce almost immediately following their marriage. In about 1947, he married the daughter of Soviet Lieutenant General (Major General, US-style) Telegin. This marriage, too, was neither successful nor long-lived. Nosenko reported he had found his wife in bed with her brother. A girl was later born with a harelip and a cleft palate. Nosenko insisted that this was not his child.

Nosenko completed a four-year course at the Institute of International Relations, but he actually received his diploma a year later, in 1950, because he had failed the examination in Marxism. He had had to wait an extra year in order to retake this examination.

In March 1951, Nosenko was assigned as an English language translator in naval intelligence (Naval RU), serving first in the Far East. While on leave in Moscow.

SECRET

SECRET

-9-

(late April 1952), he developed an illness that caused him to cough up blood, and he entered a tuberculosis sanatorium near Moscow for treatment. For reasons of health, he did not return to the Far East but was sent instead to the Baltic area.

While on leave in Moscow in late 1952, Nosenko accompanied his parents to a New Year's Eve party at the dacha of a certain General Bogdan Zakharovich Kobulov. When Nosenko indicated interest in changing jobs, the general made a vague offer of help in getting employment with the Ministry of State Security (MGB). In March 1953, while again in Moscow, Nosenko was called to Kobulov's office. Kobulov had just returned from Germany to become the First Deputy Minister of the MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs). Nosenko did not see Kobulov personally but was referred by the latter's assistant to the deputy chief of the Second Chief Directorate (internal counterintelligence), hereafter referred to as SCD, by whom he was hired.

His first MGB assignment was in the First (American embassy) Section of the First (American) Department of the SCD.

In March 1953, following Stalin's death, Lavrentiy Beriya emerged from the resultant reshuffling of the top leadership as chief of both the MVD and MGB. In March 1954, the new "Committee" for State Security--the KGB--was formed.

In June 1953 Nosenko married his third wife, Lyudmila Yulianovna Khozhevnikova, who was a student at the Moscow State University.

Nosenko, a member of the Komsomol since 1943, was elected secretary of the SCD Komsomol unit in June 1953 and served as secretary of that unit until about June 1954. However, earlier in 1954, Nosenko had contracted venereal disease and gone to a clinic; to disguise his identity, he used operational documentation in alias in applying for treatment. When he did not go back for final treatment as instructed, the clinic sent a letter to his ostensible place of work as shown on the alias document. The MVD found out about this improper use of alias documentation and reported it to the SCD. Nosenko was not only disciplined by the chief, SCD (reprimanded and placed under arrest for 15 days), but the Komsomol also removed him as secretary and expelled him from its organization.

SECRET

SECRET

-10-

In early spring 1955, Nosenko received a poor kharakteristika (performance evaluation), which described him as unsuitable for work in the First Department. Nonetheless, he was neither dismissed nor transferred.

Although Nosenko survived the 1954 episode as well as the poor performance report, these events caused him to go on what he has described as a "big drunk," which resulted in his having to spend a month under hospital care. To keep Nosenko out of further trouble, his mother intervened by making a telephone call to Petr Vasilyevich Fedotov, chief of the SCD. Seemingly as a result of her efforts, Nosenko was transferred in the latter part of May 1955 to the Second Section (which operated against tourists) of the Seventh Department, SCD. In late 1955, Lieutenant General Oleg Mikhaylovich Griбанov was appointed chief of the SCD. From a number of indications, Nosenko's relationship with Griбанov developed, despite the difference in rank and position, into a social relationship involving evenings on the town together, heavy drinking, and women. Despite numerous indiscretions, Nosenko's survival within the KGB and his subsequent promotions to increasingly responsible positions may well have resulted in part from Griбанov's patronage. To a considerable degree, of course, his rise must also be attributed to his being the son of a highly-placed member of the Soviet government.

At this point in his KGB career, Nosenko had lost his Komsomol membership and not achieved CP-member status. It was not until 1956 that he was accepted as a candidate member of the CP, and only in 1957 that he was admitted as a full Party member. Once this happened, according to Nosenko, the Komsomol removed its reprimand from his file.

In December 1959, Nosenko was promoted to the rank of captain. He held this rank until his defection in February 1964, despite having been promised he would be promoted and the fact that he had held several positions that were usually filled by officers of higher military rank.

Nosenko worked in the Seventh Department, SCD until January 1960, when he was transferred back to the First Section (American embassy) of the First Department. Then he held the position of a deputy chief of the First Section. He was retransferred back to the Seventh Department as of late December 1961-early January 1962. In July 1962, he was appointed deputy chief of the Seventh Department. He

SECRET

SECRET

-11-

continued in this position until 18 January 1964, the date he left Moscow on TDY to Geneva.

Nosenko defected in Geneva on 4 February 1964, leaving behind in Moscow his wife, Lyudmila, and two daughters. His prior travels to the West had included two TDYs to England in 1957 and 1958, a TDY to Cuba in 1960, and the first TDY to Geneva from mid-March until June 1962. He also went on TDY to Bulgaria in 1961. Details of his defection and subsequent developments are covered in Chapter III.

SECRET

SECRET

-12-

CHAPTER III

Chronicle: 1962-1969A. Initial Contacts

When Nosenko first approached the CIA on 9 June 1962, he had been assigned, as a representative of the KGB Second Chief Directorate, to be security officer of the Soviet delegation to the Disarmament Conference being held in the Palais des Nations in Geneva. Taking advantage of the fact that he was the watchdog for the delegation whereas its members could not watch him, Nosenko used his freedom of movement to approach the Agency, ostensibly for personal financial assistance.

As he told it, Nosenko had recently slept with a Swiss woman who had stolen 900 Swiss Francs of official funds that he had on his person at the time; inability to reimburse this relatively trivial amount (about US \$250 at the time) would jeopardize his career. In exchange for 2,000 Swiss Francs, he therefore proposed that he provide us with two items of information. These items, subsequently verified, related to:

1. KGB recruitment of a US Army sergeant while he was serving in the American embassy in Moscow as a "code machine repairman."
2. A Soviet official whom the Agency had ostensibly recruited but who was being run against us under KGB control.

At this time Nosenko was not forthcoming in response to general intelligence requirements on which we tried to quiz him, excluded the possibility of becoming an agent, and flatly refused to consider meeting Agency representatives inside the USSR. Nevertheless, he "agreed 'perhaps' meet us when abroad" again at a later date. For our part, our interest in him was whetted by his identification of his deceased father as a former minister of the USSR. In addition, such information as he gave about himself indicated that he would be of high operational interest. Inter alia his most recent assignment in Moscow was as head of a KGB sub-section working against American tourists.

SECRET

SECRET

-13-

B. Bona Fides

By 11 June, the two case officers (one a native Russian speaker) who were handling Nosenko sent a cable to Headquarters that read in part:

SUBJ CONCLUSIVELY PROVED BONA FIDES. PROVIDED INFO OF IMPORTANCE AND SENSITIVITY, SUBJ NOW COMPLETELY COOPERATIVE. WILLING MEET WHEN ABROAD AND WILL MEET AS OFTEN AND AS LONG AS POSSIBLE UNTIL DEPARTURE 15 JUNE.

With the question of bona fides seemingly resolved, the principal case officer flew to Washington carrying the tapes of the meeting. His arrival and sojourn at Headquarters were described by Chief, CI on 23 July 1976 as follows:

Chief, CI: . . . we got the first message . . . on Nosenko from Geneva, and [the principal case officer] was ordered back, and we had a big meeting here on Saturday morning, and [the principal case officer] thought he had the biggest fish of his life. I mean he really did . . . and everything I heard from him was in direct contrast from what we heard from Golitsyn. I mean, we had no agents, this, that and . . . yet here was a Second Chief Directorate man in Geneva peace talks on disarmament. So I got hold of [the principal case officer], and I brought him in here on a weekend.

Q: What you're saying is that it was unreasonable for a Second Chief Directorate man to be there . . .

Chief, CI: Under the circumstances, getting drunk and needing \$300 to . . . "not to be recruited but to give us three full, big secrets" for an exchange for the money in order that he could replenish the account from which he embezzled the money on a drunk. So I brought [the principal case officer] in here one evening, I think it was Friday, Saturday and a Sunday, and I brought about

SECRET

SECRET

-14-

10 to 15 volumes of Golitsyn's interrogation, without prejudicing him in any way, just to read it, and he had all the books out, and at the end of it all he said that there was no question about it, that they were being had. I mean, mind you, he was of split motivation because this was the big case of his entire life and yet there he was reading material, etc. So we went to Dick [Helms, then DDP] and we put up a proposition that we should permit Golitsyn to read the real material, I mean the transcripts and everything from Nosenko. And he wouldn't agree to that, but we made a compromise and that was to take the material and falsify it as though it was an anonymous letter sent to the embassy by an alleged KGB person. So the anonymous letter was drawn up, and [the principal case officer] interviewed Golitsyn with the anonymous letter, and Golitsyn's statement was that "this is a person under control, I want to see the letter" which created a situation because we didn't have a letter. But he began to point out in some detail exactly what was instigating and inspiring-- in terms of what he'd already given to us and he very wisely stated that he wanted everything on tape, because he knew that as time passed in hundreds of interviews and their counteraction took place, there would be people accusing him of not having divulged certain information.

The principal case officer's review of the Golitsyn information had indeed converted him to the view that Nosenko's defection was bogus. Equally convinced, as clearly indicated by a number of documents that he drafted, was his superior, the person who had become Chief, SR Division in December 1963. The reasons for Chief, SR's conviction may not have been the same as the principal case officer's, but for all practical purposes the views of the two men at the time were identical.

A joint CI Staff-SR Division recommendation was therefore made to Richard Helms, the Deputy for Plans,

SECRET

SECRET

-15-

that the transcripts of the Nosenko debriefings be made available to Golitsyn for comment. Helms agreed, with the single reservation that Nosenko not be identified by name as the source. As a result, a number of items of information from Nosenko were embodied on a letter ostensibly stemming from an anonymous KGB source; in this form, it was assumed, the information could be shown to Golitsyn without disclosing the source. (This ruse seemed plausible enough, since a previous defector, Michal Goleniewski, had written CIA a number of anonymous letters before eventually defecting and disclosing his identity.)

In carrying out the plan, the principal case officer made his own views clear to Golitsyn:

I told [Golitsyn] that . . . I thought it quite possible, in view of his own statements about disinformation, that this was the beginning of a disinformation operation possibly relating to [his] defection.

Golitsyn felt, in general and without having the full details necessary to an assessment, that there were indeed serious signs of disinformation in this affair. He felt such a disinformation operation, to discredit him, was a likelihood, as he had earlier said. A KGB officer could be permitted to tell everything he knew, now, if he worked in the same general field as Golitsyn had. When told that so far this source had not done anything to discredit Golitsyn, and had in fact reported that the KGB is greatly upset about Golitsyn's defection, and asked what he thought the purposes of such a disinformation operation now might be, Golitsyn agreed that kidnapping was a likely one, "to arrange an exchange for me." Also, to divert our attention from investigations of his leads by throwing up false scents, and to protect their remaining sources. He also added, "There could be other aims as well. The matter should be looked into. It seems serious to me." He thought the KGB might allow a first series of direct meetings with the KGB officer, to build up our confidence, and then in the next session do whatever the operation's purpose

SECRET

SECRET

-16-

might be (discredit Golitsyn, kidnap, pass serious disinformation items, etc.).

C. The Case Against Nosenko

During the remainder of 1962 and 1963, SR Division continued to build up a case against Nosenko. Virtually any information provided by Nosenko, or action taken by him, was interpreted as part of a KGB "provocation." If his information was in accord with that from other sources, this fact not only confirmed our suspicion of Nosenko but was interpreted as casting doubt on the other sources as well.

While the above aspect will be covered at length in Chapters V and VI, one example will serve to highlight the attitude that prevailed. Nosenko had, during our meetings with him in 1962, contributed information that materially aided in the identification and arrest of William John Christopher Vassall, a British Admiralty official who was also a KGB agent. Because Golitsyn had previously provided similar, but less specific, information, the usefulness of Nosenko's intelligence was discounted; once Vassall had been identified, it was concluded that Nosenko had been allowed to expose him in order to support his own *bona fides*. The argument ran that Vassall would in any case have been identified sooner or later on the basis of Golitsyn's leads.

In January 1964, Nosenko reappeared in Geneva accompanying another Soviet delegation. By now, the case against him had been well established in the minds of those dealing with the matter, and the record is therefore replete with manifestations of suspicion. A particular example of our tendency to interpret unfavorably almost anything Nosenko said is provided by notes that Chief, SR forwarded to Helms on 27 January 1964, with the suggestion that they "convey very well the flavor of the man . . . and the complexities of the operation." By way of background, although Nosenko's cryptonym at this juncture was AEFOXTROT, he had previously been designated AEBARMAN. This bit of history led to the following incident during a safehouse meeting:

I cannot attribute to coincidence a bizarre remark AEFOXTROT made on 24 January. As I went

SECRET

SECRET

-17-

behind a bar which stands in the apartment, to serve drinks to AEFOXTROT . . . AEFOXTROT saw me standing there behind the bar and his face lit up and he said with a smile, "Ha. You are the barman." Now this could be an idle pleasantry about my standing there like a bartender, but it is not funny as AEFOXTROT (ex-AEBARMAN) seemed to think it was and I am afraid it means that he knows his own CIA cryptonym.

The above incident exemplifies a main theme that CIA was itself penetrated. This fear had existed before Golitsyn defected, but it was fed constantly by the latter's allegations that information concerning him was leaking to the KGB, and the conclusion that the leaks must have originated within the Agency.

Thus it was that a memorandum from Chief, SR on 27 January 1964, submitted to and approved by Helms, began as follows:

Our goal in this case must be eventually to break Subject and learn from him the details of his mission and its relation to possible penetrations of US intelligence and security agencies and those of allied nations as well as to broader disinformation operations in the political sphere. Ideally, our interests would be best served if Subject were broken as early as possible but since this is unlikely, our actions must be conceived and carried out in a manner which contributes to our basic goal without alerting Subject unduly at any stage.

Far from "alerting Subject unduly," on the surface the Agency welcomed Nosenko with both cordiality and generosity. The following excerpts from a 30 January 1964 meeting make the point clearly:

Nosenko: . . . the only thing I wanted to know and I asked this question, "What should I expect in the future?"

Principal case officer:

The following awaits: As I presented it, you wanted to come to the United States and

SECRET

SECRET

-18-

have some job, some chance of a future life, which gives you security and if possible the opportunity to work in this field which you know. Is that correct?

Nosenko: Absolutely.

Principal case officer:

Mr. Helms said yes, flatly absolutely yes, in fact I would say enthusiastic . . . that's the only word to describe it. We talked about, and since this was a business discussion I'll repeat all of it whether it was pleasant or unpleasant. So the next thing will be some details that we spoke about. We talked about the means by which [you] could have a solid career with a certain personal independence. Because of the very great assistance you've been to us already and because of this desire to give you a backing, they will give you a little additional personal security . . . [salary details follow].

D. Defection

As might be expected, the principal case officer devoted a good deal of effort during the second Geneva visit to persuading Nosenko to stay in place. Nosenko, however, dismissed out of hand the possibility of remaining in contact with CIA from within the Soviet Union, and he became increasingly anxious to defect immediately. When the principal case officer continued to press him to remain in Geneva long enough to effect an audio penetration of the local rezidentura, Nosenko forced the issue. At a meeting on 4 February, he announced that a cable had been received from Moscow ordering him back home for a "tourism conference." Though this claim was subsequently to be the source of almost endless controversy, it was accepted at the time without apparent question. Preparations therefore immediately began for evacuation to the United States.

A layover in another country en route to the United States lasted about a fortnight. It was used for further

SECRET

SECRET

-19-

debriefing and assessment, but, while useful from the operational handlers' standpoint, the delay raised problems as their charge became impatient:

CAN EASILY CONTINUE DEBRIEFING FOR ANOTHER FEW DAYS ALONG ABOVE LINES. SUBJ IS CARRYING MANY NOTES OUTLINING DETAILS ALL SCD OPS KNOWN TO HIM WHICH HE WANTS TO CARRY PERSONALLY AND PRESENT TO HEADQUARTERS IN ORDER TO AVOID ARRIVING WITH EMPTY HANDS. WORKING ON THIS MATERIAL WILL OCCUPY US PROFITABLY BUT SUBJ NEEDS SOONEST SOME EXPRESSION OF HEADQUARTERS REACTIONS AND PLANS FOR ONWARD MOVEMENT. HIS VIEW OF CURRENT SITUATION IS THAT IT IS NECESSARY TRANSITION. HE WILL NOT UNDERSTAND INDEFINITE DELAY. REMEMBER THAT SUBJ HAS JUST MADE AN ENORMOUS DECISION AND FACED A TURNING POINT IN HIS LIFE. SIMPLY TO MOVE THE LOCALE TO ANOTHER COUNTRY AND SIT WITH THE SAME CASE OFFICERS FULL TIME IN A SAFEHOUSE IS HARDLY WHAT HE EXPECTS. REQUEST URGENTLY THAT HEADQUARTERS PROVIDE SOME RECOGNITION TO SUBJ. AMONG ALTERNATIVES WE CAN SUGGEST ARE:

- A. [CHIEF, SR] TRIP WITH ONE OR TWO DAYS DISCUSSION OF LONG RANGE OPS PLANS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATIONS FOR ONWARD MOVE . . .

The above cable triggered a visit by Chief, SR. Nothing that happened during this visit modified his already well-formed views. After a conference with the two principal handlers he wrote:

Both . . . were unanimous in their view that Subject was not a genuine defector. His contact with us in Geneva and subsequent defection were, according to these officers, clearly undertaken at the direction of the KGB. I was particularly interested in [one officer's] statement that he had suspected Subject from the very first meeting on the basis of Subject's emotionless and mechanical delivery of his statement announcing his intention to defect.

After my talks with the case officers, I had my first visit with Subject at the safehouse.

SECRET

SECRET

-20-

This lasted from 2000 to 2230 and included dinner with Subject and the case officers. Conversation during this first meeting was general in nature and followed no special agenda. However, it did give me an opportunity to take Subject's measure. I started by telling Subject that I had come to form my own impressions of him as a person and an intelligence officer who desired to place his knowledge and experience at the disposal of the United States government. I added that I wished to determine for myself why Subject had come to the West, a most serious step which neither we nor Subject should underestimate in terms of its lasting effect on Subject's own life and those of his family left behind. Subject rose to this opening by first assuring me in a most fawning manner that he, as an intelligence officer, fully understood the need for a senior officer to make his own judgments on the spot. He then went on to explain his motivation for first contacting us, his reasons for defecting and his intense desire to collaborate with us in Soviet operations since he has no specialty other than intelligence. These remarks were repetitious of his original statements delivered in the same mechanical fashion, the major difference being that Subject was intensely nervous at the outset, calming down only after it appeared that I was accepting his statements at face value.

By the end of the evening I had come to the same conclusions reached by [the principal handlers]. The totality of our conclusions are treated in detail in a separate memorandum. However, in reaching them, I was beset by a sense of irritation at the KGB's obvious conviction they could pull off an operation like this successfully and by a feeling of distaste for the obvious and transparent manner in which Subject played his role.

Chief, SR's distaste was sufficient to overcome any interest he might otherwise have had in a recruitment opportunity suggested by Nosenko:

SECRET

SECRET

-21-

One other subject touched upon . . . was the possible recruitment of Vladimir Suslov, Under-Secretary in the UN Secretariat and top-ranking Soviet in the UN organization . . . Subject [described] Suslov as a playboy who liked liquor and women and who could be easily blackmailed into cooperation for fear of hurting his career in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I objected to the blackmail angle saying that it could cause a tremendous political flap if it backfired. Undaunted, Subject modified his position to assure us that it would not have to be "crude blackmail" in which we would have to get directly involved. I certainly got the impression that Suslov's recruitment is part of the plan and that we would succeed no matter how half-heartedly we tried.

Despite his misgivings, however, Chief, SR remained convinced that the Agency must continue to dissemble:

It will be necessary to maintain an effective degree of secrecy with regard to our knowledge of Subject's true status and our plans to try to secure from him a full confession. If Subject, or the Soviets, become aware of our intentions, we will probably be forced to act prematurely.

With these considerations in mind, he therefore renewed the commitments previously made by the principal case officer:

I informed Subject that I was satisfied that he was genuine. Based on this and assuming his continuing "cooperation," I said we would proceed to make arrangements to bring him to the States. Second, I confirmed our agreement to pay him . . . [financial details follow].

On 12 February, consistent with the above commitments, Nosenko was flown to the Washington area and lodged in a safehouse, under close supervision of the Office of Security. Now that he was in the United States, the Agency (and the US government as a whole) found themselves faced with a seeming dilemma, much more crucial than the problems facing them while he remained abroad.

SECRET

SECRET

-22-

The Agency's perception of the dilemma, and the possible solutions to it, are covered in paragraphs 3, 4, 6 and 7 of a memorandum written by Chief, SR and approved by Helms on 17 February 1964:

While admitting that Subject is here on a KGB directed mission, it has been generally agreed by both us and the FBI that he still possesses valid information which we would like to obtain. At the same time, we, at least, believe that Subject must be broken at some point if we are to learn something of the full scope of the KGB plan, the timing for its execution, and the role played by others in it. In addition, we must have this information if we are to decide what countermeasures we should take in terms of counter-propaganda, modifications in our security practices, and planning for future operations against the Soviet target. Admittedly, our desire to continue debriefing to obtain additional information may conflict with the need to break Subject. Clearly, the big problem is one of timing. How long can we keep Subject, or his KGB controllers, ignorant of our awareness of this operation and how long will it take us to assemble the kind of brief we will need to initiate a hostile interrogation in conditions of maximum control?

If we are to proceed along the lines indicated above we should accept in advance the premise that we will not be able to prevent Subject from evading our custody or communicating with the Soviets unless we place him under such physical restraint that it will become immediately apparent to him that we suspect him. This may not be an acceptable risk and if it is not, we should so determine right away and decide on a completely different course of action. If this is to be the case, we should agree to forego additional debriefings, place Subject in escape-proof quarters away from the Washington area under full-time guard and commence hostile debriefing on the basis of the material we already have (although the prospects for success would not be great). Disposal would probably be via Berlin followed by a brief press

SECRET

SECRET

-23-

release to the effect that Subject had confessed to being a plant and had been allowed to return to Soviet control. [In the meantime, SR Division would:]

- Advise Subject that during this phase he will continue to live and work in the safehouse and will be escorted at all times when on shopping trips, visits to movies, etc., because of his faulty English and unfamiliarity with the country, customs, etc. While we can explain this regime as needed for his security, we cannot keep him locked up in the house 24 hours a day.
- Provide Subject with "flash" documentation in another name to be carried on his person during excursions from the house. They may also help persuade him he has been accepted.
- Make available to Subject a portion of the [money] promised him which he can use for purchases of clothes, cigarettes, personal effects, etc.
- Agree that whenever this first phase is over (four to six weeks) that he be permitted to take a two-week vacation with escort.

The vacation period will be of greater benefit to us since it will provide us with an opportunity to review and make judgments on the value of the information already obtained and also to consider the progress made in the other aspects of the case outlined below. During the vacation we can decide whether we should proceed to the second phase or are ready to commence hostile interrogation under controlled conditions. If it is the former, we will have to reckon with the need to modify the living and working arrangements for Subject in a way which will inevitably give him some additional freedom. At the same time, we would be expected to move forward with Subject's legalization, i.e., final decision on a name he will use, securing an alien registration card, establishing a bank account, etc. Therefore, it

SECRET

SECRET

-24-

will be terribly important to make the proper decision at the end of phase one.

This decision will depend not only on our evaluation of the material obtained during the debriefings but on how far we have been able to go in clarifying other cases which are related to Subject case and form an important part of any explanation of the KGB's goals in this operation.

Thus, Nosenko was surrounded from the first with ambivalence and uncertainty. On the one hand, he was housed in circumstances that his principal day-to-day handler describes as "our typical, luxurious style . . ." He continues by saying that "there was all the food and drink one could possibly want . . . I remember all of the effort and the money we spent to get a billiard table . . ." On the other hand, this handler, who was assigned to this case after having worked on the Golitsyn affair, was told at the outset that Nosenko was "dirty, that he had been sent by the KGB . . ."

Writing of his first meeting with Nosenko on 13 February, the handler recorded his first impressions of Nosenko:

In this brief meeting lasting actually less than two hours, I couldn't prevent myself from putting him in three successive categories. In the first few minutes I put him in the category of a Cuban exile living in the Harlem section of New York City. This impression came to my mind strictly on the basis of his clothing (dark trousers and sport shirt, black elevated shoes, sharply pointed and with a design) and his mannerisms . . .

Half way through the session I put him in the category of a big city but small-time con man. While dictating . . . from his notes, he knew exactly what he wanted to say and how he wanted to say it. But when I had brief conversations with him on other topics, or when I saw him stealing glances in my direction to size me up, I could almost see the con man's wheels turning rapidly in his head. I had an urge to check my wallet just to make sure it was still safe.

SECRET

SECRET

-25-

As the session ended and we moved into the living room I put him in a third category. Before leaving the debriefing room I noticed how he touched [another case officer] on the shoulder. When [that case officer] went downstairs for a few minutes, [Nosenko] and I walked into the living room. During that brief walk I decided to give him a President Johnson handshake (hand and elbow grasp, Texas style) on departure and a few sincere words about how pleased I was to meet and talk with him, but his actions soon changed my mind. As soon as we reached the middle of the living room he gave me an unexpected and prolonged hug around the shoulders and waist, the type that one man gives another well known to him only after some achievement such as making the decisive point in a football game. His embrace really took me by surprise and I had to pull away from him without hurting his feelings. At this point I realized that I couldn't go through with the President Johnson handshake; he'd have to settle for less. In this, the third category, I saw him as a jazz musician who sells heroin on the side and has homosexual tendencies.

A week later, on 20 February, however, the handler reported more favorable impressions, those of the Office of Security personnel assigned to guard Nosenko at the safehouse:

Subject is not at all concerned about his own security or the threat of assassination or kidnapping. He seems to think the present security system is fine . . . [This was in marked contrast to Golitsyn's behavior.]

Subject is not a heavy drinker and is never "under the influence" . . .

Subject is not a heavy smoker . . .

At mealtime Subject sits at the dining table with the guards and acts as if he is one of the boys. He does not sit at the head of the table but to the side. He always offers the

SECRET

SECRET

-26-

boys a drink, asks them to take more food, and kids them . . .

He does not play cards, has shown no interest in chess, and has not mentioned checkers. He does not gamble and doesn't seem to have any hobby or inside activity to keep himself busy. He has shown a desire to play pool . . .

Subject does not say anything for or against the USSR or the Communist Party. Even when viewing the Olympics on TV Subject never once commented on how good the Soviets were and how poor a showing the Americans made. The same could not be said for . . . [Golitsyn] . . . On the contrary Subject wants to be an American as soon as possible.

Subject's sexual desires appear to be normal . . . Subject has made several joking references to their all going together to a house of prostitution . . . Subject definitely wants a woman and the sooner the better . . .

Subject has not commented one way or another, for or against, any person associated with him, including the housekeepers. Compared with other cases he is ideal. He is polite, likes to kid, doesn't have a drinking problem, doesn't have a mental problem, and wants to become an American and work like and with Americans as soon as possible.

Subject became angry only once and even then it was not a loss of temper in the true sense. The day that [the principal case officer] discussed the schedule with him, Subject became moody and started to drink alone. He told the guards that he wants to use his brains and work hard as Americans do. He feels that the present schedule does not utilize his talent to the fullest.

The "schedule" referred to above had been outlined to Nosenko in a 17 February meeting, during which the principal case officer had assured him that "both [Chief, SR] and myself are enthusiastically optimistic about

SECRET

SECRET

-27-

future cooperation with him in operations against the USSR." Nosenko greeted plans for a period devoted to systematic debriefing with the statement that this "might represent an attempt to extract all his information from him, after which he would not be needed." He also said he needed a vacation at "an early date in order to help him forget and get over the strain and worry of his abrupt change of situation, particularly the strain of leaving his family behind."

E. The Problem of Disposition

Far from being optimistic about our "cooperation" with Nosenko, SR Division was discussing the possibility of forcibly returning him to the Soviets if the "overall effort to break him" came to naught. In addition, an alternative plan was being developed for the incarceration of Nosenko, so that "there can be no question of [his] escaping after he becomes aware of our attitude." Finally, it was agreed that Golitsyn, who had meanwhile recognized Nosenko as the author of the ostensible "anonymous letter" of 26 June 1962, would be brought into the operation to back up our interrogation. Helms originally had some misgivings about this procedure but appears eventually to have agreed to giving Golitsyn "full access" to material from Nosenko, but not to Nosenko himself.

The FBI viewed Nosenko much more favorably than did CIA. As early as 8 February 1964, Chief, CI had sent a cable reading in part:

. . . [FBI liaison officer] STATED . . . THAT FRIEND OF HIS WHO IS EXPERT IN FBI QUICKLY SCANNED AEFOTROT PRODUCTION AND CAUTIONED US THAT "IT LOOKS VERY GOOD" IN TERMS OF CASES KNOWN TO THEM.

Later, in a memorandum to Helms on 9 March, Chief, SR stated that "the FBI personnel on the case have so far indicated they believe Subject to be a genuine KGB defector." By implication, both Chief, SR and Chief, CI regarded this divergence of view as a serious problem. Their concern is understandable, because a subsequent paragraph of the Chief, SR memorandum contained plans for the following action, to be initiated around 1 April

SECRET

SECRET

-28-

1964, which would not be appropriate if CIA were forced, as a result of inter-agency consultations, to treat Nosenko as a bona fide defector:

- a. Subject to be moved to a high security safehouse under maximum guard.
- b. The DCI to inform the President, Secretary of State, Director, FBI, and USIB principals that Subject is a KGB plant whom we intend to return to Soviet control after (1) trying to break him, and (2) publicizing his case.
- c. Retain Subject incommunicado for about three weeks during which time we will continue efforts to break him.
- d. At the same time, commence the publicity campaign which will precede Subject's deportation. As a first step, there will be a brief official announcement probably by a State Department spokesman to the effect that Subject has confessed to having faked his defection at KGB direction in order (1) to penetrate US intelligence and security agencies, and (2) to discredit the act of defection by Soviet citizens. At the same time, a press back-grounder will be made available which will characterize this KGB operation as an act of desperation following a decade of defection and disloyalty to the regime on the part of a score of senior Soviet intelligence officers . . .

F. Erratic Behavior and Its Aftermath

While planning was going on for his confinement and hostile interrogation, Nosenko was taken on a trip for two weeks' relaxation, beginning on 12 March. During this period, his consumption of alcohol was enormous, and his behavior became increasingly erratic. Prior to his departure, he had on several occasions been violent; on one occasion he took a swipe with his fist at the principal case officer and on another tried to strangle one of the Office of Security escorts.

SECRET

SECRET

-29-

The handler who spent the first part of the vacation with Nosenko recorded these impressions:

In my opinion Subject is under extreme tension and pressure. Any man who skips breakfast and starts the day off with alcohol is on his way to becoming an alcoholic. He drinks not for the enjoyment of it, but with an attempt to erase or lessen problems of a serious nature. I suspect that these tensions are the result of two things: one, fear on his part that he cannot follow through with his assignment; and, two, his homosexual desires. I predict that the situation will not improve but grow worse.

Yet the handler concluded on the following note:

Despite our oral arguments and the various incidents we experienced, Subject and I parted on the best of terms. He gave me an affectionate embrace on the night of my departure, and in front of [the principal case officer] thanked me for my attention to his needs and patience in dealing with him. We agreed to see each other upon his return to Washington.

During the last half of the vacation, the principal case officer arrived and took charge of the escort team. Nosenko was more restrained in his presence than he had been previously, but the principal case officer had no success in eliciting information from him during this period. Not only was Nosenko uninformative, according to the principal case officer, but he was also very tense and unable to sleep more than a few hours at a time.

Although debriefing was resumed upon returning to Washington, it cannot have been very successful. Nosenko was still drinking enormously and had by now discovered unfettered night life; it is doubtful that he was physically able to respond meaningfully to interrogation during the day.

On 30 March 1964, Chief, SR wrote a memorandum to Helms entitled "Final Phase Planning," which Helms initialed and returned without written comment. Inter alia, Chief, SR had this to say:

SECRET

SECRET

-30-

We have concluded that there is little to be gained by prolonging the status quo beyond next weekend and every reason to suspect that if Subject learns we doubt him, he will try to escape. Accordingly, we have instructed the security guards to be alert to any attempts on Subject's part to elude them . . .

Further scheduling must depend in considerable degree on the results of the interrogation. However, since we do not anticipate that Nosenko will ever break to the point of becoming completely cooperative, and since we must assume that within five or six days after the confrontation begins, news of our action will have leaked out through the briefings (however necessary they may have been), we should be ready to take this action:

Have State Department spokesman issue low key statement indicating that Nosenko is plant with mission to seek out and report on bona fide defectors living in the United States.

Mail letter in Moscow (or from Helsinki to Moscow) addressed to Lieutenant General Oleg Mikhailovich Griбанov which makes it clear that we were on to operation all along but also that choice of Nosenko as key figure in operation was a mistake. To emphasize latter point include as an attachment a description of Nosenko behavior. This would be couched in dry, almost clinical, language . . . Aside from the not inconsiderable satisfaction we will have in preparing it, this letter will serve to dissuade the Soviets from an overly hasty reaction to our press stories and should also make them reasonably anxious to get Nosenko back to determine what happened.

SECRET

SECRET

-31-

Since failure to "break" Nosenko--i.e., force him to admit that he had come to us not as a genuine defector but as a KGB-dispatched agent--was considered virtually certain, plans were also being laid to return him to the Soviet authorities. Before doing this, however, it would be necessary to:

. . . Discuss with Legal Counsel the legal problems which might be encountered in arranging Nosenko's deportation. The simplest method still appears to be [flying him] to Tempelhof in Berlin. Thence to S-Bahnhof Tiergarten where Subject, in his best civilian clothes, with diplomatic passport, would be placed on an S-Bahn which then stops inside East Berlin only at the control point S-Bahnhof Friedrichstrasse.

G. The Decision to Incarcerate

Although Nosenko had already contributed considerable intelligence of value (see Chapter IV), including information that led directly to the arrest of Vassall in 1962, there is no indication in the files from this period that the possibility of his being a bona fide defector was given any credence whatsoever, either within the Agency or in discussions with other parts of the government.

On the contrary, Nosenko was treated as one whose guilt had been established. Nevertheless, even while Chief, SR was registering with certainty his lack of hope for a favorable resolution, plans were drawn up for an "arrest," strict confinement and hostile interrogation.

The long-delayed polygraph evaluation was administered on 4 April 1964. It did not, however, take place under standard conditions. In his report of 8 April 1964, the polygraph operator stated:

During the pre-polygraph conferences with representatives of SR Division, the undersigned was informed that the polygraph interview was part of an overall plan to help break Subject and elicit the truth from him. SR Division's

SECRET

SECRET

-32-

instructions were that, regardless of whether Subject passed his polygraph test or not, he was to be informed at the termination of his polygraph interview that he was lying, and had not passed his polygraph interview.

H. First Polygraph Examination

To raise Nosenko's level of apprehension and reduce his supposed defenses against the polygraph interrogation technique, an additional mechanism was also attached to him, which he was told was an electroencephalograph (EEG). Chief, SR later commented that "Nosenko was completely confident of the polygraph when told that it would be used until he discovered that an electroencephalograph was used at the same time. The unexpected addition of the EEG to the polygraph was successful and materially aided the interrogators. Nosenko proved to be an excellent reactor . . . "

Despite the unusual circumstances surrounding the examination, the polygraph operator's conclusions, as stated in his report of 8 April 1964, were categorical:

It is the undersigned's conclusion that Subject is not a bona fide defector, but is a dispatched agent sent by Soviet Intelligence for a specific mission or missions.

According to the pre-agreed upon plan, the different phases involving various pertinent areas were covered with Subject polygraphically. Challenge of Subject's reactions was indirect and "soft." On no occasion did Subject even attempt to volunteer any explanation of the possible causes for his polygraph reactions. He continually denied and refused to admit that there was anything to any of the questions which were asked of him. When the final test questions were completed and a record was obtained of all of Subject's polygraphic responses, the nature of the challenge and probing was changed.

Subject was told that he was lying to numerous pertinent questions and was accused of being

SECRET

SECRET

-33-

a dispatched agent. Subject's only explanation to the undersigned's direct accusation was that he could not be a dispatched agent because of the amount of information he had volunteered to American Intelligence.

Subject, who before and throughout testing reflected complete self-control and composure, now exhibited a completely different picture. His composure was nonexistent, his eyes watered, and his hands trembled. Prior to being confronted with the undersigned's opinion that Subject was a dispatched agent, when Subject was asked on one of the last test runs (a) if he was sent to penetrate American Intelligence, and (b) if Subject received instructions from the KGB on how to attempt to beat the polygraph, his answers were given in a voice that actually trembled.

After completion of the interview, the SR representative at the safesite was informed, in front of Subject, of the undersigned's opinion that Subject was lying and was a dispatched Soviet agent. The Subject was taken into protective custody and escorted to his new place of residence.

Once arrived at the place of confinement, Nosenko was confronted by the principal case officer who broke the news that Nosenko had been under suspicion since 1962. The record of the meeting, a stormy one, is too long to reproduce here, but the following excerpt will convey its tone:

Principal case officer:

. . . Everything you have said in 1962 and 1964 is prepared, based on disinformation . . . All disinformation is true in parts. That's all right, we know that. Now if we can talk--what I want to do is talk the real truth . . . We want to talk about the operation which sent you and others to us . . .

Nosenko: (In Russian) . . . I don't understand. What has happened? What has happened? What's the matter? I don't understand.

SECRET

SECRET

-34-

Principal case officer:

What happened in 1962?

Nosenko: What happened in general?

Principal case officer:

Your operation was known from the beginning.

Nosenko: (In Russian) I can't understand anything. I give you my word, but then my word means nothing to you. I can't understand anything. All that I could do I tried to do. I tried to do it for my soul.

Chief, SR reported these subsequent developments as he saw them to Helms on 7 April:

The results of the polygraph were reviewed with the DDP on the basis of our sessions on 6 April with the polygraph examiner. He obtained significant reactions on those areas in which we were convinced Subject was withholding information or passing deception but also uncovered for us that Subject is somehow concerned about his biography.

The first interrogation after the polygraph was conducted on the afternoon of 6 April . . . [We] monitored the interrogation through a two-way mirror in an adjoining room. It was agreed before beginning this first interrogation that its purpose was to determine whether or not Subject would respond to questions or simply clam up after making some sort of statement. The areas we planned to hit as tests were some of those on which we knew he was passing deception material.

We were all gratified by the fact that Subject was ready and eager to explain himself and in responding to questions under tense cross-examination, particularly with regard to the sourcing of some of his information, he became quite erratic, contradicted himself many times and became upset physically.

SECRET

SECRET

-35-

As a result of this session, we know that Subject can be thrown off balance by aggressive questioning in those areas which we know to be important parts of the entire KGB operation. Thus, we will continue along these lines for several days with a specific interrogation plan mapped out for each session.

At the end of the first interrogation session, Subject noted that he had not harmed the United States in any way and that if we did not believe him, he would consider going to a third country because as he put it, "I could not return to the USSR." When we begin the next session with him, we will tell him that his statement with respect to not having harmed the US is erroneous. We will refer to his direct participation in the Barghoorn case and to the fact that his very mission itself is directed against US internal security. If he again raises the third country approach (but only if he raises it), we will advise him that were he to go to a third country at some point in the future that country would be fully apprised to our information concerning his mission to the West and the details of his personal behavior.

Whether Helms was informed of the peculiar conditions under which the polygraph was administered cannot be ascertained from the record. Chief, SR simply told him that the examiner had "obtained significant reactions" and that "Subject can be thrown off balance . . ." In this connection, it is useful to note here that, in a number of documents related to this case, this polygraph examination is referred to as valid evidence of Nosenko's duplicity, without giving the reader any hint of the unusual circumstances surrounding it. Even in the lengthy study of February 1967 (commonly referred to as "the thousand-page paper"), and in the shorter "green book" formally published in February 1968, one finds no cautionary notes. To put in perspective the developments of this case, both those already reported and those still to come, we shall therefore jump ahead briefly to quote from a formal Office of Security report covering a review of the 1964 examination. The senior of the three polygraph specialists who reviewed it stated his conclusions as follows, in a memorandum dated 1 November 1966:

SECRET

SECRET

-36-

Even without the review by reviewing examiners, I considered the formal report dated 8 April 1964 to have been in error in that the conclusions reached in the case were a gross misinterpretation of the extent to which the reactions added up. In fact, in some instances the Subject was deemed to be lying when it is known he was telling the truth. With the review by the reviewing examiners, I can conclude only that the initial examiner did exactly what the requestor asked; i.e., he was told to collect reactions and he did. The fact that reactions were not consistent (and indeed may not have occurred) was not important since it had already been decided Subject was wrong and the polygraph was used only to support his decision.

I. Incarceration and Interrogation

Many aspects of this case did not go according to plan, but one that did was the incarceration of Nosenko. An Office of Security representative who periodically guarded Nosenko from November 1964 to May 1968, when questioned on 21 July 1976, described the regime as follows:

Security Officer (SO):

While he was [incarcerated], he was being held in a room in an old safehouse down there . . . it was an attic room . . . and he was afforded 24 hours visual custody observance by the security team.

Q: What does visual custody observance mean? You mean there's somebody in the room with him?

SO: No, the room had a special door. The top half of the door was a metal screen type where we were actually positioned outside the door on a 24-hour basis. There were two security escorts on duty 24 hours a day, and we were instructed to maintain visual observance of him--just observe his activities.

SECRET

SECRET

-37-

Q: Now, what was the purpose of visually observing him 24 hours a day?

SO: Apparently to see that he made no attempts to escape, made no attempts to injure himself. There were never any problems along these lines.

For much of his confinement, the principal break in a day's monotony occurred when Nosenko was under interrogation. It is not necessary here to cover the various interrogations in detail; suffice it to say that, although they were conducted fitfully, with bursts of activity followed by long periods of quiescence, almost every technique of interrogation short of physical violence was either tried or at least considered. A few of the high points will be summarized in the succeeding paragraphs.

After he "failed" his polygraph on 6 April 1964, Nosenko was interrogated on an almost daily basis for nearly three weeks. During this period a participant commented that "we have received daily support for our conviction that Subject was sent on a KGB mission . . ." and by 25 April the interrogators concluded:

We have gone about as far as the time permitted for the "information gathering" phase of the interrogation will allow . . . The task now is to sort out and analyze the results of the past three weeks of interrogation, to mark out the strong and the weak portions of Subject's story, and to plan the strategy and tactics of the next phase . . . In the meantime, Subject will be given a short haircut to dramatize his situation, and a week or so without interrogations to emphasize our willingness to keep his [sic] indefinitely and to heighten his tensions.

Meanwhile, Golitsyn had been brought into the case and was being employed as a behind-the-scenes consultant in connection with the interrogations. Golitsyn was given for analysis voluminous material relating to the case and was told that "one of the most perplexing aspects of the Nosenko case to us at the present time is not whether he was sent (we all certainly agree with your view that he was sent on a mission) but the exact nature

SECRET

SECRET

-38-

of his service with the KGB." Golitsyn's role will be covered more thoroughly in a separate chapter.

To ensure cooperation in the interrogation, an "Outline of Action to be Taken Should Subject Refuse to Answer Requirements" was drawn up on 25 August 1964. The tenor of this outline, which essentially set the basic policy of the incarceration until late 1967, is conveyed by the following excerpt:

Should Subject refuse to answer the case officer's questions, Subject will be returned to his cell at a time chosen by the case officer, there will be no further conversations between Subject and the guards except that which is absolutely necessary, and the case officer will notify Chief, SR. At the case officer's discretion, Subject may lose his cigarette privileges immediately. Each day for an indefinite period the case officer will return and begin a session with Subject. If Subject refuses each day to discuss the questions, he will lose an additional privilege in the following order: cigarettes, table, chair, reading material, ruler, paper and pencil. In no case, however, will any of these privileges be removed except with the prior approval of Chief, SR.

The basic policy to be followed during interrogations was outlined even more fully in a lengthy memorandum of 2 November 1964. Like all other documents on this subject, it assumed that Nosenko was lying and had to be "trapped":

How the Interrogation will be Begun: Subject will initially be confronted only by interrogators already known to him. They will begin detailed and apparently routine questioning on carefully selected operations or other aspects of the 1960-1962 period. This time, however, the interrogators will be prepared to stick doggedly to the particular subject. They will probe deeper and deeper for detail, never allowing Subject to dismiss them with such statements as "that is the way it was" or "that is all I remember." We would prefer to begin in this way so that Subject will already be under

SECRET

SECRET

- 39 -

pressure, cornered and in trouble by the time he realizes that this is not a routine questioning but the climax of his long period of detention. In view of Subject's personality, one psychologist believes that Subject would otherwise welcome this climax and sharpen his wits for a final battle to hoodwink us and regain his freedom.

Position Into Which Subject is to be Put:

Once Subject has been trapped and cornered a few times, the basic theme of the interrogation will be put to him. He has protested his sincerity and desire to convince us of his truth. He must do this now; otherwise he is here to stay. He can only talk his way out by convincing us. In fact, he has shown in the present session and over the past months that he is unable to support his legend. He simply does not know the facts that anyone in his alleged position would have to know. We will confront him with our collateral knowledge, and insist that he answer our questions and prove his point. As he repeatedly fails to do so, he will be repeatedly accused of lying and of proving what we already know: that the entire service in the American Department was a clumsy fabrication, and he must confess it in order to get out.

Interrogation Guides: We will identify every detailed weakness, contradiction and omission in his stories, line them up with care according to priorities designed for maximum impact on Subject, and prepare interrogation briefs accordingly . . .

The Question of Attacking Him Personally or Placing the Blame on his KGB Superiors: In planning this interrogation we have examined two alternative methods of approach: (1) to attempt to destroy his own self-confidence by attacking him personally, exploiting our knowledge of his weaknesses and misbehavior, or (2) to pin the ultimate blame on his superiors, who sent him out under serious misapprehensions and with inadequate briefing. Psychologists who have

SECRET

SECRET

-40-

examined Subject agree that he is pathologically self-centered. Since his own pride and his illusions of infallibility may constitute his last bulwark of self-protection, he may resist us more doggedly in this area than any other. The other course seems best. As he increasingly fails to answer our questions, we will point out to him the inadequacy of his briefing and the stupidity and fraud of which he has been made a victim. We will confront him with actual incidences which he must know about and then ask him for details. Over and over again, we will demonstrate and emphasize how inadequate his training and preparation was. We will demonstrate to Subject that the KGB consciously and callously sent him on an impossible mission and purposefully deceived him about the information that Subject himself considers the most important to the establishment of his bona fides . . .

The possible outcomes foreseen as a result of the interrogation were also based on the assumption that he had been lying about his reasons for coming to us:

Full Success: If Subject confesses fully, he will have broken with the KGB and will become dependent upon us for his security and well-being. After full debriefing and establishment of bona fides he will presumably be returned to a conventional safehouse and a life similar to the January to April 1964 period in which he will be permitted to go out with a security escort while we continue his exploitation and plan his future.

Partial Success: If Subject makes significant admissions and falls back on a second level cover story, he will be kept in the present safehouse. His personal circumstances and intensity of interrogation will be determined by the situation obtaining at that time.

Failure: If the interrogation fails, we would plan to put him "on ice" for a period, then interrogate him again. For this interim period, Subject would be transferred to visibly more

SECRET

SECRET

-41-

permanent and more secure quarters. From the makeshift physical set up of his present quarters, the large number of guards who rotate weekly and the round-the-clock visual observation by two guards, it is obvious to Subject that his quarters (and therefore his situation) is temporary. As long as he knows that, he can hope. Our only hope of breaking Subject will be to allow him to convince himself that he has got into a situation from which he can extricate himself only by cooperating. This could be best achieved by breaking sharply with the present situation, placing him in permanent quarters, preferably remote and more primitive than his present quarters, physically secure and resembling jail, and capable of being manned by a minimum of guard personnel who would not keep him under constant direct visual observation. No Headquarters case officer would visit him, until he has given sign that he has changed his mind. This period would last for several months, pending another attempt to break him based on information obtained in the interim.

J. Elaboration of the Plot Theory

The stringency of the rules governing treatment of Nosenko varied from time to time, but the general trend was to take an ever harder line towards him. Since it was assumed that he was a KGB-dispatched agent, he could only satisfy his interrogators by admitting that such was the case. But, while he would from time to time attempt to placate his questioners with admissions of having lied or incorrectly reported certain past events, he would never admit to the key accusation of being KGB-controlled. The inevitable result was not only greater harshness toward him but a gradually spreading suspicion in regard to other agents, past and present, who seemed in any way to support his *bona fides*. This development is mirrored in a memorandum that the principal case officer wrote after a visit with Helms on 19 November 1964:

In connection with Nosenko, Mr. Helms referred to it as one of the greatest time consumers he had ever seen. I remarked that I felt the time was well spent since our examination of this

SECRET

SECRET

-42-

case had opened our eyes not only to security threats in our own midst and within the US government, but also had revealed that many other important sources were in fact KGB provocations and in fact that our entire counterintelligence effort, double agents and all, may be contaminated and useless.

According to the theory being developed, no Soviet or Soviet Bloc agent was immune from suspicion if his reporting tended to confirm anything that Nosenko had said. Agents who were then currently producing intelligence, not only for CIA but also for the FBI and certain European intelligence services, all came under heavy suspicion. The single exception was Golitsyn. The latter, although he had confirmed Nosenko's identity (which had itself been in doubt at one point) as well as his affiliation with the KGB, also contributed the elaborate rationale according to which the KGB was sacrificing Nosenko and a host of other agents and operations to protect even more important, if somewhat nebulous, assets and plans. Golitsyn thus became the touchstone against whom the trustworthiness of all other agents was judged.

Because Nosenko refused to "break," however, it was hard to adduce proof of Golitsyn's theory substantial enough to convince Helms, the FBI, and other officials and organizations not so deeply committed to the theory. A lengthy paper on SR/CI's findings on this subject was always in the offing but was continually delayed; it did not finally materialize until February 1967. On the other hand, no one had at his fingertips the vast array of facts, and suppositions masquerading as facts, on which the case was based. The theory was therefore difficult to challenge; there may even have been reluctance to do so, because the main proponents of the disinformation theory frequently referred to unhappy consequences that would flow from abandoning the course upon which the Agency had embarked. Should the Agency change course, for example, by simply returning Nosenko to Soviet hands, terrible, though ill-defined, consequences would certainly ensue. As the principal case officer said (again to his 20 November 1964 memorandum of conversation with Helms):

I pointed out the potential dangers of returning Nosenko unscathed and within a short time.

SECRET

SECRET

-43-

I thought the KGB would be . . . concerned [by implication, amazed and delighted] only by the fact that a defector thrust into our mits [sic] could expect such an easy fate if uncovered.

K. Life in a Vault

The unforeseen stubbornness of Nosenko had meanwhile brought SR Division to an impasse from which there was but one escape--the more-or-less permanent incarceration of Nosenko. Nothing that the latter said would be believed except the one admission that he steadfastly refused to make (i.e., that he had been dispatched by the KGB), and, although Helms wanted to solve the problem thus created by simply turning Nosenko back to the Soviets, this solution was resisted by the division. The upshot was that, on 27 November 1964, Chief, SR wrote:

. . . If he fails to convince us (which he can't) and refuses to confess what we already know, the US government has every intention of protecting itself against this dangerous provocation by detaining him indefinitely.

The decision was therefore taken, with Helms' approval, to build a new detention facility. The cell constructed for Nosenko's occupancy was essentially a vault enveloped by a barracks-type building. Its projected amenities were described as follows:

- a. Small cell with concrete floor and ceiling and walls lined with metal.
- b. No electrical outlets in the cell, lighting to be recessed and grilled and controlled from the day room.
- c. No window in the cell.
- d. One entrance to the cell which will be of the metal bar type with an exterior door in front of this and a sliding panel in the exterior door which will permit a complete view of the cell area. Plexiglass will be used in the observation panel rather than glass.

SECRET

SECRET

-44-

e. A toilet facility which will adjoin the cell and contain a shower, basin and commode. With the exception of the commode, which will be the prison push-button type, all controls will be in the day room area and will also contain a plexiglass observation port with a sliding panel on the exterior.

f. An exercise area just outside the nearest door which will be fenced and screened (so that Nosenko can only look up and see only the sky).

As the new installation neared completion, Chief, SR on 15 June 1965 wrote Helms:

We believe that we have gone just about as far as normal interrogation techniques will take us, and that the time has come to prepare Subject for his move to the ostensibly permanent detention site . . . It will be ready for occupancy on or about 1 August. Chief, SR/CI visited the site on 11 June and reports that the installation is excellent from every point of view.

Before returning the memorandum, Helms penned a marginal note next to the above paragraph: "I would like both you and [Chief, CI] to examine this site."

If Helms had had any doubt about the site's suitability, he must have been reassured by a 28 July 1965 memorandum addressed to him by the Director of Security:

On Tuesday, 27 July, the Chief, CI Staff, the Chief, SR Division and the undersigned [inspected] the newly constructed special detention facility . . . As you know, . . . it is planned to utilize this facility to hold AEFOXTROT for an indefinite period . . .

By mid-August, the time had come for Nosenko's transfer. The events surrounding it are recounted in a 19 August 1965 memorandum for the record:

As planned, . . . [the principal case officer] had a brief "confrontation scene" with Subject

SECRET

SECRET

-45-

W-
 rict
 e ont
 ad no

on the same evening, immediately prior to his removal to new quarters. The purpose of this session was not to deliver a new message of any sort, or to give Subject "another chance to confess"; everything that could be said had already been said by . . . the previous interrogators, and there was no doubt that Subject understood perfectly well the meaning and importance of what had been said to him; also, it was recognized that Subject would sense an impending move or change of some sort, and that it was inevitable that he would hope that the change would be for the better until he saw otherwise. The purpose of the confrontation was rather to close the circle: to show him that although [the principal case officer] had not seen him for over a year nothing had changed, and nothing would change until he told the truth. An additional effect would be to emphasize that the interrogators who had worked with him in the interim were fully responsible and authoritative, and that just as Subject had been told when he was first locked up in April 1964, what he was up against was the collapse of the operation in which he was involved. Finally, [the principal case officer] would stress . . . that the "investigation is closed" and that Subject had only prolonged and total isolation to look forward to now unless and until he decides to confess.

The meeting took place just about as planned. It lasted for 15 minutes only (2100 to 2115) and was essentially a formality, although it is hoped that Subject will have reason to reflect on it in the months ahead. As can be seen from the attached summary transcript, Subject did not display any hesitancy or indecision, and his answers and statements were made in a mechanical manner.

The 19 August memorandum concludes:

Immediately upon termination of the interview with [the principal case officer], Subject was blindfolded and led out of the house according to the prearranged plan. He was clearly frightened,

SECRET

SECRET

-46-

but did not put up the slightest resistance. The move to the new quarters took place exactly as planned.

The new detention facility had been designed and staffed with the intention of engendering in Nosenko a feeling of hopelessness, from which the only escape would be through confession that he was a KGB agent and revelation of the full details of how he had been briefed and dispatched by the Soviet authorities. With the exception of being allowed certain books, carefully selected for him by SR Division, Nosenko was confined under conditions that were as close to stimulus-free as was consistent with maintaining him in good physical health. For example, the TV used by the guards was fitted with earphones, so that there was no risk of his overhearing snatches of dialogue. The principal case officer was assured, in answer to an inquiry, that "while he does note planes going overhead as well as animal noises from the woods during exercise periods, everything else . . . is excluded." As to the guards, if Nosenko were to attempt to open conversation with them on any subject, "the guards should instruct him in rude terms to shut up."

At this point, we must pause to consider for the moment how the period that follows is to be covered. Because there were long periods of time when no human being other than the guards was in contact with Nosenko, and because he was not allowed to keep a diary, the story of his sojourn from August 1965 to October 1967 does not lend itself easily to narrative presentation.

Yet this period cannot be ignored. It constituted over half of Nosenko's solitary confinement. And that three-and-a-half-year period amounts to five percent of the total life span of a man who lives to be 70.

Obviously, then, this period will weigh heavily in the findings made at the conclusion of our study. For these findings to be valid, they must be made on the basis of as much empirical evidence as can be gathered. Because the effect on Nosenko of this long period of confinement can only be dealt with speculatively, such few remarks as we have on that subject will be

SECRET

SECRET

-47-

confined to the relatively discursive chapter on "Psychological and Medical Findings." Within the body of Chapter III, we are limiting ourselves to coverage of the main recorded events, none of which are seen through the eyes of Nosenko himself.

We now resume our narrative.

On 13 August 1965, before Nosenko was locked into his cell for the first time, he was read the following instructions, which outlined the basic rules to be followed from then on:

Cell

This is your cell. You are to keep it clean and will be given cleaning materials for this purpose.

Reading Privilege

You will be permitted one book a week which you may retain in your cell.

Smoking Privilege

You will receive a daily cigarette ration.

Exercising Privilege

Every day, weather and other factors permitting, you will have an exercise period.

Writing Material

Writing material will be provided only for correspondence with the appropriate authorities concerning your confession.

Schedule

This prison operates on a schedule. You will become familiar with this schedule and adhere to it at all times.

SECRET

SECRET

-48-

Within the framework of the above rules, which were strictly enforced, Nosenko's only diversion was reading the one book per week that he was at first allowed. He did not even have the distraction of being questioned, for, when queried by Helms on 12 January 1966, Chief, SR stated that no one from SR Division had seen Nosenko since the beginning of his confinement there, five months earlier.

On 1 November 1965, his privileges began to be reduced, for reasons that are not always clear from the record. From that date on, for instance, he no longer received books to read, and for minor acts of indiscipline, soap, towel and toothbrush were temporarily denied him.

Some time in January or February 1966, Nosenko claimed to be suffering from auditory hallucinations. In a memorandum dated 18 February 1966, Chief, SR reported:

. . . There are hopeful signs that the isolation is beginning to have an effect on Subject. ([A doctor's] visit may have had further impact in this direction when [the doctor] told Subject that his visit constituted an "annual" physical exam; as he left Subject's room, [the doctor] also remarked, "I'll see you next year." Subject's reaction was visible.)

Now we have just received further confirmation of the development of Subject's attitude. On the evening of 16 February 1966, he shouted for a few seconds in English, apparently to guards, that he would commit suicide and kept repeating, "You'll see. You'll see." He asked to see the local "doctor" (he has been told that the medical technician at the base is a doctor), but the guards told him it was too late in the evening. When the technician came the following day, 17 February, Subject talked at some length about his worries that he might be going mad. He has repeatedly stressed his belief that he is being drugged, but said on this occasion that he recognized that there are no drugs designed to make a person mad. Consequently, he said, he was concerned about the fact that during the past day or two he had heard voices

SECRET

SECRET

-49-

emanating from various objects, such as his shoe and his spoon, the engine of an aircraft overhead, and a bird in a nearby tree. When questioned, he said that the voices were saying in English "first die" while the bird was saying "kid." He asked if the "doctor" considered him insane. He was told that he did not appear to be so, upon which he reiterated, his worries and spoke of his desire to die. He expressed his recognition that his present circumstances do not afford means to commit suicide.

Nosenko's alleged hallucinations triggered a special meeting on 24 February 1966. The resultant memorandum for the record, written by a member of SR/CI, is worth quoting at length:

Representatives of SR Division, the Office of Security, and the Medical Staff met in the SR Conference Room from approximately 1400 to 1430 hours this date to discuss recent incidents in Nosenko's behavior and a forthcoming examination of Nosenko by [a doctor] . . . The undersigned entered the Conference Room after discussions had begun, so some of the initial remarks are not noted here.

[An Agency psychiatrist] first described to those present his examination of Nosenko on 21 January 1966 and stated his opinion, based on observations made at that time, that the recent outbursts by Nosenko and his threats of suicide are all contrived and do not represent an involuntary reaction on his part. Nosenko's recent behavior started with suicide threats, then progressed to auditory hallucinations, and has now reached the stage where every inanimate object in his environment, including the trees and the wind outdoors, are talking to him. [The psychiatrist] expressed his view that, if Nosenko actually does hear voices, it could normally be expected that they would speak to him in his native language, rather than in English as he told the base medical technician during a recent visit. Nosenko apparently now realizes this ([the

SECRET

SECRET

-50-

psychiatrist] didn't describe how, but presumably the technician commented on it to Nosenko) and Nosenko, in [the psychiatrist's] opinion, has now picked this up and is trying to recoup by saying that he now does everything in English--think, speak, everything.

At this point, [the principal case officer] described Nosenko's recently begun word games, in which he takes a Russian word and then figures out as many root derivations as possible, as an illustration of how ridiculous Nosenko's claim is.

[The psychiatrist] continued to say that Nosenko is now agreeing to take medication and is asking for additional medication to help raise his spirits. [The psychiatrist] has told the base medical technician not to answer Nosenko directly, but to "let it be known" to Nosenko that the medication he is now receiving will help him out in this respect. [The psychiatrist] then repeated that he thinks that Nosenko is reacting to his isolation, his lack of human contact, and his environment, but that he is responding in a planned, contrived, and non-spontaneous way, from a psychiatric point of view. [The psychiatrist] added that the only thing that is worrying him at present concerning Nosenko is his possible urinary problem, which is now being look into.

[The principal case officer] next explained to those present that Nosenko's current behavior is consistent with our knowledge of Soviet training in techniques of resisting interrogation and imprisonment. However, because of intelligence and cunning (although he has a fair share of each), Nosenko has made some mistakes. [The principal case officer] agreed that Nosenko is probably feeling the effect of isolation and is making this try to get out. When he finds that this doesn't work, he may eventually decide "to hell with it" and start to talk. . . . [the principal case officer] said that he and [the psychiatrist] agree that, should Nosenko raise the issue of his alleged insanity during the upcoming examination, the best response should

SECRET

SECRET

-51-

be to the effect that, if Nosenko actually is going out of his head, the best possible thing for him is isolation, lots of rest, and a place where he can't hurt himself. This is what is usually prescribed and this is, in fact, the situation Nosenko already enjoys. [The principal case officer] added that the wording of any such response would, of course, be up to [the psychiatrist].

In support of the above, [the psychiatrist] then said that he had gone over things very carefully during his January visit and, on this basis, can see no basic change in Nosenko. When [the psychiatrist] arrived at the site he had remarked that he had come for Nosenko's annual physical examination and when he was leaving he told Nosenko that he would see him again next year. In [the psychiatrist's] opinion, Nosenko reacted to this by saying to himself: "How can I get out of here?" He has apparently decided that the best way to escape his present situation is to be sick with something that can't be handled locally and then it will be necessary for him to be moved to a hospital. [The psychiatrist] said that, from Nosenko's point of view, any change will be for the better and agreed with [the principal case officer] that it is important to indicate that there will be none. The simple statement suggested by [the principal case officer] may give Nosenko the message and no further explanation is necessary.

[An Office of Security representative] then asked if, under conditions of prolonged confinement, there is not a chance that a person actually will go off his rocker. [The psychiatrist] replied that this is absolutely so, that this happens in many cases under less stringent conditions of imprisonment, and that the person usually improved quickly when these conditions are relaxed. [The psychiatrist] does not believe however that Nosenko fits in this category.

SECRET

SECRET

-52-

[The Office of Security representative] then asked what sort of behavior can be expected in a person who is actually so affected by his imprisonment. Whether he could be expected to become violent or behave erratically. [He] said that he was asking this question from the point of view of his responsibilities for guarding Nosenko. [The psychiatrist] replied that such behavior can take almost any form, that there may be changes in physical behavior, eating and sleeping habits, etc. He added that there certainly has been a change in Nosenko since the January 1966 examination, that he doesn't know for certain what it means, and that there surely is a risk that he may go out of his head. [The principal case officer] pointed out that [the psychiatrist's] remark about the "annual physical" may have triggered this reaction. [The psychiatrist] agreed, saying that while he cannot dismiss true insanity as a real possibility, he doesn't think that this is what is going on right now.

[The Office of Security representative] next commented that Nosenko is again asking for reading material and asked [the principal case officer] if he wanted to give him any. [The principal case officer] replied absolutely not and [the psychiatrist] concurred that no changes should be made. [The Office of Security representative] then asked whether Nosenko has any sort of skin disease, pointing out that the guards have to wash his shirts two or three times to get them clean. Both doctors said that Nosenko is not afflicted as far as they know and [the Office of Security representative] asked whether it is still policy that Nosenko is to have a clean change of clothes only once a week. [The psychiatrist] expressed the opinion that nothing should be changed, at least until after the examination on 1 March.

[The psychiatrist] remarked that things are bound to change as far as Nosenko is concerned-- he is either going to stop faking or things will

SECRET

SECRET

-53-

get worse. [The principal case officer] added that we (SR) are working hard on other sources of information, that things seem optimistic right now, and that this is no time to falter. He added that Mr. Helms is keeping current of the situation and goes along fully with present plans, without changes.

[The psychiatrist was] asked what medication Nosenko is now receiving. [The psychiatrist] replied that he is getting 1/4 of a grain of phenobarbital together with an antispasmodic (for gas), which won't have any medical effect on Nosenko's mental state. This is why, he explained, he had instructed the base technician to let Nosenko know that the medication will help him. It can have no real effect and if Nosenko suddenly improves, this will be added confirmation that he is faking.

On 1 March 1966, the principal case officer and SR/CI representative accompanied the two doctors to another examination of Nosenko. One doctor conducted the examination, while the other members of the party observed it on a television screen. None of the four men gave much credence to Nosenko's claim of hearing voices, but the following was noted:

Though Nosenko's mental difficulties are apparently a sham, it is also evident that there has been a change in his outlook since SR last had direct contact with him in August 1965. If by nothing else, this is evidenced by the single fact that he has taken a new tack in his relationship with CIA: He has apparently given up hope that his legend or "another source" can help him escape his predicament and, as [the psychiatrist] earlier proposed, is using his "voices" (except for which Nosenko claims to be sane) to force some sort of change. For the first time in the undersigned's recollection, Nosenko said that he now knows that his CIA handling officers will never (Nosenko's emphasis) believe him because of his behavior and for other reasons, and that there is nothing he can do about it. But, beyond this, it is difficult

SECRET

SECRET

-54-

to interpret the significance of his remarks and behavior during [a second doctor's] interview--on one hand there were indications of deterioration; on the other Nosenko is an astute actor, who was clearly playing a role for [that doctor]. Bearing in mind that these superficial indications may well be a part of this act, Nosenko appeared far more subdued, almost despondent, compared with six months ago. For most of the interview, he slouched or sat listlessly in his chair and only seldom did he lean forward and, by the motions of his hands, attempt to reach and to secure the understanding and belief of the interviewer. There appears to be a slight deterioration in his English-language fluency (see transcript below) and his replies were broken by frequent pauses, incomplete sentences, and confusing revisions.

Nosenko's changed outlook next took the form of two letters to the principal case officer, written in mid-April 1966 (although incorrectly dated, because by now his calculation of the passage of time was no longer completely accurate). The first, and briefer of the two, read:

I ask you to excuse me for my baseness in 1962 and 1964. Now I have completely realized all my delinquencies and have reevaluated my past "life."

I want to live an exclusively honest and modest life and I am ready to work in whatever place that it may be possible, taking into account my knowledge of Soviet Russia. I believe that I have sufficient strength to live only a real life.

I ask you to help me.

The second letter was even more self-accusatory, and was clearly modeled after the self-criticisms exacted from prisoners in the Soviet Union. It began:

My despicable behaviour from the beginning of my acquaintance with you in 1962 led to it

SECRET

SECRET

-55-

being necessary to create special conditions for me and to assist me, which has finally helped me to realize all my delinquencies and mistakes and to reevaluate all my past "life."

I should have honestly told you everything about myself, about my moral principles and my life in Soviet Russia in order to start a conscientious life in June 1962.

This letter next summarized Nosenko's career from childhood until his arrival in the United States, and admitted that although he had been documented "erroneously" as a lieutenant colonel he had actually never held a military rank higher than captain in the KGB. It concluded:

Work in the KGB was the chief and deciding period of my degradation--drunkenness, debauchery, baseness, and falsehood.

I should have told you all about this in 1962 or in 1964, before flying to America.

I started my life in the United States of America absolutely incorrectly. My behaviour was base, dirty, and boorish.

The creation of isolated living conditions and the appropriate assistance were necessary for me. But I was unable to honestly and directly tell everything about myself in 1964 or in 1965, right up to the last conversation with you. And only in 1966 did I gradually begin to realize and to correctly understand all my mistakes and delinquencies and to think about my behaviour. And only here was I able to reevaluate all my past "life."

Now I can think correctly about real life and work, and therefore I address myself to you because you know me more and better than anyone else, with the request to decide the question of my future life. By work against the Communists, and only with real life, I will try to justify the confidence placed in me.

SECRET

SECRET

-56-

The Chief, SR commented:

The letters themselves do not represent a complete break but they reveal that his defenses are weakening and he may be seeking a way out. He tells essentially the same story as before but with more discrepancies of detail which suggest further deterioration and, by this time, an inability to recount his legend consistently. The most significant change is that he now admits he was only a Captain in the KGB and not a Lt. Colonel. On the other hand, this may be a prearranged fall-back position. We recall that [a Soviet agent]--who, in telling us repeatedly in 1964 of the importance of Nosenko, said he was a Lt. Col.--informed [us] in February 1965 (after our doubts about Nosenko had become well known and Nosenko himself had possibly missed pre-arranged contacts with the KGB) that [a Soviet agent] had heard that although Nosenko was a Deputy Department Chief, he was only a Captain and not a Lt. Colonel. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the rank of Lt. Col. was part of the KGB prepared legend for Nosenko, and not simply his own improvisation. This is proved by the fact that one of the personal documents that Nosenko brought with him to Geneva in 1964 was a TDY travel order which Nosenko claims to have used to travel to Gorkiy . . . [and] was clearly a deliberate plant by the KGB and there can be no question of its being filled out erroneously. Furthermore, the rank was necessary to sustain the fiction of Nosenko's high supervisory positions, which in turn were necessary to explain his access to the information he claims to have.

Aside from the hope they offer for success in breaking Nosenko, the most interesting aspect of the letters is their tone. He does not complain of our treatment of him but on the contrary expresses appreciation for it and says that it was entirely justified. They are the latest in a series of indications that Nosenko is weakening. They follow an attempt to feign insanity, an abortive hunger strike and some erratic behaviour concerning his exercise period.

SECRET

SECRET

-57-

We plan to answer him along the lines that we are willing to forgive his "baseness and falsehood" and discuss his rehabilitation but only when he is prepared to drop the legend which he seems to maintain in his letter. If he is, as we think, getting desperate to get out, he may reply with further admissions.

We have clarified the medical questions which were delaying further interrogation. We are now reviewing with Chief, TSD the proposals discussed with you earlier concerning the use of special interrogation techniques. The attached letters afford an ideal opportunity to resume discussions with Nosenko whenever we wish.

(The reference to "special interrogation techniques" harked back to a 13 January 1966 discussion with Helms, during which the latter had stated that "he was inclined to try special techniques on Subject in the hope that they might somehow provide the answers we are seeking." In this context, "special techniques" was a euphemism for the use of drugs as aids in interrogation. As will be shown later, although Helms was willing to discuss the use of such techniques in this case, he in fact never gave his consent and they were never employed. Nevertheless, the use of drugs for interrogation purposes seems to have been contemplated for some time, since it is foreseen in handwritten notes made by the principal case officer as early as November 1964, and Chief, SR and the principal case officer continued to press for permission to employ them until a final negative decision by Helms on 1 September 1966.)

On 26 April 1966, Chief, SR again wrote Helms to say that a response to Nosenko's letters had been delayed in order to allow time for discussion with Chief, CI and the psychiatrist. Their combined judgment seems to have been that the letters were "an attempt to relieve the isolation by reestablishing personal contact, if only with his interrogators." He bolstered this view by an appeal to medical authority:

It is [the psychiatrist's] opinion, in which we fully concur, that any such contact would in fact constitute a relief for Nosenko and that it would be a serious mistake to grant

SECRET

SECRET

-58-

him this at the very moment that his psychological defenses may be cracking. On the contrary, [the psychiatrist] feels we should cut off any hopes Nosenko may harbor that he can alter his present situation without a full confession.

Since it is the technique of isolation and rejection that has led to the recent promising changes in Nosenko's attitude and behavior, we believe that it is logical to continue along the same lines and that there is a reasonable expectation that this treatment will produce further results in the near future. We therefore intend to send Nosenko the attached letter and to wait approximately 60 days before changing our tactics.

The letter thereupon sent to Nosenko in the principal case officer's name read as follows:

I have received your letters and so-called "autobiography." We understand fully what degradation the Soviet system has forced you into and as you have been told, we are willing to help you establish a real life.

As I told you in August, however, we have no further interest in reading or listening to the legend (or its variations) that you continue to repeat. We are only interested in evidence that you really want to talk truthfully. In the future we will reply only to a true written account of your life and how your legend was prepared. Do not waste our time with the lies of the past. This legend cannot be the basis of a new life for you.

Chief, SR's next report, dated 11 May 1966, was the following:

As previously agreed on 28 April, a brief note was passed to Nosenko in response to his earlier note and slightly amended biographical statement. He made no response upon receiving our note (although he did not touch his meal that night); but on the evening of 4 May he asked

SECRET

SECRET

-59-

for a pencil and paper, indicating, in reply to a question from the guard, that he had a statement to make in response to our note. After writing his note, he sealed it in an envelope and gave it to the guard to be delivered.

The note, written in English, states:

Allow me to thank you very much for your kind letter. Now I understood fully what degradation to the Soviet Russia had forced me into. At last I can tell you that I really want to talk truthfully.

I want to begin the job against the Soviet Russia. My only wish is to establish a real life with your help as you are willing to do so.

[signed] George Nosenko

We have discussed his note with [the psychiatrist], who feels that the final sentence of the first paragraph probably reflects no real desire on the part of Nosenko to talk truthfully at this time, but is rather a further attempt by him either to generate a personal dialogue with us or at least to continue this written exchange.

We feel that it would not be in our interest to answer this latest note with another note, thus permitting additional and, to Nosenko, psychologically necessary contact and involvement--albeit impersonal. In order to cut off this effort on his part, but at the same time to allow for the possibility that this latest note might actually convey an intention to talk truthfully, we intend to deliver to Nosenko the attached statement. The requirement for direct "YES" or "NO" answers accompanied by his signature allows for no misunderstanding of the questions and does not permit lengthy discourses on peripheral matters.

SECRET

SECRET

-60-

[The psychiatrist] concurs in our plan and recommends that it be carried out as soon as possible to achieve maximum effect. If we get a positive response we will follow up immediately.

In accordance with the above memorandum, the following form was passed to Nosenko on 13 May 1966, apparently by the Security guards:

Answer "YES" or "NO":

- 1) Do you admit that you came to the United States on a KGB mission?

YES

NO

- 2) Are you ready to tell us about your KGB mission and how your legend was prepared and taught to you?

YES

NO

Date _____ Signed _____

If the answers to both questions are "YES" someone will come to talk to you. If not, there is no need to write any more letters.

The next major maneuver on Nosenko's part was a hunger strike, in the course of which he lost some forty pounds. This tactic was counteracted with the help of a medical officer while administering a physical check-up on 22 June 1966:

In the course of the examination, [this doctor] questioned Subject on the reasons for his fast and got him to admit that this was a deliberate tactic. As planned, the doctor showed no concern, assured Subject that he was still in good health, described to him in some detail the physical and mental consequences of prolonged undernourishment, and emphasized that Subject would not be allowed to do himself any damage in this manner. The doctors' description of some of the standard methods of forced feeding and his

SECRET

SECRET

-61-

matter-of-fact emphasis that all appropriate medical measures could and would be taken at the present site made an instant and evident impact on Subject, who nevertheless continued to assert that he had no need or desire for more food. (Despite the weight loss, the results of the medical exam showed that Subject is in good overall condition.)

On 23 June, the day following the doctor's visit, Subject began to eat ravenously and he has been consuming all his meals since. By 6 July he had gained 15 lbs.

The Agency's next step was to have the principal case officer see Nosenko. This interview, which took place on 6 July 1966, lasted for about 45 minutes and "was the first time that a case officer had talked to Subject since he was moved . . ." The interview resulted in another stand-off, the principal case officer insisting that Nosenko admit to being a KGB agent and the latter refusing. Once again, however, Agency officers in charge felt they were making progress:

[The psychiatrist], who monitored the entire interview, was impressed by the fact that Subject had used it solely to appeal to the pity and sympathy of the interviewer, and felt that the way in which the interview was conducted would very effectively slam shut still another psychological door. It is believed that for the first time Subject has come to appreciate the measure of our resolve and determination, and that he is actively grappling with the realities of his present situation. Subject's pattern of behavior over the past few months suggests that he will need some time to fully digest the import of the [principal case officer's] interview, but that he will then be impelled to initiate some new effort to relieve (sic) his lot. Very few alternatives short of confession--real or false--appear to be left to him.

On 23 August 1966 Helms, who had become DCI on 30 June 1966, instructed the DDP and Chief, SR to close the case "within about sixty days assuming there are no new developments which would warrant reconsideration of this development." Chief, SR gave this account of Helms' reasoning:

SECRET

SECRET

-62-

. . . the Director advised us that in his view the time had come to consider disposal of Subject. He was willing, he said, to proceed with the immediate plans we had for the sodium amytal interview and to consider proposals for use of special techniques within the time frame we suggested but unless these steps developed new information or indicated definite progress in resolving the case, he wanted us to wind it up.

Helms' decision triggered a new rash of activity within what was now the SB Division. Chief, SR, noting that "there is no appeal . . . unless we uncover new, compelling data," reconstituted a special Task Force to work on the case, headed by the principal case officer.

A problem which the principal case officer found particularly thorny, to judge by his notes, was posed by the FBI's unwillingness to accept CIA's evaluation of Nosenko.

Our case is based primarily on analysis, not confirmed by juridically acceptable evidence, and this analysis is so complex that it probably could not be made more understandable to laymen than it has been to the FBI, which has largely failed to understand it.

Despite Helms' expressed preference for returning Nosenko to Soviet hands, the principal case officer continued to have misgivings about such a course:

Danger in the Nosenko case lies not only in holding him, but in bringing his case to public notice again, and especially in allowing the Soviets to regain possession of him. (Our denial of Nosenko to the Soviets, particularly if they are in some doubt about his real status/loyalty, is a form of guarantee that the Soviets cannot take the many damaging actions available to them if they had the body.) The course of action therefore must balance the respective dangers.

SECRET

SECRET

-63-

Helms, on the other hand, hardened his position. He was perhaps influenced by [the psychiatrist's] pointing out that in his experience with sodium amytal it had only worked once, and then by accident; Helms promptly revoked his permission for use of this drug. Helms remarked that Nosenko was "one person on whom these techniques were never going to be used." The upshot was that, on 1 September 1966, Helms limited the interrogators to the polygraph in any future interrogations, and reiterated his preference for "having Subject turned back to the Soviets . . . "

On 2 September, Chief, SB saw Helms again, to ask that under the new circumstances the sixty-day deadline be extended. Helms agreed on an extension until the end of the year. A discussion of a final report and "disposal" then ensued, reported by Chief, SB as follows:

. . . it would be imprudent I thought not to have ready for any eventuality a detailed study of our findings. This would provide backup to our final report to the intelligence community principals, the Secretary of State, Attorney General and others. In the case of the FBI, I added, we would most certainly have to have such a document. [This remark stemmed from the fact that the FBI had never fully agreed with the Agency's views on Nosenko.]

As for disposal, [Director Helms] believed that return to Soviet control is the only practical solution. Third country disposal might only delay our having to face the same problems and if accusations are leveled at the agency it would be far preferable to have Subject in Soviet hands. The Director did not believe the Soviets would refuse to accept Subject and felt we could take the sting out of any Soviet reaction by our own statement concerning Subject's mission. If our position is publicized first, anything the Soviets or anyone else says about the case thereafter will have very little effect. In the conclusion the Director emphasized the need to bring this case to an end in a manner which will permit us to arrange events and timing to our advantage. He does not want

SECRET

SECRET

-64-

to be stamped by publicity beyond our control.

Interrogation of Nosenko, preparatory to the preparation of the above-mentioned final report, was recommenced on 18 October 1966. Assisting in the interrogation was the polygraph operator whose 1964 polygraph tapes were at this very time under review by the Office of Security; on 1 November, thirteen days later, they were officially and in writing pronounced to have been invalid.

This is what Chief, SB had to report on 25 October 1966:

Nosenko knows he is reacting in sensitive areas and this is worrying him because he is not sure how much we know or how we learned it. Nosenko's reactions have given us hope that we may be this procedure have begun to strike home. We do not know what it is that keeps this man sitting month after month in his present situation. We speculate that one factor may be confidence that the KGB will get him out. Related to this may be the thought that the KGB has CIA so deeply penetrated that it would be unhealthy for him to confess. Our current line of interrogation, expanded and used even more forcefully, might break down some of his obstacles to confession by showing us in a different and stronger posture.

Despite eight days of interrogation employing the polygraph, however, SB Division did not achieve their goal: Nosenko did not "confess" to being a "provocateur." Operating under the constraint of Helms' injunction to wind up the case by the end of the year, the principal case officer made one last attempt to shatter Nosenko's resolution. In a long letter, the principal case officer outlined the hopelessness of Nosenko's situation and adduced a number of proofs of Nosenko's prevarication, derived in part from a fictitious "KGB officer . . . sent out as a provocateur" whom the SB Division leadership invented for purposes of this letter. A possible tactical error on their part, however, was the inclusion of information about Nosenko, ostensibly received from the notional

SECRET

SECRET

-65-

source, which Nosenko himself would obviously recognize as false: "He heard that you had been in prison in the USSR, and that you received a Government award for your meetings with us in 1962." According to the SB Division officer who delivered the letter, Nosenko responded to this allegation with a belly-laugh, but he certainly was depressed, as his rambling remarks to the SB Division emissary showed:

. . . I know about my lies and I corrected all my false statements, my chattering. I know everything what is necessary for me to know. And I will be here, I understand this, I will be here so many years as you will consider it necessary. You consider five . . . I will be five; you consider ten . . . I will be ten. I have no, I have no exit and I have no way out of this situation, and . . .

L. Inter-Agency Disagreement

Meanwhile, enormous effort went into preparation of SB Division's "final report" on the case. This document, frequently referred to as the "thousand-page report," was described by Chief, SB as follows:

[It] will reflect all of AEFOXTROT's statements concerning his personal life, alleged KGB career and other matters as well as subsequent contradictions or denials of earlier statements plus the results of our investigations at home and abroad of these statements. It will also cover statements pertaining to AEFOXTROT made by various Soviet officials some of whom have been or are now in operational contact with the CS [Clandestine Service] or the FBI. This factual portion will be followed by analysis and conclusions. The latter will be absolutely unequivocal on these points:

- a. AEFOXTROT is a dispatched KGB agent whose contact with us and ultimate defection were carried out at KGB direction.

SECRET

SECRET

-66-

b. AEFOXTROT's claim to service in the KGB was an integral and vital part of his KGB agent mission, forming as it did the basis for all that he has had to say about KGB operations and personnel. Yet, the results of our interrogations of AEFOXTROT supported by polygraph examination demonstrate conclusively that AEFOXTROT did not and could not have served in any of the specific staff positions he has described.

c. Whatever the ultimate goals of this KGB operation might be, it has been possible to determine that among the most significant KGB aims in directing AEFOXTROT to us were: (1) to persuade us of KGB ineptitude and lack of success in developing technical and human penetrations of the US government, its security and intelligence services while at the same time deliberately diverting these services from specific areas of investigation in which the KGB has been successful; (2) to offer us leads to new sources and new investigations which had they all been pursued would have absorbed our limited manpower in handling cases in which ultimate control rested with the KGB.

Preparation of the report was somewhat complicated by disagreements between CIA and the FBI, as well as between SB Division and CI Staff within the Agency. The intra-CIA disagreement stemmed from differing views on the validity of Golitsyn information. Whereas SB Division insisted that Nosenko, during his KGB career, had never "served in any of the specific staff positions he has described," Golitsyn had in some respects supported Nosenko's claims regarding his KGB service. After a conference with Chief, CI, the Chief, SR summed up the problem on 29 March:

Chief, CI said that he did not see how we could submit a Final Report to the Bureau if it contained suggestions that Golitsyn had lied to us about certain aspects of Nosenko's past. He

SECRET

SECRET

-67-

recalled that the Director of the FBI had stated that in his opinion Golitsyn himself was a provocateur and penetration agent. On the other hand, most FBI agents have accepted that when Golitsyn was speaking on facts known to him he was accurate even though they do not accept most of his hypotheses or inferences drawn from facts.

Chief, CI went on to say that if we submitted to the FBI a report on Nosenko in the form we now have it, it would most certainly cause us difficulties. It might cause us to lose whatever impact our report would be able to make on the overall question of Nosenko's bona fides . . .

The disagreements between the Agency and the FBI were never to be resolved as long as Nosenko remained within the jurisdiction of the SB Division and the CI Staff. Within house, Chief, SR and Chief, CI eventually papered over their differences sufficiently to publish a second, compromise report on the Nosenko case in February 1968. But by then the case had been taken out of their hands, and the report was a dead letter even before it went to press.

M. Voices of Dissent

Meanwhile, although the top leadership of SR Division remained unassailably certain of its thesis regarding Nosenko as a KGB-dispatched agent, there was some dissent at the lower levels. Manifestations of disagreement were not well received by the leadership, however, and thus had no effect on the handling of the case. A former member of SR/CI remembers that it was sometimes possible to discuss alternative ways of presenting very specific points in preparing the written case against Nosenko (which was eventually to become the so-called "thousand-page paper"), but no qualification of the basic thesis was tolerated.

The first recorded dissent, therefore, came from outside SR Division, and it was a tentative one. A senior Plans Directorate psychologist had been asked to interview Nosenko in depth, which he did during a series of meetings between 3 and 21 May 1965. As a result of his questioning, he became convinced that at the very least Nosenko was in fact Nosenko. Even this rather

SECRET

SECRET

-68-

bland assertion, however, was met by Chief, SR with the statement, "there are things in this case that you do not know about." Nonetheless, in summing up the sessions, the psychologist had this to say:

I am totally at a loss to even attempt to rationalize why a story with this much pathology would be used as a legend. Nothing could be served other than to discredit the man to whom it was assigned. In some remote sense--to me--it might have been felt it would evoke sympathy but this is really far out and a very dangerous gamble on their part. The manner in which he has told his story and the nuances he has introduced would require great ingenuity and preparation. From my standpoint, he has been essentially convincing and accurate in general if not always truthful in detail. Here I am talking about the psychological data only--I am not prepared to express an opinion on other aspects. Within whatever frame of reference I can operate, I am forced to conclude that all the psychological evidence would indicate that he is Nosenko, the son of Ivan Nosenko. His life story is essentially as he has described it. It is obviously distorted in places but in each case there is a probable psychological reason for the distortion and deception. No man is a good reporter on himself and we all use rationalization to avoid seeing ourselves as others see us. My opinion, for whatever it is worth, is that Nosenko cannot be broken outside the context of his life story and personality structure. It should be noted here that the life story is completely compatible with the personality structure as projected by psychological tests.

The psychologist claims now that he had more doubts about the validity of the SR view of Nosenko than he felt it wise to express. The following excerpt from a memorandum of conversation, dated 4 August 1976, gives his memory of the situation facing him:

In discussing his lengthy series of interviews with Nosenko on 3-21 May 1965, [the psychologist] said that he was very hesitant

SECRET

SECRET

-69-

to express the full extent of his doubts about the theory that Nosenko was a KGB-dispatched agent. The reason for his hesitation was that, when [Chief, SR] got a hint of [the psychologist's] doubts about the theory, [Chief, SR] told [the psychologist] that such doubts might make [the psychologist] suspect of himself being involved in the KGB/Nosenko plan.

There is no evidence in the files to indicate that the psychologist's doubts were accorded any impartial consideration. Chief, SR, in a 15 June 1965 memorandum to Helms (who was by then DDCI, but still riding herd on the case), described the interviews as "unrewarding in terms of producing new information or insights It was obvious that Subject had given some thought . . . to improving and smoothing over some of the rougher spots in his story."

By the end of 1965, there were others in SR Division who doubted the thesis, and one of them was willing to risk his career by putting his thoughts on paper in a 31-page memorandum to Chief, SR commenting on a "sterile" version of SR/CI's "notebook" documenting the case against Nosenko. It began:

Introduction

At your request, I have read the basic Nosenko notebook and I hope you will honor my right to dissent. I find the evidence that Nosenko is a bona fide defector far more convincing than the evidence used in the notebook to condemn him as a KGB agent.

It is because I am concerned about the serious ramifications of a wrong verdict that I wish to set forth my dissenting views in considerable detail. If the present verdict of "guilty" is right I believe there must be satisfactory answers to the questions raised herein; if it is wrong--as I believe it is--it should be rectified as soon as possible.

Intelligence Production

There are several references in the Nosenko notebook to the extent and quality of the intelligence

SECRET

SECRET

-70-

he provided. In the 25 March 1964 memo to DDP, it is asserted that "A comparison of his positive intelligence with that of other Soviet Bloc intelligence officers with whom we have had an operational relationship shows that all of them were consistently better able to provide useful positive intelligence than has been Nosenko." Tab D of this same memo states "His positive intelligence production is practically nil," and later: "Viewed overall, however, Nosenko's positive intelligence production has been so meager for a man of his background, training and position as to case doubts on his bona fides, without reference to other criteria." All of these statements are incorrect.

The three persons in the Clandestine Services with the background and experience to make such a judgment regarding Nosenko's production and access agree that they are incorrect. No KGB officer has been able to provide more useful intelligence than Nosenko has; experience has shown that intelligence usefulness of KGB officers in general is "practically nil." Golitsyn's was nil. Viewed in the proper context, therefore, Nosenko's intelligence production cannot be used in his defense, but neither can it be said honestly to cast any doubt whatsoever on his bona fides. In the realm of substance, judgment regarding his bona fides must therefore be made on the basis of his counterintelligence information.

Counterintelligence Production

The ultimate conclusions about Nosenko's bona fides, as of March 1964 DDP memo and others indicate, must be based on his production--how much did he hurt the Soviets. I believe that the evidence shows that he has damaged the Soviet intelligence effort more than all other KGB defectors combined.

Chief, SR later wrote:

I have read this document and am of mixed minds. First, it shows clearly that the so-called

SECRET

SECRET

-71-

"sterile" book in the hands of a person with none of the other background on other cases or appreciation of the penetration problems affecting us and the FBI can be a very damaging document. I question seriously whether we should make it available to others in its present form. Second, the book's weaknesses are principally its language and the fact that it was made up of memos from various periods and as our evaluation matured, or we developed additional information, the tone of the subsequent memos changed but the reader can suggest our approach has been superficial or inconsistent. Third, we cannot make the book available unless we are prepared to deal with the totality or near totality of the picture. Fourth, if a book is to be used at all in briefing individuals, it should be re-written and questions of the kind posed by this . . . paper irritated [sic] no matter how irritating we find them to be. If one person has this view, others might at some point . . .

In replying to Chief, SR, another SR officer also attempted to take a balanced view:

The paper suffers from many faults. These include bias, intellectual arrogance, and lack of CI background. Needless to say, the conclusions are false. Nevertheless, I found it to be a useful paper, and I think that we would be wise to treat it seriously, because it does highlight some problems which we have all been aware of for some time.

It is inevitable, I suppose, that all of us who contributed substantially to the black books will feel personally attacked by many of the uninformed judgments and intemperate comments contained in [this] paper. I urge that we all strive to overcome the temptation to reply in kind. Despite the paper's shortcomings, it is one reader's serious and sincere response to the black book, and it reflects some serious faults in the book which we must correct.

SECRET

SECRET

-72-

This is not the first indication we have had that some of our analytical methods, and particularly the style and language we have become addicted to, are not easily understood by "outsiders." We have all been on this problem so long that we've gotten into the habit of taking mental shortcuts and using elliptical proofs, considering the gaps and omissions to be self-explanatory . . .

When the author of the dissenting paper wrote to Helms on 4 April 1966, he included the following comments:

My primary reason for bringing the attached bootleg copy of my memorandum to your attention is the morbid effect that the Nosenko case has, and will continue to have, on intelligence collection against the USSR by all agencies of the US government. The accusations against Nosenko, which I believe to be entirely false, have contaminated all current agent operations against the USSR and most of the past operations, ex post facto . . . Any case which we get from now on which supports Nosenko, especially the GRU and KGB cases, will likely be considered tainted. Since all such good cases are bound to support him, US intelligence faces a bleak future. The explicit ramifications of the concept of an all-powerful KGB, which can with impunity present us one of their senior personnel, or a knowledgeable facsimile, are already apparent in the negative moods of CIA personnel here and overseas.

Not long thereafter, Helms called the author by phone and told him he was having a great deal of trouble with the Nosenko case. He said that he was therefore going to turn it over to the DDCI, who he hoped could get to the bottom of it for him. Helms also asked the author if he would agree to Helms' passing his paper to an Agency psychologist. A few days later, Helms again called the author by phone and asked if he would agree to his paper's being passed to both the DDCI and the Director of Security.

SECRET

SECRET

-73-

N. Helms Takes Control

With the third anniversary of Nosenko's confinement drawing near, no resolution of the case was yet in sight. The FBI continued to take what Chief, SB described as a "neutral position" in regard to Nosenko.

The conflicting views of the various interested parties are not sufficiently relevant to the purposes of this study to require a detailed coverage. What is relevant is the fact that the stand-off increased Helms' impatience with continued delay. He therefore initiated a number of measures that gradually took handling of the entire Nosenko matter out of the hands of the SB Division. The first of these measures was to instruct the DDCI to undertake a thorough study of the Nosenko case.

When debriefed regarding the Nosenko case on 21 September 1976, the former DDCI remembered his involvement as follows:

DDCI: I became concerned as a result of Dick Helms [saying] that there was a matter that worried him very deeply, that needed resolution, that he doubted that there was enough objectivity amongst the people in the Agency who handled it so far to arrive at any kind of a really objective solution to the problem, and it was very sensitive indeed, would I please look into it and let him know my conclusions. Then he went on to tell me about Nosenko, the defector, who was at that time incarcerated . . . And he mentioned that there was a dichotomy of views in the DDP as to whether Nosenko was a bona fide defector or whether he had been sent on a mission, and that in any case he, Helms, felt that it was wrong to keep him confined and we had to do something with him one way or the other.

Q: He said that it was wrong to keep him confined?

DDCI: Yes, he was really distressed about the fact that this fellow had been in confinement so long and that they had never been able to arrive at a conclusion as to whether he was a bona fide or whether he was a plant, and he just had to get it resolved and something had to be done to get this fellow in a . . . oh, I've forgotten just how he put it,

SECRET

SECRET

-74-

but in a more acceptable position. So, I said, yes, I would undertake this job and I sent for all the background papers on it and studied them first. Then I interviewed [Chief, CI and Chief, SB] and arrived at the conclusion . . . I think I talked to some other people in the Soviet Division of the DDP also, but I arrived at the conclusion that people had their feet so mired in concrete of opinion as to one side or the other of the case, that it was just damned near impossible to get any worthwhile information out of interviews. And I then wrote a memorandum to Helms in which I indicated that I had, after reviewing the . . . making a preliminary review of the case, that I had considerable doubt that Nosenko was a plant; if so, I couldn't figure out what he was planted for. Nor could I get out of anybody else what he was supposed . . . what his mission was supposed to be, even in their hypothesis . . .

. . . My second memorandum to Helms was to the effect that, whatever the case, I didn't believe that Nosenko was any threat whatsoever to the Agency, that he ought to be rehabilitated, and I got a free hand from Helms to go ahead with the idea of rehabilitating him. And [the Director of Security] then had him moved . . .

Q: Well, do you remember anything about Dick Helms' reactions to your recommendations?

DDCI: He seemed rather pleased with the information. I got the impression from discussing the case with him that he never had been able to get what he felt was a really fair appraisal of it from anybody; and I got the impression that he felt at last he had a fair appraisal of it.

On 26 May 1967, the DDCI called the Director of Security to his office, and the Director of Security recorded the meeting as follows:

[The DDCI] started by asking me whether or not I had seen the eight hundred page report summarizing the Soviet Bloc Division's interrogation and exploitation of [Nosenko]. I said that I had not

SECRET

SECRET

-75-

read it personally but that [a member] of my Security Research Staff was now in the process of reviewing it and commenting on selected portions of it. He then asked if I agreed with its conclusions. I told him that I did not; that it had been the consistent position of this Office that while we did not, under any circumstances, consider him bona fide, we were not convinced that he was a provocation dispatched by the KGB with a specific mission. Rather, our position has always been that there is something wrong with [Nosenko] and his story but we do not know enough in order to make a final decision.

I went on to point out to the [DDCI] that I had thought, and had so recommended on numerous occasions in the past, that it would make a lot of sense for [a member] of my Office to take over the interrogation of [Nosenko] in order to resolve several discrepancies that had always concerned us. Further, I said that the polygraph examination given [Nosenko] at the outset was designed only to "break him" and was not an objective polygraph examination designed to establish or deny his bona fides. I indicated that the Director had approved this idea but that I had been unable to sell the idea to . . . SB Division.

[The DDCI] said that he thought this was an excellent idea. He agreed with me that we had everything to gain and nothing to lose through such a course of action and that he would so recommend to the Director. I pointed out to him that one of the things that had always concerned us was that the Soviet Bloc Division had never released any verbatim transcripts covering their many interrogations of [Nosenko] and that we could make our judgment only on the basis of written summaries prepared by the Division.

Thus, acting under the DDCI's orders, the Office of Security transferred Nosenko to "a decent, respectable safehouse." SB Division was cut out of the case, as was the CI Staff.

SECRET

SECRET

-76-

O. Resolution of the Case

The Office of Security took over the handling of Nosenko in October 1967. The officer in charge immediately inaugurated a rapid transition to normal living conditions. Throughout this process, he found Nosenko fully cooperative, and without any tendency toward drunkenness or other aberrant behavior.

The following is a summary report prepared on 16 November 1967:

Nosenko was moved to his current location on 27 October 1967 and the first interview with Nosenko occurred on 30 October. During the first interview, particularly the first hour, Nosenko was quite nervous and showed a certain reticence to talk. This condition ameliorated rapidly and it is considered that the current situation is better than could have ever been anticipated in view of the conditions of his previous confinement.

Nosenko on his first day indicated his complete willingness to answer all questions and to write his answers to questions on areas of specific interest. It was determined that his English is adequate both for interview and for preparation of written material. Interviews are not usually over two and a half hours a day, six days a week, with Nosenko preparing from six to ten pages of written material each day. Prepared material has included life history, individual cases, trips of Nosenko, reason for defection, and detailed drawings of pertinent offices during his claimed period of KGB employment.

There does not appear to be any impairment of his memory. His current living conditions, although physically secure, are luxurious compared to those he had been in during the past three years and have resulted in a relaxation of physical tension.

Definitive resolution of the complex problems in this case will require a considerable period of

SECRET

SECRET

-77-

time for further interviews, preparation of written material and a comparative analysis against his previous statements and information from other sources, interviews and investigation. Nosenko freely admits certain previous lies concerning a recall telegram while in Geneva and having received certain awards or decorations.

All interviews with Nosenko are recorded and transcripts of the interviews are being prepared. In addition, all written material from Nosenko is being typed with certain explanatory remarks . . . In addition, the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence has been orally briefed by the Director of Security. As of the present time, it is estimated that there are 1,000 pages of material completed or awaiting completion. All of the finished material is in a form which will permit dissemination to the FBI in part or in toto when such dissemination is considered appropriate.

Work thus far with Nosenko has resulted in a clarification of certain areas of previous controversy. As an example, it is considered that there can be at this time little doubt that Nosenko was in the KGB during the approximate period which he claims to have been in the KGB. The matter of the actual positions held by Nosenko during the approximate 1953-early 1964 period is not considered adequately resolved at this time and any speculation concerning the dispatched agent aspects would be completely premature.

If even a degree of optimism is realistic, it is felt that the additional interviews and work in the Nosenko case together with a detailed comparative analysis of all information will provide a firmer basis for a final conclusion of the Nosenko problem. Nosenko has been very responsive [to] the normal consideration he is now receiving, e.g., our current work with him, and if it accomplishes nothing else, will at least condition Nosenko more favorably for whatever future action is taken relative to his disposition.

SECRET

SECRET

-78-

This questioning of Nosenko was paralleled by a separate investigation conducted by the FBI. Results were covered in two reports published at about the same time, the FBI's on 20 September 1968 and the CIA Office of Security's on 1 October 1968.

The essence of the Office of Security's findings was expressed in a covering memorandum to the Director of Security:

In brief, the conclusion of this summary is that Nosenko is the person he claims to be, that he held his claimed positions in the KGB during 1953-January 1964, that Nosenko was not dispatched by the KGB, and that his previous lies and exaggerations are not actually of material significance at this time.

The conclusions of the FBI report were more sweeping:

1. The current interrogations and collateral inquiries have established a number of significant omissions and inaccuracies in the February 1968 CIA paper and have invalidated the vast majority of conclusions on which that paper relied to discredit Nosenko.

2. The current interrogations and the polygraph examination* disclosed no indication of deception on the part of Nosenko. He is knowledgeable in the areas and to the extent he should be; he furnished logical explanations for acquisition of information which would not normally have been accessible to him in his claimed positions. There is no substantial basis for doubting his bona fides as a defector.

3. The variety and volume of information provided by Nosenko is such that it is considered impossible that he acquired the information only by KGB briefing. It is also illogical and

*Reference is being made by the FBI to the polygraph examination of Nosenko performed by CIA between 2 and 6 August 1968 as part of the interrogation undertaken by the Office of Security.

SECRET

SECRET

-79-

implausible that the KGB would have dispatched an officer of his caliber with instructions to disclose the variety and volume of valuable information furnished by him. No compensatory objective is apparent.

4. The current interrogations show that Nosenko is in possession of information not previously obtained. In the interest of both intelligence and counterintelligence agencies of the government, interviews should be continued to exhaust his knowledge.

5. There should be a thorough re-examination of all information and cases emanating from Nosenko and other defectors where the decision for action, or lack of action, was previously influenced by the presumption that Nosenko was not a bona fide defector.

Despite the above findings, the CI Staff never gave up its contention that Nosenko was a KGB-dispatched agent. On 31 January 1969, the CI Staff argued that to accept Nosenko's bona fides meant repudiating Golitsyn, "the only proven reliable source about the KGB for a period of time which appears to be vital to both Nosenko and CIA."

An undated memorandum written by the Office of Security officer in charge of Nosenko essentially brings this chronicle to a close:

Since April 1969, Nosenko has had his own private residence and since June 1969, his own automobile. Even prior to April 1969, Nosenko could have, if he chose to do so, acted in a way seriously adverse to the best interests of this Agency since control was not of such a nature as to preclude independent action by Nosenko.

It is the opinion of Agency representatives in regular contact with Nosenko that he is genuinely interested in maintaining the anonymity of his current identity, that is, not becoming publicly known as identical to Nosenko. As an example, he was very interested in having a facial birthmark removed. However, he has on numerous occasions indicated his interest in participating under the Nosenko identity in some action or

SECRET

SECRET

-80-

activity which would "hurt the KGB." Nosenko considers that he has certain capabilities and knowledge which could be useful in the effort of the United States government against the KGB. This interest has not been associated with any particular curiosity in regard to the activities of this Agency . . .

Nosenko has consistently expressed his deep interest in obtaining United States citizenship as soon as possible. He realizes that under normal circumstances, citizenship could not be obtained until February 1974, but also is aware that citizenship can be obtained in less than the normal waiting period by legislative action.

Nosenko is considered by Agency personnel and FBI personnel in contact with Nosenko to have made an unusual adaptation to American life. He lives like a normal American and has an obvious pride in his home and personal effects. His home life from all appearances is quite calm. The fluency of Nosenko in the English language has greatly increased and there is no difficulty in understanding Nosenko or in his ability to express his thoughts. Obviously his accent and occasional incorrect sentence structure (and misspelling of words) has not been eliminated and probably will never be entirely eliminated.

Nosenko continues to complete work assignments expeditiously and with interest. As indicated above, Nosenko is very interested in doing "something active" which is understandable. Full consideration should be given to this interest since if properly controlled and channeled, could be used in a way adverse to the best interest of the KGB.

Nosenko has since become a United States citizen, has married an American woman, continues to lead a normal life, and works productively for the CIA.

SECRET

SECRET

-81-

CHAPTER IV**Nosenko's Contribution: A Summary Evaluation**

Any attempt to assess Nosenko's value to the US government must begin by pointing out that he might well have been able to contribute more had he been permitted to do so. Unfortunately, we were unwilling to give serious consideration to his stated desire to assist us in making recruitments of Soviet officials; we discounted Nosenko's suggestions along this line as possibly part of a plan to embarrass the US government. There is no telling what potential recruitment targets might have emerged had we, soon after Nosenko's defection, briefed him with such targets in view.

In this part of our study, we therefore confine ourselves to a summary of the contributions that, despite considerable odds, Nosenko was able to make. Let us take them, very briefly, one by one.

A. Information on KGB Personnel

The Office of Security's 1968 report summed up Nosenko's contribution in this field as follows:

Nosenko has furnished information concerning perhaps 2,000 KGB officers and 300 KGB agents or operative contacts (here the terms agents or operative contacts are used to refer to Soviet nationals), mainly in the Second Chief Directorate or internal KGB organizations. However, he has identified approximately 250 former or current First Chief Directorate officers and there is a considerable exchange of officers between the FCD and SCD. In addition, numerous officers of the SCD and other internal KGB organizations travel abroad with delegations, tourist groups, and as visitors to various major exhibitions such as World's Fairs. It is impossible at this time to estimate the number of KGB officers identified by Nosenko who have been outside the Soviet Bloc since his defection or who will be out some time in the future.

SECRET

SECRET

-82-

There has been very little attempted exploitation of information furnished by Nosenko concerning other KGB officers and, therefore, the possible value of this information to United States Intelligence cannot be estimated nor can the potential damage to the KGB be estimated.

B. KGB Recruitment Efforts Against US Citizens

Most of Nosenko's own operational experience with the KGB involved efforts against US citizens, either visitors to the USSR or members of the US embassy in Moscow. As a result of this background, Nosenko was able to provide some 238 identifications of, or leads to, Americans in whom the KGB had displayed some interest.

Some of the KGB operational efforts culminated in "recruitments" that, according to Nosenko, were more statistical than real; the KGB played the numbers game, for purposes of year-end reporting. Nonetheless, Nosenko's reporting did result in the uncovering of certain US citizens genuinely working for Soviet intelligence:

1. US Army Sergeant Robert L. Johnson, who had been recruited in 1953, was arrested in 1965 on the basis of a Nosenko lead to an agent assigned to a US military installation outside Paris who was providing the KGB with important documents as of 1962-1963. Johnson was custodian of classified documents at Orly Field Armed Forces Courier Transfer Station during this period, and he provided documents from there. Excerpts from a preliminary damage assessment are included below:

The full extent of damage will only be known when the current review of documents by all affected agencies is completed. The damage assessments prepared by the military services, however, based on a review of their documents to date, indicate that as a result of access to documents in the Orly vault, the Soviets may have learned:

SECRET

