

JFK ASSASSINATION SYSTEM
IDENTIFICATION FORM

AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY : CIA
RECORD NUMBER : 104-10534-10082
RECORD SERIES : JFK
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : NOSENKO RECORDS

Released under the John F.
Kennedy Assassination Records
Collection Act of 1992 (44 USC
2107 Note). Case#:NW 53216
Date: 06-14-2017

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

ORIGINATOR : CIA
FROM :
TO :
TITLE : ATTACHMENT B TO MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD:ANATOLE RE
NOSENKO, CRUCIAL QUESTIONS.
DATE : 04/07/69
PAGES : 45
SUBJECTS : NOSENKO
"ANATOLE"
NBR

DOCUMENT TYPE : PAPER, TEXTUAL DOCUMENT
CLASSIFICATION : SECRET
RESTRICTIONS :
CURRENT STATUS : POSTPONED IN FULL
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 02/02/01
OPENING CRITERIA :
COMMENTS : JFK-M-24:F44 2001.02.02.09:27:45:170084: DOCUMENT DATE
TAKEN FROM LAST TWO PAGES - CORRECTION AND AMENDMENT.
NOT BELIEVED RELEVANT (NBR).

[R] - ITEM IS RESTRICTED

ANATOLE Re NOSENKOCRUCIAL QUESTIONS

A. ANATOLE was consulted 31 March and 1 and 2 April 1969 concerning his recommendations on how to proceed to elicit additional information from NOSENKO. ANATOLE offered specific topics and questions about which NOSENKO is to be questioned after setting forth items or topics which ANATOLE considers the CRUCIAL QUESTIONS which need explanation or resolution. These CRUCIAL QUESTIONS are set forth below with comment or notations which emerged during our discussions.

B. ANATOLE understands that the immediate period of elicitation from NOSENKO is part of the program to attempt to resolve the bona fides of NOSENKO. He understands that his participation and contribution is actually the implementation of the program he originally believed was to be followed before there were any conclusions about NOSENKO's bona fides. ANATOLE had been reviewing his file material and the transcripts of his comments in January 1969 (The KY transcripts) so he was prepared to discuss aspects of the CRUCIAL QUESTIONS as well as specific elicitation topics. As our contribution to the discussion with ANATOLE we had prepared 26 papers relating specifically to NOSENKO and I had notes concerning other points or topics to be discussed. Each paper was read by ANATOLE, he

retained certain of the papers and, as set forth below, he commented about certain of the papers or related matters. After outlining the CRUCIAL QUESTIONS we worked out an elicitation guide to be followed with NOSENKO as the beginning of the program. The elicitation guide is detailed separately.

C. ANATOLE submits the following as his recommendation about how to proceed with NOSENKO:

1. Isolate the CRUCIAL QUESTIONS for our guidance and consideration. (We basically accomplished this 31 March and 1 and 2 April although obviously these may be revised)
2. Devise questions for elicitation. The questioning of NOSENKO is to begin immediately and is to follow the procedures set forth separately. (The initial phase of this was accomplished. Additional or revised elicitation topics or questions will be considered when the results of the first elicitation phase are reviewed with ANATOLE).
3. A polygraph examination. (ANATOLE believes another polygraph based on questions he will help frame will be essential. It is his opinion that it will be possible to make the polygraph meaningful if questions are based on a careful review of the results of the elicitation and specifically on the basis of his knowledge. ANATOLE believes it should be possible to use the polygraph effectively and to eliminate or explain more adequately the qualifications concerning NOSENKO's veracity

such as "substantially truthful" by pinpointing questions and areas where there remains doubt. ANATOLE agreed there might be a question of when a polygraph examination should be administered since it might be more effective after the confrontation or hostile interrogation of NOSENKO.)

4. A hostile/confrontation interrogation phase at which time NOSENKO would be faced with the errors, inconsistencies, falsehoods, etc. in his story and advised that his mission failed. This phase of the approach to NOSENKO would only be undertaken upon conclusion of the elicitation phase or if or when NOSENKO's attitude changes during the elicitation phase. The confrontation would be undertaken only when full research on every aspect of each CRUCIAL QUESTION has been completed and specific questions are framed with ANATOLE on the basis of NOSENKO's information or answers and all collateral information. In this connection ANATOLE expects continuing research on each crucial question so that each can be examined on the basis of a summary of all information about the question, the details of what NOSENKO has said and related or collateral information such as photographs or documents, etc. The hostile interrogation phase ANATOLE anticipates will be undertaken only after full consideration of all possible problems. For example ANATOLE stresses he will need to review the Bagley letter of November 1966 to NOSENKO since this will be a key element in considering how to proceed with the confrontation as well as to attempt to determine

what influence that letter has had on NOSENKO during the 67-68 interviews.

D. It was necessary to emphasize to ANATOLE the fact that at this time it is not possible for me to assure him that everything NOSENKO has said on any topic has been recovered or is retrievable even for the interview period of 1967-1968 (and 69). Noting the papers we had prepared ANATOLE had to be told there was no assurance that everything NOSENKO has said was included or considered when attempting to extract or summarize his statements about a person or event. Specifically it was noted that with a few exceptions no topic or item is fully covered during one or two interviews. Even though ANATOLE recognized the problem based on his review of the transcripts of the 1967-68 interviews it was necessary to emphasize the fact that the validity of any given question we had framed might be challenged, reversed or modified as the process of indexing the transcripts continued. ANATOLE was told that as of 31 March 1969 we had been able to index and extract the transcripts and memoranda of the 1967-68 interviews only through N-188 of approximately 260 N-memoranda. ANATOLE also was told it is not possible to be certain that all previous information from NOSENKO can be accurately and fully recovered. For this reason it is difficult if not impossible to isolate what he might have said in 1964 and/or 1965 and compare that

statement with what he said in 1968. ANATOLE also acknowledged noting the possible significance of the interview techniques as these have varied over the years. Contrast in the technique and the approach to NOSENKO where, for example, he is provided information or asked only to confirm a leading question has tended to dilute if not obscure what NOSENKO actually has had to say about many subjects; at this stage it may be virtually impossible to distinguish NOSENKO's original information from subsequent statements modified as a result of questioning. This problem is an important consideration because the approach to the elicitation phase was developed with this in mind. Essentially it was agreed with ANATOLE that despite previous statements or information from NOSENKO the elicitation phase would be managed to attempt to obtain from NOSENKO everything he has to offer or say about each CRUCIAL QUESTION at this time without reference to any previous statement. It is ANATOLE's opinion that if NOSENKO provides a full statement without prompting that further questioning can be meaningful after analysis of his statement despite the possibility NOSENKO has modified or revised his information as he has learned or apparently learned what he thinks is wanted or he should say. ANATOLE believes the fundamental problem remains and that despite NOSENKO's twists and turns it will be possible to sort through the various stories to focus on the reason for NOSENKO's dispatch and determine the

key items of diversion.

E. In reply to ANATOLE's question he was told that the FBI continued to interview NOSENKO usually with Mr. Solie present but that I did not know in advance anything about the topics of any interviews. I told ANATOLE it was my opinion that once elicitation from NOSENKO began on the basis of his recommendations that other interviews would stop. We recognized and agreed that there might be a tactical and/or psychological problem with NOSENKO by shifting the interview technique to elicitation rather than consultation and a response to questioning. ANATOLE could not emphasize too strongly the need to let NOSENKO respond fully with minimal prodding or stimulation and without refreshing his memory. ANATOLE was told it was my understanding the elicitation phase would be conducted by Mr. Solie without FBI participation although I did tell ANATOLE that the elicitation transcript results would undoubtedly be given to the FBI just as have the results of all the 1967-69 interviews.

F. ANATOLE expects and recommends that the period of elicitation will be followed by the period of interrogation or confrontation to be conducted by a team of three persons - The security expert, Mr. Solie; a counterintelligence specialist who knows related cases and CI problems, and a Soviet specialist.

~~SECRET~~

-7-

ANATOLE says this team approach will be necessary to implement a fast moving interrogation, based on the script he will help devise, which will not permit NOSENKO time to reflect or think about his answers. The tactic will be to insist on immediate and full answers and ANATOLE insists that once the new elicitation phase begins NOSENKO not be permitted to write any answers: He is not to be given any written assignments: every response and reply is to be oral and transcribed and NOSENKO must be encouraged and permitted to respond fully: he is not to be asked to confirm or deny any statement nor is he to be assisted in replying to any question with suggestions or reminders.

G. ANATOLE recognizes the problem of information from FBI sources and the release of this information to him. He respects the FBI need to protect its sources and understands the FBI attitude even though he quite obviously disagrees. He believes that our failure to make relevant information available to him is shortsighted and lessens both his effectiveness and our ability to decipher the NOSENKO puzzle faster. ANATOLE recalls that at the time NOSENKO defected in 1964 and there was discussion with the FBI about the SASHA lead and related matters he asked for FBI file and source information pertinent to the problems. ANATOLE continues to believe there probably

~~SECRET~~

is a serious question about the possible significance of NOSENKO to penetration of the FBI and the bona fides of FBI sources in terms of misinformation (disinformation) in relation to both NOSENKO and other information. He is of the opinion that a FBI source(s) probably came to the FBI after his defection and perhaps after NOSENKO's contact if not dispatch in 1964. He suggests the possibility there may be a false arrest and show trial of a FBI source in order to further bolster NOSENKO's story. Although it has not been possible to discuss this aspect of the NOSENKO story with ANATOLE it seems clear that if we are to gain full measure from ANATOLE it will be necessary for the FBI to approve or conduct a briefing of ANATOLE appropriate to putting a perspective on the FBI sources so he can assess what they have said about NOSENKO and GOLITZYN.

H. The following are the CRUCIAL QUESTIONS which are to form the basis for elicitation from NOSENKO. They are set forth in the order discussed.

1. Misinformation in the Second Chief Directorate (SCD)
(This is an immediate topic for elicitation as set forth separately)
2. Leadership of the KGB
3. Leadership of the First Chief Directorate (FCD)
4. Leadership of the SCD
5. SHELEPIN's 1959 Report (This topic will be discussed

~~SECRET~~

more thoroughly with ANATOLE before the question is raised with NOSENKO again. ANATOLE was emphatic in stating that it had been a mistake to raise the subject of the KGB policy and 1959 reorganization with NOSENKO. He read the paper with attachments but deferred comment except to note that NOSENKO had said very little of significance. It was at this time that ANATOLE first noted it was a mistake to permit NOSENKO to write memoranda. ANATOLE obviously considers this aspect of the NOSENKO case most important and a topic which requires his study particularly in view of the fact he now has extracts from the GOLENIEWSKI letters which relate to the 1959 KGB reorganization and disinformation. ANATOLE also did not recall the book so it will be necessary to make certain he has a copy.)

6. Penetration of the American Embassy Moscow

(ANATOLE considers this a most important topic which requires additional study and elicitation later after research will permit us to assess NOSENKO's statements rapidly. ANATOLE reiterates his concern that it is exactly and specifically in this area that NOSENKO's reassurance of no KGB successes is most likely diversion. ANATOLE expressed his concern that in January he may have commented too extensively and theoretically about this problem. He now wants to re-examine this problem and refocus everyone back more precisely to NOSENKO and his story)

7. Penetration of CIA (This is a topic for later elicitation from NOSENKO.)

8. VASSALL Case (ANATOLE believes NOSENKO should be asked to reconstruct completely in detail everything he knows about the VASSALL case: times, sources, officers, etc., at one taped session. Simultaneously ANATOLE says we should construct a complete chronology of everything NOSENKO has said about the VASSALL case since June 1962, including the questions or comments put to NOSENKO about VASSALL. An analysis comparison of these two papers will follow.

ANATOLE proposes it may be possible to demonstrate how a possible penetration of CIA could have precluded NOSENKO's safety from 1962 to 1964. This may assist us to solve our problem and also be ultimately useful in confronting NOSENKO on the point of his dispatch and apparent immunity.

9. Boris BELITSKIY Case (ANATOLE approved elicitation and questioning on the basis of the summary and questionnaire. ANATOLE stresses the need to confine the questioning to the questionnaire and the fact that NOSENKO is not to be given additional information about the case, its origins, etc., either as we knew it or now know it from ANATOLE. There will be some tie-in to the elicitation about Vladimir Luovich ARTEMOV and Aleksandr Konstantinovich KISLOV but other than the questions as set forth in the papers ANATOLE reviewed there should be no questions asked which brief NOSENKO or relate the three or any other persons.

ANATOLE needs a photograph of ARTEMOV to make certain of identification and he needs photos others in the delegation with BELITSKIY to try to determine if there were other KGB officers in the delegation who might have been in on the case or the disinformation aspect)

10. The 1960 period of NOSENKO's career.

This is to be an elicitation topic later after we have summarized what we can about NOSENKO's story of this period. In reply to ANATOLE's question based on his review of the paper NOSENKO Timetable and Associates I told ANATOLE the researcher had found it impossible to date to sort out and isolate NOSENKO's 1967-68 statements about his career during the period 1960 to 1962. ANATOLE was told this was obviously a priority job but that it just had been an impossible task without additional research and analysis. We will discuss this fully when the isolation is completed and in conjunction with other topics.

11. Vadim Viktorovich KOSOLAPOV 's November 1960 trip.

This item is for later elicitation after more research is completed about the code clerks, perhaps a reinvestigation to make positive identifications, etc. ANATOLE asked if ~~K~~OSOLAPOV's trip to Copenhagen was confirmed (N-167 pg. 16) and I told him I thought it was under a different name. ANATOLE would like details.

12. The Robert Lee JOHNSON case.

ANATOLE considers this an important aspect of NOSENKO's throw-away material. He again questions why the SCD would lend technicians to the FCD and wants NOSENKO to explain this in detail as well as to fully detail again how, from whom, etc. NOSENKO learned of this case. ANATOLE is of the opinion new questions can be asked but agreed to defer elicitation on this case primarily because I pointed out that in 1965 a paper was written setting forth apparent inherent security weaknesses in the Johnson case some of which at least suggested strongly that, in addition to Johnson's lack of access at one time, the KGB could have anticipated a blow at any moment. I outlined some of the points I recall about the weaknesses of the principals and quite frankly I told ANATOLE that I doubted that anyone currently of the opinion NOSENKO is bona fide would be any more inclined to credit the 1965 paper today than he has in the past. I agreed that it might be useful to again attempt to get NOSENKO's story about the JOHNSON case when this story would be exclusively NOSENKO's.

13. Aleksey Mikhaylovich GORBATENKO.

ANATOLE wants NOSENKO to tell in detail everything he knows about GORBATENKO. ANATOLE notes the 1955 promotion is a key element but stresses no mention of this is to be made to NOSENKO. Despite previous mentions of GORBATENKO, which should be collated, NOSENKO is to restate everything completely.

~~SECRET~~

14. Serafim Nikalayeovich LYALIN

Elicitation about LYALIN is to follow later.

All references to LYALIN by NOSENKO should be collated with collateral information about him. If there is a photograph of LYALIN, ANATOLE wants to see it to verify any NOSENKO identification.

15. Vladislav Mikhaylovich KOVSHUK. ANATOLE

considers NOSENKO's information about KOVSHUK most important as a later elicitation point. He does not want NOSENKO asked any questions about KOVSHUK which may relate to KOVSHUK's trip to the U.S.A. or KOVSHUK's association with KISLOV. If NOSENKO in connection with detailing the biographies of his friends includes any of this about KOVSHUK he is NOT to be questioned on this matter or about the woman trouble previously mentioned.

ANATOLE needs exact dates KOVSHUK was in the U.S. and any details of activities he can be given from FBI reporting. In connection with our discussion about KOVSHUK possibly working with and associating with journalists ANATOLE said he recalled an incident which he thinks took place in 1959 when he met KOVSHUK on the street not far from the KGB offices when KOVSHUK signalled him not to speak. ANATOLE did not and observed KOVSHUK meet a Soviet journalist in an apparent agent type meeting.

ANATOLE said he had forgotten this incident and he never spoke to KOVSHUK about it. ANATOLE cannot recall the name of the journalist but said he recalls knowing him slightly. He will try to recall the name. (Note for SM check: did KOVSHUK per NOSENKO work vs. Americans with journalists and specifically Ed Stevens?)

16. Eugene Peter SEREBRENNIKOV.

ANATOLE says what NOSENKO has said is clear but that this needs full research and analysis - what he said contrasted with what NOSENKO said and what SEREBRENNIKOV said - before asking NOSENKO about this again.

17. Adam BROCHES Case

ANATOLE was told this lead information was being reviewed in detail. That there was some apparent confusion and possibly misinterpretation or misunderstanding about his lead information.

ANATOLE reiterated his point that the KGB wanted to reestablish relations which had been broken after BROCHES left France. ANATOLE knows about this from reading ZARUBIN paper and he knows that the KGB wanted to talk to ZARUBIN about this.

ANATOLE said that he would leave the decision about when NOSENKO would be asked about BROCHES again to SM - it could be immediately when the review was completed or later. The review is in process and we will have to see what FBI may have asked recently.

18. Viktor KOPEYKIN. A later topic.

19. The CHEREPANOV Papers

ANATOLE stresses the importance of this case but says this must be a later topic for NOSENKO probably in interrogation although it may be useful to have NOSENKO review his knowledge again in detail before confrontation.

ANATOLE referred to the need to analyze the results of the BOWDEN investigation before proceeding too far with NOSENKO. In this connection ANATOLE was told State Security was securely organizing this investigation and that it was currently planned that interviews would commence with BOWDEN first including mention to BOWDEN about his mention in the CHEREPANOV papers. In response to ANATOLE's question he was told that to my knowledge the FBI did not yet know about the BOWDEN investigation since to date it was a State Department inquiry based on a need to clarify certain possible problems. ANATOLE said that he saw CHEREPANOV after CHEREPANOV had transferred to the American Embassy Section wearing a Lt. Col. military uniform. ANATOLE said this was unusual and it suggests to him that CHEREPANOV was engaged in an operation, perhaps a contact posing as a military beginning in 1959. He said CHEREPANOV had as a constant companion a young man in the American Department but ANATOLE cannot recall the young man's name. (ANATOLE suggests later NOSENKO be asked if CHEREPANOV wore a military uniform and who was his companion,

probably in operations.) I told ANATOLE I did not know if NOSENKO had named any friends of CHEREPANOV but would check for names. ANATOLE said he recalled also there was a big change in CHEREPANOV's attitude and demeanor between early 1959 to mid - 1960 or, more probably, Dec. 1960 when ANATOLE saw Cherepanov again. ANATOLE said he can only interpret that CHEREPANOV was in a better mood, more confident in personality because he may have had some operational success. ANATOLE is of the opinion that CHEREPANOV's change in demeanor and mood could only relate to American Embassy operations.

20. The Case

ANATOLE says this is not really a crucial question although an important case which needs resolution eventually along lines set forth in the paper NOSENKO - Homosexual Aspects but not on the basis of the homosexual angle (see separate discussion re homosexual aspects).

21. The POBOV and PENKOVSKIY Cases

ANATOLE says both of these cases should be delayed until later. They require special consideration and more research and discussion. We are not ready now to delve into these and it is his opinion he may have tended to obscure some of the points about NOSENKO by drawing parallels with PENKOVSKIY in January. He believes there are parallels and a relationship

and we should continue to examine all aspects of the cases but he concedes a better base of understanding should be laid before it will be possible to make a meaningful tie to NOSENKO.

~~SECRET~~

22. NOSENKO's Friendship with GUK, CHURANOV, KOVSHUK, etc.

ANATOLE emphasized the need to get from NOSENKO complete details about his friends or claimed friends. ANATOLE agreed with the line of inquiry outlined in the paper "Knowledge Because of Association with other KGB Officers" and said elicitation should include information sufficient to give us in one place a perspective on NOSENKO's associates and friends. This topic can be covered immediately. ANATOLE stresses real importance of Guk, Kovshuk and Churanov to NOSENKO. He notes Guk's wife was the daughter of a minister and asks if NOSENKO could have introduced them. He also points out CHURANOV in school with NOSENKO.

23. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Lead.

ANATOLE agreed elicitation on this topic should begin immediately and was most interested in the possible significance of this case vis a vis disinformation. He noted, of course, the different perspective on the case and that apparently when this case was considered in the context of support to NOSENKO's bona fides analysis had not taken into account the actual origins and development of the case. ANATOLE immediately connected the SLAVACHENSKAYA angle to the PENKOVSKIY case and speculated that the KGB may have been attempting to establish a separate ostensibly confirmatory source to the FBI to bolster PENKOVSKIY

~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

who was in contact with the British and CIA. ANATOLE emphasized his view that NOSENKO should not be given a hint about the actual beginnings of the case to prevent NOSENKO from modifying his story or being led to explanations. NOSENKO should retell his account of the [REDACTED] case and then be asked the questions listed without confrontation or explanation.

24. [REDACTED]

(See N-24 - This a later topic) ANATOLE requests everything available about GINSBURG and specifically everything NOSENKO has ever said. After the research ANATOLE thinks he can spot something in connection with GINSBURG which is significant but which he says eludes him at this time.

25. The Military Attache Incident. ([REDACTED])

ANATOLE stresses importance again as he did in KY transcripts. He persists in thinking there may be more here than we have covered - that one of the MA's may have been recruited or someone else was recruited and advised about the trip. He refers to N-32, and maintains this incident needs reexamination and that probably after research the Attaches should be questioned again. ANATOLE says it his recollection that the KGB knew exactly the device they were looking for; that the KGB did not have a detection device which could have been effective and that the use of a box which looked like a detection machine was staged

to cover up fact KGB knew exactly where to find the device and what it was. He says his recollection is that KGB knew where to look and there was no search or monitoring. They just went to the right place. This means to ANATOLE a human not a machine source. He says questioning NOSENKO about this can only follow research.

(ANATOLE asked if the information about the Japanese Colonel in intelligence had been reported to the Japanese and what was the outcome. ANATOLE was told I did not know - would check.)

26. [REDACTED]

ANATOLE was interested in this but we did not dwell on this subject. ANATOLE believe it a give away diversion although probably true. Decision re additional elicitation to be made by SM on basis time and framing questions.

27. Microphones in American Embassy

ANATOLE still suggests review this information from NOSENKO and questioning particularly to establish exactly what NOSENKO said when and if he said anything about NORTH (?) Wing. Decision re timing of questioning by SM.

28. WATKINS - Canadian Ambassador Case.

ANATOLE thinks it necessary NOSENKO retell in detail everything he knows about WATKINS in same way he to be asked about Vassall. Then it will be necessary line out and compare

exactly what ANATOLE said and what NOSENKO said. ANATOLE points out importance of early information from NOSENKO before he was given background information or leading questions. ANATOLE thinks this can begin early in elicitation or be done later. Decision re timing by SM.

(ANATOLE thinks it might be helpful for him to review what NOSENKO has said about Svetlana STALINA ~~ALIEJEVA~~. This is speculative but ANATOLE recalls or was told NOSENKO should or did know something and he thinks there may be some clue here about NOSENKO's associates, friends, etc., possibly of importance.)

29. Code Clerks - 59-62

ANATOLE again emphasizes his need to see a full review of results of investigation of all the code clerk cases. He is convinced there may be a case here and that the clues have been missed or overlooked. He says he cannot recall the necessary detail and that it is only when he can be stimulated with names, dates, etc., that he may be able to pinpoint some angle of significance. ANATOLE was told we were also bothered about these cases - that much work had been done but that, quite frankly, I could not estimate how long it would take to assemble the information for orderly review. ANATOLE was told this is on the agenda - it is a matter of time and people. Any questioning of NOSENKO about these cases can only be done later.

~~SECRET~~

-22-

30. CIA Complex Moscow

ANATOLE said it would be necessary to research and collate all the information about CIA officers and operations in Moscow including visitors, i.e., TDYers, to get a picture of their activities, associates, KGB officers they met and operational activities which might have made them vulnerable. ANATOLE opines NOSENKO should know more specifics about this and that later it will be necessary to question him with specifics during the confrontation stage after comparing late elicitation results with collateral details.

31. A Code Clerk in American Embassy with Spanish Language or Spanish Background.

ANATOLE noted the reference in the paper re Vladimir Lvovich ARTEMOV to NOSENKO's information that ARTEMOV knew Spanish and said there might be a connection to something he vaguely recalled about an interest in or a case against an American code clerk of Spanish background or who spoke Spanish. ANATOLE said the period was 1957-60. He could not recall details. He said this should be considered a special case for him to work on now for later questioning of NOSENKO if research indicated this necessary. ANATOLE requested a for review any information available re code clerks, civilian or military, in Moscow 57-60 with Spanish language or background.

~~SECRET~~

32. Vladimir SUSLOV and Vasilii V. VAKHRUSHEV

ANATOLE agreed that the questions re VAKHRUSHEV should be asked of NOSENKO during the first elicitation stages. ANATOLE was concerned that NOSENKO not be given any indication of our current special interest in VAKHRUSHEV. (SM NOTE: Question re [REDACTED] deleted from paragraph 11 by SM on basis unnecessary. When reviewing paper with ANATOLE. He, of course, asked about [REDACTED] and was told [REDACTED] was on same ship once with VAKHRUSHEV and researcher had included question because [REDACTED] had high US Government contacts including some early 1950 work on U.S. intelligence community reviews.)

A specific question ANATOLE asked was about any collateral or documentary information that VAKHRUSHEV attended the Institute of Foreign Relations. He also asked if there were photographs of VAKHRUSHEV's wife(s) available and if NOSENKO had identified them. He would like to see them too. (SM NOTE: See 12 August 1964 interview).

ANATOLE thinks there may be a significant aspect about NOSENKO's schooling and VAKHRUSHEV's schooling which needs checking. ANATOLE is speculating on possibility NOSENKO was in Military Institute of Foreign Languages. I had to answer ANATOLE that I did not know if there was any collateral proof that NOSENKO was a student at the Institute of Foreign/International Relations but would check. ANATOLE projects this point on the logical

~~SECRET~~

progression of NOSENKO's schooling in the military and probability that higher education would have been under military unless some special family or other influence permitted change. He also notes NOSENKO's continuation in Naval Service and confirms he saw NOSENKO in Navy uniform in March 1953 in KGB Hdqs.

ANATOLE suggests this aspect be reexamined after elicitation in light of NOSENKO's answers and information about ~~VAKHRUSHEV~~ and SUSLOV, who was in Institute of Foreign Relations. ANATOLE says ~~CHURANOV~~ was in Foreign Relations Institute and that Guk was in Military Institute. ANATOLE speculates this ~~may be~~ area where NOSENKO is hiding his close relationship with Guk - that he might have first known Guk in the Military Institute although GUK a couple of years older than NOSENKO. Guk worked in GRU but ANATOLE does not remember if Navy. ANATOLE says he ^{will} consider ^{will} further elicitation later and also a surprise question on new polygraph about NOSENKO's attendance at the Military Institute.

A. The paper NOSENKO's Defection was read by ANATOLE with interest. I did not have 2 copies of this paper. ANATOLE was told a copy would be furnished him at next meeting. Certain comments which follow are based on information from this paper but a specific comment by ANATOLE was (see para 2 page 2 of paper):

It is true TSYMBAL was a former member of Department 4. It is illogical that TSYMBAL was transferred to the Illegal Directorate and more illogical he would travel with the delegation if he were head of the Illegals Directorate. As head of the 4th

Department he would go with the delegation but normally and logically there would be no mixing of legal and illegal elements. The KGB would not permit any publicity or identification of TSYMBAL if he were head of the Illegals. ANATOLE can only conclude this information is to create the impression of reorganization after his defection.

B. ANATOLE also points out the illogic aspect of a Tourist Department officer as security officer to such a delegation. He also notes that when senior officials such as GROMYKO travel there are specially assigned expert security officers with their delegations if any are sent at all. He notes that for the most part the senior officials travel without security officers except protective experts assigned such as would be the situation NOSENKO describes.

ANATOLE says a basic question for confrontation will be about the inclusion of a "special security officer" in a delegation such as one headed by the Foreign Minister. He says the inclusion of a person such as NOSENKO is very unusual. The Foreign Minister and his aides, etc., are trusted men who go abroad regularly. These are always experienced KGB officers on the operations in support of the delegations and the planning is well in advance. These officers can handle anything. At a later date ANATOLE says we can confront NOSENKO with this opposite position from ANATOLE.

~~SECRET~~

C. ANATOLE said the story about NOSENKO's role with SHAKHOV just gives a reason to us about why NOSENKO was in Geneva. There would be no reason for any special interest by NOSENKO. The residentura could and would handle any technical devices and operations such as NOSENKO describes.

D. / VALERIY
KREPKOGORSKIY.

ANATOLE found this connection and final drinking bout interesting and said both Guk and KREPKOGORSKIY would know what NOSENKO's mission was in 1962. I could provide no information about KREPKOGORSKIY and ANATOLE asked to see photo of KREPKOGORSKIY, nothing he could not recall name.

E. [REDACTED]

ANATOLE asked for information about [REDACTED] (SM NOTE: SM needs check significance - where in "NOSENKO - Defection" paper. What NOSENKO say, etc.).

F. ANATOLE says a later question NOSENKO should be asked ^{is} why in 1962 he rejected the idea of using his position in the Tourist Department as the logical position from which he could keep in contact with AIS, i.e., a tourist sent to be recruited by NOSENKO, etc.

33. Personnel of 1st Section, 1st Dept. 1959 - 61

ANATOLE believes this will be important area for later elicitation and, perhaps, confrontation after we have opportunity to analyze everything NOSENKO says vs the collateral and ANATOLE's information. It will be necessary to research this.

ANATOLE suggests we double check the debriefing of [REDACTED] about NOSENKO's approach and reexamine [REDACTED] background and what he has been doing to see if there is anything which looks significant now, i.e., anything important given hindsight and more information.

34. The Maurice De Jean Case

ANATOLE said it was important to line out in quotes by date everything that NOSENKO said about De Jean and do the same for the information from Yuriy Vasilyevich KROTKOV. These should then be lined out and chronologically compared with what ANATOLE said. On the basis of these conclusions and the time sequence we should ~~even~~ examine the problem of the leakage of lead information to try to get indications ~~at~~ least of how, why and where ANATOLE's information leaked. ANATOLE said we should also consider the possible problem of leakage in connection with the WATKIN's Case and the RCMP in this. He also notes that GRIBANOV's role and visit to Paris may be important so when NOSENKO responds to questions about GRIBANOV we should examine this aspect also. Specifically, NOSENKO should comment about why GRIBANOV went to Paris.

35. BUSHEK and GRIBANOV

In connection with discussions about GRIBANOV and his trip in 1964, we discussed the BUSHEK case and ANATOLE was told the following re chronology:

~~SECRET~~
SECRET

~~SECRET~~

-28-

18 January NOSENKO to Geneva from Paris.

4 Feb (SM believes) GRIBANOV arrives Paris from Vienna -
NOSENKO defects.

7 Feb. GRIBANOV departs Paris for Vienna (GRIBANOV uses name GORBUNOV in Vienna and with BUSHEK.)

12 Feb Soviets in Switzerland strongly protest to Swiss about NOSENKO's defection.

14 Feb (maybe 13 Feb.) GRIBANOV, according to BUSHEK, relaxed about NOSENKO defection when BUSHEK raised question. ANATOLE suggests questions re BUSHEK come later.

36. Recall Telegram

It is apparent to ANATOLE there is significant information about this aspect of the NOSENKO case from the FBI. This goes to the basic question of cooperation with the FBI and his knowledge which he concedes is a basic FBI decision about what he sees of the recall telegram information. ANATOLE has seen only NOSENKO's information (transcripts, etc.). The significance of this may bear on the question of rank discussed separately but even without being able to discuss all aspects of the recall telegram with ANATOLE he suggests we should examine if we have not done this the details of NOSENKO's admissions he lied about his rank and the recall telegram. ANATOLE says it is necessary to determine: the exact date NOSENKO broke on each story; who was involved; who knew he was being pressured; was there coordination with the FBI about the pressure on the recall telegram;

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

-29-

what and who led us to conclude the stories were false; what were the dates involved between NOSENKO's story of the telegram and the information from another source(s); was there time for NOSENKO to confirm his use of the recall telegram story; could the message from NOSENKO have gotten to another source or would it appear the telegram story had to be planned in advance and not triggered by confirmation from NOSENKO; after NOSENKO broke was the other source(s) confronted; was there any change in the relations with the other source(s); has there been any collateral information reflecting KGB knowledge he has broken on rank or the telegram stories. ANATOLE suggests this aspect of the question of bona fides come later in confrontation and he assumes SM will be covering this fully even though he hopes there will be permission for him to be fully read into this. He was told, for the record since he obviously understood the implications, I could promise nothing since any discussion about the recall telegram and any other source would mean opening to him full information about any source since everyone, including the FBI, knew he would never be satisfied with partial limited information. He laughingly agreed he would press for full information but did concede he might (temporarily?) settle for less than the full source information if the context of the information about NOSENKO was complete and he could understand the significance of the source's position, etc.

~~SECRET~~

I said we would think about what could be done but that optimism was not in order.

37. NOSENKO Statement Condemning Soviet Regime

ANATOLE outlined the steps to be taken to obtain from NOSENKO a statement which in its ultimate written form may serve both as a control and a propaganda instrument. ANATOLE believes that leading NOSENKO to a final absolute written and documented statement against the Soviets will not only permit us to judge NOSENKO more accurately by observing his reactions but also provide additional psychological pressure useful in the final stages of dealing with NOSENKO when we confront him with the evidence we know he was on a mission. ANATOLE believes the final denunciatory statement may help tip the balance in gaining NOSENKO's cooperation/confession.

The steps to be taken are as follows:

A. Elicit from NOSENKO statements as detailed and specific as possible condemning the Soviet regime, the KGB, the party, individuals, etc. This should be at a fast tempo. (This can begin immediately.)

B. After reviewing these statements elicit from NOSENKO increasingly detailed condemnatory statements by having him add details about persons and activities.

C. Concurrent with 37A above NOSENKO should be asked to enumerate in detail each example of those things he did, saw or heard about which brought him to the point of defection. If he does not mention the KGB then at later stage in the elicitation process he is to be pressed for reasons he dislikes

~~SECRET~~

-31-

the KGB. He should be led to make statements about repugnant KGB techniques such as blackmail, hetero-sexual and homosexual entrapments against diplomats, tourists, prominent Western scientists, etc. He should be led to express his disgust at every stage about the intimidation practiced and should include Russian youth and the spying on intellectuals.

D. After NOSENKO has enumerated and elaborated his denunciation and condemnation of the Soviets, orally and at length he should be asked to write in his own words a statement which he will agree can be published. He should be asked at this point, although it may be necessary to ask him earlier, if he is prepared to make an official statement condemning the Soviet regime and specific people. He will be told that with his cooperation we want to expose the Soviet regime on the basis of real knowledge. This first statement will be revised by us to include specifics and which will include statements such as "I condemn SHELEPIN, GRIBANOV, etc. for - 0 - - -"; "I condemn GRIBANOV for forcing me to engage in reprehensible homosexual entrapments - - "; "I condemn a system which deals in misinformation and confusion such as that led by AGAYANTS - - ".

E. At a later stage after review of his other statements about personnel, the KGB organization, etc; as follow-up he should in interview only detail what steps were taken to counteract the damage from GOLITZYN's defection and the KGB reorganization. He should list all personnel structural and

~~SECRET~~

particularly the functional changes in the KGB. He should be asked the specific question of when was a conference held to consider the impact of GOLITZYN's knowledge about tourists and the loss of documents. He should relate this to the 1964 Tourist Conference he says was scheduled.

F. The final written condemnatory statement will be considered for publication with or without NOSENKO's approval or agreement. The statement should be a key element in assessing his reaction at the point where his confession/cooperation is solicited and he is told it will be published.

38. NOSENKO's "SASHA" Case

There was little discussion of this except to consider need to review more and consider this a topic for later questioning.

39. PREISFREUND

ANATOLE considers this a topic worth more study and review on the basis that something may have been overlooked which relates to misinformation about the American Embassy or American personnel. We should not consider this case closed and more research is needed.

(ANATOLE sees no relevancy to the questions re GOLITZYN. If we have some operationally significant angle he can approve questions but he sees none - he finds this unnecessary and question 15 especially unnecessary. ANATOLE

~~SECRET~~

ANATOLE

pointed out the basic and only question with respect to NOSENKO is misinformation and he sees no advantage or assistance resulting from questions about GOLITZYN. However, he said this was not his decision. He was told the paper about the GOLITZYN question was prepared by a researcher who works exclusively at this time on the 1967-1968 materials and the researcher responded to a general requirement to extract information and frame questions to be asked of NOSENKO which could be tested against known information. The researcher obviously believes that if NOSENKO were to make a false or misleading statement which GOLITZYN has or could deny or prove wrong NOSENKO would be in a bind. ANATOLE was also told he must understand that compartmentation in research and on NOSENKO as well as on larger issues means that we will review a few papers which are useless in the larger context eventhough to the researcher who has a narrow view the concern is real.)

40. Gennadiy Ivanovich GRYAZNOV.

ANATOLE's reaction to the questions and paper was that they will not accomplish much of significance re GRYAZNOV since he thinks there is a GRYAZNOV relationship to the code clerk cases which can only be determined after that research and analysis of information about GRYAZNOV. He agreed the questions could be used later during elicitation as time fillers and preliminary to hard questions but not much will come because the questions are not to the point, which he did not explain fully.

ANATOLE did specifically challenge NOSENKO's story of his close relationship with GRYAZNOV as a lie. ANATOLE notes the possibility there was leakage of his identification to the FBI and CIA of GRYAZNOV as a source. Particularly ANATOLE says NOSENKO's story of a close relationship with GRYAZNOV in 1962 is probably false because there was no previous relationship leading to this. ANATOLE said definitely that GRYAZNOV would have been punished if the KGB knew he was identified as a source to GOLITZYN.

ANATOLE says there is a contradiction with NOSENKO trying to build up his relationship with GRYAZNOV and down-play or, more accurately minimize, the extent of his relations with CHURANOV and GUK. ANATOLE believes it was a deliberate part of NOSENKO's legend to set him close to GRYAZNOV since GRYAZNOV was an acknowledged source of some of GOLITZYN's information. The NOSENKO-GRYAZNOV relationship will be a key element in future questioning.

A. "Comment on NOSENKO Family Relations" was a paper in which ANATOLE found little of importance or significance as a crucial point except that as the discussions progressed he developed the idea that the 1945-50 period may be crucial after all. ANATOLE sees little question about most of his life and specifically ANATOLE says the homosexual question is not "in line with available evidence". ANATOLE thought these questions would give NOSENKO the impression we are "unprofessional" but

