

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

FILE TITLE/NUMBER/VOLUME: DETAILED REPORTS ON  
INTERROGATION OF AUSAHO

INCLUSIVE DATES: \_\_\_\_\_ Released under the John F. Kennedy Assassination  
CUSTODIAL UNIT/LOCATION: SE/CRP Records Collection Act of 1992  
ROOM: \_\_\_\_\_ (44 USC 2107 Note)  
NW 53216 6/17/17

DELETIONS, IF ANY: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

DATE RECEIVED	DATE RETURNED	REVIEWED BY (PRINT NAME)	SIGNATURE OF REVIEWING OFFICIAL

NO DOCUMENTS MAY BE COPIED OR REMOVED FROM THIS FILE

~~SECRET~~  
~~EYES ONLY~~

## REPORT ON INTERROGATION

DATE: 26 July 1965

1. The interrogation took place from 1230 to 1500 and from 1600 to 1730. I commenced according to the previously prepared plan. Subject asked no questions about my identity, raised no objections of any kind, and said he was willing to answer any questions. Although I frequently challenged the truthfulness and correctness of Subject's answers, the overall tone of the interrogation was calm, and Subject's attitude was correct and cooperative. Soft drinks were served, and at his request, Subject was allowed to smoke during the second part of the interrogation. Subject said at the beginning that he had told only the truth in the past, that he had not been sent by anyone, and that he was willing to tell only the truth to me.

2. Questioning was concentrated on the 1953-54 period. The following are the most interesting and significant points that emerged:

a) In talking about his return to Moscow on leave from "Sovetsk, Primorskiy Kray, in the Baltic," at the end of December 1952. Subject was unable to correctly explain the proper registration procedure for a military officer on leave. He affirmed that he did not have to report to anyone upon arrival in Moscow.

COMMENT: If Subject was truly a naval intelligence officer, according to regulations he would have been required to report to the Personnel Department of the GRU/VNF and also to the Naval Commandant of the City of Moscow within three days of his arrival. Subject did not dispute my statement that these were the regulations, and finally said vaguely that he reported to Naval GRU Personnel "seven or ten days" after arrival.

b) Under close questioning, Subject's story about his meeting with KABULOV took on some new aspects. He now says that relations between his father and KABULOV were those of colleagues only, that the two families had never gotten together before, and that he (Subject) himself had never spoken to KABULOV before this occasion. Furthermore, Subject now says that the meeting took place at KABULOV's dacha (rather

~~SECRET~~  
~~TOP SECRET~~

2

that at the NOSENKO dacha), that the date of this get-together was either 1 or 2 January 1953, and that Vasily VAKHRUSHEV (who was then married to KABULOV's daughter) was also present. In a typical piece of improvisation, Subject even said that it was VAKHRUSHEV, rather than KABULOV, who first raised the question of what Subject was doing.

COMMENT: In view of Subject's different previous stories about this incident, his readiness to change his story and to improvise under my questioning makes it impossible to believe that he was actually recommended by KABULOV to the KGB.

c) In talking about his first visit to the KGB, Subject was unable to give a consistent and accurate account of the procedures at the KGB pass office. Specifically, he maintained that the name of the interviewer was not indicated on the pass.

COMMENT: The name of the interviewer is always indicated on the visitor's pass. It is difficult to understand why Subject would not know this if he had ever served in the KGB, much less in 1953-54.

d) Subject maintained that on this first visit he talked to some personnel officers (he could not remember any names) who were located in an office on the sixth floor of the 8th entry of Building #12. He said that he left his coat at the wardrobe on the ground floor of this entry. He said that these officers were in the same section of offices as ROZHENKO, whom he talked to here on a later visit.

COMMENT: Subject insisted that he was positive about the fact that ROZHENKO's office was in the 8th entry even though I told him this was impossible. In fact, up to the time of my departure from Moscow (Sept 1953) neither ROZHENKO nor any units or officers of KGB Personnel were located in the 8th entry. As far as the wardrobe is concerned, although Subject correctly mentioned that there was also one on the second floor by the dietetic restaurant, there was no wardrobe on the ground floor in those years. (From 1947 to the time I left, KGB personnel were located on the 6th and 7th floors of the 7th entry, Building #12.)

~~SECRET~~  
3

e) Subject said that on the day he first reported for work ("13 or 15 March 1953") he went from the pass office to the 4th entry, where his pass was checked by the guards, and then went unescorted to KABULOV'S office on the 3rd floor.

COMMENT: It is not possible to go through any entry of Building #2 with a visitor's pass without escort. (Especially to the office of the deputy minister!)

f) In general, Subject gave a correct description of what was located in entries 2-7 of Building #12. However, he did not mention the existence of an extra entrance to the left of the KGB Club. More important, he said that he did not know whether or not there was a 9th entry, but that he believed there was not.

COMMENT: The 9th entry was located around the corner on Malaya Lubyanka, and was used by a few sections of the 9th Directorate. Although Subject may never have had occasion to enter it, he should certainly be aware of its existence, especially since he mentioned going to the Moscow UKGB, which was located next to entry 9.

g) In describing the papers that he had to fill out to apply for entry into the KGB, Subject mentioned only a questionnaire/anketa/ and an autobiography. He said that he received the forms on his first visit to the KGB, took them home and filled them out, and then delivered them to the personnel officer on the following day. He said that he was obliged to turn both the questionnaire and the autobiography in in two copies. He maintained that the questionnaire did not have any name, other than simply "anketa." He said that it was four or six pages long. Subject was challenged on all these points, but insisted that he was correct.

COMMENT: The questionnaire is called "Anketa Spetsialnogo Naznacheniya Sotrudnika KGB;" This is prominently printed at the top of the first page. It is not less than 12 pages long - probably 16. Never, under any circumstances, is it permitted to take this questionnaire home to fill out. Only one copy of the questionnaire (or autobiography) was ever required, although an applicant might be asked to make a new one if the first was incorrectly filled out.

~~SECRET~~  
EYES ONLY

When Subject was asked what the second copy could be for, he said that he thought it was for the security check /spetsproverka/. This is not correct. Also, Subject maintained that these were the only forms and papers that he had to fill out - this is not correct, and he will be questioned later on the others.

h) Subject insisted that he was not required to take a medical examination as part of his processing for entry into the KGB. When challenged on this and asked to explain it, Subject said that it was probably because they knew that he was on active duty in the Navy, and possibly also because his application had a special character because of KOBELOV's involvement.

COMMENT: A medical exam was mandatory for all new employees of the KGB, whether or not they were officers on active military service.

i) Asked about his salary when he first started to work for the KGB, Subject said that he got a basic salary of 1700 rubles as a case officer, 500 rubles for his rank of lieutenant, plus secrecy, language, and length of service pay. He affirmed that this was correct under close questioning. I then told Subject that MGB officers were no longer being paid for rank in March 1953. Subject first said that he wasn't at all interested in money in that period and really couldn't remember. Then he said that he remembered that there was one year when they were not paid for rank - which he believed was 1954, and that he still thinks that he was paid for rank when he first entered the KGB.

COMMENT: Salary for rank was taken away from MGB officers in mid-1952. It had not been restored as of February 1954, although I believe it is likely that it was restored at some time thereafter.

j) Asked who were IGNATYEV's deputies, Subject mentioned SAVCHENKO (among others). Asked what was SAVCHENKO's background, Subject said that he had been in the Ukraine, then had been head of the Intelligence Directorate of the KGB; after BERIYA he was deputy chairman of the KGB for a short while, after which he went to Moldavia as Chief of the Moldavian KGB. Subject thus repeated a mistake he had made previously. He firmly stated

~~SECRET~~  
EYES ONLY

that he did not know of any other SAVCHENKOS. When told that there are two General SAVCHENKOS and that he had them mixed up, Subject replied that he didn't know SAVCHENKO's first name, and that he didn't see what difference it made anyway.

COMMENT: As explained earlier, Subject has confused Lt. General Sergey Romanovich SAVCHENKO and Lt. General Ivan Tikhonovich SAVCHENKO. Both of them occupied prominent positions in the MGB at this time. Sergey Romanovich had been MGB Minister in the Ukraine prior to 1950, was Deputy Minister MGB and head of the Intelligence Directorate/ MGB from 1950 to Nov 1952, was a Lt. Gen. "without portfolio" from Nov 1952 to March 1953, when he was made deputy chief of the advisor's section of the FCD. Ivan Tikhonovich SAVCHENKO was head of the Chief Directorate of Special Services under the CC/CPSU from 1948 to November 1952 (the predecessor organization of the 8th Directorate KGB), then Chief of the 8th Directorate MGB from Nov 1952. It is this SAVCHENKO who later went to Moldavia. Any officer who served in the MGB in 1953 or later should know of both SAVCHENKOS and be able to distinguish between them.

k) Asked to describe the front of the KGB club, Subject said that he did not remember any sign (there was one in 1953), but mentioned that there was a Gastronom next to it. Asked when the Gastronom was opened, he said firmly that it was already there when he started to work in the KGB. Told that there was no Gastronom there in 1953. Subject became rather confused; he made up a little story about how KGB officers complained about the poor security created by the opening of the Gastronom, and said finally that perhaps the Gastronom wasn't there until 1955.

COMMENT: The Gastronom was definitely not there as of 1954. It is listed in the Moscow Telephone Directory for 1958 (no directories are available for the years 1955-1957). It is believed that Subject's slip on the Gastronom may be a revealing one, and if we can establish exactly when it opened it may provide a good clue as to when Subject was first associated with the KGB.

l) Asked to describe the location of any safehouse belonging to N/N (external surveillance) of the SCD in 1953-54,

~~SECRET~~  
EYES ONLY

Subject had difficulty in grasping the terminology "N/N" and finally said, "Oh, you mean UODK." He replied that he had never been to any of their bases or safehouses in that period, and tried to talk instead about some of the 7th Directorate installations that he has already reported on.

COMMENT: If Subject had really been a case officer in the American Embassy section of the BCD in 1953-55, he would have had to visit N/N safehouses very often. His inability to name a single one is very damning. The confusion about the terminology is also interesting - even though Subject has previously shown in his homework that he is aware of the organizational evolution of the surveillance apparatus, he does not respond to the old terminology in conversation as he should if he had worked there at that time. "UODK" is a new term for what was formerly "UPDK"; it was staffed by and subordinate to N/N, but was in no sense the same thing as N/N.

m) Describing what was located in the 4th entry of Building #12, Subject mentioned the 3rd Spetsotdel, which was responsible for the preparation of various false documents. Asked several times what the former designation of this unit was, Subject replied that it had always been called the 3rd Spetsotdel as far as he knew.

COMMENT: This unit had always been called Department "D." The designation was changed only after the death of Stalin. In other words, at the time that Subject allegedly came to work for the KGB it had just barely been re-named, and most officers continued to refer to it by its old designation for some time.

n) In speaking of his naval GRU service in the Baltic, Subject said several times that he had served in the Baltic for "several months only."

COMMENT: This is a significant change in his story from the April 1964 interrogations. He first made it in the conversations with John Gittinger, who did not challenge him on it. It may be worthwhile returning to this period later in this interrogation.

~~SECRET~~  
~~EXCERPT~~

7

3. Tentative Conclusions: The above items all indicate that Subject did not work in the KGB in 1953 or 1954. Some of them cast doubt on whether he ever worked in the KGB at all, although it is very difficult to come to a firm conclusion on this as yet because he does have an impressive knowledge of KGB personalities, and knows quite a bit about KGB procedures and installations as well. The rest of the interrogation will attempt to establish, if possible, whether Subject's knowledge of the KGB can be explained entirely by rigorous briefing, training, and carefully planned exposure, and to determine more precisely in what capacity he was actually connected with the KGB.

Ted

~~SECRET  
EYES ONLY~~



## REPORT OF INTERROGATION

DATE: 28 July 1965

1. Questioning concentrated on how Subject joined the Komsomol organization in the KGB in 1953, and on his alleged service as Secretary of the Komsomol organization of the SCD. Under detailed questioning, it quickly became apparent that Subject did not serve as the secretary of the SCD Komsomol organization. The following examples should suffice:

a) Subject does not know how a secretary is selected, and cannot describe his duties in a specific manner.

b) Subject does not know the name of the secretary of the MVD K/O. Yet he would have had to deal with him very frequently.

c) Subject was unable to recall the name of the man whom he succeeded as Secretary of the SCD K/O. He finally said that it was Nikolay YEGOROV, from the "German Dept." of the SCD, but since he has never mentioned this name before it is likely that he improvised it.

d) Subject was unable to identify the two other members who served on the K/O board with him, except that one of them was "Nina," a typist from the "German Dept."

e) Subject was unable to give a satisfactory account of his dealings with the MVD K/O or of the identities or responsibilities of the people with whom he dealt there.

2. Subject insisted that in 1953-54, when he was Secretary of the SCD K/O, the maximum age for a Komsomol member was 27. This point important both because he should know exactly if he had been Komsomol Secretary, and because it was of vital concern to him personally. In actual fact, the maximum age was 26. (A new ustav was adopted in March 1954, which also set a maximum age of 26 but provided for a two year extension in certain cases. Subject should have known very well about this new ustav, both because he was Secretary at that time, and because of his own problem.)

3. Subject maintained that all the members of his K/O paid 2% monthly dues. This is incorrect, as monthly dues were calculated on a sliding scale determined by the wage group of the member. 2% is the correct figure for entry dues.

2

4. Subject was unable to give a consistent or correct account of how he deregistered from the Komsomol Organization of the MRP in the Baltic and registered with the K/O in the MVD. His statement that he was issued a new Komsomol registration card by the MVD K/O is impossible. His difficulties with this question probably stem more from the limitations imposed by his legend than ignorance of Komsomol procedures.

5. In general, Subject's knowledge of Komsomol procedures is consistent with that of any ordinary, apathetic Komsomol member (he could easily have this same knowledge even if he had never been a Komsomol member). However, his knowledge of how dues were collected, registered, and deposited in the Bank on Kuznetskiy Most is special knowledge on which he was probably briefed (the same procedures and the same bank are used by all the Komsomol and Party organizations of the MVD-KGB). Subject's overall knowledge of a K/O secretary's duties is far too weak for him to have served in this capacity anywhere.

6. Other questions:-

a) In discussing his Komsomol membership in the Baltic, Subject again referred to this area as the Primorskiy Kray. Challenged on this, Subject appeared to be astounded, and insisted vehemently that he served in the city of Sovetsk, Primorskiy Kray, and that he even received letters addressed that way (Subject was not told that he was also wrong on the city). Told that Primorskiy Kray is in the Far East, Subject compounded his geographical blunder by saying that he knew all about that because Sovetskaya Gavan', where he had served before coming to the Baltic, is in that Primorskiy Kray (it is actually in Khabarovskiy Kray).

b) When Subject first mentioned the German Department, he was asked to think carefully about whether or not there was a German Dept in the SCD in 1953. At first he asserted categorically that there was, but when challenged he retreated very quickly, saying that "I think there was, I'm not sure, I'll think about it." After the luncheon break he returned and said he was sure that there was a German Dept in 1953.

~~SECRET~~  
~~EYES ONLY~~

COMMENT: There was no German Dept in the SCD in 1951 or 1952, or up to my departure in Sept 1953, although it is possible that there was a small group of a few officers working on German matters. In any case, Subject's reaction to my challenge on this point was not that of a man who was really there.

c) Evidently aware that he had made a serious slip with the Gastronom on the previous day, Subject said - out of context with the matter under discussion- that he didn't know what used to be located in Dzerzhinskiy Square at the spot that the Detskiy Mir store now occupies before it was constructed in 1957, even though he used to go by it every day.

d) Subject gave a rather complex explanation about the changes of terminology for the surveillance apparat and for the elements responsible for supporting the diplomatic colony. Comments on this will be reserved until there has been an opportunity to compare it with what Subject himself has said on this in the past and with collateral information.

7. At the beginning of the session, when Subject remarked that this was his 481st day in the safehouse, I asked him how he managed to keep track of the days so well. He replied, "prison experience was acquired" /tyuremnyy opyt otrabatyvalsya?. The phrase is difficult to translate exactly, but it is the past tense that is significant. I asked him if he had ever been in jail before, but he said he had not.

Ted

7  
14  
21

~~SECRET~~  
EYES ONLY

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

## REPORT OF INTERROGATION

DATE: 29 July 1965

1. Questioning was concentrated on documents that had to be filled out when Subject was entering the KGB. Komsomol questions and service in the Baltic were not touched at all. Following highlights:

a) ANKETA (DPIHQ): Subject displayed a superficial knowledge of this basic questionnaire. He knows generally the appearance, the nature of the questions, and the purpose of the document. He continued to maintain, incorrectly, that it was required in two copies, that he filled it out at home, that it consisted of 4-6 pages. He amended his story to say that he does not remember for sure whether he turned it in to ROZHENKO's people on one of his first visits, or gave it to SAKHAROV when he first reported for work.

COMMENT: An ordinary member of the KGB might conceivably have forgotten the details of this document which was filled out only at the beginning of his career. As a supervisor, however, Subject claims to have reviewed many personnel files (as he should have): as such, he could not possibly make the mistakes that he has about this document, or be unable to give a better description of it.

b) Secrecy Agreement: Subject himself stated that he had signed such a form for SAKHAROV when he first reported for work. He was unable to remember the proper designation or contents of the document, however. The description of the wording which he provided was similar to that used prior to 1947; also, it is similar to the secrecy agreement that might be signed by an agent.

c) Lichny Listok po Ucheta Kadrov: This is not a very important document, but it is filled out by every officer, and is found in every personnel file. Subject was not only unable to recall it, he maintained he had never heard of it even after it was described to him.

COMMENT: Again, although Subject might have forgotten it if he had been just a plain case officer in the KGB, he should know of it as a supervisor, or even as Secretary of the Komsomol Organization (~~it is a CC/CPSU questionnaire~~).

d) SPRAVKA No. 1: This document is required for every personnel action. Subject did not react at all to its name and said he didn't know of it. When its purpose was described to him, Subject managed to give a superficial description of the document.

COMMENT: An ordinary case officer would know of the existence of this form, but would not necessarily have ever seen it. As deputy chief of a department, however, Subject would handle this document 30-40 times a year, and would be thoroughly familiar with it. Thus, his limited knowledge of it could only have come from a brief.

e) Posluzhnoy Spisok (Employment and Service Record): Asked about this document, Subject gave a good description of its nature and purpose. His answer that he himself did not fill it out but that it was filled out by personnel on the basis of the data in his Anketa is perfectly plausible. It is odd, however, that Subject insisted that he did not sign this document when he first entered the KGB (as is normally done), but only "in 1958 or 1957."

2. Subject was asked how he answered some of the questions in the Anketa, particularly the questions on his former wife, her relatives, and on his mother's ancestry. I then asked Subject how it was, taking into account his mother's aristocratic ancestry, the fact that he father died in jail, the Trotskyite allegations against Subject's father, the fact that Subject's former father-in-law was still in jail, and the fact that Subject was present when TELEGIN's apartment was searched -- that he had been accepted into the KGB, particularly in 1953! Subject admitted that the question was logical, and said that he could only assume that the influence of KOBULOV and the important and influential position of his own father outweighed these negative factors. He also cited his GRU experience in this connection.

I then asked Subject how he had reported his second marriage to the KGB. He replied that before the marriage he had mentioned it briefly to GORBATENKO, and that he had

~~SECRET~~  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

unofficially run a name check on his prospective bride, (which was "clean"), and that after the marriage he had filled out another anketa for personnel in which he included all the required data on his wife and her relatives. After considerable prompting, Subject said that he had indicated that she and her parents had been in France, but that he had concealed the fact that her grandmother had been in German occupied territory during the war (he admitted that the KGB would have learned this in a routine check, however.) I then reviewed for Subject the negative security factors mentioned above, adding the arrest of KOBULOV, the fact that his new wife and her parents had been abroad, the fact that her grandmother was in German-occupied territory, the fact that Subject was now overage for the Komsomol but not yet a party member or candidate, and the fact that Subject received a 15 day sentence for misuse of cover documents and incurring venereal disease, and asked if he didn't think that his personnel file had been reviewed in 1954, and if so, what grounds there could have been for retaining him in the KGB. Subject said that he thought that his file probably was reviewed but that again the influence of his father had saved him. Subject added that another important factor was probably his language qualification and particularly his higher education. I told Subject that we would examine the question of his education in greater detail later. He made no comment. I also pointed out to Subject that if his second wife and her parents had been abroad it was impossible that her name check could have been negative. He admitted it was illogical, but insisted that this was so.

4. CONCLUSIONS: Evidence continues to pile up to show that Subject was never in a supervisory position in the KGB, and that he could not have and did not enter the KGB in 1953. His weak knowledge of the documents discussed indicates that if he was ever in the KGB at all, it was later, and for a relatively short time.

5. Despite the fact that I continued to challenge Subject frequently, the tone of the interrogation was particularly friendly today. The following exchange was of some interest:

Subject: You probably worked for twenty years in personnel!

Ted: Not exactly. You should know better.

Subject: No, I don't know. If you told me your name?

Ted: We'll talk about that later, and maybe even drink to each other's health.

~~SECRET~~  
EYES ONLY



4

6. The plan for tomorrow's session is to attack Subject on his service in the Baltic in 1952.

Ted

~~SECRET~~  
~~EYES ONLY~~

~~SECRET~~

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: REPORT OF INTERROGATION

DATE: 30 July 1965

1. Today's interrogation consisted of two short sessions (1410-1515, and 1610-1650). Subject was confronted with proof of his errors on Komsomol regulations, and also of basic geography in Kaliningrad Oblast. Questioning was confined to these two areas, and will be described below. In addition, there were some interesting additional indications that Subject may have spent some time in Soviet jail or prison camp.

## 2. KOMSOMOL:

a) Despite a number of leading questions and hints, Subject was unable to recall that Komsomol Congress (the 12th) took place in February 1954, while he was allegedly the Secretary of the SCD K/O. If he had really been a Komsomol Secretary at the time he should remember the Congress very well, since he would have been involved in its preparations. Told about it, Subject said that such Congresses took place practically every year. This is false; the previous Komsomol Congress, the 11th, was in 1949.

b) Subject again stated that he was sure that the maximum age for Komsomol members at that time was 27. Subject was shown the pertinent Komsomol regulations for the period, which provide that the maximum age is 26. Subject simply continued to insist that he is sure that he was excluded from the Komsomol in 1954 when he reached the age of 27, and that no exceptions were made for him. He did not comment on how he could be wrong on the regulations if he had been a Komsomol Secretary.

c) In the discussion of Komsomol regulations, Subject continued to insist that the dues were 2% for all members. He spotted the paragraph about 2% entry dues in the regulations that were shown to him and said that monthly dues were identical with entry dues. This is not so, but as we do not have a copy of the 1949 membership dues scale, I was not able to show him documentary proof of his error.



d) Subject was again unable to describe how he was permanently registered as a member of the MVD K/O, how he performed his duties as a Secretary or what these duties were in connection with the 12th Pomsomol Congress, or to name the Secretary of the MVD K/O.

3. Service in the Baltic: In the course of the discussion of his service in the Baltic in 1952, Subject made such incredible errors, and gave such lame descriptions of his work, that it is necessary to conclude that he did not serve there as an intelligence officer, and that if he has ever visited that area at all it was only very briefly.

a) Subject not only was unable to name the Chief of Intelligence of the 4th Naval Fleet, he could not even give his proper title (he insisted that his official designation was "nachalnik razvedki;" actually, of course, it should be "nachalnik razvedyvatelnogo upravleniya" of the 4th fleet).

b) Subject does not know the name of his immediate commanding officer, the chief of the MRP. Subject did not know the names of more than two of his fellow officers at the MRP. In an effort to answer this question he gave a name - YELISEYEV - that he had not once mentioned when under similar pressure in April 1964; it is apparent that he invented it on the spot.

c) Subject continued to insist that he served in "Sovetsk, Primorskiy Kray." Subject was then shown a map, and found that the name of the place where he had allegedly served was in fact Primorsk. Subject said that he couldn't understand why he had remembered it as Sovetsk, and said that he had never been in the city of Sovetsk. Subject was also shown the Administrative-Territorial Divisions of the USSR, and conceded that there is no Primorskiy Kray in the Soviet Union except the one in the Far East. Again, he had no explanation for his error. Oddly, after initially conceding his error, from time to time Subject continued to say that he thought that he was probably right after all, and that the village of Sovetsk was too small to appear on the map that he was shown.

d) In describing his initial arrival at the MRP, Subject said that he arrived in Kalingrad, then had to go by car from Kalingrad to Baltiysk because there was no

~~SECRET~~

railway to Baltiysk. He then went by car from Baltiysk to Primorsk. In reality there was and is a rail connection from Kaliningrad to Baltiysk, which passes through (Subject was not told this, however.)

e) Subject admitted that he did not do any operational work at the MIP, and said that was why he was dissatisfied and wanted a transfer. However, Subject could not give a detailed or believable description of what his duties were. As he has done so often in the past, he attempted to divert the questioning by launching into what is evidently a prepared lecture about the concept of stay-behind operations. He was cut off.

4. (NOTE: In talking about his service in Kaliningrad Oblast, Subject has mentioned Primorsk, Sovetsk, and Zelenogradsk. It is interesting that towns of identical or closely similar names also exist in Leningrad Oblast: Primorsk, Sovetskiy, and Zelenogorsk. Both Zelenogradsk and Zelenogorsk are resorts. The Primorsk and Sovetskiy in Leningrad Oblast are both on the coast, about 10-12 kilometers from each other. Bearing in mind that Subject has previously described working in the woods in Leningrad Oblast in 1945 under conditions that sound very similar to forced labor, it is possible that there is some clue here as to how Subject's legend was prepared. At this stage, however, it is not possible to draw any firm conclusions and the coincidence is simply noted for future reference.)

5. In the course of the four days' of interrogation to date, there have been a number of indications which tend to confirm previous impressions that Subject may have spent some time as a prisoner in a Soviet jail or prison camp. As some of these have not been noted in the previous interrogation reports it may be convenient to summarize them here:

a) On 28 July Subject made the intriguing remark, "tyuremnyy opyt otrabatyvalsya." This was in answer to my question about how he kept track of the days.

b) On 30 July, Subject voluntarily launched into a long and detailed explanation of how he keeps track of the days in his present circumstances. A possible explanation for this unsolicited description is that Subject had reflected on the implications of his remark on 28 July.

~~SECRET~~

4

c) On 28 July, while I was asking Subject about the number of his Party membership card (which he did not remember) Subject said, "I don't even remember my personal KGB number." I immediately asked Subject when such personal serial numbers had been instituted in the KGB, and he replied that he didn't remember, that no one carried them with them but kept them in the safe, that they were intended for wartime purposes.

COMMENT: Personal serial numbers never existed either in the army or in the KGB, and to the best of our knowledge they do not exist now. The only place in Soviet society where such numbers existed is in the prison camps: this was one of the chief grievances and complaints that the prisoners made in the famous Vorkuta uprisings of 1953.

d) In previous interrogations Subject has described working in the forests outside of Leningrad for two months in 1941. The conditions that he described sound much more like forced labor than that of a military unit.

e) Although tattooing is certainly practiced to some extent in the Soviet Navy, Komsomol and Party pressures restrict this to a considerable degree. The number and extent of Subject's tattoos is more characteristic of young jailbirds.

f) Subject's account of the handshooting episode suggests one possible way that he might have wound up in jail. Certainly this incident could not have been taken as lightly in wartime as he would have us believe.

g) Subject's story about a 15 day sentence in the Lyubyanka because of the venereal disease incident suggests that this may have been inserted in his legend to cover slips stemming from long prison experience, and possibly also to help him in passing the polygraph.

h) Subject's earlier accounts about fighting at Tuapse, running away from school, etc. also have several references to prison that may be significant. He once referred to the military unit in which he allegedly joined in Baku as a "penal battalion", he returned to the school "under guard," upon arrival in Moscow he was "arrested."

Ted

~~SECRET~~

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: REPORT OF INTERROGATION

DATE: 3 AUGUST 1965

1. Most of today's session (0945-1130 and 1230-1330) was devoted to questioning on the structure and organization of the MVD in 1953 and 1954. It was originally planned to touch on this subject only lightly and then to move on to another topic, but Subject's knowledge was so limited that it seemed worthwhile to cover it in considerable depth.
2. Asked to describe what directorates existed in the MVD under BERIYA, Subject named the FCD and the SCD, which he said were the intelligence and counterintelligence directorates respectively. Asked if he were sure, Subject said he was positive, and that the only change that took place later was that for a short time, under KRUGLOV, the FCD became the SCD and vice versa. I told him that he was wrong and asked again if he were sure. He replied that he was certain that this was done by KRUGLOV and that it was for a short time only. Actually, of course, this change was instituted by BERIYA and existed until at least February 1954. Thus, Subject does not even know in what directorate he worked during the first year of his alleged service in the KGB. Previously, because Subject had indicated in a homework assignment that he was aware that the directorates had been numbered differently, we had assumed that he knew when and how this happened. This was a false assumption and we now have conclusive proof (if more was needed) that Subject did not serve in the MVD in 1953-54.
3. Subject displayed a similarly hazy and insufficient knowledge on all other organizational questions of that period. He could not describe the functions of the 4th Directorate accurately. He did not know the functions of the 4th and 5th Special Depts. He claimed that there was a 10th Directorate, which was the Directorate of the Kremlin Commandant (this had actually merged with the Okhrana in 1947, and was called the 9th Directorate since 1952). he had never heard of Spetsbure #1. he had never heard of the Directorate for the Preservation of Govt. Treasures, he knew nothing about the Jails Directorate, he had no notion of the subordination of the Internal Troops, Convoy troops, GULAG, GUSHASDOR, the Militia, etc. etc.

4. Subject did not even know when the KGB was organized. He said that it was in late 1954 or early 1955. Told that he was wrong by a year and asked to think it over. Subject stubbornly insisted that he was right.

5. Asked to the name the chiefs of the directorates and separate departments of the MVD under BERIYA and KRUGLOV. Subject was able to name only nine out of 28. He was unable to name the leadership of the Intelligence Directorate, saying that he remembered only SAKHAROVSKIY (PANYUSHKIN was chief until 1955). Subject was able to name only SEROV and ROMASHKOV as KRUGLOV's deputies. He was ignorant of such prominent names as LUNEV and SHATALIN.

6. Asked where the Main Directorate of Militia of the USSR was located in 1953 and 1954. Subject said that he did not know, and knew only that later it was on UL. Ogareva. Actually, in 1953-54 it was located next to the main KGB building on Dzerzhinskiy #2.

7. Asked to describe how he conducted name checks on a Soviet citizen and on a new arrival to the American Embassy in 1953-54. Subject managed to give a superficial description of how such checks were done. However, he resisted every attempt to get him to describe this process in detail, and he made several blunders which show that he never actually ran such a check himself. For example, he did not know where the records of all Soviet citizens who have been tried are kept, and attempted to improvise an answer (completely wrong) that they would check with the militia about this. Subject correctly said that Archives were located in Bldg 2, Bldg 12, and on Kirov Street. But he was completely unable to stretch his limited knowledge to provide a description of how these various repositories were actually checked. Subject was also asked to describe how he ran such a check on a Soviet citizen in the 1956-59 period. Here again he was in difficulty as soon as pressed for details on how the check was run. It was particularly interesting that he did not feel able to dispute my challenges of his information in this period, even though he undoubtedly knows that I do not have first hand knowledge of procedures in this period.

8. Subject was asked to describe the KGB identity document that he received when he first entered the KGB. He was asked if there was anything unusual in connection with this document at that time. He replied that he knew of nothing unusual. He was then told that both under BERIYA

~~SECRET  
EYES ONLY~~

and KRUGLOV it was necessary to have a special stamp placed in the pass in order to have free access to the KGB buildings. Subject was totally ignorant of this, and was unable to recall anything about it despite a number of hints and leading questions. Actually, this business of the special stamps was the subject of numerous anecdotes at the time, and no officer who served in the MVD in 1953 could possibly have forgotten it completely.

9. Subject was asked again about the personal KGB number that he had mentioned in a previous session. HE replied that he did not remember exactly when this was instituted, but that he was sure it was not before 1956, and that he received his number while he was in the Seventh Department. He said that the numbers were issued on a metal, aluminum dogtag about 2 by 4 or 5 cms. that it was inscribed at the top: "VS SSR" (Armed Forces of the USSR), and below that was the serial number, which in his case was E 00 and four digits which he could not remember exactly but thought were 1033 or 1022. A hole is punched in this dogtag, which properly speaking is called a "lichnyy znak." The serial number is also entered in the KGB identity document. Subject that the purpose of these number tags was not explained when they were issued, that they were supposed to be carried with one's personal documents, but that he kept it in his safe, as did most others.

10. It was interesting that at the very beginning of the session, Subject declared that he had thought it over and was sure that although he had been wrong about Primorskiy Kray, there had to be a little Sovetsk in Kalingrad Oblast that was called Sovetsk/Primorskiy to distinguish it from the other Sovietsk. Subject was told that this is nonsense, which it is. Subject has probably decided that he cannot afford to admit to any substantive errors which cannot be explained by just poor memory.

11. Subject was told that there was and is a RR connection from Kaliningrad to Baltiysk. Subject immediately said that there was a narrow gauge line that ran from Kalingrad to the various resorts but insisted that under no circumstances did it go to Baltiysk.

~~SECRET~~

12. It was also interesting that Subject returned from the lunch break saying that he had tried to think of other names of MVD chiefs in the early period, and that although he did not know this from his own service in the KGB he knew that Gen. Iru DOCHIKOV, whose son Boris DOCHIKOV lived in same house as Subject on Ul. Granovskogo, was Chief of convoy troops ca. 1946-47, and similarly he knew of a General NAGORNYY-NASETKIN (perhaps reversed) - whose son Gennadiy was in Naval School with Subject in Baku - who had been Chief of GULAG at one time.

Tod

~~SECRET  
EYES ONLY~~

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: REPORT OF INTERROGATION

DATE: 4 August 1965

1. Today's session (0945-1145) was devoted almost entirely to Subject's education from the 7th to the 10th grades, the period in which he allegedly attended Naval Schools in Kuybyshev, Baku, and Leningrad. Subject was challenged sternly and repeatedly, and he grew visibly upset. For the first time in this series of interrogations he started to sulk and the session was ended when he virtually stopped answering questions.

2. Moscow Special Naval School: Subject said that when he attended this school in Kuybyshev it consisted of only the 7th and 8th classes. It is quite possible that if the school was first created in 1940 it had only two classes in 1941. However, Subject insisted that the Special Naval Schools were intended to go only through the 9th grade. This is quite incorrect; both ARTAMONOV and GORDEYEV state positively that these schools gave the final three years of a full secondary education: the 8th, 9th and 10th grades. In talking about the school, Subject gave no more information than previously: he can remember the names of five or six schoolmates, one or two instructors, he doesn't remember exactly how or when he went to Kuybyshev or back, he doesn't remember where in Kuybyshev the school was located. Because of the paucity of his recollections it is difficult to come to a conclusion about whether or not he was really there: judged by itself, it seems impossible that he was there and is unable to recall more; compared to his story about Baku it looks good. One possibility, perhaps is that he enrolled in this school in Moscow, but dropped out at some point in the first year.

3. Baku Naval Preparatory School: Subject repeated his previous story that in the summer of 1942 he returned to Moscow and through the Moscow Naval Equipage he was processed to join the Leningrad Naval Preparatory School which at that time had been evacuated to Baku and combined with the Baku Naval Preparatory School. He said that he



arrived in Baku in the end of 1942 and joined the Baku Naval Preparatory School which had a three year school consisting of the 8th, 9th, and 10th grades. Subject was told that this was nonsense and that no Naval preparatory schools offering a three year course ever existed in the Soviet Union. He insisted that he was right, and said that not only did such schools exist in Leningrad and Baku, but also in Sevastopol and Vladivostok. For the first time, Subject struck a very confident and even aggressive attitude, saying such things as, "I know, I was there," and "you are evidently not sufficiently well informed about these schools," etc. (Actually, ARTAMONOV's testimony about the location and organization of the Special Naval Schools, the Naval Preparatory Schools, and the Preparatory Courses of the Naval academies - which is both logical and consistent - completely contradicts and rules out Subject's story.)

4. Subject was asked to describe his route from Moscow to Baku in the summer of 1942. He replied that he didn't remember. He was then reminded that originally he had said that he went directly, and that when told that the RR lines were cut, he had made up a story about a two-week long train ride. Subject looked uncomfortable and made no reply. I then told Subject that there was only one possible way to get from Moscow to Baku at that time and that the cities through which it passed were so unusual that no one who had made the trip could forget it. Subject said he did not remember. (The only way was by way of Tashkent!)

5. Asked to name the leadership of the Chief Directorate of Naval Schools and Academies at that time, Subject said that Vice Admiral RAMIASHVILI was the chief, and that his deputy was Major General TATARINOV. The chief of the Directorate of Educational Institutions was Vice Admiral SUKHIASHVILI. According to ARTAMONOV, SUKHIASHVILI was the chief of the first prototype Nakhimov school which was organized in Tbilisi in 1943. The fact that Subject knows SUKHIASHVILI's name (which he mentioned for the first time), the character of the Nakhimov Schools (a full secondary education for sons of the Soviet elite), and the fact that Subject's story for this period includes a trip to Tbilisi with his father all point to the possibility that Subject was actually in the Nakhimov School in Tbilisi at this time. Subject will be questioned further on this at the next session.

~~SECRET~~  
EYES

6. Subject again insisted that he took the military oath in Baku when he was 15 years old, as did all the other students in the school. Subject was told that this was impossible, but continued to maintain that he was telling "how it was."

7. Subject repeated his old story about completing the 9th grade by enrolling in "externat" (somewhat similar to correspondence courses) at the Mining Institute in Moscow. Subject gave a completely wrong description of what such a course of study consists of, and it is not possible that he actually did what he said. For example, he stated that he studied at the Institute four days a week, for approximately 7 hours a day; actually, an "externat" student would do all of his studying at home. Here, as elsewhere throughout the session, I told Subject that he was making things up and that if he obtained his 9th grade certificate by blat it would be much better for him simply to say so, but he did not avail himself of the opportunity.

8. Subject was asked what Subjects he studied in the 10th grade (in Leningrad). He replied that he did not remember, and gave a similar reply to questions about what he had studied in the 9th and 8th grades. The session was ended on this note. Subject was visibly upset by this time and his answers are probably more indicative of his mood than of total inability to recall what subjects are taught in Soviet secondary schools.

9. In the middle of the session, as a change of pace I asked Subject to tell me the locations of all the residences of KGB officers that he could recall. Subject was able to recall about 12 different buildings inhabited by KGB officers, and although he did not give the exact addresses his locations and descriptions were generally correct. What was interesting was that on every case he pegged the building to the name of a KGB officer, most of whom play a prominent part in his legend: KARETNIKOV, PETROV, KRUPNOV, CHURANOV, GORBATENKO, GRIBANOV, A.S. KOZLOV, ZAKHAROV, KUTYREV, CHELNOKOV, Sergey GUSKOV, Georg. ZHUKOV, KOVSHUK, YAKOVLEV.

Ted.

~~SECRET~~  
~~EVERY~~

~~SECRET~~

9 August 1965

**SUBJECT: Report of Interrogation of 6 August 1965**

1. Today's session was from 1000 to 1200 and from 1305 to 1410. As planned, I started the session by summarizing for Subject the results of the first six sessions, listing for him approximately twenty points on which he had failed badly. (Summary list attached.) At first Subject attempted to contest the points as I cited them, for example, on the variations in the KOBULOV story, and on the location of ROZHENKO's office, but when I gave him the facts he did not challenge them and he listened to most of the litany in silence. I told Subject that the results of these sessions had confirmed further the previous findings. I asked him why he continued to cling to his legend, and reminded him that he had turned down the opportunity offered to him last spring to change his mind while we still could take steps to preserve his operational usefulness. I said that this opportunity was now past, but that I did not want to conceal from him the fact that he still had knowledge and information which could be useful to us. However, there was a time limit even to this. I reminded him that he had been out of circulation for a long time and that many things had happened in the world and especially in the Soviet Union during this time; for example, KHRUSHCHEV was no longer in power (Subject's comment, as expected, was "Thank God!"). Other changes had taken place. If Subject did not make up his mind to tell the truth, his 490 days could easily turn into 4000, and he would not be of interest to anyone. I told Subject again, that he had nothing to fear, no matter what he had done in the past, that we would not prosecute him for any past crimes, no matter how bad. If he were worried about reprisal from Soviet security organs, I told him that we were just as capable of keeping his confession secret as we were of keeping secret the fact that we knew he was a provocateur for a year and a half before his defection. I promised him

~~SECRET~~

2.

that he would be given normal living conditions as soon as he started to cooperate by telling the real truth. (A complete transcript of this part of the session is being done for the record.)

2. As expected, Subject's only response to all this was that he had told the truth--with allowances for mistakes on minor points of detail owing to forgetfulness--and that he would continue to tell nothing but. He said that despite his grievances over his treatment he continued to be willing to serve American Intelligence in any way he could, short of returning to the USSR, of course. He complained that I denied and contradicted everything he said, great and small, and said that he could see by many remarks that I had made that I thought that he had never served in the KGB as a staff officer but had perhaps been an agent for the KGB. This, he said, was completely excluded, and I should know that it is not possible for the KGB to recruit the son of a minister as an agent. I replied simply that I knew of several cases where not only children of ministers but even more important people had served in this capacity.

3. Another interesting remark that Subject made was that he fully appreciated the fact that his knowledge was rapidly getting dated. He mentioned that this applied not only to his knowledge of the KGB, but also to what he knew about prominent members of the Central Committee of the CPSU. I said that he had not provided anything of interest on this subject, and he replied that there had not been an opportunity, implying that there was much that he had to offer in this field. It is planned to explore his knowledge on this next week.

4. Subject complained that we had not checked his story sufficiently and pointed out that thousands of boys had studied in the same schools as he had and that we should be able to get confirmation somewhere. Here he made an interesting remark as follows: "Incidentally, when I first came here I understood from something that Mr. Peter Bagley said that you have operational contact with a Spartak KAZAKOV. He was also in the Baku Naval Preparatory School with me."

3.

5. Subject was questioned in some detail about his duties as a SCD officer on the big public holidays. Subject's description was generally accurate, and even quite good as long as he kept his answers general. When forced to be more specific he made a number of mistakes about the procedures involved, such as insisting that instructions for the holiday were issued by the chief of the department without the participation of a 9th Directorate officer, about the preparation of the duty and guest lists for passes, which lead me to conclude that he did not stand duty there as a KGB officer. He was unable to remember a single delegation that he had been assigned to watch, although he maintained that he had pulled such duty every year since 1957. However, on the basis of his otherwise very good familiarity with Red Square and the procedures of parades there, I would conclude that he has attended more than one such event as a guest, or perhaps with his father.

6. After the luncheon break, I started to question Subject on his first marriage. As before, Subject was unable or unwilling to remember any of the data that would enable us to pin this story down. He does not remember exactly when he met Telegina, the date of Telegin's arrest, the date of the marriage, the location of the ZAGS office where the marriage was registered, or even the year of birth of his wife (1928 or 1929). Subject simply made no effort to answer these questions, and for this reason the questioning proceeded to Subject's first passport.

7. Asked where and when he received his first internal passport, Subject said that he thought it was in Moscow in early 1944 before leaving for Leningrad. Reminded that this was a change from his previous story that he had gotten his first passport in Leningrad, Subject replied that he hadn't remembered it, and that in any case he also got a passport in Leningrad. Asked to describe the purpose of the internal passport system, Subject's answer would embarrass any real SCD officer. He insists that all Soviet citizens over the age of 16, except those on active military service and prisoners, have passports.

8. Asked to describe the surroundings of Ul Narodnaya, where he lived from 1956 to his departure, Subject's answer

4.

was in general quite good. As before, he was unable to name correctly the city rayon in which his residence was located.

9. Asked to describe his entry into the Naval Preparatory School in Leningrad in 1944. Subject at first gave a vague and unsatisfactory answer, and when pressed for details he became irritated and said that his father had arranged it all po blatu. The session was ended on this note.

SECRET

5.

List of Points Reviewed with Subject on 6 August:

1. ABIDIAN and other operations (simply a reminder).
2. Registration in Moscow upon arrival from the Baltic on leave.
3. KOBULOV, VAKHRUSHEV, and the recommendation to the MVD.
4. Procedure of issuing visitor's passes to the MVD buildings.
5. Unescorted access to the 4th Entry to see KOBULOV.
6. Location of ROZHENKO's office. The 9th Entry.
7. Anketa
  - a. Doesn't know its name;
  - b. Filled out in 2 copies;
  - c. Filled out only the anketa and autobiography;
  - d. Filled out anketa at home;
  - e. Doesn't know the lichnyy listok po uchetu kadrov;
  - f. Posluzhnoy Spisok;
  - g. Secrecy agreement;
  - h. Size of the anketa.
8. How to run a name check. Mixed up the various archives and was unable to describe correctly how to check a Soviet citizen or a foreigner.
9. Doesn't know entry date into MVD.

6.

10. Did not take an entrance medical exam.
11. Doesn't know his salary correctly, particularly when they stopped paying for rank and when they restored rank pay.
12. Mixed up the two General SAVCHENKO's, and doesn't know about one of them at all.
13. Gastronom.
14. Service in the Baltic:
  - a. Sovetsk;
  - b. Railroad to Baltiysk;
  - c. Doesn't know Chief of Intelligence, 4th Baltic Fleet;
  - d. Doesn't know commanding officer of his MRP;
  - e. Now says he spent only 4 months there;
  - f. Doesn't know elementary geography: Primorskiy Krai instead of Kaliningrad Oblast.
15. Doesn't know in what directorate he served, FCD or SCD; doesn't know when or why they were redesignated.
16. Wife's relatives were in France. Logical, but doesn't know why there was no data on them when ran name check.
17. Knows the basic structure of the MVD in 1953, but did not name almost half of the directorates and departments. Doesn't know the functions of the 4th and 5th Spetsotdels, or how the spetsotdels used to be called. Doesn't know the deputy ministers under KRUGLOV.
18. Komsomol:
  - a. How a secretary is elected;
  - b. Regulations;
  - c. Name of the Komsomol Secretary of the MVD;



7.

- d. How he registered and deregistered;
  - e. Age;
  - f. Membership dues;
  - g. Komsomol Congress.
19. Doesn't know about special stamps on MVD passes under EERIYA and KRUGLOV. Couldn't have entered buildings.
20. Doesn't know date or even year when KGB organized.
21. Education:
- a. The trip to Baku;
  - b. Three year course of study in Naval Preparatory School;
  - c. Extension - Correspondence courses at Mining Institute;
  - d. Doesn't know what subjects taught in 8th, 9th, or 10th grades.

Attachment to 6 August 1965  
Interrogation Report

**SUBJECT: Transcript of Interrogation (Excerpt)**  
**6 August 1965**

**T:** Well, perhaps I spoke a little too loud, but I find I have no other way out, because I can't buy what you are saying, and no one wants to waste time by pouring water from one pitcher into another. I only want to say further, that would it not be better--speaking out of friendship, for you to drop this entire legend--start acting the part of that which you really are, and start to form a real friendship--for which it is still possible, at this time, to find some basis; some basis--as of now... it is still possible to find. As you were told before--you remember, later, when that tall fellow spoke to you, you were told that if you were to begin to tell the truth--you had a choice to tell the truth--and to influence to some degree some important operational activities and decisions which are concerned with operations of the KGB--a participant of which you are. I am speaking to you seriously, so listen well.

**N:** That's all I am doing, listening.

**T:** You turned down the opportunity at the time when you might still have been used operationally, when it was possible to burn? (provalit') some of KGB's operations--which would all have put you in much better circumstances than those in which you are now. You turned down this opportunity. The time has now passed. The opportunity to exploit the situation operationally now does not exist, because all the operations which were in any way connected with you have either reached the end, or are approaching an end. There is no longer any possibility of your participation or assistance to us in this work, because, after our conversation with you, when you refused to tell the truth and so on, or to cooperate, we had to make several decisions, and after making these decisions and carrying out some operations you are no

2.

longer of any operational value whatsoever. However, to tell the truth, and I don't want to conceal this from you--you still possess some operational information which might be useful to us. No one takes this away from you... But for this there is also a deadline, one which is approaching very quickly. I think the time is soon coming when we will have absolutely no interest in you whatever, and not only we--but anyone else as well. This is a serious matter. I would like to remind you--as you have said yourself, that you have been here now 490 days and during this time great many changes have taken place all over the world and especially in the Soviet Union.

N: A great many!

T: Including the fact that there is no more KHRUSHCHEV--for your information.

N: Thank God! One scoundrel less!

T: I expected this answer--and you can imagine the consequences which took place--after this--not only as a member of the KGB, but as an ordinary Soviet citizen. I want to tell you that I don't throw words around, I am carrying on a very serious talk--this happened some time ago, during the time that you have been here. When I mentioned all that I did about the operations and all that, I had a good basis for it. We have done a great deal of work since you are here.

N: I should think so--he he he!

T: As you were told before--these are my last words to you, you will not be punished for being sent over here, because our Government system does not work like the Soviet system, and you will not be punished for those crimes which you might have committed before--including murder, or what have you,--of course I speak of extremes--such things may not have taken place, necessarily--not for having been sent--not for not speaking the truth in the beginning--not for anything which the KGB may be holding over your head which makes you afraid to speak. In this matter I have specific authority and I am authorized to say this to you. You are being offered an opportunity to start a normal life. However, as I told you before, this opportunity may also expire soon, and then the 490 days, speaking between us--may turn into 4,000 days. Because there is no other way out. Even

3.

if you were not a counterintelligence worker you know that intelligence work is war. Further--if you are afraid of what you will be doing, how you will be occupied, of your life--that is, afraid of a strike against you from the Soviet Organs, or afraid of something else, you may rest assured that your confession can be kept secret, just as we kept secret our games with you beginning in 1962--until the time when you finally came to us. As you were told before--we were aware of this. In addition, and as I told you before, we knew about this operation but did not tell anyone about it. Only a narrow circle of people knew about it--and if this narrow circle did not know about it things would not have happened the way they did. So, we are able to save your life and to help you start anew; no one will reproach you for what you did in the past, for coming here, nor for what or who you were and so on. You will be received as a human being. This is all I wanted to say to you. Between us--speaking from the heart, as I said to you before, I was there before--I worked there--and now I am here, and am working here. I don't want to either boast about anything or complain about anything--I work like all the rest of the people who are here--have the same rights. It is another matter--who was I, how did I get here--you know this, perhaps, -- this conversation is just between us--I am just expressing my opinion to you--perhaps the time has come to shake hands and begin to . . .

N: You want me to talk when I have nothing to say--you refuse to believe in my education, my training in the school--my work in the KGB--you refuse to believe anything!

~~SECRET~~

10 August 1965

**SUBJECT: Report of Interrogation for 9 August 1965**

1. Today's session (1100 - 1200 and 1245 - 1400) was devoted primarily to questioning about Subject's divorce and second marriage. In this context, a number of other subjects were touched upon in passing, and at the end I put some further questions about the organization and leadership of the MVD in 1953.

2. At the beginning of the session Subject said that he had been thinking about my questions on the naval preparatory schools and that he wished to remind us that Felix KRUTIKOV, who was recruited in France by either the French or British Intelligence Services and later arrested by the Soviets for this, had also studied at the Baku Naval Preparatory School and that since he undoubtedly gave some biographic data to his case officers we should at least be able to confirm the existence of the naval preparatory school in this way.

3. In questioning Subject about his divorce, the question of the territorial subordination of Sovetskaya Gavan quickly came up. Subject said repeatedly that it was in Primorskiy Kray. (Sovetskaya Gavan is, and always has been in Khabarovskiy Kray.) When I told Subject that he was mistaken, he was quite upset. At first he insisted that he was right, then he shifted to a position that he was pretty sure he was right but that he really had no occasion to know because it wasn't included in the mail address, which was: Sovetskaya Gavan, V. Ch. 90-176. Subject did not know how many krays there are in the USSR (there are six), nor could he explain the difference between a kray and an oblast, and whatever the rest of his education, his knowledge of geography is rudimentary. As with Sovetsk, it is virtually impossible to make a mistake of this magnitude if you have actually served in the place. In contrast to the Baltic, Subject evidently has learned some descriptive facts about Sovetskaya Gavan which he seemed eager to tell me, however, I cut him off.

2.

4. In discussing the procedures involved in getting his divorce, Subject displayed a general knowledge of how this is done, but broke down on a number of specific points. It is difficult to say that he was never divorced, but we may certainly conclude that he was not divorced at the time and under the circumstances that he describes. Subject's divorce is so woven in to his legend of service in the Naval GRU that it is impossible to isolate it. Everything in this period sounds wrong, and it must be significant that this is the period in his life story that has been subject to the most variation during the different interrogations. Subject continues to say that he published the notice of intention to divorce in Sovetskaya Gavan in 1951, but is "unable to remember" the name of the newspaper or the date or month of publication. The choice of an obscure newspaper in the Far East for the publication of this notice is theoretically possible if we assume that Subject was actually serving there at the time, but is particularly significant in that we would have the capability of checking it if the notice had been published in one of the Moscow papers. Subject did not name correctly all the documents required to file for a divorce, he could not remember the dates of the various hearings, he does not remember what People's Court of which Moscow city rayon the first hearing was at, nor does he know where the City Court of Moscow is located. Subject continues to say that he did not receive a divorce certificate, and that the divorce was simply entered into his military identification booklet. Subject was unwilling to estimate the date of the divorce more precisely than summer 1952; asked why he had previously told the story about returning from the Baltic for the divorce, Subject was unable to give an explanation.

5. Asked why he had so much leave in Moscow in 1952, Subject again became entangled in the question of military leave procedures. He does not appear to know, and improvised some false statements about, the correct amount of leave coming to an officer serving in the Far East, and the normal procedures for registration in Moscow while on leave status. Similarly, Subject at first said that he did not report his divorce to Naval GRU. Reminded that Personnel would be interested, Subject improvised a little story about "mentioning it" to them. All this tends to confirm previous findings that Subject did not ever serve as an officer in the Navy. (In this connection, it is striking that in

3.

Subject's language there is not the slightest hint or trace of naval terminology or slang, even when discussing the naval schools.) The only officer in Naval GRU Headquarters in Moscow with whom he seems to have had any personal contact is the Chief of Personnel, KOLOSHIN; he claims not to remember the names of any other officers there. Asked about how he deregistered from the Komsomol organization in Sovetskaya Gavan, Subject again said that he hadn't deregistered and had simply been picked up by the K/O in "Sovetsk/Primorskiy" upon arrival there on the basis of his transfer orders.

6. Subject was shown an exemplar of the Lichniy Listok po Uchetu Kadrov and asked if he had ever seen it before. He immediately said importantly, "Yes, yes, I know this document. I've seen it in personnel files. But don't believe I ever filled it out myself." Asked where, when and in whose personnel files he had seen the document, Subject was totally unable to give an adequate answer--the best he could manage was "I think it was for civilians... interpreters, and so forth"--and finally said that he didn't think that the KGB used the document at all. Here Subject's initial response is as noteworthy as the fact that he does not know the purpose of the document.

7. Subject was questioned about his second marriage. He has changed his story slightly and now says that he lived with his wife at her parents apartment for two weeks prior to the final registration at ZAGS is Subject's assertion that he did not have and was not required to produce a Certificate of Divorce. This is not possible. Subject provided a complete guest list of the party at the dacha. In answer to my question, he said that KOBULOV was not invited because the party was for close friends only, and that although VAKHRUSHEV was a close friend he simply wasn't there.

8. Subject was then asked a few further questions about MVD structure in 1953. He was again unable to recall any of KRUGLOV's deputies except SEROV. Asked what CC/CPSU member was appointed deputy to KRUGLOV at this time Subject was completely baffled, said he didn't know, and finally said that I was evidently making a mistake. (It was SHATALIN.) Subject continued to insist that when he joined the MVD the CI Directorate was the SCD. Asked where the Intell Directorate was located at the time, he replied Building 2, the Agricultural Exhibition, the K.I. building, and Kiselnyy

4.

*Not true*

Perculok. This is a confused and incorrect answer. Subject seems to think that the K.I. building is something separate from the Agricultural Exhibition building--actually it is the only building there used by the KGB. Asked for clarification, Subject said that he never visited the K.I., and never visited the FCD building at the Agricultural Exhibition. Thus, he also seemed to be unaware that the K.I. had not existed since 1951. Asked who was the Chief of the Intell Directorate under KRUGLOV and SEROV, Subject replied that he knew only SAKHAROVSKIY, but didn't know when SAKHAROVSKIY became chief. He said that he knew that before BERIYA, LESNOY, SAVCHENKO and even FEDOTOV had served in this job. I asked Subject a direct question about PANYUSHKIN, and he said that he had heard that he served in the MGB at one time, and then later became Ambassador to America, and after that a CC worker. Even in this context, Subject did not realize that PANYUSHKIN was Chief of the Intell Directorate as of July - August 1953. It is increasingly apparent that Subject's preparation for his legend of service in 1953-1954 was limited to his work in the American Department and that it did not occur to the KGB that we might question Subject in detail on information already provided by myself and other defectors.



11 August 1965

SUBJECT: Report of Interrogation of 10 August 1965

1. Today's session was from 1100 to 1200 and from 1300 to 1500. It was largely devoted to a review of Subject's military ranks and awards, but inevitably a number of related topics were touched upon. Subject was also questioned about his father's funeral, and about members of the praesidium and the Soviet Government generally.
2. Subject was first asked when and where he first entered on active military service. He said that normally people were called up at the age of 18, and I told him that the age was 19, but 18 if the person has the equivalent of a full secondary education. He said he was never called into the army, but received a deferment because he was a student at the Institute of International Relations. In June or July 1947, at the end of his second year at the Institute he received the rank of Jr. Lt. of the Reserve, as did all his classmates. He received his first voyonnyy bilet (VB) at the end of 1945 or early 1946, at the rayvovnenkomat for his place of residence at Ul Granovskogo, he said he thought it might have been Krasnopresnenskiy rayon (this is correct, and is the first time he has correctly mentioned a rayon in which he lived). This was an ordinary enlisted man's VB. In 1947 this VB was replaced with an officer's VB. In neither case was Subject able to give an adequate description of how the documents were issued, nor did he have any idea of what was in them. He does not know in what branch of service he was (except that it was not the navy), what his sostav /category/ was, or his MOS. He said that the military registration desk was located in the voyenkomat, whereas prior to 1958 they were actually located in the Militia Sections.
3. Subject said that he first went on active military service when he entered Naval GRU. This was in October

2.

1950, although the processing had started in the spring. He deregistered from the rayoyenkomat in September. He left for the Far East immediately. Questioned about the procedures involved in processing for his departure, Subject was totally unable to describe the correct documents and procedures, and even said that he travelled in civilian clothes. If Subject had ever been a naval officer anywhere (or for that matter an officer in any branch of service) he could easily have invented satisfactory answers to my elementary questions; instead he appeared to be improvising answers on the basis of very inadequate knowledge.

4. Subject gave the following chronology of his military ranks:

July 1947 - Jr. Lt. of the Reserve  
 October 1950 - Jr. Lt.  
 April 1951 (while in Far East) - Lt.  
 April 1953 (in MVD) - Sr. Lt.  
 October 1959 (KGB) - Capt.  
 October-November 1963 (KGB) - Lt. Colonel

In no instance does he remember who signed the order of his promotion to a new military rank (normally, one would remember at least a few). I told Subject that it was impossible for him to have been promoted in the MVD in April 1953, or at any time in March-June and even later in 1953--because not one single person in the MVD was promoted at this time. He looked astounded and at first seemed undecided what line to take, but finally said that he couldn't say about anyone else, but he was sure that he received his promotion at that time. (In fact, this is excluded. All promotions were held up from Beria until late 1953.)

5. Subject said that he was put up for captain in 1956, but that the promotion was blocked by LYALIN--who was deputy chairman at that time and a member of the promotion board--on the grounds that Subject should be made to wait because of shortcomings in his work. Subject said that he was proposed for major in 1959, but only received captain. At that time, he was promised by GRIBANOV that he would be promoted directly to Lt. Colonel the next time around, and this happened. I told Subject that

3.

this was impossible, and pointed out to him that not even the astronaut GAGARIN had been able to skip a rank. Subject simply insisted that this is what had happened. He said that he didn't know why he should have gotten such special treatment, and could only suppose that allowance was made for his long stretch as a Sr. Lt. and the fact that he was a deputy chief of department. (Subject's story does not hold water no matter how you turn it; even if his career had proceeded normally he would not have been eligible for Lt. Col. before 1964.) Asked why he had previously told us that he had been a major (in the autobiography prepared in Frankfurt), Subject said he did not think we would believe the true story.

6. Subject was then questioned briefly on the famous VD incident. His story about the investigation of this incident does not conform to normal practice in such cases, and is not believable. Still worse is his account of the consequences this incident had on his Komsomol standing. He maintains that the vzyskaniya (punishment) was removed from his record in October 1954, just a few months after the incident. This is never done in less than a year, especially for such a serious offense. His explanation that this was done to enable him to leave the Komsomol because of age without a black mark on his record is simply absurd: for a KGB officer to leave the Komsomol because of age and without entering the Party is a black mark in itself, and would inevitably mean expulsion from the KGB. Subject was completely unable to describe the procedure involved in turning in his Komsomol card. He admitted that he was the only member of the SCD who was not either in the Komsomol or the Party, but maintained that no one had ever even talked to him about it.

7. Subject said he received the following medals and awards:

- Medal for Victory over Germany - 1945-46
- Medal for Defense of Moscow - 1945-46
- Medal 40 Years Soviet Army - 1957
- Medal 3rd Class, for Honorable Service,  
10 years - 1962 or 1963
- Order of Red Star - end 1961

In regard to the Medal for Honorable Service, 10 years, Subject first said he received it in March 1963, then corrected himself and said 1962. Asked why not in 1960 (it takes into account both military and KGB service), Subject said he didn't know why it was so late, that it

4.

was personnel's fault, possibly because of the reorganization of the SCD. These are nonsensical answers, and it is obvious that Subject is unsure about when he should have received this medal, remembers the previous interrogation, and is being careful.

Asked what he received the Order of the Red Star for, Subject was extremely evasive. He claimed not to remember the exact formulation of the order, and perhaps slipped when he said "For exceptional performance of mission." When I asked him what mission, he said that it was just for good work in general.

Subject also said that in 1959 he was put in for the Order of the Red Banner because of his tourist recruitments, but did not get it, probably because he was transferred to the First Department at the time. Reminded about his previous boasts about the Order of Lenin, he said that it was promised to him in 1963 but he did not receive it. Subject did not say what it would have been for.

8. I asked Subject if he had attended the opening of the Dzerzhinskiy Memorial in front of the KGB building. Subject quickly said that he wasn't there and that he didn't remember when it was opened or where he was at the time. He refused to estimate whether this took place under BERIYA, KRUGLOV, SEROV, SNELEPIN, or SEMICHASTNYY, and looked uncomfortable when reminded that it was a very big event, attended by DZERZHINSKIY's wife and son, among others. (It was opened on 20 December 1958--the 41st birthday of Soviet State Security--and was attended by KHRUSHCHEV and all other praesidium members.)

9. Subject was asked to describe his father's funeral. This he did in a satisfactory manner. Asked where he had come from to attend this funeral, Subject replied that he was in Moscow all the time of his father's illness from May 1956 until his death in August 1956 with the exception of a few days TDY in Kiev (this would be for the BURGI case, about which Subject will be questioned next time). Of possible interest is Subject's remark, apropos of nothing in particular, that the portrait of his father that hung in the House of Columns and was published in the papers at the time of his death was not a good likeness.

5.

10. Some time was spent questioning Subject on the residences and private lives of the Soviet hierarchy, especially those who lived either at Granovskiy or Serafimovich Streets. The results were inconclusive: Subject did not make any mistakes, nor did he have any sensational revelations. Asked what residences he personally visited, he said only BULGANIN, KOSYGIN, MALYSHEV, TIMOSHENKO, MIKOYAN (dacha), SHCHERBAKOV. Subject said he did not know where KOBULOV lived in Moscow.

11. At the end of the session Subject was reminded that previously he had said that he received his first VB in Leningrad. He admitted that this was wrong, but said he got some sort of documents connected with his schooling through the voyenkomat in Leningrad; however, he could not remember what documents they were.

12 August 1965

SUBJECT: Report of Interrogation for 11 August 1965

1. Today's session was from 1310 to 1500. Subject was questioned on the types of files used in the KGB, on cable procedures, on Bldg #2, and finally was tested on his knowledge of underworld slang.

2. Subject was questioned in considerable detail about the different types of files that exist in the KGB. Asked what such files he remembers, Subject replied, "I will list for you all the files from 1953 to the present time, including the changes." He was not able to do quite that, but he did have a pretty good familiarity with the different types of files. However, he did make some mistakes--such as affirming that the files on Soviet citizens who correspond abroad are kept in the 6th Department of OTU--and almost all his answers rang of memorization rather than of first hand, daily experience. As usual, he had difficulty in answering specific questions. He was weakest on questions which involved a knowledge of procedures in the 1953-1954 period--such as the delo formulyar, agenturnoye delo, and lichnoye delo formulyar. He was unable to describe the format and breakdown of a liternoye delo, although he knew its purpose well enough, and when pressed on this he said that he never handled one personally, although he was responsible for an annex to one. Conclusion: Subject's knowledge of this topic is largely memorized; however, some limited direct experience cannot be excluded.

3. Subject was asked what KGB directorates and departments are located in Building #2. He replied the FCD, Border Troops, leadership of the Personnel Directorate, leadership of the KGB, part of the 9th Directorate, and part of the 3rd Directorate. I cannot judge whether this is true now or not, but it is certainly possible. What was interesting was that Subject said he did not remember

2.

and refused to guess when any of these elements--such as the border troops, for example, moved into Building #2.

4. Asked where the 8th Chief Directorate was located, Subject said he didn't know, except that they had something beyond Kuntsovo, and something on Komsomolskaya Pl. One would expect an officer with 11 years' service in the SCD to have a better idea than that, and it's possible that the KGB considers this sensitive information. Asked to describe the procedure for writing a cable, both abroad and within the USSR, Subject gave an adequate generalized answer but did not seem to be aware of the use of cryptonyms. He had never heard of the "Book of Black Magic," which was the cryptonym book used in the FCD for all cable traffic with the field, and he denied that any equivalent book or system was used in the SCD.

5. I started asking Subject the meanings of various KGB terms and words, and then continued without break or comment into a list of criminal slang. Here Subject made an astounding showing: he knew the correct meanings of 34 of the 43 words I asked him (I did not know the meanings of many of these words myself--I took the list from the book Concentration Camps of the USSR, Munich 1955). Moreover, most of his "don't know's" came at the end of the list, when he was obviously starting to worry about the implications of the questions. At the beginning he simply answered, then he answered, adding "but that's thief's jargon," then he gave three different unsolicited explanations about why he knew the words: (1) In 1951 he made a trip to Smolensk with a couple of criminal agents from the Department of Criminal Search; (2) He knew some of the words from Naval Prep School; (3) "Literature nowadays is full of these expressions," and specifically mentioned reading the book Petrovka, 38 in 1963 (oddly enough, Petrovka, 38 did not come out until January 1964, probably not until after Subject's departure from Moscow). I made no comment either about the questions or about Subject's explanations, but simply continued through the list. He finally started answering "don't know."

6. As we were leaving the house, the guards reported that since returning to his room Subject had sat on the edge of the bed, holding his face in his hands.

13 August 1965

**SUBJECT:** Report of Interrogation for 12 August 1965

1. Today's session was from 1030 to 1200 and from 1245 to 1435. Subjects covered were the Richard BURGI case, working hours in the KGB, number and location of KGB dining rooms, Leningrad naval prep school, and the hand-shooting incident.

2. Subject was questioned in detail about certain aspects of the BURGI case. He claims to have been the case officer responsible for handling all the paper work on the case, and to have assisted A.S. KOZLOV in the recruitment. Despite the fact that he was supposed to have been the only Hqs case officer handling the case from its beginning, Subject was completely unable to describe the origins and planning stages of the operation. It is obvious from the circumstances of the case, from BURGI's testimony, and indeed from much of what NOSENKO himself says that the operational proposal must have originated in the FCD: BURGI had never been in the USSR before, but the KGB knew a great deal about his life history (according to BURGI), and they certainly knew beforehand that he was a homosexual. Yet Subject says that he ran the name checks, which were blank, he does not remember whether or not there was a cable from the United States about BURGI, and if so, what was in it, he has no idea when or how the KGB learned that BURGI was a homo, who first proposed an entrapment operation, or what the ops plan was. He insists that it was the SCD that first raised the case with the FCD, and that he went with GUSKOV to talk to FEKLISOV, Chief of the 1st Department, FCD, about it, but he cannot remember what was discussed except in the most general terms. He maintains that FEKLISOV spelled out the specific meeting arrangements which should be given BURGI in New York at this meeting--which took place before BURGI had even been approached, much less recruited; this is absurd. Subject



2.

was uncomfortable and uneasy during this part of the questioning and took frequent refuge in "Don't remember." In discussing the Kiev phase of the operation, Subject was equally weak on all questions which pertained to planning, communications, and behind the scenes arrangements: he doesn't know what instructions were given to the surveillance team, whether or not BURGI's room was tapped, etc. Subject did not even know that there was trouble with BURGI's visa, and that special steps had to be taken to extend it for him. Subject claimed a much larger role in the actual recruitment than BURGI describes, and he deliberately falsified certain aspects which show him in an agent light: for example, he claims not to remember that he was introduced to BURGI in Moscow by the homosexual agent "STROYEV," and he was careful to say that although he stayed in the same hotel as BURGI in Kiev, he was on a different floor and BURGI didn't know he was there (BURGI says he was in the next room). There can be no doubt that Subject did not participate in this operation as a case officer.

3. Subject repeated what he had told previously about the New York sequel to the operation. Asked how he had learned this, he replied that he and BUSKOV learned this from FEKLISOV, because they were interested. He admitted that this was unusual, and that FEKLISOV shouldn't have told them. Pressed, he threw in KOSOLAPOV for good measure: KOSOLAPOV was working in the New York Napravleniye of the 1st Department, FCD at that time, knew of the case, and told Subject that it had ended.

4. Subject was asked what the working hours were in the MVD when he first started to work there. He said it was 1000 or 1030 to 2400 with a break from 1700 to 2000. Asked when this changed, he said he thought it was about a year later, in 1954. In reality in MVD Hqs up to August 1953 the hours were 1100 to 2400 with break from 1700 to 2000. The hours were changed by MALENKOV in August 1953. Subject said he did not know who changed the hours or why. Subject gave the new hours correctly. His mistake on the old hours is another example of the lack of preparation that was given to the 1953-54 period of his legend.

5. Subject was then asked how many dining rooms there were in the old part of Building #2. He replied that there were four: in the basement, on the first floor, on the eighth floor, and the general's dining room between the

3.

first and second floors. In 1953-54 there were only three-- the one Subject describes on the first floor did not exist and it is very unlikely that it has been added.) Asked about dining rooms in the new building, Subject replied that he did not know how many there were, and that he had never eaten there. This is an astonishing remark for someone who was supposed to have worked 11 years in the SCD. There is only one restaurant in the new building, and it is at the main entrance on the first floor, right by the elevators. I then asked Subject if he had ever ridden in the elevator in the new building, and he said he had not. Asked about Building 12, Subject said he knew only of the dietetic restaurant, and that he had never eaten there (there are two).

6. Asked about attendance at the KGB Club, Subject again said that he practically never went except to meetings, that he had been only once on KGB birthday, that his wife had been only once or twice.

7. Subject was questioned briefly about study in Leningrad in 1944-45 and the hand shooting incident, but nothing new emerged: his story is just as terrible as ever. I asked Subject a few questions about elementary naval subjects and he was barely able to explain the difference between a battleship and a cruiser.

8. As planned, I concluded by reading Subject a verbatim transcript of what he said about this period of his life in Geneva on 25 January 1964. Subject smiled at some points, contested others, and did not seem disturbed by the contradictions. I ended by reminding Subject that he did not have much time left.

9. P.S.: I asked Subject what sort of a lapel pin (znachok) he received upon graduating from the Institute of International Relations. He immediately replied that he had received one, but much later, in 1957 or 1958 when he was serving in the Tourist Department. I asked him if he were sure, and he said he was, and recalled going with BELIKOV to get it. He described the pin. I then read him the decree establishing these pins for all higher educational institutions, dated January 1961. Prior to that, so far as I am aware, only Universities and military academies had such pins. Subject insisted that he received his in 1957 or 1958. (Upon returning we checked with KAZNACHEYEV, who graduated from the Institute of International Relations in 1956. He says that there were no such pins in his time, and he never heard of them being instituted later, although he knows that the universities had them.)

17 August 1965

SUBJECT: Report of Interrogation for 13 August 1965

1. Today's session lasted only from 1500 to 1530. As the purpose of the session was primarily to put Subject in the proper frame of mind (apprehension) for the confrontation scene tonight, Ted asked only a few questions at the beginning, and used most of the time to deliver a few final remarks and to give Subject a last opportunity to say something sensible.

2. Ted told Subject that there was no sense in continuing because he insisted on contradicting all the facts in an absurd way, and that this would be the last time that he (Ted) would talk to Subject. Ted told him he had only a few hours left. Ted asked Subject if he knew why "the doctor" (Gittinger) had spent two weeks talking to him, and when he said "no," Ted told him that it was simply to establish whether Subject was rational or not, because none of us could believe that he expected his answers to be taken seriously. However, the doctor had found that he was sane.

3. Ted told Subject that the only thing he seemed to know anything about was prison slang. Subject laughed--he was apparently prepared for this job--and again mentioned literature, this time citing "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich." Ted asked him when he had read Petrovka 38, and he said in 1963. Subject mentioned that the author of this book, Yulian Semenovich SEMENOV, had been an operational contact or agent who had submitted the manuscript of his book to the KGB for clearance; however, he had read the book when it was published. Ted then told Subject that the book was not cleared for publication (podpisana k pechatu) until 6 January 1964. Subject then said that he must have read it in draft, although he didn't remember. He could not remember the name of the case officer who had handled SEMENOV.

2.

4. Ted told Subject that there were a number of interesting and significant topics--such as Subject's family life, his wife and children--that he had not even touched upon, but that there was no use in continuing because of Subject's obstinate refusal to tell the truth. Today was his last chance, and if he didn't choose to tell the truth he would be of no further use and no one would even want to talk to him. Subject replied that he had only told the truth, was not lying on any point, didn't intend to lie, etc. He said that he understood that we didn't believe him and could only hope that "my work and time" would prove us wrong. Ted told Subject that he was sorry for him, and ended the interrogation.