

This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are
responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages
released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: **<http://www.theblackvault.com>**

~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

14 May 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, SR/CI

SUBJECT : 3-13 May Interrogation of NOSENKO

1. Although I have attended all nine (9) sessions in the current phase of NOSENKO's interrogation, I as yet have been unable to determine the reasons for the interrogator's conduct and manner and the true purpose of the phase itself.

2. As the interrogator noted in the beginning, he is to be concerned only with "certain personal matters." The interrogation of NOSENKO along such lines and NOSENKO's responses — neither have produced any change in my opinion of NOSENKO nor have appeared to have opened up any new, useful or valuable information to us.

3. Perhaps, from the psychologists' point of view, this interrogation has been of some value; but, even if this is so, I cannot see it from a review of his reports. These reports all contain basic errors arising from the psychologist's lack of knowledge of Soviet reality and his lack of experience with the true nature of Soviet man. The psychologist is not prepared to properly deal with and evaluate NOSENKO because NOSENKO is first, a Russian; second, a Soviet; third, a Communist; and, in addition to all of this, a highly trained intelligence agent.

4. NOSENKO is one of a kind. It is quite likely that the psychologist never has experienced such a personality before. Then, with the wide difference in their backgrounds and the psychologist's resulting inability to understand NOSENKO's character, it is understandable that he cannot properly judge NOSENKO and his conduct. The most we can ~~improperly~~ go on in NOSENKO's case ~~improperly~~ are the carefully considered opinions of those who

~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1994
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

~~SECRET~~

2

have backgrounds more similar to that of NOSENKO and experience with persons of NOSENKO's type. This becomes more and more obvious to me as I hear the psychologist say, "Well, he is probably telling the truth," when in fact I have seen clearly that NOSENKO has been lying. There have been many such cases in this FM latest phase of the interrogation.

5. As a result of such instances — instances of "soft interrogation," where NOSENKO's obvious lies have not been challenged — NOSENKO can now only be getting the impression that there still is a way out for him. We must remember that NOSENKO came to us prepared only for complete success or failure; he expected that in the case of failure he would be subjected to ~~hard~~ hard interrogation, harsh treatment, strong punishment. Yet he now finds himself in the peculiar position of having ~~outwardly~~ outwardly failed in his primary assignment, yet being fairly well treated and allowed to continue with his lies and dezinferratsiya despite his detention. He can now only be thinking that there still is some hope for him and for his mission.

6. In his report on the 3 May session (first session), the doctor wrote: "... After apologizing for having stomach trouble he became most receptive and even eager to cooperate. In general his manner during the interview remained relaxed, spontaneous and relevant.... As the interview progressed it was apparent to me that he was getting considerable psychological relief from the interview. At the time he left, he actually told me goodbye...." This is typical of many such statements and incidents which are my reasons for asking — do we really need this kind of interrogation? ~~Aside from considering the report itself we must ask if we really need to concern ourselves with giving NOSENKO "psychological relief." If not — and since it is obvious we are getting nothing else out of it — then this type of~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

interrogation should be abandoned.

7. Elsewhere the psychologist writes that "the picture that NOSENKO painted of his father was that of a hard working man.... Accredited as a worker at 13 or 14.... He graduated from the institute the year after NOSENKO was born in 1928. NOSENKO tells of being told that his father would work at home on his studies while holding NOSENKO across his knees to quiet him when he would cry." We know all of this — except the fact that NOSENKO held his son across his knees — from the Soviet newspaper, Pravda, 3 August 1956; and what father has not held his crying child across his knees to comfort him?

8. It is certain that ~~MEM~~ our NOSENKO did have a father, and ~~that~~ it is quite likely that this father held him across his knees. Yet this does not answer the real question — is our NOSENKO's father Ivan Isidorevich NOSENKO?

9. NOSENKO told us in this first session that his father studied in the Babfak and the institute while working full-time during the years 1923-28. The doctor was quite impressed with NOSENKO's statements on this. Yet Pravda (again on 3 August 1956, in NOSENKO's obituary) ^{noted only the studies of} ~~noted only the studies of~~ NOSENKO, Ivan Isidorevich; ^{if} ~~had~~ NOSENKO, Ivan Isidorevich, also/been working at the time he was studying, Pravda would have mentioned this without fail, because it was that much more to NOSENKO's credit. Further, the 3 August 1956 Pravda clearly stated that after graduation from the institute, NOSENKO, I. I., was sent to ~~MEM~~ a ship-building plant.

10. In the same session, NOSENKO stated that at some point in 1922 his father was admitted to the Party. ^(3 Aug 56) Pravda states that NOSENKO I. I. entered the Party in 1925. According to NOSENKO his family moved to Leningrad early in 1934. Pravda (3 Aug 56) states that they moved in 1935.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

11. If NOSENKO does not remember what his father did — how he worked and studied, when the family moved, when he was admitted to the CPSU — why does he not say so? Why is he apparently guessing at these things? Also, why can't he remember these things when he can remember being held across his father's knees?

12. The psychologist's report includes an assessment of NOSENKO's mother: "An hypothesis that could be made based on the description of the mother, would be that she would have difficulty adjusting away from Nikolayev where she had been born and where she could depend on her mother." Of whom is this not true? Who does not experience some difficulty in moving away from familiar neighborhoods and friends? Do we really need this assessment of NOSENKO's mother's emotions at 35 years age? Do we need it badly enough to spend this much time and effort getting it?

13. The psychologist's report continues: "... His (NOSENKO's) mother continued to get support from her father, and they apparently lived better (or beyond their means) in Leningrad." So what? Is the point that we should thank NOSENKO's grandmother for helping NOSENKO grow and come to us? ~~MEMO~~ If not, then again what is the point? Why do we need this?

14. It is my opinion that the type ~~MEMO~~ and line of questioning used ~~MEMO~~ present in this phase of NOSENKO's interrogation should be abandoned; we must drop this policy of letting NOSENKO ramble on freely and uninterruptedly about the unimportant details of his youth. Instead, we should begin now to press NOSENKO and question him in detail about such things as:

a. His father's life (we still cannot be certain that NOSENKO's father was the I. I. NOSENKO); for example, NOSENKO's father's service in Chon (& what credit was given NOSENKO for this while he was working in State Security?); was it even mentioned in his file?);

b. His grandfather (maternal); for example, his arrest and death in

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

jail, the role this played when NOSENKO entered the KGB, the manner in which it was recorded in NOSENKO's file, NOSENKO's questioning in Personnel (identities of Personnel employees included) about this; NOSENKO spoke with some happiness and gratitude of the financial assistance given his family by the grandfather — the KGB would have been most unhappy to learn of this/.

15. If NOSENKO were really the person he claims to be he would have spoken more precisely of his father's rank (rank given and date received)/. According to Pravda, in 1944 NOSENKO's father got the rank of Engineer-Rear Admiral. ~~NOSENKO should be able to tell us more decorations~~ The real NOSENKO also should be able to tell us more decorations precisely of the ~~decorations~~ given his father. According to Pravda, he was awarded three Orders of Lenin, Order of Makhimov First Class, three Orders of Red Banner (Labor), Order of Red Star, Order of "Medal of Honor (Znak Pecheta)".

16. Further, in order to be certain that we have the real NOSENKO, we should question him in detail about his father's death and funeral, starting with the illness and the doctors in attendance through the procession from the Hall of Columns to the Kremlin wall. I do not wish to include such detailed questions in this memo, but can ~~produce~~ produce them upon request/~~submitting~~ especially these on the funeral procession, having twice been in such procession myself.

17. According to Pravda (5 Aug 56), N. I. BOBROVNIKOV was a member of the ~~funeral~~ funeral commission and opened the funeral ceremony on Red Square. BOBROVNIKOV at that time was Chairman/ of the Moscow City Council. During the 13 May 1965 interview, NOSENKO mentioned a girl friend, Marina, who once worked as secretary to BOBROVNIKOV. If this was ~~was~~ a true statement, then NOSENKO should be able to tell us much about BOBROVNIKOV; furthermore, when talking about Marina, NOSENKO should probably have also volunteered the information that "this was the same BOBROVNIKOV who was on the commission for my father's funeral....."

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

6

18. 3 May 1965 Interview. Even now we are not certain of the date when the NOSENKO family moved to Leningrad; NOSENKO says it was in 1934, but Pravda reports the move as having been in 1935. It is possible to believe that NOSENKO might have forgotten the date, but we must remember that he associates the move with his level of schooling. That is, NOSENKO says that he moved from the O-class in Mikelayev in 1934, when he was 6 years old; he says that in Leningrad he was in the first grade.

a. NOSENKO could ^{remember} ~~remember~~ none of his friends from Mikelayev. It is possible to believe that NOSENKO might have forgotten these friends if he had had no contact with them in later years; yet NOSENKO himself says that he visited Mikelayev twice after the family had moved from there. Certainly he must have met with some of those friends, and ~~now~~ it is certain also that he would remember these meetings.

b. Although NOSENKO could remember none of his friends from Mikelayev, it is interesting to note, he remembered very well that when his family moved to Leningrad in 1934 they were met by his father with a "GAZ" automobile.

c. NOSENKO remembers also that while in Leningrad his family lived at

(1) Pleshchad' Stachek,

(2) Griboyedov/a Kanal, and

(3) ~~30055/41992M~~ ulitsa Gerkego. ~~Y.M.~~ But NOSENKO could name

no friends or neighbors whom he knew well while in Leningrad.

d. NOSENKO never mentions visiting former friends when visiting former places of residence.

e. The psychologists may accept these "lapses of memory" as being "just human," but I cannot.

19. 4 May Interview. During this interview, NOSENKO changed his story

~~SECRET~~ 7

slightly, saying that his family moved to Leningrad in March-April 1935, where he started the first grade (in September 1935). NOSENKO could not, however, describe the school or name even one of his teachers. When the doctor insisted this time that NOSENKO name some friends, he gave the nickname, "Shturm," but failed to give the boy's true name; he also ~~NOSENKO~~ gave the name, Oleg ~~NOSENKO~~ SAFRONOV. ^{Even if} ~~NOSENKO~~ accept as a fact that NOSENKO ~~NOSENKO~~ really cannot remember any of his friends ~~NOSENKO~~ from childhood, we cannot believe that he also has completely forgotten about the naval school and the tekhnikum.

20. General. During these latest sessions, NOSENKO has been trying very hard to put the record of his schooling in proper order. But in view of what has been stated in the past, ~~NOSENKO~~ and his present errors, it must be said that he is finding it impossible and he is ~~not~~ not at all convincing. In my opinion everything he has told us about this, starting from the 1941 period, has been a lie. It is possible that he really was in Krybyshev and Baku for one reason or another, but ~~NOSENKO~~ his ~~description~~ description of the circumstances and situations is unbelievable ~~and~~ and fits no Soviet pattern of life.

21. On 4 May NOSENKO said that while he attended the 585th High School in Moscow, he had two friends -- Vladimir KABANOV and Anatoliy TIMAKOV. But these were not friends who also lived on Serafimovich Street, nor were they children of Soviet high officials. NOSENKO failed to name any friends who were children of high officials, except SABUROV.

22. NOSENKO's description of his life on Serafimovich Street could never convince me that he ever really lived there. Among the high officials living on Serafimovich Street, NOSENKO mentioned ~~NOSENKO~~ SHVERNIK ~~friend~~. According to my knowledge, prior to WW II ^{so} many other members of the

~~SECRET~~

8.

~~SECRET~~

Soviet government also were living there (KAGANOVICH, etc.). If NOSENKO is the person he claims to be he should be able freely to name and discuss many persons ~~known~~ from among the first-ranking officials who lived on Serafimovich Street; not just SHVERNIK (whose address, incidentally, already has been published in The Secret World).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

24 Feb 1965

1. It was the intention of the undersigned to attend every session conducted by the doctor in hope to gain something new and useful for our future interrogations. During these sessions, I managed only to refresh my memory of things NOSENKO had previously said. Nothing new or significant developed during these sessions except for a few minor facts which have no great value. It should be mentioned that many of the facts that NOSENKO stated about his past life were more mixed up than the story he had previously related.

2. It is not the intent of this paper to criticize the work which the doctor has done because the sessions have already taken place and the work is completed. My main objection to this type of interrogation is that the doctor tried to maintain a neutral attitude and never challenged any of NOSENKO's statements. ^{my opinion that} It is/ the doctor made a mistake in the last session when he told NOSENKO "You are NOSENKO." This leads NOSENKO to believe we accepted his life story and family background, and it would be very hard to question him again on this subject. It is my opinion that we did not have enough information to make a definite conclusion that he is NOSENKO. What NOSENKO told us could be obtained or learned by another person very well brief on these matters. Most of the information that NOSENKO gave to us about his parents is still not convincing to make conclusions. Most of the questions during the recent sessions were of a leading nature and NOSENKO's answers appeared to be of the type that the doctor wanted.

~~SECRET~~

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1994
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

[Redacted]	
Classification	(S)
Date	Indefinite
Date Accessible to Determine	

~~SECRET~~

In my opinion, NOSENKO did not say more about his father, and in many instance less, than the newspaper Pravda said in 1956.

3. In the doctor's opinion, NOSENKO mentioned to us quite a few family friends who were around the NOSENKO family and at the first look it is convincing that he is NOSENKO. In my opinion, NOSENKO gave to us only names who logically would be ^{associated} ~~connected~~ with NOSENKO or NOSENKO's ^{revealing} ~~father~~, and nothing ~~revealing~~ about their activities or private lives. Significantly, most of the information NOSENKO has given us is about people who are ~~either~~ either dead or no longer in authority. For example, MALYSHEV, (former Deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, died); VAKHUSHEV, (died); SABURCH, (no longer a VIP); KABULOV, (shot); ^{another functionary no longer a VIP} BULGANIN, (no longer VIP); KUZNETSOV, ~~shot~~, (shot); SECHERBAKOV, (died); and others.

4. He mentioned a few names who are VIPs now, but did not say anything interesting about them. For example, he mentioned SHVERNIK who lives on ^{vicha} ~~Serifimovskaya~~ Street, a fact known to everyone, ^{and the} or family friendship with KLSYGIN.

Lately he mentioned Marshal ZHUKOV's daughter who he knew ^{already} we have a good picture of Rima ZHUKOVA from one of our employees as well as a good description of ZHUKOV's apartment.

5. The only conclusion we can come to from the foregoing is that NOSENKO has been allowed to say little or nothing about the lives of important Soviet officials, or this man is not NOSENKO and all he knows is the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

is the legend which has been provided him or or answers which he could figure out himself.

6. Withx regard to his mother, he did not mention anything of importance to us. He did not mention any of his mother's friends among Soviet VIPs, and tried to avoid or change the subject when this matter was brought up.

7. I am not convinced that NOSENKO lived on Serimevicha and Granovski Streets because he gave so little information about these areas that it is impossible to judge if he actually lived there. Although he gave correct information about a few VIPs who lived in houses in that area, other details are lacking which would confirm his residence there.

8. NOSENKO's latest information on his educational background is so mixed up and he made so many mistakes regarding Soviet realities that it is impossible to believe ~~xxxx~~ any part of his education.

9. I don't believe any part of NOSENKO's story about his military service. "The Naval Preparatory School in Baku and Leningrad." According to Soviet regulation, a person was usually called in the army when he is 19 (these who have graduated from high school or otherwise have a higher education/^{called be called at age 18.})

NOSENKO ~~xxxx~~ was born on ~~thax~~ 30 October 1927, then he would be 18 years old on 30 October 1945. He could be called into the army at this time, i.e., the fall of 1945, although he should have been 18 by September of that year. Ordinarily, he would be called to service in 1946. In my opinion, everything NOSENKO said about his military background in any kind of service school prior to the fall of 1945 is a lie. NOSENKO, then did not attend the Higher Naval Schools in Leningrad and Baku because he was too young to attend these

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

schoools and the schools only accepted students who were ready for regular
for acceptance in these schools was
military service, and the lowest age/~~minimum~~ 18 years. Then we still have
unanswered questions on where, when, and how KOSENKO finished high
school. KOSENKO's story that he took some courses in Moscow Evening High
School Attached to ~~Faculty~~ Gernyy Institute and his attendance at the Leningrad
Shipbuilding Technicum, I consider as a complete lie, because it does not
logical
fit any pattern of Soviet reality.

10. It is my belief that KOSENKO probably never was in actual military
service and definitely did not take ^{the} military oath the way he described it,
i.e., that he ~~took~~ took the oath at the age of 15 or 16 in Baku. It is not
conduct
necessary to ~~make~~ any ~~thorough~~ research since an individual has to
be 18 and on active duty in the service in order to be eligible to take
the military oath. If we believe that KOSENKO was admitted to the
Leningrad Higher Military Preparatory School in 1944 with 9 grades of
education; however,
education / he would not be admitted to the school because of his age and
because he could not take the oath until October 1945.

11. During the last interrogation, there was some confusion on KOSENKO's
part about his military ranks. And now we have three different stories about
his ranks. Jr. Lt. — June 1947

Lt. — spring of 1951.

Sr. Lt. — end of 53 or early 54.

. He also has stated that he was promoted to
Lt. in 1950. In last interview, he stated that he was promoted to Sr Lt in April
or May 1953.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Capt — July 1956

Major — Aug/Sept 1959

He now states that he never was a major.

Lt Col-Nov 1963

He said his

Promotion had to be approved by the Central Committee because of his youth. These stories about his military ranks should not be taken seriously and/considered as a complete lie.

SOME POINTS FROM THE DOCTOR'S INTERVIEW

1. NOSENKO stated (7 May 1965) that he took the oath in Baku in 1943 when he was 15 years old, but he did not remember how he enrolled in the Baku school. In the same meeting, he stated that while he was in the Baku school he was komandir otdeleniya. Also in the same interview he stated that he was in the Moskovskiy Flotskiy Kipazh. It should be said that the Moskovskiy Flotskiy Kipazh was only for naval personnel who were called in the regular naval service. All of this should be considered as a lie.

2. On 10 May 1965, NOSENKO stated that somewhere he was arrested when he was 16 years old and was xxx put under home arrest. If this incident really took place, it is not likely that papa helped him to get out of the arrest or it is possible to think that after this arrest for some crime unknown to us he was put in jail and then in a concentration or labor camp. This is why NOSENKO tells us a story that in 1944, in the fall, he was working for two or three months in the forest, where he got sick and conditions were very bad. As NOSENKO described it, the conditions were more like a labor camp than a regular military unit.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

3. According to MOSENKO's latest story, he voluntarily went to the naval preparatory school of Frunze in 1944 but he didn't start any studies until November or December 1944 because the whole school was working in the forest. Then in February or March 1945, the shooting accident took place and he spent some time in the hospital and in May he enrolled in a shipbuilding technicum. MOSENKO tried to make us believe that while he was in the naval preparatory school he studied 10th grade subjects, but as we can see, in actual fact, he did not study anything because he had no time. Later he stated that when he enrolled in the shipbuilding technicum in May, the next month he graduated and received his certificate as if he graduated from a high school, and got the right to go to a higher institution. Only a crazy person could believe this story.

4. During all the interrogations, we never got a clear picture how he received his first/^{internal} passport in Leningrad and how he received his first military ticket. If he really was demobilized and put in the reserve it should take place somewhere later than October 1945 when he became 18 years old. Definitely there will be no talk about any military ticket before you reach 18 years old. And more likely at that time he should have been 19 years old to have been called into the service or posted to the reserve. It should be noted here if MOSENKO really was in the naval preparatory school in 1944 and 1945 and received his military ticket in 1945 then he definitely should be two years older than he claims.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

5. On 5 May, NOSENKO named more friends. He mentioned again SABUROV's sons. One of them killed his wife (Valya Yefrimova), the daughter of deputy minister YEFRIMOV. He killed her because he found her in bed with another man. Deputy Minister V. V. YEFRIMOV was deputy to NOSENKO's father. He was at his funeral and delivered a speech in Red Square during the funeral ceremony. It was noticeable that ~~the official maxim~~ when we questioned him about friends he always mentioned SABUROV. ^{Also} NOSENKO only mentioned YEFRIMOV by name and did not give any details. If NOSENKO is the person ~~the~~ person he is supposed to be, he would know much more about the life and background of the deputy to his father. And here again we have an example of a person ~~who is not a VIP~~ who is no longer a VIP.

6. On 6 May NOSENKO told us stories about the eldest son of SABUROV who was married the daughter of the former Minister of Railroads KOVALEV. It should be noted here that the full story of KOVALEV was published in my book The Secret World. KOVALEV was punished and lost his V.P. status in 1950.

7. On 21 May, in answering the doctor's question about his first work in the KGB, NOSENKO told us a story how he received an order to write a statement to arrest a Soviet citizen who was connected with foreigners. (~~XXXXXXXX~~ The Soviet citizen wrote a letter to the American Embassy.) According to NOSENKO he rejected this type of work although there was BERIYA's resolution for arrest (Russian word is razretat!). Further, NOSENKO ~~explained~~ ^{felt} that the man was not guilty. The point of this story was to prove that he was working in the SCD.

8. On 20 May NOSENKO once again mentioned that the working hours of the KGB were from 10:30 in the morning until 1 o'clock in the morning, with a

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

break between 5 and 8 in the evening. As I already said before Moscow Headquarters until later July or August 1953 working hours were from 11 AM to 12 PM with a break from 5 to 8 in the evening. In oblast' KGB, including Moscow city, working hours were from 10:30 in the morning to 1 o'clock in the morning. Somewhere at the end of July and the beginning of August 1953, working hours were changed and were from 9 AM to 6 PM with a lunch break of 1/2 to 1 hour taken between the hours of 1 PM to 3 PM for all the offices of the KGB including headquarters and the oblast'. Then it is possible to think that, maybe somewhere in Moscow oblast', Leningrad, or some other city, KOLSENKO used to work as a case officer or was closely connected with the oblast' KGB. That is where he learned the working hours. That is why he made the mistake of regarding the working hours in headquarters.

9. When the doctor is writing in the summary of KOLSENKO's psychological assessment, he called him a bright sociopath. Maybe he is, but in my opinion he is a very well trained agent with great ingenuity and propaganda preparation. I absolutely disagree with the doctor's statement that "He has been essentially convincing and accurate in general if not always truthful in detail." In one point it is possible to agree with the doctor that KOLSENKO does not present to us the complete legend. In my opinion,, KOLSENKO developed his own story or legend himself in response to leading questions, especially about his early life and schooling up to 1953. And from 1952-1953 and on, up to his defection, we should believe that it was a legend developed for KOLSENKO by the KGB, of course, with his help.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

SUGGESTIONS

1. It is suggested that I participate in the next hostile, needling interrogation. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] It is also suggested that I interrogate him alone in the interrogation room, although I prefer that someone be present in the room. But if I am alone it will give me greater authority in NOSENKO's eyes, and this may be a psychological factor working to my benefit. But if NOSENKO is taken to another place, then it is possible to interrogate him [REDACTED] who has asked CIA authorities for a long time to talk to NOSENKO. In the event of my participation in the interrogation to avoid mistakes and misunderstandings, the interrogation should be held in Russian. It is not possible to make the interrogation as hostile as it might be and to needle him if the interrogation is held in English, as NOSENKO does not understand strong words in English as well as he does in Russian. During the interrogation I will not speak fast in order to make it understandable. It is understood that I am going to be correct, but not polite. I would try to avoid getting into any arguments with NOSENKO. In case of arguments, I would ask him to be seated and to answer the questions. In the event he recognizes and tells me who I am, it is possible to give two answers: 1. I am not he but he is coming soon to talk to you, and you are mistaken. 2. Yes, I am D and you are going to give me proof that you are H. You have to give me proof that you did work for the KGB.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

In case of my participation, I would like to be able to use all the information that NOSENKO has previously told us. In utilizing this information, I would like to have a free hand to press him on certain points which I feel would be of value to us in gaining a confession from him. I need permission to use the names of Bagley, Big George, and Murphy, of course, only in the proper way and when it is necessary. The use of the changes in the Soviet government could be discussed having in mind these events in at the proper time when it is apparent that it will help him to confess (the use of only the fall of KHRUSHCHEV without revealing the rise of SHELEPIN and SEMICHASTNYI.) It could be used in various ways, for example, a newspaper on the ~~table~~ table with only the headline showing. He could be allowed to see the paper inadvertently and we could see what his reaction is. Or, the information could be brought out at a point in the interrogation when we are trying to stress that he must confess since we know he is telling lies, and furthermore, his bosses are no longer in authority in the Soviet Union and all is lost for him anyhow.

2. During the interrogation stress should constantly be given to the fact that NOSENKO is being used as a tool of the KGB without proper training of American realities, and that his mission was doomed from the start because of this.

3. If it is decided to give him some drugs, it should be given prior to the hostile interrogation, so that we can use any of the information gained from the use of these drugs against him. The first matter which should be ~~xxx~~ determined if drugs are used is whether he is NOSENKO or not.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

4. I would not hesitate to continue the interrogations to the point where
MOSENKO would be extremely tired and ^{perhaps} ~~perhaps~~ less able to resist hostile
questioning. If there is not ~~sufficient~~ ^{enough} personnel for extended periods of
interrogation, then he should be left in the interrogation room during
breaks in the interrogation.

VULNERABLE

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ AREAS TO BE EXAMINED DURING THE NEXT HOSTILE INTERROGATION

1. Everything about MOSENKO's education starting from Leningrad elementary
the the
school, move to Moscow, Moscow schooling, should be examined. And special
attention should be devoted to the schools he attended in September 1941,
Kubyshev, Baku, Moscow, Leningrad, and back to Moscow again. During the
interrogation of this period, we should challenge MOSENKO by the facts
that he could not be at any military school prior to the fall of 1945. Then
we do not believe his story. This interrogation should include detailed
questioning about his travel to Kubyshev, Baku, to find out where he
really was at that period. At the same time, MOSENKO should be questioned
about where his parents lived from October 1941 thru 1942. Also he should
be questioned about his first passport which he is supposed to receive not
earlier than ~~thru~~ November 1943 and not later than the beginning of 1944.
The same can be said about his military ticket, i.e., when and how he
received his first military ticket, through what military commissariat,
because he could not receive his military ticket earlier than November 1945.
His story that he received his military ticket in the summer of 1945 is false.
What medical commission was he examined by before he got his military
ticket should be ascertained. It is impossible that MOSENKO was on active
military service prior to 1945 including any military schools because of his
age. He should have been called to active duty in the fall of 1945 or more

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

likely in 1946. If he was posted in active reserve in 1945 or 1946 then the question is why he was not called into the army.

Together with this goes the question of NOSENKO's education in the Institute of International Relations. The story he told us is unbelievable. First he states that it was a four year course and that he graduated in 1949 and later on he changed his story and said that it was a five year course and that he graduated in 1950.

2. NOSENKO's first marriage to TELEGIN's daughter and divorce. On this subject, NOSENKO should be questioned about his registration of the marriage, passports, what district was the marriage registered in, about bank apartments on the First Meshchanskaya Street, including his military status at this time, what kind of military ticket he had, when it was registered. More definite questions should be asked about the divorce announcement in the newspapers and full procedure of the divorce including the two court sessions (district and oblast' courts). Alimony — the exact amount of alimony, reminding to him that earlier he told us that he paid to his first wife 150,000 rubles from his money which he earned serving in the Far East. According to the latest NOSENKO statements he spent in the Far East less than 20 months. If this is the case, then NOSENKO 33333 received more than 5,000 rubles a month. To make during the 20 months the 100,000 rubles. Even if NOSENKO was in the Far East and received there a double salary in as a jr. lt. the first year of service in the GRU, he could not make more than 3,000 rubles a month (I gave here the highest possible salary for a junior officer)

3. Both of the subjects mentioned above should be immediately investigated

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

along with the matter of where NOSENKO was living at that time, paying special attention to Serifonicha, Granovskaya and First Meshchanskaya Streets, keeping in mind that these subjects will really show if he is NOSENKO. If we do not get proper answers on the first two subjects, if he continues to lie or give unsatisfactory answers, then in my opinion it is not necessary to question him about his study in the foreign relations institute. If the answers are satisfactory or more realistic then we would move to the Institute of International Relations.

4. NOSENKO's Entry to the KGB. Because we have 4 or 5 different dates on his entry into the KGB I think it would be a good idea to start questioning him from the point when he said that once prior to 1952 he had complete interview with the KGB ~~representative~~ representative about his employment in the KGB, but he rejected their proposal because he did not like it. From this point we would go on from the beginning somewhere in 1952 when he first talked with KABULOV and so on. And he should be challenged all the time that KGB did not work the way he described to us. Then somewhere during the interrogation he should be reminded or asked questions could a person be in KGB service if he:

a. ^{was} recommended to the KGB by a person who was shot to death as an enemy of the people.

b. whose mother's background is noble (dvoryan), and whose grandfather was a Trotskyite and who was arrested and died in jail.

c. whose father or first wife was arrested and was in jail the day he entered the KGB.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

d. who divorced his first wife not in the proper way and probably was the guilty and question about ~~he~~ his immorality was discussed in the party commission of the CPSU

e. who entered the KGB when he was already average member of the Komsomol without any desire to become ~~xxx~~ a member of the Communist Party

f. would a person with such background mentioned above be taken to work in the SCD American Department

g. who ~~xxx~~ lost his Komsomol membership because of his misuse of operational documents and immorality.

h. who was arrested for 15 days for the reasons mentioned above.

i. who was without Komsomol and party membership for 2 years.

j. who rejected the order of the Minister to write a statement for arrest in the course of his work .

etc.

It is very hard now to develop questions about his entry into the KGB but he should be challenged all the time about his answers.

5. I did not mention about his being in the Far East and how he was transferred from GRU to KGB . The line of questions on this matter would be depend or connected with answers ~~xxx~~ about his education and how he entered the KGB. Questions about his ~~xxx~~ transfer from the GRU to the KGB could be put together when we will question him about his entry into the KGB , his personal file, and military ranks.

6. I would definitely utilize and show to him the number 7 , what is connected with it , and just ask him for an explanation.

7. MOSENKO's trip to Gorkiy in search of CHEREPANOV. This question should

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

started from the point where he first heard of CHEREPANOV's defection from Moscow, NOSENKO's trip to Corky and how long he studied the CHEREPANOV papers. Here all the NOSENKO documents should be at hand.

8. NOSENKO's operational and social activities on Red Square during the holidays and father's funeral also ~~xxx~~ NOSENKO's presence at the Kremlin should be closely investigated because it is my belief ^{not} as he ~~was~~ often in Red Square as he claimed. If he was there, it was only once or twice and it would be easy to mix him up about these matters. Questions on this subject could be developed according to his answers.

9. I would like to take NOSENKO on a trip from Kurskiy Station in Moscow to his apartment on Karednaya Street along Chkalovskaya Street and Taganka. Also on a trip along Dzerzhinskiy Street, Sretenka Street and First Meshchanskaya Street to his apartment building where he lived with his first wife. This is necessary to be sure that he really lived in these places. I still do not believe that he really lived at these addresses, except for the fact that he may have lived nearby in safehouses.

10. Interrogation on operational questions such as his work with agents and his use of safehouse, etc. could be held later. It depends how the ~~present~~ interrogation goes.

Note: I have no special suggestions how to exploit NOSENKO's information, it depends on the next stage of the interrogation, but I am against ~~turning~~ turning him back to the Soviets, whether he confesses ^{or} not. We have ~~have~~ ^{to} everything in our power to make him confess in order to win this big game.

If we publish his story even with our changes without his confession

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

we will be on the losing side. There is no room to ^{demonstrate} ~~indisputably~~ that
defection is ~~the~~ the act of an honorable motivated man without his
confession.

~~SECRET~~

GR-1

14 January, 1964

1. It should be noted that the following analysis is necessarily incomplete, as the undersigned did not have access to the original documents; nor has it been possible to debrief Mrs. OSWALD regarding some of the Soviet documents and other material contained in the FBI provided material. However, despite these shortcomings, the following analysis is offered in the hope that it may serve as guide for future debriefing of Mrs. OSWALD. It is my firm belief that such further debriefing of Mrs. OSWALD is necessary because of numerous mistakes in her Soviet documentation; suspicious gaps and discrepancies in her story regarding her life in the USSR; and some peculiarities in her correspondence with addressees in the USSR, which strongly suggest that some form of open code was employed between her and her correspondents in the USSR.

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1994
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

After a close analysis of the USSR's Soviet documentation should be asked how she received the matronymic Nikolayevna. Her biographical data indicates she was born out of wedlock. This is confirmed by her birth certificate in which the name of the father is not listed. Later the ordinary Soviet practice for registration of bastard children. If she took the patronymic of her stepfather, her matronymic should be Stepanovna, after her stepfather's given name. In the Soviet police state, birth registration records are meticulously maintained.

Especially ^{with} regard to the patronymic of bastard children, ^{because} this is a life-long indicator of the father of the child.

As is well known the derivation, profession, politics, etc. of the father frequently determines the future security

clearance of Soviet citizens, their qualification to enter the ^{the Komsomol} USSR, to function in teaching, government service etc.

From my own experience in the Soviet security services I

know that the Soviets will not register the name of the father if there has not been a formal marriage - even if the identity of the common-law father is known.

3. Birth Certificates - Actually three copies of Marina's birth certificates are furnished. ITEM #340 is a copy of her birth certificate issued on 19 July 1961, in Arkhangelsk. The other two birth certificates are contained in ITEMS 262-270. These are notarized copies of ITEM #340, notarized in MINSK. One of these later two birth certificates was ^{required} procured on 4 Aug. 1961 and the second was obtained on 8 Aug. 1961. Two different notarys notarized these two birth certificates - both obtained in Minsk within a four day period. By the handwriting it is obvious that the same person filled out the MINSK birth certificates - only the notarys' signatures

are different. Regarding all three birth certificates

the following questions should be asked of Marina:

- a) ^{What is} The origin of her NIKOLAYEVNA patronymic.
- b) What happened to the original of her birth certificate which she must have had in order to enter primary school, pharmacy school, and to get her passport when she reached the age of 16 - in 1957?
- c) Why did she request a second copy, marked "POVTORNAYA", of her birth certificate ITEM #349 from ARKHANGELSK?
- d) ITEM #340 was issued in Arkhangel'sk about a 1000 kilometers from MINSK. Did she travel there personally to apply for her birth certificate? Did she write for it? Was it sent to her through the mail or did she pick it up at the Minsk militia headquarters?
- What reason did she give the ARKHANGELSK militia

authorities for requesting the second copy of her birth certificate. Why was she applying for this birth certificate on 19 July 1961.

e) The ITEM #340 birth certificate is supposed to be an exact duplicate of the birth certificate issued after her birth. This normally is issued several days after birth because parents do not usually rush down to register the birth of a child on the day of the birth -

not even in the USSR. ITEM #340 shows that MARINA's birth was registered on 14 Aug. 1941 and that she was born on 17 July 1941. Marina applied for a copy of this certificate on 19 July 1961. For some reason the 9 in 19 July 1961, is marked over and is an obvious change of the figure 4 to a 9 in the following way. An examination of the original will better show if this was a marked over deliberate change. Such a change could only be signifi-

can't if it is not a bona-fide document, actually
issued in ARHANGELSK. Personal document conscious
Soviets would note such an obvious change. Certainly
if she applied for the two notarized copies of her
birth certificate using ITEM #340 as a basis for
these new copies she would be closely questioned
and it is more than likely that notarized copies
would not be issued on a marked over original. Now
it might be possible that the first notary would
not have noticed the marked over original. However,
a second notarized birth certificate was issued in
Minsk by still another notary.

4. Vaccination Certificate. (included in IRMS 202-270)

In connection with discussion of Marina OSTAID's date of birth, it is worthwhile to note that this date is given as 17/7/37 on her vaccination certificate. This indicates that 17 only is the day she intended to use as a birth date. The "correction" of a "natural error" of using the current year -- ⁶²1962 -- in the date, however, does nothing to dispel the confusion of the year of her birth.

a) Mrs. OSTAID might be asked about the procedure followed in accomplishing the vaccinations and in obtaining the certificates. It appears that at least four persons were involved in the completion of each certificate -- 1. Marina signed her name to the certificate, then signed for same.

2. The doctor filled in the names and dates of birth (6 persons) 3. The nurse filled in these blanks

for him, but it was neither Lee nor Marina who
displayed this portion of Marina's certificate):

3- the vaccinator ("ship's physician") dated
and certified the vaccinations; and
4- apparently still another person (possibly an
assistant to the physician) printed in the vacci-
nator's position and the type of vaccination given.

Ms. OSWALD certainly should be asked how she
and Jane received vaccinations from the ship's
physician and certificates signed by the physician
and bearing a Dutch certification stamp on 15 and
17 May 1962 although they did not leave Moscow

until June (for which date the OSWALD's signed a
temporary note for the transportation board).
It also would be interesting to know the reason

*is actual explanation
for his entries in
certificate
can be found at this explanation
(...).*

that Marina and her daughter were vaccinated on
different days.

5. Military Service Booklet (Voyenny Bilet: included in

() ()

1937 (No. 270). Examination of this document also raises some question concerning both biographic information supplied and that found neither in Marina's autobiography nor in the reports on interviews with her.

a) Marina -- already 15, according to her given date of birth, and with a pharmacist's training -- arrived in Miami at the end of August 1938. Why was she not issued a temporary pilot until 12 September? Further, why was no registration stamp placed in the booklet until 18 October?

b) According to Lee OBYED's diary, Marina was a Komsomol member. The military service booklet, however, shows that she was neither a Komsomol or CPSU member. What proper explanation can Marina offer for this?

c) In Section XII, "Special notes. (Osobyie Otmetcheniya)" of this document, it is shown that Marina was given

notice to be ready for the military call-up;
the document also shows, however, that on 1 August
this notice was cancelled. One logical explanation
for this might be that the cancellation was made
when Marina informed the commissariat of her
marriage. But Mrs. OSWALD should be asked about
this, and her answer should be noted carefully.

d) Section X of this document shows that as noted
above, Marina was registered in Minsk in Frenzen-
skiy Rayon on 23 October 1969, whence she was de-
registered on 1 August 1969; on 9 August she was
registered in Leninsky Rayon. Nowhere in Marina's
autobiography, the report on the FBI's interviews
of Marina or any other official papers belonging
to the OSWALDs, is there any mention of the change
of residence which allegedly required this change in
registration. There is some discussion of the change

in Lee Oswald's correspondence, with an indication that this apartment in Franzensky began was re-occupied almost as soon as the OSWALD's left.

Mrs. Oswald must be asked about this move in detail.

Why did they move? What were the exact addresses?

Who were their neighbors? And so on. This move

is all the more interesting, not because it was

given so little attention in Mrs. Oswald's testi-

mony (it seems she has offered little detailed

coverage of any part of her life), but because

it took place in the middle of the period in

which the OSWALD's were arranging to return to the

U.S. According to Lee's diary for the period,

15 July to 20 August, the OSWALD's found that they

were required to have around twenty documents in

order to apply for an exit visa; they submitted

these documents on 10 August and learned that they

people have a three-month half-cent with file
... either or not they could want the
... Why did the DFI ID's take the more
... planning to leave the USSR, ac-
... of her letters, in a more
... especially through a re-
... period of her personal critical period is an
... absolutely necessary.

6. Work booklet. (ITC 43'6) It must be noted here that the
copy of the document as supplied is incomplete, unless
the remainder of this document has been withheld, it is
necessary to know why Marina had only this portion of
her Work Booklet.

7. Another change in Marina's life which occurred
within the 1. July - 30 August 1951 period is
recorded in this document by an order, dated
July 1951, Marina was transferred, apparently

... to the duties of assistant engineer at
the hospital where she had been working since 1929.

An investigation of the persons for this charge,
particularly in light of other charges noted, is in
progress.

B. It seems from the copy supplied that all entries
on pages 1 and 2 were made not only by the same person,
but - from the "fist" of the script - also at the same
time. An examination of the original is required to de-
termine if this is so.

7. Trade Union Picket. (Profsoyuznyy билет; included in
ITEMS 160-170) There are a number of irregularities --
indicated in questions below -- in Marina's Profsoyuznyy
билет for which ^{explanations} might be
found. They do not occur singly, however, and in
view of the appearance of similar and apparently related
irregularities in her other documents it is

10. The second matter to be considered is that the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America (the "Union") issued a booklet entitled "Medical Testimony" in 1953 (see Exhibit 100). This same booklet, however, records her trade union dues payments beginning only in June 1954; further it shows that in 1955 she made only two payments (one of \$1.00 and the second, of \$2.00 each). After July 1955, no payments are recorded until January 1956, in which year she made monthly payments until August. No later payments are shown. Aside from the question of irregularity of payments, we must ask how it was possible for her to have passed through the 1954-1955 period without paying dues at all. It is not unusual and not therefore surprising that at least one other trade union booklet during those three years. It is noted that Murray has issued her first

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

[illegible]

of hospital records booklet gives documentary
evidence for the very real questions of her date of
birth, indicated in paragraph 2, "Birth certificates".
In the record, on these questioning certificates
and in the record, on the hospital birth certificate in
paragraph 1, it is not given. In this document
the date of birth is recorded as 1904. It is pos-
sible that an error in spelling or an error of a

It might be made by an official issuing such a passport, but it is reasonable to believe that either the clerk or the official routinely would err in recording her year of birth. It is probable that someone other than Marina filled in the information required for this document; then, either the issuing official or Marina deliberately lied in this instance. Why? Here, when and by whom was the basic information recorded.

See also: (William Sherelley, ITX 8340).

Without the original of the document and supporting papers at hand, it is difficult to find documentary grounds for a number of questions which might be asked of Mrs. OSWALD. In any case, however, her answers to the following inquiries concerning her passport will be of greatest importance and usefulness.

a) Why was Mrs. OSWALD given a passport made valid from 11 January 1961 to 11 January 1964?

It might be said, of course, that it was expected that she would no longer need the passport after the latter date because she was the wife of a U.S. citizen returning to the U.S. to stay.

According to her visa on page 17, on 14 May 1962

she was granted non quota (2-D) status for entry into the U.S. Then, why was the passport made

and I am a person when she was expelled - according to her exit visa (see page 12 in the packet) - to ^{leave} the USSR on or before 1 December 1964. Did she expect to return to visit her relatives? About two years? On the as yet undetermined salary of a man unable to purchase a passage to the U.S. on the basis of his own resources? See also paragraph 4 in below.

b) Why was Jane's name entered into both Marina's and Lee's passport, instead of just into Lee's?

c) Although the OSWALDs were given official permission to leave (see exit visa) only on 11 January 1964, Lee's diary notes that they knew of this on 5 January. How were they informed?

d) Marina's passport was made valid until 1 December 1964, but the diary notes that they had only 6 months in which to leave. Why? Although some explanations for this can be found, it seems best to question Mrs. OSWALD and let her give the explanations.

9. Various Certificates. (ITEM 6340).

a) Certificate of "Information on Person Being Adopted (developed in 1962 by the State Department)." The entries on the copy of this document as provided for below are completely illegible in spots con-

information which would be significantly different from that concerning Mrs. OSWALD's passport and exit visa; this is particularly true of the portion bearing her statement of destination and proposed length of stay. It would be most interesting also to know what is written beneath the words "private exit (absolutely required)" in her statement of purpose for her travel. She was no doubt under strict supervision) concerning this certificate. The first portion of the certificate, given in the space for names and birthdates (names of members of her family going abroad) Why did the person completing that portion of Oswald's certificate recording the date upon which her passport was submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the number and date of the cover letter fail to fill in the above-mentioned information, after apparently starting to provide it?

B. Certificate of vaccination for Jane, issued by the Minsk First City Children's Hospital, May 14, 1962. This date does not correspond exactly to the date of vaccination (15 May) given in Mrs. OSWALD's International Certificate of Vaccination or Revaccination against Smallpox. In

and the vaccination information from the hospital
certificates into the official certificate required.
It is not unlikely that such an error could be
made under normal circumstances, particularly in
view of the clarity with which "16 May" is written
on the hospital certificate. See paragraph 11 a)
below.

c) High school identification card for Lee
Covello, dated 4 September 1954. There is nothing
unusual about this card as shown in the copy given,
except that it was among Marina's papers and that
it, along with other types of papers possible, was
seized and carried away by Lee Covello when he seized
the COVELLO possessions from 4 September 1957 until
the loss of its release. Lee COVELLO should be
questioned in connection with this item.

10. Pharmacy school diploma (included in IT-115 100-114).

All information required in completing Marina's pharmacy
school diploma has been entered therein, with the ex-
ception of the year of her entry into the school. IN
view of the care taken by the responsible official
to see that her "M" (last, post-natal, chronological)
was entered in the appropriate space, this omission
can only be considered deliberate.

11. Two documents (included in IT-115 101-103). The first
of these (see 11 a)) is of greater importance to our

examination at the moment, leaving as it does on the
discussion of irregularities in the OSWALD ship records.
The importance of the second is yet to be proven.

a) Certificate of revaccination (for Marina), issued by
the Vinsk (exact designation unclear in copy) Poly-
clinic No. 2, 18 May 1962. Again, (see paragraph
9 by above), the date does not correspond exactly
to the date of vaccination (16 May) given in
Marina's International Certificate. Here also it
is unlikely that an official certifying a vaccina-
tion given by someone else at an earlier date
would have mistaken the date as given on the ori-
ginal certificate. Then if the certifying ship's
physician merely accepted the OSWALD's word for the
date of the vaccinations, why did he not so indicate
in the International Certificates? How did it hap-
pen that he also accepted their word for Marina's
revaccination, on a second (16 May) date? Why
was he given a second date? Surely even if the
OSWALD's had been unable to remember the exact
date, they would have remembered that the vaccinations
were accomplished on the same day. Then, why did
Marina not return to her former place of employment
(the Combined Third Clinical Hospital) for the
vaccinations? Remembering that, according to the

and not confining. Marian and Jean actually were vaccinated on the same day, and that date has yet to be determined. It is possible to believe that Marian had to take care of the children's hospital and then went to Polyclinic No. 2 because it was closer to that hospital. It is also possible that Marian was instructed to have the vaccinations done only at these places. But by whom and under what circumstances were these instructions issued? The other similar and seemingly related irregularities in Marian's documents mentioned above require that the answers to the questions posed and others indicated be clarified to the greatest detail.

6) Payroll voucher. Maria should be asked when and in what manner this item came into her possession and who entered the name -- STALL (ORRIN?) -- upon it. By its appearance -- i.e., by the entry of her married name -- and in accordance with its purpose, unless it belonged to her, entirely in view of her monthly salary, it should have been prepared some time between 15 April 1961 and 20 March 1962. In what condition is the original document? Why was this voucher and no other kept? Why are the bottom portions of the voucher not completed? It is not unusual for the two portions at the top of the document are filled out and the bottom portion with a signature, thus

...document as official document of official person. It is, in fact, the official of the as indi- in the in

... .. are not readily available to to and of this case or must the the to include to be

13. Personal life in the FBI (Literary, included in FBI interview).

Let us proceed from this brief examination of the documents -- to irregularities and the, to an examination of her, the biographic information was provided -- and failed to provide -- in her interviews with the FBI and the apparent title which they were provided. It must be noted that, and from re- still, these still and questions -- greater be- and indicate falsification and,, and frustrating it is difficult to prove this fabri- facts for suspicion.

at Marina's autobiography under 1937 the year of her mother's death as 1937. Yet, it was noted that in both cases, Marina first has written "1936", then has she written the date to read "1937". Then did her mother die. Is it reasonable that after so few years, and for such a critical point in her life, Marina could have made an error of a year (prior to her year of birth)?

2. Passing over questions regarding Marina's father, the year of her birth and that on which she entered planning school -- which were discussed in connection with her documents, we must look at Marina's list of relatives in the USSR. If this autobiography was prepared for the purpose of getting a visa to the US -- it was written in the USSR (see note on husband's place of work), was it necessary to list uncles and aunts? If so, why did she mention only the DERLOV's of Minsk and omit mention of the PRIGOROV's, also of Minsk. Comparatively little contact between Marina and the DERLOV's while in the USSR, and none (no correspondence) since in the US.), is on record; while she did live with the PRIGOROV's in Minsk and maintained contact with them by mail after she came to the US. (In the record of her interview with the FBI, Marina apparently made no mention

() ()
if the BERLOV's). They are the BERLOV's. Really. By
consequence it seems, her aunt -- Mariya Vladimirovna
BERLOV -- was working in the sanitation-epidemiolo-
gical Detachment (ZED) in Minsk. In what form were
Marina's relations with the BERLOV's? What contacts
did Lee OSWALD have with the BERLOV's during the
"detachment" and after the marriage? Did the BERLOV's
object to Marina's marriage? To Lee? To an American?
When and why did the apparent break in relations take
place?

What occasioned the preparation of this autobio-
graphy? Was it, as suggested above, to accompany an
application for a visa? Was it to accompany a request
for an exit permit? In any case, Marina -- a citizen
of the USSR since birth, fully aware and thoroughly
practiced in the realities of Soviet life -- cer-
tainly should know very well that such an autobio-
graphy as that she has offered would never be accepted
even as a "helpful autobiography", as final by Soviet
authorities. It is reasonable to assume ^{also} that,
as a bona fide citizen on the street Soviet, despite any
threats from her or from classed officials, she would
think it as true of U.S. authorities, too. Here, then,
are all the basic details of her life -- names, dates,
places -- and it is hard pressed to find this deeply
personalized offer of information to be anything
but a carefully planned and executed lie.

() ()
The original of reportage
... source
... of the question posed in the fore-
... paragraph and raise many more.

(1) When Marina's mother married Aleksander Ivanovich
EIGHTY-SEVEN why did he not adopt Marina officially and
legally? According to the material at hand, Marina
was not a very young child when her mother married
ALEXANDER. Why did Marina continue to live with
her grandparents for such a long time after the marriage?

(2) Why, after living so long with her grandmother
did she then return to live with her mother and step-
father? Upon whose decision did she make the change?

(3) When and why -- before Marina went to live with
them -- did her mother and stepfather move from Arkhan-
gelsk to the Belovian S.P. What was the stepfather
doing there?

(4) What occasioned the family's move to Leningrad?
Was Marina's stepfather transferred? Or did he change
organizations? If he was transferred to Leningrad as
a move within the same organization he must have had
a very good position and reputation. Also, according
to the interview record, the stepfather was a skilled
electrical worker -- yet, judging by letters (postcards)
which were received from her family -- if her step-
father signed these, he is nearly illiterate.

() Note the corrections (two) in the autobiography made in regard to the year of Marina's mother's death, possibly to coincide with her statement that her mother died during her second year in the Pharmacy Department.

(6) Marina has stated that she worked in a central drug store on Nevsky Prospekt during her last year in school. Under what circumstances did she go to work there? What were her duties? How (and how much) was she paid for this work? What other details (names of supervisors, fellow workers; hours of work, etc) can she provide about this job? How was this job terminated?

(7) What type (official designation) of pension did Marina and the other children receive? To whom (to the children directly, or to the stepfather) did the pension fall? How was it received? What was the amount of the pension?

(8) Marina said she took her meals away from home. Where? How was she able to do this? What was her total income?

(9) What did Marina dislike so much about her first job after graduation that made her quit after one day? It is one thing - not common, but not unheard of - not to appear for work at the place to

() ()

which a definite day be assigned; but it is another thing to go to work and then quit after one day. Whether or not there exists a right to a 3-day trial period, such as Marina mentioned, it is almost impossible for her to have quit and gone on vacation so easily. First, she would have been in trouble immediately with the Komsomol and her trade union. Second, she has said that she spent little time in her stepfather's home taking her meals outside, because of strained relations. Yet, there she stayed, apparently with no income - no pay and no mere pensions, either from school or government. Then, how was she able to do this?

(10) Why did Marina go to work in Minsk? She has said that she lived with an aunt and uncle PRISAKOV - her mother's brother and his wife. Marina has said nothing more in these interviews about the BERLOV's, whom she above mentioned in her autobiography (see paragraph 12 a (2) above). Marina should be asked about Lee's connections with both the PRISAKOV's and the BERLOV's; particularly with the latter. Lee has mentioned other relatives in his diary and address book, but never the BERLOV's (in this case, the question should be addressed in just that way - what was Lee's connection with the BERLOV's?)

() ()

(D) Marina's reasons for refusing to identify various figures from her past -- former boyfriends, acquaintances and even the woman who was her supervisor in the pharmaceutical warehouse -- and for giving such vague answers to some questions regarding her background and her life with Lee must be ascertained. Her attitude and conduct in these interviews obviously is other than that which can properly be expected of the person she represents herself to be. Her testimony regarding her social life in Leningrad and prior to marriage is most suspicious. Her statements regarding the attitude of her aunt and uncle -- an MVD colonel or lieutenant colonel -- to Lee and to her marriage to an American, taken as part of her story of being "just a plain ordinary girl in love", are just unbelievable. Another example of this strange combination of refusal to give names and outright departure from the realities of Soviet life is to be found in Marina's story of her first meetings with Lee. USVMB... she refuses to name actual acquaintances present at these meetings and tell of returning to her home with this American to whom she gives her phone number, the phone number of an MVD officer. And this MVD officer poses no objections to her later meetings, even marriage, with the American.

() ()

(12) Marina's explanation of the reason for her husband's "illness" is quite unconvincing. Her other explanations really exposed her as a difficulty with the name. Lee, the obvious next choice would have been "Lev", or even "Alksey", in preference to "Alib". She should be questioned further about this.

(13) Other subjects which Marina obviously must know more than she has told include the reason for Lee's employment in Minsk, rather than Moscow and the reason for the difference between Lee's high pay for his unsilled labor and her low salary. With regard to the latter, even if the only reason was just as Lee himself presented it: he received a subsidy grant through the Red Cross -- with no other considerations to be made, certainly Marina would have known of this, and, unless there were something sensitive about the subject, should not be reluctant to discuss it. Yet, her testimony would indicate she knows little or nothing of these things. Why?

(14) Why does it seem she also knows so little of her husband's nature? Marina remarked that...he did not discuss politics with her or, to her knowledge with any other associates (see page 16.) It is not remarkable that an ordinary man-on-the-street American would not discuss politics to a noticeable extent. But

How many US Marxists read the Daily Worker, espouse
its Soviet and pro-Castro views, defend Fidel
Castro, study the Russian language and prepare to
renounce their citizenship and go to the USSR? How
many return to the US to proclaim their Marxist views
and hand out pro-Castro pamphlets on street corners?
And to assassinate the President of the US? And
how many such men, usually most outstanding for their
verification, are able to keep noticeably silent on
political subjects even before their wives, while
spending two or three years in their "political
homeland"? Marina must be questioned closely about
these things, just as she must be questioned closely
in order to identify these "other associates" with
whom Lee OSTEALD did not discuss politics.

(15) Mrs. OSTEALD must be asked about her trip to
KHAR'KOV of which we would know nothing were it not
for the small collection of letters written to her
during her stay there. Why did she make no mention
of this trip, yet talk freely of her vacation trips
to Leningrad, etc? What was the purpose of the trip?
What other details, (length, place of residence, etc.)
can she offer about it?

13. In brief, as indicated in the foregoing, it is the
belief of the undersigned, based on the materials made

31

available. That Maria O'NEIL must be re-examined, thoroughly and at considerable length, by able experts and means available in order to clarify her story and her role in the activities of her husband following their return to the US.

[Handwritten signature]

15 November 1968

MEMORANDUM OF TRANSMITTAL

TO : Chief, []

ITEM : AEDONOR Interrogation Transcripts

1. Submitted herewith, as requested, are AEDIPPER/20's verbatim transcripts (15; English-language) of his interrogation of AEDONOR, 26 July-13 August 1965; the first five (5) of these transcripts are accompanied by the corresponding verbatim Russian-language transcripts

[] an index to the names mentioned in all of the transcripts also is submitted. Further, the original English-language transcripts (15), with corrections, are being returned to Headquarters with this memo; [] corresponding tape recordings already have been returned.

2. With regard to the remainder of the original Headquarters request, it has been agreed that AEDIPPER/20's transcripts are self-explanatory at most points and that his background comments on the course and content of the interrogation will be reserved, to be addressed to any future specific questions and requirements generated in Headquarters review of those transcripts.

3. It should be noted here, however -- in view of part three (3) of Headquarters' request -- that AEDIPPER/20 did not use false or unfounded statements for any reason in any of the interrogation sessions; it is believed possible that ideas to the contrary may have arisen during review of the original transcripts, which included many instances of improper interpretation of the Russian "double negative". Reviewing the interrogation, AEDIPPER/20 noted only two (2) points at which he did not have a basis in detailed personal knowledge (to 1954) or specific documents for statements made to AEDONOR:

a. MRPs (Morskoy Razvedyvatel'nyy Punkt -- Navy Intelligence Point) -- AEDIPPER/20 stated that at the time AEDONOR was assigned to duty with an MRP on the Baltic other MRPs also were in operation in that area; in fact, although AEDIPPER/20 knows that other MRPs were in operation there, he has no knowledge of their specific designations, locations or dates of operation;

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1994
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

b. Letter on KRUGLOV's Removal -- AEDIPPER/20's statement that a letter explaining KRUGLOV's removal had been circulated within State Security was based upon personal knowledge, not of the fact itself, but of the State Security practice always of circulating such letters following the removal of other State Security chiefs, such as ABAKUMOV and BERIYA.

4. AEDIPPER/20's English-language transcripts employ the following key (not repeated in the transcripts):

- a. A -- AEDIPPER/20;
- b. B -- AEDONOR;
- c. C -- T. H. BAGLEY
- d. () -- Single sets of parentheses enclose transliterations or, in case of
- e. (2G), (XG), (XM) -- indicate a number of missing or garbled or otherwise "unreadable" words;
- f. (()) -- Double sets of parentheses enclose transcriber/translator remarks, explanations, etc., in addition to not part of interrogation content;
- g. (? ?) -- Queried transcriptions are thus indicated;
- h. -- Ellipses indicate either a brief pause in speech or an unfinished sentence, not omitted or "unreadable" phrases;
- i. ____ -- Underlines, except in cases of book and periodical titles, indicate emphasis in speech.

5. As noted, the AEDIPPER/20 transcripts are verbatim transcripts; however, there has been some "amelioration" of the few obscenities found therein.

Attachments : per para 1

Distribution :

Orig & 1 -- Addressee

1 -- AEDIPPER/20