New Doubts Raised Over the Warren Report

By JOHN M. CREWDSON Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Oct. 9-Key United States intelligence officials have long had doubts about the reliability of a purported Soviet defector whose statements apparently influenced the Warren Commission's conclusion that there had been no foreign involvement in President Kennedy's assassination, according to intelligence sourcs.

But neither the name of the defector, Lieut. Col. Yuri Ivan-ovich Nosenko, nor the suspi-cions of some officials about the legitimacy of his motives appear in the commission's final report or in any of the volumes of testimony and exhibits that accompanied it, according to Senate investigators who are re-examining the commission's

inquiry.

An internal working memorandum of the commission, now in the hands of the Senate Se-lect Committee on Intelligence, recounts in detail Mr. Nosenko's assurances that the K.G.B. the Soviet intelligence service, never tried to recruit Lee Harvey Oswald, Mr. Kennedy's assassin, during Oswald's residence in the Soviet Union.

Doubts about the Warren Commission's conclusion that Oswald acted allone have existed in some minds almost from the moment that the panel released

moment that the panel released its final report in September, 1964. But as internal commis-sion documents like the working memorandum have become declassified in reeent months, new questions have been raised in the Senate and elsewhere about the thoroughness o fits investigation.

One of these questions, typi-

One of these questions, typified by the Nosenko matter, is
the dual concern of whether
the commission was fully informed by other Federal agencies of all of the relevant details surrounding the Kennedy
assassination, and of how it
weighed the information it did
receive in reaching its conclusion.

clusion.

"The statements of Nosenko," according to the memorandum's authors, W. David Slawson and William T. Coleman Jr., "if true, would certainly go a long way toward showing that the Soviet Union had no part in the assassination" of

TIMES, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1975

by Lack of Reference to a Purported

Nothing im that memoran-dum, however, or in the nine-page interview of Mr. Nosenko by the Federal Bureau of Inves-tigation on which it is based, reflects the considerable doubts reflects the considerable doubts
that, the sources said, existed
in the American intelligence
community at the time about
the legitimacy of the Soviet
officer's motives for having
come to the United States.

Two sources familiar with

the Warren Commission's in-vestigation said that while the panel had received no formal assertions of doubt about the colonel's legitimacy as a defec-tor, the commission staff had been informally cautioned "that this man might have been sent over to allay our suspicions" about possible Soviet involvement in the Kennedy assassinaone source declined to say

from where such a cautionary advice had come, but the other said that he believed it had been offered by Richard Helms, the then Deputy Director of Central Intelligence who is now the American Ambassador to

Iran.

John A. McCone was the Director of Central Intelligence at the time of the Kennedy assassination on Nov. 22, 1963, and he was asked last May in an interview with CBS News why neither he nor Mr. Helms had cited Mr. Nosenko's assertions in their formal testimony before the Warren Commission.

Mr. McCone replied that it was a tradition among inteligence agencies not to accept a defector's statements "until we have proven beyond any

we have proven beyond any doubt that the man is legiti-mate and the information is

correct."

He 'added that "the bona fides of the man," which "were not known at the time of the testimony," had subsequently been established by the Central Intelligence Agency.
One former high-ranking

Soviet

American intelligence official took exception recently to that assertion, saying that the offi-cial doubts about Mr. Nosen-ko's motives, far from having been resolved, had increased as time went on.

"No doubt about it," a second former official said in a recent interview. "Nosenko was a phony. Nosenko was a notori-ous deception — he really ous deception — he really screwed up everything."

This official said that his

conclusions, which had been shared by the C.I.A.'s counter-intelligence section, were based on a number of factors, including Mr. Nosenko's identification of an American television correspondent as a Soviet intel-ligence agent, an allegation that was later proved to be false.

A third source, one familiar with the F.B.I.'s investigation and debriefing of Mr. Nosenko after his arrival in the United States, recalled that "we did have some doubts about him, and they're probably recorded in the bureau—but we didn't let it out anywhere."

At the least, he said, the for asylum, they said, came shortly after his arryial that F.B.I. should have told the War- in Geneva on Feb. 4, 1964, Oswald was too emotionally ren Commission that "this information comes from a man of unknown reliability."

The should have told the war- in Geneva on Feb. 4, 1964, Oswald was too emotionally barely 10 weeks after Mr. Kennedy wars shot to death while warrant cultivation by the Sortium of unknown reliability."

of unknown reliability."

Neither the C.I.A. nor the F.B.I. would comment on the sources' assertions.

Other persons familiar with the record of the Warren Commission's investigation of the Kennedy assassination pointed out what they said were some oddities and anomalies that cast further doubt on the validity of Mr. Nosenko's testimony.

Mr. Nosenko's aid he had understood that some other agenderstood that some stood that some other agenderstood that some other agenderstood

In each instance, according to the interview reports, Osman was an "extremely poor shot."

The Senate intelligence committee recently designated two of its members, Richard S. Schweiker, Republican of Pennsylvania, and Gary Hart, Democrat of Colorado, to look into the growing number of questions about the circumstances surrounding the Kennedy assassination and the thoroughness of the Warren Commission was apprised of the commission was apprised of the provided by the bureau to the Warren Commission was apprised of the official doubts about Mr. Now senko, and the consideration is got that information.

Weanwhile, two interviews with Oswald were provided by the bureau to the Warren Commission staff, the commission and the thoroughness of the Warren Commission's interview reports, Oswald agreed to the agents' request that, if he were to be sought out by Soviet intelligence operatives in this country for any reason, he would report the contact to the F.B.I. Although the F.B.I. interview senko, and the consideration is got that information. Wearnen Commission staff, the commission and the thoroughness of the Warren Commission's interviews with Oswald was not an informant or agent of the F.B.I." and that "no attempt was made" by it "to recruit him in any capacity."