His book Legend and New York Magazine, Issue of February 27, 1978 with the cover indicating an article by Epstein. It has a title "A War of the Moles" by Edward Jay Epstein and the subtitle, Russian Spies Inside the CIA and the FBI. But on the first page of the story which is on page 28, with the same title, there is a subhead "An interview with Edward Jay Epstein by Susana Duncan."

What follows is not organized. It is comment on the sequence of the appearance of what I commented upon in this article.

Duncan puffs Epstein a bit too much in the first column on page 28 at the bottom saying "Twelve years ago, Epstein published Inquest, the first and most damaging critique of the Warren Report..." He did not publish it and it was not the first book on this subject.

In answer to a question on page 30, column 1, Epstein discloses that a fact about the assassination is irrelevant. His answer is "I began by rejecting the idea that there was something new to be found out about bullets, wounds, or grassy knoll. Instead, I asked: Why did Lee Harvey Oswald defect the Soviet Union in 1959?..."

The question was "How can you hope to come up with any new facts or different answers?" after all the work done by some of the others for so many years. Page 30, third column, there is what I seem to remember, but can't place a source on in the form of an answer "Now, under the CIA's mail-opening pro-

gram, the agency intercepted a letter written by Oswald in Moscow to his brother in which Oswald said that he had seen Powers." This means Francis Gary Powers. Epstein then said "No one had ever explained where he would have had the opportunity to see Powers."

From this he builds a whole structure that need not be true. Powers was tried.

He goes further in answer to another question "...and Powers also thought that Oswald was involved in his being shot down over Russia."

When he was ghost writing Powers' book, (Kurt) Gentry called me up and did not indicate that Powers had said Oswald was involved in his being shot down. Gentry indicated to me that they were exploring that possibility because it would make ~~a~~ good copy. He was trying to say then that without somebody like Oswald, it would not have been possible for the Russians to have shot down ~~by~~ Powers and that seems to be what Epstein is saying here. In the same paragraph, Epstein says that Oswald was in a position to "ascertain the altitude at which the U-2 flew." Epstein's proof is that Oswald worked at the Atsugi air base from which U-2's took off. Of course, they don't reach their altitude when they take off.

On page 31, there ~~was~~ is a box titled, "'Stone': The Man Who Warned About The Moles."

Epstein begins by talking about the penetration or the alleged penetration of French intelligence by the Soviets. He concludes with this sentence "Leon Uris's Topaz is a fictionalization of this case."

The source of Topaz is Pierre de Vosjoli. De Vosjoli wrote the book supposedly non-fiction called "Lamia". I just myself wondering why Epstein who signed this box referred to the novel instead of the supposed non-fiction.

While it is not important, I note one of several instances of Epstein talking about intelligence operations and a matter that doesn't seem to come from his sources, but does seem to come from novels. He says "...but in the late 1957, V.M. Kovshuk, one of the key executives of the KGB, had come to Washington under the code name 'Komarov', presumably to activate the mole."

It doesn't require a "key executive" of an intelligence agency "to activate the mole." This is normally done by other than those who are up at the top.

At the bottom of this page, and continuing thereafter, Epstein goes into the story of a Russian official at the United Nations who became an FBI spy. The man is known under the code name "Fedora". I note in passing that from what is in this article alone, it would not be difficult for the Russians to identify Fedora.

In the first column on page 32, Epstein is answering a question of why CIA and FBI officers were willing to talk to him and give him facts about the case. Epstein replies, limiting himself to "The CIA officers I approached." In his explanation, he said "...I received some documents under Freedom of Information which mentioned them or their cases."

cited in all records I have received on other subjects

This states pretty clearly that he got documents under Freedom of Information from CIA and the names or other identities of CIA officials or case officers were left in the records that Epstein obtained.

In response to another question, he gives added detail of what he obtained under Freedom of Information "...documents mentioning their names or operational details of a case." Presumably, operational detail and name are exempt under the Act from the way the CIA treats the records that I obtained from it.

In the next column, toward the top, he talks about having been able to identify from the records he received or from other sources the man who handled Nosenko and who had retired. Epstein says "We met at the Waterloo battlefield in Belgium, and I showed him about a hundred pages of documents that involved him. I had acquired these documents under Freedom of Information."

I have a Nosenko request several years old at the CIA and I have received no response to it.

Beginning a little below the middle of the second column on page 32, there are these questions and answers:

"Q. Did you ever get to see Nosenko? And if so, how?

A. Yes. The CIA put me onto him.

Q. How do you explain that?

A. I presume that it found out I was writing a book on Lee Harvey Oswald and it wanted me to put Nosenko's message in it. Nosenko's message was that Oswald was a complete loner in the Soviet Union

and never had any connection or debriefing by the KGB. I spent about four hours interviewing Nosenko.

Q. Your book strongly suggests that Nosenko is a fake. Do you believe the CIA was trying to mislead you be sending you to him?

A. Yes. It sent me Nosenko as a legitimate witness to Oswald's activities in the Soviet Union without telling me that Nosenko had been suspected of being a Soviet disinformation agent."

This is very important in terms of the official representations in my Civil Action 75-1448 and the Appeal#771831. The Nosenko transcript of the Warren Commission of June 23, 1964 is one of the transcripts withheld. The representations are in the court records. This proves that the representations are false and were known to be false by those who made them. Now, Epstein is a little bit disingenuous, or he knows less than he pretends. He claims the CIA did not tell him that Nosenko "had been suspected of being a Soviet disinformation agent." Several years ago Danny Shore aired that on CBS. ~~It~~ THIS was, I am sure, from Epstein's account of his book prior to the beginning of Epstein's book project

Epstein does not make a vice of consistency. In the caption on page 34, it says ~~that~~ of that Nosenko "even disorientation techniques ~~didn't~~ did not break him." But on page 35 in a box titled "Nosenko: The Red Herring" signed by Epstein, it says "Under intensive cross-examination, Nosenko broke down." These ~~to~~ refute each other.

In the same box which takes up all of page 35, Epstein represents of Nosenko

"He claimed that he was the KGB officer who had superintended Lee Harvey Oswald's file during his three years in Russia..." This is not a representation attributed to Nosenko by the FBI which interviewed Nosenko right after he was brought to the United States by the CIA. All Nosenko represented, according to the FBI, is having had access to the Oswald file when it was flown from Minsk to Moscow after the assassination.

This is Epstein's explanation of how Nosenko got to the United States after his defection: "Given Nosenko's status as an Oswald witness, the CIA had no choice, and Nosenko came to the United States."

I can't imagine any circumstances under which they would not have taken a KGB officer of Nosenko's rank to the United States.

In the middle of the second column on page 35, Epstein attributes suspicion of Nosenko to Angleton. My belief is that Angleton did not like Nosenko's story because ~~he~~ wanted to be able to have a "red" in the Kennedy assassin. I'd be surprised if this is not the beginning of Angleton's suspicions.

Again relating to the CIA and my FOIA request: "Finally, in 1967, the CIA's Soviet Russia Division was asked to produce a report on Nosenko. The report, which ran 900 pages in length, virtually indicted Nosenko as a Soviet agent." This report would be within my Nosenko request and I, of course, have not received it.

~~Although~~ Epstein says that Nosenko was a disinformation agent and that ~~he~~ this had to be suppressed otherwise the Warren Commission would have had to change its

conclusions about Oswald's connections with the KGB." Epstein then says, "It was finally decided in 1968 to give Nosenko $30,000 a year as a 'consultant' to the CIA, a new identity, and a new home in North Carolina." The last sentences in this box are "Seven years later, after the Angleton firing, Nosenko was rehabilitated. He's now in Washington handling 120 cases for 'new' CIA."

There is a box on Fedora on page 36. In the middle of this box, there is an item that, if nothing else, would have disclosed to the Soviet Union the identity of Fedora. Epstein says "...it was Fedora who poisioned the atmosphere", meaning at the time of the Pentagon papers leaking, "by telling the FBI that the papers had been leaked to Soviet intelligence."

When Epstein is asked how it is that Angleton spoke to him (in the third column of page 36) his reply is "Because I had already interviewed Nosenko. Angleton knew that since Nosenko was working for the CIA, he wouldn't have seen me unless the CIA had sent him." Epstein says that Angleton "wanted to know why, after keeping Nosenko in isolation for 13 years, the CIA would suddenly send him to see a journalist doing a story about Oswald."

This isn't true. Nosenko was interviewed by Baron for the book KGB. There isn't much about Angleton's connection with that book or with John Baron who reportedly was the project director of the Epstein project for Readers Digest.

At the top of the first column on page 37, there is further indication of the assistance the CIA gave to Epstein. Epstein recounts his interest in running "down a lead concerning Pavel Voloshin." He says of this "I got a CIA 'trace'

(In the Dell he says he got all the traces and that they may been made earlier - or not for him.)

on Voloshin, and he turned out to be a KGB officer..."

In the middle of the third column of this page, when asked about help from the FBI, Epstein's answer "It provided me with very little information, but what they did give me was generally straightforward, and I think they tried to be as helpful as they could." There was a box on page 38 titled "A Warning From the 'Old' CIA." In the middle the magazine discloses its political perspective by referring to "the present détente devotees."

This question and answer from the middle of the second column also indicates that Epstein, if he is telling the truth, was given access to the kind of material that is properly exempt under FOIA:

> "Q. Which of the spies that you mention in your book have never been discussed in print?
>
> A. All the stories are almost totally new. Fedora has never been mentioned to my knowledge. Neither has Stone. The breaking of Nosenko's story has never been mentioned, and it leads me to wonder how much is still left to uncover."

Toward the top of the third column, again relating to the CIA's deletion of all names from the records it supplies and even from the records of other agencies! Epstein is explaining his own view of what happened to the CIA under ~~Kolbe~~ Colby. Epstein repeats that Angleton was fired. He then quotes one of Angleton's ~~quotes~~ "keystaffers" giving his name, Newton Miller.

From this first of a series of articles, it is apparent that Epstein had extra-

ordinary help from the CIA as an organization and from some of those no longer with the CIA, some like Angleton fired, others retired. It also is apparent that Epstein has not changed and still proceeds as did the Warren Commission and the rest of the government on the assumption of Oswald's guilt rather than by proving it. His approach is essentially that of George McMillan, who, having decided that ~~Oswald had no motive, Oswald therefore, became guilty~~ Ray had motive also decided that motive alone establish Ray alone as guilty.

If the representations made in Civil Action751448 are truthful, this article alone is proof of the commission of criminal acts by people in the CIA.

(I learned the night of February 27 that the new issue of New York Magazine has come to Frederick, a copy is being saved for me. I will get it in the morning and go over it as soon as I can.) (See later typed notes - HW)