5. Making Ignorance and tragmess into History

In different words Blakey begins his chapt er 7, "A Message from the Soviet Dunion "(pages 109-134) referrigns to Kennedy, when he took office, as a hawk. Which Kenney then Was. He then refers to a "report" that "Oswald met with the Soviet

a KGB officer who was cou consul (in Mexico City), Vaflery Vladomirch Kostikov, who wasss was thought to be a member of Department 13, the sabotage and assassination section of the Soviet intelligence agency.... It was up to us, as it had been to the aWarren Commission, to determine whether g the Soviet Union chose neither mutual obliteration nor coexistence but elimination of a free wordld leader The state of U.S.-Soviet relations as of November, 1963, was therefore relevant (page 110) .

If Blakey knew, or had any intention of reporting what at the time of the assassination U.S.-Soviet relations actually were he'd not have written this, used these words. And everything else here quoted from Blakey was not true.

Oswald did not meet with Kostikov, the misinformation begun by the hot CIA's hotshots in the Medico City station and that mising misinformation had been acknowledged by the CIA well before the Baakey committee had been formed. Blakey can say this because he did not want, which means did not get, the cited CIA records, which were released and I have the my file.

As the CIA did not reprt to begin with. it had Kostikov under surveillance and it would have known if Oswald met with him outdeide his office. When Oswald went to Mexico City he had, as Blakey also does not say bit is again included fin disclosed records I have, no plan to go to the Soviet embassy. He was sent there by the Jubans when Oswald asked for permission to go to Cuba. Asked why he said to go to the Soviet Union. This is what led the Cubans to send him

there, to get that required permission.

Not only did Oswald, to the CIA's knowledge, not meet with Kostikov, when he returned prod to see if he had been given this permission, he was not even allowed to enter that embassy. They church him

As the KCIA also knew. 9 It disclosed that tekephone intercept.

So, there is nothing to this part of the false background Blakey is latying. building on.

As there also is to that "state of relations" line Blakey made but because the fact in that after Kennedy and Khruschchev had gone the to the very brink during the 1962 Juba missile crisis, thereafter they explore, in rprivate correspondence, the possibility of better relations.

One ting is fcertain, particularly with Kennedy true nd dove a by that crisis, the Soviet Union, be ing bankrupted by military fosts, certainly preferred the hawk-turned-dove that Kennedy was (and as Blakey does not say) to the hawk of hawks, Johnson. But killing Kennedy automatically made Johnson his successor.

As he gives his view of those relations Blakey does report that what became the Bay of Pigs was authorized by Eisenhower on March 17, 1960. He also says that what the CIA said it anticipated, that there would be an interna, uprising never materialized, "(page 110.)()

Whether the CIA really was stupit enugh to anticipate such an uprising or had other reasons it preferred not to face is outside of ABlakey&'s understanding. He makes no mention of that.

But he does acknowledge the peaceful intent Kennedy expressed in hais speech at merican university in Washingtoh in June, 1962.

Nonethelezss this wyOswald trip to MexicoVity and his earlier "defection" in which Oswald did not defect Blakey regards as a sign of "Soviet cimplicity"in the assassination (aspage 113 /.

He also "found"reasonestion the candor of the So viets and therefore their their innocence." What he has there to build his case for suspecting the Soviets is not included in any of those many thousands of pages I obtained and reviewed and it also makes no sense(page 113,)

Blakey the n gew into his co mmittee's efforts to learn more about Oswald when he was in the Soviet nion but in the course of his account he again found it helpful to omot what he had to know, that the CIA prepared questions it wanted the State Department to get answered for the Warren Commission that we so offensive they were not asked and very little information had been asked for by the Commission. How the CIA had used for its questions the venom it was given by defectors on its teat was not mentioned by Blakey but it was indeed a factor. The Soviets had to wonder why so little was asked of it by or for the Commission as well as what would likely follow any questions it answered.

Blakey then gives his version of the defection of a KGB pfficer, Yoki Nosenko (pages 115-119). In it he manages to not include what the CIA let it know in official testimony that was also telecast ive from coast to coast, about the insanities and stupifities of the #CIA peopl for the three years that had Nosenko confidened with charger no *charger* placed against him. Those paranoids even considered the various ways in which they could get rid of Nosenko, like from driving him crazy, which they did attempt, to dropping him far out into the Atlantic. In his treatment of this incredible stupidity for which there was no basis at all except the insanity of another defector, which they could read the insanity of another defector, which they could that anyly other defector

would be "dispatched" to discredit him, Golitsyn.

Who did more than enough of that himself, if he had been in the hands of people not much less irrational than he.

After three years the CIAK made a long and detailed study as the result of this Nosneko was cleared of the insane allegation by Golitsey and his CIA buddies, paid generously for his years of pa <u>Including in function</u>. suffering and was employed by the CIA. What to most people would wipe aout all those many irrational allegation is but pot VBlakey. He says (on page 117) that "Our effort to evaluate Nosenkod's of Oswald story drew us into the controversy over Nosenko's bona fides," (page 117), a matter that had all ready been resoloved by the CIA, which threw out all that Golitsyn and pals had made up.

Blakey then treats Edward Jay Epstein's fabrication, <u>Legend:</u> the Secret World of Lee Harvey Oswald. That bo ok is dignified nuttiness made fup fby Epstein and heavilty promoted. Blakey says of that awful trash that when it appeared "Our work was further complicated" by it. jn fact only an assassination idiot would have giewn that political trash a second look or any thought. It was as if possible as impossible could be. But Blakey does quote George Lardnerk's Washington Pest review,"... fascinating (but) eessentially dishonest." He prefaces this by saying that Lardner's stories in the Post "tended tp reflect bias rather than the facts." The reality is that what Blakey did on and with his committee was so bad criticism was called for. _Much originated with(me and as noted earlier, Blakey could notand did not-find any factual error in any of withem.

In his writing here Blakey makes it clear that he still fatting favors the insant Golitation fabifications even after the CIA had resolved that nonsense that was so hurtful to it, (page 117).

As Blakey continues with his contribution to this utter insaniyt

69wou

he has another subchapter titled 'Nosenko Unmasked" (pages 119-125).

No questionmark in his subtitle. He says that Nosenko was "unmasked," is nonsensical as the fabrication of the crazy Golitsyn and his many CIA chums, fools he dominated. This attitude is particularly impossible to understand given the entirely unprecedednted confession of its own unprecedented abuses of Nosenko made under oath and on cost-to-coast TV by the CIA itself, a story that is imply astounding.

ASIDE FROM STUPID, MEASTERS PREJUDICE THAT PERMEATSES Blakey's treatment of this matter, it is tainted by ignorance do basic that he again tainst himself, criticizes himself as no enemy could. He is that wrong, that worse than stupid because he did, after all, run the investigation of which this is part.

Skipping, for the Ko, ent at leas, what is well known. of Nosenko's telling the CIA in Switzerland that he would work for it, Blakey says that the next year, when Nosenko did contact the KySwitzerland CIA again and try to defect there is a fat record that was disclosed to me and thereoffre was readily #avalable to Jilly Nesenko of which he here expresses total ignorance. It included non-stop CIA efforts to prevent his defection. Ignoring that, which \mathcal{A} of Blakey being Blakey again. he said says:

mint

It developed from our investigatioj that Nosenko had been in the United States of y a couple of months when officials of sethe CIA began to have doubts that he was a servious defector. There were several reasons for their misgivings: much of what Nosenko had provided had been "giveaway" information...(page 119).

All of this, with not a word of it true, is Balakey's subjectmatter ignorance/prejudice and the pobrications of the rabid and irrational Golitsen gang, including many man people in the CIA. Rather than this evil/sytupidity beginning after Nosenko was when he has his ignorance to **print** indulge and to depend on. Aside from all tat is <u>official</u> public knowledge so much of which was testiffied to before his committee and which Blakey here suppresses,

he argues against the CIA decision that Nosenko had not been dispatched to disinform about Oswald - for which there was no real purpose, only the nutty imaginings - with nothing but his uninformed opinion to refute the official fact, which evolved after a long, informed (and painful actual investigation.

Finally, on page 125, Blakey gets to, his subpheading, "Committee hearing on Nosenko." Here he mentions Hart, who he omitted from his index, and this is a fair reflection of the dependability of what Blakey presents as scholarship and again is nothing but what he wa wants believed, regardless of the truth. Or of the UNITAR

He also has his own way of putting things to present them in reverse. He talks about the deep rift"/caused at the agency" by Nosenko (page 125) [when in fact that rift was caused by the nuts who believed the Gelitsy n nutty fabrications. Here Blakey is actually arguing against the CIA, which took three years for it to reach its decision.

This who section refers constantly to Hart, even quoting his testimony, yet it is missing from Blakey's index. Or, it is a fair assumt/pion with pange after page referring to hart and what he said that Blakey, when he dared number of it it entirely, took this divide the sector of the sector of

Continuing with his Nosenko hangup, Blakey has another section with the subhead "Nosenko antigenalyzed", heginning on page 131. Blakey's qualifications for this "analysis" are high baseless personal

prejudice and his ignorance only a tiny part of whatch is referred to above. He discloses both right off, at the very beginning. He says that Nosenko was "untruthful" about Oswald, and that is a lie.

He says that Nosn ko "lied about there being no connections if between the KGB and Oswald and in this Blakey himself lie because there in fact was no such connection. The made that up and on the manage and basis of his own infabrication calls Nosenko the liar that in all the basis of his own infabrication calls Nosenko the liar that in all of this Blakey is how to high the Management of the performance of this blakey is how to and perform in any 1 Mb, showing molecular the infagined but non-existent connection between Oswald and the KGB, Blakey argues that "been because the KGB, from whom Nosenko was talking orders (and tis after his defection) feared that if any relationship with Oswald ...recruitment to spy, eytc.) were acknowledged it would inevitably interpreted in the united Statess to mean recruitment und assassinate."

> Aside from all the insanity in this kind of "reasoning," there is the fact that, as Blakey ignored in the *#readilyavailable* official evidence, that Oswald was not the assassin. In fact, that evidence, which Blakey ignored in favor of his ignorant imagining, gctually proves that Oswald could not have been the assassin. But for the *#Blakeys*, official fact is not what they want. They all had

that national policy set the bright before Kennedy was buried to It, not in the device for the power of guild in active evidence live with. Any Onucle was not guilty, it who Takeys jub to report that, and Michauf do has jub much his responsibilities and bick and baselens conjecturing substi presented as fact in the opening paragraph that runs on for more than a full printed page? As Blakey argues and discloses more about his beginning prejudice he discloses his subject-matter ignorance. As in saying agin that Oswald saw Konstikov in the Russian Wmbassy in Mexico" (page 135) when he did not see Kostikov at all. As the disclosed CIA records in ghe (nifed States "only a cuple of months" it actually began before he managed to cinnive his way out of Switzerland and to a the united States. I have a fat file disclosed to me under FOIA in which it is unhidden that one of the Washington CIA nuts, influenced by the "olitsyn inagnity and by those under his influence, was sent to Swit-erland to prevent his defection. After he ownwived first getting to the United States he was interviewed by the FBI, which did not classify it is reports on what he told it. But that CIA nosties/nuts did have them classified.

The first of these FBI interviews/reports was February 26 and 27, 1964. The first of this series of reports states that Nosenko are decfected only twenty-two days earlier. The same date as appear on the first of these reports, February 276 and 27, 201964, and the FBI doubling of these reports. February 276 and 27, 201964, and the FBI file number fits MFO 105-37111.

The first of the notes I made after going over all the many of Nosenko records disclosed to me is;

angle Angle Brennan to Sulivan, 2/5/64, begins with the CIAK's sowing of suspicion about ANosenko from its first contact with the FBI....

Those notes also state that Nosenko went to the CIA in Geneva 1/23/64. Or, rather than it taking "several months" after Nosenko was in the United States for the CIA to develop coubts about him it is preceirded in official CIA and FBI records that the CIA wa's determined to prevent his defection knowing fell well that in The tit could be signing his death warrant.

All becayse an insane garlier defector could and did con so many of them nd then could and did create policy for the United States.

For what Nosenko told the CIA to be called ""giveaway information," another Golitsyn invention that is false, all those in the CIA who had any idea of what Nosenko did really tell the CIA, one illustration is that he pinpointed the location of fifty Soviet bugs in such the former was happening and was decided in and by that United States embassy!

Including the ambassador's own office! That is "give away" like the Paj Mehal is a give away.

Why Blakey holds back the truth when h e is known to know it and NU and lies when he did not do his job and indevestigate again failed to get records that were disclosed to md and that he should have asked for is not known but it evaluates him agan indevestigator and as for is not known but it evaluates him agan indevestigator and as the head of a congress ional investigation as, once again, a inlk the head of a congress ional investigation as, once again, a inlk the head of a congress ional investigation as, once again, a inlk the head of a congress ional investigation as, once again, a inlk the head of a congress ional investigation as, once again, a inlk the head of a congress ional investigation as, once again, a inlk the head of a congress ional investigation as, once again, a inlk the fair to add knowing and deliberate dishonesty instead of bing a Can her print panyirt, jinior grade, he is rather an apprentics for that rank as an investigator.

Bearing on Blakey's intent in all of this, he does not mention the name of the representative of the CirA in charge of the final evaluation and the returned CIA officer who had been called back to disty for that and to testify before Blakey's committee, as we dow in All of which this junior Golitsyn idiot suppresses from his book. As we also edited about that testimony, by John Lemon Hart, the details of one of the many C.TA crimesin all of this, sethat paplanning for killing Nosenko who was and had been of great help (IMPARIMON Golitsyn,

Hart's name does nt appear in the index to Blakey's mistitled book.

And Blakey headed a Gronressional investigation and had the reputat ambition to become the attorney by ogeneral of the United States.

The reasons Blakey gives for not trusting Nosenko really boil down to what those crazy earlier KGB defectors made up in what they imagined was their oown interest. One that glakey singles out again, this long after all that Oswald information was made available to the Warren Commission and this much after what Nosenko said on his defection was more than available, was available with ample time for checking, is that the information Nosenko thad given about Oswald just did not running true, "(page 120). What to Blakey did not ring true is that Nosenko said the KGB did not speak to Oswald. That an agent of the KGB did and told The KGB Oswald could not be trusted does not ring true? Wo natter how true it? That the WaKGB already knew ever so much more about United States radar that Oswald could have, as was known, if not to the Pink Panthers, made no difference to Blakey.

what Nosenko said was the truth and there was no reak reagison the KGB had for not wanting the truth to be known.

Especially because the disclosed records, disclosed long before ρ the mafia bug bit Pink Panthr**f** spotapprentice Blakey made it clear that Oswald was not the assassin-and that, and this s according t o the official records, was without real question, the Blakey who had made up his mind and preserved what he had made up with ignorance had no deduse for.

(What the KGB knew and its opotential is made clear in the a. book by on ℓ of the CLA's exeperts, Dino² Brugioni. Pu blication was approved by the CIA, as it had to be. It is titled #Eyeball to guote Eyeball and it was published by Random House. I cite the relevant sections in Epilogue 2 to Waketh the Watchman, one of the books in this series. Brygioni's book is included in my archive.)

Blakey is the kind of "investigator" to whom fact is not material

explicit in sating .

Next he says that Nosenko was sent by the KGB.

As it gets nuttier and nuttier and he inagines more and more for which there can be a basis only in insanity he brings this incredible display or fignorance, stupidity and prejuddice to an end (on page 134) he cites an unidentified person he heard "at a luncheon recess" say fathat "ift is impossible to conceive for a KGB agent, for example, ever admitting that anything they d did fifteen years ago was wrong."

All of this is crazy. nuclearly is the more, much worse than crazy. It is part of the determined effort of the man who had r the duty of establishing the truth of this great national disaster to rewrite that truth. which to a large degre, a waits his free ex 4deexamination of it, and to make our history a combination of his fractual ignorance and his hatred/prejudices.