Tom Mangold's "Cold Warrior," on CIA Counterintelligence head 6/29/91
James J. Angleton, Chapter 13, "The CIA's Secret Prisoner". and more...

Background: Several years ago, apparently as soon as he decided to write this book on Angleton, Mangold phoned me from England. He told me about the project and asked me if I would help him with it. I said I would. He said he would send me copies of three of his books to give me some understanding of him, I told him that wasn't necessary, but he said he'd do it anyway. I immediately started work collecting what I did not have already collected to be able to help him. When some time passed and I did not get the books or any call or letter, long after he'd said he'd be in the United States, I wrote and told him that I'd taken time and put in some effort to be in a position to help him and did not want to waste time if he no longer wanted me to. I got no response and I did nothing further to be able to help him. His book is now out and I've read and annotated it through the first of his Nosenko chapters, A glance at the book indicates a possible explanation or two of his cutting off from me but does not explain his bad behavior in not telling me or responding to my letters. As soon as I saw the review copy of page proofs I wrote him and asked him if he has any Nosenko information not used in the book he can let me have. Again no response.

Mangold and Tony Summers are friends. They collaborated on a book. My Tony Summers file will reflect that he and his assistants were here many times and made innumerable copies of records they selected without supervision, that I did many other things to help him, they when he no longer had any need for our transcribing machine he did not return it and that my requests were ignored until I made strong complaint. He also did not keep an agreement we had with regard to a King assassination book. This was several years ago.

Aside from their writing Jeff Goldberg was virtually a coauthor and it credited by Mangold generously. He conducted some of Mangold's more important interviews for him. Jeff was one of the founders of the Boston Assassination Information Bureau. They were in the wildest competition with Jim Garrison for public attention, made up what they said, ~~xxx~~ excited college and other audiences with their fabrications about the JFK assassination and were ardent collaborators with the obviously intending-to-be-dishonest House Select Committee on Aassassinations. I was critical of them over their unconscionable exploitation

of the JFK assassination in their paid-for speeches and for their fabrications and ignorance of the available information, what the government, then mostly the Warren Commission, had disclosed. They did not like it and they liked it less when I was specific to their faces.

I was at HSCA only a couple of times. At least once I saw Goldberg and he was unfriedly.

Whether or not Mangold's connection with him adcounts for it and whether or not it comes from ignorance, as the AIB gang was ignorant of what had been disclosed, there are significant omissions and misrepresentations in this Nosenko chapter and one very glaring lie, the latter that the KGB did not suspect Oswald of being an American sleeper agent. It did and the FBI's Nosenko interviews are quite specific on this.

They also are specific on Oswald's politicas as he disclosed them in the USSR - anti-USSR. My first book cites this from his writings. He called them "Fat, stinking politicians" and said of the American party that they had betrayed the working class." This is to say that there was confirmation for what Nosenko said he'd read in the KGB's reports on Oswald, who it had under surveillance.

There are other singificant questionables, one I did not note on the book is that coinciding with the CIA's phony claim that Nosenko could not be credited because he said the KGB did not interview Oswald is that Nosenko also said the KGB got all it needed from the Intourist guide, who was KGB. In addition, as was known, Oswald had been interviewed by the MVD in Moscow.

In thinking of these omissions and errors, the later including what the CIA really did to talk the Warren Commission out of taking secret testimony from Nosenko and bad-mouthing him to the Commission, I began to wonder, access to Nosenko being controlled by the CIA, whether Mangold had made any kind of deal with the CIA to get access to Nosenko. He and Goldberg interviewed him several times, including for a masked appearance on BBC-TV sold for use here on public TV, which I missed.

Possibly bearing on this is the annotations, footnotes in the back of the book, referring to two FBI reports that the Warren Commission had and HSCA almost 15 years later used. My Post Mortem did use them earlier and did give them a correct interpretation as well as reporting correctly that the KGB did not suspect Oswald was a "sleeper" agent.

So, while many books, articles and news stories are included in the notes, Post Mortem isn't. I don't mind and it is commonplace. But is it possible that Mangold departed from his practise because he did lie and Post Mortem proved he lied, the lie essential to the CIA's self-justification over its behavior with the commission if not also with Nosenko?

Mangold also accepts uncritically the phony CIA self-justification, that it had reason to suspect that Nosenko had been dispatched to "disinform" the United States, particularly the Commission, about Oswald to disassociate itself from the JFK assassination.

There never was any legitimate reason to entertain this suspicion and in fact what the whole world knew and Goldberg either was ignorant of or dishonest about, the FBI had already made clear (beginning 12/4/63) what the official "solution" would be long before Nosenko defected in Febriary 1964, which was his second contact with the CIA, this meeting having been agreed earlier. It was at a scheduled disarmament conference in Switzerland.

There are disclosed Warren Commission records about and including what the CIA told it and what the CIA sent it that have been available for 25 years that are ingored in the book and they are relevant to Angleton, Helms and the CIA and the Commission with regard to Nosenko. There also are the executive-session transcripts relating to using defectors, one on Nosenko in particular that I have and they should have known about if only because Mangold's lawyer in FOIA cases is Jim Lesar, who filed the suit for me under which I got those transcripts. We ever gave copies away in his office the day I got them. I have to wonder why all of this also is omitted. (More follows, pp 4-7.)

I do not here go into all the other records I also got of which Lesar does not have copies that are quite relevant to the defection and CIA opposition to it from the first, under a variety of contrived and spurious explanations that fall of their own weight. I am not now displeased that Mangold did not have them to use. In most respects it is a good book and for what is good he did not need them. For what is the opposite, I regard as very bad, I'm glad he did not have them to misues.

It is clear that the CIA did not oppose this book. Many under contract with the CIA as former employees not to discuss or write anything about what they learned as its employees were allowed to be interviewed and quoted at some length. This really means that the CIA wanted Angleton, not it, exposed- to blame him esclusively for what it did.

The lie about the KGB's suspicion that Oswald could have been a sleeper agent is in one of a number of lengthy notes that really do belong in the text and are not there. It is on page 391.

What it also relevant and they omit is that Nosenko's initial treatment in Washington was offically described by the CIA as princely- which they also omit - and was changed to subhuman, which they minimize considerably - exactly when the CIA learned what Nosenko had told the FBI about Oswald suspected as a possible American agent (meaning most likely the CIA's) and of his politics.

Mangold has the scantiest treatment of the detailed CIA testimony about how Nosenko was treated and mistreated, understating it considerably and omitting much. I think that aside from the fact that some of his understating can come from what I am confident did happen, that John Lemon Hart's testimony authored by and officially for the CIA before HSCA was edited - censored - prior to publication. I am confident of the clear recollection I have of the broadcast of it. He gives about as much space to the alleged explanation of it, one that is inherently incredible. Which he does not indicate.

There is more that relates to this in a sense in the disclosed records. One is the so-called analysis of the assassintion for the CIA by an unidentified defector, clearly Golitsyn, Also relevant and disclosed is the questions the CIA proposed having our government ask the USSR about Oswald. They are so grossly insulting that State strongly objected to their being used. The net result is that the USSR was not asked for all the information it had and thus, what everyone misses, including Mangold, the USSR did not give the United States offense by giving it voluntarily these KGB records on Oswald. That the CIA drafted questions it knew would be seriously offensive cannt be accidental.

It is not unreasonable to regard this as a book that to the degree possible protects and serves the interest of the CIA and prominent officials of the day by making Angleton as close as possible to 100% responsible for all that craziness that permeated so much of it.

Resumed 6/30. Having now read through "I Am Nonseko" and reached p. 207 I add more that confirms what I have been getting at, that Mangold made a deal under which he in this book covers the CIA's institutuonal ass and whether or not as part of this deal, strange in particular for the Goldberg of the "Assassination Information Bureau," misrepresents and covers up over the Oswald part of what Nosenko said, ignoring in reporting on Nosenko's rehabilitation that the CIA had intimidated the Warren Commission into not listening to what Nosenko had said and could say. What I go into also was not volunteered by the CIA's representative, John L. Hart, when he testified to HSCA, and HSCA asked no questions that I can recall along these lines. All failed all over again!

In recounting still another interbal CIA investigation, this one painstaking and unprejudiced by Bruce Solie that includes eight months of Solie's questioning of Nosenko and a reliable polygraph that Solie supervised, referring to this polygraph, Mangold writes,

> Nosenko was asked during this examination whether he had previously told the truth about Oswald and the John F. Kennedy assassination. The new polygraph operator found the subject showed only a positive response to this crucial question.

What "crucial question" the reader will not find in this book. To begin with Mangold lied, as earlier noted, about what Nosenko had actually said about the KGB's suspicion, that Oswald had been a "sleeper" agent. And then Mangold omits, among other things, that Oswald was openly anti-USSR within the USSR.

This, of course, is covering the CIA's institutional ass for its major transgression in the Warren investigation and as the agency that could have used Oswald as an agent.

(In this regard I note that to the degree possible, as I recall is also true of Bob Woodward's "Veil", on Casey and the CIA, the CIA is covered -Angleton is focused on and blamed as was the case with Woodward and Casey - and to the degree possible the CIA as an institution is exculpated. Particularly true of Helms.)

There is but one additional reference in the text, as distinguished from the notes, where much that should have been in the text is for practical purposes sublimated if not hidden from some readers, to this matter. On page 204 Mangold writes about the confirmation of Nosenko by one of the man KGB defectors who did confirm him. This one is a "top KGB defector in the postwar year", Col. Oleg Gordievskiy:

> Gordievskiy also corroborated Nosenko's story that Lee Harvey Oswald, Kennedy's accused assassin, was not recruited by the KGB during his stay in the USSR. "Nosenko's statements agree with the facts," he explains."Oswald was of course known to the KGB, but he was never recruited as an agent. It appears our people deemed him to be useless.

First I note that I do not recall that Mangold mentioned the fiction of "recruitment" earlier and this in this use it is a diversion from what is important. And second, while referring to Nosenko's "statement," Mangold does not here or elsewhere say what those statements are, except where he lied about the KGB's suspicions.

What is missing from the text is that Nosenko's KGB role had him in charge of who was recruited, not only Americans, as Mangiod indicates without so saying in his notes on 400. In addition to other and earlier references to the real and important leads Nosenko gave on potential KGB recruits, here the notes specify that Nosenko later "gave his FBI interviewers more than seventy-five leads on a variety of operations he knew about in Moscow, where the KGB recruited. ...As deputy chief of the KGB section responsible for recruiting American agents in Moscow, Nosenko was able to supply the FBI with ten years worth of significant leads."

Without here going into what this alone means about the authority with which Nosenko spoke, more on which is also brief in the notes at this point, I do note that it also means what is absent in the text and is important, that as soon as the KGB learned that Oswald had been accused as the assassin and its records on him had to be reviewed and reported on upward, that logically fell to Nosenko and thus he had to know what the KGB's Oswald records contain.

This is to say that there could not have been a better source available to any U.S. agency or institution after JFK was assassinated. Or a more authoritative or informed one.

And the CIA, the most logical of Oswald's possible agency connections, did what it did to Nosenko without any comment other than a lie in this supposedly definitive expose and exhaustive treatment of Angleton.

That the Warren Commission held several executive sesssions on KGB defectors in general and Nosenko in particular is not mentioned in the book - not because Mangold did not know about it. He makes two mentions of this litigation, C.A. 75-1448 on 401-2

without any mention of what I was suing for - and got- and was available to him not only from me, which he knew from his call to me from London almost as soon as he started on this book but also because his lawyer, Jim Lesar, also was my lawyer, another matter of which he makes no mention.

What I now say I believe bears on whether or not Mangold made a deal with the CIA to cover its institutional ass to the degree possible.

In brief mention of his interviews of "a group of decent and conscientious former CIA officers" who were "fiercely pro-CIA" and in the context of their "love for the agency's mission [never ever defined]" Mangold says "The only condition I was asked to observe was to avoid making the book hostile to the CIA as a concept." This is in his less than a page of Preface, pp. 9-10.

I believe this provides context for what I believe is an atrocious dishonesty and not an accidental one by Mangold in his first reference to this FOIA lawsuit in which I got the Nosenko transcript he makes no mention or any use of. He quotes from the CIA's affidavit of Charles A. Briggs, Chief, Information Services Staff of the CIA's Directorate of Operations in that lawsuit, identifying it merely as "Exhibit 2" where there were a number of exhibits with this number, including some that I filed -of which he also makes no mention. This is what he here quotes from Briggs's addidavit that my affidavits proved beyond question was knowingly false and intendedly deceptive. I note that he does include the date, 12/20/76, which is quite some time after the CIA cleared Nosenko of the outrageous Golitsyn/Angleton fabrications.

(Here I digress to note also that I got and told him to begin with he could have much relevant information from the FBI that Mangold not only didn't ask for - he never again spoke to me.

Mangold's paraphrase of this Briggs affidavit is,"The CIA has stated that every precaution ~~possible~~ must be taken to protect Nosenko's new identity and whereabouts since disclosure would place him in 'mortal jeopardy'." This was entirely irrelevant in the litigation. That transcript long preceeded Nosenko's "new identity" and could not even indicate that it existed, and it could not even get into any such areas.

On the next page, again citing this one affidavit, Mangold writes that "the [other

KGB] defectors have said that Nosenko was tried in absentia . . . condemned to death," also entirely irrelevant, except for possible intimidation of the judge, which appears to have happened in any event. (Aubrey Robinson, who began by saying that he'd fill his witness room with CIA witnesses if they did not respond and dismissed the case without understanding it speaking to a single one and accepting a false affidavit like this one even after it was proven to be false. If I had not proved it I'd have been guilty of perjury.)

What Briggs also swore to as Mangold inevitably had to know from his knowledge of the affidavit he quotes, is that the CIA had to withhold everything about Nosenko, and I'm reporting from recollection, without getting and quoting directly but I am confident accurately, because his treatement was intended as a "model" to attract other defectors!

I note the obvious that I do not want to be overlooked- this is a book about that "model" treatemnt! And with 462 pages Mangold makes no mention of suppresses this gruesome CIA felony, perjury about the subject-matter of his book.

I note before again suspending that also on 402 Mangold refers to a list of named "Soviet intelligence officials who have defected in the past 10 years" and among these is Ilya Dzhirkvelov, one of only three defectors from the [KGB's] Second Chief Directorate" and Mangold says that they supported Nosenko's statements but does not include Nosenko, word about whether or not the total of four in addition to Nosenko said a single word about Oswald or about what Nosenko had said about Oswald, or about whether or not they had any knowledge of what the KGB's records reflect about him.

It is obviius that both the CIA and the FBI had the official obligation to pursue what Nosenko had said about Oswald, particularly because of the CIA's involvement as the primary agency of foreign intelligence and the FBI's responsibilities, including its unended JFK assassination investigation.

It also is obvious that in undertaking this book Mangold had the same responsibility. If he obtained any such information, he does not indicate it, or even any interest in it. In this regard I note that as soon as I heard his book was about to appear and knowing nothing about its content I wrote and asked him if he had gotten any Nosenko information he did not use in the book that he could let me have. I got no response.