## New Doubts Raised Over the Warren Report by Lack of

## By JOHN M. CREWDSON Special to The New York Times

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

according to intelligence sources. 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 fi-nal report or in any loft the vol-umat after stimony and schembling. umes offestimony and exhibits that accompanied it, according to Senate investigators who are re-examining the commission's

re-examining the commission's inquiry. An internal working memor-andum of the commission, now in the hands of the Senate Se-lect Committee on Intelligence, recounts in detail Mr. Nosen-ko's assurances that the K.G.B., the Soviet intelligence service, never the to recruit Lee Har-vey Oswald, Mr. Kennedy's as-sassin, "during Oswald's res-idence in the Soviet Union. Doubts' about the Warren Commission's conclusion that Oswald acted alone have existed in some minds almost from the moment that the panel released in some minds almost from the moment that the panel released its final report in September, 1964, But as internal commis-sion documents like the work-ing memorandum have become declassified in recent months, new questions have been taised in the Senate and elsewhere, about the thoroughness o fits investigation.

about the thoroughness o fits investigation. One of these questions, typi-fied by the Nosenko matter, is the dual concern of whether the commission was fully in-formed by other Federel, agen-cies of all of the relevant de-tails surrounding the Kennedy assassination, and of how it weighed the information it did receive in reaching its con-clusion. "The statements of Nosenko," according to the memoran-dum's authors, W. David Slaw-son and William T. Coleman Jr., "If true, would certainly go a long wawitoward showing that the Soviet Union had no part in the assassination," of President Kennedy. Nothing in 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 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

CTOBER 10, 1975

vestigation said that while the panel had neceived 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 involver ment in the Kennedy assassina-tion.

tion. One 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.

Ine American Annoassador to Iran. John A. McCone waso the Director of Central Intelligence at the time of the Kennedy assissination, on Noy. 22, 1963, and the was asked last May in an interview with CBS News why neither he nor Mr. Helms had gited Mr. Nosenko's asser-tions in their formal testimony before the Warren Commission. Mr. McCone replied that it was, a tradition among intel-ligence agencies not to accept a defector's statements "lintil 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 11

testimony," had subsequently been established by the Central Intelligence Agency. One former high ranking 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

as time went on. "No doubt about it," a second former official said in a freent interview. "Nosenko was a phony. Nosenko was a notori-ous deception — he really screwed up everything." This official said that his

This official said that his

BIDS

Reference to a Purported Soviet Defector

on a number of factors includ-ing Mr. Nosenko's identifica-tion 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 tates, recalled that "we did tates, recalled that "we did tates, recalled that "we did tates arrival in the United oddities" and anomalies that States, recalled that "we did tates arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tates arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tates arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tate tates arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tate tates arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tate tates arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tate arrival in the United tate tates arrival in the United tate arri

for asylum, they said, came shortly after his arrvial that in Geneva on Feb. 4, 1964, barely 10 weeks after Mr Ken-nedy was shot to death while riding in a motorcade in Dallas. Although the colonel was identified at the time as a Soviet "disarmament expert" at a multinational conference in October, 1959, when Oswald arrived in Moscow with the sources pointed out, however, intention of becoming a Soviet citizen, he had been in charge of the K.G.B. department that no that position me said, he senko's assertion that Soviet had been made privy to the de-tails of the K.G.B.'s decision had hunted rabbits during his

nearly three years in the Soviet Union had reported that the man was an "extremely poor shot." The Senate intelligence com-mittee recently designated two of its members, Richard S. Schweiker, Republican of Penn-sylvania, and Gary Hart, Dem-ocrat of Colorado, to look into the growing number of ques-tions about the circumstances surrounding the Kennedy assas-sination and the thoroughness of the Warren Commission's in-vestigation. Senator Schweiker said Schweiker

Senator

conclusions, which had been At the least, he said, the shared by the CTRA's counter Filefushould-have told the War-intelligence section, were based ren Commission that "this in-on a number of factors, includ-formation comessification a man

said day.

In each instance, according to the interview reports of wald agreed to the agents? re-quest that, if he were to be sought out by Soviet intelli-gence operatives in this coun-try for any reason, he would report the contact to the F.B.L. Although the F.B.L. inter-views with Oswald were pro-vided by the bureau to the Warren Commission staff, the commission concluded in its re-port that "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." wald agreed to the agentative