

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT  
ROUTING SLIP**

*Memo  
Chow*

TO:

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI <i>PLD</i>		X		
2	DDCI		X		
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA				
7	DDO	X			
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OLL				
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	VC/NIC				
17			X		
18	ES		X		
19					
20					
21					
22					

SUSPENSE \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Remarks

Executive Secretary  
*[Signature]*  
13 May 86  
Date

STAT

STAT

WILLIAM W. GEIMER  
PRESIDENT

THE HAMSTOWN FOUNDATION  
1708 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

(202) 462-6811  
TELEX 248 724  
AMNHUR

The Director of Central Intelligence

Washington, D.C. 20505

Executive Registry

86-2115

12 May 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR:

[Redacted]


STAT

FROM: DCI

SUBJECT: William Geimer

Jim:

Attached letter is FYI.

  
William J. Casey

Attachment:

Copy of letter  
dtd 29 April 1986  
to Mr. Tom Mangold  
from Mr. William Geimer

THE JAMESTOWN FOUNDATION

2 MAY 1986

William W. Geimer, President  
Barbara D. Abbott, Vice President  
James E. Gowitz, Vice President  
Gregoire R. Siderau, Secretary

BOARD OF ADVISORS:

Hon. Richard V. Allen  
Hon. Les Aspin  
Dr. Richard Berendzen  
Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski  
Hon. Dick Cheney  
Midge Decter  
Robert A. Georgine  
Donald F. B. Jameson  
Hon. Tom Lantos  
Mrs. Isaac Don Levine  
Hon. Sam Nunn  
Hon. Donald Rumsfeld  
Dr. Vladimir N. Sakharov  
Arkady N. Shevchenko  
Hon. Malcolm Wallop  
Lt. Gen. James A. Williams (Ret.)  
F. Mark Wyatt  
Hon. Clayton Yeutter

April 29, 1986

Mr. Tom Mangold  
Panorama  
British Broadcasting Corporation  
Lime Grove Studios  
London, England W12 7RJ

Dear Tom:

I found your letter puzzling in many ways, but apparently clear on the question of responsibility. You say that the reporter and the producer gather the material and that the producer and editor are responsible for the editorial selection of material, in other words the final shape of the show. It would seem then that I should be writing to Lorraine and Dickinson, rather than to you. But since you undertook to defend the program, you are the beneficiary of my further comment. When I use the word "you" in this letter, I'm addressing whomever is responsible for the "editorial thrust" of the show. (Incidentally, doesn't it strike you as odd to speak of the "editorial thrust" of an "objective look"? Perhaps we use the words differently over here.)

I have gone over the film again, and find that my earlier listing of errors and distortions was a bit off the mark. In addition to the 29 mistakes which I sent to you previously, I have found, coincidentally, 29 more. I should have been more careful.

You'll be glad to know that I am not going to detail the more recently-found errors. The exercise is tedious and somewhat depressing. However I will send you a list if you like. You should also be glad to know that, although tempted, I am not going to engage in a point-by-point refutation of your letter. Instead I will set forth for your consideration a few facts about the film. I will also try to explain what the Jamestown Foundation is.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

General S. Gowitz, Chairman  
Wanda H. Borchardt  
William W. Geimer  
Gordon I. Smulyan  
William E. Timmons  
R. James Woolsey

You accused me of a selective memory which focused unduly on Sorokun, Nicholae, and Ushakov. Okay, lets take a look at the Shevchenko piece. Concerning Shevchenko, you said in the film:

"In 1973 Shevchenko was working with the Soviet Mission to the United Nations in New York as Undersecretary General for Political and Security Affairs. He was also Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko's personal political advisor. When Brezhnev and Gromyko visited the United Nations that year it was Shevchenko who sat by the side of Secretary General Kurt Waldheim for the most intimate discussions. Ironically he was already planning to defect, an act that was to leave him permanently scarred."

The facts are: In 1973 Shevchenko was not working with the Soviet Mission. He was Undersecretary General of the United Nations. Nor was he ever simultaneously working at the UN and working as Gromyko's assistant. Did Brezhnev visit the UN that year? I doubt it. But in any case the photograph on the screen was taken in Moscow in 1977. Was Shevchenko planning in 1973 to defect? No he wasn't. And in what way is he permanently scarred? As far as I can tell he's not scarred at all, unless you consider occasional nostalgia a serious problem. He's healthy, happy, and making a whale of a contribution to the West - which, I should remind you, includes you. I'll be interested in your comments on this part of the piece.

In the beginning of the Shevchenko segment the camera is tightly fixed on a glass containing ice cubes. We see a clear liquid being poured over the cubes. Then a cola drink is added. The camera then pans back to show a hand placing a vodka bottle next to the filled glass, alongside which is a second filled glass. Then we see Arkady and his "new" wife (of seven years) sitting with the vodka bottle in front of them, toasting each other, presumably with the vodka-laced cola.

Now what I would like to know is whose hand was pouring that vodka? Was it Arkady's? Were Arkady and Elaine really drinking vodka and cola, as the film claims? Or did you, the generic you, fake the film to deceive the viewer? And if so why? Why? I would really like you to answer this.

Arkady tells me that you brought that vodka bottle to the filming, that you put it on the table, that you told him that it wouldn't appear in the film, that you were merely using it to test the light. Why? Didn't you like the fact that he doesn't drink anymore? Was that as inconvenient as all the positive things which he said about his life here, and which were omitted from your final product in favor his description of his circumstances seven years ago?

Now let me say a word or two about Jamestown. The film says that we created the foundation to help resettle defectors. This is not why we created the foundation. We created the foundation so that the hitherto unheard voices of people who had held significant positions in the East could be heard in the West. Most of our time is spent helping these people to plan and write books and articles, and to educate policy makers. Was that clear in your film, which was supposed to be "devoted entirely to the work of the Jamestown Foundation"?

If the CIA did the resettlement end of things as well possible would there still be a need for Jamestown? I think your viewers would say no. The answer is yes. No one over here wants our government in the business of producing books and articles on international topics for domestic consumption.

Contrary to your assertion, I do not persist in suggesting that the CIA has perfected their resettlement program. I don't know whether the changes which have been made will be sufficient. It's too soon to say. What I do know, and I told you this on the film, is that the leadership of the agency are trying to make the program work better. And I hope they succeed. Life at Jamestown would be easier if we could get rid of resettlement problems.

The statement made by your film is: All defectors to the United States, even the apparently successful Shevchenko, experience difficulty. Some even redefect. The reason for this state of affairs is that the CIA is inept. There is, however, a little foundation which has helped a few defectors with their resettlement problems. But some defectors are nevertheless in bad shape. For example, Sorokun is still washing dishes, and Nicholae is still mired in his laundromat. (To help make this point, Jamestown's work with these two is omitted from the film.) The government is investigating this situation, but so far there are no changes.

The film we thought we were cooperating in would have made this statement: Defectors are a source of information vital to the West. It is important that they be resettled properly and assisted to make their insights available to as wide an audience as possible. In the past, some defectors have been mishandled. However the Yurchenko affair is forcing the government to improve its program. Moreover there now exists a foundation which picks up where the government resettlement program necessarily ends. The Jamestown Foundation is successfully assisting many defectors to write and lecture, and those helped by the foundation can look forward to productive careers.

Do you know why we expected such a film? Because it's the truth. And because we trusted the BBC to tell the truth.

Do you know why we wanted such a film? You should. I told you often enough. We wanted it because your work is seen in many countries by many potential defectors. We believed that a truthful film would encourage people of stature to defect and to bring to the West information which would be otherwise unobtainable. You say that the aim of Panorama is not to induce defections. Is it your aim to discourage them? If so, you may have succeeded admirably.

Barbara told me that you were surprised that my reaction to the film was negative. At first I found this hard to believe. But evidently you either never understood what Jamestown is, or you disagree with what we are trying to accomplish. Or maybe you merely find it strange that some people care less about looking good on television than they do about larger issues.

Sincerely,



William W. Geimer

WWG/dmw