

Page Denied

IQ INTELLIGENCE QUARTERLY

A journal devoted to the review of books and events in the intelligence field.

Volume 4, No. 3

August 1989

TROUBLE IN INTENSIVE CARE

by Michael Speers

In an amazing bit of puffery the Washington-based Jamestown Foundation attached a long self-laudatory description of its activities to something called Form 990, a form filed by all institutions in the U.S. which have convinced the tax people that they are exempt from paying taxes. This attachment to its 1984 return stated in part: "It has been said of the Foundation that whereas the International Rescue Committee is the general hospital for immigrants, the Jamestown Foundation is an intensive care unit...." Unfortunately, a good many people with knowledge of Jamestown and its activities over the five years of its existence do not agree with this analogy. Perhaps even more unfortunately, the U.S. editor has come to the conclusion that to a major extent these gainsayers may have reached the correct conclusion.

IQ has written of Jamestown before, and both the editors of *IQ* are acquainted with the institution and its two top people: founder and president William Geimer, a Chicago attorney who came to the attention of the late William Casey of the CIA, and vice president Barbara Abbott, who appears to effectively run the day-to-day operations of the foundation while Geimer works the fund raising, political, and cocktail circuits. In Washington, these circuits tend to merge at various times of day and at various expensive commercial establishments. The beneficiaries of this confluence are lobbyists, wealthy widows, and those in the Executive and Congress-

sional portions of the U.S. constitutional troika.

The ultimate beneficiaries are those seeking tax free funding and/or power. What appears to have happened to Jamestown is that its appetite for both money and power has exceeded its digestive capacities and thus is causing the most alarming symptoms. Jamestown, rather than offering "intensive care" facilities, appears to be in urgent need of such attention itself.

Jamestown is a creation of its founder and president, William Geimer, a Chicago attorney working in Washington. Geimer had made a name for himself as an ardent and successful Republican Party fundraiser and thus had come to the attention of, among others, the late DCI William Casey.

"It has been said of the Foundation that whereas the International Rescue Committee is the general hospital for immigrants, the Jamestown Foundation is an intensive care unit..."

Even before its birth, Jamestown, through the efforts of its father-to-be, was doing good works. In 1978, The Under Secretary of the UN, Arkady Shevchenko defected. After many months of debriefing, Shevchenko began to experience the usual defector's post partum trauma. In this case, that meant a very expensive liaison with a Washington call girl and a descent into alcohol dependency. He also became

embroiled in a series of legal difficulties surrounding his attempt to get his book published. Shevchenko, according to sources, was handed by the CIA a "short list" of attorneys who might help him. On the top of this list was Geimer's name. Geimer, on a straight fee basis, helped Shevchenko. His book was published and became a best seller, he overcame his problem with alcohol, and he met and married an American woman. Today, he is still happily married and is a much sought after figure on the lucrative speaker's circuit. He owes his second life to Bill Geimer. This did not go unnoticed.

Casey had correctly foreseen the need for an institution not connected with the government to take over and assist defectors once they had finished with their debriefing by the intelligence community. Casey went to some very wealthy and patriotic friends. Chief among them was the Gidwitz family of Chicago whose business interests included the Helene Curtis cosmetic empire. The most crucial meeting reportedly took place at Wrigley Field in Chicago during a Chicago Cubs professional baseball game. The principals present were Geimer, Shevchenko, and the Gidwitz family. The Gidwitz contribution was in excess of \$100,000, and on December 2, 1983, the Jamestown Foundation was born. It started operations in 1984.

The general public apparently has some sort of an idea that defectors

[Continued on next page]

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1]

defect, get debriefed by the CIA, and then live happily ever after. This has rarely been the case and the fault is certainly not with the intelligence debriefing process.

The angst suffered by defectors—or most of them—is nowhere better described than by former intelligence professional and author John Barron in his book *MIG PILOT*, which was published in 1980 by The Reader's Digest Press. The subject is Viktor Belenko who flew his then top secret Mig 25 fighter from the USSR to Japan and asked for asylum in the U.S. Belenko left behind a wife who was leaving him and a young son whom he knew he would never see again. Belenko is now established as a consultant and a highly respected citizen of the U.S. He underwent an extensive intelligence debriefing and was guided by a CIA officer and that officer's wife. Some quotations from Barron's book are worth noting in this connection:

"The KGB habitually warns (potential defectors) 'The Americans will squeeze you like a lemon, and once they have squeezed you dry, they will throw you into the garbage like a peel.'"

Barron goes on to note that "unless the transition from dependence to independence is accomplished adroitly, the... (defector) may feel that he is being thrown away." After reading Barron's book, I believe he has captured the whole agonizing process by which a defector, and most particularly a Soviet defector, achieves the final emotional bridge by which he can walk from his past to a state where he can live and function in the West. The book mentioned is still available and is highly recommended. Less recommended are those works purportedly written by well known defectors. These tend to be over-edited and often contrived to sell well. Shevchenko's book *Breaking With Moscow* is in that category. It would be interesting and valuable if Belenko wrote an autobiography.

What the media does not choose to recognize is that neither the CIA nor the FBI were established to serve as social service agencies. No matter how well they prepare their defector charges, there will be that inevitable time when they have to learn to walk on their own in the West. It is to assist with that "toddler stage" that Jamestown was created. It is a good idea. Jamestown has indeed helped many people. The question is how well is Jamestown doing this job and has it changed over its five year lifespan?

Redefection of Yurchenko

The whole subject of intelligence community handling was, of course, raised in headlines when Vitaly Yurchenko redefected in 1986 to the accompaniment of the kind of media attention usually accorded the resurrection of Elvis Presley or the news that a volcano in the West has blown its top. There is a book on the Yurchenko incident due out next year, and that good gentleman is still available for interviews in Moscow. The fallout from Yurchenko was as expected: the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations held hearings in October of 1987. Everyone remotely concerned rushed to testify—Bill Geimer of Jamestown was not absent. The result of these hearings was as expected: everyone agreed we should do a better job, the CIA pledged to improve its defector handling, and almost everyone else testifying on behalf of the various charitable foundations concerned made a pious pitch on behalf of their own fiefdoms and subtly sought some public funding for their good works. Nothing else happened except that the CIA did in fact move to materially improve its team charged with debriefing and babysitting defectors. This has happened while the real question of strengthening the bridge between the intelligence community and life thereafter for the defector was not addressed in any useful manner.

Jamestown was chartered as a tax free, charitable foundation. In its five years of existence, the foundation has received

in excess of \$2,100,000 in contributions and grants. Its list of sponsors is a "Who's Who" of American industry and power elite. Among those acknowledged are Eastman Kodak, FMC Corporation, Lockheed Missile Systems and among the individuals are names such as Donald Rumsfeld, President Ford's former Secretary of Defense. It is not fair to judge a foundation on its first year or two of existence. There is too much groundwork to accomplish and usually too little funding. I have chosen to look at the years 1986, 1987, and 1988; my information is based on audited financial reports by Peat Marwick.

During the last three years, Jamestown took in \$1,670,000 in contributions and spent 65% of those funds on three categories of expenses: staff salaries, travel and entertainment, and fundraising. Over that same period, 5% was shown as being spent on "resettlement." Less than 2% was spent on research—some \$28,000. The balance of the funds went to rent, utilities, printing, etc.

There is a small item which appears every year on these reports and this category (otherwise unexplained) is simply entitled "Late Payment Penalties." These aggregate some \$6,800 over the period. In addition, there is another item mentioned, a line item of approximately \$23,000+ under "Notes Payable." A footnote to the 1986 audit report identifies this item as an "unsecured promissory note to a friend of the Foundation, bearing interest at 12% compounded annually." This, too, is an interesting item. I am in possession of copies of three successive promissory notes, all executed by Jamestown, and all to the same person. The first note is dated September 27, 1984 and is in the face amount of \$25,000. The second note, presumably the one referred to in the 1986 audit, is dated May 30, 1985, is also in the amount of \$25,000, and carries an annual rate of 12%. The note is shown as having a maturity of 150 days and further indicates that "said interest is payable monthly." This does not

[Continued on next page]

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2]

exactly jibe with the auditor's report. There is yet a third note from Jamestown to the same party and this one is dated July 26, 1988 in the face amount of \$31,007 with a maturity date of July 1990. The increase from \$25,000 to \$31,007 presumably represents unpaid interest on the previous note. The auditor's report is for the year ending December 31, 1988 and is dated February 1989, and thus should have accurately reflected this note. Further, Peat Marwick describes this latest note as "An unsecured promissory note to a friend of the Foundation, bearing interest at 12% compounded annually, due in monthly payments of \$1,460. In fact such payments did commence in August of 1988 but ceased in May of 1989.

The beneficiary of this promissory note is a sad and rather distraught Russian woman in her fifties, an emigre and not a defector, and a widow of a U.S. citizen who was killed several years ago in an accident. She does not wish her name to be divulged because she still has relatives in Russia. She lives in Washington in an expensive area and she lives quite well despite her failed investment in Jamestown. She has been described as a person who had always been shielded by her late husband from the realities of living in the West, and has been distraught since his sudden death. She wanted her money back and perhaps did not fully understand what she had signed. Jamestown officers failed to set her mind at ease. She kept showing up at the Foundation offices, embarrassing people and demanding her money. She sought the assistance of, among others, a former charter member of the Jamestown Board, but to no avail. Subsequently, it was learned that she even went to the Soviet Embassy to seek help in getting her money. When the money started to come in she was happy, but now that payments have allegedly stopped, I am unaware of her state of mind. If I were in her place, I would be hiring an attorney.

I mention this incident because (1) I have the supporting documentation, and (2) it seems so totally needless. Why would Jamestown borrow money from someone like this? Why would it not seek equivalent funds elsewhere if it became difficult to pay off the original note? Why is the note(s) of a different value than that reported by the auditors? Most curious of all, why would a foundation with the likes of Donald Rumsfeld, Senator Sam Nunn, Lt. General James Williams (USA Ret.), and Zbigniew Brzezinski on its board not take steps to defuse this unhappy situation and get on with its work? What's going on? Is the Foundation in financial trouble? It is.

Current Financial Woes

Jamestown held its annual awards banquet on May 2, 1989. Among those shown as sponsors or honored guests were Senators Malcolm Wallop and Sam Nunn, various members of the board, assorted defectors, and the highly esteemed retiring Director of the Arms Control Agency, Max Kampelman, who was being honored that night. The keynote speaker was former Congressman Richard Cheney. Cheney is now Secretary of Defense and has resigned from the Jamestown board. The banquet was held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. The invitation required one to pay \$375 per person for the reception (where you could mingle with defectors) and dinner. In 1988 a similar dinner netted some \$40,000. This year it reportedly lost several thousand dollars and the Foundation is now *in extremis*. What happened? Why is such an excellently conceived institution floundering? What happens next and, in the meanwhile, what happens to Jamestown's "clients"?

Another straw in the wind is a truly incredible letter received by a well known investigative journalist who had been on Jamestown's mailing list for some time. The letter he received noted that he hadn't contributed anything recently and that unless Jamestown received a

check for at least one hundred dollars, he would no longer receive mailings.

Confusing Goals

In a letter dated November 11, 1983, that amounted to a proposal to the Gidwitz family, William Geimer described the Foundation as follows: "...The initial activity of the Program will be research. What can we learn about those who have already emigrated to the West from the East? What have been the disincentives to their making a public contribution? How can these disincentives be overcome?..."

Now read what Geimer attached to the Foundation's income tax return at the end of 1984: "The primary activity of the Jamestown Foundation is assisting recent immigrants to the United States to adjust to life in the United States."

Now read one of Geimer's typically insulting letters to the only person on his staff who actually was trying to establish a research capability at the Foundation: "Research never has been, and never will be, a high priority at Jamestown. We are primarily an action organization whose main concern is solving the problems of our clients..." (this letter is dated February 13, 1987).

Further in this same letter, Geimer continues to insult a young man whom he has already fired: "...having more or less been forced to hire you, we hoped for the best... Most of your energy was expended on activity which was, at best, irrelevant to our mission... I tried to explain to you that your 'Defining defector' (research) project was meaningless sophistry..."

What Jamestown Says of Itself

Now read what Jamestown says of itself and its programs as currently described in literature intended for potential "friends," those who might possibly contribute either their names or their money or both:

[Continued on next page]

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3]

PROGRAMS**Resettlement Services**

Publications: Jamestown currently has 27 book projects underway. Jamestown helps plan these writings, provides editorial and translation services, functions as a literary agent, and circulates and promotes its clients' works.

Communications: The vehicle to achieve (this goal) is the Jamestown Speakers' Bureau, which places defectors before business and academic audiences.

Public Policy: Jamestown officers have been actively involved in advising Congress (and others) on...comprehensive guidelines for improving government handling of defectors.

At this point, I suspect the reader will share with me a sense of confusion. Just what IS Jamestown up to and how does it believe it will reach its goals? The various citations quoted above appear to veer all over the lot. From resettlement to research, to what appears to be an attempt to create a U.S. version of the Moscow Arbatov Institute of American and Canadian Studies. The creation of such an institute, staffed in part with Jamestown's clients, would indeed be a worthwhile project, but not one likely to be achieved without government support and at least partial funding. Geimer, in his testimony in front of the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations in October 1987, did broach such a possibility.

There is no doubt that such a foundation would be of great value to this country—in the same manner that the Arbatov Institute is of value to the Soviet Union. The question is whether Jamestown under its present management would be the appropriate vehicle.

What is not generally known is the extent to which Bill Geimer has progressively alienated some of his more important clients and key members or former members of his board. This story

is a rather shocking and sad commentary.

Item: One of the early members of the Advisory Board was Vladimir Sakharov, the well known and highly regarded KGB defector. Sakharov has broken completely with Jamestown and is no longer a member of the board. In 1986, Jamestown obtained a speaking assignment in front of a group of conservative Republicans. Sakharov spoke, or rather served on a panel, but came away with a bad taste for the manner in which the event was stage-managed. In fact, he wrote a stinging article on the meeting that appeared in the December 2, 1986 edition of the *Chicago Tribune*. Sakharov was and is dependent on the speaker's circuit for his livelihood. He never received the promised honorarium and expenses of \$1,000. Before that article appeared he received a letter from Geimer dated November 5, 1986:

"I'm tempted to believe that some idiot sent me a letter to which he signed your name. But, sadly, I conclude that the incredibly petty and childish message really did come from your typewriter... We will of course honor your wishes and disassociate you from Jamestown. We will also cease our efforts to find a job for you. We will tell Mark Wyatt [who also disassociated himself from Jamestown-Ed.] that he can continue to associate with you or with Jamestown, but not both. We will also inform our friends [read big bucks backers-Ed.] who have been interested in your future that, as far as you're concerned, getting a thousand dollars is more important than other values."

The result was that Sakharov filed a lawsuit against Jamestown on October 22, 1987 for one thousand dollars. The suit was listed as #67888 at the South Orange County Municipal Court in Laguna Nguel, California. I do not know whether this suit was settled or is still outstanding. Had I been Sakharov, I might have been willing to forget the whole thing until I received Geimer's letter. Then I would have declared war.

What a pointless and gratuitously nasty letter to an important and widely publicized KGB defector! Why not pay the thousand dollars and collect in turn from the Republican group that had contracted for Sakharov's services?

Item: The very considerable talent of Geimer for alienating people has been illustrated from quotations noted above. However, Geimer reached his apogee in an exchange with a well regarded BBC TV producer and reporter, Tom Mangold. Mangold had requested Jamestown's permission to do a documentary on the resettlement problems of defectors in the U.S. The film was run in 1986 on BBC's program *Panorama*. It was never run in the U.S. The film quite accurately portrayed the problems of defector resettlement and, by implication, the then-failure of the CIA in regard to such problems. It was most laudatory of Jamestown and Geimer. One sequence showed Geimer with a Soviet defector. They were visiting the offices of a major New York publishing house and talking with a senior editor there about the possible publication of the defector's book.

Among those who appeared in the film were Geimer, Lt. General James Williams, and Mark Wyatt. While not necessarily complimentary of the CIA, it certainly was of Jamestown. Geimer received copies of the video tape from Mangold and was quite pleased. Things changed drastically a few days later when Geimer again showed his mastery of the art of enemy-making in a letter to Mangold: "...We had hoped that our cooperation with the BBC would result in a program which would show prospective defectors that they would be adequately cared for... Instead our cooperation [with the BBC] helped produce a film that tells a prospective defector that he might be better off staying where he is. It's a document which readily lends itself to conversion to a KGB training film. I'm thankful it's not on MY conscience.

[Continued on next page]

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4]

"I'd like to believe that overriding superiors at the BBC are responsible for the shape which the program took... I'd hate to think that you two [Mangold and his producer] deceived me. And I'd hate to think the loss of future defectors was on YOUR conscience."

Mangold replied in a gentlemanly and placatory manner.

Geimer's next letter to Mangold was dated April 29, 1986: "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 you previously, I have found 29 more... 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... Contrary to your assertion [in a previous letter-Ed.], I do not persist in suggesting that the CIA has perfected their resettlement program... It's too soon to say. What I do know, and I told you on the film, is that the leadership of the Agency are trying to make the program work better... Do you know why we expected [sic] such a film (one in which Jamestown cooperated-Ed.)? Because we trusted BBC to tell the truth... But evidently you 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..."

Why the Sudden Change?

If one disagrees with the media one should certainly register a complaint. But to disagree with a TV documentary with which one has cooperated and which has already been aired to a national audience is a rather self-defeating exercise and is unlikely to change history. Why did Geimer change his mind about this film so suddenly? Who was he trying to impress by writing such petty letters? And should a person so given to such excesses of anger and vindictive-

ness be the future chairman of the American version of the Arbatov Institute?

The "defections" from Jamestown itself are legion. Both senior retirees from the CIA on the board have left, as has Vladimir Sakharov. Another high ranking client of the foundation who has also disassociated himself from Jamestown is Ambassador Zdzilaw Rurarz, the former emissary from Poland to Japan who left Tokyo in 1981 with his wife and daughter and came to the United States.

I invited Ambassador Rurarz to speak at one of the New England AFIO meetings we had in Vermont in 1986. He was accompanied to the meeting by Lt. General Williams, who was asked to make a brief pitch to this group about Jamestown. I had known of Geimer and Jamestown some years before. In my naivete, I offered to acquaint the members of the New England Chapter of AFIO with Jamestown's activities. I asked Jamestown to provide me with written material that might interest potential donors among our group. When no such material arrived and the meeting was two weeks away, I called again and reached Jamestown's executive vice president, Barbara Abbott.

"Why haven't we received any brochures?" I asked.

Ms. Abbott responded by asking how many of our chapter members might be listed in Dunn and Bradstreet.

I replied that (1) I did not know, and (2) It was neither my business nor hers.

I then appealed to Mark Wyatt [at that time a member of the Board of Advisors of Jamestown], and he saw to it that something arrived in time for the meeting. I dutifully mentioned Jamestown, but I must admit my heart wasn't in it. I had thought that an association of former intelligence officers, most of them on government pensions, might appreciate hearing about Jamestown and might contribute ten to twenty dollars apiece to the cause. No one did. I guess they simply sensed my lack of enthusiasm or were not listed in D&B.

Since I began working on this article in April, there have been a number of new developments, most of which tend to reinforce the evidence that Jamestown is indeed in trouble and in effect has turned to the U.S. Congress for help and sympathy while criticizing the CIA. Geimer provided the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence with a report the contents of which were promptly leaked to the press. Geimer has now declared open war on the CIA. In a letter to "Our Friends" dated July 24, 1989, Geimer begins, "Our long-smoldering struggle with the CIA has flared into public view. For six years we've muted our disagreement with the way the Agency treats defectors, and have pushed for improvement quietly behind the scenes." Indeed, the day after the date of that letter, Geimer and senior CIA officials testified in closed hearings in front of the House and Senate intelligence committees. It is difficult to understand how Jamestown can continue to function when it has entered into a public adversarial role with the CIA. However, when your institution is financially troubled, it is probably only natural to seek the financial safety of Congressional assistance.

Previous to the above, Mr. David Wise, a clever and facile investigative journalist who long since found he could make a handsome living by criticizing the CIA, wrote an article which appeared in the July 9 edition of *The New York Times*.

The article dealt with the complaints of one Viktor Gundarev, a colonel in the KGB who defected from Athens in 1986. Gundarev, otherwise known as the "crying KGB colonel," claimed that the CIA had stolen ten thousand dollars from him and bugged his telephone. He threatened to go back home and reportedly had begun the process of seeking a meeting with Soviet diplomats to explore that possibility. Other than the fact that Gundarev had won himself a reputation as a "difficult" pensioner who refused to take a job during his

[Continued on next page]

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 5]

three year vacation, what is notable in the Wise article is a "plug" for Jamestown. One might wonder how Gundarev knew exactly to whom to go for a sympathetic hearing and how to reach him. The whole episode reminds me that this is contract time in the National Football League with all sorts of prima donnas declaring that they wanted to be traded unless they were paid twice what they earned the previous year. The Yurchenko affair has thus broken new ground. It won't be long before some clever lawyer sets up shop to represent defectors of Gundarev's ilk as an agent in negotiations with the CIA.

In the final analysis the real question is how should the handling of defectors to the U.S. be improved? The CIA has indeed made improvements and reportedly assigns high level people, including psychologists and psychiatrists, to manage the defector program. The fact remains however that the CIA and, in fact, the U.S. Government cannot usefully go beyond the initial step of resettlement—the kind of hand holding which, in some cases, Jamestown often did do effectively.

Where Jamestown went wrong was when it tried to go beyond the resettlement stage to something else; it saw itself as the natural core of what was envisioned as an American Arbatov Institute. Further, Jamestown, as reported in the press, has been arguing with Congress that the government should extend its largesse and include defectors who essentially have no intelligence value but do have significant artistic, educational or scientific value—doctors, professors and the like. This makes sense if there were an American Arbatov Institute, but there is not. If there were, or if it were decided to establish such an entity, Geimer would be the wrong person to lead it as he lacks the academic credentials and the academic entre. His track record on research is, as you will recall from the quotations above, less than outstanding. The Ar-

batov Institute is all about research. Further, Geimer has failed to place many of his well deserving clients in academia and has criticized the attitude of those institutions he has approached.

The West truly does need an Arbatov Institute—particularly given the radically changing situation in the Soviet Union. However, the kernel of such an institution is research, and Jamestown threw away a very promising research capability in 1986 and has never tried to revive it. Geimer does not understand that you do not place qualified defectors at Yale or Princeton or Harvard by breaking down the door to the university president's office. The approach must always be through the relevant department heads—and one must offer something in return, which in this case is a unique research capability backed up by the very people whom Jamestown is trying to help.

It is doubtful that Geimer's end run around the CIA will succeed on Capitol Hill. It is also doubtful that Jamestown will prosper until some professional management is brought in and until relations with the CIA are improved. One suggestion made by people familiar with the scene is the recruitment of a former ambassador [there are quite a few in Washington]. Such a person with Eastern Bloc experience and academic credentials would likely be the saving of Jamestown—and might also be the person who would know how to approach academia, the government, and the intelligence community.

Meanwhile, the latest news reports tell of a suggestion that the U.S. defector resettlement program be handed over to the U.S. Marshall's Office. Apparently, this idea has not met with favor. One can only hope that it will not be revived. The problem is not with physical safety—but with utilizing the enormous talent which is flowing to the West. Geimer recognizes this—but he apparently can't also recognize that it will take more than a feel for political power and fundraising to achieve that goal.

□ □ □

Soviet Defectors: The British Record

by Nigel West

Soviet intelligence defectors to the UK are a rare breed indeed. The statistics make chilling reading, especially if you take the view that a sign of a healthy, penetration-free security service is a steady flow of defectors. The fact is that between the receipt of Grigori A. Tokaev in the British Sector of Berlin in 1948 and the defection of Oleg A. Lyalin at the end of August 1971, only one Soviet intelligence officer opted to switch sides. Furthermore, that single individual, Yuri V. Krotkov, was subsequently believed to have been a KGB "plant" all along.

Tokaev was a GRU officer, and now resides in England under the name Professor Grigori Tokaty. He is an aeronautical engineer specializing in rocket dynamics and made a major contribution to the West's understanding of Soviet missile technology when it was still in its relative infancy. Lyalin, by contrast, has been described as a low-level KGB thug, attached to the Soviet trade delegation in London, whose principal task appears to have been the preparation of sabotage contingency plans in anticipation of a conflict. Allegedly his main targets were the Liverpool docks and the early warning radar station at Fylingdales in Yorkshire.

Since Lyalin's defection, which was motivated not so much by ideological considerations, but an illicit affair with his secretary, Britain has enjoyed a marked improvement in its fortunes. The four best-known recent defectors include Vladimir B. Rezun, who defected from Geneva in 1978; Ilya G. Dzirkvelov, who followed two years later; Vladimir A. Kuzichkin, who was exfiltrated from Iran in 1982; and Oleg A. Gordievsky, whose resourceful escape from Moscow in 1985 ended a spying career which had lasted twelve years.

[Continued on next page]