

## "CIA AND THE PENKOVSKY AFFAIR"

Columbia, S.C.

Dear Sir: It may interest you to know that *worldview* somehow reaches a select audience in official circles in the USSR, as indicated by the fact that my article, "CIA and the Penkovsky Affair" (February 1966) was reproduced in abridged form as a major feature article on page four of *Izvestia*, the Government newspaper, April 17, 1966. However, for some strange reason the editors of *Izvestia* wrongly attributed it to "an American journal, *Weekly Review*."

The portions reprinted were literally and accurately translated, but the deletions indicate certain continuing Soviet sensitivities and propaganda lines which may interest your readers.

First, my statement that "The Penkovsky memoirs undoubtedly struck a sensitive Soviet nerve and produced a hasty, ill-considered reaction" (expulsion of the *Washington Post's* Moscow correspondent, Stephen Rosenfield) was deleted.

Second, the section dealing with Soviet writers, such as Viktor Nekrassov, who have written objectively about the United States, was also cut, indicating that the regime has a continuing problem with such writers and prefers to treat them, in their propaganda, as "un-persons" by ignoring them entirely where possible. The same "deep-freeze treatment" was given to Wise and Ross' *The Invisible Government* and my own book, *The Strategy of Subversion* (although presumably both volumes have been pirated "for official use only" by Soviet agencies). It is also interesting that the "cult of impersonality" by which Brezhnev and Kosygin seek to efface themselves has reached such proportions that a long quotation from Kosygin was simply attributed to "the Soviet Government." This kind of distortion is hardly accidental in Soviet propaganda, as established by such "esoteric communications" specialists as Myron Rush in his work on *The Rise of Khrushchev*.

Third, the Soviet editors skillfully distorted a key observation, "In the early 1960s the Intelligence services of both the U.S. and the USSR began to make increasing use of frauds, forgeries and fabrications for political warfare and propaganda purposes," by simply deleting any reference to the USSR. My forthcoming book *Agents of Deceit, Frauds, Forgeries and Political Intrigue Among Nations* (Quadrangle-Books) deals at length with those matters and includes as an Appendix an official study of "The Soviet and Communist Bloc Defamation Campaign." Not unexpectedly, a reference to

this latter study was also deleted by the editors of *Izvestia*.

Fourth, the most shocking distortion in the abridged article concerns the "books for idiots," the long series of false Soviet memoirs produced after World War II in Paris by Besedovsky, Alexandrov and other "historians." Boris Souvarine's statement to the effect that these phony memoirs were in fact produced for *pro-Soviet* propaganda purposes was deleted, thus leaving the misinformed Soviet reader with the idea that these lurid tales were fabricated by Western propaganda agencies!

In short, in the Soviet abridgement, almost all those sections of my original article which were designed to give it balance and impartiality were deleted, thus demonstrating once again the Soviet editors' contempt for what, as Communists, they call "stupid, bourgeois objectivity."

Paul W. Blackstock

## "ORGANIZED RELIGION AND PEACE"

Princeton, N.J.

Dear Sir: It is a small point, but still there is need to correct a reference to me in Arthur Moore's article "Organized Religion and Peace" in your May 1966 issue. I would never question the qualifications of clergymen to speak on specific points of foreign policy. That would be like questioning the qualification of clergymen to play baseball. While either proposition would be, as Mr. Moore says, "a valid point," one could also "make rather too much" of it, since there doubtless are some clergymen qualified to play baseball and a great many more qualified in the field of foreign policy.

I have argued that clergymen as such, Christians and Jews as such, and the churches and church councils are not "competent" in the jurisdictional sense to make specific policy recommendations to political leaders. When they do, they speak with as much or as little authority as any other group of citizens. Attempting to put the engine of religion and morality behind particular policy decisions, we are led, more often than not, away from the hard task of clarifying the word the church is "competent" to speak to the world of today.

Paul Ramsey

*Readers are reminded that worldview welcomes correspondence. Letters may be specific comments on articles in recent issues or general discussion, but readers are requested to limit their letters to 500 words.*