**CORRECTION, PLEASE!**

ITEM: From a Column by Thomas J. Hamilton in the *New York Times*, December 20, 1964:

The African attacks in the Security Council on the Belgian-American rescue mission to Stanleyville have diverted attention from the disclosure that some of the attackers are aiding the Stanleyville rebels to fight the Congolese Government.

These developments constitute a grim epilogue to the United Nations' peace-keeping intervention in the Congo.

**CORRECTION:** There is an even grimmer epilogue to the American rescue mission to Stanleyville, which has diverted attention from the disclosure that some of the attackers are aiding the Congolese rebels to fight the Congolese Government.

**ITEM:** From an Editorial in the *Los Angeles Times*, December 11, 1964:

Failure of the Pentagon or White House to announce any definitive decision about the Vietnam situation following conferences with Ambassador Maxwell Taylor should not be surprising, nor does it mean that there will be no upgrading of the effort. After all, this is a military matter, and it isn't smart to announce bombing raids in advance.

**CORRECTION:** We agree with Mr. Henry that “it isn’t smart to announce bombing raids in advance”, but we are surprised—although he is not—that the Administration did not follow its precedent of last August. Representative Ed Foreman (R.-Tex.) on the floor of the House, described how President Johnson gave the Communist Vietnamese advance warning of bombing attacks in the Gulf of Tonkin episode:

On Tuesday, August 4, following the unprovoked attack by the Communist Vietnamese PT boats upon the U.S. destroyers Maddox and C. Turner Joy, the President made a television announcement to the American people. The announcement was made at 11:36 p.m., eastern daylight time. In his announcement, the President said:

Repeated actions of violence against the Armed Forces of the United States must be met not only with alert defense, but with positive reply. That reply is being given as I speak to you tonight. Air action is now in execution against gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Vietnam which have been used in these hostile operations.

The events of that historic night were reported in the August 7 edition of the *Washington Post* as follows:

The President went on the air to announce what was happening at 11:36 p.m., e.d.t., Tuesday, and talked 6 minutes. At 12:02 a.m. Wednesday, McNamara told a news conference that some of the action had already taken place.

Now the facts are that the initial attack, the attack on Quang Khe, the southernmost PT boat base, was not made until 1:15 a.m., eastern daylight time. The first attack on the northernmost base, Hon Gai, did not take place until 3:45 a.m., eastern daylight time, a full 4 hours and 9 minutes after the President's nationwide television announcement. This time schedule is available through the Secretary of Defense's Pentagon office. The final attack, a retake on PT bases at Vinh, was at 4:45 a.m., eastern daylight time. This was over 5 hours after the President's television announcement.

The Communists had the opportunity of over 4 hours’ notice of the impending attack on Hon Gai.

**ITEM:** From an Editorial in the *New York Times*, December 25, 1964:

In a speech bristling with insults to the United States, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic has declared that his country intends to go on sending arms to the Congo- lese rebels.

(continued on page 2)
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The communist conspiracy alone benefits from such outrageous words, as it battens on disorder and misery, and fears only an honest definition. Mr. Wilson calls his party a “Crusade”; clearly it does not crusade very effectively against communism, as it normally advocates a weaker Britain on the grounds that the London School of Economics does not consider a strong Britain can be afforded, and it seeks to perpetrate discords as it fails to recognise any problem between people of different backgrounds.

Being a “crusader” and a “liberal” may lead to power, but the responsibility for the Congo tragedy cannot be laid at the door of the “traitors” or the “lepers”. It is the fake crusaders and pseudo-liberals who are responsible for the chaos and misery—UNO, U.S.S.R., U.S.A. and irresponsible Britons are the guilty because they were criminally blind to the noble benefit of order. Ignorance of the law is a poor plea, and ignorance of the laws of power cannot excuse those who trade in power and live and thrive on power.

We cannot believe that the accused whites are all as callous about their coloured neighbours as the self-righteous politicians so obviously are. Because the havoc that these politicians have caused is obvious and grows more obvious, whereas the patient work of those put in the dock and presumed guilty is being undermined as rapidly as the communists dare move. It is about time someone started a crusade in the name of sanity.

—H.S.S.

Correction, please! (continued from page 1)

The Nasser declaration makes it impossible for the United States to escape a recognition that the millions of dollars in surplus food this country sends to Egypt operates—as freeing Egyptian funds—as an indirect subsidy in helping it carry out its policy of international disruption.

Correction: As was indicated in the above correction [see p. 1], the United States not only offers Nasser an indirect subsidy but also a direct subsidy in the form of flight control and communications equipment, as well as technical help and instruction. [Incidentally, the United Arab Republic has received over $800,000,000 in United States aid.]

Item: From a column by Ralph McGill, publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, in the Boston Globe, December 7, 1964:

History is full of ifs . . .

December 7, 1941, “a day that will live in infamy”, was one such day. Radar picked up the flight of Japanese bombers. They were shrugged off as a practice flight.

Correction: Mr. McGill is guilty of inventing history in this instance. On December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbour, there was one mobile radar set in operation, manned by Privates Joseph L. Lockard and George E. Elliott. Private Elliott was watching the oscilloscope, when a “blip” appeared. The source of the “blip” was “bearing three degrees east of north, it was 137 miles away, and though the radar of that time afforded no means of telling just what it was, it looked like a lot of airplanes, perhaps as many as 50 or more”. Here we are quoting from Walter Millis’ This is Pearl (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1947, page 352). And now we interject Mr. McGill’s comment that the flight of Japanese bombers was “shrugged off as a practice flight”.

Again we quote Walter Millis:

Elliott was pretty excited about it.
This was the best thing their new radar had done yet, and he wanted to send in a report. Lockard told him, in effect, not to be silly; the exercise [i.e. Lockard's instructions to Elliott on how to operate the radar set] was over and it was no more of their business. [Note: Lockard was not shrugging off anything as a practice flight. His three-hour tour of duty was over, and Private Lockard was merely guilty of clock-watching.) But Elliott insisted. Entertaining a grossly exaggerated idea of the real capabilities of the Information Centre, he thought that this might be a bunch of planes about to attack Pearl Harbour. Such evidence is over-whelming in such studies as: George Morgenstern, Adm. Stark, et al.—had been advised of the Japanese intentions. There is no record that this information was acknowledged here. But the (Japanese) police documents make it clear that Stalin & Co. had this accurate information and passed it back to us in return for our information about the impending attack by Germany on Russia.

In reply to a direct question, Mr. O'Donnell says, “Before writing the column, the complete record of Sorge's confession had been made available to me although I was never in possession except for the time required for reading the documents.” It will be noted that Mr. O'Donnell positively states that the “complete record of the Sorge confession” was available to him before he wrote the article. That means both documents—the 32,000-word Sorge confession and the police documents related to the Sorge activities and confession. This statement is especially important because certain portions of the Sorge confession had been deleted from the file copy in the Pentagon, obviously for the purpose of preserving the secret of Pearl Harbour and President Roosevelt's part therein from the knowledge of anyone who might see that file copy. We thus now know that President Roosevelt was warned at least twice of the Japanese intended attack, by Admiral Moorer in January 1941, and by Sorge, via the Kremlin, in October 1941.

ITEM: From a Column by C. L. Sulzberger in the New York Times, November 11, 1964:

Russia still seems to desire to spread world revolution by political rather than military means and to prefer peaceful coexistence with the West, whereas China is more bellicose.

Correction: Mr. Sulzberger not only overlooks the continual Soviet practice of supplying military hardware to satellite nations of both hemispheres—hardly political means of world revolution or peaceful coexistence—but also overlooks Soviet espionage in the United States, which is neither political means of world revolution nor peaceful coexistence.

In June 1964, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, in an interview with syndicated columnist Edward J. Mowery, discussed the matter of Soviet espionage in the United States. We quote pertinent excerpts from that interview (reprinted in the Congressional Record, June 10, 1964, pages A3120-21):

Question [Mr. Mowery]. How do you evaluate the current espionage threat against the United States by the Communist bloc?

Answer [Mr. Hoover]. The United States is today target No. 1 of the Soviet espionage system. At this hour, trained and professional Russian spies are working to steal whatever information they can secure from this country. They are primarily interested, of course, in scientific, military and technological data. They know the United States is a vast reservoir of highly valuable information which they so desperately would like to secure.

Ever since the founding of the Bolshevik régime in 1917, the Soviets have been trying to supply their spies in the United States. But in recent years they have stepped up their tempo, under the belief that they are engaged in a major spy effort to penetrate our internal security.
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Ever since the founding of the Bolshevik régime in 1917, the Soviets have been trying to supply their spies in the United States. But in recent years they have stepped up their tempo, under the belief that they are engaged in a major spy effort to penetrate our internal security.
The danger of Soviet espionage is quite serious, and every American should be deeply concerned.

Along with Soviet espionage, there is the concomitant of terrorism, as was described in The Allen-Scott Report, October 27, 1964 (White Plains Reporter Dispatch):

According to one U.S. intelligence estimate, the KGB [Soviet secret police] now has agents operating in every major Western country; several hundred have been placed in strategic positions in these governments, including the United States.

Since early 1961, the KGB has sent into the West more than 200 deadly trained assassins, equipped with weapons that few people have ever heard of or seen.

The same Allen-Scott Report reveals that the aforementioned intelligence estimate is kept "tightly locked in the Central Intelligence Agency's files". The information available to the CIA includes a description of a "sabotage-diversionist school near Tula or Tambou", established by the KGB at a time when the GRU, the Soviet military intelligence-espionage organisation, came under the control of the KGB. According to the intelligence estimate, graduates of the sabotage-diversionist school are assigned to sabotage-espionage groups in the West and are a strategic implement available to the Kremlin. Furthermore, says the estimate: "The KGB is using its agents to plant articles in pro-Western or neutralist publications. Such articles are not necessarily pro-Soviet in tone, but are designed to further Soviet interest in some fashion."

What Allen and Scott have reported agrees with information given to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover:

A high official of the KGB, who defected to the West, revealed to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that the Russians' external intelligence apparatus has an annual budget of $1.5 billion.

Much of this vast fund is earmarked for coverage and infiltration of the U.S. . . . Mr. Hoover, in a recent off-the-record report to a group of congressmen, reported that the USSR is not only increasing its espionage activities but putting them on a broader-ranged long-term operational basis.

The FBI director . . . disclosed that the Soviets have intensified their efforts to seep agents into the FBI itself, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and the U.S. Information Agency. (World magazine, June 8, 1964.)

ITEM: From an Editorial in the New York Times, December 15, 1964:

The new formula presented by Ireland for resolving the China issue in the United Nations deserves more attention than it has received.

The Irish formula would permit Taiwan to keep a seat in the General Assembly. But the China seats both in the Assembly and in the Security Council would go to Peking in exchange for a pledge to uphold the Charter and to cooperate in limiting nuclear weapons.

Neither Peking nor Taipei is likely to accept this "two-China" proposal initially, since each claims that it is the only legitimate Chinese Government and that there is only one China. But it is not vital for the United Nations to adjudicate this issue. The Soviet Union and the Ukraine hold separate seats in the General Assembly without having partitioned the U.S.S.R.!

CORRECTION: The New York Times' crusade to rehabilitate Red China seemingly has no bounds. We quote from G. Edward Griffin's The Fearful Master:

It was at the Yalta meeting that the decision was made to give the Soviets three votes in the General Assembly to one for the United States. Giving votes to the Russians for the Ukraine SSR and Byelorussian SSR made as much sense as giving extra votes to the United States for Texas and California. At any rate, even if Roosevelt had been inclined to protest this absurd agreement, he was up against the demands of Joe Stalin and the advice of Alger Hiss

Of course, the Ukraine had been conquered and incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1922 by the Communist imperialists. The National Government of China has not been incorporated into the Red Chinese empire, but rather is an independent ally of the United States.