

Introduction

A special investigation carried out under the direction of this office into the circumstances of the alleged seizure of the U.S. ship SS Mayaguez by the Cambodian Navy, and the subsequent actions of the Ford-Rockefeller Administration, have produced conclusive evidence of a planned and calculated provocation of the incident by the U.S. Administration designed to result in a test-run of military confrontation in "crisis" situations. The objective of the Administration's provocative actions was to ensure "blank-check" acquiescence of the U.S. Congress to such U.S. actions in far more serious direct confrontations planned against the Soviet Union. The completion of this test-run, and the capitulation of the Congress to the war hysteria created by the Administration, has increased the immediate danger of planned nuclear confrontation with the USSR, most likely in Europe and/or the Middle East, within the next days or weeks.

For the past few months, the U.S. Labor Party has warned of the existence of operational plans, implemented under the direction of Vice-President Nelson Rockefeller and his immediate associates in the Administration, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger, to seize the first opportunity to stage a "Cuban-missile crisis"-type confrontation with the Soviet Union. The operational doctrine of Schlesinger for such crises is the doctrine of "limited nuclear warfare" (also known as "flexible response" or "tactical nuclear warfare"), which envisions a staged nuclear provocation involving a "limited exchange" of nuclear strikes. The Rockefeller cabal is firmly committed to the psychotic belief that the Soviet Union will back down in the face of such provocation; such a hypothetical capitulation would result in a major strategic defeat for the socialist countries and would enable the U.S. dollar empire, which is dominated by the Rockefeller financier faction, to maintain itself as the economy collapses.

This psychotic belief that the Soviets will back down persists, and has been incorporated into existing NATO operational planning (NATO document MC-14/4), despite the repeated clear statements (for example: May 8 and May 10) by the Soviet Union that their response to "limited nuclear warfare" provocation will be "Mutually Assured Destruction" (MAD). The Soviet Union stands by the accepted strategic doctrine of MAD with the sane knowledge that this provides the only actual deterrent to nuclear holocaust. Therefore, it must be clearly understood that the provocative intentions of the Rockefeller cabal, as carried out in a "dry-run" during the Mayaguez incident, are the actions of an insane clique that, if allowed to remain in power, will bring about thermonuclear destruction of humanity.

The immediate result and the actual objective of

the Administration's actions during the Mayaguez incident, were the destruction of Congressional control over the Defense and Foreign Policy of the United States Government. The staged atmosphere of the "crisis" was designed to create a controlled psychological environment of war hysteria and terror, on the model of the Tonkin Gulf incident, to ensure Congressional surrender to the Executive. The Mayaguez operation successfully accomplished this objective. As certain Congressional representatives have themselves stated, and as certified by the unanimous approval given the President's actions by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the 1973 War Powers Act (and accompanying legislation) restricting the Executive power to initiate U.S. military actions in Indochina have been effectively abrogated.

This brief presents conclusive evidence demonstrating the nature and objectives of the Mayaguez incident, as stated above. The brief is organized in the following form: First, the political context for the incident; second, the internal evidence drawn from the details of the incident itself; third, the Congressional response to the Administration's actions.

Part I. The Political Context for The Mayaguez Incident

The immediate political context for the Mayaguez provocation follows the defeat of the Rockefeller cabal in Vietnam (the seizure of power by the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam — PRG — on April 30) and the international strategic implications of that defeat. Since that historic event, the Rockefeller Administration has made numerous public pronouncements of "the necessity to prove the willingness of the United States to...fulfill its commitments" in the world. The Rockefeller faction is determined to initiate strategic confrontation with the Soviet Union in particular, in a desperate effort to reverse what they correctly perceive as the tidal wave of collapse, politically and economically, of the dollar empire in the non-socialist world.

The intended nature of the Rockefeller's planned nuclear confrontation — which, to be effective, must be staged in a region the Soviet Union considers vital to its strategic interest (the Middle East, Central Europe, the Balkans) — necessitates destruction of any opposition from North America or Western Europe to this policy. Such opposition in North America and Western Europe is based on the understanding among anti-Rockefeller capitalist and military circles that the Schlesinger Doctrine will mean the thermonuclear extinction of the U.S. and all of Western Europe. The Mayaguez incident, which occurred outside an area of direct confrontation with the Soviet Union, provided the perfect "test-run" context, with minimal military risks, to force the capitulation of internal opposition (mainly U.S. Congressional and military opposition, and Western European opposition

from layers of politicians, industrialists and professional military men concentrated in West Germany and France).

The immediate impetus for such a staged "proof" of confrontation capability was produced by the organizing initiatives the Soviet Union and its allies have taken to undercut and eliminate the political environment for nuclear war in the coming weeks. This initiative was clearly presented in the Open Call issued to the world on May 9 jointly by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Government of the Soviet Union (full text is appended). The Soviet Call clearly stated the immediate danger of nuclear war and outlined the basis for world peace in a program for world development: the eradication by science and technology of famine, poverty and epidemics throughout the world. The powerful nature and proposals of the Open Call parallel the International Caucus of Labor Committees proposal for the formation of an International Development Bank, a proposal now circulating throughout the advanced sector with the support of key Third World forces and the socialist movement.

The impact of the Soviet Call, and the direct transmission of that call to parliamentary representatives and governments, has accelerated the emergence of resistance to the Rockefeller nuclear strategy, particularly in parliamentary layers in West Germany and France (along with the efforts of the French Communist Party — PCF). Among military professionals, who previously voiced opposition within NATO to the Schlesinger Doctrine, the restatement of the Soviet commitment to the doctrine of MAD, in a speech by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, May 8 (see appendix) on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism had a similar catalyzing effect. In the United States, and especially among anti-Schlesinger factions in Congress (see Part III), a similar process has been underway.

The response of the Rockefeller Administration to the Soviet Call was clear and immediate: provocation and nuclear confrontation. This response was expressed by Secretary of State Kissinger on several occasions May 12 - 15, timed to coincide with the Mayaguez incident. The first occasion was a Kissinger interview with Thomas Ross of the Chicago Sun Times, printed May 12 but (by internal reference) given at least a day earlier. According to the interviewer, Kissinger outlined the following "new" foreign policy: "Kissinger is urging President Ford to respond to the defeat in Vietnam with a tough, even abrasive, foreign policy....Kissinger is pressing Ford to adopt an even more forceful foreign policy so as to deter the Soviet Union from attempting to exploit presumed U.S. weaknesses....Kissinger expects the Soviets to exploit the slightest chink in U.S. defenses. For example, he foresees a possible crisis in the Middle

East this summer and expects the Soviets to be much tougher than they were in the 1973 war....Colby's statement (referring to a speech by CIA Director William Colby May 7 in San Francisco) can be read as a signal that Ford and Kissinger are again unleashing the CIA as a major tool of foreign policy."

Following this major attack on detente, which effectively announced the end of official U.S. foreign policy, Kissinger directly attacked Congress: "Kissinger also has been complaining that Congress is intruding too deeply into the details of foreign policy, depriving him and Ford of the ability to move swiftly, powerfully and secretly...."

This Kissinger threat was followed May 12, the day the Mayaguez incident was begun, in a major policy speech which Kissinger gave in St. Louis, Missouri before the St. Louis World Affairs Council. The references were similar and in certain respects more pointed with regard to the Mayaguez test case and its significance: "The willingness of the Soviet Union to exploit strategic opportunities — even though some of these opportunities presented themselves more or less spontaneously and not as a result of Soviet action — constitutes a heavy mortgage on detente. If detente turns into a formula for more selective exploitation of opportunities, the new trends in U.S.-Soviet relations will be in jeopardy. If our contention in peripheral areas persists, even more if it becomes exacerbated, the progress achieved in some other areas of detente (like nuclear disarmament — Ed.) will ultimately be undermined....It (the U.S.) is equally determined to resist pressures or the exploitation of local conflict."

The implementation of the Kissinger policy began with the Mayaguez incident. There can be no doubt (as Part II of this brief demonstrates) that from the very beginning of the incident Kissinger, Schlesinger, and Nelson Rockefeller were determined to stage a display of military force. This has been indicated and referenced by numerous press reports on the incident; for example, on May 14, New York Times correspondent Philip Shabecoff, citing "high-ranking Administration sources" (a phrase often used in referring to Kissinger), revealed that "the seizure of the vessel might provide the test of American determination the U.S. had been looking for" since the Vietnam revolution succeeded.

Secretary Kissinger's gloating comments May 17 at a State Department press conference following the Mayaguez incident provide further confirmation of the intentions of the Administration in conducting the Mayaguez provocation. Kissinger said: "It (the incident) ought to make clear that there are limits beyond which the United States cannot be pushed, and that the United States is prepared to defend those interests, and that it can get public support and *Congressional support for those actions*" (emphasis added).

The internal evidence of the incident itself — as assembled by our investigation from available press

and other sources — provides definitive proof of the objectives of the Administration's actions. Despite the controlled flow of "information" from the White House concerning the incident, the following picture is available.

Part II. Grid of Internal Evidence in Mayaguez Incident

This grid analyzes the evidence surrounding the Mayaguez incident. The evidence demonstrates 1) that the incident was deliberately created by the Ford-Rockefeller Administration; 2) that the Rockefeller forces' intention from the outset was to use the created incident as a pretext for military action, and that no diplomatic avenues whatsoever were pursued; and 3) that a spurious atmosphere of "crisis" (used, as Part III shows, primarily to terrorize Congress into submission to planned nuclear confrontation against the Soviets) was deliberately generated by the Administration to justify provocative military confrontations in the immediate weeks.

The reactions of the Press Affairs Representative of the National Security Council, in an interview with IPS during the Mayaguez incident, themselves lend considerable weight to this analysis. The IPS correspondents had not mentioned nuclear war, nuclear confrontation, and so forth at the point in the interview when the National Security Council spokesman burst out "We are not engaged in some kind of Dr. Strange-love thing...We're not going to nuke Cambodia...(The U.S. is) not planning nuclear confrontation." The spokesman's train of thought was unmistakably suggested by what he knew to underly the incident.

Events before Mayaguez Incident

The evidence shows that the Administration knew of earlier reports of firings on and detention of ships by Cambodia in the same area where the Mayaguez was detained; however, these incidents were deliberately blacked out of the U.S. press and no U.S. government warnings were issued to ships using the sea-lanes to steer clear of the area.

On May 3 a South Korean ship was fired on in the area. This was reported in the South Korean paper *Dong A Ibo* May 5. The same day the South Korean Transport Ministry issued a warning to all ships in the area. Also May 5 Agence France Presse wire service carried the story, which was printed May 6 in the English-language edition of the major Japanese newspaper *Asahi*. On May 5 and May 6 the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency's Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS), which is published daily, monitored and reported the attack on the Korean vessel. On May 6 the FBIS monitored the South Korean warning bulletin to local shipping firms and maritime offices.

Also on May 6, a Panamanian vessel was fired on, boarded, and detained for 36 hours before release in the vicinity of Poulo Wai, the island near which the Mayaguez was detained.

The Administration claims that it lacked knowledge of these incidents in time to warn U.S. ships away. The Mayaguez was seized May 12 — a full week after the CIA's FBIS monitored the earlier incidents.

It is normal U.S. Government practice for the Defense Mapping Agency-Hydrographic Center to inform ships of such incidents (broadcast via Merchant Marine Radio). Mr. Glenn De Young of the Defense Mapping Agency, upon being questioned, stated that they had received no reports of such incidents in the past two weeks. De Young said if such an incident had occurred "We would be told...the State Department or the U.S. government would put out such a message." The Defense Department replied to questioning that a Notice to Mariners (No. 45) had been released. The date of the notice — May 12 — was after the Mayaguez was seized.

The Administration has attempted to cover for deliberately withholding this information (and thereby creating the Mayaguez incident) by claiming (in the words of White House Press Secretary Ron Nessen): "This word took some time to get back to the U.S." The international press coverage — outside the U.S. — of the Korean vessel incident, and the fact that the CIA's FBIS had that information by May 5, prove that this is a lie. The Administration permitted U.S. ships to travel those waters (within Cambodia's publicly claimed 12-mile territorial limit) in order to create the pretext for military action.

As was the case with the events preceding the Mayaguez incident, throughout the Mayaguez test-run itself the White House — that is, Henry Kissinger and other Rockefeller operatives — maintained tight control over the flow of all so-called "information." Congress and the public were fed a stream of conflicting lies by Kissinger.

By Tuesday it became clear that the lower levels of the State Department and the Pentagon were being fed only very minimal information to maintain White House control of the entire incident. On Monday, a spokesman from the East Asian and Pacific Affairs Bureau of the State Department said that he had gotten no information on the incident until the White House statement, and that he had no information beyond that statement. "No comment"; "I don't know"; or "Call the White House" were the responses from almost all government quarters when questioned by IPS correspondents.

Seizure of Ship; U.S. Military Retaliation

At 5:03 a.m. EDT Monday, May 12 the State Department, or at least the Secretary of State, was informed that the Mayaguez had been seized and boarded within the claimed 12-mile limit off the Cambodian island Poulo Wai. Captain Miller of the Mayaguez has since stated that the ship was six and a half miles from the island.

President Ford's reference May 12 to "piracy on the high seas" were supposedly explained May 13 by a State Department representative who stated that it is not clear if the United States recognizes the Khmer

Rouge as a government. If not, the seizure could be considered piracy and the Executive could act without consulting Congress.

Cambodia gave its grounds for the seizure in the Cambodian government's charge, seconded by the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) on radio broadcasts, that the Mayaguez was engaged in espionage or espionage-related activities.

It should be noted that this type of investigation of suspicious ships in territorial waters is extremely commonplace internationally. For example, on Saturday May 17 the U.S. Coast Guard stopped, boarded, and brought into San Francisco harbor a Polish fishing vessel which had strayed into the 12-mile limit claimed by the U.S. The Administration used such an unremarkable event in Cambodia to precipitate a "crisis" and a military adventure.

The Administration responded immediately and provocatively to create a military incident. By noon May 12 (seven hours after the first report; before U.S. reconnaissance planes had located the ship) the National Security Council had convened for the first of four meetings in the next two days. At 2:00 p.m. Monday Ron Nessen gave the first White House briefing, at which he quoted Ford on "piracy on the high seas"; Nessen declared that no matter what Cambodia claims as territorial waters, "we consider the ship to have been in international waters." This posture was adopted from the outset as the pretext for military response.

No Diplomatic Efforts: No diplomatic channels were pursued by the Administration except a cover-up diplomatic feint. On Wednesday, May 14 it was revealed that the State Department had taken only the following diplomatic steps; One note was dispatched to the Chinese envoy in Washington to relay to the Cambodians; one note was allegedly given to the Cambodian legation of Norodom Sihanouk in Peking. Both were reported returned undelivered Wednesday morning. Early in the week the Administration claimed diplomacy was being used and that "third parties, including the Chinese" were being contacted. This is a lie. No other "third parties" were contacted. Ford acknowledged Wednesday, as Nessen reported, that "he had no idea whether the messages he had sent" had been delivered.

By Tuesday morning Cambodian Time (CT) (Monday evening EDT) U.S. reconnaissance planes had located the Mayaguez making its way to Koh Tang, 30 miles from Poulo Wai, and the crew being moved into Thai fishing boats.

U.S. military operations began during the day Tuesday. U.S. bombers reportedly sank three Cambodian vessels and damaged several more. This bombing and strafing commenced after a National Security Council meeting called at about 10:30 a.m. EDT Tuesday, at which Ford issued orders (according to the May 17 Washington Post) "for U.S. forces to interdict any boats coming from or going to Koh

Tang." According to evidence from Captain Miller of the Mayaguez, the bombing started about 7:00 p.m. EDT Tuesday. Nineteen hours later the White House first announced the U.S. bombing, lying about the chronology to make it appear as if the bombing took place two and a half hours after it did (according to Miller's evidence), and to make it appear as if the bombing of the ships came in response to Cambodian groundfire, rather than the other way around.

U.S. Knows Crew Is On Mainland: About 11:00 p.m. EDT Tuesday, according to Miller, the crew of Mayaguez reached Sihanoukville on the Cambodian mainland. The U.S., whose reconnaissance planes maintained constant surveillance, knew this. According to Miller, the U.S. jets strafing the Cambodian vessels flew 70 feet above the boat carrying the Mayaguez crew and hit to within 10 feet of it, but never hit that ship: "It is clear they saw we were in the boat." Miller also reported that "After we got in close to Sihanoukville the jets left us alone and they put the (reconnaissance) plane on top of us again" (from the New York Times).

The U.S. knew on Tuesday during the National Security Council meeting of 10:20 p.m. EDT that the crew was on the mainland; on Wednesday the U.S. sent Marines into the island of Koh Tang to stage an invasion to "rescue" the crew — which the Administration knew was not there.

Marines Sent on "Rescue"....to Koh Tang: The fourth National Security Council meeting convened at 3:52 p.m. EDT Wednesday May 14; orders were issued at 4:45 p.m. from that meeting for the beginning of military operation. Twenty-nine minutes later assault forces (Marines who had been flown in from Okinawa to Thailand Tuesday) lifted off en route to Koh Tang. The National Security Council meeting ended at 5:40 p.m. EDT.

Cambodian Message Before Invasion: At 7:07 p.m. EDT, 13 minutes before the first Marines landed on Koh Tang, the Cambodian government began broadcasting a message that they would release ship and crew soon. The scheduled U.S. invasion proceeded.

The Administration has claimed two different cover stories as to why the attack proceeded. One is that the CIA did not transmit a translation to Kissinger and Ford until about 8:15 p.m. EDT — a full hour after the Cambodian broadcast began. This "delay" which the Administration reports is absolutely not credible. Even assuming that CIA monitors and simultaneous translators did not communicate the full text of the Cambodian message before 8:15 p.m., the Secretary of State must have received word of the message's existence and summary content.

The second cover story is that the attack proceeded after the Cambodian message was broadcast because the message mentioned releasing the ship but not the crew! This is an equally obvious lie. The Cambodians referred to "evicting" the ship, which is not possible without a crew to man it. The tone of the message — "Wishing to provoke no one nor to make trouble, we

will release this ship" — finishes off the Administration's public so-called "analysis" of the message's intent.

The White House claims to have gotten the full message by 8:15 p.m. Wednesday. Marine fighting on Koh Tang, continued for 11 hours thereafter; two bombing raids were conducted against Sihanoukville thereafter.

Crew Released: The crew was released about 8:20 p.m. EDT on a Thai fishing boat sailing under a white flag. The Administration claims first knowledge of the release at 10:30 p.m. EDT when the destroyer USS Wilson sighted the boat. Miller, however, reports that shortly after he and his crew were released "A radar reconnaissance plane flew over and wiggled its wings. We all knew we were identified." The Administration to date has refused to admit that the U.S. knew of the release shortly after 8:20 p.m.

Mainland Bombing Begins: At 10:30-10:45 p.m. the Wilson reported sighting the crew. Between 10:57 and 11:09 p.m. Wednesday night the first air strike against the airfield at Sihanoukville began — although the crew was known to be safe. At 11:14 Schlesinger reported that the full crew was aboard, safe, accounted for. Two minutes later, the Administration reports, Ford ordered an end to all offensive operations and withdrawal from Koh Tang. And at 11:50 p.m. — 35 minutes after the crew was in U.S. hands — came a second air strike against Sihanoukville. During the fighting on Koh Tang the U.S. dropped the largest conventional bomb in its arsenal—15,000 pounds — on the island.

Schlesinger and Kissinger subsequently attempted to distort the chronology of events to account for the two heavy air strikes against Sihanoukville by implying that the air strikes caused the release. However, even as reported in the Rockefeller-controlled press, the crew had been identified from the Wilson before the first of the two above-mentioned bombings.

Schlesinger, Thursday, May 15: (The crew) arrived at the Wilson as a result of what is presumed to be the decision of the Cambodians to deliver them in order to terminate combat activities directed primarily at the mainland."

Kissinger (Thursday, May 15) : "There seems to have been some relationship between the release of the crew and the attacks on the mainland. That is to say, some crew members were told that they should tell the Wilson that they were being released on the assumption that this would end the bombing attacks."

Either (a) Schlesinger and Kissinger are lying to imply that the release of the crew was brought about by bombing documented to have occurred after the release; or (b) there were earlier air strikes — so far entirely blacked out by the Administration and in the press — before the two strike reported. Cambodia has charged that there were earlier air attacks.

Marines Sacrificed: At 12:31 a.m. EDT Thursday May 15, Ford announced that lift-off of the Marines from Koh Tang was about to begin. Not until 7:13 a.m.

did it begin. During the prolonged fighting on Koh Tang an estimated 21 Marines were killed and 70-80 wounded. Miller reports seeing five or six dead Marines on board the Wilson. About 16 were killed as helicopters crashed into the sea. These relatively enormous casualties were sustained by men sent to fight to "rescue" a crew which was known not to be on Koh Tang. The Marines were sent in in haste: without proper air cover, insufficient helicopters, without prior "softening up" bombardment of Koh Tang. At least 21 Marines were sacrificed — sent in to be slaughtered — and an unknown number of Cambodians, in order to ensure the Rockefeller forces their planned provocation and test-run.

The evidence shows: (1) the Rockefeller faction created the incident; (2) planned military action from the outset; (3) proceeded with military action despite the release of the Mayaguez and crew; (4) proceeded with military action entirely unrelated to the supposed objective of "rescue."

The two-day "crisis" prepared by Schlesinger and Kissinger included four National Security Council meetings, invasion of Cambodian territory, use of the largest U.S. non-nuclear bomb, and heavy loss of life. It resulted in subjugation and terrorization of Congress (see Part III) and immeasurably increased the Rockefeller forces' freedom to maneuver the United States into nuclear confrontation against the Soviet Union.

Part III. Congressional Response

On Monday May 12, the government of the Soviet Union took a nearly unprecedented step in "open diplomacy." The Soviets' "Open Call" for international economic development and disarmament, which was issued by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, the Supreme Soviet of the Presidium and the Soviet government on May 9, was hand-delivered to Speaker of the House Carl Albert and President of the Senate Nelson Rockefeller, along with a communication from Premier Kosygin asking for the response of the United States government to the initiative. Representatives of the Soviet embassy also delivered the "Open Call" and the telegram to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee. Journalists from TASS followed up with calls to key members of Congress asking for their reaction to the Soviet initiative. The message was unmistakably clear—the Soviet government, recognizing the threat of nuclear war provoked by the Rockefeller faction's intention to prop up their disintegrating economic order, was moving decisively to offer minimally sane factions of the U.S. government a basis for opposing Rockefeller.

The Soviet move intersected with and implicitly supported the organizing drive of the U.S. Labor Party on Capitol Hill which over a period of weeks has

demanding that the Congress act on two proposals:

1) the establishment of an International Development Bank which would preempt the June 30 international economic collapse and disintegration of production.

2) open a "Great Debate" on United States strategic doctrine which would culminate in the removal from the government of the advocates of the so-called Schlesinger doctrine (variously identified as "counterforce," "tactical," or "limited nuclear warfare" or NATO document MC 14/4") before its ongoing activation leads to the total annihilation of the human race.

Factional opposition within the Congress was beginning to coalesce. In the preceding weeks both Senators Thomas McIntyre (D-NH) and George McGovern (D-SD) had made speeches strongly attacking the Schlesinger doctrine, for placing a "hair trigger on nuclear war." A group of Senators loosely including McIntyre, McGovern, Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill), Edward Kennedy (D-Mass), Gary Hart (D-Colo) and others was preparing to attack the counterforce doctrine—first, in the context of the defense appropriations bill debate (to be held during the week of May 18), and with a call for open debate on overall United States strategic doctrine (to be held in three or four weeks). A similar group led by Rep. Robert Leggett (D-Cal) was operating in the House of Representatives.

The limitation of this incipient factional opposition was severe (both in allowing the debate to be defined in the context of future appropriations for tactical nuclear weapons, when in fact, the tactical nuclear warfare doctrine is already operational; and in holding off on open strategic debate for a critical three or four weeks). However, the Soviet initiative on May 12 threatened to force this Congressional opposition immediately into the open and push it onto the appropriate factional footing.

On Monday May 12, within that explosive potentially factional atmosphere, the Mayaguez hoax exploded. The hoax was explicitly aimed at destroying that potential opposition and at turning the United States Congress into Rockefeller's doormat. Congress responded totally according to its psychological profile and disintegrated. On the pretext of the most outrageous dirty tricks operation in post-war history, Congress stood either mute or approvingly as the Administration tore up the War Powers Act and the Case-Church Amendment (as documented in the preceding section of this brief). The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including such formerly outspoken doves as Senators McGovern, Church (D-Ida), and Mansfield (D-Minn) voted unanimously to uphold the Administration's blatantly illegal actions. Senator Clifford Case (R-NJ), co-author of the Case-Church Amendment prohibiting the use of force in Indochina without Congressional approval, openly condoned the emasculation of his own amendment at a

May 14 press conference. When asked by IPS, "Does that mean you don't give a damn about the constitution or your amendment?" Case retorted, "Put it anyway you like."

In the face of this complete capitulation to the Administration's use of a "blank check" in the use of military power anywhere in the world, the potential factional advocates of a great debate on strategic doctrine were driven into hiding. Those advocates were now openly organizing to postpone the debate until early in June so that they "could mobilize their forces," which had just been rolled over by the Administration steamroller. An aide reported that the Senators felt it would be "counterproductive" to call for the resignation of Secretary of State and madman Kissinger at this time and that the Senators wanted no publicity for their upcoming call for an open debate because they were "very frightened." The leading spokesmen of the anti-Schlesinger faction, Senator McIntyre and Representative Leggett, retreated to fight on the defensive, limited issue of appropriations for tactical nuclear weapons.

The Rockefeller Administration accomplished this successful pacification of Congress by isolating Congressmen within a controlled environment of terror and war-mongering and by forcing them to capitulate to the same RAND print-out to which they had capitulated during the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin incident. Rockefeller was aided massively in this operation by the press, by Congressional allies, and by agents operating within Congress in the guise of aides and "Common Cause" lobbyists.

The essential element of Rockefeller's psychological manipulation is forcing the legislator to function within a strictly controlled, shrunken, unreal world. Congressmen were suddenly yanked away from considering the crucial, world-historic issues put forth by the Soviet Union's call and by the U.S. Labor Party's proposed legislation, into a "deja vu" fantasy world of a fabricated Gulf of Tonkin crisis. Congressmen were isolated from any information on the incident, from each other, and, most importantly, from the growing rage of the population at Rockefeller's brinkmanship.

The press and the Administration worked hand in hand in a "black propaganda" operation to intensify the Congressmen's sense of impotence and isolation. Throughout the three day period, the press presented a picture of overwhelming Congressional support for the Administration's moves. The remarks of Rockefeller allies such as Senators James Buckley (CONY), Hugh Scott (R-Pa), Jake Javits (R-NY) and others, which advocated the use of force, were played up prominently throughout the media. Remarks opposing the use of force were significantly downplayed or ignored. Senator McGovern, when asked why he hadn't publicly raised an outcry over the Administration's actions early during the week, shrugged his shoulders and responded, "Well, you know that the

press wouldn't report it."

The most vicious fabrication came mid-day Wednesday after the Pentagon announced the use of United States military forces to sink three Cambodian patrol boats the night before. Presidential Press Secretary Ron Nessen stated that the Administration had briefed Speaker of the House Carl Albert and Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield prior to the military attack and had attained the "firm agreement of both." Shortly thereafter, Mansfield angrily reported to the press, "I was not consulted, nor was I briefed either before or after the attack. I did not give my approval. There are a lot of unanswered questions." Albert's office responded in kind. Nonetheless, the press either ignored the Mansfield-Albert denial or only touched on it briefly—and continued to report that the President had the "overwhelming" support of Congress.

In addition to the "black propaganda" operation straight from World War II OSS manuals, overt arm-twisting was brought into play. Immediately after issuing the above mentioned denials, both Mansfield and Albert were yanked over to the White House to be whipped into line. Several hours later, Mansfield voted with the rest of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to support the President's actions.

Other closed door brow-beating sessions occurred throughout the three-day period. Probably the first took place a few hours after the first "emergency" National Security Council meeting adjourned on Monday May 12. An unidentified high-ranking Administration figure, flanked by secret service men, (possibly Rockefeller himself), conducted a heavily guarded meeting with Congressmen in the Rayburn House Office Building and laid down Rockefeller's marching orders to Congress.

At the same time, Rockefeller's personal arm-twisting and extortion service—John Gardner's Common

Cause Organization—was deployed heavily onto Capitol Hill to practice its usual thuggery. From the frightened and hysterical responses of Congressmen when confronted, especially in public, by U.S. Labor Party Washington organizers, it is clear the Gardner's covert agents were supplemented by overt CIA agents who ordered Congressmen to steer clear of the Labor Party and the Soviet Union's proposals.

When handed a packet of USLP material containing the Soviet proposals, Senator Kennedy immediately sought out the nearest security guard and obediently turned in the packet. Big Brother was watching.

The final nail in the coffin of the dying Congress was provided by Congressional aides (over 100 of whom come directly from a Rockefeller-funded internship program) who deliberately misrepresented the mood of their constituencies to Congressmen. While over 50,000 workers have been directly mobilized against Rockefeller's nuclear policies by the U.S. Labor Party in the first four days since the Congressional collapse on May 14, most Congressmen feel that their constituencies are far to the right of their own timid protestations.

A few Congressmen are now, five days after the fact, beginning to demand an investigation into and accounting of the Mayaguez affair. Such actions are according to the RAND computer print-out — to fixate Congress on an endless, useless, impotent post-mortem while Rockefeller faction races ahead with its plans to provoke a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union in another part of the world. The issue is not the Mayaguez affair, the issue is not the War Powers Act, the issue is not defense appropriations for tactical nuclear warfare.

The only issue facing Congress and the human race is the immediate removal of the Rockefeller clique from the government.