

## II. HOW THE MURPHY COMMISSION DEVELOPED

Nelson Rockefeller has been on record since the beginning of the postwar period, as an advocate of various forms of "institutional and personal realignments." (4) These were designed chiefly to provide the supranational Rockefeller forces with the kind of overall policy control they had during World War II when Nelson Rockefeller had a "blank check" for the entire Latin American continent as the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. In a 1951 report to President Truman, Rockefeller advocated the creation of "one overall agency" to supervise international affairs. (5) Rockefeller's testimony before Senator Henry Jackson's Government Operations Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations (1959-1962) advocated a superagency for foreign policy which would supersede all the other various agencies and departments. The sections of that testimony dealing, supposedly, with "organizing for National Security, Science Organization, and the President's Office," have been labeled "For Official Use Only," and remain classified material.

Rockefeller controlled such a "superagency" as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs — but only for a clearly defined, although substantial, part of the globe. The schemes for reorganizing the government presently being designed by Rockefeller's Murphy Commission are intended to ensure that total global control. Rockefeller himself does not really care whether he is President, Vice President, Assistant President, First Secretary, Coordinator, or Governor of New York State — as long as the global policies of Schachtian looting and genocide are implemented despite the desires of democratic constituencies and sovereign governments.

### Historical Background

The roots of the present Murphy Commission and Trilateral Commission designs to restructure the United States Government can be traced back to the mid-1960s when the first series of major fissures in the international monetary system appeared. The tremendous growth of corporate and government debt, combined with the stagnation in real productive wealth, threatened to explode the so-called depression-proof Bretton Woods system, potentially bringing the increasingly Rockefeller-dominated Eastern financial cabal down in a collapse.

Since that time, a select group of academics on contract to the Rockefellers, have labored to ensure Rockefeller's final success. These Rockefeller loyalists, presently the "brains" behind the Murphy Commission reorganization schemes, personally have been responsible for masterminding and manipulating the major CIA operations since the late 1960s which have allowed the Rockefeller forces the "freedom of action" necessary to develop their present Murphy Commission capabilities.

Politically incapable of moving for direct

control of the U.S. Government, and not fully cognizant of the inherent problems in their Bretton Woods system, the Rockefellers and their network — in the mid-1960s — began to formulate contingency-type plans for their future rule. Two major, interconnected decisions were made at that time by the Rockefellers and their CIA planners, regarding the domestic political "futures" market.

First, they launched a significant attempt to bring the counterinsurgency techniques of the "local control," "strategic hamlet" programs back from the Vietnam testing-ground for use against the U.S. working class population and, in particular, the U.S. ghettos.

The domestic counterinsurgency push was designed to destroy the growing potential for independent, political mass organization among workers and ghetto victims on a classwide basis. The historic development of the U.S. Labor Party as a mass-based working-class political organization during 1974 signaled the defeat of the counterinsurgency intent forcing the Rockefellers to shift in favor of the intentions of the present Murphy Commission strategy: "surgically" to separate the growing influence of this democratic constituency pressure from the government's policy and legislative "machinery."

In that context, significant "academic" resources from the CIA's university and "think-tank" network were deployed specifically to map the various political layers of government officials, both elected and non-elected, as well as organizational and bureaucratic structures of the government. Behaviorist, psycho-political studies for the U.S. sector then began in earnest, just as the CIA and RAND, for example, had "mapped" the "political elites," governments, populations, etc., throughout the world in their well-known "area studies" programs for over two decades. Increasingly, the Rockefellers viewed the U.S. sector as just another potential satrapy dominion to be "mapped," "profiled," and looted.

A series of interconnected developments in Spring 1966 strikingly bears out this analysis and makes clear the actual nature of the present Rockefeller political machinations.

Having served several years as the chief bureaucratic link between the top financiers, the CIA, and the President, McGeorge Bundy moved from the post of Special Advisor for National Security Affairs and head of the National Security Council (NSC) staff to the top position at the CIA-conduit Ford Foundation in March 1966. From that outpost, Bundy, a longtime leading member of the Rockefeller-CIA cabal, began to direct the increased allotment of vast funds to various Rockefeller "research centers," "think-tanks," and assorted domestic counterinsurgency operations of the CIA.

The Harvard-Washington-New York transmission belt for top CIA operatives swung into full gear around the Bundy move, sending younger proteges like Morton H.

Halperin from Harvard's Center for International Affairs to Washington, where he became Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense in the CIA-nest known as International Security Affairs (ISA). By his own admission (6), Halperin was sent into the bureaucracy as what he has called a "participant observer," to profile its workings and report back to various "academic" study groups. One such Halperin study group was the so-called May Group, formed at Harvard in Spring 1966, which has continued to function as the core group for the restructuring schemes currently pushed by the Murphy Commission. The key operative then was Graham Allison of Harvard's Transnational Relations Study Group, now a member of the Trilateral Commission and a consultant to the Murphy Commission. Allison, according to his secretary, has spent every day of the past six months working on the Murphy Commission. The original May Group also included William W. Kaufman and Henry Rowan of the RAND Corporation. (RAND figures prominently in the workings of the current Murphy Commission.)

The Halperin move and the May Group establishment coincided with the release of a series of articles on the CIA by the New York Times. According to former Times reporter Gay Talese in his book *The Kingdom and the Power*, the Times series was reviewed, edited, and personally approved by the just-retired Director of the CIA, John A. McCone. The series served to promote a major shake-up in the CIA-Intelligence bureaucracy at the time. (Times columnist Tom Wicker, a major figure in the current CIA scandal, was also key author of the 1966 series.)

#### **The Modus Operandi**

This is precisely the modus operandi of the Rockefeller forces. First, they plant "inside men" in the bureaucracy to provide necessary information. Then, they initiate a series of highly publicized press leaks which will create a **controlled** crisis environment, within which the Rockefeller forces can maneuver for greater control. Then, having manufactured the "crisis," the Rockefeller forces step in with a simultaneously (or previously) created study group or Commission with proposals for "solving the crisis" which they themselves engineered.

The CIA or national security is the issue with which the interlocking group of people clustered variously around the May Group, Morton Halperin, and the Murphy Commission have generated and "solved" various government crises. The 1966 escapade represented the establishment of several beachheads from which the Pentagon Papers, the ensuing Watergate scandal, and the current CIA expose were launched.

In 1967, this core group began collaboration in writing that packet of CIA-whitewash documents later known as the Pentagon Papers. Morton Halperin, still in the Defense Department/International Security Affairs, as well as the May Group, recruited his

former Harvard colleague Leslie H. Gelb, then Senator Jacob Javits' executive foreign affairs aide, to head the special task force which wrote the Papers. Gelb subsequently recruited members of Harvard's May Group to the project, including William K. Kaufman and CIA agent Richard Holbrooke (7), as well as several RAND Corporation operatives, including agent Daniel Ellsberg and Melvin Gurtov.

Rockefeller's link to the Pentagon Papers came through Henry Kissinger, who knew that the so-called Pentagon Papers were not the product of the Pentagon. He had been commissioned by Halperin and Gelb, in Summer 1967, as a "consultant" to the project task force. At that time, Kissinger was serving as a direct messenger for Nelson Rockefeller, as Rockefeller's personal staff advisor on foreign policy.

Under the guise of compiling an "historical" study of Vietnam policy-making since the early 1950s, this group continued its psychological profiling of the government bureaucracy, while writing a document which later had extreme importance for the Rockefellers.

By 1969, the Rockefeller forces apparently decided that the profiling done by Halperin and the May Group was sufficiently far advanced to facilitate an open move and they introduced the idea of an official Murphy Commission into the United States Congress. Prompted by the CIA-connected members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff, Senators Mansfield, Aiken, and Fulbright pushed for legislation to that effect. The idea was temporarily dumped, however, after running into political opposition in the House of Representatives.

Still unable to move openly for full political control, Rockefeller's May Group operatives and the inside men in the Department of Defense established themselves somewhat closer to Washington politics as a special Brookings Institution "study group." The Brookings group, formed in 1969 under the auspices of "assisting" Morton Halperin to write his recently-released book, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*, included Graham Allison of the original May Group; Robert Bowie, currently of the Trilateral Commission and on contract to the Murphy Commission; Henry D. Owen, and Philip Trezise, both "free-lance" writers for the Trilateral Commission; and Leslie H. Gelb, currently with the New York Times.

Two years into the work of this "new" Brookings group, Rockefeller activated the first phase of the final discreditation of the United States government: The Pentagon Papers were leaked to the New York Times. The leak served two immediate purposes: First, as a subtle whitewash of the CIA's own direct responsibility for planning and conducting the murderous counterinsurgency war in Vietnam, and placing much of the blame on the non-Rockefeller, Pentagon "old guard." Second, and more important, the

[Two pages missing]

within the Murphy Commission have stated that the Commission will propose reorganization recommendations along the lines of the Bolling proposal. Research is currently in progress at IPS to ascertain whether the Bolling proposal originated in Murphy Commission circles. The Murphy modus operandi indicates that this may be the case.

Although the body of the Murphy Commission report will not be released until June 1975, two specific committee reorganization plans are already known. The first would entail the establishment of a Joint Committee on CIA Oversight. In the wake of the current CIA scandal, the credibility of the standing House and Senate Armed Services Committees (which currently have CIA oversight responsibilities) has been shaken and will be further shaken if this responsibility is removed. The new CIA committee which would be firmly in Rockefeller hands may also be given broader responsibilities in foreign affairs, it has been rumored. The second reorganization would involve a considerable strengthening of the House Foreign Relations Committee, which currently has jurisdiction only over foreign affairs appropriations matters. The elevation of the House Committee to the powerful heights of the Rockefeller-dominated Senate Foreign Relations Committee would give Rockefeller a convenient propaganda organ and rubber stamp for the treaties and international agreements necessary to reduce the United States to a satrapy of the Trilateral Commission.

#### **The President and the Bureaucracy**

On the Presidential side of the subcommittee, the important input is coming from two professors connected with the Harvard Transnational Relations Study Group (an effective Trilateral Commission subcontractee). Samuel P. Huntington, as was previously mentioned, is writing the Trilateral Commission's study on the "problems of governing democracies." Huntington, working out of Harvard's Center for International Affairs, was the **seminal architect** of the murderous "strategic hamlets" program which was used in South Vietnam to "ghettoize" the countryside and, by such isolation, wipe out any and all pro-communist or anti-American sentiment. Huntington has also been a proponent and has written extensively about the need for "progressive-military" government in the Third World — a slightly outmoded formulation of "fascism with a democratic face." Graham Allison, a member of the Trilateral Commission, is the author of "The Essence of Decision: the Cuban Missile Crisis" and is apparently in charge of behaviorist psychological studies of the bureaucracy.

While Rockefeller maneuvers to hand effective governmental control to the National Security Council, the Murphy Commission is proposing the formal emasculation of the Presidency and the bureaucracy while simultaneously orchestrating the public

discrediting of the entire executive branch through the CIA expose.

On the formal side, the following proposals are reportedly going to be released by the Murphy Commission in June:

- A constitutional amendment to revise the treaty-making mechanism, an obvious and important aspect in the subordination of the United States to supranational policy.

- The curtailment of the President's ability to institute executive agreements with foreign nations.

- The curtailment of the President's national emergency powers.

Besides tinkering with the government bureaucracy, the Commission is studying how to tinker with bureaucrats. Irving L. Janis, while not officially connected to the Murphy Commission, has written a book based on earlier work done by Graham Allison which is clearly representative of one of the ways in which the Commission would like to "organize the government for the conduct of foreign policy." The book is entitled *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. In it, Janis (a veteran of the notorious British brainwashing school, the Tavistock Institute) suggests the following innovations in the bureaucracy:

- "Audio-visual aids that provide the equivalent of melodramatic background music ... multiple scenarios as a stimulant to the imagination of the members."

- "Psychodramatic role-playing exercises ... to overcome ... stereotypes and to facilitate understanding of rivals' warnings..."

- "A second-chance meeting at which every member is expected to express as vividly as he can all his residual doubts....It might not be a bad idea for the second-chance meeting to take place in a relaxed atmosphere far from the executive suites, **perhaps over drinks.**"

These methods, as has been thoroughly documented, are aspects of the coercive behaviorist methods used in brainwashing.

Brainwashed individuals, such as Wilbur Mills now definitely appears to be, cannot make policy decisions. They can only apply a rubber-stamp marked "Democratic" to the fascist policies advocated by the Trilateral Commission and made possible by the reorganization schemes of the Murphy Commission.

Or, to quote again from the Murphy Commission document:

"U.S. officials will find themselves advocating policies whose short-term effects will be the ceding of national sovereignty to international entities which alone will be able to make and monitor the necessary decisions concerning world allocation and control of populations, food, non-renewable resources, oceans and the like...This is a most unattractive environment for responsible elected officials. It may be even more unattractive for officials of foreign affairs-oriented agencies, forced steadily to advocate unpopular policies."