The original documents are located in Box 14, folder "Mayaguez - Media Interviews" of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

MAY 16, 1975

Mayaguan 1

INTERVIEW OF PRESIDENT FORD

.

HUGH SIDEY

by

ïó

MR. SIDEY: This is just kind of a personal look at your thinking in the crisis, Mr. President. Did this come as a surprise to you, Mr. President, had you expected this sort of incident?

THE PRESIDENT: I never expected this kind of an incident. We thought and I certainly thought that Cambodia was out of the picture now and so I was greatly surprised that Monday morning at 7:40 or 7:45 when I got my CIA briefing and they announced that an American merchant ship had been seized. It was just something that didn't occur to me.

MR. SIDEY: Was your initial response, your first feeling that something had to be done?

THE PRESIDENT: My first response was that I knew.

I would be seeing Henry, I think, at 9:15 that morning and that is where we usually talk over any operational problems and so when he came in that morning, we discussed the situation.

I asked for a full report and then we had an NSC meeting at noon that day, as I recollect. As a result of that conversation with Henry, I ordered an NSC meeting at noon that

day.

MR. SIDEY: When did you begin to get the sense?

THE PRESIDENT: The real sense of some potential development that might require a major decision came at the NSC meeting at noontime.

MR. SIDEY: What in general has been your feeling about that sort of thing over the years, about a show of U.S. force and the necessity to assert yourself in a time like that?

THE PRESIDENT: I have always been on the side of stronger action rather than weaker action and I think my comments, for example, during the early stages of the Vietnam war reflect that. That is not a comparable situation, but it is a reflection of my general attitude.

In this case, I made no decision because we had to get the availability of military equipment, hardware, ships; where they were, what they could do. Of course, at that NSC meeting we made the decision to send a note to the Cambodian government through the PRC Office here and through the liaison office in Peking with George Bush having it delivered to the Cambodian embassy in Peking.

But at that NSC meeting, things started to go through my mind. It could be serious. It might require some very direct action in a variety of ways.

MR. SIDEY: What worried you most?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, to attack the boats.

WOICE: There was an NSC meeting at 10:30 that morning, which is where the decision to attack the boats was made.

THE PRESIDENT: That is right.

VOICE: But the actual attack didn't start until 6:30 in the evening.

THE PRESIDENT: You see, we had that NSC meeting at 10:30 that morning which is darkness there. We had information from our observation aircraft that there were boats around the island. I guess they might have even been observed during the daytime. But we still had them under observation at night.

We didn't know at that time whether the people were on the ship or on the island or whether they would be moved from either the ship or the island to the mainland. So I issued an order that we should prevent enemy boats or launches to either leave the island, the ship to go to the mainland or to come from the mainland to the ship or the island.

The aircraft that were over the area were able to keep pretty darned good track of the ships, the boats. I think we sank three, damaged four, and one got away.

VOICE: That pilot thought he saw some people on the deck that he wasn't entirely sure about, so rather than risk hitting any Americans.

. 7

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, to attack the boats.

WOICE: There was an NSC meeting at 10:30 that morning, which is where the decision to attack the boats was made.

THE PRESIDENT: That is right.

VOICE: But the actual attack didn't start until 6:30 in the evening.

THE PRESIDENT: You see, we had that NSC meeting at 10:30 that morning which is darkness there. We had information from our observation aircraft that there were boats around the island. I guess they might have even been observed during the daytime. But we still had them under observation at night.

We didn't know at that time whether the people were on the ship or on the island or whether they would be moved from either the ship or the island to the mainland. So I issued an order that we should prevent enemy boats or launches to either leave the island, the ship to go to the mainland or to come from the mainland to the ship or the island.

The aircraft that were over the area were able to keep pretty darned good track of the ships, the boats. I think we sank three, damaged four, and one got away.

VOICE: That pilot thought he saw some people on the deck that he wasn't entirely sure about, so rather than risk hitting any Americans.

MR. SIDEY: That may have been the one.

THE PRESIDENT: It may have been the one that got our people. He called back for instructions and we discussed it.

MR. SIDEY: You must have had incredible communications.

THE PRESIDENT: Pretty good.

.17

MR. SIDEY: I mean it could come from the Pentagon right over here.

THE PRESIDENT: Right, and we made the decision.

In fact, General Jones -- or was it Brant -- one of them went out and actually told them to tell the pilot to not attack the boat if he questioned the possibility that those he saw on the deck were Americans. He had reported to us that he thought he saw eight or nine individuals that looked like Caucasians

MR. SIDEY: This was your feeling not to jeopardize any lives.

THE PRESIDENT: Right.

So he did let them go and that may be those Americans, some on the deck, some down below and when that ship gets in we will know. That will be an interesting question.

MR. SIDEY: What was the toughest one of these orders and decisions you had to make?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the toughest one was whether in the course of the operation we should have air attacks on

the land-based areas at Kompong Som and at Ream. But that decision became easy the more information we got as to the military equipment that was there.

The question was, they had options and a recommendation to land on the D.E. with 63 personnel and then have them come alongside the ship and they would board. We had 40-some Marines plus an interpreter plus personnel who were capable of manning the ship in case nobody was there. That was rather easy; there was no problem there.

The next question was how many Marines, at what time would go on the island and how many. That wasn't any serious problem.

The third question was whether to attack the land installations, the two naval bases and one or two airports. That became easier, but that was the hard one attfirst. When we got more intelligence information, we know they were both naval bases. We know they had airports, but we didn't know the extent of the hardware.

As we got more information, we were told there were were 2400 Cambodian troops. We were told there were a number. They weren't precise about the T-38's which of course had a capability. We had information about several other aircraft. We got pictures of the harbor and we saw in the one picture that I remember there were four of these launches on one side of the breakwater and four on the other side, which appeared

to be fast-moving or had the capability of fast movement.

MR. SIDEY: These are ships or boats?

THE PRESIDENT: Boats. I am guessing, but I would think they would be 50 to 75 feet long.

MR. SIDEY: Kind of like P.T. boats.

THE PRESIDENT: Something like that.

So at first I was a bit apprehensive about using U.S. aircraft attacking the land installations. But when we saw this equipment that was potential with the personnel that was available, I decided that it was to insure the accomplishment of the task on the island and the ship, we could not tolerate interference from the mainland and this was the way to avoid it.

days. At any time doubts or any problems?

THE PRESIDENT: What was the night, was it Tuesday night we had the NSC meeting?

VOICE: It was a late one that started about 10:45.

THE PRESIDENT: Ten-thirty, ten-forty five. I went home for dinner. I had dinner with Betty. I told her in general what the situation was. I knew by that time that I had to make some hard decisions, and that was the time when, after looking at the situation, I ordered the Navy, the Air Force and the Marines all to be prepared. We figured we had to make the execute order the next day; although there was

some feeling, not strong at all, that we might have delayed another 24 hours.

But I would say before coming over here at that :

10:30 meeting, I realized we obviously had to do something.

I came over here for ten minutes or so and then went into the

NSC meeting.

VOICE: I think it would be fair to say, too, that the Pueblo was in the back of everybody's mind throughout the whole week.

MR. SIDEY: Did you, when you got the reports on the boats that were sunk, know anything about whether our own men had been killed or not at that point?

THE PRESIDENT: No, nobody knew, and we didn't know whether people were on the ship, on the island, whether they had gotten to the mainland. I must say that I assumed -- not happily, but I assumed that we would be most fortunate if we got everybody back without loss of life.

In fact, as we saw this thing developing, and my impression of the Cambodian attitude and the possibility that our people were in the hands of the Cambodians, that we would lose some. How many, I couldn't tell.

MR. SIDEY: Mr. President, were you dead set against the notion of having them taken in as hostages and then negotiated over for months?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. That was one thing I was

absolutely going to avoid.

MR. SIDEY: The whole idea. Why are you so strong on it?

THE PRESIDENT: Because I didn't think it worked in the case of the Pueblo and we were dealing with a government that, by its recent actions, had shown a very abnormal attitude toward its own people and I could imagine how they might treat Americans.

For example, we knew, of course, after the American ship was seized that they had fired or or sought to intercept a Korean merchant ship in more or less the same trade lanes. They had seized but let go the Panamanian merchant ship and they had seized an American ship but didn't let it go, which convinced me that they were going to treat us differently than the Koreans and Panamanians which of course made me very concerned that the longer thay were in the hands of the Cambodians, the more likely they would be mistreated, killed, or used as hostages.

MR. SIDEY: Is this sort of thing piracy or related to things like that? Does this mean something very special to you, Mr. President -- the notion of what is inviolate in this world? You acted so swiftly and so clearly on this. I gather this sort of thing to you is something that is inviolate, the right to the freedom of the seas.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it is also a broader thing.

You cannot condone misdeeds, international law, and the best way to prevent them in the future is to meet head on with one that comes up first.

MR. SIDEY: Do you think this will have some of that effect?

THE PRESIDENT: It better. It ought to be a very clear signal, Hugh, that we are going to act with responsible caution but firm action.

MR. SIDEY: What about the mild criticism about you didn't consult with Congress; you told them rather than asked them.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is all dependent on how you interpret the word "consult". Our interpretation was that it required full notification, which we did.

MR. SIDEY: You have no real criticism or anything by any responsible leaders?

THE PRESIDENT: There were some questions asked at that meeting by the leadership, but in the right tone, Hugh, and my answer was to a very direct question -- I don't want to identify to you which -- I said under our Constitution, we have an Executive, a Legislative and a Judicial Branch and the head of the Executive Branch is Commander-in-Chief and I had to act in that capacity.

We did carry out the law as we understand it in our relationship with the Legislative Branch. But the

Constitution is very clear as to who is Commander-in-Chief, and I had to take the risk and make the decision and I don't want to destroy that co-equal branch relationship.

MR. SIDEY: There is one other question about why you didn't call off that air strike. That is debated in the papers.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you mean the air strike on the mainland?

MR. SIDEY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: After we had gotten the men?

MR. SIDEY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is very simple. Our Marines on the island were still under attack and the Marines deserve, as long as they were carrying out their mission and were being attacked by the enemy that we do anything and everything to protect their lives.

VOICE: The statement that was sent out that night said that we would cease offensive operations as soon as the men were released, and it was confirmed at 11:15 that they were released. At 11:16, the order went to stop offensive operations and from then on, the rest of it was trying to get them off and there were no further offensive operations. We were just trying to get the Marines off.

MR. SIDEY: What is the best moment?

THE PRESIDENT: There were two of them. I was

sitting here and people were sitting around, and Jim Schlesinger

called and said a launch or some kind of a boat had just come

toward, I guess, our ship. It must have been; it wasn't the

island, with a white flag or a white piece of something and

it turned out there were, according to him, 30 unharmed

American crewmen.

We certainly didn't anticipate that kind of a conclusion. Well, there were still nine or ten left, and he called back roughly 15 minutes later and said we got them all back. That was, of course, was the highlight.

MR. SIDEY: What precautions will there be in the future, Mr. President, anything more that will be done in that part of the world?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, one thing, we have got to accelerate notification to us, now that we know this kind of thing does happen, when other ships are stopped on the high seas.

It was known and notification did go out in commercial channels, but at least I didn't know that it was being done. I think we have got to include that in some of our background information and action. But I don't know of anything else. I think the military people all handled their jobs in a very able and very courageous way.

I have asked for, however, a full review of the total sequence, the chronology, just to review to see whether

we did everything the best way. After looking at that, I 2

will be in a better ---

MR. SIDEY: Might it require some change in the presence of our ships in those waters?

THE PRESIDENT: It could.

MR. SIDEY: You don't know, you are going to wait?

THE PRESIDENT: Very much off the record. We found that -- and again, I want to get to the inside, the full story -- that some of our equipment on the ships was not as hundred percent as it ought to be, and I think that it is a true reflection of not enough money to maintain our operations and maintenance capabilities.

We had one ship, one of its four boilers broke, and some other little things. But they are all indicative of inadequate funding, inadequate attention to maintenance and operation. In this case, it didn't interfere, but it slowed down one ship getting there.

MR. SIDEY: Did you yourself issue the command, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: I issued the order to prevent boats going in and out from the island. That was the first order. The second order I issued was to have the Marines, the ships and the Air Force ready to go. This was an order issued at that night meeting on Tuesday. In other words, everybody was to be put on one hour's notice. Then I issued the order

6 7

3

4

5

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

- 16

17

- 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

Wednesday afternoon when we were in here with charts and everything. 2 MR. SIDEY: To go ahead with the final operation. 3 So you are really in pretty direct command here. THE PRESIDENT: I issued the orders in all three 5 cases. MR. SIDEY: Were you worried about the military size 7 the force, the matter, how much power it had, did you get down into details like that? THE PRESIDENT: Well, I sure asked the question 10 whether we had enough. 11 MR. SIDEY: That was your concern. Were there other 12 plans, Mr. President, in case the men were killed or it hadn't been successful like this? 14 THE PRESIDENT: Well, we had some one or more other 15 options, but we thought those were so remote that they really weren't anything we thought we would have to do. 17. MR. SIDEY: Is this the toughest one you have had 18 of this nature? 19 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 20 MR. SIDEY: I mean the most open and shut, I guess. . 21 THE PRESIDENT: Well, you could talk about 22 Vladivostok, but that is negotiature. This one, you had to 23 either fish or cut bait. 24 MR. SIDEY: The range of options is so great, you 25

had to decide in your mind which way to go.

I am under the impression the NSC structure worked beautifully. I feel that your Generals -- you brought the leaders in, you had the CIA there -- am I missing something?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I would say it got very good. When we first started out, maybe that is indicative that the problem didn't seem too big. But the first meeting was sort of exploratory, Hugh. From that first exploratory meeting, yes, it did work very well. The first meeting was where is the ship, what are the circumstances, what broad alternatives do you have.

So I wouldn't be critical of that, but when we got down to the execution, it worked well.

MR. SIDEY: Were there any special personal messages sent that we are unaware of to the Soviet Union?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

MR. SIDEY: China?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

MR. SIDEY: No hot lines. It was pretty much worked out on a ---

THE PRESIDENT: Straightforward diplomatic.

MR. SIDEY: Any general observations about your feeling? Did you get overtired, or did you pace yourself?

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't get overly tired because the excitement sort of generated the necessary energy.

Wednesday night after the dinner, and we came back here, that is the night it all culminated, of course. We left here around one o'clock. Well, I went by the doctor's office and he gave me a little pill. I didn't ask him what it was and I set my alarm to get up at 5:30 the next morning and at 7:00 Betty is waking me up and saying "I just looked at your schedule. You are supposed to be over at the Oval Office at 7:40" and I said "What time is it" and she said "It is 7:00". So I think the doc sort of gave me a pill to relax me. .

MR. SIDEY: Mr. President, this matter of command which is pretty direct and I think a new experience to you. -- were you able to do it without Brown and Kissinger in town?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, yes. We laid out the preparatory meetings and decisions, although I did talk to Henry when he was in Kansas City and St. Louis, And then of course, we delayed the meeting on Tuesday night for two reasons. We wanted to get as far down the road before we had to make some decisions and then Henry got back at that time.

We originally set it for 9:00 as I recall, and then it was moved to 10:30 because Henry was getting back and it gave us more time and more daylight to make it.

MR. SIDEY: For your information and intelligence pictures, was that (unintelligible) you saw?

THE PRESIDENT: I thought the intelligence community did as well as they could under most difficult circumstances.

It is hard to see, certainly at night, if they move people from a ship to an island or from an island to the land.

MR. SIDEY: That was the big uncertainty, wasn't it?

THE PRESIDENT: That was a very substantial

uncertainty.

VOICE: One of the first big breaks was, I guess,
Monday night when it was first discovered that the ship had no
gone into Kompong Som. Monday night our time would have been
just the beginning of daylight their time. It was discovered
not in port. It kind of opened up a whole range of things.

THE PRESIDENT: At first we knew they had begun to move it and there was a question that first, whether they were going to take it into Kompong Som.totally, but they stopped by this island roughly halfway in, which was surprising to us. One of the first decisions we made was, and this was aborted by the fact they stopped at the island, that we were going to try to head it off by aircraft, but they stopped at the island so that order was aborted.

MR. SIDEY: Mr. President, it was good going, I must say.

mayaquez file

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ARC NEWS RADIC AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC NEWS: ISSUES AND ANSWERS."

ISSUES AND ANSVERS

SUNDAY, MAY 18, 1975

GUEST:

JAMES SCHLESINGER - The Secretary of Defense

INTERVIEWED BY:

Bot Clark - Issues and Answers Chief Correspondent Frank Tomlinson - ABC News Pentagon Correspondent

HIGHLIGHTS

New casualty figures on the Mayaguez incident released by Secretary of Defense Schlesinger are higher than previously announced.

Five dead - three Marines, 2 airmen.

Sixteen unaccounted for.

Seventy to eighty wounded.

This is a rush transcript for the press. Any questions regarding accuracy should be referred to ISSUES AND ANSWERS

* * *



THE ANNOUNCER: Our guest today on ISSUES AND ANSWERS is

James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense. Secretary Schlesinger

here are the issues:

Did the rescue of the Mayaguez hurt or help the United States in Asia?

Should we recognize the Communist Governments of Cambodia and Vietnam to lessen the danger of future incidents?

MR. CLARK: Our guest today is the Secretary of Defense,
James Schlesinger, and with me to interview the Secretary is

Will Thailand be the next domino to fall to the Communists?

ABC News Pengaton Correspondent, Frank Tomlinson.

Mr. Secretary, one of the problems is that we tried to find some diplomatic solution to the Mayaguez incident, was our total inability to communicate with the Cambodians.

As we look ahead now, and try to figure out ways to avoid such incidents in the future, would you favor recognizing the Communist Governments of Cambodia and Vietnam?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Well, I think that I would have to withhold judgment on that. That is an issue that will have to be reviewed very carefully by the Department of State.

I think that one should stress that with regard to communications that the Cambodian Government expelled two million people from its capital city. It is difficult at best even for those prepared to recognize the Cambodian Government, to communicate with it. So there are difficulties

S

E

that are inherent, as well as the difficulties that you cite.

MR. CLARK: And our efforts to work through the Chinese just failed totally; as the story was told by the White House, we tried to deliver a letter to the Cambodians through the Chinese Embassy and they simply and rather inscrutibly gather returned the unopened letter the next day.

Do you know any more about that or any more about other attempts that were made to work through the Chinese?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: No, I think that was the principal attempt. What may have been conveyed by the Chinese in other directions is a matter of speculation, but they did return the letter that had been delivered.

MR. TOMLINSON: Mr. Secretary, there has been some concern about the bombing of the Rean Airfield and the petroleum and the oil and lubricants storage area near Kompong Som after the crew had already boarded the destroyer Wilson, there had been some complaints that we were trying to teach the Cambodians a lesson that this wasn't really necessary. Could you expand on why we carried out these bombings?

Secretary Schlesinger: The bombings were associated with the effort to recover the vessel and the Marine landings on the island. If my recollection is correct, that the attack on Rean Airfield came before the recovery of the crew, the subsequent wave occurred after the attack. When we

ţ

5 1

started we had planned for the possibility of cyclic aircraft operations, as long as they were necessary. We did terminate the fourth wave and in all some 15 TAC air sorties were directed against the mainland, 15, and expended ordnance. Now, this I might compare with the period before the summer of 1973 when were running a thousand approximately B-52 sorties amonth thousand and several/TAC air sorties. This was a very prudent, limited use of force. The motivation was clearly to protect the Marines on the Island. The Marines were still engaged on the island; whether or not there is criticism in the United States, it is plain that the 200 Marines who were engaged on the island were not at all critical of the United States continuing to provide the support that was deemed necessary.

MR. TOMLINSON: Mr. Secretary, there is also I believe now some discrepancies on the number of casualties that we had. The Pentagon, I believe, is sticking with one Marine killed, 13 men missing, I think ten Marines and three Air Force men, and 22 wounded.

The Captain of the Mayaguez now says that when they boarded the Wilson that there were seven Marines who had been killed on board the Wilson already when they got on theme.

Do you have anything to add to what our casualties were?

may have been in error, was in error, that those probably referred to wounded Marines rather than Marines who had been

17

循纸

13

20

3

22

23

2.3

killed. The numbers are a little bit higher than was initially released. As a result of the reassessment of the MIAs, the wounded and the KIAs, I think the current indication is something like three Marines and two airmen were killed.

MR. TOMLINSON: In other words, a total of five men?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: But once again, we have to be very careful. This is a complex operation, but that is the general indication.

MR. CLARK: Is there any change in the number of those unaccounted for?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: The number wounded is between 70 and 80. I do not recall. This includes all sorts of minor wounds. I think that that number is essentially intact.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Secretary, those figures are substantially higher than the ones announced originally. Why the delay in getting the correct tally?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Well, we indicated at the time that we were withdrawing from the island that initially there had been a number of choppers that had been downed, that we were running a muster on board the ships in order to assess what had been the damage.

We attempted to get out the results as they became clear, after notification of next of kin.

MR. CLARK: As it turned out, of course, the crew of the Mayagues, the members of the crew were not on the island of

Khotang where the Marines landed. Does the degree of the faulty intelligence in that operation bother you? Wasn't that a rather large error for somebody to make?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: No, I don't believe that any error in fact was made. What we knew was that the crew had been moved to Khotang and we did not know whether or not the crew in its entirety or even in part had been removed from the island. We therefore felt it essential to seize the island before any further movement might -- opportunity for movement occurred for the crew.

Now, we had had a report on late Tuesday evening, I believe, that the time of the movement of one ship, one small boat, from the island towards the mainland and the pilot indicated he believed there were Caucasians aboard. We made every effort to stop that ship by firing ahead and to the rear of the ship. We used riot control agents, but, because of the observation that there might be Caucasians aboard, that vessel was not attacked directly. That was a very fortunate decision.

We did not at that time know whether there were any Americans on board that ship or what the number was, but apparently that was the ship that did escape from the island. We wanted to take whatever actions we could in a situation of considerable uncertainty, to give as high a chance as we could for the survival of the crew members and their return.

E.P.

-3

Z

(a)

ವಿ

(O

1 3

ð 3

MR. TOMLINSON: Mr. Secretary, I understand that the first word coming from the United States on the Mayaguez capture was picked up in Jakarta by an American employee of company there. Is that what happened, was it picked up in Jakarta and then relayed to an embassy in some way, and how long did it take the Administration to start making a move on this?

Monday morning and it was in the way that you indicated, through Jakarta and through the commercial firm.

The actions began to take shape Monday, later in the day, as we began to assess the availability of force, if that should be needed. The first thing that was done, of course was for the President to demand the immediate release of the vessel and an indication that the responsibility would rest with the Cambodian authorities if they failed to make immediate release. The actual movement against the vessel and against the island came more than 48 hours later, which is I believe the traditional diplomatic time that elapses under those circumstances.

MR. TOMLINSON: Why did it take so long to get out a warning to marioners? We had had a Panamanian ship stopped and I understand a Korean ship had been fired on by the Camvodians, and still there was no warning to mariners until after the Mayaguez was captured. Then they

sent out a message saying "Stay 20 miles away from Vietnam, 35 miles away from Cambodia."

3

á,

8

1

£.

Š

340

11

第章

3

2 5

. 5

16

8.4

18

8

20

29

22

23

22

25

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: I think the kind of warnings you refer to are primarily warnings of insurance companies. The kind of major warning of emergency has been issued about 45 times since the days of John Paul Jones, and that does not occur very frequently.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Secretary, the protests from the
Thai government about the Marines that we first
landed there for use in the operations have been considerably
stronger than was first anticipated in Washington. They
are still demanding a formal apology. There was a demonstration by several thousand Thai students in Bangkok
yesterday outside the American embassy where they
ripped the seal off the embassy. How seriously do you
regard these protests?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Well, I hope that the protests will die down. I think that Dr. Kissinger indicated the other day at his press conference that in the past there has been assumed to be a wider latitude in the use of those bases. If this has caused any embarrassment to the Thai government, then we would regret that embarrassment. It was I think necessary for us to take the actions that we did take and we awaited the arrival of the Coral Sea to provide much of the force, as well as the Holt and the Free.

Wilson.

ø

翁

\$ 3

7.5

MR. CLARK: If you had it to do all over again, would you still send those Marines first into Thailand or if you knew it was going to stir usuch a ruckus there, would you have done it in some other way?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Well, that is a leading question, but I repeat we took the response under the circumstances that was firm and judicial.

It accomplished the objective. This has been -- including an element of good fortune -- a very successful operation and I would not change it.

MR. CLARK: But has it been successful diplomatically, and that would seem to be the danger now and again the Thais protest being louder than they expected. They seemed to have been much more upset than we expected. Could that have been a spinoff in putting greater strain on our relations with Thailand, our only remaining ally in Southeast Asia? And relations with other Asian countries.

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER. I would hope ultimately it would not have a spinoff. I think the main thing is the United States must take action to defend the right of innocent passage, to defend the right of freedom of the seas, and that the actions that were taken were judicial. I do not think, given the direct circumstances, that the

United States could have reacted otherwise. We took an action that was firm and it was also right, so I have no regrets about it.

(Announcements)

* * * * * * *

MR. CLARK: Mr. Secretary, just one more question about Thailand. We have had some 25,000 American troops in Thailand, mainly airmen. We have already agreed with the Thais to begin pulling them out on a timetable that would have them all out by next March. If now, because of the strong feelings of the Thais over this incident, they ask us to pull our troops out more quickly than that, would we do it?

any agreements that we make with the Thai government. We had close to 40,000 men in Thailand. We had withdrawn about 13,000. We are going to reduce substantially, had planned to reduce substandially by the end of this fiscal year. There may be some adjustment of the pace of withdrawal, but ultimately I think that we have to talk very carefully with the Thai government to see indeed just what the pace should be.

1.2

8

73

.

1

30

?

5

10

3 6

. 0

13

14

ូទូ

17

13

5

.C

er . #

23

2.0

-

£,

ř

MR. TOMLINSON: Mr. Secretary, I remember at 3:30 in the morning everyone bleary-eyed, that you had held a news conference and you said, I believe, that the lessons learned from the Mayaguez incident were salutary.

Has this message gotten through and specifically in the northern part of Asia, to Korea, what happens if the Koreans should start something? How will the United States react to that?

emphasize, and I cannot recall what I said at 3:30 a.m., that morning, that the action that we took was the right action. Firmness in the right, as Lincoln would say, and we had to do it that way, and I think that under those circumstances the consequences are likely to be salutary, but the motivation for the action was to assure that this vessel and the crew was indeed returned to the United States.

firmly and it dispels any illusions about America in the post-Vietnam period, it is healthy, and I think that they will consequently bring others to recognize that our commitments elsewhere will be observed.

I doubt whether the North Koreans are in a position to challenge what is a mutual defense treaty between the Republic of Korea and the United States. I would think they would be very hesitant to do so.

.

€,

Ţ

9 9

e K

MR. TOMLINSON: If they did though, in a hypothetical situation, would we look at Korea as another Vietnam and go in and stand in one area for ten years or would we strike back with some force and quite frankly hit them hard?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: I think one of the lessons of the Vietnamese War is that ancillary military operations, not directed against any fixed military objective, such as destroying the heart of enemy power, his military forces, is likely to be ineffective, if the opponent has will and determination to persist, and that may be a lesson that we will draw, and I would hesitate if I were some other power to test whether that is the lesson that we have drawn.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Secretary, there seems to me to be an implication in that, if there were aggression by the North Koreans against South Korea, we would react with overwhelming power and that would have to be air power, would it not?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: I did not say that we would react with overwhelming power. What I said was a lesson that could be learned from Vietnam --

MR. CLARK: Ineffective not to meet --

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: That we go against the military power of the opponent and that we not simply spend our time parrying their offensive operations. Now, whether this is overwhelming power immediately, what the precise reaction of the United States would be, I do not -- I cannot at this

Ē

ð

time state, but I would emphasize that it is necessary for us to recognize and the North Koreans to recognize that the United States is bound by a mutual defense treaty to South Korea.

MR. CLARK: Well, Mr. Secretary, we have something like 38,000 troops in South Korea. I think the American people, after the experience of Vietnan, would really be appalled at the idea of getting involved in another land war in Asia. As a practical matter, if you are going to respond with full force against an attack from North Korea, aren't you talking about very heavy bombing even beyond the extent of the bombing we engaged in in Vietnam?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: I think that is an option to be considered. I would hesitate to say now what we would do under the drcumstances. The heart of deterrence is to maintain uncertainty about the specific actions or maintaining certainty about our commitments.

MR. CLA RK: Well, one or the other options obviously would be to beef up those 38,000 American troops but there you would run head-on into opposition from both the Congress and the American people. Would you not --

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Oh, I think so and I think one must recognize that we have been reducing our forces in Korea. In 1969 we had 60,000 troops. We have removed one division. The number of men is the lowest that it has been since the time of the war and represents an American presence,

The state of the s

e Ag

Ť

9

3

eg:

Ø.

\$ 10

19

13. A

6&

8

16

97

18

19

23

22

24

23

25

an American commitment but as far as a smaller number of men than previously.

MR. CLARK: But we are then also reducing our options, are we not, to the point where the option would be heavy use of air power?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: One must remember that the South Koreans maintain a very formidable military establishment, and what would be required under the circumstances remains to be seen, but what would be done by the United States would be what would be required under the circumstances.

MR. TOMLINSON: Mr. Secretary, what has been the reaction that you have received from the American people? The White House seems to have gotten a lot of letters and telegrams praising the action of the Americans. What about you? Have you received any particular communique from the people of America on what the military did?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: I think that the reaction is one of universal acclaim. I was in South Carolina yesterday and there was unstinted praise for the performance of the American forces as well as for the decisions and American policy.

There have been some questions that were raised, particularly initially, about the measure of force, the type of response, but these kinds of issues will always come up.

I think these days that if manna were to fall from heavn there would be criticism if we were to accept it. Some

criticism; not very much.

MR. TOMLINSON: Well, let us, if we may here, as the time is drawing close, jump to another part of the world.

You, I believe, look at NATO as a real cornerstone and you mantioned detente. We have got some NATO meetings coming up.

Tomorrow the Senate votes on aid to Turkey.

In the time we have not given aid to Turney, how has that affected NATO?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: It has caused concern within

NATO generally, and appropriate concern. It has, of course,
adversely affected the Turkish forces because of the lack of
availability of spare parts.

There has been some decline in the readiness of those forces and therefore the military posture of NATO overall has been reduced slightly.

We would hope that we will be able to straighten out this situation. Turkey is perhaps the best example of the effectiveness of mutual security, and it is tragic that we have gotten into the situation that we have gotten into.

MR. CLARK: The word from the head counters in the Senate is that you are going to win tomorrow, that the ban on American arms aid to Turkey will be lifted. But if you don't, if you should lose that vote, would it weaken your hand as you and Secretary Kissinger and the President go off to next week's NATO meeting?

v

ij

9 1

ŧ

£ .

Î

a A

į &

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: It would not strengthen it.

MR. CLARK: And what do you -- and you and Secretary
Kissinger will be heading this week for Europe; the President
will join you there next week where all of the Prime
Ministers of NATO countries will assemble, what do you see
as the chief goal of that big NATO meeting?

Defense Ministers' meeting, in which I shall participate, our objective is to see that the force structure and the strategy of the alliance is the correct one. To continue to deter, as we have deterred for 30 years, any hostile action against Western Europe. We have made some progress in recent years with regard to force structure and strategy but we must recognize that the Warsaw Pact forces have been beefed up.

I think that the objective in the North Atlantic Council will be to achieve a reaffirmation amongst the principal members of the Alliance, all of the members of the Alliance, of the continuing need for this alliance in this period of diplomatic uncertainty.

MR. TOMLINSON: Are the European members of NATO pulling their full weight now?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Some are, some aren't. I think that we must do more and they must do more to assure that they do put up the forces that are necessary, that they are ready forces and well equipped.

There has been talk, as you know, of what is the American commitment to Europe, but there is less question of America abandoning Europe than whether the Europeans might abandon themselves through lack of effort. I think that a number of the states in Europe have increased their efforts in the past years and we are satisfied with that trend.

MR. TOMLINSON: When you say we should do more, does that mean we should send more troops to NATO?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: No, we should do more to urge them to take the actions necessary from the standpoint of the Alliance as a whole.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Secretary, while we are sending out signals to the rest of the world these days how tough we are going to stand and our credibility still exists, what would happen in the event of a new outbreak in the Middle East that has imposed an oil embargo on the United States; would we peacefully go along with the embargo as we did last time?

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Well, as I have indicated before, we might be less tolerant of such an embargo than we have been. Just precisely what measures we might take would remain for the circumstances, but I do not expect those circumstances to arise.

MR. CLARK: But in your view military action against the Arab world could still be a viable option if there were an oil embargo?

S

A.

9 1

secretary schlesinger: I think that it could be achieved but we regard that as a very improbable event in the first place and it certainly is not an option that is attractive on its face, save in desperate circumstances.

Ĉ,

Ž

Ç,

÷

83

10

9 9

32

Æ5

82

15

16

17

28

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CLARK: One more very quick question: There is confusion in this country as to what precisely our commitment is to Israel.

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: I think there is no precise commitment to Israel. We have been concerned about its survival for many years. The United States played a substantial role in its establishment and we continue to be interested in its well-being.

MR. CLARK: I am sorry we are going to have to cut you off on such a very complicated question and answer. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for being with us on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER: Delighted to be with you.