

123. 1977-78

Chicago Tribune

FOUNDED June 16, 1847

STANTON R. COOK, Chairman and Publisher
ROBERT M. HUNT, President

CLAYTON KIRKPATRICK, Editor
MAXWELL MCCORDON, Managing Editor

JOHN MCCUTCHEON, Editorial Page Editor
WILLIAM H. JONES, Managing Editor, News

2 Section 3

Friday, October 7, 1977

THE NEWSPAPER is an institution developed by modern civilization to present the news of the day, to foster commerce and industry, to inform and lead public opinion, and to furnish that check upon government which no constitution has ever been able to provide.

—THE TRIBUNE CREDO

If the treaty is flawed . . .

Early in the discussion of the Panama Canal treaties, before the agreement had been put into precise words, the Tribune recommended that we wait to see the fine print before deciding anything.

Since then the world has seen the fine print, but, alas, there is disagreement about what it means. For example, what about defense of the waterway? A separate treaty devotes itself to this vexing question, but the answer it provides is read differently by different people. A summary of the principal defense points issued Aug. 12 by the White House includes these fairly clear sentences:

"Under the new treaties the U.S. will be able to guarantee the security and defense of the Panama Canal."

"The U.S. will have the permanent right to defend the neutrality of the canal from any threat, for an indefinite period."

"U.S. warships will have the permanent right to defend the canal expeditiously and without conditions, for an indefinite period . . ."

Very good. We believe we understand it. But now comes Sen. Robert Dole (R., Kan.) with a confidential State Department cablegram describing "vast differences of interpretation" between the U.S. and Panama as to the key defense provisions. The Carter administration has said the treaty means we can continue to defend the canal after 1999, the time at which Panama would assume control of the waterway and by which our troops would be out of the Canal Zone.

But according to the cablegram, that is not how Carlos Lopez Guevara, a Panamanian negotiator, reads it. The U.S. should stop using the term "intervention," says Mr. Lopez. Since U.S. forces would be out of the zone after 1999, it is hard to see how we could defend the canal, if it were attacked,

unless we did intervene. But, says Mr. Lopez, "Panama cannot agree to the right of the U.S. to intervene." If not, pray tell, what is the meaning of the words to which it has already agreed?

Now, what about those words stating our warships' right "to transit the canal expeditiously and without conditions"? Do they mean, as our officials have said, that naval vessels could in an emergency go "to the head of the line" and get through the waterway ahead of other traffic? Not at all, says Mr. Lopez. Our ability to defend the canal—not to mention much of the world—might depend on this priority. But the priority doesn't exist, says this Panamanian negotiator.

The State Department has said it is seeking clarification.

Diplomatic language sometimes is made vague for the purpose of gaining agreement, only to prove so unspecific as to produce later disagreement. We appear to have a severe case of that here.

It therefore becomes all the more important to wait until Panama's referendum on the proposed treaties is held before deciding whether to ratify them.

In the Panamanian debate which will precede the referendum later this month it may become clearer what that nation as a whole believes the defense treaty means. If the consensus is acceptable to the U.S. as representing an agreement which will enable this country to keep control of the waterway and by which our troops would be out of the Canal Zone, the Senate may conclude that ratification would be safe and correct. But if the definition given by the Panamanians differs substantially from that given us by the White House and from what our requirements call for, then we shall have to recognize the treaty as a P.R. gimmick which will only lead to trouble and which we should want no part of.

. . . Don't blame Sen. Dole

In the wake of Sen. Dole's disclosure of the leaked State Department cablegram described in the editorial above, two unusual things happened:

• The department denounced the senator for spilling State Department secrets.

• Sen. Frank Church (D., Idaho), acting chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to which the disclosure was made, said the Senate is not likely to approve the canal treaties unless it gets answers to questions raised by the cablegram.

Certainly the State Department needs confidentiality in the diplomatic process. But does this justify hiding information as crucial to the public interest as this? Must the Senate rely on leaks to get information essential to its decisions?

Did Mr. Church's committee already have the information and keep it quiet? If one of Panama's negotiators differs so markedly from our own representatives about the meaning of the agreement, shouldn't the State Department

itself have rushed that information to Mr. Church's group?

After Mr. Dole appeared before the committee, Mr. Church said, "This is a matter which must be clarified." The impression is left that, had there been no leak and no appearance by Sen. Dole, the committee would not have known of this need for clarification.

How can the department justify not telling the Senate, if it in fact did not do so, and not telling the public (which it did not do) of a situation so urgently needing clarification? Why does it oppose amendments which would clarify the intent of the treaties—even if that would mean new negotiations with Panama?

If clarifying what was really meant would wreck the treaties, they of course deserve to be wrecked. It is difficult not to endorse Mr. Dole's facetious remark that "This is a great open administration we're dealing with."

2—Topeka Capital-Journal, Saturday, December 10, 1977

Farmers boo Dole for 'non-support'

By MARTIN HAWVER
Staff Writer

Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., Friday afternoon turned aside pleas of Kansas farmers that he endorse a farm strike Wednesday by supporters of the American Agriculture Movement.

He was booed by a crowd Shawnee County Undersheriff Ed Smith estimated at more than 1,000 at a hangar at Forbes Field, where several hundred tractors and heavy farm machines spent Friday night before Saturday's massive parade and rally in Topeka.

"I'm not endorsing your strike. I support what you want; now is that what you want?" Dole said.

Responding to a question shouted by the crowd of whether Dole would support the farmers in their planned strike, Dole said, "I don't run around the state supporting strikes. I didn't support a strike a couple years ago that you were against—the food strike, where people boycotted meats and other farm products," Dole said.

Alternately applauded and booed, Dole spoke briefly, and then answered, or responded, to more than a score of questions, many from persons who had driven tractors to the Topeka Air Cargo Hub Inc. hangar on the Forbes Field flightline.

The Kansas Highway Patrol said 719 vehicles took part in motorcades and tractorcades to Topeka Friday.

The patrol tally included 480 tractors and 232 support vehicles, 3 combines, 1 hay baler, 1 fertilizer spreader, one semi-trailer truck and one truck sporting a privy.

"I haven't been this cold in three days, but I feel like I've been out in the cold since the election," Dole said.

Atop a conveyor belt in the unheated hangar, a coat-less Dole told the crowd, "Farmers have a great deal of influence in Congress, but face it, most of the members of Congress don't come from farms. They are from urban centers."

But such efforts as those last winter by the United Farm Wives, who buttonholed nearly every member of Congress to tell them about farm problems, help a lot.

"People used to say that there was one good 'no' vote each year—on the farm bill, because that was a vote for the consumers. Well, they are changing their minds," Dole said.

"Our farm bill for '77 is a disaster because it doesn't give you the cost of production. We had a rough fight to move the price support from \$2.47 to \$2.90 in the Senate, and we did it with only four votes."

"It brought about \$87 million to Kansas wheat farmers, and about \$400 million to wheat farmers across the nation," Dole said.

He said he will ask the Senate Agriculture Committee to hold hearings in Kansas on farm problems, and was inundated with suggestions of locations.

"We need hearings so we can get a record, so we can get something for the Senate to see and read, so they learn the problems. We have to give them something to show them how you feel, to show them what your problems are," Dole said.

Chicago Tribune, Thursday, October 13, 1977

Patrick J. Buchanan

Exposing canal treaty coverups

WASHINGTON—With Watergate, Keogate, and Lancelgate already in the political vocabulary, let us in the name of the delay and the English language resist the temptation to call it Canalgate.

Yet, evidently, the Department of State has attempted a coverup on the Panama Canal treaties, a deliberate withholding from the Senate of information critical to an informed judgment.

Herewith the chronicle of events: On Monday, Oct. 3, Sen. Robert Dole (R., Kan.) came into possession of a State Department cable from the United States Embassy in Panama which gave him "great cause for concern."

The five-day-old cable conveyed complaints from a Panamanian negotiator, Carlos Lopez Guevara, that Washington was misinterpreting the treaty. Specifically, Lopez Guevara argued that Panama's promise of expeditious passage for U.S. Navy vessels in time of war did not mean American warships would automatically go to the head of the line. Further, the "neutrality" guarantee did not give the United States any right of intervention in Panama to guarantee said neutrality.

GUEVARA WAS echoing precisely claims made by chief Panamanian negotiator, Escobar Bethancourt in a radio address on Aug. 24.

"The pact does not establish that the United States has the right to intervene in Panama," proclaimed Escobar. Further, "Expeditions passage does not mean privileged passage. As a matter of fact, the concept of privileged passage was rejected. . . . If after examining

the provisions the gringos with their warships say, 'I want to go through first,' then that is their problem with the other ships waiting there. We cannot go that far."

Doing his duty, Sen. Dole made the "confidential" cablegram available to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as relevant and crucial to U.S. understanding of the Panamanian position. To have done less would have been to acquiesce in the sort of coverup which apparently led to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

The response of President Carter's "open administration" was to send one of its minions scurrying over to the Senate Ethics Committee to inquire if disciplinary action would be taken against Dole. But if any action is justified, it is against the Department of State officials who conspired to keep the U.S. Senate in the dark about the two nation's conflicting interpretations of American rights under the Canal treaties.

ENTER NOW Averell Harriman, scion of the old robber baron. Speaking to an assemblage of journalists, Harriman described Sen. Dole's action as "perfectly shocking" and the Panama Canal as the "very last and the worst of our chauvinist actions." As for the treaties: "I am absolutely convinced that the treaties are clear; they don't need clarification and if the Senate demands clarification we'll be in trouble."

As one tries to decipher that last sentence, one begins to understand why Harriman's career as American diplomat and negotiator has contributed to, and been coterminous with, the decline of the West.

Thankfully, the Senate has chosen to ignore Harriman. It has demanded from Panama a precise clarification of what the U.S. rights are under the treaties. It should go further, and accede to the suggestion of Sen. Howard Baker (R., Tenn.) that the Senate be provided access to every memorandum, document, and cable concerning the treaty negotiations.

If, as the Panamanians seem to be claiming, the United States has agreed to the gradual surrender of all rights and privileges in the canal we built, surely the country has the right to know the extent of the sellout.

NEW YORK TIMES Special Features

He said he flew into Topeka from Omaha, where the American Farm Bureau had just approved a resolution of support for the Agriculture Movement's planned strike for parity prices.

The AAM is seeking a law which mandates 100 percent parity. Parity is a mathematical formula which links the value of farm products in the base years 1910-1914 with the cost of goods and services then. Essentially, the farmers want the same buying power for a bushel of wheat, or a crate of eggs, or a hundredweight of meat, that it had back at the turn of the century.

Dole stressed the free market system as a mechanism for improving farm prices, and said loan programs to foreign governments to allow them to purchase wheat spur demand. "We loan them the money to buy wheat for less than we pay in interest for the money, and they buy the wheat."

"That's what I'm interested in, selling wheat, that's how we increase prices to sell our goods," Dole said.

Dole heard a flurry of questions on foreign grain trade, authority of President Carter to immediately increase farm support prices to parity level, and effects of deregulation of natural gas and its effect on the farm economy.

"I'm not in a contest; you can say you won and insult the Senator if you want, but I'm here to listen to you, to learn from you."

"I'm here because I care," Dole said. "I raised the farm prices because I found another 50 senators to support me," Dole said.

Many of the farmers at the TACH hangar said they are primarily grainmen, but a few with cow-calf operations to supplement their grain crops said participating in the strike will be a little difficult.

Tom Kee, Yates Center, said "I really don't know what we can do. I am holding my calves off the market, but I really don't have any ready to go to the finishing lot until after the first of the year. So I can keep my calves off the market line until then, at least."

Kee said, though, that he intends to keep out of stores, and do as little purchasing as possible.

"I guess farmers with stock that needs feeding will have to either use their own feed, or try to work out a trade with some other farmers if we're going to keep out of the market," Kee said.

Several other cattle feeders from northeast Kansas said they see little difference in holding their calves or marketing them to feedlot operations.

Ed Clark, a custom cutter from Esbon, said though he doesn't farm himself, "I have a big stake in this movement, and I want it to work."

"If the farmers don't have the money to pay me to cut their wheat, then where am I? They're not making the cost of production, and when things get that bad, the checks are slow coming in."

"I pay \$70 in county taxes a month, not a year, a month, on my combine, and even the price of combines is going crazy. A combine costs about \$45,000 now, and the manufacturers raise prices a flat 8 percent every 90 days, and unless the farmers can make a little money, how am I going to be able to afford to buy those combines to keep me in business?" he asked.

Eugene Addison, Cimarron, an organizer of the rally, said about 500 tractors are expected for a massive parade Saturday morning through Topeka. He said about 6,000 persons are expected to take part in a rally at Municipal Auditorium at 2 p.m. Saturday.

TOPEKA CAP 12-8

Dole's support of Israel earns Brandeis award

By Our Washington Bureau

BALTIMORE — Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., received the Justice Louis D. Brandeis Award Wednesday night from the Baltimore district of the Zionist Organization of America.

Former recipients of the award, named for the late U.S. Supreme Court Justice, have included Sen. Daniel P.

Moynihan, D-N.Y., Arthur J. Goldberg, former Supreme Court Justice and now U.S. Ambassador to the Helsinki talks in Belgrade, former Israeli defense minister Shimon Peres, and former Israeli foreign minister Abba Eban.

In remarks prepared for the ceremony here, Dole declined to compare himself with Brandeis because, he said, few men in U.S. history can be placed on the same level with the high court official.

"As I look within myself for some motive, some action, some deed, some fine thread to link any part of myself with the life of Louis Brandeis, to justify this award, let it be the fact that the cause of Israel was one which he found, and which I find, consistent with the cause of America, and one we sought to advance, each according to his own understanding and ability and responsibility," Dole said.

The awards presentation marks the third time in less than a month Dole has spoken to Jewish groups. He addressed the Jewish National Fund in California last Sunday and in mid-November spoke to a Jewish convention in New York.

In his Wednesday remarks — written personally by the senator, according to an aide — Dole expressed confidence that peace will be achieved in the Middle East but added that "outside forces," including the United States, could imperil the peace effort if they seek to assert their own influence in the negotiations. A proposed conference with United Nations involvement would lead to little constructive action, Dole said, because neither the United Nations nor Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim "have lately distinguished themselves as pillars of reason and restraint in the Middle East arena."

His words were even harsher for the Carter administration, labeling U.S. efforts "more portentous" than those advanced by the U.N. He speculated Egypt and other Arab states may take a hard line during negotiations in the hope that U.S. pressure on Israel would force concessions otherwise not possible.

"The purposes of peace are best served now by our trusting Prime Minister (Menachem) Begin and (Egyptian) President Anwar Sadat to advance their own great work they have begun and to serve as we are asked and to support their efforts as we are asked," Dole said.

WICH EAGLE 1-8-78



DOLE DEDICATES PLAQUE COMMEMORATING 1976 GOP CAMPAIGN
... Stands between his mother, Bina, left, and wife, Elizabeth, in Russell, Kan.

Dole Says '76 Defeat Won't Halt His National Leadership Efforts

RUSSELL, Kan. (AP) — Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., returned Saturday to his hometown and said his unsuccessful bid for the vice presidency was not the end of his efforts to provide national leadership.

"We worked hard. We fought hard. It didn't turn out the way we hoped it would. We were not successful," said Dole, the 1976 Republican vice-presidential nominee.

"But neither were we really defeated. We were just delayed a little. Real defeat is when you accept failure."

DOLE WAS IN Russell to dedicate a native stone marker and plaque marking the courthouse square site of his first appearance Aug. 20, 1976.

with former President Gerald Ford in their national campaign.

"This marker commemorates something important that began here," said Dole. "And what began here is not yet finished. America wants leadership. She still doesn't have it. Until she does, the effort that began on this spot will not be finished."

Earlier Saturday in Kansas City, Dole criticized the pending Panama Canal treaties and the Carter administration farm policy.

THE KANSAS REPUBLICAN promised numerous amendments to the treaties in the Senate, including a proposal that would insure an American military base in the canal for defense purposes after the year 2000.

The senator, in his address to the Agribusiness Trade Show and Information Conference in Kansas City, also accused the present Democratic administration of lethargy in dealing with the nation's farm economy problem.

Dole urged Agriculture Secretary Bob Bergland to set a national goal of \$30 billion in farm exports by 1980 in an effort to help financially ailing farmers.

"The best way out of the current cost-price squeeze in which so many U.S. farmers are caught is through expanded exports and reduced inflation," Dole said.