Folder: Panama Canal Treaty, 9/77

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of the Chief of Staff Files; Series: Hamilton Jordan's Confidential Files; Folder: Panama Canal Treaty, 9/77; Container 36

To See Complete Finding Aid:
http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Chief_of_Staff.pdf

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
cable	American Embassy Panama to Secretary of State	9/27/77	A
~~memo~~	~~Rick Inderfurth to RJ, Landon Butler~~ Opened 1/31/91	~~9/27/77~~	~~A~~
memo	Panama Canal Treaty negotiations (5 pp.)	ca. 9/27	A
memo	Rick Inderfurth to RJ	9/6/77	A
memo	Elmer T. Brooks to ZB	9/6/77	A
~~memo~~	~~Bob Thomson to JC~~ Open 1/24/90	~~9/26/77~~	~~C~~

FILE LOCATION

Chief of Staff (Jordan)/Box 6 of 8 (org.)/Panama Canal Treaty-Sept. 1977

RESTRICTION CODES

(A) Closed by Executive Order 12065 governing access to national security information.
(B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
(C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

J

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: HAMILTON JORDAN H.J.

DATE: AUGUST 30, 1977

SUBJECT: PANAMA CANAL ENDORSEMENTS

1. The AFL-CIO Executive Council officially adopted a strong statement in favor of the new Panama Canal Treaties today. Mr. Meany, in a press conference afterwards, said that the resolution "means full support, using whatever influence we have on Members of Congress - it certainly means lobbying." good

   In addition, we have a commitment from John Williams, President of the Panama Canal Pilots Association, and from Al Walsh of the Canal Zone AFL-CIO, to testify at Senate hearings that the employee provisions contained in the new treaties will assure an orderly transition to Panama control. good

2. Former Republican Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky will make a public statement in favor of the treaties on Monday. His statement will be covered by Kentucky television and newspapers. Senator Cooper told Ambassador Bunker today that he expects that both Senators Ford and Huddleston will vote in favor of the new treaties. good

3. Ambassadors Bunker and Linowitz had lunch today with Generals Maxwell Taylor and Lyman Lemnitzer. Ambassador Bunker thinks there is a good chance that the two Generals will support the new treaties. good

"Electrostatic reproduction made for preservation purposes."

9/6/87

It's a great group
J

FILE

TO: PRESIDENT CARTER

FROM: HAMILTON JORDAN HJ.

RE: BREAKFAST MEETING TOMORROW WITH NATIONAL LEADERS

We have had an excellent response to our invitation to the breakfast briefing in the morning for national leaders. The people invited to this meeting include:

-organizational and institutional leaders

-key multinational executives

-former government officials and military leaders

Special attention was given to inviting key persons from states where the Senator(s) are undecided on the treaty.

We hope to use this group as the nucleus for a "Citizens Committee" which can publicly advocate Senate ratification of the treaty. That same Committee would be the best mechanism for obtaining public endorsements from these people, running newspaper ads, organizing a targeted direct mail campaign, etc.

"Electrostatic reproduction made for preservation purposes."

We will have a couple of the people there at the meeting prepared to stand up and propose that they organize such a group in the private sector. I will give you more details before the meeting. The goal is to get actual committments of support before all of these people scatter back to their homes and businesses.

cc: Vice-President

ATTENDEES TO SEPTEMBER 7TH

WHITE HOUSE BREAKFAST AND BRIEFING

Robert O. Anderson
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
Atlantic Richfield Company

J. Paul Austin
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
The Coca Cola Company

David M. Blumberg
President
B'nai B'rith

Col. Frank Borman
Chairman of the Board, President, and Chief Executive Officer
Eastern Airlines, Inc.

A. W. Clausen
President and Chief Executive Officer
Bank of America

Clark M. Clifford
Attorney,
Former Secretary of Defense

Mrs. Ruth Clusen
President
League of Women Voters of the United States

David Cohen
President
Common Cause

William T. Coleman, Jr.
Former Secretary of Transportation

John Sherman Cooper
Former U. S. Senator
Former U. S. Ambassador to Nedal, India and the
German Democratic Republic

John DeButts
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T)
Chairman, Business Council

Frederick B. Dent
President, Mayfair Mills
Former Secretary of Commerce
Former Federal Trade Negotiator to the President

C. Douglas Dillon
Managing Director
Dillon, Read and Co., Inc.
President, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Robert Rushton
Pres.
Jaycees

Alfredo Duran
Chairman, Florida Democratic Party

Charles Frazier
Natl. Farmers Organization

Peter Flanigan
Managing Director
Dillon, Read and Co., Inc.

John W. Scott
Natl. Grange

Orville L. Freeman
President and Chief Executive Officer
Business International Corporation
Former Secretary of Agriculture
Former Governor of Minnesota

W. H. Krome George
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
Aluminum Company of America (ALCOA)

Henry R. Geyelin
President
Council of the Americas

Alan Grant
President
American Farm Bureau Federation

Maurice F. Granville
Chairman of the Board and Chief Exeuctive Officer
Texaco, Inc.

W. Averell Harriman
Former U. S. Ambassador to Russia and Great Britain
Former Governor of New York

Alexander Heard
Chancellor, Vanderbilt University

Andrew Heiskell
Chairman of the Board
Time, Inc.

Father Theodore M Hesburgh
President, Notre Dame University

Benjamin Hooks
Executive Director, NAACP
Former Federal Communications Commissioner

Patrick Hughson
President, Association of American Chambers of Commerce
in Latin America

Frank Ikard
President, American Petroleum Institute

Lady Bird Johnson

Vernon Jordan
Executive Director
National Urban League

Bishop Thomas C. Kelly
General Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Bishops
Auxliary Bishop of Washington, D. C.

Lane Kirkland
Secretary-Treasurer
AFL-CIO

Lee Kling
Former Finance Chairman
Democratic National Committee

Melvin R. Laird
Former Secretary of Defense

Moon Landrieu
Mayor of New Orleans, Louisiana; Member, Exec. Committee, U.S.Conf. of Mayors

R. Heath Larry
President, National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)
Former Vice Chairman of the Board,
United States Steel Corporation

Harding L. Lawrence
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
Braniff International

General Lyman Lemnitzer
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;
Former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe

Dr. Richard Lesher
President
U. S. Chamber of Commerce

John Lyons
General President, International Brotherhood of
Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers

John J. McCloy
Attorney;
Former President, World Bank; former Chairman,
President's Advisory Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament,
Former Assistant Secretary of War

Richard Maass
President,
American Jewish Committee

John O. Marsh
Former Counsellor to President Ford

George Meany
President,
AFL-CIO

Frank Milliken
President and Chief Executive Officer
Kennecott Copper Corporation

William G. Milliken
Governor of Michigan; Chairman Designate, National Governors' Conference

J. Irwin Miller
Chairman, Executive and Financial Committee,
Cummins Engine Company Inc. and Chairman of Executive Committee of
Irwin Union Corp.

Seymour Milstein
President
United Brands Company

Peter G. Peterson
Chairman of the Board, Lehman Brothers
Former Secretary of Commerce

Dr. Claire Randall
General Secretary,
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA

Admiral Hyman Rickover
Director, Division of Naval Reactors,
Energy Research and Development Administration

David Rockefeller
Chairman of the Board, The Chase Manhattan Bank, N. A.

Robert V. Roosa
Partner, Brown Brothers, Harriman and Company
Former Undersecretary of the Treasury

Eugene G. Rostow
President, Atlantic Treaty Association;
Former Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs;
Sterling Professor of Law and Public Affairs, Yale University

George P. Schultz
President, Bechtel Corporation;
Former Secretary of the Treasury,
Former Director OMB, former Secretary of Labor

David C. Scott
Chairman of the Board,
Allis-Chalmers Corporation

Hugh Scott
Former U. S. Senator, Minority Leader of the Senate

William W. Scranton
Former Governor of Pennsylvania;
Former Ambassador to the United Nations

Irving S. Shapiro
Chairman, E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company;
Chairman, Business Roundtable

General Maxwell D. Taylor
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Martin J. Ward
President, United Association of Jorneymen and
Apprentices of the Plumbers and Pipefitting
Industries of the U. S. and Canada

Thomas J. Watson
Chairman of the Executive Committee of IBM Corporation
Graduate Member of the Business Council

Glenn E. Watts
President, Communications Workers of America

William C. Weaver, Jr.
Chairman of the Board,
National Life and Accident Insurance Company; Chairman of the Board,
NLT Corporation

Dr. Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.
President, Michigan State University
Chairman of the Board for International Food & Agricultural Development

Jerry Wurf
President, American Federation of State, County and
Municipal Employees

Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt,
President, American Medical Buildings; former Chief of Naval Operations

DETERMINED TO BE AN ADMINISTRATIVE
MARKING BY BB DATE 2-11-83

September 19, 1977

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TO: PRESIDENT CARTER

FROM: HAMILTON JORDAN HJ

RE: PANAMA CANAL TREATY AND FIRESIDE CHAT

If we assume the worst - that the Senate will not consider the Treaty until next year - I would still favor an early "Fireside Chat" for the following reasons:

-The media has been dominated recently by Bert's situation. We need to re-focus the attention of the Administration and the public on the treaty. A "Fireside Chat" is a good way to demonstrate continued committment and Presidential interest.

-The Senate hearings begin soon. If we don't define the issues and the discussion of the treaty, they will be defined for us through the Committee hearings

by the opponents of the treaty. A "Fireside Chat" is the best mechanism for our defining the case for the ratification by anticipating the objections of the opponents and dealing with them first.

-The Congress has been and will continue to be flooded with mail from right-wing groups and organizations. The public opinion polls have shown substantial movement already. A "Fireside Chat" should help sustain this movement. It would be politically devastating for those polls to show a reversal or even to stall at this point.

-The Congress has an inordinate fear of your use of the media. They would probably all think that a good "Fireside Chat" would have a greater impact than in fact it would.

The argument against a "Fireside Chat" now is that we should save some of our ammunition for later and not do too much now. I disagree. To refocus attention on the treaty, demonstrate Presidential interest and committment

to the Congress and the American people, define the issues before they are defined by the opponents at the Committee hearings and to neutralize the very effective mail campaign that is already being felt, I would recommend an early "Fireside Chat".

We have more weapons in our arsenal. If we do a "Fireside Chat" now but feel that we need another dose in late October or January, we can do a Town Hall meeting on the treaty and/or you can make highly publicized trips to target states.

CC: Powell, Moore and Vice-President

Sept 6, 77

TO: PRESIDENT CARTER

FROM: HAMILTON JORDAN HJ.

RE: BREAKFAST MEETING TOMORROW WITH NATIONAL LEADERS

We have had an excellent response to our invitation to the breakfast briefing in the morning for national leaders. The people invited to this meeting include:

-organizational and institutional leaders

-key multinational executives

-former government officials and military leaders

Special attention was given to inviting key persons from states where the Senator(s) are undecided on the treaty.

We hope to use this group as the nucleus for a "Citizens Committee" which can publicly advocate Senate ratification of the treaty. That same Committee would be the best mechanism for obtaining public endorsements from these people, running newspaper ads, organizing a targeted direct mail campaign, etc.

We will have a couple of the people there at the meeting prepared to stand up and propose that they organize such a group in the private sector. I will give you more details before the meeting. The goal is to get actual committments of support before all of these people scatter back to their homes and businesses.

cc: Vice-President

* will attend signing also

ATTENDEES TO SEPTEMBER 7TH

WHITE HOUSE BREAKFAST AND BRIEFING

Robert O. Anderson
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
Atlantic Richfield Company

J. Paul Austin
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
The Coca Cola Company

David M. Blumberg
President
B'nai B'rith

Col. Frank Borman
Chairman of the Board, President, and Chief Executive Officer
Eastern Airlines, Inc.

A. W. Clausen
President and Chief Executive Officer
Bank of America

Clark M. Clifford
Attorney,
Former Secretary of Defense

Mrs. Ruth Clusen
President
League of Women Voters of the United States

David Cohen
President
Common Cause

William T. Coleman, Jr.
Former Secretary of Transportation

John Sherman Cooper
Former U. S. Senator
Former U. S. Ambassador to Nedal, India and the
German Democratic Republic

John DeButts
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer * signing
American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T)
Chairman, Business Council

Frederick B. Dent
President, Mayfair Mills
Former Secretary of Commerce
Former Federal Trade Negotiator to the President

C. Douglas Dillon
Managing Director
Dillon, Read and Co., Inc.
President, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Robert Rushton
Pres.
Jaycees

Alfredo Duran
Chairman, Florida Democratic Party

Charles Frazier
Natl. Farmers Organization

Peter Flanigan
Managing Director
Dillon, Read and Co., Inc.

John W. Scott
Natl. Grange

Orville L. Freeman
President and Chief Executive Officer
Business International Corporation
Former Secretary of Agriculture
Former Governor of Minnesota

W. H. Krome George
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
Aluminum Company of America (ALCOA)

Henry R. Geyelin
President
Council of the Americas

Alan Grant
President
American Farm Bureau Federation

Maurice F. Granville
Chairman of the Board and Chief Exeuctive Officer
Texaco, Inc.

W. Averell Harriman
Former U. S. Ambassador to Russia and Great Britain
Former Governor of New York

Alexander Heard
Chancellor, Vanderbilt University

Andrew Heiskell
Chairman of the Board
Time, Inc.

Father Theodore M Hesburgh
President, Notre Dame University

Benjamin Hooks
Executive Director, NAACP
Former Federal Communications Commissioner

Patrick Hughson
President, Association of American Chambers of Commerce
in Latin America

Frank Ikard
President, American Petroleum Institute

Lady Bird Johnson

Vernon Jordan
Executive Director
National Urban League

Bishop Thomas C. Kelly
General Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Bishops
Auxliary Bishop of Washington, D. C.

Lane Kirkland
Secretary-Treasurer
AFL-CIO

Lee Kling
Former Finance Chairman
Democratic National Committee

Melvin R. Laird
Former Secretary of Defense

Moon Landrieu
Mayor of New Orleans, Louisiana; Member, Exec. Committee, U.S.Conf. of Mayors

R. Heath Larry
President, National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)
Former Vice Chairman of the Board,
United States Steel Corporation

Harding L. Lawrence
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
Braniff International

General Lyman Lemnitzer
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;
Former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe

Dr. Richard Lesher
President
U. S. Chamber of Commerce

John Lyons
General President, International Brotherhood of
Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers

John J. McCloy
Attorney;
Former President, World Bank; former Chairman,
President's Advisory Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament,
Former Assistant Secretary of War

Richard Maass
President,
American Jewish Committee

John O. Marsh
Former Counsellor to President Ford

George Meany
President,
AFL-CIO

Frank Milliken
President and Chief Executive Officer
Kennecott Copper Corporation

William G. Milliken
Governor of Michigan; Chairman Designate, National Governors' Conference

J. Irwin Miller
Chairman, Executive and Financial Committee,
Cummins Engine Company Inc. and Chairman of Executive Committee of
Irwin Union Corp.

Seymour Milstein
President
United Brands Company

Peter G. Peterson
Chairman of the Board, Lehman Brothers
Former Secretary of Commerce

Dr. Claire Randall
General Secretary,
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA

Admiral Hyman Rickover
Director, Division of Naval Reactors,
Energy Research and Development Administration

David Rockefeller
Chairman of the Board, The Chase Manhattan Bank, N. A.

Robert V. Roosa
Partner, Brown Brothers, Harriman and Company
Former Undersecretary of the Treasury

Eugene G. Rostow
President, Atlantic Treaty Association;
Former Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs;
Sterling Professor of Law and Public Affairs, Yale University

George P. Schultz
President, Bechtel Corporation;
Former Secretary of the Treasury,
Former Director OMB, former Secretary of Labor

David C. Scott
Chairman of the Board,
Allis-Chalmers Corporation

Hugh Scott
Former U. S. Senator, Minority Leader of the Senate

William W. Scranton
Former Governor of Pennsylvania;
Former Ambassador to the United Nations

Irving S. Shapiro
Chairman, E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company;
Chairman, Business Roundtable

General Maxwell D. Taylor
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Martin J. Ward
President, United Association of Journeymen and
Apprentices of the Plumbers and Pipefitting
Industries of the U. S. and Canada

Thomas J. Watson
Chairman of the Executive Committee of IBM Corporation *signing
Graduate Member of the Business Council

Glenn E. Watts
President, Communications Workers of America

William C. Weaver, Jr.
Chairman of the Board,
National Life and Accident Insurance Company; Chairman of the Board,
NLT Corporation

Dr. Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.
President, Michigan State University
Chairman of the Board for International Food & Agricultural Development

Jerry Wurf
President, American Federation of State, County and
Municipal Employees

Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt,
President, American Medical Buildings; former Chief of Naval Operations

~~Agnew Johnson~~		✓ 37 David Rockefeller
✓ 2 Walter Mondale		✓ 38 John DuBois
✓ 4 Nelson Rockefeller		✓ 39 Heath Lowry
✓ 5 Henry Kissenger		✓ 40 Dick Leisher
✓ 6 ~~Mrs. Kissenger~~		✓ 41 Henry Geyelen
✓ 7 Brezezinski		✓ 42 A W Clausen
✓ 8 James Schlesinger		✓ 43 George Meany
✓ 9 Bert Lance		✓ 44 Vernon Jordan
10 SS		✓ 45 Ben Hooks
11 SS		✓ 46 Averall Harriman
✓ 12 ~~Cy Vance~~ Bob Strauss		✓ 47 Ruth Clausen
✓ 13 Warren Christopher		✓ 48 Adm Zumwalt
✓ 14 Andy Young		✓ 49 Melvin Laird
✓ 15 Phillip Habib		✓ 50 William Scranton
✓ 16 Ellsworth Bunker		✓ 51 Andrew Heiskell
✓ 17 Sol Linowitz		✓ 52 George Schultz
✓ 18 Lucy Wilson Benson		✓ 53 Seymour Milstein
✓ 19 Barbara Watson		✓ 54 Wm Wewa
✓ 20 David Popper		✓ 55 ~~Philip Habib~~ Din Rusk Gilb
✓ 21 Terrance Todd man		✓ 56 Lane Kirkland
✓ 22 Evan Dobelle		✓ 57 Glen Watts
✓ 23 Carol Laise ?		✓ 58 Jerry Wurf
✓ 24 ~~Colin McGee~~		✓ 59 Bishop Tom Kelly
✓ 25 Amb Ian Moss ?		✓ 60 David Blumberg
✓ 26 Harold Brown		✓ 61 Dr Elton Trueblood
✓ 27 Clifford Alexander		✓ 62 John McCloy
✓ 28 Gen Brown		✓ 63 Clark Clifford
✓ 29 Gen ~~Bergesx~~ McBride		✓ 64 Alex Heard
✓ 30 Adm Holloway		✓ 65 Clifford Winston
✓ 31 Gen ~~Jonesx~~ Kerwin		✓ 66 Theodore Hesburgh
✓ 32 Gen Wilson		✓ 67 Adm Rickover
✓ 33 Gen Dolvin		✓ 68 Gen Maxwell Taylor
✓ 34 ~~Gen McGiel~~ Charles Duncan		✓ 69 Gen Lyman Lemnitzer
✓ 35 ~~Evan Shapen~~		✓ 70 Gen Lucius Clay Jr.
3E880 Col Powell	175 132 43 102 73	✓ 71 Curtis Lemay
		✓ 72 William Buckley
		✓ 73 David Cohen
		✓ 74 Hugh Scott
		✓ 75 Peter Peterson

TREATY SIGNING

W House

Treaty signing ceremony

~~Pres. Carter~~ 77 William Rogers

THE
FRITZ HOLLINGS
REPORT
bringing South Carolina government to Washington

Washington, D. C. Sept. 1977

THE PANAMA CANAL

Do you want to give the Panama Canal away? NO! I don't either. Nor does President Carter. If President Carter's treaty is not giving it away, what is it doing? Keeping it to use! Given the present circumstances, the two new treaties are the only reliable and fair way for the United States to keep the Canal to use.

We all start by agreeing that the Panama Canal is important to the United States, both from a commercial standpoint and from a strategic standpoint. We all start by agreeing that the Canal should be continuously open and continuously in use. The debate centers on how best to keep it open and operating, so that our commerce can flow and our Naval fleets can remain mobile.

After looking at this question from every angle, listening to both sides over the years, and visiting Panama for another first-hand look, I join all our recent Presidents, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a bi-partisan group of political leaders in supporting Senate ratification of the treaties. They are the best safeguards for an open Canal, and they guarantee America's continued access and continued freedom of transit permanently.

If this treaty prevented our ability to use or defend the Canal, it would be different. But it does no such thing. On the contrary, the United States continues to operate and defend the Canal until the year 2000. After 2000, we retain the right to intervene to guarantee the Canal's accessibility to U.S. shipping.

Let's be practical. The Canal is like an airplane -- it is no good unless it can be used. We can go out and squat in the airplane, but unless we can fly it, the plane is of no use. So title to the Canal is not the issue. The problem is the unimpeded right to use it. Does the treaty give the United States the permanent, unimpeded right to use the Canal? Are we guaranteed freedom of transit even after 2000? A few days ago in Panama when President Demetrio Lakas was asked these questions, he answered "Yes" to both. Returning home and checking, Article IV of the treaty provides it, and Dictator Torrijos states in Washington, "we are agreeing to a treaty of neutrality which places us under the protective umbrella of the Pentagon."

Why, then, all the hubub? Two main reasons. First, we have not yet fully learned the lesson of Vietnam. A decade there should have convinced us that people do not like foreigners in their country. The Vietnamese did not like it. The Panamanians do not like it. But failing to recognize this, the treaty opponents see no problem. They think the whole thing is a scheme of the State Department, and all we need to do is prove title or sovereignty and the treaty will be defeated. Secondly, we feel frustrated. The cry is, "We lost in Vietnam; we lost in Angola; we are pulling out of Korea; we talk about abandoning Taiwan. We have given away too much and 'detented' too much, and just once we should stand up and say -- 'NO!'" This was exactly my reaction ten years ago when former Secretary of the Navy Robert Anderson came before our Commerce Committee to testify on a proposed new treaty for the Canal. "We bought the Zone, we built the Canal, we paid for it all. Why should we want a new treaty?" Secretary Anderson said quietly, "We made a bad treaty. The people of Panama have never accepted it, and now they are ready to lay down their lives for their country." "Baloney" was the reaction. America's sovereignty must be protected at all costs. In 1967 in Vietnam, it was becoming difficult to explain to next-of-kin how their sons were being sacrificed for U.S. sovereignty. But in Panama -- it could be explained easily. This feeling permeated a glowing newsletter about U.S. "sovereignty" five years ago. But the legal opinions to support sovereignty were not forthcoming.

President Lyndon Johnson had conferred with former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman and the three Presidents agreed we needed a new treaty. When President Nixon and President Ford also endorsed the idea, everyone began to wonder. Nixon had ignored the State Department and Ford would like to have ignored State if his conscience would allow him. Ronald Reagan was giving him a fit and it would have been a lot easier for Ford if he could just stand up and say "No" on the Panama Canal. My conscience hurt -- and in another newsletter last year, it was pointed out that we did not have sovereignty, and the need was emphasized to rid ourselves of the vestiges of the "Ugly American" in the Canal Zone by relinquishing separate courts, the commissaries, special stores, etc. But, the newsletter concluded, the United States should make sure ". . .that we will be in charge of the Canal both five years and 50 years from now." Previously, I had joined in the Panama Canal resolution putting Henry Kissinger on notice. We never knew what he was up to and it was thought healthy to let him know that some of us in the Senate were watching. In January of this year, with Henry gone, there was no need to co-sponsor the resolution.

which a Panamanian patriot could object." Said Woodrow Wilson, who would soon be President, "Our acquisition of the Panama Canal Zone has been a scandal since the day of the fake "revolution" of November 3, 1903.... In every country to the south of us we are distrusted, feared, hated." Today this diplomacy is characterized by conservative columnist James Kilpatrick as a "national shame."

DON'T WANT SOVEREIGNTY -- After spending our history destroying colonialism from the beginning in 1776 thru to the Philippines, Cuba, World War II, Korea and Vietnam, let's not insist on colonialism in Panama. If there is one thing that President Carter and the United States have going for us in the world today, it is our stand on human rights -- the right of people to determine their own destiny. We finally are getting the Soviets and others on the defensive about their denial of human rights, and things are beginning to move our way. Are we now going to say, "Yes, human rights for everyone -- except the people of Panama."

2. DEFENSE

Flying up and down the length of the Canal in a helicopter, Lt. General McAuliffe was pointing out the strategic points to be defended -- the lakes, the power facilities, the bridge and most important, the dam at Gatun Lake filling from the Chargres River. This lake is 24 miles across, the largest manmade lake in the world. The locks are filled by gravity flow taking 52 million gallons of water for each ship that goes through. If the dam was blown at any point emptying the lake, it would take two years to refill. "It would take 80,000 to 100,000 men to defend key points," said General McAuliffe. "This does not mean wall-to-wall coverage of the entire length, only the key places. And this would not include the hundreds of inspectors necessary to examine each ship going through -- an almost impossible task." Guantanamo Bay in Cuba is a tip of land -- easily defended. But the Panama Canal is open to ships from Cuba, Russia -- all nations -- and a lunch box of explosives could put it out of commission.

3. COMPETENCE

Can the Panamanians learn to operate the Canal efficiently? Presently there are 12,000 Panamanians helping to operate the Canal efficiently. Can they take over the jobs of pilots, engineers, etc? Yes. This could be done in short order. The Pan-American Airlines manager in Panama City, having operated in seventeen countries, said the best management and operating team of the seventeen was right now in Panama. Another friend, the Latin American manager of Intercomsa handling 85% of the communications from Latin America, came two years ago with an operating team of twenty-two U.S. experts. Already, he has sent back all but three to the United States -- the Panamanians are doing the job. Let's remember the Egyptians readily learned to operate the Suez Canal.

4. TOLLS AND PAYMENTS

Can the Canal operate without further appropriations from the Congress? This year the Canal will operate at a $7 million profit. But for the past several years, the Canal has been subsidized by the American taxpayer. The first ship with Alaskan oil went through the Canal on August 30. This increase in traffic will permit the Canal Company to pay the added 30¢ per ton plus the $10 million required annually under the treaty. Tolls will have to be increased from $1.29 a ton to approximately $1.70. But if a pipeline connection for Alaskan oil is made from the West to the East Coast, then further increases in tolls could be counterproducitve. This plus the loan guarantees may require us to subsidize again.

Treaty opponents cry, "It's bad enough to give it back, but why do we have to pay them to take it?" This completely ignores U.S. payments for military bases around the world.

SPAIN: $685 million for base rights for five years.
GREECE: $700 million for base rights for four years.
TURKEY: Demanding $1 BILLION for base rights for four years.
PHILIPPINES: Demanding $1 BILLION for base rights for five years.

We have had a free ride in Panama for 74 years. Now Panama, like other allies, wants compensation for the military installations in her country -- Fort Kobbe, Fort Amador, Howard Air Force Base, Fort Clayton, Albrook Air Station, Fort Davis, Fort Gulick, Fort Sherman, the Jungle Warfare Range, etc. We are not paying to take the Canal back -- we're paying for these installations. And most of the payments will be coming from toll revenues.

5. NEW CANAL

A new sea-level canal will probably be built by Panama and the United States before the year 2000. An estimate in 1970 reported the cost at $2.7 billion. With inflation today that cost would be $5.7 billion. With hindsight now we realize that rather than working for thirteen years to renegotiate the old treaty, we should have insisted on a new sea-level canal. This would have been wide enough for all our warships as well as the largest oil tankers. Then the sovereignty, sabotage and other problems would have been moot. What is unexplainable is the provision that forbids us to negotiate a new canal anywhere but Panama.

6. IMPORTANCE OF THE CANAL

The Panama Canal is important to the commerce and defense of the United States. It is especially important to South American countries such as Colombia, Peru, Chile, Ecuador and Nicaragua. Colombia, for example, drills its oil on the Pacific side and refines it on the Atlantic side. The Canal is Colombia's lifeline. Over 3/4 of Nicaragua's trade passes through the Canal. The list goes on. I recently heard the statement that all Latin American nations wanted Panama to control the Canal. False. They feel that Panama should have sovereignty over its own territory, but time and again different leaders in South America told me that the United States is the only power in the Western Hemisphere strong enough to protect the Canal. They are worried about toll increases. They are worried about freedom of transit for their countries. They feel that the neutrality treaty is ideal in that Panama regains sovereignty and they all

have freedom of transit -- with a U.S. guarantee. Finally, they are worried about communism. More so than are treaty opponents, because attempts have been made on these leaders' lives. They all oppose any communist takeover of the Canal.

7. COMMUNISTS IN THE CANAL

Treaty opponents feel that once the treaty is ratified then in a couple of years the Canal will be turned over to the communists. No one knows or can guarantee what will happen in the years to come. All studied opinion holds firm that communism will have no issue upon which to take root if the treaty is ratified. However, they all feel that if the Senate turns the treaty down, then the communists will have a controlling issue not only in Panama but all over South America. Right now the communists in Panama are in the streets agitating against this treaty which they know will deprive them of their big issue. The best way to keep it from the communists in the future is to validate the neutrality treaty. And the best way to keep it from the communists today is to ratify the new treaty.

8. TORRIJOS

No question about it -- he is a dictator. But not "tin horn" like opponents contend. Every head of state emphasized this fact -- Torrijos is a man supported by his people. Previously, rulers of Panama were from the city, educated in Europe. But as President López-Michelsen of Colombia said, "Torrijos is not a patrician. He is first and foremost a man of his people." Torrijos is from the countryside. He was educated in Panama and trained at Fort Sherman and the U.S. Army School of the Americas. He came to power after the uprising in 1964. At the time he was a major in the National Guard -- and had the bitter task of subduing his own people. After the riots, he took over pledging to rid the Canal Zone of foreigners. When asked if the Senate's failure to ratify the treaty would weaken or strengthen Torrijos, all national leaders in South America plus the American business leadership in Panama City said it would strengthen him. Several immediately replied: "It would make him a hero."

WHAT HAPPENS IF THE SENATE RATIFIES THE TREATY -- There is no guarantee that this would solve all of our problems in Panama or in Latin America. Brazil particularly has a chip on her shoulder. They favor the treaty but the Brazilians want the United States to know that this would not solve all the problems in Latin America.

During the twenty year transition period, the Panamanians will have a chance to prove themselves. No doubt ratification will be followed with free elections next year as promised. There is every reason to believe that with the United States and Panama working together under the new treaty, Panama could become a showcase of American free enterprise. Ratification could prove a dramatic turning point in U.S. - Latin American relations. For ten years now, we have ignored South America. Each President has promised a new policy -- only to be followed with neglect. During this period, the countries down under have developed a nationalism. No longer are they client states of the United States. And the disregard for this development has resulted in a "Bad Neighbor" policy. With the new Panama treaty, the United States could once again start acting as a "Good Neighbor."

WHAT HAPPENS IF THE SENATE FAILS TO RATIFY -- The one group in Panama solidly opposed to the treaty are the communists. They realize that their principal arguing point will vanish with ratification. But they become an important movement if the treaty is rejected. Talking recently to a senior U.S. official in Panama, one who had served in combat at the DMZ in Vietnam -- a man with guts and a lot of sense -- "Just remember," he said, "There's lots of jungle out here and the use and control of this Canal depends upon a friendly people. If the treaty is not confirmed, you will have another Vietnam on your hands." Maybe not a Vietnam, but at least an Ireland. The top CIA man in one South American country said, "Turn that treaty down and within hours, cars will be overturned and this embassy will be firebombed." When asked how long this would last, he answered, "Just as long as the President of this country permits it -- and, politically, he would probably have to let it go on for some time." I wondered who would be with us. Surely not the British and French after the way we treated them in the Suez Canal. The Free World and the Communist World would both be arrayed against us. We would have learned nothing from experience. Separatism cannot sustain. It held us back in the South; it is the trouble today in Africa; and that ten-mile wide strip of separatism in Panama is an embarrassment.

Listening and studying as carefully and thoroughly as one can, I am convinced that our future in the Canal, our credibility on human rights, our being true to ourselves, and the respect for the United States will all be advanced by ratification. By every count, the new Panama Canal treaties are in the best interests of every American. In short, ratification is in our national interest.

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

U.S.S.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 7, 1977

BRIEFING ON PANAMA CANAL TREATIES

Wednesday, September 7, 1977
9:30 a.m. (30 minutes)
The State Dining Room

From: Hamilton Jordan

I. PURPOSE

To demonstrate broad-based support among public opinion leaders for the ratification of the Panama Canal treaties.

II. PARTICIPANTS & PRESS PLAN

A. Participants: All of the persons invited are in favor of the new treaties, or have open minds on the subject. As far as we know, no one present is likely to oppose the treaties. A complete list of the participants is attached. The list includes:

--Lady Bird Johnson.

--Prominent Republicans (Melvin Laird, William Scranton, Hugh Scott, Pete Petersen, John Sherman Cooper, Jack Marsh).

--Leaders of key business groups (Irvin Shapiro, Business Roundtable; John DeButts, Business Council; Dick Lesher, U.S. Chamber of Commerce).

--Retired Military (two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Lemnitzer, General Maxwell Taylor; former Chief of Naval Operations Elmo Zumwalt; Admiral Rickover).

--Chief Executive Officers of 17 multinational corporations doing business in Latin America.

--George Meany, Lane Kirkland and three union presidents (Glenn Watts, C.W.A.; Marty Ward, Plumbers; John Lyons, Iron Workers).

--Vernon Jordan, Ben Hooks.

--Three University Presidents (Alex Heard, Vanderbilt; Father Hesburgh, Notre Dame; Cliff Wharton, Michigan State University).

--Governor Bill Millikin, Chairman-designate, National Governors' Conference.

--Mayor Moon Landrieu.

--Other prominent individuals, including Averell Harriman.

B. Press Plan: The press will cover your entrance and the first five minutes of your talk.

III. TALKING POINTS

A. You are scheduled to be present from 9:30 to 10 a.m. I suggest you use 10 minutes for your talk and 15 minutes for questions.

B. In your initial comments, which will be covered by the press, I suggest that you acknowledge the broad spectrum of interest and support which this group represents and thank the participants for coming to the briefing on such short notice.

C. During the question and answer session, someone--perhaps Irvin Shapiro--may suggest that some of the participants in this group should form a Panama Canal Citizens Committee. You should encourage this suggestion.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 7, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: STU EIZENSTAT Stu

SUBJECT: Talking Points For Your Meeting with Institutional Leaders Wednesday, September 7, 1977 - 9:30 a.m.

Attached is a memorandum which I suggested Charlie Schultze get up if you wish to talk about the economy in addition to your discussion about the Panama Canal, during your meeting with business leaders tomorrow morning.

Bob Strauss suggested that a discussion about the economy, even briefly, would be appreciated by the businessmen and would help bridge what Ambassador Strauss perceives as a void between the Administration and the business community.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS
WASHINGTON

September 6, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Charlie Schultze CLS

SUBJECT: Meeting with Businessmen on the Panama Canal Treaty

In your meeting with business leaders tomorrow, you might want to say something about the shape of the economy.

Attached are some talking points.

Attachment

Where We Stand

-- While the recovery to date has been far from perfect, it has been a relatively balanced one:

1. Inventories are generally in good balance with sales.

2. No bottlenecks or serious shortage problems have developed. The rate of inflation, apart from temporary runups of food and fuel prices, has shown no tendency to accelerate.

3. Interest rates, though up since spring, still are at or below recession troughs of two years ago. Long-term rates are well below levels at the trough. Savings flows to mortgage lenders are at high levels. Credit is readily available.

4. Consumer confidence has remained strong. Real incomes are up substantially. Although consumer spending growth has clearly slowed in the last four months, consumers are still in a buying mood.

5. Business investment, while lagging in comparison with other recoveries, increased strongly in the first half of the year.

Problems on the Horizon?

-- Despite this performance, concern that the recovery is faltering is being expressed. There are many reasons behind this concern:

1. Growth has slowed from the rapid pace of the first half.

2. Personal consumption spending slowed appreciably in the second quarter.

3. Slowdown in consumption led to an involuntary buildup of inventories among nondurable goods producers, and was followed by a cut back in production schedules for a time. Result was a slowdown in employment growth.

-- Unemployment has failed to decline since April.

-- The mere fact that we are in the third year of recovery has caused some observers to begin looking for signs of topping out of expansion.

-- Traumatic effects of 1974-75 recession have not fully worn off. There is deep worry that it could happen again, and some tendency to overinterpret wiggles in economic statistics.

Prospects for Continued Expansion

-- There are several reasons that the slower rate of growth thus far in the third quarter should not be expected to turn into more general weakness of the economy:

1. We have expected, and continue to expect, that the second half of 1977 will see slower growth than the first half. But growth should stay healthy.

2. When inventories backed up, producers adjusted quickly and inventories of both manufacturers and wholesalers are in better overall balance with sales now than they were a year ago.

3. The President's stimulus program also has begun to take hold. The jobs and income provided by public works, public service employment, and youth employment programs will rise steadily over the next year.

4. Business fixed investment is still growing. In particular, outlays for equipment are stronger and more widely-based than a year ago. New investment in structures is still lagging.

5. The latest consumer surveys show a sharp increase in consumer buying intentions.

Tax Reform

-- Among the objectives of the tax reform program that will be shortly submitted to the Congress are:

1. Moderating the rise in the ratio of personal taxes to personal income brought about by inflation and economic growth.

2. Improving the climate for business investment and risk taking.

-- These measures will help to keep economic growth proceeding at a healthy pace.

-- Stress importance you attach to a strong growth of private investment and your awareness of the importance of the tax and regulatory climate to that growth.

Administration Outlook and Expectations

-- Continued growth in the second half of the year, after current "lull."

-- Further reductions in unemployment by year-end.

-- Continued real growth and reductions in unemployment during 1978.

-- Inflation in last half of 1977 falling well below the high, but temporary rate, of the first half. (Consumer prices: first half year, annual rate of 9%; second half year, about 5-1/2%).

What if we are wrong, and the economy slows down substantially?

Economic recoveries never proceed evenly from month to month and quarter to quarter. We cannot change government policy on the basis of such temporary fluctuations.

On the other hand, we are monitoring economic developments very closely, and continually subjecting our economic forecasts to critical scrutiny.

Should convincing evidence now develop -- and it has not to date -- that the economy is experiencing something more fundamental than a temporary lull, so as to slow the improvement in employment, output, and incomes to unacceptable rates, the Administration will take whatever steps and make whatever recommendations that seem appropriate to deal with the situation.

We will be prudent and will not overreact to short-lived fluctuations in economic statistics. But we are committed to doing everything in our power to keeping a healthy and sustainable recovery going.

DINNER - Wednesday, September 7, 1977 at 8:30 p.m.

127

SW gate
TK
Bus suit

The President and Mrs. Carter

Mr. and Mrs. Isaac Stern
211 Central Park West
New York, New York 10024

Sunday
5:00

Mr. and Mrs. André Previn
Heinz Hall for the Performing Arts
600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Miss Martina Arroyo
114 East 72nd Street
New York, New York 10021

The Vice President and Mrs. Mondale
West Wing

The Speaker and Mrs. O'Neill 2206 speaking eng. +2
Room H-204, The Capitol -- 20515

Hon. and Mrs. John J. Sparkman +2 (Ala 11-6-46)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. John C. Stennis 6253 +2 (Miss 11-5-47)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Henry M. Jackson prior commitment +2 (Wash 1-3-53)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Clifford P. Case 2224 +2 (N.J. 1-3-55)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Frank Church +2 (Idaho 1-3-57)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Jacob K. Javits 6542 +2 (N.Y. 1-9-57)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Robert C. Byrd 5556 +2 (W. Va. 1-3-59)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Robert P. Griffin 6221 +2 (Mich 5-11-66)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Ernest F. Hollings 6121 +2 (S.C. 119-66)
U. S. Senate - 20510 speaking eng.

Hon. and Mrs. Howard H. Baker, Jr. 4944 +2 (Tenn 1-3-67)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Ted Stevens 3004 +2 (Alas 12-24-68)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. Alan Cranston (Calif 1-3-69)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Barry Goldwater 2235 +2 (Ariz 1-3-69)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Mike Gravel 6665 +2 (Alas 1-3-69)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Richard S. Schweiker 4254 (Pa 1-3-69)
U. S. Senate - 20510 +2

Panama
Brigadier General Omar Torrijos Herrera
Chief of the Government and Commander of the National Guard of Panama
and Mrs. Torrijos

Paraguay
His Excellency
General of the Army Alfredo Stroessner
President of the Republic of Paraguay

Dominican Republic
His Excellency
Dr. Joaquin Balaguer
President of the Dominican Republic
Mrs. Emma Balaguer de Vallejo (sister of and hostess for Pres. Balaguer.

Bolivia
His Excellency
General Hugo Banzer Suarez
President of the Republic of Bolivia
and Mrs. Banzer

Chile
His Excellency
General Augusto Pinochet Ugarte
President of the Republic of Chile
and Mrs. Pinochet

Costa Rica
His Excellency
Daniel Oduber Quiros
President of the Republic of Costa Rica

Venezuela
His Excellency
Carlos Andres Perez
President of the Republic of Venezuela

Guatemala
His Excellency
General Kjell Eugenio Laugerud Garcia
President of the Republic of Guatemala
and Mrs. Laugerud

Colombia
His Excellency Alfonso Lopez Michelsen
President of the Republic of Colombia
and Mrs. Lopez

Honduras
His Excellency
Brigadier General Juan Alberto Melgar Castro
Chief of State of the Republic of Honduras

Peru
His Excellency
General Francisco Morales Bermudez Cerrutti
President of the Republic of Peru

Ecuador
His Excellency
Vice Admiral Alfredo Poveda Burbano
President of the Supreme Council of Government of Ecuador
and Mrs. Poveda

Argentina
His Excellency
Lieutenant General Jorge Rafael Videla
President of the Argentine Nation
and Mrs. Videla

Uruguay
His Excellency
Dr. Aparicio Mendez Manfredini
President of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay

El Salvador
His Excellency
General Carlos Humberto Romero
President of the Republic of El Salvador
and Mrs. Romero

Canada
The Right Honorable
Pierre Elliott Trudeau, P.C., M.P.
Prime Minister of Canada

Jamaica
The Honorable
Michael Norman Manley, M.P.
Prime Minister of Jamaica
~~and Mrs. Manley~~

Bahamas
The Right Honorable
Lynden O. Pindling
Prime Minister of The Commonwealth of The Bahamas
and Mrs. Pindling

Grenada
The Right Honorable
Sir Eric M. Gairy
Prime Minister of the State of Grenada

Brazil
His Excellency
General Adalberto Pereira dos Santos
Vice President of the Federative Republic of Brazil

Guyana
His Excellency
Ptolemy Alexander Reid
Deputy Prime Minister of Guyana

old Barbados
The Honorable
Bernard St. John
Deputy Prime Minister of Barbados

Haiti
His Excellency
Edner Brutus
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Worship of Haiti

Nicaragua
His Excellency
Dr. Cornelio Henry Hueck Salomon
President of the Chamber of Deputies of Nicaragua
and Mrs. Hueck

Mexico
His Excellency
Santiago Roel Garcia
Minister of Foreign Relations of Mexico
and Mrs. Roel

Trinidad and Tobago
His Excellency The Ambassador of Trinidad and Tobago
and Mrs. McIntyre (Victor C. McIntyre)

Surinam
His Excellency The Ambassador of the Republic of Surinam
and Mrs. Karamat (Roel F. Karamat)

Barbados
His Excellency ~~Oliver H. Jackman~~ The Ambassador of Barbados
~~Ambassador of Barbados~~ and Mrs. Jackman (Oliver H.)

a- The Honorable Gerald R. Ford
Box 1945
Vail, Colorado 81657

a R The Hon. (Dr) and Mrs. Henry A. Kissinger (872-0300)
1800 K Street, N.W., Suite 520
Washington, D. C 20006 - in Japan

-a Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson
~~LBJ Ranch~~ c/o Ushers
~~Stonewall, Texas 78671~~

aa Mr. and Mrs Irving Shapiro (Chmn),
E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co., Inc. 302/774-2297
Wilmington, Delaware 19898

a Mr. and Mrs. George Meany (Pres)
AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, N.W. no reason
R Washington, D. C. 20006

a- The Hon. W. Michael Blumenthal
Secretary of the Treasury
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D. C. 20220

R The Hon. (Amb) and Mrs. Evan S. Dobelle
aa Chief of Protocol
Department of State - 20520

aa His Excellency The Secretary General of the (Alejandro Orfila)
Organization of American States and Mrs. Orfila
Pan American Union Building, Room 2
Washington. D. C. 20006

aa The Hon. (Amb) Ellsworth Bunker and Mrs. Bunker (Amb at Large)
S/AB 7260, Dept. of State - 20520

The Hon. (Amb) Sol M. Linowitz & Mrs. Linowitz (Coudert Bros)
Coudert Brothers
1 Farragut Square South
Washington, D. C. 20006

a- The Hon. (Amb) Gale W. McGee (US Rep to the OAS)
ARA/USOAS 6494, Dept. of State 20520

a- The Hon. (Dr) Zbigniew Brzezinski (Asst to the Pres for NSAffs)
West Wing

a- The Hon. (Amb) Robert S. Strauss (Spec Rep for Trade Nego)
Room 719, 1800 G Street, N.W. - 20506

a- The Hon. (Amb) Andrew J. Young
U. S. Mission to the United Nations
799 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017

aa Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Turner (Ted)
c/o Channel 17
1018 West Peachtree Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

+ Mrs. Brown
General George S. Brown, USAF no reason (Chmn., JCS)
Room 2E873, Dept. of Defense - 20301

a Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.
234 Sunset Avenue, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314
(Pres., Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Social Change (404/522-2350)

a Mr. and Mrs. Muhammad Ali
P.O. Box 53293
Chicago, Illinois 60653

Mr. Frank Moore (Asst to the Pres for Congr Liaison)
West Wing 2230

R Mr. and Mrs. Edson Arantes do Nascimento (Pele) (steve ross - 212/484-6111)
web - Tue. must be in Japan

Hon. and Mrs. John H. Glenn, Jr. 3353 (Ohio 12-24-74)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Claiborne Pell 4642 (Rhode Island 1-3-61)
U. S. Senate - 20510

Hon. and Mrs. Charles H. Percy 2152 (Illinois - 1-3-67)
U. S. Senate - 20510

R Hon. and Mrs. James B. Pearson 4774 (Kansas 1-31-62)
U.S. Senate - by messenger out of town

a Mrs. Forrest Church (address: 51 MacArthur Rd., Concord, Mass.)
c/o Hon. Frank Church
U. S. Senate - by messenger

a Hon. and Mrs. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (Del 1-3-73)
U.S. Senate - by messenger

Hon. Richard Clark (Iowa 1-3-73)
U. S. Senate - by messenger

Hon. Terence A. Todman (Ass't Secy of State for Inter-Am Affs)
ARA/LA 6263, Dept. of State - by msgr

R Hon. and Mrs. George McGovern prior comm (S. Dak.) 1-3-63
U. S. Senate - by messenger out of town

Hon. and Mrs. Richard Stone (Fla 1-1-75)
U. S. Senate - by messenger

10 As 30 Rs 101 ?

GUEST LIST FOR THE DINNER TO BE GIVEN BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND MRS. VANCE ON THE OCCASION OF THE SIGNING OF THE PANAMA CANAL TREATY, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1977, 8:30 P.M., IN THE THOMAS JEFFERSON ROOM, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FOREIGN GUESTS (Delegates)

ARGENTINA

A/A H.E. Vice Admiral Oscar Antonio Montes, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship, and Mrs. Montes

A/A Brigadier General Jose R. Villarreal, Secretary of State, Secretary General of the Presidency, and Mrs. Villarreal

A/A Major General Oscar Nestor Caeiro, Secretary of State, Chief of the Military House of the Presidency, and Mrs. Caeiro

A Captain Carlos Pablo Carpintero, Secretary of State, Secretary of Public Information

BAHAMAS

A The Honorable Paul L. Adderley, Minister of External Affairs

BARBADOS

BOLIVIA

H.E. Xavier Murillo de la Rocha, Sub-Secretary for Political, Maritime, and International Waters Affairs, Minister of Foreign Affairs

BRAZIL

A/R H.E. Alarico Silveira, Jr., Chief, Department of Regional American Organizations

CANADA

The Honorable Donald C. Jamieson, P.C., Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Mrs. Jamieson

CHILE

A/A H.E. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile and Mrs. Carvajal

A Brigadier General Sergio Covarrubias Sanhueza, Chief of Presidential Staff

15

COLOMBIA

H.E. Ernesto Torres Diaz, Director General of Protocol

COSTA RICA

H.E. Gonzalo Facio Segreda, Minister of Foreign Relations

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

H.E. Ramon Emilio Jimenez Reyes, Secretary of State for Foreign Relations, and Mrs. Jimenez

ECUADOR

H.E. The Minister of Foreign Relations, and Mrs. Ayala

H.E. The Minister of Industry and Commerce, and Mrs. Montano

EL SALVADOR

H.E. Major Alvaro Ernesto Martinez, Minister of External Relations

H.E. Lieutenant Colonel Rafael Flores Lima, Secretary of Information

GRENADA

The Honorable Henry Bullen , Permanent Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs

GUATEMALA

H.E. Adolfo Molina Orantes, Minister of External Relations

H.E. Roberto Giron Lemus, Secretary of Public Relations

GUYANA

H.E. Frederick R. Wills, Q.C., S.C., Minister of Foreign Affairs

HAITI

HONDURAS

H.E. Roberto Palma Galvez, Minister of Foreign Relations

JAMAICA

Mr. Gordon Wells, Permanent Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister

MEXICO

~~Mr. Angel Alvaro Pena, Coordinator of Presidential Visits~~
Mr. Feliciano Rivera, Director General of Information, Dept. of Foreign Affairs

NICARAGUA

H.E. Alejandro Montiel Arguello, Minister of Foreign Relations

PANAMA

H.E. Fernando Gonzalez, President of the National Assembly

H.E. Juan Materno Vazquez, President of the Supreme Court

H.E. Nicolas Gonzalez-Revilla, Minister of Foreign Relations

Lieutenant Colonel Manuel A. Noriega

Lieutenant Colonel Armando A. Contreras

Lieutenant Colonel Armando Bellido

H.E. Romulo Escobar, Chief Negotiator

H.E. Aristides Royo, Minister of Education

H.E. Adolfo Ahumada, Minister of Labor

H.E. Nicolas Ardito Barletta, Minister of Planning and Economic Policy

Mr. Rodrigo Gonzalez, Advisor to the Chief of Government

Mr. Ernesto Perez Balladares, Member of the Legislation Committee

Mr. Ruben Dario Herrera, Member of the Legislation Committee

H.E. Jorge Illueca, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

PANAMA Cont'd

Mr. Edwin Fabrega, Negotiator

H.E. Diogenes de la Rosa, Special Ambassador, Negotiator

H.E. Carlos Alfredo Lopez Guevara, Special Ambassador, Negotiator

Miss Raquel Torrijos, daughter of the Chief of the Government

PARAGUAY

H.E. Dr. Alberto Nogues, Minister of Foreign Affairs

H.E. General (Ret.) Cesar Barrientos, Minister of Finance

PERU

H.E. Lietuenant General Jorge Tamayo de la Flor, Minister of Aeronautics, Second Member of the Revolutionary Junta

H.E. Jose de la Puente Radbill, Minister of Foreign Affairs

SURINAM

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

URUGUAY

H.E. Enrique Delfante, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs

VENEZUELA

H.E. Simon Alberto Consalvi Bottaro, Minister of Foreign Affairs

H.E. Reinaldo Figueredo, Minister, Director of the National Trade Institute

His Excellency Hector Hurtado, Minister of State of Venezuela, President of the Investment Fund

His Excellency Carmelo Lauria Lesseur, Minister of the Secretariat of the Presidency

AMBASSADORS TO WASHINGTON

H.E. Dr. Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Ambassador of Nicaragua

The Ambassador of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, and Mrs. Johnson

The Ambassador of El Salvador and Mrs. Bertrand Galindo

The Ambassador of Costa Rica and Mrs. Silva

The Ambassador of Honduras and Mrs. Lazarus

The Ambassador of Uruguay and Mrs. Perez Caldas

The Ambassador of the Dominican Republic and Mrs. Vicioso

The Ambassador of Haiti and Mrs. Salomon

The Ambassador of Jamaica and Mrs. Rattray

The Ambassador of Guyana and Mrs. Mann

The Ambassador of Peru and Mrs. Garcia-Bedoya

The Ambassador of Bolivia and Mrs. Crespo

The Ambassador of Guatemala and Mrs. Maldonado

The Brazilian Ambassador and Mrs. Pinheiro

~~The Ambassador of Surinam and Mrs. Karamat (*possibly on White House list)~~

The Ambassador of Venezuela and Mrs. Iribarren

The Ambassador of the Argentine Republic and Mrs. Aja Espil

The Ambassador of Mexico and Mrs. Margain

The Ambassador of Ecuador and Mrs. Ycaza

The Ambassador of Chile and Mrs. Cauas

H.E. Gabriel Lewis, Ambassador of Panama

The Ambassador of Paraguay and Mrs. Lopez Escobar

The Ambassador of Colombia and Mrs. Barco

The Ambassador of Canada and Mrs. Towe

PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (who are not also accredited as Ambassadors to Washington)

	MEXICO	H.E. Rafael de la Colina and Mrs. de la Colina
	PANAMA	H.E. Nander A. Pitty Velasquez and Mrs. Pitty
	GUATEMALA	H.E. Eduardo Castillo Arriola
	ECUADOR	H.E. Dr. Galo Leoro
	VENEZUELA	H.E. Dr. Jose Maria Machin and Mrs. Machin
	BRAZIL	H.E. Paulo Padilha Vidal and Mrs. Vidal
	COLOMBIA	H.E. Dr. Juan Pablo Gomez-Pradilla and Mrs. Gomez-Pradilla
	ARGENTINA	H.E. Dr. Julio C. Carasales and Mrs. Carasales
	BOLIVIA	H.E. Dr. Fernando Ortiz Sanz and Mrs. Ortiz Sanz
	CHILE	H.E. Maria Eugenia Oyarzun and Mr. Errazuriz
	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	H.E. Kemil L. Dipp-Gomez and Mrs. Dipp-Gomez
	U. S.	Mrs. Gale W. Mc Gee
	PERU	H.E. Dr. Luis Marchand Stens and Mrs. Marchand
	URUGUAY	H.E. Dr. C. Alberto Roca and Mrs. Roca
	GRENADA	H.E. Fabian Alexis Redhead

PERMANENT OBSERVER - OAS

	CANADA	H.E. Arthur E. Blanchette and Mrs. Blanchette

OTHER OAS MEMBER

H.E. Dr. Jorge Luis Zelaya, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, and Mrs. Zelaya

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(in order of precedence)

A/A The Honorable Thomas J. Ashley, and Mrs. Ashley 54146

A The Honorable Dante B. Fascell

The Honorable Robert H. Michel, and Mrs. Michel 56201

The Honorable John Brademas, and Mrs. Brademas 53[illegible]

The Honorable Silvio O. Conte, and Mrs. Conte 55[illegible]

A/A The Honorable Edward J. Derwinski, and Mrs. Derwinski

R/R The HOnorable Robert N. Giaimo, and Mrs. Giaimo

R/R The Honorable Dan Rostenkowski, and Mrs. Rostenkowski

The Honorable John Slack, and Mrs. Slack 52711

A The Honorable John B. Anderson

A/A The Honorable Benjamin S. Rosenthal, and Mrs. Rosenthal

R/R The Honorable Morris K. Udall, and Mrs. Udall

The Honorable Clarence D. Long, and Mrs. Long 53061

A/A The HOnorable Jonathan Bingham, and Mrs. Bingham

The Honorable John H. Buchanan, Jr., and Mrs. Buchanan 54921

The Honorable Thomas S. Foley, and Mrs. Foley 52006

A/R The Honorable Lee H. Hamilton, and Mrs. Hamilton

A/A The Honorable Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., and Miss Scholtz

A/A The Honorable Richardson Preyer, and Mrs. Preyer

The Honorable Gus Yatron, and Mrs. Yatron [illegible]554

R/R The Honorable Bill Frenzel, and Mrs. Frenzel

A/A The Honorable David R. Bowen, ~~and guest~~

R/R The Honorable William S. Cohen, and Mrs. Cohen

A/A The Honorable Stephen L. Neal, and Mrs. Neal

he HOnorable Anthony C. Beilenson, and Mrs. Beilenson 55[illegible]

UNITED STATES AMBASSADORS AND DEPUTY CHIEFS OF MISSION

ARGENTINA	Mr. Max Chaplin, and Mrs. Chaplin
BAHAMAS	The Honorable William Schwartz, Jr., Ambassador-designate and Mrs. Schwartz
	Mr. Rush Taylor
BARBADOS AND GRENADA	The Honorable Frank Ortiz, Ambassador
BOLIVIA	Mr. William Beal
BRAZIL	The Honorable John Hugh Crimmins, Ambassador
CANADA	The Honorable Thomas Enders, Ambassador, and Mrs. Enders
CHILE	Mr. Thomas Boyatt
COLOMBIA	Mr. Robert Drexler
COSTA RICA	The Honorable Marvin Weissman, Ambassador
DOMINICAN REP.	The Honorable Robert Hurwitch, Ambassador, ~~and Mrs. Hurwitch~~
ECUADOR	The Honorable Richard Bloomfield, Ambassador
EL SALVADOR	Mr. Earl Lubensky
GUATEMALA	The Honorable Davis Eugene Boster, Ambassador
GUYANA	The Honorable John Burke, Ambassador-designate
HAITI	The Honorable William Jones, Ambassador
HONDURAS	The Honorable Mari-Luci Jaramillo, Ambassador-designate
	Mr. Carl Bartch
JAMAICA	The Honorable Frederick Irving, Ambassador, and Mrs. Irving
MEXICO	The Honorable Patrick Lucey, Ambassador, and Mrs. Lucey
NICARAGUA	The Honorable Mauricio Solaun, Ambassador-designate
PANAMA	The Honorable Robert Jorden, Ambassador, and Mrs. Jorden
PARAGUAY	The Honorable George Landau, Ambassador, and Mrs. Landau
PERU	The Honorable Harry Shlaudeman, Ambassador
URUGUAY	The Honorable Lawrence Pezzullo, Ambassador
VENEZUELA	The Honorable Viron Vaky, Ambassador, and Mrs. Vaky

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Honorable Cyrus Vance, Secretary of State, and Mrs. Vance (HOSTS)

The Honorable Warren Christopher, Deputy Secretary of State, and Mrs. Christopher

The Honorable John J. Gilligan, Administrator, Agency for International Development, and Mrs. Gilligan

The Honorable Philip C. Habib, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and Mrs. Habib

The Honorable Richard Cooper, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs

The Honorable Lucy Wilson Benson, Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance

The Honorable Ben Read, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management

The Honorable Evan S. Dobelle, Chief of Protocol

The Honorable Terence A. Todman, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Mrs. Todman

The Honorable Douglas J. Bennet, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, and Mrs. Bennet

The Honorable Herbert Hansell, Legal Adviser, and Mrs. Hansell

The Honorable Stuart Rockwell, Deputy Chief of Protocol

The Honorable David Popper, Deputy Negotiator, and Mrs. Popper

Mr. Robert Beckel, Deputy Ass't Secretary for H

Mr. Robert E. White, Deputy Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States, and Mrs. White

Mr. S. Morey Bell, Director, Office of Panamanian Affairs

Mr. Richard R. Wyrough, Senior Treaty Affairs Adviser, Office of Panamanian Affairs, and Mrs. Wyrough

ALTERNATE

The Honorable William Stedman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs

Mr. Robert Gershenson, ARA Task Force, and Mrs. Gershenson

OTHER GOVERNMENT

The Honorable Harold Brown, Secretary of Defense, and Mrs. Brown

The Honorable Hamilton Jordan, Assistant to the President

The Honorable Charles W. Duncan, Jr., Deputy Secy of Defense, and Mrs. Duncan

The Honorable Clifford Alexander, Secretary of the Army, and Mrs. Alexander

The Honorable W. Graham Claytor, Secretary of the Navy, and Mrs. Claytor

The Honorable John C. Stetson, Secretary of the Air Force, and Mrs. Stetson

Admiral James L. Holloway III, Chief of Naval Operations, and Mrs. Holloway

General Louis H. Wilson, Commandant, United States Marine Corps, and Mrs. Wilson

MR. TIMOTHY KRAFT, SPEC ASS'T TO THE PRESIDENT FOR APPTS

Lieutenant General Welborn G. Dolvin, and Mrs. Dolvin

Mr. Robert Pastor, National Security Council Staff

Mr. William Cable, Congressional Liaison Office

Miss Becky Hendricks, Staff of Assistant to the President, Mr. Jordan's Office

OTHERS

The Honorable William P. Rogers, and Mrs. Rogers

The Honorable W. Averell Harriman, and Mrs. Harriman

The Honorable Nelson Rockefeller, former Vice President of the United States, and Mrs. Rockefeller

The Honorable Melvin Laird and Mrs. Laird

The Honorable Donald Rumsfeld and Mrs. Rumsfeld

Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Jordan

Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Hooks

Adm. Elmo Zumwalt and Mrs. Zumwalt

Mr. Thomas Watson

Mr. David Rockefeller

Mr. John DeButts

Mr. Heath Larry

Mr. Dick Leisure

Mr. Henry Guyelin

Mr. A. W. Clausen

Mr. Bernardo Zuleta, Under Secretary General of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea,

ALTERNATES

The Most Reverend Marcos Gregorio McGrath, Archbishop of Panama

The Honorable Manuel Ramirez, Chief of Protocol of the Organization of American States

Mr. Robert Thomson , Deputy Assistant for Congressional Relations, The White House

Mr. Joseph Aragon, Special Assistant to the President

LUNCHEON CRUISE TO MT. VERNON - Thursday, September 7, 1977

11:30 a.m. Pier 4

Sunday 5:00 p.m

Mrs. Carter

Argentina

Mrs. Jorge Rafael Videla
Wife of the President of the Argentine Nation

Mrs. Oscar Antonio Montes
Wife of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship of the Argentine Republic

Mrs. Jorge A. Aja Espil
Wife of the Ambassador of the Argentine Republic

Mrs. Julio C. Carasales
Wife of the Ambassador of Argentina to the OAS

Bahamas

Mrs. Lynden O. Pindling
Wife of the Prime Minister of The Commonwealth of the Bahamas

Mrs. Livingston B. Johnson
Wife of the Ambassador of The Commonwealth of the Bahamas

Bolivia

Mrs. Hugo Banzer Suarez
Wife of the President of the Republic of Bolivia

Miss Erika Banzer Prada
Daughter of the President of the Republic of Bolivia

Mrs. Alberto Crespo
Wife of the Ambassador of Bolivia

Mrs. Fernando Ortiz Sanz
Wife of the Ambassador of Bolivia to the OAS

Brazil

Mrs. Joao Baptista Pinheiro
Wife of the Ambassador of Brazil

Mrs. Paulo Padilha Vidal
Wife of the Ambassador of Brazil to the OAS

Chile

Mrs. Augusto Pinochet Ugarte
Wife of the President of the Republic of Chile

Mrs. Patricio Carvajal Prado
Wife of the Minister of Foreign Relations of Chile

Mrs. Jorge Cauas
Wife of the Ambassador of Chile

Her Excellency Maria Eugenia Oyarzun
Ambassador of Chile to the OAS

Colombia

Mrs. Alfonso Lopez Michelsen
Wife of the President of the Republic of Colombia

Mrs. Virgilio Barco
Wife of the Ambassador of Colombia

Colombia - cont'd

Mrs. Juan Pablo Gomez-Pradilla
Wife of the Ambassador of Colombia to the OAS

Costa Rica

Mrs. Rodolfo Silva
Wife of the Ambassador of Costa Rica to the US and to the OAS

Ecuador

Mrs. Alfredo Poveda Burbano
Wife of the President of the Supreme Council of Government of Ecuador

Mrs. Jose Ayala Lasso
Wife of the Minister of Foreign Relations of Ecuador

Mrs. Gustavo Ycaza Borja
Wife of the Ambassador of Ecuador

Mrs. Galo Leoro
Wife of the Ambassador of Ecuador to the OAS

El Salvador

Mrs. Carlos Humberto Romero
Wife of the President of the Republic of El Salvador

Mrs. Francisco Bertrand Galindo
Wife of the Ambassador of El Salvador to the US and to the OAS

Mrs. Juan Ricardo Salaverria
Wife of the Chief of Protocol of El Salvador

Dominican Republic

Mrs. Horacio de Vicioso
Wife of the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic

Mrs. Kemil L. de Dipp-Gomez
Wife of the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic to the OAS

Guatemala

Mrs. Kjell Eugenio Laugerud
Wife of the President of the Republic of Guatemala

Mrs. Abundio Maldonado
Wife of the Ambassador of Guatemala

Mrs. Eduardo Castillo Arriola
Wife of the Ambassador of Guatemala to the OAS

Guyana

Mrs. Laurence E. Mann
Wife of the Ambassador of Guyana to

Haiti

Mrs. Georges Salomon
Wife of the Ambassador of Haiti

Honduras

Mrs. Roberto Lazarus
Wife of the Ambassador of Honduras to the US and to the OAS

Jamaica

Mrs. Michael Norman Manley
Wife of the Prime Minister of Jamaica

Mrs. Alfred A. Rattray
Wife of the Ambassador of Jamaica

Mexico

Mrs. Santiago Roel Garcia
Wife of the Minister of Foreign Relations of Mexico

Mrs. Hugo B. Margain
Wife of the Ambassador of Mexico

Mrs. Rafael de la Colina
Wife of the Ambassador of Mexico to the OAS

Nicaragua

Mrs. Cornelio H. Hueck
Wife of the President of the National Congress of Nicaragua

Mrs. Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa
Wife of the Ambassador of Necaragua to the US
and to the OAS

Panama

Mrs. Omar Torrijos Herrera
Wife of the Chief of Government of Panama

Miss Raquel Torrijos
Daughter of the Chief of Government of Panama

Mrs. Nicholas Gonzalez-Revilla
Wife of the Minister of Foreign Relations of Panama

Mrs. Gabriel Lewis
Wife of the Ambassador of Panama

Paraguay

Mrs. Mario Lopez Escobar
Wife of the Ambassador of Paraguay to the US
and to the OAS

Peru

Mrs. Carlos Garcia-Bedoya
Wife of the Ambassador of Peru

Mrs. Luis Marchand Stens
Wife of the Ambassador of Peru to the OAS

Uruguay

Mrs. Jose Perez Caldas
Wife of the Ambassador of Uruguay

Mrs. C. Alberto Roca
Wife of the Ambassador of Uruguay to the OAS

Venezuela

Mrs. Ignacio Iribarren
Wife of the Ambassador of Venezuela

Mrs. Jose Maria Machin
Wife of the Ambassador of Venezuela to the OAS

Trinidad and Tobago

Mrs. Victor C. McIntyre
Wife of the Ambassador of Trinidad and Tobago
to the US and to the OAS

Suriname

Mrs. Roel F. Karamat
Wife of the Ambassador of the Republic of Suriname

Barbados

Mrs. Oliver H. Jackman
Wife of the Ambassador of Barbados

R Mrs. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. in Mass.
Wife of The Speaker

A Mrs. Cyrus R. Vance
Wife of the Secretary of State

E Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson attending both Bd. meeting

A Mrs. Andrew J. Young
Wife of the U.S. Rep. to the UN

Mrs. Zbigniew Brzezinski
Wife of the Asst. to the President for National Security Affairs

A Mrs. Robert S. Strauss
Wife of the Special Rep. for Trade Negotiations
Room 719, 1800 G St., NW - 20506

w/o Mrs. John J. Sparkman
Wife of the Senator from Alabama (11-6-46)

R Mrs. Clifford P. Case prior commitment
Wife of the Senator from New Jersey (1-3-55)

w/o Mrs. Frank Church
Wife of the Senator from Idaho (1-3-57)

w/o Mrs. Jacob K. Javits
Wife of the Senator from New York (1-9-57)

w/o Mrs. Robert C. Byrd
Wife of the Senator from West Virginia (1-3-59)

w/o Mrs. Claiborne Pell
Wife of the Senator from Rhode Island (1-3-61)

R Mrs. James B. Pearson out of town
Wife of the Senator from Kansas (1-31-62)

R Mrs. George McGovern out of town
Wife of the Senator from South Dakota (1-3-63)

R Mrs. Robert P. Griffin
Wife of the Senator from Michigan (5-11-66)

w/o Mrs. Howard H. Baker, Jr.
Wife of the Senator from Tennessee (1-3-67)

A Mrs. Charles H. Percy
Wife of the Senator from Illinois (1-3-67)

w/o Mrs. Ted Stevens
Wife of the Senator from Alaska (12-24-68)

w/o Mrs. Hubert H. Humphrey
Wife of the Senator from Minnesota (1-3-71)

w/o Mrs. Joseph R. Biden, Jr.
Wife of the Senator from Delaware (1-5-73)

Mrs. John H. Glenn, Jr.
Wife of the Senator from Ohio (12-24-74)

Mrs. Richard Stone
Wife of the Senator from Florida (1-1-75)

Mrs. Paul S. Sarbanes
Wife of the Senator from Maryland (1-3-77)

Mrs. John J. Rhodes
Wife of the Representative from Arizona (1-3-53)

Mrs. Jim Wright
Wife of the Representative from Texas (1-3-55)

Mrs. Robert H. Michel
Wife of the Representative from Illinois (1-3-57)

Mrs. John Brademas
Wife of the Representative from Indiana (1-3-59)

Mrs. John B. Anderson
Wife of the Representative from Illinois (1-3-61)

Mrs. Thomas S. Foley
Wife of the Representative from Washington (1-3-65)

Mrs. Ralph H. Metcalfe out of town
Wife of the Representative from Illinois (1-3-71)

Mrs. Frank Moore
Wife of the Assistant to the President for Congressional Liaison

Mrs. Henry A. Kissinger in Manila
Wife of the former Secretary of State
1800 K St., NW., Suite 520 - 20006

Mrs. Warren Christopher
Wife of the Deputy Secretary of State

Mrs. John J. Gilligan
Wife of the Administrator, AID

Mrs. Philip C. Habib
Wife of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs

The Hon. (Amb.) Carol C. Laise
Director General of Foreign Service
(wife of Amb. Ellsworth Bunker)

Mrs. George S. Brown
Wife of the Chairman, JCS
Room 2E873, Dept. of Defense - 20301

Mrs. Alejandro Orfila
Wife of the Secretary General of the OAS
Pan American Union Bldg., Room 2 - 20006

Mrs. Gale W. McGee
Wife of the U. S. Permanent Rep. to the OAS

Mrs. Thomas O. Enders
Wife of the American Ambassador to Canada

Mrs. Robert A. Hurwitch
Wife of the American Ambassador to the Dominican Republic

Mrs. Frederick Irving
Wife of the American Ambassador to Jamaica

Mrs. William J. Jorden
Wife of the American Ambassador to Panama

Mrs. George W. Landau
Wife of the American Ambassador to Paraguay

Mrs. Viron P. Vaky
Wife of the American Ambassador to Venezuela

Mrs. Evan S. Dobelle
Wife of the Chief of Protocol

Mrs. Benjamin H. Read
Wife of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management

Mrs. Maxwell Chaplin
Wife of the American Charge a.i. to Argentina

Mrs. Terence A. Todman
Wife of the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs

Mrs. Douglas J. Bennet, Jr.
Wife of the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations

Mrs. Herbert J. Hansell
Wife of the Legal Advisor, Dept. of State

Mrs. Robert E. White
Wife of the Alternate Representative of the US to the OAS

Mrs. William B. Schwartz, Jr.
Wife of the American Ambassador-desigate to the Bahamas

Mrs. William Stedman
Wife of the Deputy Asst. Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs

Mrs. Sol M. Linowitz
Wife of the Co-Negotiator for the Panama Canal Treaty

Mrs. David Popper
Wife of the Deputy Negotiator for the Panama Canal Treaty

Mrs. Jorge Luis Zelaya
Wife of the Assistant Secretary General of the OAS
Pan American Union Building, Room 20 - 20006

Mrs. James O. Eastland
Wife of the Senator from Mississippi (1-3-43)

Mrs. John C. Stennis in Miss.
Wife of the Senator from Mississippi (11-5-47)

Mrs. Henry M. Jackson
Wife of the Senator from Washington (1-3-53)

Mrs. Edward M. Kennedy
Wife of the Senator from Massachusetts (11-7-62)

Mrs. Daniel K. Inouye
Wife of the Senator from Hawaii (1-3-63)

Mrs. Ernest F. Hollings
Wife of the Senator from South Carolina (11-9-66)

Mrs. Henry L. Bellmon
Wife of the Senator from Oklahoma (1-3-69)

Mrs. Barry Goldwater out of town
Wife of the Senator from Arizona (1-3-69)

Mrs. Mike Gravel
Wife of the Senator from Alaska (1-3-69)

Mrs. Richard S. Schweiker
Wife of the Senator from Pennsylvania (1-3-69)

Mrs. Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr.
Wife of the Senator from Texas (1-3-71)

Mrs. Pete V. Domenici
Wife of the Senator from New Mexico (1-3-73)

Mrs. Walter Huddleston
Wife of the Senator from Kentucky (1-3-73)

Mrs. Wendell H. Ford
Wife of the Senator from Kentucky (12-28-74)

Mrs. Robert B. Morgan
Wife of the Senator from North Carolina (1-3-75)

Mrs. Wendell R. Anderson
Wife of the Senator from Minnesota (12-30-76)

Mrs. S. I. Hayakawa broken ank
Wife of the Senator from California (1-2-77)

Mrs. Daniel P. Moynihan
Wife of the Senator from New York (1-3-77)

Mrs. James R. Sasser
Wife of the Senator from Tennessee (1-3-77)

Ham - See if you can get HR to distribute this to members of Congress - JC

As Prepared for Delivery

Mr. President - Dr. Kissinger has call in for you which you should probably return. He made this speech last week - might want to review before you call. Also, says we have "serious" problem with Jewish community which is unavoidable. Also, Dr. K. has been working hard + effectively on Panama Canal. NJ.

STATEMENT OF

THE HONORABLE HENRY A. KISSINGER

WITH RESPECT TO THE PANAMA CANAL TREATIES

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

OF THE

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1977

10:00 A.M.

Embargoed until delivery, scheduled for 10:00 a.m. EDT
not to be previously published, quoted from, or used in any way.

"Electrostatic reproduction made for preservation purposes."

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here today to testify on an issue about which I feel deeply.

I am here before you today to express my firm conviction that the new treaties with Panama regarding the Canal significantly advance the national interests of the United States. I have carefully reviewed the treaties and discussed them in detail with Ambassadors Bunker and Linowitz; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Brown; the Air Force Chief of Staff, General Jones; President Carter and former President Ford.

-- These treaties preserve for the remainder of this century the significant elements of the existing arrangements for management and defense of the Canal, while at the same time establishing a cooperative relationship with Panama which will actually enhance the Canal's security and efficient operation.

-- After the year 2000, when management of the Canal passes to Panama, the United States will continue to have the right to guarantee the Canal's neutrality and impartial access to it. The Neutrality Treaty defines neutrality in terms of specific standards for Canal operation. It establishes that the United States as well as Panama has the responsibility to maintain those standards. We have in the Treaty the foundation for acting, if need be, to keep the Canal neutral and open.

-- And these treaties will gain international support for the continuing United States role and responsibility during this century and beyond.

Since 1964 four successive Presidents representing both political parties have concluded that the achievement of a new treaty relationship with Panama was important for the long-term security and foreign policy interests of the United States. All four Presidents have engaged in negotiations based on the conviction that a modernized relationship embodying shared commitment and responsibility would best assure our basic interest in continuing access to an efficiently run, nondiscriminatory and secure Canal. All four Presidents have felt strongly that the present 1903 treaty does not adequately assure that interest. In February 1974 I signed on behalf of the United States in the presence of a Congressional delegation a Joint Statement of Principles that was an important step in the negotiation of the new treaties.

The new treaties, freely negotiated and signed in 1977 with the support of the other nations of this Hemisphere, will improve the political environment for the protection of our interests. While the United States would, in any event, continue to have the physical means to defend the Canal unilaterally, we could exercise that ability under the present 1903 treaty only at the risk of considerable cost to our other Western Hemisphere interests. Were the new treaties rejected, it would be impossible for even our

friends in the Hemisphere to support us. No leader and no public opinion anywhere in this Hemisphere would be willing to go along with the United States in defense of the consequences of a refusal to modernize the Canal relationship with Panama. Rejection of the treaties would poison our relationship with all the countries of Latin America on all other issues, and leave us, for the first time in our history, facing the unanimous hostility of all the nations to the south of us in our own Hemisphere.

Even on the extreme assumption that Panama might not live up to the terms of the treaties, a new agreement freely worked out and signed in 1977 in the presence of Western Hemisphere Heads of Government places the United States in a far stronger moral and juridical position to defend its interests in such a case than does a treaty concluded in 1903 which was not even signed by a Panamanian and which is universally regarded as inequitable. The new treaty arrangement will provide us with international conditions vastly more favorable than currently exist to defend both the agreement and the Canal itself should the need arise. The new arrangement, above all, accords with the current reality that cooperative endeavor is the only possible basis for the satisfactory operation by the United States of a canal located within Panamanian territory and even now run by a labor force which is predominantly Panamanian. We shall not again have the opportunity to safeguard our real interests in the Canal on terms as favorable as those that have been negotiated.

The new Panama Canal treaties present us with the opportunity both to advance our basic interests in the Canal and to solidify our long-term friendship and cooperation with the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. A creative Western Hemisphere policy must have many components,

but the fate of these treaties will be its touchstone for the countries of Latin America in this period. Of course, even if the treaties are ratified there will be considerable anti-United States agitation in the Western Hemisphere. But it will not have the unifying focus of explosive opposition to what will be considered American power politics throughout the Western Hemisphere. And if the treaties are accepted, our friends -- the moderate nations that wish to work closely with us on other issues -- will have the possibility of elaborating their cooperation with us.

I understand the reluctance and concern of the opponents of the treaties. But there is no viable alternative. It is not a question of "giving" the Canal to Panama, it is a question of the United States' ability to distinguish between symbol and reality, to plan for our future needs and to preserve and in fact enhance our basic interest in the accessibility, neutrality, and security of the Canal.

Firmness in the defense of essential national interests is vital to any nation. But unreasoning adherence to the status quo has never been the test of an effective foreign policy. A nation assures its international position by understanding clearly what its interests are and by taking timely and effective action to safeguard those interests.

We have often acted on this principle. At the end of World War II, we embarked on a number of new initiatives -- the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, Point Four, to cite a few -- that constituted a dramatic change in course from those we had followed in the past. We do so because we realized that the new circumstances of the post-war era called for new responses -- that we could not assure the security and prosperity of our nation by adhering to the isolationist policies of the past. To cling to outmoded approaches was to allow ourselves to be overwhelmed by future events.

And there are many more recent examples of constructive response to changing world conditions. The SALT agreements, the opening of relations with China, our efforts to modernize

the institutions of international economic cooperation are cases in point. In each case, we did not hesitate to modify old policies and arrangements when we felt that our national interests required change.

I firmly believe that the new Panama Canal Treaties should be viewed in the same light. They are a step forward -- an improvement -- over what has existed heretofore. They present the Congress and the people of this country with an opportunity to modernize an outdated arrangement that has itself become a threat to the interests it was designed to protect.

I would like to stress a final point. These treaties represent the most important and serious international undertaking presented to the Congress by the Administration of President Carter. A defeat of the Panama Canal Treaties would weaken the President's international authority at the beginning of his term. It would jeopardize our entire Western Hemisphere relationships. The undermining of Presidential authority at home would be demonstration of fundamental weakness and a grave responsibility for the Congress to assume. I feel this all the more strongly because in my opinion we have every reason to consider that the new Treaties are to our advantage. They make the efficient and neutral operation of the Panama Canal a joint commitment with the broad support of the international community. They are the essential foundation of a long-term relationship of friendship and cooperation with the nations of

the Western Hemisphere. And they enhance our security and raise new prospects for a peaceful and constructive international order.

These treaties, in conclusion, advance fundamental national purposes. The consequences of failure would be serious. Their passage undoubtedly would be an act of courage. But we are all accountable to history for our action, and for the consequences. I believe that passage of these treaties is the only possible act of wisdom and the course of true patriotism. It is the necessity of statesmanship. I therefore urge your support.

As Prepared for Delivery

STATEMENT OF

THE HONORABLE HENRY A. KISSINGER

WITH RESPECT TO THE PANAMA CANAL TREATIES

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

OF THE

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1977

10:00 A.M.

Embargoed until delivery, scheduled for 10:00 a.m. EDT
not to be previously published, quoted from, or used in any way.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here today to testify on an issue about which I feel deeply.

I am here before you today to express my firm conviction that the new treaties with Panama regarding the Canal significantly advance the national interests of the United States. I have carefully reviewed the treaties and discussed them in detail with Ambassadors Bunker and Linowitz; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Brown; the Air Force Chief of Staff, General Jones; President Carter and former President Ford.

-- These treaties preserve for the remainder of this century the significant elements of the existing arrangements for management and defense of the Canal, while at the same time establishing a cooperative relationship with Panama which will actually enhance the Canal's security and efficient operation.

-- After the year 2000, when management of the Canal passes to Panama, the United States will continue to have the right to guarantee the Canal's neutrality and impartial access to it. The Neutrality Treaty defines neutrality in terms of specific standards for Canal operation. It establishes that the United States as well as Panama has the responsibility to maintain those standards. We have in the Treaty the foundation for acting, if need be, to keep the Canal neutral and open.

-- And these treaties will gain international support for the continuing United States role and responsibility during this century and beyond.

Since 1964 four successive Presidents representing both political parties have concluded that the achievement of a new treaty relationship with Panama was important for the long-term security and foreign policy interests of the United States. All four Presidents have engaged in negotiations based on the conviction that a modernized relationship embodying shared commitment and responsibility would best assure our basic interest in continuing access to an efficiently run, nondiscriminatory and secure Canal. All four Presidents have felt strongly that the present 1903 treaty does not adequately assure that interest. In February 1974 I signed on behalf of the United States in the presence of a Congressional delegation a Joint Statement of Principles that was an important step in the negotiation of the new treaties.

The new treaties, freely negotiated and signed in 1977 with the support of the other nations of this Hemisphere, will improve the political environment for the protection of our interests. While the United States would, in any event, continue to have the physical means to defend the Canal unilaterally, we could exercise that ability under the present 1903 treaty only at the risk of considerable cost to our other Western Hemisphere interests. Were the new treaties rejected, it would be impossible for even our

friends in the Hemisphere to support us. No leader and no public opinion anywhere in this Hemisphere would be willing to go along with the United States in defense of the consequences of a refusal to modernize the Canal relationship with Panama. Rejection of the treaties would poison our relationship with all the countries of Latin America on all other issues, and leave us, for the first time in our history, facing the unanimous hostility of all the nations to the south of us in our own Hemisphere.

Even on the extreme assumption that Panama might not live up to the terms of the treaties, a new agreement freely worked out and signed in 1977 in the presence of Western Hemisphere Heads of Government places the United States in a far stronger moral and juridical position to defend its interests in such a case than does a treaty concluded in 1903 which was not even signed by a Panamanian and which is universally regarded as inequitable. The new treaty arrangement will provide us with international conditions vastly more favorable than currently exist to defend both the agreement and the Canal itself should the need arise. The new arrangement, above all, accords with the current reality that cooperative endeavor is the only possible basis for the satisfactory operation by the United States of a canal located within Panamanian territory and even now run by a labor force which is predominantly Panamanian. We shall not again have the opportunity to safeguard our real interests in the Canal on terms as favorable as those that have been negotiated.

The new Panama Canal treaties present us with the opportunity both to advance our basic interests in the Canal and to solidify our long-term friendship and cooperation with the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. A creative Western Hemisphere policy must have many components,

but the fate of these treaties will be its touchstone for the countries of Latin America in this period. Of course, even if the treaties are ratified there will be considerable anti-United States agitation in the Western Hemisphere. But it will not have the unifying focus of explosive opposition to what will be considered American power politics throughout the Western Hemisphere. And if the treaties are accepted, our friends -- the moderate nations that wish to work closely with us on other issues -- will have the possibility of elaborating their cooperation with us.

I understand the reluctance and concern of the opponents of the treaties. But there is no viable alternative. It is not a question of "giving" the Canal to Panama, it is a question of the United States' ability to distinguish between symbol and reality, to plan for our future needs and to preserve and in fact enhance our basic interest in the accessibility, neutrality, and security of the Canal.

Firmness in the defense of essential national interests is vital to any nation. But unreasoning adherence to the status quo has never been the test of an effective foreign policy. A nation assures its international position by understanding clearly what its interests are and by taking timely and effective action to safeguard those interests.

We have often acted on this principle. At the end of World War II, we embarked on a number of new initiatives -- the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, Point Four, to cite a few -- that constituted a dramatic change in course from those we had followed in the past. We do so because we realized that the new circumstances of the post-war era called for new responses -- that we could not assure the security and prosperity of our nation by adhering to the isolationist policies of the past. To cling to outmoded approaches was to allow ourselves to be overwhelmed by future events.

And there are many more recent examples of constructive response to changing world conditions. The SALT agreements, the opening of relations with China, our efforts to modernize

the institutions of international economic cooperation are cases in point. In each case, we did not hesitate to modify old policies and arrangements when we felt that our national interests required change.

I firmly believe that the new Panama Canal Treaties should be viewed in the same light. They are a step forward -- an improvement -- over what has existed heretofore. They present the Congress and the people of this country with an opportunity to modernize an outdated arrangement that has itself become a threat to the interests it was designed to protect.

I would like to stress a final point. These treaties represent the most important and serious international undertaking presented to the Congress by the Administration of President Carter. A defeat of the Panama Canal Treaties would weaken the President's international authority at the beginning of his term. It would jeopardize our entire Western Hemisphere relationships. The undermining of Presidential authority at home would be demonstration of fundamental weakness and a grave responsibility for the Congress to assume. I feel this all the more strongly because in my opinion we have every reason to consider that the new Treaties are to our advantage. They make the efficient and neutral operation of the Panama Canal a joint commitment with the broad support of the international community. They are the essential foundation of a long-term relationship of friendship and cooperation with the nations of

the Western Hemisphere. And they enhance our security and raise new prospects for a peaceful and constructive international order.

These treaties, in conclusion, advance fundamental national purposes. The consequences of failure would be serious. Their passage undoubtedly would be an act of courage. But we are all accountable to history for our action, and for the consequences. I believe that passage of these treaties is the only possible act of wisdom and the course of true patriotism. It is the necessity of statesmanship. I therefore urge your support.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 9, 1977

To the People of Panama

This has been an historic week for our two countries and for all the peoples of the Americas. The treaties that Chief of Government Omar Torrijos and I have signed mark the beginning of a new era for all of us. They open the way for a new relationship between our peoples -- a relationship of friendship and cooperation, of mutual responsibility and mutual advantage.

On the return of General Torrijos to Panama, I have asked if he would convey to you, the people of Panama, my warmest good wishes and those of the American people. I want you all to know how proud I am to have been able to sign these historic documents.

The road to these treaties has been long, and our journey has not been easy. The pledge to work out a new agreement to replace that of 1903 was first made to your country by my predecessor, President Lyndon Johnson. For 13 years, through four administrations, we have tried to work toward the goal we have finally reached -- a new and fair and just arrangement between our countries.

You, the Panamanian people have been patient and understanding throughout this long process. We are fully aware of this and appreciate what it has meant. Please accept my great respect and my pledge that we Americans look forward to the years ahead when we are working together in understanding and friendship.

With warmest regards.

Most sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 27, 1977

Hamilton/Landon,

Attached is from Vance's
evening report of last evening.

Rick Inderfurth

~~SECRET~~

Canal Treaty Hearings. The key problem which surfaced ~~at today's opening Senate~~ Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the Panama Canal treaties concerns alleged discrepancies between the United States and Panamanian interpretations of key provisions of the treaty. Citing public statements made August 19 and 22 in Panama by Romulo Escobar (the Panamanian chief negotiator), Senators Baker and Stone claimed that there are significant differences of interpretation between the two countries concerning the U.S. right to act to preserve the neutrality of the Canal, the right of expeditious passage for U.S. warships, Panama's obligation to keep the Canal open in the event it becomes unprofitable, and U.S. rights to construct a sea level canal. Both Baker and Stone recommended that Panama be asked to provide a written statement to clear up any divergence of views. Ratification of the treaties may well hinge on our ability to deal with this problem, and we have begun working with the Panamanians to solve it. Senator Baker also asked that the Committee have access to all negotiating records and other documents which might be pertinent to resolving these issues. On the latter point, Cy said we would be cooperative in providing the Committee necessary background materials.

The hearings lasted over four hours and were attended by thirteen of the sixteen Committee members. Senators Church, Case, Javits, Glenn, Biden and McGovern pursued lines of questioning which were helpful in establishing for the record many of the advantages of the treaties.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4
PER ~~dept state ltr~~ RE MR-NLC-90-25
BY [signature] NARS, DATE 1/30/91

~~SECRET~~

September 14, 1977

RATIFICATION OF THE PANAMA CANAL TREATY

Assumptions:

1. The Senate will not vote on the treaty until February or March. Hearings and considerable debate, however, will precede the vote.

2. There will be a filibuster when the treaty reaches the Senate floor (though cloture requires only 60 votes, Senators are reluctant to limit debate).

3. With a third of the Senate up for reelection next year, some Senators who would support the treaty may find their vote more than usually difficult.

4. The majority of Senators will support the treaty if the situation is understood and if expressions of constituent support are received to counter right-wing mail.

5. The opposition will be vocal, professional, determined, well-financed, well-organized and small; its appeal will be to the emotions and to exaggerated patriotism.

Plan of Action:

1. Senate head count:

   a. Senators firmly committed to the treaty

   b. Senators leaning toward the treaty

   c. Senators leaning against the treaty

   d. Senators firmly opposed

   e. Senators up for reelection

2. Concentrate on b, c and e, with some support and encouragement for a.

   a. Political profile of each -- party affiliation, Committee and Subcommittee assignments, reelection date, stands on other issues, etc.

   b. Identity of his major financial contributors and other persons who influence him

   c. Position of other Senator from his state

   d. Editorial policies of major newspapers in his state on treaty

   e. Do papers generally support Senator, etc.

3. Plan to influence each Senator, state by state:

   a. Direct lobbying -- e.g., labor, local religious leaders, civic groups, White House, other Senators

   b. Grass-roots lobbying -- designate coordinators in Congressional Districts of key states to rally support for the treaty (visits, calls, letters, telegrams to Senators; campus and community meetings; local media debates; newspaper ads and editorials. . .)

4. Research -- Negative:

   a. All opposition material; list and note main points -- on a continuing basis; prepare brief rebuttals.

   b. Names of opponents and organizations -- background information, financial and other affiliations.

   c. What else do the opponents oppose and/or support (for target groups)?

5. Research -- Positive:

   a. Gallup poll

   b. Reasons for the treaty -- simple, succinct, short

   c. Groups and individuals already supporting the treaty should be listed.

   d. Clipping service

Implementation:

1. Establish a COMMITTEE FOR THE RATIFICATION OF THE PANAMA CANAL TREATY to facilitate the lobbying by nongovernmental organizations. The Committee will:

   a. Conduct bi-weekly meetings to review the treaty's status and to discuss legislative strategy

   b. Direct field organizing in target states (locate and brief local coordinators, prepare activists' kits, urge neighborhood educational and letter-writing meetings)

   c. Prepare vote counts, analyses and fact sheets

   d. Provide a clipping service

   e. Organize a speakers' bureau for community and campus meetings (the Committee should recruit local speakers for small/medium-size meetings)

   f. Assist local newspapers in writing editorials; arrange local media debates

2. Prepare a preliminary budget and raise funds

3. Hire a coordinator and support staff. If funds are forthcoming, hire a field director who can travel to the target states.

CABLE TO: MR. ANDRES AGUILAR
Chairman, Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
OAS; 1725 I Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Mr. ANDRES AGUILAR
Chairman, Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
c/o General Counsel of PETROVEN
Caracas, Venezuela

THERE HAVE BEEN A NUMBER OF UNFOUNDED, AND IRRESPONSIBLE CHARGES MADE AGAINST MY GOVERNMENT ABOUT ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS. PANAMA IS NOT PERFECT, BUT WE DO RESPECT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL THOSE PERSONS WHO LIVE WITHIN OUR GEOGRAPHY, AND THE NEW CANAL TREATIES ARE A SYMBOL TO THE WORLD OF OUR DESIRE TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION AND INJUSTICE. WE WELCOME A STATEMENT AND A VISIT BY THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS TO SEE FIRSTHAND THE REALITY OF OUR HUMAN RIGHTS POLICIES. YOU ARE WELCOME TO TRAVEL ANYWHERE IN PANAMA, TO SPEAK TO ANYONE, AND REPORT TO THE WORLD. I WILL GIVE YOU THE KEYS TO OUR JAILS, AND IF YOU FIND ANY POLITICAL PRISONERS, YOU CAN RELEASE THEM.

I BELIEVE THE ROLE OF THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT ONLY BE TO INVESTIGATE VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS, BUT ALSO TO DISPROVE UNFOUNDED CHARGES. IT IS ONLY BY THIS APPROACH THAT THE HEMISPHERE WILL BE FREE OF INJUSTICE, BECAUSE HERE YOU WILL NOT FIND OPPRESSORS OR PEOPLE BEING ABUSED.

THE POLLS TO VOTE ON THE NEW PANAMA TREATIES. THAT WILL BE A DAY OF TRANSCENDENTAL SIGNIFICANCE TO PANAMA AND TO THE ENTIRE WORLD. WE WELCOME YOU TO COME HERE OR TO DESIGNATE YOUR REPRESENTATIVES TO SEE THE PEOPLE OF PANAMA FREELY DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT TO APPROVE THE NEW TREATIES. WE HOPE THAT YOUR REPRESENTATIVES WILL REPORT TO YOU AND TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY ABOUT THE FREEDOM WITH WHICH THE PANAMANIANS EXERCISED THEIR RIGHT TO DETERMINE THEIR DESTINY.

PANAMA ASKS INQUIRY INTO ITS HUMAN RIGHTS

Invitation to O.A.S. Body Seen as Attempt to Undercut Treaty Foes

By GRAHAM HOVEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 13—The Government of Panama has invited the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to make an on-the-spot investigation of human rights in that country, Panamanian officials said today.

Panama has also invited the United Nations to send observers for the national plebiscite on Oct. 23 in which Panamanians are expected to ratify the two new Panama Canal treaties with the United States, the officials said.

These invitations, sent by Panama's chief of government, Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera, were clearly designed, Latin American diplomats said, to undercut opponents of the treaties, who have charged that the plebiscite would be rigged and that human rights violations by Panama should be a reason for rejection of the pacts by the United States Senate.

United States officials have long regarded the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights as the most careful and responsible of the international agencies working in that area.

It is made up of seven members, elected by the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States from names submitted by member governments. Once appoined for a four-year term, however, a member functions independently, not as a representative of his government.

Andres Aguilar, a distinguished Venezuelan jurist and former ambassador to the United States, is chairman of the commission. Tom J. Farer, a Rutgers University law professor, is also a current member.

For many months, the Carter Administration has been trying to generate greater support from members of the O.A.S. for the Inter-American Commission and to persuade governments charged with human rights violations to accept commission investigations.

At the O.A.S. General Assembly in Grenada last June, the United States led a successful fight, supported by Panama, for a resolution intended to strengthen the commission and to bind all members to a declaration that "there are no circumstances that justify torture, summary execution or prolonged detention without trial, contrary to law."

El Salvador, another Latin American nation accused of flagrant human rights violations, announced last week during the meeting in Washington of heads of government and other high officials for the signing of the Panama Canal treaties that it would accept a team from the commission.

EMBAJADA DE PANAMA
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20008

September 16, 1977

PRESS RELEASE

Embassy of Panama, Washington, D.C.

The Government of Panama is aware of a CBS news broadcast this morning concerning negotiations of the new Canal treaty.

The Government of Panama denies any allegation that it was aware of electronic eavesdropping of its negotiating team. It also strongly denies the allegation that it ever engaged in blackmail or any other kind of threat against the U.S. negotiators. The negotiations were always conducted with a high degree of mutual respect.

EMBAJADA DE PANAMA * WASHINGTON, D.C. *

Ricardo A. Bilonick-Paredes
Chargé d' Affaires, a.i.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BOB THOMSON Bob

THROUGH: FRANK MOORE

RE: Panama Canal Treaties - Strategy

1. SENATE ALTERATIONS OF THE TREATIES

Opponents of the new Canal treaties now know that they are not likely to succeed in winning a simple up-or-down vote on a resolution of advise and consent to ratification of the treaties. Instead, their strategy is to add amendments and reservations to the treaties nullifying their effect and making them unpalatable to Panama.

Last Thursday, Senator Allen departed from a prepared text he was delivering on the Senate floor to express his hope that the Senate would defeat the treaties by reservation and amendment. The remarks were edited out of the text of his speech as it now appears in the Congressional Record.

As you may know, fights over Senate alteration of controversial treaties are typical. We have enclosed a Congressional Quarterly summary of Senate consideration of the Treaty of Versailles. Note that disputes over reservations contributed to defeat of that treaty.

Obviously, Senate alterations of the treaties could be of great benefit if Senators can protect their political flanks by supporting an alteration while still voting in favor of the resolution of advise and consent. However, the process is also our Achilles heel if too many unacceptable reservations and amendments are added. We have begun to devise a strategy that will prepare us to tread the line between disaster and a success that is least harmful for treaty supporters.

2. ALTERNATIVE SENATE PROCEDURES

a) Report Language - the Senate may consent to ratification of a treaty and include its views or interpretations in a committee report accompanying the treaty.

b) "Understandings", "Interpretations", or "Declarations"- these terms, used interchangeably, refer to a process whereby the Senate includes in the resolution of consent its interpretation, clarification or explanation of particular provisions.

c) "Reservations" - the Senate may add a reservation to the resolution of consent involving some modification or limitation in U.S. obligations under the treaty.

d) "Amendments" - the Senate may amend the terms of the treaty itself by adding new sections or deleting provisions.

3. DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVE SENATE PROCEDURES

The substantive difference between understandings, reservations and amendments is a matter of degree. Reservations and amendments normally will add or delete provisions that are relatively important to the framework of a treaty. Understandings usually add nuances that have a less important impact on the treaties.

However, the procedural and legal differences that flow from these alternative Senate actions are enormous. If a particular Senate action on the Canal treaties is phrased in terms of an "understanding", then Panama may issue an ambiguous statement or reject the understanding, and the treaty may still be brought into force. The effort would be to postpone questions of interpretation implicit in the understanding until the issue arises.

However, if the Senate action is phrased in terms of a reservation, it is unlikely the treaties may be brought into force without specific Panamanian approval. To make matters worse, Panama's plebiscite is scheduled for October 23, well before Senate action is liekly on the treaties. Consequently, Panama's constitution may require that reservations adopted by the Senate be approved, if at all, by a second plebiscite.

Formal treaty amendments, if added by the Senate, would have the same impact as reservations. On the other hand, report language, would be the best of all, since it would be similar to legislative history rather than a modification of the text of the agreements.

4. STRATEGY

a) Strong Opposition to Reservations or Amendments - we should strongly oppose reservations or amendments to the treaties. The documents are the results of 13 years of negotiation and represent a delicate compromise between this country and Panama. Reservations and amendments could destroy that compromise. Administration witnesses at the Senate hearings today have testified to that effect.

COMMENT

b) Silence on the Passibility of Understandings or Report Language - we should not advocate understandings or report language. In response to queries about these procedures, we should neither support nor oppose them conceptually. The Senate will interpret such a response as indicating flexibility. Of course, when Senators offer specific understandings or report language in Committee or on the floor, we should take positions at that time on the issues as they arise.

COMMENT

c) More Extensive Legal Research on Alternatives - the legal department at State has done the preliminary work that has been used as a basis for this memorandum. Much more needs to be done in this area. We have asked them to prepare a more detailed analysis of relevant domestic and international law on the Senate procedures discussed above. After preparation of this analysis, we would like to take 15 minutes of your time to brief you on the results. ok

COMMENT

d) Listing Possible Reservations, Understandings, etc. - We are reviewing statements made by treaty opponents and listing all of their points of attack. From that list, we will prepare a list of possible Senate alterations and propose a position on each of them. ok

COMMENT

e) Secret Preparations for Acceptable Compromise - we will be hard-pressed to avoid Senate reservations on the neutrality issue, the sea level canal and other key provisions. Consequently, the State Department should secretly draft acceptable language for compromise reservations and begin secret negotiations with Panama for their approval. If this can be done before the plebiscite, it may be possible for the Panamanians to construct their text of the treaties in such a manner as to avoid a second plebiscite if the Senate approves the compromise reservations.

COMMENT

f) Coordination with Senate Leadership - We must find a way to make our strategy Senator Byrd's strategy. Obviously, it would be most effective if he, Senator Baker and others were to introduce a package of acceptable compromise reservations that would push the treaties over the top. We are still exploring ways to do this.

COMMENT

The potential of congressional veto of an executive agreement also raises national security problems, argued Leigh and Robert Ellsworth, assistant secretary of defense.

Interference with the President's ability to make executive agreements as commander in chief would be "unacceptable," said Leigh.

Major Treaties: 1919-75

League of Nations

Senate opposition to ratification of the Treaty of Versailles was directed principally at the League Covenant, which formed an integral part of the treaty, although other provisions, especially the Shantung settlement which favored Japan at the expense of China, also aroused strong objections. It was upon the League issue, however, that ratification hinged.[70]

The treaty was lost in the irreconcilable conflict that developed between a large group of Republicans led by Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who refused to accept the treaty without drastic reservations, and a group of Democratic followers of President Wilson, who in turn would not accept the Lodge reservations.

On more than one occasion during the war Lodge had publicly advocated an international league for the maintenance of international peace, but his final position was that this proposal should be postponed, in order to give opportunity for adequate study, and that to attempt to make it a part of the treaty of peace with Germany would only lead to prolonged discussion. This viewpoint was given support by 39 Republican senators and senators-elect who signed a proposal, drafted by Sen. Philander C. Knox (R Pa.), which was offered by Lodge in the form of a Senate resolution on March 3, 1919, the closing day of the 65th Congress. The proposed resolution declared that "the constitution of the League of Nations in the form now proposed to the Peace Conference should not be accepted by the United States" and "that the negotiations on the part of the United States should immediately be directed to the utmost expedition of the urgent business of negotiating peace terms with Germany, ...and that the proposal for a League of Nations to insure the permanent peace of the world should be then taken up for careful and serious consideration."

The resolution received an immediate reply from President Wilson. On the evening of March 4, the day before he sailed the second time for France, he told a large audience in the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City that when he finally returned with a completed treaty, that instrument would contain not only the League Covenant but "so many threads of the treaty tied to the Covenant that you cannot dissect the Covenant from the treaty without destroying the whole vital structure. The structure of peace will not be vital without the League of Nations, and no man is going to bring back a cadaver with him."

The Committee on Foreign Relations, composed of 10 Republicans and seven Democrats, held public hearings on the treaty from July 31 to Sept. 12, 1919. The majority report, written by Lodge, recommended ratification but proposed 45 amendments and four reservations. The minority report, signed by Sen. Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska and five other Democrats, declared against any amendments and deprecated reservations.

Even before the Foreign Relations Committee submitted its reports, a division of the Senate into a number of factional groups was becoming apparent. At one extreme stood the group of "irreconcilables" or bitterenders," led by Sens. William E. Borah (R Idaho), Hiram W. Johnson (R Calif.) and James A. Reed (D Mo.). They were opposed to the treaty with or without reservations. Borah contended that "it really incorporates a scheme which, either directly or indirectly, greatly modifies our governmental powers." At the other extreme were the administration Democrats led by Hitchcock, who lined up with the President in favoring unconditional ratification. Between these two extremes was the important group of "reservationists," which included Lodge. There were also the "mild reservationists," who wanted the treaty accepted with slight alterations.

By the end of October the friends of the treaty, as represented by the Democrats and mild reservationists, had succeeded in defeating all amendments proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee. Amendments were opposed not only for their content but also because they would have required approval by all other signatories of the treaty—a virtually impossible accomplishment—whereas reservations applied only to the power which made them. It was after defeat of the amendments that the struggle for reservations was seriously begun. Inability to reach a compromise there defeated the treaty.

Opposition to the League Covenant centered on Article 10, of which President Wilson himself was the author. This article read as follows:

"The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

The irreconcilables feared that Article 10 would draw the United States into foreign wars at the bidding of the League of Nations. Another fear raised by the League of Nations proposal was that it would deprive the United States of full liberty of action under the Monroe Doctrine.

Lodge Reservations. The apprehension aroused by the League Covenant and the objections to that instrument and to other parts of the treaty were reflected in the 14 reservations finally incorporated in the Lodge resolution for consent to ratification. The resolution stipulated that ratification by the United States should not become effective until the reservations had been accepted, through an exchange of notes, by three of the four following powers: Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

The reservations disclosed a determination on the part of their authors to prevent any encroachment on the powers of Congress, as well as any encroachment on the sovereignty of the United States. In carrying out that purpose, in the view of proponents of American membership in the League, the reservations went far beyond any necessary precautions. They were so distasteful to President Wilson that he wrote to Sen. Hitchcock on Nov. 18, 1919, that in his opinion the Lodge resolution "does not provide for ratification but rather for nullification of the treaty."

Ratification Votes. The Lodge resolution was finally brought to a vote during the evening of Nov. 19, 1919, and twice defeated. On the first vote there were 39 yeas and 55 nays. On a reconsidered vote ratification again failed with only 41 yeas as against 51 nays. Without further debate the Senate proceeded to vote on a separate resolution for simple approval of the treaty without reservations of any kind. Consent to ratification was then withheld for the third time by a vote of 38 yeas to 53 nays. In this last count the 13

Congress Uses Resolutions to Influence Foreign Policy

On numerous occasions, Congress has attempted to influence the course of foreign policy by adopting resolutions. In some cases, the President has followed the advice of Congress, in others, not.

In 1836, President Jackson received separate resolutions from both chambers favoring the acknowledgment of the independence of Texas by the United States; the preamble of the House resolutions intimated that the expediency of recognizing the independence of Texas should be left to the decision of Congress. On Dec. 21, 1838, Jackson replied: "In this view, on the ground of expediency, I am disposed to concur, and do not, therefore, consider it necessary to express my opinion as to the strict constitutional right of the executive, either apart from or in conjunction with the Senate, over the subject."[1]

While the Civil War was in progress, there was universal resentment at the French interference in Mexico. In the Senate, numerous resolutions were introduced condemning the French action, but all were tabled. The House, however, by unanimous vote adopted a resolution on April 4, 1864, declaring: "It does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge a monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America, under the auspices of any European power."[2]

Secretary of State Seward responded by instructing the U.S. minister to France to inform the French government that "the decision of such questions of policy constitutionally belongs, not to the House of Representatives nor even to Congress, but to the President...." When the House learned of this, it passed by an almost unanimous vote a resolution "that Congress has the constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States as well as the recognizing of new powers as in other matters; and it is the constitutional duty of the President to respect that policy...."[3]

Beginning in the Civil War period, there were repeated instances of the Senate attempting to control, by resolution, U.S. relations with Mexico. In addition, resolutions have been introduced from time to time for the recognition of new foreign governments. However, the power of recognition constitutionally lies with the President, through his role of sending and receiving foreign diplomats and ministers. (Washington established a controlling precedent when he received Citizen Genet and then demanded his recall by France without consulting Congress.)[4] On the other hand, the Senate, through its role of advice and consent to ambassadorial nominations, has considerable influence over the nation's foreign relations.

In his book, *Congress and Foreign Policy-Making*, James A. Robinson, discusses congressional involvement in foreign policy decisions in the period 1933-61, concluding that in the vast majority of cases, congressional resolutions or authorizations were in fact measures legitimizing the executive's proposals and amending them, rather than representing a congressional initiative in recommending major policies.[5] A case in point is the Vandenberg Resolution of 1948, named after Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Arthur H. Vandenberg (R Mich.), whose support the Truman administration had particularly sought out for bipartisan cooperation. The resolution, noted Robinson, provided "the legitimization for the origins of United States participation in the development of the North Atlantic Treaty." Adoption of the resolution, he concluded, was an example of the "executive's primacy in the identification and selection of problems which occupy the foreign policy agency of Congress and the executive...."[6] The resolution, "usually regarded as a case of senatorial initiative, was in fact a response to an appeal from the executive."[7]

One clear example of congressional initiative in post-war foreign policy, according to Robinson, was S Res 264 of the 85th Congress, suggesting that the administration study the possibility of proposing to other governments the establishment of an international development association (IDA) as an affiliate of the World Bank. The resolution, introduced by Sen. A. S. Mike Monroney (D Okla.), was at first opposed by the State Department, but it was approved by the Senate July 23, 1958, by a 62-25 vote. "It is not too much to say that the idea of such an organization occurred independently to Senator Monroney," says Robinson. "It is highly unlikely that the executive branch would have taken the initiative of this sort."[8]

Promptly after the Senate passed the resolution, the administration initiated discussions with other governments about the feasibility of attaching an IDA to the World Bank. In late January 1960, the Articles of Agreement on IDA approved by the executive directors of the World Bank were released to the press. Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on a proposal for U.S. participation in IDA opened in March 1960. The bill passed both chambers that year.

Footnotes

1. George H. Haynes. *The Senate of the United States* (Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1938), p. 673.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 674.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 675.
4. C. Herman Pritchett, *The American Constitution* (McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1959), p. 357.
5. James A. Robinson, *Congress and Foreign Policy-Making* (Dorsey Press, 1962), Chapter 2.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 62; see also pp. 70-92.

Republican irreconcilables, who in the two previous votes had opposed ratification even with the Lodge reservations, were joined by the whole body of reservationists. McCumber was the sole Republican to favor unconditional consent to ratification.

The treaty issue was revived in the second session of the 66th Congress, and another vote was taken on March 19, 1920. On this occasion there was no question of unconditional approval. The resolution before the Senate contained the original Lodge reservations, slightly revised but

with no essential change. President Wilson still characterized them as amounting to a "sweeping nullification of the terms of the treaty," but shortly before the vote was taken Thomas J. Walsh (D Mont.), who had opposed the Lodge resolution in the preceding November, appealed to his colleagues to accept the reservations, since the treaty was too important to be lost. Although more than a dozen Democrats responded to this plea, consent to ratification was once more denied, this time by a vote of 49 yeas to 35 nays, seven votes short of the two-thirds required.

United Nations

Mindful of the Senate's rejection of the League of Nations in 1919, the Roosevelt administration had begun to court bipartisan support for the United Nations long before the Dumbarton Oaks meetings of August-October 1944 at which a draft charter was drawn up; Secretary of State Cordell Hull had assured congressional leaders of both parties in 1943 that Congress would have the final say on U.S. participation in any world security organization.[71] The eight-member delegation to the San Francisco conference, announced Feb. 13, 1945, was picked with an eye to the widest public support. Headed by Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius Jr. (who had succeeded Hull Dec. 1, 1944), it included Hull; Sens. Tom Connally (D Texas), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Arthur H. Vandenberg (R Mich.), a committee member; Reps. Sol Bloom (D N.Y.) and Charles A. Eaton (R N.J.), chairman and ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; former Gov. Harold E. Stassen (R Minn.) and Virginia Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard College. John Foster Dulles, foreign policy adviser to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York during the 1944 presidential campaign, was named a principal adviser to the delegation.

Public discussion of the charter was intense and widespread before and during the two-month conference, at which Vandenberg and Dulles played leading roles. In San Francisco on the day the conference ended, June 26, President Truman acclaimed the charter as a declaration of "faith that war is not inevitable." In a personal appearance before the Senate July 2, he called for prompt ratification of the charter and the annexed statute of the International Court of Justice. Said Truman: "The choice before the Senate is now clear. The choice is not between this charter and something else. It is between this charter and no charter at all."

Following a week of hearings, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 13 voted 21-1 to approve the charter (Exec. F, 79th Cong., 1st Session)—the lone dissenter being Hiram W. Johnson (R Calif.), ranking minority member. During Senate debate July 23-28, most of the discussion centering on Article 43, pledging members to "make available to the security council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security." Burton K. Wheeler (D Mont.) and others feared this would give the U.S. delegate "the war-making power," but the President assured the Senate on July 27 that any agreements under Article 43 would be sent to Congress for "appropriate legislation to approve them." Next day the Senate gave assent to the establishment of the United Nations, by the overwhelming margin of 89-2. Opposed were GOP Sens. William Langer (N.D.) and Henrik Shipstead (Minn.). Hiram Johnson (who died Aug. 6) announced his opposition.

NATO

Following passage of the Vandenberg Resolution in 1948, which declared U.S. determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense, President Truman directed the State Department to explore the question of regional security with Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.[72] By October, these seven countries had reached tentative agreement on a collective defense arrangement and had invited Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Italy and Portugal to join them. Negotiations were concluded April 4, 1949, when representatives of the 12 nations signed the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington "to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security."

The text reaffirmed support for the United Nations and for the peaceful settlement of disputes. It also pledged the signatories to work jointly for political, economic and social stability within the North Atlantic area, defined to extend from Alaska through the North Atlantic to the three French departments in Algeria. But its key provisions called for intensified self-help and mutual aid measures to defend the area and pledged that, in the event of an armed attack against one of the members, each of the others would come to its aid by taking "such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area." The treaty also provided for establishment of a North Atlantic Council to draw up plans for concerted action, for the admission of other nations by unanimous invitation, and for the right of members to withdraw after 20 years.

President Truman sent the treaty (Exec L, 81st Cong., 1st Session) to the Senate April 12 and urged prompt approval. The key question that arose at once concerned the relationship between the treaty and the not-yet submitted military assistance program: would approval of the treaty commit Congress to vote for the latter? To clarify the matter, several senators called for consideration of the two together. But the administration refused, withholding its military aid proposals until action on the treaty had been completed.

Hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, beginning April 27, produced strong backing for the treaty by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and other administration officials. Former Vice President Wallace denounced the pact, saying it would destroy the chances for European recovery and entail costs of $20-billion for military aid. On June 6, the committee voted unanimously to approve the treaty. Its report asserted that approval would not commit the Senate to approve the arms aid request and that the treaty did not give the President any powers "to take any action, without specific congressional authorization," which he could not already take.

The Senate debated the treaty from July 5 to 20, with Sens. Tom Connally (D Texas) and Arthur H. Vandenberg (R Mich.) carrying the burden of the defense. Sen. Robert A. Taft (R Ohio) announced that he would oppose ratification without a reservation disclaiming any obligation to arm Western Europe—a step he said would "promote war." Answering Taft was Sen. John Foster Dulles (R N.Y.), sworn in July 8 as the appointed successor to Sen. Robert F. Wagner (D N.Y.): "If the impression became prevalent that this country was turning its back on international cooperation, the results would be disastrous. Other free countries...would almost certainly fall. We would be encircled and, eventually, strangled ourselves."

New Directions
021 L Street, NW • Washington, DC 20036 • (202) 452-1050

September 15, 1977

Don Scroggin	Center for Law & Social Policy	1751 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007	872-0670
Ann Tarbell	United Presbyterian Church, D.C. Office	110 Maryland Ave., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002	543-1126
Jane Leiper	National Council of Churches	110 Maryland Ave., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002	544-2350
Charles Bergman	New Directions Council		
Marni Holbrook	Izaak Walton League	1800 N. Kent Street Arlington, Va. 22209	528-1818
John J. Jackley	Council of the Americas	1700 Pa. Ave., N.W. #680 Washington, D.C.20006	298-9016
Dick McCall	Office of Senator H. H. Humphrey	Room 2113 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg.	224-3244
Murray Woldman	Members of Congress for Peace thru Law	201 Mass. Ave., N.E. #316 Washington, D.C. 20002	544-4250
David E. Ortman	Friends of the Earth	620 C Street, S.E. Washington, D.C. 20003	543-4312
A. P. McLellan	AFL-CIO	815 - 16th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036	637-5060
B. P. Cameron	ADA	1411 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005	638-6447
H. Sisson	CWA	1925 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036	785-6736
Beth Perkins	League of Women Voters	1730 G Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006	296-1770
Curtis Cutter	State Department	C Street Washington, D.C.	632-1246
Jo Husbands	CDI	122 Maryland Ave., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002	543-0400
Sally Kabisch	Sierra Club (for Brock Adams)	330 Pa. Ave., S.E. Washington, D.C. 20003	547-1144
Vern W. Pond	NWF (Nat'l Wildlife Fed)	1412 16th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036	797-6800
Thomas Quigley	U.S. Catholic Conference	1312 Massachusetts Ave. Washington, D.C. 20005	659-6817

Joseph Eldridge	Washington Office on Latin America	110 Maryland Ave., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002	544-8045
Louise Bowman	Church of the Brethren	110 Maryland Ave., N.E. Box 50, Wash., D.C. 20002	546-3202
Jill Schuker Doug Bennett	State Department	C Street Washington, D.C.	632-0596
Frances Neely	Friends Committee	245 - 2nd Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002	547-4343
Keith Haller	Democratic Forum	1621 Conn. Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20009	332-0603
Roger Cochetti	UNA	413 E. Capitol St. Washington, D.C. 20003	547-6445
Phil Strickland		Dallas, Texas 75201	
Bill Hellert	UNA	413 E. Capitol St. Washington, D.C. 20003	547-6645
Jacqui Chagnon	Coalition for a New Foreign & Military Policy	110 Maryland Ave., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002	546-8900
	Clergy & Laity Concerned	1114 G Street, S.E. Washington, D.C. 20003	546-8985
Michael Shower	National Democratic Forum	1621 Conn. Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20009	332-0603
Martin McLaughlin	Overseas Development Council	1717 Mass. Ave. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036	234-8701

Bob Pastor - WSC - Latin America
Pearson - U.N. - (?)

Panama Canal Treaty Ratification Campaign
September 15th Meeting

Partcipants

AFL-CIO
Communication Workers of America
United Steel Workers
United Nations Association
Overseas Development Council
Washington Office on Latin America
Presbyterian Church
World Federalists, USA
U.S. Catholic Conference
National Council of Churches
Network
Friends Committee on National Legislation
United Methodist
United Methodist Women
Unitarian Universalist Association
Mennonite Central Committee
Church of the Brethren
Emergency Committee for American Trade
U.S. Chamber of Commerce
League of Women Voters
Americans for Democratic Action
National Farmers Union
Natural Resources Defense Council
Members of Congress for Peace through Law
Center for Defense Information
National Wildlife Federation
Friends of the Earth
Council of the Americas
Sierra Club
Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy
Common Cause
New Directions

State Department
Dick McCall - Office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey