

the Senate, was delighted over the whole course of events. Laxalt expected a resolution to delay the transition of the canal to Panama to be introduced next week along with another reservation which would reinstitute the 1903 Treaty if the Panamanians reject the Senate's ultimate version.

Panama on DeConcini Clause: Violates Sovereignty

Excerpts from a March 28 note verbale by the Permanent Representative of Panama, Jorge E. Illueca, to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General:

...According to its proponent, the "DeConcini Amendment" is intended to give to the United States of America the unilateral and perpetual right to "take military action on Panamanian soil without the consent of the Panamanian Government," pretending that said amendment must be construed to permit the United States to intervene in Panama in the event of labour unrest, strikes, a slow-down, or under any other pretext labeled as interference with Canal operations (see text of Senator Dennis DeConcini's statement before the United States Senate on 16 March 1978 inserted in the attached clipping of the United States *Congressional Record*, vol. 124, No. 38, pp. S3817-3818 (appendix II)).

Not only does the amendment make no reference to the régime of neutrality, but, as stated by Senator Edward Kennedy, who opposed the DeConcini Amendment,

"Panama has waited 75 years since its independence to end American occupation of its heartland. It must wait another 22 years before it achieves full control over its national territory." Now Panama is asked, in Kennedy's words, "to accept an amendment which has the ring of military interventionism — not just during this century, but for all time..."

Statement made by Senator Dennis DeConcini in the Senate of the United States of America on 16 March 1978:

...Although General Torrijos has brought a welcome degree of stability to Panama in recent years, it can be argued that the history of Panama is one of substantial political instability and turmoil....

The amendment contains a very specific reference to the use of military force in Panama. I believe these words are absolutely crucial because they establish the American right — which I am not convinced is adequately provided for either in the body of the treaty or the leadership amendment — to take military action if the case so warrants. It further makes it clear that the United States can take military action on Panamanian soil without the consent of the Panamanian Government.

The question of consent is also crucial. Since the main thrust of this amendment is directed toward situations in which the canal is closed because of internal difficulties in Panama — difficulties like a general strike, a political uprising, or other similar events, the consent of the Panamanians to take action would not make sense. If America is to have any rights at all under this treaty, it must have the right to act independently to protect the canal and to keep it open....

SALT II:

Will Administration See It Through?

"A SALT agreement is critical to U.S.-Soviet relations," declared a political analyst, underscoring his own concern about Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's trip which takes him first to Afirca, then to Moscow on April 19 for the arms limitation talks. Much depends on Vance's trip and the state of the SALT negotiations; if the progress on SALT is reversed then there will be a major strain in the U.S.-Soviet relations and the world will be set for a crisis.

The danger has been exacerbated by opponents of a SALT agreement, who believe the U.S. should engage the Soviets quickly in a confrontation. Through various press articles in the U.S. and Britain they have been pressuring Carter to make a clear show that he is not "giving in" to the Soviets. This pressure increased markedly after Carter determined not to go ahead with immediate production of the so-called neutron bomb, *repeatedly identified* as a provocation by the Soviets (see Special Report).

"Jimmy Carter's image as an American President able to lead the western alliance and deal effectively with the Soviet Union appears to be in serious and worsening trouble in Western Europe," declared the *Washington Post* April 10. This coordinated press campaign is aimed at convincing the President that he can only maintain his

credibility at home and abroad through a face-down with the Soviets. "If Carter perceives that the Soviets perceive he is a lightweight, he will be encouraged to seek a confrontation," warned a source close to the Administration. The United States would then face the choice of annihilation or a humiliating backdown.

Carter and Vance have so far maintained their commitment to a SALT agreement, despite much pressure. Chief SALT negotiator Paul Warnke last week in a speech in New York revealed that in fact 90 percent of the items for a SALT agreement have already been settled. But what is keeping SALT from being finalized is not actually U.S.-Soviet differences, but the political will of the Carter Administration to see it through the U.S. Senate. "Most people I talk to say that there is good reason for pessimism for passage of SALT, it depends on the Administration's campaign to get it through and the way they present it," declared a member of the U.N. Association.

A dangerous sign of Administration pandering to SALT has come in a speech Monday by Secretary Vance to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, in which he tried to assure the world that the U.S. was not giving away anything to the Soviets in the SALT treaty. While

discussing the need for arms agreements, Vance also prefaced his remarks about the U.S. SALT position with an attack on Soviet troop buildups in Eastern Europe and the Indian Ocean. He then outlined a negotiating posture that claimed the U.S. sought to reduce Soviet but not U.S. strategic weapons, and to impose technological restraints on the Soviets primarily, while the U.S. modernized its arsenal, specifically the cruise, the Trident and MX missiles. These proposals led to the collapse of Vance's SALT negotiating trip to the USSR last year.

Izvestia Goes After Kissinger's Dirty Role

The leading foreign policy observer for the Soviet government newspaper Izvestia, V. Matveev, published an article on April 7 under the title "When All Sense of Moderation is Lost."

For the second time in recent days, former U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger has turned to Africa in a public speech, trying to portray recent events there in a grossly distorted fashion. What has provoked him to speak out in such an unrestrained fashion?...

From Kissinger's statements, it follows that the U.S. should more actively support Somalia in actions against Ethiopia. The social and political changes which have taken place in Ethiopia in recent years, marking the end of the feudal-monarchical order, have met with hostility in those U.S. circles for whom Africa is either a raw materials continent, or a strategic bridgehead, or both.

Explaining the goals of U.S. Africa policy in June 1976, Kissinger referred to the importance of "preventing its radicalization." This statement was condemned by many countries on the continent: on what grounds was this politician assigning himself the role of abitrer and ordergiver, telling other countries how to act?... It may also be recalled that in his time he was one of the instigators of subversion operations against the legal

government of S. Allende, which led to the fascist coup in Chile.

In a word,... this politician has not hesitated to resort to the most dubious means and devices. Not every representative of influential U.S. political circles shared in such lack of scruple.

TASS: "J. Carter's Decision on the Neutron Weapon"

From an April 8 Tass wire:

U.S. President J. Carter has announced that he has taken a decision "to postpone production" of the neutron weapon. "The final decision on using enhanced radiation properties in our modernization of tactical weapons will be taken later," stressed the President's statement, published by the White House.

Judging from the content of J. Carter's announcement, however, the present decision by no means signifies a renunciation of preparations to produce and deploy the neutron weapon. The President reported that he had given "a directive to the Department of the Defense to begin work on modernizing nuclear warheads for the "Lance missiles and enhanced radiation weapons system" in anticipation of subsequent utilization of the neutron weapon with them.

"We will continue," he said, "together with our allies, to take measures for the modernization and strengthening of our military capability, both nuclear and conventional."

At the same time the President, with the obvious purpose of obtaining concessions from the Soviet Union on other, unrelated matters, tried to link the final decision on U.S. production of the neutron weapon with measures for strengthening the defense capability of the Soviet Union, which are completely unrelated to the neutron weapon. But J. Carter did not mention at all the clear proposal of the USSR to agree on a mutual basis not to produce, stockpile, or deploy the neutron weapons in any place whatsoever.

Support For Export Policy Grows

Last week, several prominent private industry and government spokesman added their support to programs for an expansion of U.S. exports — programs which cohere with the U.S. Labor Party-initiated campaign for expansion of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

*Exim Bank Chief: What U.S. Does Best—
Trade and Technology*

United States Export-Import Bank chairman, John Moore, continued his well-known support for export growth in a speech before a conference on U.S.-Arab trade held April 6-7 in Georgetown, sponsored by the Georgetown Center for Contemporary Arab Studies.

American labor costs have not increased that much, not as much as out competitors. The interests of the United States are served by free trade, not by protecting labor-intensive industry, but by doing what we do best...

by developing new technologies and not being afraid to sell them abroad. The answer is trade and technology...

There is little concern in Congress for... exports... Until this is gotten across to the country, we will have a weakening dollar and a trade deficit...

Fulbright Calls for U.S.-Arab Deals

Former U.S. Senator William Fulbright also addressed the same conference in Georgetown.

The U.S. should facilitate oil-for-technology deals with the Saudis... we're not the ones risking anything when they invest... they are taking the risks... We need joint ventures elsewhere... They're (the Saudis — ed.) interested in the Third World...

The Saudis know this Administration welcomes their investments, but they see that the U.S. Administration does not want to face opposition...

I would think it appropriate for the Carter Ad-