

Panama Canal

August 31, 1967

[REDACTED]
Stockton, Kansas 67669

Dear Mrs. [REDACTED]:

Thank you for the pamphlet concerning the Panama Canal Treaty proposed by President Johnson.

Since treaty ratification is reserved exclusively for the Senate, I will not, as a member of the House, have a direct voice or vote in the matter.

I am enclosing a copy of a recent release to the weekly papers in the 1st District, which more fully expresses my views on this issue.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE
Member of Congress

BD:jh
Enclosure

Dear Bob Dole.
Let's not give
PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S
away the Panama Canal.
FOLLY

Thank You.

The New Panama Treaty

Stockton, Ca.

RECEIVED 67669



**Committee on Pan-American
Policy**

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FOLLY

The New Panama Treaty

by Harold Lord Varney

The American people stand upon the brink of one of the most humiliating surrenders in our history. And the pity of it is that only a frighteningly few Americans are even aware of what is happening.

Unless they are halted by an informed and outraged public, the President and his peace-at-any-price hemispheric advisers are going to sit down with Panama representatives, some time this year, and sign away 503 square miles of American soil—the Canal Zone. They will do this blunderingly and under duress. Neither the compulsion of superior force, nor the spur of American self-interest will have brought them to this Canossa. They will have yielded because, although they speak for the most powerful nation in the world, they have allowed themselves to be outmaneuvered and outfought in a war of nerves by a midget nation of only one million people.

If this seems incredible, then contemplate some of the further concessions we are planning to make to placate Panama.

The text of the new proposed Panama Treaty has not yet been published, although negotiators from Panama and the United States have wrestled over its terms in deep secrecy for over three years. But enough is known, from the President's official statements of Dec. 18, 1964 and Sept. 24, 1965, and from the news leakages from the negotiating room, to indicate that the following has been promised to Panama:

(1) We will give up the exercise of sovereignty over the Canal Zone (ours "in perpetuity" under the existing Treaty). The Stars and Stripes will come down forever in this Zone which has been an integral part of

the United States since 1903.

(2) We will surrender U.S. control of the Panama Canal, a \$2 billion American asset, built solely with our money and know-how. Administration of the Canal will be turned over to a Commission of nine, five Americans and four Panamanians.

(3) We will place our military establishments in the Zone at the mercy of a neutralist-minded Panama. This, despite the fact that they are the pivot of the Southern Command of our Armed Forces, which are responsible, under the Monroe Doctrine, for maintaining security from foreign aggression of the whole Caribbean and South American area. In surrendering sovereignty, we will give Panama the right to evict us, at any time, if anti-Americans gain the upper hand in the Panamanian government.

(4) Although the issue is still in debate, we are being pressured by Panama to renounce the use of atomic weapons in the Isthmus, thus rendering us naked to our enemies in the event of atomic attack.

The question naturally occurs to any American, how can responsible American officials even consider acceptance of such a loaded Treaty.

To drive us to this appalling surrender, the only weapon which Panama possesses is the threat of mob riots in Panama, if we refuse. The Panama politicians who are negotiating with us have ended every argument with the implicit threat that, if we don't sign, more extreme Panama leaders will take control and again unleash the Communist-led mob against us in the Canal Zone. Our negotiators have meekly submitted to this threat of force.

Of course this is nothing new, in our relations with Panama. We have been buncoed and blackmailed by this argument ever since 1959, when the shrewd "Hundred Families" who control and enrich themselves from Panama encouraged the first all-out mob uprising in Panama City. It was the officially encouraged bloody demonstration of 1964

which frightened President Johnson into his glorious agreement to renegotiate the 1903 Treaty. Panamanian President Chiari could have snubbed off this riot in a matter of hours by mobilizing the Panama National Guard, which was standing by. Instead, he permitted the riots to continue for three murderous days while he insisted that he would not act unless the United States agreed to renegotiate. Once again, the Panama politicians are using this argument of bloodshed in the current negotiations. It is an extortioner's bluff, and we ourselves are the only fools if we fail to call it.

It would be pleasing to record that our Washington officials have been candid and honest with us in presenting the new Treaty issue to the public. Unhappily, they have not.

By a masterpiece of news management, the Administration has succeeded in burying the whole issue of surrender of the Zone and Canal by setting up a strident publicity outcry about our intention to build a new sea-level canal. The idea has been subtly implanted in the public mind that, since we are going to build a new Canal, the fate of the present Canal is not actually important. The whole sea-level Canal furore has been built up synthetically to divert public wrath from the fact that we are ignobly surrendering the present Canal, and the Zone.

Actually, there is no certainty that we are going to build a new Canal at all. It is not immediately necessary; even the Panama press itself has acknowledged that the present Canal will not become obsolescent for another 30 years. And yet the sea-level Canal issue has been blown up, by clever Administration manipulation, into a huge red herring which has confused the whole Treaty discussion. Probably its best refutation is to ask if American officialdom is too incompetent to hold the Canal we already own, what certainty is there that they can hold onto a new one.

That the sea-level Canal issue has been deliberately staged is shown by its timing. On Sept. 1st, 1964, three months

before President Johnson first admitted publicly that he was prepared to surrender the Canal Zone, the then Chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee hastily brought in a resolution, under suspension of rules, without benefit of published public hearings, to set up a commission to study the sea-level Canal possibility. The resolution excluded any other alternative for modernizing the Canal, such as the highly favored Terminal Lake Third Locks plan, which would avoid the necessity of a new Canal altogether. By a clever legislative trick, the United States was thus committed to the sea-level project. The resultant publicity clamor over the new sea-level Canal blanketed the staggering effect which President Johnson's Dec. 18th announcement would otherwise have had. Since 1964, the whole Administration and press discussion of the proposed new Panama Treaty has been conducted in this atmosphere of unreality. The real issue has been obscured by a publicity specter.

Alarmed Americans, writing to their Congressman or to the State Department about the Panama Treaty have received a cleverly and arrogantly phrased form letter, prepared in the State Department, advising them that the Panama outcome has already been decided by the Administration. The effect of the letter is to persuade inquirers that the debate is already closed.

But it is not closed. The Panama issue will not be determined until the American people have spoken through the voices of their 100 United States Senators. President Johnson may affix his signature to this Treaty of dishonor, but it will not be effective until two-thirds of the United States Senate has voted to ratify it.

We do not believe that President Johnson can obtain this two-thirds vote. We believe that, at least, 34 American-minded Senators will stand up and be counted against the Treaty.

It will be the task of Americans who love their national heritage, and who will act to preserve it, to make their voices heard by the Senate during the few months that still remain.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

The people can defeat this shameful Treaty, *But they must speak out, and now.*

- (1) Write to President Johnson, to the Senators from your State, and to your Congressman, expressing your firm opposition to the ratification of the new proposed Treaty.

Ask your friends and acquaintances to write similar letters. Do it now.

- (2) Write letters to your local newspapers, giving your reasons for opposition to the Treaty.
- (3) Try to secure bookings for speakers opposing the Treaty before your local service clubs, women's clubs, discussion groups and schools.

- (4) Give wide distribution in your community to publications giving the truth about the Treaty. The Committee on Pan American Policy can supply the following publications, at these cost rates:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FOLLY THE NEW PANAMA CANAL

Single copies	\$.10
12 copies	1.00
60 copies	5.00
125 copies	10.00
500 copies	35.00

WHAT ARE WE AFRAID OF IN PANAMA?

(A longer booklet, giving the backgrounds of the present situation)

Single copies	\$.25
10 copies	2.00
50 copies	8.00
100 copies	15.00
500 copies	65.00

COMMITTEE ON
PAN AMERICAN POLICY
Suite 1430, 60 East 42nd St.,
New York, N. Y. 10017

AMERICANS AGAIN! THE TREATY

THE AMERICAN LEGION:

"Resolved, by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D. C., August 30, 31-September 1, 1966, That the American Legion (1) reaffirms its support of the basic and still existing provisions of the 1903 treaty, and the continued, indispensable sovereign control of the United States over the Canal Zone."

NATIONAL SOCIETY, D.A.R.

"Resolved, that the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, favor no United States surrender or further abrogation to Panama of the United States of America's absolute treaty rights over this strategic Canal Zone." 75th Continental Congress, April 18-22, 1966.

AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES

"Resolved that the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies opposes any revision of the Treaty of 1903 at this time and reaffirms its support of the continued indispensable sovereign control of the United States over the Canal Zone."

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

"Be it further resolved that, until and unless the United States Government obtains permanent rights and an adequate alternate canal is operational, that there be no abrogation of existing treaties regarding the Panama Canal and our rights thereto." 46th Annual Convention, 1966.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, U. S. SENATOR FROM GEORGIA

"It is vital that the United States maintain sovereignty over the Panama Canal, and we must insist that the U. S. alone determine the policy for its operation, in time of peace or war. I hope the administration will reconsider its proposal to renegotiate the 1903 treaty and let it stand as is."

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD, REPRESENTATIVE FROM PENN.

"The Panama Canal cannot be maintained, operated and governed efficiently with less authority than that granted the United States by the 1903 Treaty. Moreover, it is evident from what has transpired that authoritative elements in our own government who have so basely acquiesced . . . in the furtherance of supine and suicidal policy are now endeavoring to accomplish by treaty what could never be obtained by the normal process of congressional enactment."

MRS. LENOR K. SULLIVAN, CHAIRMAN PANAMA CANAL SUB-COMMITTEE OF HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE COMMITTEE

"Panamanian nationalist objectives will never be satisfied short of a complete take-over of the Canal and the Canal Zone. . . . No responsible American citizen could possibly tolerate this."

THE STATE LEGISLATURES SPEAK

SOUTH CAROLINA—PASSED BY BOTH
HOUSES, APRIL, 1967

Calendar No. H. 1447

Introduced by MR. E. JUETTE WRIGHT
Read the first time March 14, 1967.

A Concurrent Resolution

Expressing Strong Opposition to the Proposal that the United States Relinquish Its Sovereignty Over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the General Assembly opposes the relinquishing by the United States of its existing rights, powers and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

TENNESSEE—PASSED BY BOTH
HOUSES, MAY, 1967

House Joint Resolution No. 84

Identical with above

by

Norvell	Steinhamer	Dunavant
Bowman	Richardson	Morgan
Webster	Arning	Moore (of Sullivan)
Lane	Oehmig	Kidwell
Caldwell	Baker	Bridges
West	Aderhold	Carter (of Hamilton)
Atchley	Cox	Givens
Taylor	Kissinger	

VIRGINIA—PASSED BY HOUSE OF
DELEGATES, MARCH, 1966

House Joint Resolution No. 122

*Relating to United States Sovereignty over the
Canal Zone and Panama Canal.*

Offered March 8, 1966

Patron—Mr. Daniel, W. C.