

5. .GOP morning daily Matutino 2-columns frontpage ~~XXXX~~ headline reading "H. Kissinger's visit opens up panorama of prospects" over photo of Secretary and EFE story dated Panama. Article written by Albert G. Marrder de Acan notes that declaration of principles is not a treaty and points out document will be signed in same legislative palace where UN condemned US for "colonialist presence" in Panama last March.
6. Daily 3-columns frontpage commentary from Radio Liberty (Panama) titled "Recognition for a Leader" saying visit of Secretary is "the culmination of a long process of struggle, failures, frustrations yet always the permanent fight of a people that never lowered and never will lower the flag representing their national dignity and territorial integrity." Editorial acclaims diplomatic talents of Kissinger and asserts that document signed today "will be foundation" for new departure in Panamanian-US relations. Inside editorial pages, Matutino commentary says with signing of Declaration today "Panamanian Revolutionary Government completes one more phase in the process of liberation and national transformation that ~~has~~ began when the Government took over the reigns of power."
7. Also inside under series of columns titled "Revolutionary Focus" reflecting GOP point of view same underlying theme stressed: document to be signed today is result of "historic struggle" of Panamanian people.

UNCLASSIFIED

*Classification*

8. English-language Star and Herald lead story says

Kissinger will sign agreement that will get Canal negotiations moving "this time on a firm basis."

Prominent headline bold type reads "Kissinger Due Today to Get Treaty Going" over large photo of Secretary.

9. Editorial same daily titled "Welcome Dr. Kissinger is translation of editorial appearing in La Estrella (see above).

10. English-language tabloid the Panama-American Thursday morning bannerlines "Kissinger, Tack to Sign Joint Statement as US, RP Take First Step On New Pact." UPI story datelined Washington says Kissinger's stay in Panama will mark "beginning of end of controversial and often stormy, 71 year chapter of Inter-American relations...."

11. Editorial same daily says Declaration of Basic Principles will be stepping-stone towards new negotiations "to replace the abhorrent 1903 instrument under which the United States now operates the Canal."

12. Wednesday evening editions of GOP El Panama America 5-columned page 1 prominent headline reading "Kissinger visit has great historic transcendence." Inside daily publishes article signed by Edilia Camarge titled "Henry Kissinger and the equilibrium of Forces," illustrated by numerous photos of Kissinger diplomatic triumphs.

UNCLASSIFIED

Classification

13. Editorial commentary same paper suggests important reason for Kissinger presence need to present diplomatic victory for U. S. people. ITEM

UNCLASSIFIED

Classification

# FEATURES COLUMNISTS

U.S. NEW & WORLD REPORT - 18 FEBRUARY 1974(12)

## WHAT U.S. WILL YIELD IN NEW DEAL FOR PANAMA

A treaty that's stood since 1903 is going to be revamped. Howard Handleman of "U. S. News & World Report" flew to Panama with the American Secretary of State, who is paving the way for big changes ahead.

### PANAMA CITY

In one quick afternoon's visit, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger opened what may be the final chapter in 70 years of absolute American rule of the Panama Canal and its "Yankee Zone."

He flew in from Washington on February 7 for the ceremonial signing of accords that pave the way for talks with Panama on a new treaty that would end an era of American history. The United States' objective, said Mr. Kissinger in a speech at the Legislative Palace, is to "restore Panama's territorial sovereignty while preserving the interests of the U. S. and its participation in what is for us an indispensable international waterway."

The agreement the Secretary signed with Panama's Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack is just a beginning. Ahead are difficult negotiations—not only between the two countries but also involving forces in Congress and the Pentagon that oppose changes in the 1903 Treaty.

That Treaty gave the U. S. complete control of the Canal and sovereign jurisdiction over the 10-mile-wide Zone that flanks it in perpetuity—forever. Both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations agreed in principle to give up these rights—and in time turn over full sovereignty to Panama. Yet years of intense negotiations have failed to bridge disagreements. Among them:

- The actual turnover. The U. S. wants the change to come over a long period—30 years or so. Panama wants possession much sooner.

- Canal operations. Panamanians will be taken into the Canal Company gradually and trained to assume full responsibility for its operations by the time the U. S. relinquishes ownership. That date is still in dispute.

- Defense. The U. S. wants its forces to remain in position to defend the Canal even after all U. S. troops have left Panama at the moment.

- Revenue sharing. Under the current Treaty, Panama now gets a flat payment of 2 million dollars a year. The United States proposes to increase this to about 25 million a year when a new treaty is signed. Panama indicates it wants more.

- Options to build. U. S. wants time—up until about the year 2000—in which to decide whether to expand the existing Canal or build a new one. Panama, with an eye on the prosperity new construction would bring, is insisting on an American commitment to start work on new facilities well before that.

- Land. The two countries are far apart in their views on how much land the U. S. may use to operate and defend the Canal until the Panamanians take over control.

- American controls. Still in dispute is a schedule to phase out U. S. laws, courts, police, bureaucracy, schools, postage, auto tags, government in the Zone.

**Street scene.** The streets of Panama City were jammed with people—friendly but far from overenthusiastic—when Mr. Kissinger drove from the airport to the Presidential Palace.

Some onlookers waved banners with such slogans as "one land, one flag," and "Southern Command Out." There were a few pro-Cuban and "anti-imperialist" slogans but the left-wing students carrying them did not engage in violent demonstrations.

It seemed clear the Panamanians were not so much welcoming the Secretary as they were celebrating in advance what they hoped would be a second "independence day"—marking return of the Zone to Panama's control.

The 533 square miles are a bit of America that cuts Panama into two parts. Panamanians must obtain American permission to cross the Zone from one side of their country to the other. That is not difficult, but the restriction is resented. Also, Panamanians arrested in the Zone are taken by American police to an American jail and then tried before an American court.

There are more than 40,000 Americans in the Zone now—10,500 military men, 4,500 workers for the Panama Canal Company and a total of 25,500 military and civilian dependents.

Many of the workers are grandsons of "Zonians" who also worked the Canal. The Zone is home to them.

On the military side, the U. S. Southern Command based in the Zone operates both United States and Latin-American servicemen.

How hard to fight to keep these facilities even after Panama takes over is a point of dispute between the U. S. military and the State Department.

Despite the many obstacles, Mr. Kissinger is driving hard to win approval

See PANAMA, Page 2-F

NEW YORK TIMES

12 FEBRUARY 1974

## Questions About That 'Spy Ring'

By Tom Wicker

Curiouser and curiouser grows the case of the young Navy yeoman who is accused of having stolen secret White House documents and passed them along to high Pentagon officials, including the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer.

Charles E. Radford, the yeoman (the Navy's name for an enlisted man who does office work), says that while he was attached to Henry Kissinger's national security staff in the White House, he was directed by his Navy superiors to steal top secret documents and pass them along to the Pentagon. He provided them with hundreds of such documents, he says, and many of them went to Admiral Moorer, whom Mr. Radford pictures as having been pleased by his work.

The Admiral, however, as well as high White House officials, has sought to play down the importance of the yeoman's activities, and to deny that he was acting on military instructions. As they tell it, Mr. Radford was an over-zealous youth who shipped over to the Pentagon a few documents that contained only information already known to the Joint Chiefs and other defense officials.

The matter can hardly be left to rest there; obviously someone is not telling the truth. Aside from the fact that it seems thoroughly implausible that an enlisted man, acting on his own, would steal documents and send them to his superior officers, Admiral Moorer himself says he recommended a court-martial for Mr. Radford, but that "civilian leadership" decided not to proceed. Why? And what civilian leadership?

of the matter, terming it a case of an enlisted man who "was told to keep his eyes open and who went ape" as well as a matter being blown "terribly" out of proportion. Yet, the White House said formally on Jan. 11 that it touched on "a matter peripheral to a national security issue which was

See SPY RING, Page 2-F

WASHINGTON POST - 12 FEBRUARY 1974

# Victor Zorza Divorce With China?

Peking's new campaign against the West contains undertones which could be the first signs of a divorce in its marriage of convenience with Washington.

In Moscow there have been new indications of concern about the threat posed to the Soviet Union by the Chinese-American alliance. In Washington, the administration's persistent denials that it was using the Chinese connection to put pressure on the Soviet Union have been shown to be hollow by Secretary of State Kissinger himself. President Nixon's motives were publicly questioned by the Kremlin at the time of his visit to Peking, but Moscow's misgivings were evidently stilled by repeated assurances from Washington that the United States and China were not ganging up against the Soviet Union.

Now comes Dr. Kissinger, in an interview with Jewish writers and professors which was intended to be private, but the substance of which has now been published in the Washington Post, apparently saying the opposite of what he has always said in public. His interview was designed to reassure

Jewish leaders about his attitude to Israel. But he also said that the new relationship with China was absolutely necessary so that the United States should be able to press the Russians. Some participants, though not all, also recalled him as saying that it was necessary to play one off against the other.

Dr. Kissinger's remarks came at a time when the signs from Moscow were already suggesting that the Kremlin faction which had always doubted the validity of Washington's assurances about its relations with China was gaining ground. The journal International Life, which had raised in the past some of the most pointed questions about the Chinese-American relationship, has returned to the charge. It again asks the question, left dormant for the past two years, which was voiced publicly by party secretary Leonid Brezhnev soon after Mr. Nixon's trip to Peking.

Brezhnev wanted to know what really happened in Peking. But, he said, since the American and Chinese leaders had "resolved to keep secret" the details of their talks, their future deeds would show what they had been up to. International Life has now answered his question. After Kissinger's six trips to Peking, it said, the "initial results" showed a rapprochement between China and the United States on a number of international as well as regional problems.

The "facts," the journal said, now showed that Peking was trying to enlist the United States in its struggle against the Soviet Union, and was using its new alliances "to forge ahead with the economic and military development of China."

SPY RING.....CONTINUED

found to involve deliberate leaks to the media of extremely sensitive information of interest to other nations." The statement went on to say that "the Administration still considers it inappropriate for public disclosure."

The alleged spying operation also had been the subject of a major investigation in 1971 and 1972 by the so-called White House "plumbers"; David R. Young of that shadowy unit submitted a lengthy report as a result of the investigation. Seymour Hersh of The New York Times has established that it was this investigation and the report to which Richard Nixon referred last November, before the Associated Press managing editors, when he spoke of a plumbers' operation "so sensitive that even Senator Ervin and Senator Baker have decided that they should not delve further into" it.

Mr. Nixon was explaining why he had originally resisted and delayed a Justice Department investigation of the plumbers, who had carried out a break-in at the Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist, moreover, Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox and Attorney General Elliot Richardson, before they were fired, are said to have been at least briefly convinced that the plumbers' investigation of the Pentagon spying operation was so "sensitive" that inquiry into the plumbers' activities had to be limited.

What is the truth here? Was this really a case of an enlisted man who "went ape" and embarrassed the chairman of the Joint Chiefs? Or a matter so serious that it had to be

covered up on grounds of national security, and even set outside legitimate inquiry by the Watergate prosecutor and a Senate committee?

If the spying operation existed, why was Admiral Moorer not relieved of his high post following David Young's report in 1972? In order to keep the matter secret? Because it might have been embarrassing to the Administration in an election year? Because the Administration was prosecuting Daniel Ellsberg for what it called "stealing" the Pentagon Papers and did not want to admit that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs was having classified documents stolen from the White House?

If Yeoman Radford was directed to steal documents, moreover, why did the Pentagon have to go to such lengths? Was the White House passion for secrecy and its paranoia about leaks so great that the military was being denied information it needed? Or was the military seeking improv-

legitimate voice? Surely these are questions Senator Stennis' Armed Services Committee, which is investigating, cannot leave publicly unanswered.

On the other hand, maybe the Pentagon "spy ring" represented no more than hard bureaucratic infighting for closely held information. If that is assumed, however, the smell of another cover-up becomes overpowering: for in that case Mr. Nixon could have had no legitimate reason to picture the matter as "so sensitive" that it barred inquiry into the plumbers' operations.

The journal accused Peking of playing an "unprincipled political game" in an attempt to form anti-Soviet alliances. But to the extent that the Chinese were succeeding, it implied, they must have had the willing support of the United States, which was playing the same game for its own purposes.

But the Moscow analysis also made the point that not all the Chinese leaders were in favor of Peking's alliance with the United States. Repeated Soviet discussions of such differences in Peking constitute an open invitation to some of the Chinese leaders to work for the revival of what Brezhnev called, in a recent speech, "friendship" with the Soviet Union.

Now they seem to find a response in Peking, at least to the extent that anti-American notes are beginning to be heard in the massive propaganda campaign being mounted by the Chinese Left as part of the new internal power struggle. It seems, says the Peking People's Daily, that "the specter of John Foster Dulles still clings to a bunch of American imperialists." Could it have Dr. Kissinger in mind? It calls for the unmasking of a Western "friend" engaged "in a shameless anti-China deal" so that he should no longer be able to "bluff and deceive."

The Kremlin, for its part, perhaps emboldened by what it perceives as the weakness of the U.S. administration, is in effect telling Washington that it must stop playing off China against Russia.

Dr. Kissinger's recent remarks underline the benefits which the United States has gained from the Sino-Soviet conflict. It was of great help to him in extricating the United States from Vietnam and in concluding successfully a number of other diplomatic initiatives. Both Moscow and Peking were the losers--unless Russia's failure to launch a nuclear attack on China is counted as a gain for Peking. But the Russians claim that there was never any danger of such an attack. Some Russians even go so far as to say that the CIA had deliberately manufactured evidence of the Soviet Union's warlike intentions, and had planted this on Peking, in order to make the Chinese leaders look more favorably on Mr. Nixon's advances.

The shrillness of the invective which Russia and China are directing against each other is now rising to new heights. But some signs, few as they are, point in a different direction, and they may prove more significant than the customary recrimination.

© 1974, Victor Zorza

PANAMA.....CONTINUED

of his negotiating track--attested by his unusual flight to Panama solely to sign a set of principles that had already been agreed upon.

**The broader view.** To the Secretary more than just Panama is at stake. He sees the outcome of negotiations as being

For example, just two weeks after he signed the accords with Panama, the Secretary is due to begin a three-day meeting in Mexico City with most of the Latin-American foreign ministers.

One item on the agenda: Panama. That subject has often been on the agenda in earlier conferences with Latin Americans, and usually has been used to make a whipping boy of the United States.

The Secretary hopes the agreement he signed in Panama City will take some of the steam out of the issue. [END]