

# Spanish Pact Challenged By Fulbright

8-3-70  
By Murrey Marder  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) opened a frontal attack yesterday on President Nixon's plans to sign a new, five-year military base agreement with Spain.

"Action must be taken within the next two weeks," said Fulbright, when the base accord is due to be signed, to limit this method of "making commitments with foreign countries" through an executive agreement. Fulbright seeks to force the administration to submit its plan as a treaty requiring Senate approval.

What the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is mounting is an expansion of the still-unresolved struggle to curb the President's war-making power in Cambodia through the Cooper-Church amendment.

The new objective is to invoke the Senate's "advise and consent" authority for all U.S. security commitments, at their outset.

Fulbright made public in advance a speech he will deliver in the Senate today.

See BASES, A4, Col. 3

## BASES, From A1

In it, he served notice of his intention to amend the pending \$19.2 billion weapons appropriation bill to prevent spending any money for U.S. forces or bases in Spain after next January, unless that is approved through a treaty or legislative convention.

### Points to Peril

"We should have learned from the tragic war," which has spread from Vietnam to Laos to Cambodia, Fulbright said, where "the first step could lead."

"A commitment today," he said, "which requires the spending of money and results in the stationing of our troops on foreign soil contains the prospect that sometime in the future it might require the spending of American lives."

In closed hearings before the full committee and the Symington Subcommittee on U.S. commitments, during the last 18 months, Fulbright charged, Nixon administration officials "whether consciously or not, have clearly misled the committee" on questions concerning Spain.

The subcommittee's record shows, Fulbright claimed, that "facts are being tailored—even changed," to suit the administration's varying expla-

nations. The original controversy between the Foreign Relations Committee and the Nixon administration began over extension of the terms for continued U.S. use of two large air bases in Spain, Torrejón and Zaragoza, and of Rota, a major naval base.

Spain originally sought a mutual defense treaty with the United States and, reportedly, about \$700 million in new weapons in return for the base rights. In the bargaining, the United States tried in vain to get Spain admitted to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a move which foundered on opposition to the regime of Generalissimo Francisco Franco.

### Senator Defines Issue

Fulbright has said the issue is not Franco, because "to me Spain is a more civilized and liberal dictatorship than the one in South Vietnam." The question, he said, is the need for open airing of a major U.S. "commitment."

One "irony," said Fulbright, is that while the Nixon administration has limited its testimony on the Spanish base agreement to secret hearings, "under Spanish law, the proposed . . . agreement must be approved by its legislative body, the Cortes."

"There is 'more open dis-



SEN. J. W. FULBRIGHT  
... advise and consent?

cussion" of the subject in Spain, Fulbright said, than here. Fulbright said "the direct and indirect costs" to the United States for extending the Spanish agreement for five years are "near \$400 million."

He cited published U.S. press reports that this includes 36 used F-4 Phantom jet fighter-bombers; five destroyers, two submarines, four minesweepers and other vessels, plus Army and other equipment.

Although U.S. officials have

denied to his committee there is any security "commitment" to Spain, said Fulbright, "it is an open secret between the executive branches of the Spanish and the United States governments that since 1953 we have had a de facto military treaty."

In a closed hearing on July 24, Fulbright said, the Under Secretary of State, U. Alexis Johnson, virtually conceded that previous U.S.-Spanish language did represent a "commitment."

#### Quotes Secretary

He quoted Johnson as saying that "during our discussions with the Spanish in their efforts to get language which I would interpret as a commitment, they pushed very, very strongly for getting this language that was in the joint (U.S.-Spanish) declaration of 1963. I have said that we could not do that without entering into a mutual defense treaty, and this was a road that we did not want to go."

Fulbright also said that "during secret discussions" in November, 1968, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said:

"By the presence of United States forces in Spain the United States gives Spain a far more visible and credible

security guarantee than any document."

The Nixon administration contends it has trimmed down the language it used in the 1963 accord and there would be no "commitment," as such, to Spain, in the new language. If the pending agreement were converted from an executive agreement to a treaty, the State Department insists, the degree of commitment would be enlarged.

Fulbright's contention is that the "commitment" exists in either case, and if it is to be given, it should be tested openly, in public hearings, debate, and a treaty.

The 1963 language stated that:

"A threat to either country, and to the joint facilities that each provides for the common defense, would be a matter of common concern to both countries, and each country would take such action as it may consider appropriate within the framework of its constitutional processes."

Fulbright stated that the new language, as reported in the press, "drops that old language and adopts new phrases such as United States 'support for the defense system of Spain . . .'" Fulbright said that "only affirmative congressional action" can define the actual commitment.