

**SECRET**

## ADDENDUM TO JOURNAL

## OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Tuesday - 30 July 1974

25X1

25X1

1. [REDACTED] Received a request from Jack Brady, House Foreign Affairs Committee staff, for assistance to the Foreign Affairs Committee staff in preparation of comments relating to various amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act which will be in mark up in open session starting tomorrow, Wednesday, 31 July. The amendments were ones specifically relating to limitation of activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in its relations with "foreign security forces". Draft comments for staff use were provided.

25X1

**SECRET**

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/07/20 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100040061-9

Approved For Release 2005/07/20 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100040061-9

**SECRET**Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel  
Tuesday - 30 July 1974  
[redacted]

Page 3

25X1

25X1

9. [redacted] Called George Gilbert, OMB, to tell him that things were moving rapidly on the House side on the Foreign Assistance Act and that our information (both from AID and Al Westphal, House Foreign Affairs Committee staff) was that Congressman Donald M. Fraser (D., Minn.) had already or would soon introduce an amendment similar to Senator Abourezk's amendment No. 1511 to S. 3394. Because the House Foreign Affairs Committee was beginning markup on the House bill tomorrow morning at 10:00, I requested verbal approval on our letter to Chairman Morgan. Gilbert said that he would try but it was unlikely that OMB would be able to give clearance before the next afternoon.

Later, Mr. Cary called Jim Oliver, OMB, on the same subject underscoring the urgency of our request. I read our letter to Oliver who typed out a copy on his end. Oliver said he would do what he could but again thought it would be the next afternoon before the letter could be cleared.

25X1

10. [redacted] Called Dennis Neill, OGC/AID, to briefly bring him up-to-speed on the Agency's actions concerning the expected Fraser amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, similar to Senator Abourezk's amendment No. 1511 to S. 3394.

25X1

[redacted]

GEORGE L. CARY  
Legislative Counsel

cc:  
O/DDCI Ex. Sec. [redacted]  
Mr. Thuerner Mr. Warner  
[redacted] Mr. Lehman EA/DDO  
DDI DDS&T DDM&S Compt.

**SECRET**

	H.R. 69 <sup>1</sup>	Continuing resolution <sup>2</sup>	Difference		H.R. 69 <sup>1</sup>	Continuing resolution <sup>2</sup>	Difference
Alabama	43,509,013	37,802,143	-5,706,870	Nebraska	9,400,371	8,481,814	-918,557
Alaska	4,918,257	4,554,764	-363,493	Nevada	2,523,215	2,211,012	-312,152
Arizona	17,398,230	15,243,827	-2,154,403	New Hampshire	3,439,947	3,018,421	-421,216
Arkansas	26,087,884	22,888,370	-3,199,514	New Jersey	56,638,496	53,378,325	-3,215,871
California	148,317,398	130,117,491	-18,199,907	New Mexico	14,329,979	12,777,483	-1,552,496
Colorado	17,604,413	15,479,140	-2,125,273	New York	210,218,014	205,223,815	-4,994,199
Connecticut	17,281,415	15,388,280	-1,893,135	North Carolina	54,295,914	50,604,729	-3,691,185
Delaware	5,254,828	4,664,058	-590,770	North Dakota	5,824,210	5,272,083	-552,127
Florida	67,391,836	59,519,759	-7,872,077	Ohio	58,635,735	52,796,450	-5,839,285
Georgia	47,674,302	41,797,790	-5,876,512	Oklahoma	21,295,661	18,644,098	-2,651,563
Hawaii	5,664,790	4,885,726	-779,064	Oregon	17,400,661	15,342,386	-2,058,275
Idaho	5,141,454	4,585,349	-556,105	Pennsylvania	83,343,015	76,451,418	-6,891,597
Illinois	90,297,820	78,381,164	-11,916,656	Rhode Island	6,878,115	5,941,481	-936,634
Indiana	26,455,157	23,524,326	-2,930,831	South Carolina	34,704,912	30,808,468	-3,896,444
Iowa	16,649,934	15,155,319	-1,494,615	South Dakota	34,704,912	30,808,468	-3,896,444
Kansas	13,816,614	12,281,660	-1,534,954	Tennessee	24,882,397	22,122,381	-2,760,016
Kentucky	33,855,202	30,711,103	-3,144,099	Texas	6,199,135	5,431,804	-767,331
Louisiana	5,071,226	4,735,139	-336,087	Utah	3,954,589	3,507,301	-447,288
Maine	7,102,255	6,308,979	-793,276	Vermont	39,721,223	34,855,843	-4,865,380
Maryland	30,322,561	26,616,892	-3,705,669	Virginia	23,128,948	20,267,679	-2,861,269
Massachusetts	33,673,303	29,533,650	-4,139,653	Washington	17,872,066	16,529,448	-1,342,618
Michigan	77,290,600	67,302,067	-9,988,533	West Virginia	29,910,951	25,921,604	-3,989,347
Minnesota	27,958,912	24,498,084	-3,460,828	Wisconsin	2,751,743	2,435,299	-316,444
Mississippi	41,888,253	36,677,791	-5,210,462	Wyoming	11,377,176	10,958,330	-418,846
Missouri	31,802,845	28,184,388	-3,618,457	District of Columbia			
Montana	5,999,430	5,340,726	-658,704				

<sup>1</sup> Estimates by the Library of Congress on H.R. 69 as reported from the conference committee.

<sup>2</sup> Estimates by HEW of the continuing resolution.

## KISSINGER DEFENDS U.S. AID TO SEOUL

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the July 25 edition of the New York Times carried two stories on one page, the first of which was a story in which Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in an appearance before the other Members of the other body, said, in effect, that although the Nixon administration did not approve of South Korea's repressive policies it had decided to continue economic and military aid for Asian security reasons.

The second story appeared on the same page. Ironically, it was a story of the Seoul court dooming five more civilians on a plotting charge.

A total of 19 persons have now been sentenced to death this month for anti-Communist activities, but 5 of the sentences had been changed to life imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, what are some of the types of activities that can gain the death penalty in South Korea? One is a student and he publicly calls for a reconstitution or restoration of the constitutional government, he can be sentenced to death. By conservative estimate, there are between 1,100 and 1,200 persons now languishing in South Korean jails for so-called antigovernment activities.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to Dr. Kissinger and to the Members of the House that Asian security, that American security, and that world security are far more threatened by the repressive tactics of the Park regime than from any other source.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that American aid should not be used in that effort.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the two articles in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1974]  
KISSINGER DEFENDS U.S. AID TO SEOUL—TELLS SENATORS SECURITY FACTORS OVERRIDE ANY DISLIKE OF POLICIES

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—Secretary of State Kissinger said today that although the Nixon Administration did not approve of South Korea's repressive policies, it had decided to continue economic and military aid for Asian security reasons.

Testifying before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on the Administration's foreign aid request, Mr. Kissinger was asked by Senator Edward W. Brooke, Republican of Massachusetts how the Administration justified continued aid to countries like South Korea whose police units were "authoritarian."

Mr. Kissinger, aware of moves in the Congress to bar military aid to the Government of President Park Chung Hee because of the widespread arrests and repression of critics, said that after a consideration of South Korea's political and strategic importance in Asia, the Administration decided "to authorize economic and military assistance even when we would not recommend the actions of the Government of South Korea."

### JAPAN'S VIEW IS CITED

He said that South Korea's strategic position was "very crucial" to Japan and that "our judgment has been shared by the government of Japan."

"Where we believe the national interest is at stake we proceed even when we don't approve" of a country's policies, Mr. Kissinger said.

In the House, Representative Donald M. Fraser, Democrat of Minnesota, chairman of the Foreign Affairs subcommittee on international organizations, plans a joint hearing next Tuesday with Representative Robert N. C. Nix's subcommittee on Asian and Pacific affairs, to consider proposing a possible cut-off of military aid to Korea because of Mr. Park's policies. Mr. Nix is a Pennsylvania Democrat.

The Administration has requested \$161-million in aid and \$52-million in low-interest military credit sales to South Korea for the current fiscal year ending next June 30.

Mr. Kissinger's remarks about South Korea were consistent with the Administration's view that security interests take precedence over human rights considerations in aid matters.

Mr. Kissinger also strongly defended the

Administration's aid requests for Indochina, which run more than \$3-billion, on the ground that such aid was needed to maintain "the achievement of recent years."

He also disclosed that the Administration had submitted a six-year projection "which reflects our expectation of a gradually declining role in Indochina."

Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Democrat of Hawaii, complained that the six-year projection was classified "secret," and therefore the figures could not be debated publicly. Mr. Kissinger promised to declassify much of the report by next week.

### MIDEAST AID DEFENDED

Mr. Kissinger defended the bill's requests for more than \$1-billion in aid to Middle Eastern countries. He said "the program before you is vital to give substance" to the new improving relations in the area.

"We are witnessing one of the most arduous but also one of the most hopeful developments of the past generation," he said.

Most of the committee members seemed favorably disposed to the aid bill, but Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, seemed dubious about the program.

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1974]  
SEOUL COURT DOOMS FIVE MORE CIVILIANS ON PLOTTING CHARGE

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA, July 24.—The Seoul district criminal court sentenced five civilians to death today on charges of espionage on behalf of North Korea and of plotting an uprising against President Park Chung Hee.

Three other civilians were sentenced to life imprisonment, and 24 were given terms ranging from one to 15 years.

A total of 19 persons have now been sentenced to death this month for anti-Government activities, but five of the sentences were commuted last Saturday to life imprisonment.

The Government charged today that the defendants were members of a spy ring that had operated in Seoul and other cities since December, 1962. It said the group had received funds equivalent to \$150,000 from the Communists.

The court said that members of the ring, in addition to spying, had been assigned to infiltrate political, intellectual and labor organizations to incite unrest and confusion and to prepare them for an uprising against the Government at the "decisive moment."

The defendants included two university professors, one of whom was sentenced to

death; a veterinarian, two Protestant clergymen and a bank employee.

## SOUTH KOREAN OPPRESSION AND FOREIGN AID

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a growing number of our colleagues are finding it difficult to justify propping up the oppressive regime of South Korea's Park Chung Hee with U.S. military assistance. How can we justify military assistance to South Korea while Park rules with the iron hand of martial law, arbitrarily arresting, detaining, and sentencing to death all manner of political opponents? Ostensibly, the United States supports South Korea against potential aggression from North Korea. But 21 years after the Korean war, it is increasingly difficult to determine which Korean government is more reprehensible.

Under its present domestic policies, the Park government is its own worst enemy. How long will the oppressive regime of Kim Il Sung in North Korea be seen as a greater threat to the rights and freedom of the people of South Korea than the oppressive regime of Park Chung Hee?

President Park arbitrarily casts aside the rights of his countrymen by saying, "We can no longer sit idle while wasting our precious national power in imitating the systems of others." Whether he imitates other systems or not, he evidently expects our system to continue supporting him. And the policymakers of our executive branch intend to fulfill his expectations. Only last week Secretary of State Kissinger dismissed a congressional query about aid to Park with this statement: "where our national interest is at stake, we proceed even when we don't approve." I cannot believe that the national interest of the United States is tied to Park Chung Hee's blatant disregard for internationally recognized standards of decency toward his own people. Accordingly, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I intend to propose a substantial reduction in the amount requested by the administration for military assistance to South Korea this year. I urge all of our colleagues to support that reduction on the House floor. And this week, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Nixon) and I will begin joint hearings in our two subcommittees on human rights in South Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been an active supporter of the concept of assisting developing countries in their hard task of nation building. But my support for aid legislation will diminish unless the policies of the executive branch demonstrate a more active concern for internationally recognized human rights. I refer especially to military assistance, since military power is so often an instrument of governmental control over the civilian population.

I urge our colleagues to ask themselves whether the traditional concern of the American people for human rights should be represented by strengthening

the oppressive hand of governments such as that of South Korea.

An editorial in the Washington Post on July 27 addresses itself to some of the concerns I have expressed here. I include it in the Record at this point:

### Trouble in South Korea

Late in 1972, President Park of South Korea conducted a virtual coup against his own government, installing martial law and setting himself on a course of arbitrary one-man rule which has steadily intensified since. "We can no longer sit idle while wasting our precious national power in imitating the systems of others," Mr. Park said to those who had hoped that American-introduced democracy would put down roots in Korea. But what apologists call the "Korean style of democracy" has now become so repressive as to raise the question of whether dictatorship flourishes more on the north of the 38th parallel, the dividing line with Communist North Korea, or on the south.

Hundreds if not thousands of political opponents have been arrested, including students (students toppled the Syngman Rhee dictatorship in 1960, every Korean recalls), Christians, intellectuals and every manner of political rival real and imagined. Upwards of a dozen political foes have just been sentenced to death in a trial in which few observers could perceive evidence of due process. Among them is the country's leading poet, Kim Chi Ha, previously arrested and beaten for a poem. The man Mr. Park defeated at the polls in 1971, Kim Dae Jung, who was kidnaped from Japan and brought home last year, faces trial now for alleged campaign violations dating back to 1967. One can now be sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment in South Korea for petitioning peacefully for changes in the martial law constitution under which Mr. Park rules.

Unsurprisingly, President Park regularly invokes the cause of national security, claiming that dangers emanating from North Korea justify his measures at home. And it is so that North-South Korean relations remain tense. Their incipient political dialogue, begun two years ago, is frozen. Military incidents continue. North Korea, few doubt, is itself a rogue regime. But there is nonetheless a hint that Seoul may be manipulating the foreign security threat to help create the proper rationale for domestic repression. North Korea had no cause to sink a South Korean patrol boat in international waters in a well publicized incident a few weeks ago. Yet the boat was sailing a few miles further north, and a bit closer to North Korea's territorial waters, than such boats normally go.

Whether President Park is stifling opposition faster than he is creating it is the central question of Korean politics today. It is a question which must trouble Americans as well as Koreans. For the fact is that the United States is the principal foreign patron of South Korea. Some 40,000 American troops remain there from the Korean War. American aid is extensive—in the \$200-\$300 million range. The familiar dilemma for Americans is, of course, that not only does American support keep South Korea independent, but American support allows President Park to keep fastening his dictatorship on the land. The administration's answer is simply unacceptable. Asked in Congress on Wednesday about the Korean excesses, Secretary of State Kissinger said that "where we believe the national interest is at stake, we proceed even when we don't approve."

Is there no possibility for a break in this intolerable situation? The continuing American presence in South Korea has been justified in recent years as a source of confidence for Seoul while Seoul worked out a new political relationship with the North. But that

relationship is not moving ahead. Military and food aid has been offered on the basis that the South Korean economy needed it. But the South Korean economy is doing well otherwise, all things considered. Seoul insists that the American troops remain vital but its nationalism pushes it tacitly to assert that it does not need an American crutch for all time. We continue to believe that the essential elements of the American presence in South Korea should be altered only by a process that takes into account the need to provide for stability in East Asia as a whole. But a large and growing cause of instability in East Asia now is the police rule of the Park regime.

## OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IN FLORIDA

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I rise today on a matter of deep concern to Floridians and potential concern to all Americans. I hesitate to criticize the judicial branch of Government, but late last week the chief justice of Florida took an unprecedented action which can only be characterized as a major obstruction of justice and denial to Florida voters of their right to know the whole truth about candidates for public office.

For some time now, Federal and State investigators have been looking into allegations of misconduct by certain high Florida officials. As a result of their investigations, one cabinet official has already resigned after being indicted. Two other cabinet officials were under investigation by grand juries, and in my own Pinellas County, the very able State attorney was checking into allegations of wrongdoing at the local level.

However, last week Florida Chief Justice James C. Adams, acting in his capacity as the chief judicial officer of the State of Florida, ordered a postponement of all ongoing investigations of candidates for public office until after the November 5 general election. He asserted that this action would protect the voters of Florida against a "hysterical" atmosphere during the campaign.

I find it absolutely incredible, in light of the current atmosphere of concern over the actions of high government officials, that Florida's chief judicial officer would move to tie the hands of justice and place a lid on important ongoing investigations.

If this order is allowed to stand, how can Florida voters be sure that they are not going to elect a potential felon to high office? How can we deny our citizens the right to be informed about their political candidates? How can we stay the course of justice when actions of similar sort are the cause of the Nation's worst constitutional upheaval in a century?

Chief Justice Adkin's decision is a dark blotch on the record of the State which pioneered "government in the sunshine." If there ever was a coverup in blatant defiance of legal and constitutional principles, this is it.