

*Gen* *File*  
**Allegedly Got \$213,000 From Park**

# Passman Indicted in Korean Scandal

By Timothy S. Robinson  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Former Rep. Otto E. Passman (D-La.) was indicted by a federal grand jury here yesterday on charges that he received \$213,000 in cash from Korean businessman Tongsun Park in return for urging the South Korean government to buy Louisiana rice through Park.

In addition, the 26 pages of criminal charges accuse Passman of putting pressure on Department of Agriculture and State Department officials to approve the financing of the rice sales to South Korea through the federally funded Food for Peace program.

Passman, 77 years old and in a New Orleans hospital because of "mental and physical exhaustion," was unavailable for comment on the charges. However, Passman, the former chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that held a virtual veto over foreign aid, has consistently denied receiving illegal payments from Park.

Passman is the second former congressman to be indicted in connection with the Korean influence-buying scandal. Former Rep. Richard T. Hanna (D-Calif.) pleaded guilty two weeks ago to a conspiracy charge involving payments he received from Park totaling \$200,000.

Park, who has been granted immunity from prosecution, has reportedly testified that he gave \$750,000 in cash and gifts to about 30 members of Congress. He received approximately \$8 million in commissions on the rice exports he handled from the United States to South Korea, according to government figures.

The indictment against Passman — who served in Congress between 1947 and 1977 — charges that he entered into a conspiracy with Park between Jan. 16 and Jan. 22, 1972, in Southeast Asia to promote Park's rice export business.

In return, according to the seven-count indictment, Park agreed to "pay Passman sums of money derived from the commissions to be earned on the rice sales by Tongsun Park at times and in amounts to be specified by Passman."

Cash payments to Passman ranging in size from \$10,000 to \$50,000 were made on at least eight occasions between 1972 and 1974, and Park bought jewelry and watches from Passman in 1975 at "substantially inflated prices" to account for another \$20,000, the charges said.

The indictment charges Passman with conspiracy to defraud the United States of the proceeds of the sale of government officials, three counts of

bribery and three counts of receiving an illegal gratuity.

The settings of the alleged illegal acts included in the indictment range from Seoul to Hong Kong to the Joan of Arc Co. in St. Francisville, La., to a U. S. Capitol dining room, to various government offices in Washington.

The first purchase made by Park after his agreement with Passman was an order of 1,000 cases of sweet potatoes from the St. Francisville firm, according to the indictment.

Passman specifically asked Park to make the purchase personally "in order to help Passman's re-election campaign"—apparently by showing Passman's influence in selling goods produced in his congressional district, the indictment alleged.

Shortly thereafter, Passman met with the Korean ambassador to Washington, Gov.-elect Edwin Edwards of Louisiana, then congressional candidate and now U.S. Rep. John B. Breaux (D-La.) and others to urge the Korean ambassador to buy more Louisiana rice, the indictment continued.

Within a week, the indictment alleged, Park paid \$30,000 in cash to Passman in three installments and Passman issued a press release announcing that "Korean ambassador Tongsun Park" would tour sweet potato plants and rice mills in Louisiana.

At around the same time period, the indictment continued, Passman had begun attempts to influence the manner in which the Agriculture Department and the State Department AID program would deal with Korean rice sales.

He also suggested to Agriculture Department officials that Park be used to work out a compromise in a dispute between the Korean government and the department, a suggestion that was accepted, the indictment said.

Later in 1972, Passman sent a telegram to the Korean ambassador in Washington saying "Korean's stubbornness [sic] on the rice purchase is on the verge of bringing about my defeat for re-election to Congress," the indictment charged. He reportedly urged the ambassador to call Korean President Park Chung Hee "to get this [rice purchase] off dead center, otherwise, I could be defeated."

Passman himself later wrote to President Park to thank him for "this mutually advantageous arrangement between our countries," the indictment alleged.

Within the next three months, it charged further, Passman received \$213,000 in cash and gifts from Park. Passman repeatedly made contact

with U.S. and Korean officials to praise the arrangement involving Park as a rice broker between the two countries, according to the charges.

In a meeting with Korean officials in the U.S. Capitol on Sept. 12, 1974, further discussions were held concerning the continuation of the rice-export relationship between the United States and Korea, it was alleged. Seven other members of Congress, unnamed in the indictment, reportedly attended the meeting.

In 1975, Passman began putting more pressure on AID officials to make funds available to South Korea so it could purchase rice from the United States, the indictment alleged.

The appropriate AID official refused to do so, but Passman later wrote a letter to Tongsun Park praising him for his efforts involving a 400,000-pound Food for Peace rice deal for fiscal 1976 and saying that Passman "anticipated congressional funding at an early date" for the sale, according to the indictment.

At the same time, Passman was urging the Korean government to make additional substantial purchases of rice for cash, the charges added.

In the bribery counts involving some of the specific alleged cash transactions, it is charged that Passman "did corruptly, directly and indirectly, ask, demand, exact, solicit, seek, accept, receive and agree to receive" the cash from Park.

The case was assigned to U.S. District Court Judge Barrington D. Parker. No date for arraignment has been set.

*Indelli*  
*Ambrato*  
*Secret*

## ITT, Equal Justice and Chile

On the very last day it was legally possible to do so the Department of Justice has brought charges of lying and obstructing justice against two officials of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation. One day more and the statute of limitations would have barred the prosecutions. We are told that one reason why it took so long to bring these subordinate ITT men to book was that innumerable pages of classified CIA records had to be ploughed through in order to make the cases against them.

The CIA connection is, of course, the vital one. It is known and thoroughly established that ITT, a giant American corporation with large interests in Chile, operated in the closest cahoots with the Central Intelligence Agency to prevent Salvador Allende from ever taking the office he had won in a free election. The two ITT men, whose names are hardly worth recording (Gerrity and Berrellez), are now at last charged with repeatedly lying to a Senate committee when they denied that they had done anything to try to stop Allende from assuming the Presidency in 1970.

The striking thing about this legal action is the omission of two names—one of an individual and the other of an organization. The missing person in this case is Harold Geneen, chairman of the board of ITT, and the missing organization (not that it could be indicted under the law) is the CIA. In the latter case, everyone must remember that the then head of the CIA, Richard Helms, who knew all about the dirty work in Chile, pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor charge for his lying to Congress on the same matter and got off with a small fine.

About Geneen, whose veracity in this affair must be extraordinarily suspect, the Justice Department is quite defensive. Announcing the charges against the two subordinates, Acting Deputy Atty. Gen. Benjamin Civiletti bridled at a reporter's question about why the generals in ITT were not being prosecuted along with the corporate privates. "The law," declared Civiletti, "doesn't depend on whether someone is senior or junior. It depends on the facts." Facts provable in court is what he must have meant, and we are asked to take it on faith that the government tried hard, and failed, to make a case against the maximum leader of ITT.

Perhaps Geneen had the protection, enjoyed also by Helms, of being able to expose the secrets of "national security" if he was forced into the dock. This blackmail power, in effect, is the best sort of protection

CONTINUED

*medea  
Gen  
fil*

against the fair administration of justice in cases involving dirty work at the crossroads, especially if the intersections are abroad. Henry Kissinger as wiretapper is clothed in an almost impenetrable suit of this kind of armor.

One can hope that justice will be done in the cases of Gerrity and Berrellez and their operations in what used to be the Chilean democracy. The charges against them suggest that they rehearsed with the CIA their scheme of lying to the Senate. That agency can hardly be further tarnished for its role in Chile, and now we are told that it is reformed and will sin no more. But the public will have to be forgiven if it notes once again that the Nixons, Geneens and Helmses of this world are judged by standards of law utterly different from those applied to their subordinates. "Equal justice under the law," the motto on every federal courthouse, remains more hope than reality.

## The CIA—Again

It was, apparently, Adm. Stansfield Turner's original intention as director of the CIA to alter public impressions of the agency. We were to learn to think of it as a research organization, like the Bell Laboratories or the National Institutes of Health, rather than as a bureaucracy run amok. By now, the Admiral must wish that he had undertaken a more modest assignment—something like convincing the Congress that giant carriers are worth their weight in cost overruns. The news about and from the CIA suggests that it remains a national disaster.

First, there was the Admiral's personal campaign to take over control of the nation's entire intelligence apparatus. For a time, the CIA's primary antagonist was not the KGB but the Department of Defense. Then came his decision to fire some hundreds of senior officials. Stung by the nation's alleged ingratitude, they promptly threatened to tell all. Frank Snepp's book on the CIA in Vietnam confirmed our worst suspicions about the agency's arrogance, brutality and lying incompetence. The agency decided to have Snepp prosecuted, making it clear that it regards questions of constitutional propriety irrelevant or worse. Now William Colby has been heard from, explaining that he was dismissed as CIA director because he thought he had an obligation to be minimally truthful with the Congress. We also learn that the CIA penetrated American black organizations, but that those of its officers who knew of this illegal intrusion obliged the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence by remaining silent. As one CIA source said to Seymour Hersh of *The New York Times*, these were adversary proceedings.

The stream of outrages from the CIA, then, shows no sign of diminishing to a trickle. On the contrary, it threatens to swell to a torrent. The latest news entails the reckless endangering of the Soviet Jewish dissidents, and beyond them, of Soviet dissent as a whole. The KGB arrested Anatoly Shcharansky, a Jewish dissident spokesman, a year ago. In June, he was charged with treason, punishable by death, for alleged ties to the CIA. President Carter then denied that Shcharansky had any relationship with the CIA. The agency, however,

has now acknowledged that it had connections with Dr. Sanya Lipavsky, the person with whom Shcharansky shared an apartment. Lipavsky has indeed denounced Shcharansky and his associates, and presumably will testify at the trial. American correspondents in Moscow, wise after the event, now take the view that Lipavsky was a KGB agent—instructed to approach both them and the CIA in Moscow, to discredit the Jewish dissidents, the Western press and our Embassy. The President, one hopes, has been told the truth about Shcharansky by the CIA—but neither he nor we can be sure.

No more effective instrument to discredit the dissidents can be found than the CIA. The CIA officers at our Moscow Embassy who recruited Lipavsky behaved, in the circumstances, with an unusual degree of cretinism. Lipavsky, who was a medical examiner at the office which licensed bus and taxi drivers in Moscow, claimed inside knowledge of the Soviet scientific program. Our own elite, these days, has begun a subtle whitewash of the KGB. The CIA views its colleagues as fellow professionals, who may also suffer from the interference of politicians and the incomprehension of their public. The KGB's director, Yuri Andropov, has been depicted as a bon vivant, a cultivated connoisseur of avant-garde art, and a man who thinks about the liberalization of the regime. Andropov must indeed like avant-garde art a great deal, since he prefers to reserve it for himself and not have it shown in public. As for the liberalization of the regime, his efforts of thought must be too exhausting for mere practical expression. In any event, one can hardly imagine the KGB, either in its baggy-trousered older model or in its more Italianate newer one, taking seriously an "informant" like Lipavsky.

Bureaucratic momentum goes a long way. The CIA is incapable of staying out of anything that comes to its attention. I recently sued the agency in Federal District Court for opening a letter to a colleague at Moscow State University (a letter dealing with an international scholarly conference on religion, which promptly found its way to the CIA's files). At the trial, a CIA official testified that the agency kept a watch on the university, on Americans studying in the USSR, and on Soviet citizens who might (or might not) be dissident. With economy, indeed elegance, he verified Soviet official paranoia about international exchanges—and about dissent. (I am now in possession of a court-ordered letter of apology from Admiral Turner—as well as a brief filed subsequently by the Department of Justice, declaring that no such letter should have been ordered.)

Continuing failure of the executive branch to discipline the CIA makes it an impediment to an effective foreign policy—as well as a continuing danger to our own liberties and those of other nations. The case for the abolition of the agency, and the distribution of its tasks amongst other departments, is stronger than ever. In the meantime, the Congressional committees charged with intelligence oversight should be heard from. Senator Moynihan, who sits on the Senate committee, has been outspoken in Shcharansky's defense. Will he now assist the Soviet dissidents against the embrace of the CIA—which many of them have publicly spurned?

NORMAN BIRNBAUM

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE A-4THE WASHINGTON STAR  
1 April 1978*file*  
*media*  
*Gen*

## CIA-FBI Informant Got \$32,200, Still Gets Pay, Viet Spy Trial Is Told

The government disclosed yesterday that a CIA-FBI informant who is expected to be a major prosecution witness in the espionage trial of a two men accused of spying for North Vietnam has been paid \$32,000 and is continuing to receive \$1,200 a month.

The disclosure, which came in a letter from Alexandria U.S. Attorney William E. Cummings to defense lawyers, was filed yesterday in U.S. District Court. It may affect the credibility of the informant's testimony, a lawyer for one of the defendants asserted.

"The amount that this informant was paid is extraordinary," said Warren L. Miller, chief counsel for one of the defendants, former USIA employee Ronald L. Humphrey. "It clearly raises a very serious question as to the credibility of the witness and of the motivation for any testimony she might give at the trial."

The informant is identified in court records as Dung Krall, the daughter of a former Vietcong representative to the Soviet Union. According to an affidavit filed by Attorney General Griffin Bell, she acted as a courier for the other defendant, David Truong, carrying packages to between him and Vietnamese officials in Paris.

**KRALL — CODE-NAMED** Keyseat — revealed to federal agents the contents of the packages, the court papers say. Some of the letters are expected to be used as evidence in the trial, which is scheduled to begin May 1.

The revelation of the payments to Krall was made by the prosecution under rules requiring such disclosures to be made if they might help the cases of criminal defendants.

U.S. District Judge Albert V. Bryan Jr. yesterday ordered the government to turn over to the defense documents that he had been asked to review privately by Bell. Bryan ordered that the material be kept secret by the lawyers, however. They had not yet received them late yesterday.

"We still don't know what they are," Miller said. The lawyer suggested that they might contain records of Humphrey's being picked up in electronic surveillance in an unrelated national security case.

The other case, Miller said, involved an approach to Humphrey by a Soviet agent during the time the defendant allegedly was spying for Vietnam. At the time, Miller said, Humphrey informed U.S. authorities of the approach.

**HUMPHREY'S REPORT** to authorities demonstrated his "clear intent to assist his government and report possible compromises of national security," Miller said in court last week.

Bryan yesterday also released an order preventing the government from using as evidence much of its electronic surveillance of Humphrey and Truong, ruling that the material he was suppressing was inadmissible because there had been no warrant issued for it.

Wiretaps of both defendants and a microphone surveillance of Truong's apartment began early last May, and some of the surveillance continued for 268 days. In addition, the government surreptitiously took videotapes of Humphrey in his USIA office between June 20 of last year and Sept. 15.

Bryan ruled yesterday that none the surveillance after July 20 — or any other evidence deriving from it — could be used in court. On July 20, the judge concluded, the government investigation ceased to be a simple counterintelligence operation and became a criminal investigation.

Bell had said in an affidavit that the decision to prosecute the two men was not made until January, just before they were indicted. But Bryan concluded in the ruling released yesterday that the Justice Department apparently "was trying to put together a criminal case" by July 20.

*medlin  
Cren*

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## *Decimating 'the First Line of Defense' at CIA*

The Post's March 21 report that the CIA now claims its "second wave of ousters will be less than expected" must be read for what it also says: that nothing and no one has persuaded Director Stansfield Turner to give up his original plan to oust 820 senior and middle officers from the CIA's clandestine service, the Operations Directorate (DDO) and abolish their slots.

That will leave just 4,045 officers to man the first line of defense for 215 million Americans and the other billions of the world who depend on us as their ultimate bulwark.

That is stunning folly when the United States—once more—is becoming worried about the intentions of the Soviet Union while continuing to worry about what transnational terrorists may do next, what the Mideast oil producers may do next, etc. All those are matters for which the DDO is the American policymakers' prime source.

Only the president and the Congress can stop Turner from fundamentally compromising the United States's clandestine intelligence-reporting organization—this unique organization—for years to come. For them to do nothing is to acquiesce in Turner's depredations.

As for the 50 officers who are still going to be fired—for whom Turner has summarily snapped the bonds of loyalty that are vital to the agency—they must decide if they want to fight for themselves, since they have no

more recourse within the Byzantine system by which they have been Turner-ed out.

One wonders if the fired 50 might be able to help restore the agency's sense of confidence in itself, as well as helping their own cause, by going to the only forums where they might still be able to get a fair hearing: the courts and Congress.

CHRISTOPHER MAY

Chevy Chase

*(The writer retired from the CIA last year.)*

*File*