

editorials

U.S. should halt aid to South Korea

*They command the national defense
with their golf club in their left hand
While fondling the breasts of their mistresses
with their right*
—from Kim Chi Ha's "Five Bandits."

While the eyes of last week's world focused on the death of his wife, South Korean President Park Chung Hee added fuel to the fire of tyranny he ignited in 1972. The United States, through some \$300 million in aid, is helping Park in his tyranny.

The oppression began in 1972 when the South Korean constitution was abrogated. To criticize the government is now a crime punishable by death. The death sentence can even be handed out to students who cut classes or examinations without adequate reason.

Since January, 280 critics of the government, most of them students, have been arrested under Park's harsh rule. The most notable of those sentenced to death is South Korea's best known poet, Kim Chi Ha. Kim, 33, has been one of Park's targets since the 1970 publication of his poem "Five Bandits." In April, Kim was arrested and tried for allegedly providing \$5,400 to student agitators. Three weeks ago his sentence was reduced to life imprisonment.

Park has repeatedly justified the measures as a defense against Communist aggression. A better bet is that his actual motive is the elimination of domestic opponents.

Saturday night Park told the Korean press his investigators had concluded that the assassination attempt which claimed his wife was ordered by the president of Communist North Korea, Kim Il Sung. Monday, Sung refuted the charge.

Whether the North Korean president ordered the attempt or not, Park was able to point to it as further evidence of communist influence in his country—further justifying his oppressive measures.

And Park's repression is causing international reaction. The conviction of two Japanese citizens—Yoshiharu Hayakawa, 37, a language instructor, and Masaki Tachikawa, 28, a freelance journalist—has caused a rift in Japanese-Korean relations. The two were sentenced to 20 years in prison for aiding North Korean and Japanese Communists in the Seoul student anti-government movement. Japan, which provided 93 per cent of South Korea's foreign investment last year, has hinted that its entire Korean policy is under review. The U.S. should also review. Section 32 of

the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973 states: "it is the sense of Congress that the President should deny any economic or military assistance to the government of any foreign country which practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes." South Korea clearly falls into this stipulation.

But despite this, America's former number one hero (enter Gerald Ford), Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, said in Senate testimony that the administration has decided to authorize \$300 million in economic and military aid "even when we would not recommend the actions of the government of South Korea." His reason: "where we believe the national interest is at stake, we proceed even when we don't approve."

So it's the national interest song again. Look where it has gotten us:

—It was in the national interest to aid in combating Greek insurgents during the Truman administration.

—It was in the national interest to enter the Korean conflict over 20 years ago.

—It was in the name of national interest (interchangeable with security from now on) to invade Cuba in 1961.

—It was in the national interest to escalate the war in Viet Nam.

—It was in the national interest to keep from the American public countless revealing documents in the Watergate cover-up.

And now it's in the national interest to support a government which is in direct opposition to the beliefs of our founding fathers and even many public servants today.

If we are ever going to break this deeply-grooved record, the Congress will have to do the breaking.

The Congress of two years ago would undoubtedly fall in line behind the administration. The Congress of today, hopefully, is different. The Watergate investigations left Congress with a new-found vitality and has many people rooting for the Congress to stay on its toes. A good first step would be to override the administration on the South Korean issue.

Congressmen and women should ask themselves if it would be in the national interest to fight for the Park regime in the event that anti-government forces or Communist North Koreans decide to attack the Park regime. If the answer is no, then aid should be cut-off promptly — for three reasons:

—The similarities between Viet Nam 15 years ago and the present Korean situation are alarming. The Congress should realize that it is

much easier for an administration to wage war on behalf of a country that receives aid from the U.S. than for a country that does not. With the growing dissent among South Koreans and Park's constant jabs at North Korea, the prospect of war is becoming quite real.

—The United States shouldn't economically and militarily support a country which holds ideals and practices practices which are in opposition to our own.

—With this country's money shrinking, we should be more selective in doling out dollars. It's expensive in terms of lives (the U.S. has 38,000 military personnel in South Korea) and money to support an unwanted government against the will of its people.

Kissinger says we can't afford *not* to support South Korea. The fact is, we can't afford to support governments like South Korea's.

But here we sit in Eugene, Oregon discussing foreign aid. If you have an opinion and want it heard where it will do some good, try writing your Congressman or woman or one of our Senators. After all, it is an election year.

DH

Unfair prices

The Lane County Fair, billed by local media as "the best entertainment buy in town," turned out to be a bust for students on a limited budget.

Admission was \$1.50 for adults and university students. Adult rides went for 45 and 60 cents. A cup of coffee cost 20 cents. And the Fair Board imposed the prices on groups which sought to charge less.

If a person was interested in the exhibits or the shows only, the Fair could be seen as a good buy. But a person wishing to spend an hour riding rides and eating would have to spend \$5 to \$10.

By comparison, an excellent comedy double-feature showing downtown provided three hours of enjoyment at a student cost of \$2. I know, I opted for the movie after seeing the "Fair" prices.

The Fair Board should take into account the student plight, and charge accordingly.

DH

opinion

Tennessee Valley Authority stooping to new lows

BY NICHOLAS VON HOFFMAN

WASHINGTON (KFS)—The Tennessee Valley Authority, once the originator of many good ideas but now long since gone to sleep, has come up with an innovative wrinkle. It is now charging people for information about its operations. For every hour a clerk must spend checking the files for data, the inquirer is billed \$6.75.

By way of explanation, Paul Evans, TVA's public information officer, says, "We are relatively new in complying with the Freedom of Information Act, but when it starts to intrude on our regular operations we have to do something."

The idea of having government agencies charge for the news they put out is so startling we might dismiss it without considering its merits. One of the reasons that the media is clogged with inconsequential junk, which neither entertains nor informs, is that we get all our stuff free. If we had to pay for information, economics would force us to exercise a more stringent selectivity. Would we print the cartloads of stuff and feathers that Ron Ziegler has been dumping on us for years if

we had to pay for it? Another benefit is that, if government agencies and politicians thought they could profit by selling news they would have an incentive to offer a higher-quality product than the sawdust they currently give away.

In the TVA's instance, however, the \$6.75-an-hour charge was leveled against Jim Branscome of Letcher County, Kentucky's "Mountain Eagle" weekly newspaper because, one suspects, the Authority's authorities knew that these rates were too high to be paid by a small country newspaper—or by reporter Branscome, who must live off a stipend from the Southern Regional Council, a not-for-profit, do-goodish organization. Nor is there any way around the charge. Evans says that it is quite impossible to allow Branscome in the files to do his own research work. And they wonder why some journalists write lies.

It wasn't lies but the truth that got the TVA to lower the Freedom of Information Act on Branscome. He had been writing about Aubrey Wagner, the Authority's chairman, fighting for a continuation of strip-mining and a weakening of the Mine

Health and Safety Act. A source inside the TVA told Branscome of a plan to strip-mine the Red Bird coal tract in the Daniel Boone National Forest, a project that would have the spin-off advantage of affording tourists a nice, deep convenient flat place to set their air-conditioned campers and trailers.

Next came the case of Hawk Littlejohn, a Cherokee Indian whose actions have been less than supportive of the TVA's Tellico Dam project, waters of which will cover the remains of Enchota, the capital city of Littlejohn's ancestors. Branscome's journalistic archeology has brought to light the fact that the Authority's police force is keeping some kind of a file on Hawk Littlejohn, and that this file contains material of a private nature that has no business in a government document.

The TVA is positive in its assertion that it doesn't keep dossiers on its critics. Public Information Officer Evans says that the data collected on Littlejohn was only for the purpose of being able to refute him in public debate. In another period such an unqualified statement by an official spokesman might have been accepted, but not these days.

The TVA's case isn't helped by the fact that its board hasn't held an open meeting in 41 years. "The board makes its own rules as to its conduct," says Evans, who adds that, although there has been some informal discussion of going public, he doesn't think it's very likely.

Even though the President appoints the three-man board, this is one you can't blame on Nixon. The board was running what has become the largest power company in America on this kind of private, no-peek-a-boo basis back in the days when the President was gaining his imperfect knowledge of our Constitution in the Duke Law School.

No, the design of the TVA was set during the New Deal. Then it represented the government's going to the people in the best way the 1930s could conceive. Whether it has grown too big or too old, its governance is vulnerable to the most serious criticisms in the 1970s—yet it remains the organizational model for such failures as the new, not-reformed Post Office, as well as other still-unlegislated proposals of large consequence in fields like energy and transportation.