

the U.S. would have to be assured that a resident U.S. team in Hanoi would have sufficient work to justify its presence; this would include access to archival information.

Thach's interest in establishing a U.S. POW/MIA office in Hanoi was immediately apparent. Not only in discussions with Vessey, but in subsequent discussions with members of Congress and other interested Americans, Thach frequently stressed his desire that the office be opened quickly.

The question of an official U.S. presence in Hanoi had become more than a mechanism to hasten resolution of the POW/MIA issue. Thach, who was Vietnam's leading proponent of rapprochement with the U.S., perceived the opening of a U.S. POW/MIA Office in Hanoi as evidence of progress toward normalization of relations.

Despite its Foreign Minister's interest, Vietnam did not move quickly to ensure U.S. confidence that its POW/MIA team would have the access to documentary evidence required. Progress stalled over Vietnam's insistence that U.S. access to military documents would compromise Vietnam's national security. Accordingly, only Vietnamese personnel would search the archives, after which they would share with the U.S. their summary notes of any information related to U.S. POW/MIA cases they discovered. This arrangement was not satisfactory to the U.S.

In 1990, 17 sets of remains were repatriated by Vietnam and identified as those of Americans.

#### 1991: The Pace of Activity Quickens

In April 1991, Senator John McCain traveled to Vietnam for meetings with President Do Muoi and Foreign Minister Thach in an effort to advance the establishment of a U.S. POW/MIA office there. McCain sought Vietnam's agreement to allow U.S. investigators the kind of access to archival information which would meet both Vietnamese and U.S. concerns. McCain was also authorized by the Bush Administration to discuss in general terms a forthcoming U.S. proposal for bilateral cooperation leading to the full normalization of relations, which came to be referred to informally as the "Road Map."

Thach was initially reluctant to modify Vietnamese strictures on access to their archives, but near the end of their discussions Thach asked McCain to offer his assurances to Vessey that American investigators would be granted the level of access that the U.S. had requested.

In April 1991, Assistant Secretary of State Solomon outlined to U.N. Ambassador Lang the United States' road-map proposal for improved relations. In general terms, the Road Map provides in four phases for the normalization of economic and diplomatic

relations between the United States and Vietnam conditioned on Vietnam's cooperation in the achievement and implementation of a settlement to the Cambodian civil war and the fullest possible accounting of American POW/MIAs.<sup>282</sup>

Vietnam never formally accepted nor rejected this outline of reciprocal steps toward full normalization of relations, although Vietnamese officials have often expressed resentment at its terms. Nevertheless, Vietnam appears to recognize that U.S. terms for normalization are unlikely to be improved (from their perspective).

Since the Road Map proposal was put forward, Vietnam has fully met the standard of cooperation requested with respect to the peace plan in Cambodia. Although serious problems exist with respect to the implementation of that plan, the responsibility for these problems does not rest with Vietnam.

Vietnam's cooperation on the POW/MIA issue over the last 20 months is not as satisfactory as its constructive cooperation in the Cambodia settlement. However, when judged as a whole, the steps Hanoi has taken since April 1991 depict dramatic, albeit irregular, progress in joint efforts to account for missing Americans.

Unfortunately, the number of Americans accounted for has fallen dramatically during the same period. The impetus for Vietnam's cooperation has come from several sources. Vessey has provided the Vietnamese with a respected and influential contact within the U.S. government.

- . The Bush Administration's Road Map establishes a clear linkage between increasing levels of Vietnamese cooperation and American response.
- . The disintegration of the Soviet empire has deprived Vietnam of many external sources of economic assistance and political comfort. Vietnam's relations with China, which have been tense traditionally, have worsened over territorial disputes. With its Soviet allies gone, Vietnam now lacks a counterweight to Chinese influence.
- . The rapid economic growth of other Southeast Asian nations has given younger Vietnamese leaders a strong incentive to establish their own contacts with the West.

---

<sup>282</sup>The road map remains classified. Vietnam has released it, however; a version that was published in the Thai newspaper The Nation is reprinted below:

-----FAZ: OK to print the text here, or no?

The formation of the Select Committee has demonstrated anew the high priority attached to the POW/MIA issue by the American people and Government.

Obviously, the Committee does not know precisely how all of these matters have been factored into the calculations of the Vietnamese Government, but the overall trends offer hope for better cooperation on POW/MIA issues.

Shortly after Solomon discussed the Road Map with Lang, Vessey led another U.S. delegation to Hanoi. In the course of their discussions, Thach reiterated Vietnam's humanitarian purpose: an implicit, though not formal, rejection of the Road Map's linkage of normalization to POW/MIA accounting.

The most important accomplishment of the April 1991 Vessey trip was an agreement to establish a U.S. POW/MIA office in Hanoi. Although the office was originally intended to be temporary, it remains in full operation today, staffed by the Joint Task Force-Full Accounting (JTF-FA). The office, informally referred to as the "Ranch," coordinates archival research, helps to plan field investigations, and serves as a base of operations for live-sighting investigations.

Although establishment of the Ranch was a step forward in U.S.-Vietnamese cooperation, U.S. investigators did not gain promised access to archival information on a timely or regular basis for many months. In July 1991, prospects for further cooperation appeared to suffer a setback when Thach was relieved of his ministerial portfolio and his seat in the Politburo. As previously observed, Thach was considered to be Vietnam's leading senior advocate of better relations with the U.S. His removal was seen by some observers to be at least partly attributable to dissatisfaction inside the Politburo with the pace of progress toward lifting the U.S. trade embargo against Vietnam.

In August 1991, Vietnam's Vice Foreign Minister Le Mai met with Solomon in Bangkok. Mai argued that Vietnam and the U.S. had resolved already the discrepancy cases, presumably clearing the way for rapid progress towards normal relations. Solomon responded by suggesting that greater progress on these cases was still expected by the U.S.

In September 1991, the United States announced a grant of \$1.3 million to assist the war-disabled in Vietnam.

In October 1991, Vessey returned to Hanoi for a meeting with the newly-appointed Prime Minister, Vo Van Kiet, and newly-appointed Foreign Minister, Nguyen Manh Cam. During the meeting, the Prime Minister pledged "unconditional cooperation" to resolve the POW/MIA issue, which gave U.S. officials encouragement that Vietnam had not

forsaken such cooperation in the new internal political environment in Hanoi.

Also in October, Secretary Baker announced that the U.S. was prepared to take some steps toward normalization with Vietnam in light of Vietnam's support for the Cambodia peace plan. In December, the U.S. Government lifted its ban on organized travel to Vietnam by Americans and began implementing other steps within Phase I of the Road Map.

About this time, U.S. investigators in Vietnam received part of an 84-page military record documenting U.S. air losses in Military Region Four. The U.S. made frequent appeals for the rest of this valuable document. Vietnamese officials assured the U.S. that they would turn over the complete document, but did not do so.

In 1991, three sets of remains were repatriated by Vietnam and identified as those of Americans.

#### 1992 : Administration and Committee Efforts to Encourage Cooperation

The Select Committee has worked closely with the Executive Branch, and especially with Vessey, to encourage greater cooperation from Vietnam and the other countries of Southeast Asia. During 1992, a series of high-level U.S. delegations traveled to the region for the purpose of demonstrating American interest and conveying specific U.S. requests. The continuing series of visits helped greatly to maintain diplomatic pressure on the governments of the area and to see that assurances given one month were followed up the next.

In January 1992, General Vessey led a military delegation to Hanoi for meetings with Foreign Minister Cam, and for the first time with Defense Minister Doan Khue. Additional meetings were held with vice ministers of the Interior and Defense ministries.

The mission's primary objectives were to achieve access to archival information consistent with past Vietnamese assurances by securing Vietnamese permission to field multiple U.S. teams of archival researchers, and to establish a credible way to conduct live-sighting investigations on short notice.

The results of the January mission were disappointing, with one exception: the long-delayed release by Vietnam to the U.S. of the remainder of the 84-page anti-aircraft battery record of Military Region Four. However, the Vietnamese were unwilling to accede to U.S. requests for a live-sighting investigation agreement and a formalized structure for archival research.

According to senior members of the delegation, Vietnamese negotiators all seemed to speak from the same list of talking

points. They agreed only to establish a point of contact to coordinate with the U.S. on live-sighting investigations; to strengthen existing measures for acquiring documentary information about POW/MIAs; and to reconsider U.S. requests at a later meeting.

Shortly after the Vessey delegation returned, the U.S. began considering a higher profile delegation to Hanoi as a means of encouraging Vietnam to accept Vessey's proposals for live sighting investigations and archival research. In March, a delegation headed by Solomon traveled to Hanoi.

The Solomon delegation found a much different attitude prevailing in Hanoi than that which Vessey had encountered in January. The causes for Hanoi's change of heart are open to speculation; all that can be said with certainty is that, with surprising ease, the Solomon delegation was able to conclude agreements on the aforementioned proposals. The U.S. now had a very specific commitment on short-notice, live-sighting investigations, and a detailed plan to provide the U.S. with access to Vietnam's war archives.

One month later in April 1992, the Select Committee would test the sincerity of Vietnam's commitments to Solomon, and, in some areas, expand those commitments.

#### April 1992: Select Committee Delegation

On April 16, five members of the Select Committee -- Senators Kerry, Smith, Robb, Brown and Grassley -- embarked on a ten-day mission to Southeast Asia. Members of the delegation spent three days in Vietnam. Their purpose was twofold: first, to obtain the necessary assurances of cooperation from senior Vietnamese leaders; and, second, to ensure that those guarantees of access would be carried out.

The Senate delegation's stay in Vietnam demonstrated both the significant progress that had been made on the POW/MIA issue as well as the formidable obstacles which still remained to obtaining the fullest possible accounting for the 1,655 servicemen lost in or over Vietnam. The senators arrived in Hanoi on April 21, shortly after 58 JTF-FA and CIL-HI crash-site and live-sighting investigators had arrived for the nineteenth "joint iteration" and had divided into five teams to conduct 30 days of excavations and investigations in seven northern and central provinces in Vietnam.

Meetings in Hanoi. During meetings with numerous senior Vietnamese officials in Hanoi, the Senate delegation received assurances of continued cooperation on the POW/MIA issue. Initial meetings on April 21 with Foreign Minister Cam and Defense Minister Khue, while promising in tone, did not yield specific plans to advance Vietnamese cooperation. Both ministers adamantly reasserted that

there were no American prisoners of war in captivity or living freely in Vietnam.

The senators repeatedly emphasized the importance of immediate access to areas of live-sighting reports, access to war-time archives and officials, better logistical support for joint investigative teams, and a resolution of the issue of warehousing remains.

Senators also met with Interior Minister Bui Thien Ngo whose Ministry controls the Vietnamese prison system. Ngo promised cooperation in providing U.S. investigators access to prisons where Americans were alleged to be held after the Operation Homecoming.

Other meetings with VNOSMP officials focused on the procedural and administrative difficulties U.S. investigators encountered in attempting to conduct thorough live-sighting and crash-site investigations. The delegation also visited the Army war museum in Hanoi where flight gear of downed American pilots is displayed.

General Secretary Do Muoi's "Breakthrough" Guarantees. Of great significance was the delegation's meeting with Vietnamese Communist Party General Secretary Do Muoi and Interior Vice Minister Le Minh Huong, held on the morning of April 22. The senators received from the General Secretary direct guarantees that the delegation and JTF-FA personnel would have whatever access to places, persons and records they determined essential to resolving the POW/MIA issue in 1992. In fact, Do Muoi asked the delegation on three separate occasions to tell him exactly what the Select Committee expected from Vietnam to resolve the issue.

Do Muoi also agreed to grant U.S. investigative teams access to border sites in Laos through Vietnam if Lao officials agreed. And he steadfastly maintained that no American prisoners were kept after Operation Homecoming, and denied that Vietnam had ever warehoused American remains.

The use of U.S. helicopters in POW/MIA investigations was one concession which Do Muoi and other Vietnamese leaders were unwilling to make, citing the probable negative reaction of the Vietnamese people to the sight and sound of U.S. choppers as a reason for their refusal.

#### Inspection of Thanh Liet Prison

On April 21, the Senate delegation informed Vietnamese representatives that the senators wished to go to Thanh Liet prison located about 20 kilometers south of Hanoi in the Thanh Liet district. Thanh Liet had been the detention site for about 10 American POWs between 1968 and 1972, and had served as the location of three first-hand live-sighting reports of alleged American POWs

since 1984. U.S. investigators had been denied permission to inspect Thanh Liet several weeks earlier.

On April 22, when the senators arrived at Thanh Liet Prison, their access initially was restricted by the camp commander to those areas where Americans were held during the war. Calls to the Foreign and Interior ministries by Vietnamese personnel accompanying the delegation won the delegation unrestricted access to all prison quarters.

Although the delegation found no evidence of Americans being held at Thanh Liet in recent years, their inspection of the prison established a precedent for the conduct of similar short-notice inspections by JTF-FA personnel.

**Ho Chi Minh City, Da Nang, and Mekong Delta Visits.** On the morning of April 23, Senators Kerry and Smith flew to the Mekong Delta; Senator Brown flew to Da Nang; and Senator Grassley met with Vietnamese officials in Ho Chi Minh City.

Senator Grassley and Select Committee staff talked extensively to Bui Duc Cam, a Vietnamese official involved since 1975 in the search for American MIA remains. Cam acknowledged that it is a crime in Vietnam to file a false live-sighting report and attributed many of those reports to the rumors of a two-million dollar reward for a live American. The need for communication on live-sighting reports between Vietnamese and American live-sighting investigators was emphasized.

Grassley later met with former Vietnamese "re-education camp" inmates, most of whom had been interned in North Vietnam for many years after the fall of Saigon. Several of the men said they had seen Marine Private Robert Garwood working in a re-education camp in North Vietnam. None reported seeing or hearing of any other Americans in detention camps after the war.

During his visit to Da Nang, Brown met with the KGB station chief at the Russian Consulate in Da Nang. He had been in Vietnam since 1972, and despite hearsay reports he had received, he was convinced that there were no Americans presently held prisoner in Vietnam.<sup>283</sup>

---

<sup>283</sup>A few days earlier, the former number-two Soviet diplomat in Hanoi had described to the delegation a 1985 directive by the Soviet leader to the 9,500 Soviet advisers then in Vietnam. Seeking improved relations with the U.S., Mikhail Gorbachev had ordered all Soviet advisers to search for signs of living Americans -- in captivity or living freely -- in Vietnam. They found none, the diplomat said. It was the first time the extent of the Soviet presence was acknowledged.

Senators Kerry and Smith flew by helicopter to three sensitive military areas in southern Vietnam to further test Vietnamese commitment to short-notice live-sighting investigations. The Senators touched down on Phu Quoc Island, an active naval base; Dong Tam, former headquarters of the U.S. 9th Infantry Division, and Can Tho, a former U.S. Cobra helicopter base.

At each site there was initial local resistance to the visit which in most cases was eventually overcome. The stops highlighted several of the procedural and administrative obstacles to be dealt with if U.S. investigations of live-sighting reports are to be effective and credible.

The Senate delegation's activities in Vietnam were successful in a number of respects. First, while Vietnamese leaders steadfastly denied holding any Americans after the war, they gave specific assurances that Lt. Col. John Donovan, Chief of JTF-FA for Vietnam, and his investigators would be given access to all the places, persons and records necessary to achieve the fullest possible accounting. The delegation identified particular individuals which the Vietnamese should make available, records they should produce and places they must provide access to for the Select Committee to report favorably on Vietnamese cooperation.

Second, Senators had put Vietnam's assurances to a vigorous test, particularly the short-notice, live-sighting investigations -- more than previous delegations had attempted.

Third, the delegation identified some of the logistical problems which Vietnam must resolve to enable U.S. investigators to investigate live-sighting reports, examine crash sites and otherwise freely pursue evidence about the fate of our POW/MIAs.

#### Recent Developments

In April, following the Senate delegation's return the Bush Administration took the next reciprocal steps on the Road Map by allowing the commercial sale of certain products required to meet basic human needs, by easing restrictions on American non-governmental and non-profit groups working in Vietnam, and by agreeing to the establishment of telecommunications links between the U.S. and Vietnam. These steps were followed shortly by permission for Vietnamese-Americans to make direct money transfers to relatives in Vietnam.

In July, the Select Committee's staff director, Frances Zwenig, traveled to Southeast Asia to meet with Vietnamese and Lao officials. The purposes of Zwenig's trip to Vietnam were to impress upon Vietnamese officials the urgency of completing all current live-sighting investigations and to explore the possibility of holding an informal U.S./Vietnam hearing to discuss the status of unresolved discrepancy cases. Her visit to Vietnam coincided

with JTF-FA Commander Maj. Gen. Thomas Needham's trip to the area.

Zwenig's discussions with Vice Foreign Minister Le Mai yielded Vietnam's agreement to an expedited schedule for investigations of prisons and military facilities on a priority list at DIA's detachment in Bangkok (Stony Beach). Further, Vietnam agreed to add a second investigator to its live-sighting team.

During this period, the U.S. was beginning to receive significant amounts of information from Vietnamese archives through the work of an American, Mr. Ted Schweitzer, who had been granted access to these records by the Government of Vietnam. Accordingly, on October 8, Acting Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger and Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney met with Vietnam's Foreign Minister Nguyen Man Cam, and the Director of the Americas Department, Le Bang, to discuss the information which the U.S. had been receiving and to work out an agreement to formalize U.S. access to this type of information.

Vietnam responded by inviting Vessey to Hanoi. Vessey departed for Hanoi on October 15; included in his delegation, at the request of President Bush, was Select Committee member Senator McCain.

McCain carried with him to Vietnam a letter from Chairman Kerry, encouraging and authorizing McCain's participation in the Vessey delegation.

The delegation arrived in Hanoi on October 17. In the first formal meeting on the following day, Vice Foreign Minister Le Mai led Vietnam's negotiators. Shortly before the meeting began, Vessey and McCain had an informal discussion with Mai, during which Mai indicated that the U.S. would receive the agreements we sought.

Progress in achieving U.S. objectives in the meeting proceeded so rapidly that the negotiations adjourned in considerably less time than anticipated by the delegation. Mai explained that the Government of Vietnam was currently collecting widely dispersed documentary evidence showing the fates of American POW/MIAs into Vietnam's military archives, where it would all be made available to U.S. investigators, and that Vietnam would sign an agreement to that effect before the delegation departed for the U.S.

Vessey then suggested that the delegations divide into teams to draft the formal agreement for access to this information and a memorandum of understanding detailing the mechanisms for that access. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Ken Quinn led the team drafting the formal agreement, and Needham led the team to draft the memorandum of understanding. All U.S. personnel involved in the initial negotiations, and in the subsequent drafting sessions remarked on the relative ease with which the agreements were concluded.

The delegation departed Vietnam on October 19. Upon their return to the United States, Vessey and McCain characterized the agreements as a "breakthrough" that had established finally the mechanism through which the United States could receive the fullest possible accounting for our POW/MIAs. In a Rose Garden ceremony a few days later, President Bush also hailed the agreements as a "breakthrough."

A Senate delegation returned to Vietnam in November 1992 to follow up on Vessey's accomplishments of the month before and to push for further cooperation. The delegation's primary objectives were:

- . To accelerate the pace of joint American-Vietnamese investigations of live sighting reports;
- . To press for specific answers to questions raised by the most troubling of the remaining discrepancy cases;
- . To expand research capabilities within the archives of Vietnam's military museums;
- . To obtain access to Vietnamese veterans of the war, for the purpose of taking oral histories; and
- . To push for the repatriation of remains held by private individuals throughout Vietnam.

Senators Kerry, Daschle and Brown held three days of meetings in Hanoi with President Le Duc Anh, Foreign Minister Nguyen Manh Cam and other officials of the Defense and Foreign Ministries, including working-level officials of the VNOSMP. Kerry delivered a letter from President Bush to President Anh encouraging Vietnam to continue to increase its level of cooperation on the POW/MIA issue.

The delegation made great progress in the area of live-sighting investigations. As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, the members of the delegation personally conducted investigations of six high-priority live-sighting reports and won assurances that American officials stationed in Vietnam would be permitted to conduct investigations of all of the remaining priority live-sighting reports by Dec. 10, 1992.

The members of the delegation also asked the Vietnamese hard questions about specific discrepancy cases in which it appeared most likely that the Vietnamese could provide information. In two meetings with officials of VNOSMP, the Senators discussed the factual details of several discrepancy cases and learned of archival, anecdotal and other information known by the Vietnamese about the fate of unaccounted-for Americans. Similar meetings at the working level are to continue.

The delegation stressed the great importance that the United States places upon access to Vietnam's war archives. Photographs, documents, artifacts and other materials already have provided answers to questions which have lingered for more than 20 years in a small number of discrepancy cases, and the Committee expects that more answers will be forthcoming as U.S. officials gain access to the wealth of information that exists within Vietnam's archives. In response to delegation requests, the Vietnamese promised to open new archival research offices in Da Nang and Ho Chi Minh City, in addition to the office already open in Hanoi.

The delegation also sought and obtained a promise from the Vietnamese Government to make Vietnamese veterans of the war available to American investigators for the taking of oral histories. Both sides recognized that Vietnamese soldiers have an enormous amount of information about individual battles and other incidents which will complement archival information as it is uncovered. The Committee expects that oral histories obtained from Vietnamese veterans will answer many outstanding questions about what happened to unaccounted-for servicemen.

Finally, the delegation pressed the Vietnamese on the subject of remains. The Vietnamese assured the Senators that the Government was not holding any American remains and promised to take actions to encourage private citizens who might be holding remains to turn them in for repatriation to the U.S.

#### Committee Hearings

During its final public hearing, on Dec. 4, 1992, the Select Committee reviewed the status of progress in securing cooperation from Vietnam. Vessey testified that:

That long-sought agreement to get at the Vietnamese war-time archival material puts in place what I believe to be the last piece of procedural machinery that we needed to get to the fullest possible accounting. . .

I believe we now have in place the necessary agreements with the Vietnamese Government. We have correctly organized within our own Government. We have competent people working on the matter. But again I say there is a lot of work ahead. And a lot of cooperation will be required on both sides if we're to get the answers we seek.<sup>284</sup>

Needham, head of the JTF-FA, told the Committee that:

---

<sup>284</sup>Vessey testimony, Dec. 4, 1992

In the last year, the cooperation in Vietnam has been steadily improving. . .

Recently, with the visits of General Vessey and Senator McCain, and your Committee, there's been some dramatic improvements.

I think the Vietnamese could still do more, but right now we see cooperation getting better and better every day at the central level. In the field level, cooperation is mixed. In some provinces, it's better than others. In some areas, it depends on the central government team leader or the local officials as to whether it's up or down. We are still, across the board, seeing better improvement.<sup>285</sup>

A long-standing issue in U.S.-Vietnamese relations concerns the possibility that the Government of Vietnam has stockpiled the remains of American servicemen to be doled out at politically convenient times and, if so, whether that stockpile has by now been depleted. On this point, Vessey testified:

. . . the number of remains that some people expect to be in storage is too high. It doesn't stand the sensibility check. . . we don't know whether they hold remains or not.<sup>286</sup>

Needham testified:

I just don't know the answer on remains. I do know that there are many remains being held by private citizens and I've addressed that with the Vietnamese, because it's against their law. They tell me that they are trying to find a way to solve that problem. . .

I also believe that there are some remains being held by the local district and village officials, all of this in hopes that there will be some monetary reward at some point.<sup>287</sup>

Mr. Garnett Bell, JTF-FA's negotiations assistance officer, testified:

There certainly was a warehouse in the Hanoi area at one time. The "mortician," I think, after he defected in

---

<sup>285</sup>Needham testimony, Dec. 4, 1992

<sup>286</sup>Ibid

<sup>287</sup>Ibid

1979, he testified here in Congress that he processed some 452 remains. The Vietnamese were confronted with that information. They denied it. They indicated that they thought the mortician was fabricating.

He (the mortician) actually provided about seven different items of information. I think six of those have been verified. . .

The Vietnamese, I believe, came to the conclusion that we were confident that the man was telling the truth. Since the mortician gave his testimony, they have returned to us approximately 450 remains.

Approximately 260-269 remains have now been identified, and that indicates to me (that). . . they're telling us that we have given you those remains back and the warehouse here in Hanoi is empty.<sup>288</sup>

An important perspective on the issue of cooperation and accountability was presented to the Committee by Schweitzer, an individual who is now employed by the DoD and who played a major role in gaining U.S. access to Vietnam's military archives, where he had been working for more than a year first as a private researcher, compiling information for a book and then as a DoD consultant. Schweitzer said that a great deal of evidence and information concerning lost Americans is in the hands of private Vietnamese citizens, but that those citizens have lacked a strong incentive to come forward. In Schweitzer's opinion, Vietnamese citizens will be more likely to respond to appeals for information from the central government in Hanoi and from the U.S. if they see the U.S. beginning to act more favorably towards Vietnam.

Schweitzer also questioned the degree to which the central Government of Vietnam knows more than it has told the U.S. about the fate of missing Americans:

There were orders from Hanoi throughout the war that any American who was captured or any American who was killed, there was to be a complete report made and sent to Hanoi. But in the heat of battle in the war. . . a lot of times these reports just didn't get made. Sometimes they did get made and they didn't arrive in Hanoi. . . one specific case I was told about a report was made and then before the group taking the report back to Hanoi could get there, they were all killed in a bombing attack. So that report never made it.

<sup>288</sup>Bell testimony, Dec. 4, 1992

Another case, a Navy flyer who was shot down, his airplane crashed in the sea. The Vietnamese went out with a boat and they actually pulled up the airplane, got it, got the pilot and buried him on the beach. The very next day, a bomb struck right on top of that pilot's grave where they buried him and absolutely nothing is left. Even though they had remains and pictures the remains are now completely unrecoverable. . .

Schweitzer also had some provocative observations about the slowness in getting answers from Vietnam about some of our missing servicemen:

The methods employed by the U.S. side in searching for MIAs were basically unsound. The U.S. would provide the Vietnamese leadership with a list of names of missing Americans and expect the Vietnamese to come up with information on them. The Vietnamese leadership had no idea how to approach this problem. . .

The Vietnamese archive system, such as it is, is not arranged by name, but rather by date and location of incident. Thus, if the U.S. side had requested a search of the Vietnamese archives by date and location of shootdown, many pilots would have been found, whereas a search by name would yield nothing. . .

Another factor delaying the process is the U.S. side's failure to show any interest whatsoever in Vietnam's own 300,000 MIAs. . .

Further, there is almost a religious resistance among the official and unofficial POW/MIA community and the U.S. against any serious scholarly research on dead MIAs. . . I personally spent tens of thousands of dollars, and nearly three years of my life, trying to get someone, anyone, to believe me that there was a mountain of information on dead Americans in Hanoi. . .

#### December 1992: Kerry-Smith Trip

Senators Kerry and Smith returned to Hanoi on Dec. 17-18, 1992 for a final series of meetings with Vietnamese officials. The visit followed closely an announcement by President Bush that authorized American companies to open offices in Vietnam and to sign conditional contracts there; contracts could become effective upon the lifting of the economic embargo.

The delegation met in Hanoi with President Le Duc Anh, General Secretary Do Muoi, Foreign Minister Cam and several high-ranking officials of the general Political directorate of the Ministry of Defense. The purpose of the delegation's visit was to press the

Vietnamese officials one final time to cooperate fully with U.S. efforts to resolve the POW/MIA issue by providing access to every source of POW/MIA-related information in Vietnam. The Vietnamese officials responded with promises of full cooperation and openness.

In a written memorandum presented to Senators Kerry and Smith at the conclusion of the visit, the Vietnamese officials described six new or expanded areas of cooperation, promising to:

- Make available to U.S. investigators all POW/MIA-related documents, files and other information, including documents in the custody of the General Political Directorate of the Ministry of Defense, the successor to the Enemy Proselytizing Division and reputed to be Vietnam's most hard-line Communist bastion: its war-time archives include debriefing records of U.S. POWs and other documents which the Select Committee expects will shed light on the fates of many unaccounted-for servicemen. The Vietnamese also promised to U.S. investigators all POW/MIA-related information received from the possession of private citizens.
- Search their files for information relating to the capture or loss of U.S. personnel along the Ho Chi Minh Trail and elsewhere in Laos and to coordinate this research with their Lao counterparts.
- Strengthen the operations of the VNOSMP by adding senior personnel from other ministries of the government.
- Grant amnesty for private citizens who turn in remains of U.S. servicemen. It is illegal in Vietnam for private citizens to hold remains, and Vietnamese officials believe that many private citizens who are holding remains have been reluctant to turn them in for fear of prosecution. The amnesty program is expected to result in the repatriation of many sets of remains.
- Permit American "MIA families" and veterans to visit Vietnam to participate in the process of obtaining the fullest possible accounting.<sup>289</sup>

The Vietnamese also reaffirmed their on-going efforts to assist U.S. investigators in following up on all remaining unresolved live-sighting reports. By the end of December 1992, Vietnamese officials will have assisted in 65 live-sighting investigations in Vietnam.

<sup>289</sup>Memorandum, Dec. 18, 1992

Kerry and Smith both expressed satisfaction with the progress made on this final trip. All of these promises will require the cooperation of numerous officials at all levels of the Vietnamese Government, and many initiatives will take time to complete. If Vietnam's Government follows through on its assurances and provides access to all of the information and materials it has promised, there will be little more Vietnam could be asked to do to assist in accounting for missing Americans.

#### Laos

U.S. efforts to obtain information from Lao authorities have been complicated by the facts that Laos was not a party to the Paris Peace Accords and the United States was not a party to the 1973 Laos cease-fire agreement that pledged all sides to return captive personnel. In addition, the DoD estimates that at least 75 percent of the Americans missing in Laos were lost in areas controlled at the time by North Vietnamese armed forces, generally in eastern Laos along the border with Vietnam and near the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Although the quality of information and record-keeping in Laos is low, there is reason to believe that North Vietnamese military were instructed to recover and record all they could about downed U.S. aircraft. Thus, efforts to account for these Americans require a tri-lateral effort, involving not only the U.S. and Laos, but Vietnam, as well.

The current leaders of Laos, who are successors to the Pathet Lao guerrillas who contended for power during the war, may have some information concerning missing Americans that they have not yet shared. In general, Lao leaders have been far more reluctant than the Vietnamese to grant U.S. access to their territory to conduct live-sighting investigations and inspect crash sights. The atmosphere has improved in recent months, however, and negotiations are on-going for the establishment of a permanent POW/MIA investigation office in Vientiane, the capital.

During the Senate delegation's trip to Southeast Asia in November 1992, Senators Kerry and Daschle flew to Vientiane for meetings with Foreign Minister Phoun Sipaseuth and Vice Foreign Minister Soubanh Srithirath. The Senators reported to the Lao officials on the agreements that had been made in Vietnam and pressed the Lao officials to show a similar level of cooperation. Specifically, they asked Laos:

- To permit the U.S. to have a full-time, live-sighting investigator stationed in Laos,
- To permit U.S. crash and grave-site investigation teams to use Lao-Americans as translators during their investigations,
- To open the Laos Government's archives to U.S. investigators,

To loosen restrictions imposed on U.S. investigative teams operating in Laos.

During the Committee's public hearing Dec. 4, 1992, Vessey testified:

Personally, I think more answers are deserved from the present Laotian Government than we are getting. I think that they need to be continually pressured for more answers.

Secondly, there's another good reason that the accounting will not be as good from Laos as it was or as it is likely to be from Vietnam. You've flown over the area. It's very rugged terrain, but the other thing is it is very sparsely populated. Compared to Vietnam, which is quite heavily populated, Laos is very sparsely populated. The second thing is that Laos is not as homogeneous a nation as is Vietnam. It's tribal ethnic groups that are split up in various places, the communication during war-time was miserable, and I doubt that it's much better today.

All that contributes to it, but I think more answers are deserved.<sup>290</sup>

Later, Bill Gadoury, a casualty officer working at Stony Beach, testified:

. . . starting in 1985, I personally have seen a dramatic change in the level of cooperation that we get in the field. . . certainly it's not anywhere near where we'd like to have it in terms of being able to field multiple teams and things of that nature, but just recalling back to my first field operations in Laos, just to show the contrast of where we were then and where we are now. . .

In February of 1986, we went on our first excavation in Savannakhet Province. And our team went into Savannakhet. . . and we had to spend the night because the landing site wasn't prepared. We were put up in a hotel. They put armed guards outside the door and they advised us not to go walking around.

More recently, on the operation I came back from a few weeks ago, we were given pretty much unlimited access in the area. . . to address the cases that we had agreed upon before going out to the field. The Lao were very cooperative. . .<sup>291</sup>

---

<sup>290</sup>Vessey testimony, Dec. 4, 1992

<sup>291</sup>Gadoury testimony, Dec. 4, 1992

The Committee believes that, in general, cooperation from Laos has been disappointing over the years. Moreover, the Committee notes that the Laos Government has permitted only a handful of live-sighting investigations in the field and to date, U.S. investigators have not visited any detention camps in Laos. The Committee concurs with Gen. Vessey that more answers are deserved.

#### Cambodia

Cambodia was not a party to the Paris Peace Accords and no separate agreement on repatriation was reached in the aftermath of the war. The recovery of American POWs or remains in Cambodia was made virtually impossible after 1975, when the Khmer Rouge seized power and embarked on a bloody reign of terror directed at Cambodians and foreigners alike that left a million people -- out of a total population of seven million -- dead. Throughout much of the past 20 years, the U.S. has had either difficult or non-existent diplomatic contacts with the Cambodian Government. The years of struggle and chaos leave little hope that documents or records have survived that would reveal additional information about U.S. personnel.

As in Laos, however, most of the Americans unaccounted for in Cambodia were lost near the border with Vietnam in areas where North Vietnamese forces dominated. Thus, the best potential sources of documentary information concerning those lost in Cambodia may be in Hanoi, not in Phnom Penh.

The present government of war-ravaged Cambodia cannot be expected to possess documentary information relevant to the fate of missing American servicemen. Although the government has expressed its willingness to cooperate fully with the U.S. in efforts to resolve discrepancy cases, and has taken nearly every step requested by U.S. investigators -- including granting permission to fly U.S. helicopters around the country -- the Government is unable to guarantee security in areas controlled by Khmer Rouge guerrillas.

Background

The Committee's mandate from the Senate encompassed a review of the fate of Americans still listed as missing from World War II, the Korean War and the Cold War.<sup>292</sup> Accordingly, the Committee has conducted an investigation of reports that unacknowledged U.S. prisoners had been held by Soviet, Chinese and North Korean officials during and after one or more of these conflicts, and that U.S. prisoners might have been transferred to the Soviet Union during the war in Vietnam.

U.S.-Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIA Affairs

The disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the establishment of a democratic government in Russia have created new possibilities for investigating reports concerning U.S. POWs. In mid-February, 1992, Sen. John Kerry and Sen. Bob Smith met with Russian officials in Moscow to discuss the prospects for cooperation on this issue. This visit laid the groundwork for the creation on March 26, 1992 of the U.S.-Russian Joint Commission for POW/MIA Affairs (Commission) under the leadership of Col. Dmitri Volkogonov and former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Malcolm Toon. Sen. Kerry and Sen. Smith were designated as representatives of the U.S. Senate on the Commission.

The objectives of the Commission are 1) to obtain access to people and documents in Russia that could shed light on the fate of U.S. servicemen missing from World War II, the Cold War, the Korean War and the war in Vietnam; 2) to pursue all reports alleging the presence of U.S. POW/MIAs in the former Soviet Union and assist in facilitating their repatriation if they desire; and 3) to establish a mechanism by which remains identified as American can be returned to the United States.

A full description of the activities of the Commission may be found in Section 3 of this Chapter.

**Task Force Russia**

An organization had to be created to convert the Commission's policy objectives into action. The Secretary of Defense directed the Secretary of the Army to form such an organization. The Army recalled from retirement Maj. Gen. Bernard Loeffke to be the director, Task Force Russia (TFR); the deputy director is Col. Stuart Herrington, USA, a career intelligence officer.

---

<sup>292</sup> In this chapter, the term "POW" is sometimes used to include American airmen downed in the former Soviet Union during the Cold War.

Chapter 9

Information from Russia, North Korea and China

The responsibilities of the Task Force are to acquire and analyze data provided by the Commission. In Moscow, archivists, historians, and an interpreter were assigned to pursue leads concerning U.S. POWs through interviews and access to archival records. Staff in Washington, D.C. were assigned to translate, analyze and compare the new information with information in existing U.S. databases, and to assess its value and reliability before releasing it to family members through DOD casualty affairs offices. In all, Task Force Russia has a staff of 35 persons, including seven in Moscow.

The close coordination between the committee and the U. S. Delegation to the Commission was enhanced through the direct liaison established between the Committee staff and TFR resulting from the assignment of a Committee investigator, Al Graham, to the Task Force element in Moscow.

A more detailed description of the organization and activities of Task Force Russia may be found in Section 3 of this Chapter.

#### Investigation in Progress

While substantial progress has been made, the investigation remains incomplete. The reasons for this include the relatively brief duration of the life of the Committee; the voluminous nature of the materials stored in Russia; logistical impediments to reviewing materials held abroad; and limited cooperation on the part of individual officials in Russia assigned to work with the Commission and the Committee.

The difficulty in reaching a firm judgment based on current information is illustrated by the present status of data regarding the 8,177 Americans still listed as missing from the Korean War. Of that number, the U.S. Government has information that 2,177 people died in POW camps; 293 were missing in action at sea; 412 died in aircraft incidents over North Korea; approximately 300 were buried in abandoned graves in United Nations cemeteries in North Korea; and another 576 were buried in isolated, unidentified graves. This leaves more than 4,600 soldiers who did not return who could be, as RAND researcher Paul Cole put it, "anywhere [in North Korea]. . . literally, anywhere."<sup>293</sup> Further complicating the arithmetic is the uncorroborated testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Phillip Corso, who was posted at the National Security Council during the Eisenhower Administration, that at least 900 U.S. POWs were taken to the Soviet Union from North Korea.<sup>294</sup>

Although firm conclusions remain elusive, some progress on the issue of U.S. POWs in the former Soviet Union has been made.

<sup>293</sup> Senate Select Committee hearings, November 10, 1992.

<sup>294</sup> Committee hearings, 11/11/92.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin has stated that some Americans were imprisoned in the former Soviet Union after World War II, that a small number of U.S. prisoners were interrogated by the Soviets during the Korean War, and that approximately a dozen U.S. airmen were captured and imprisoned during the Cold War period. The Russian Government has stated, however, that there are no Americans now being held in the former Soviet Union against their will.

Based on the research to date, the Committee cannot make definitive judgments that go beyond what the Russian Government has stated is the case. Reports alleging the transfer of prisoners to Soviet soil during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts remain under investigation, as do the specific circumstances of Cold War shoot-downs. Large quantities of archival material remain to be examined; and many potential sources of first-hand information have not yet been interviewed.

The Committee recommends that the U.S. continue to attach a high priority to cooperation with the Russian Government in efforts to resolve the fate of missing Americans. Efforts to obtain cooperation from the Governments of China and North Korea should also continue.

#### Committee Hearings

The Committee held public hearings on this subject on November 10 and 11, 1992. The first day featured testimony from eight witnesses:

Alan C. Ptak, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for POW/MIA Affairs;

Dr. Paul Cole, researcher for RAND corporation;

Capt. John P. Gay, USN, director of the Asia/Pacific Division, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Lt. Col. Phillip Corso (USA, Ret.), of the National Security Council staff under President Eisenhower;

Serban Oprica, a former Rumanian engineer, now an American citizen, who served in North Korea;

Col. Delk Simpson, former U.S. military attache in Hong Kong; and

Steve Kiba, a POW from Korea held in China.

The second day of hearings, November 11, featured testimony from an additional twelve witnesses:

Richard Boylan, archivist at the National Archives;

James Sanders, co-author of Soldiers of Misfortune;

John M. G. Brown, author of Moscow Bound (unpublished manuscript);

Thomas Ashworth, researcher, author, and speaker on POW/MIA issues;

Col.Gen. Dmitri Volkogonov (ret.), military adviser to President Boris Yeltsin and Co-Chairman of the U.S.- Russian Joint Commission;

Richard D. Kauzlarich, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs and member of the Joint Commission;

Gen. Bernard Loeffke, USA, director, Task Force Russia;

Albert Graham, the Committee investigator posted to Moscow;

Dolores Alfond, the chairperson for the National Alliance of Families;

Robert Dumas, the brother of a soldier lost in Korea;

Bruce W. Sanderson, whose father was lost in a Cold War shoot-down;

Jane Reynolds Howard, whose husband suffered a similar fate; and

Gregg Skavinski, the nephew of Master Sergeant William R. Homer, a member of the crew of a USAF RB 29 shot down by a Soviet Air Force MIG-15 over the Sea of Japan in 1952.

These witnesses provided the Committee with a wide spectrum of sometimes irreconcilable viewpoints concerning Americans missing from World War II, the Cold War, Korea and Indochina, and on Soviet involvement with American POWs in these conflicts.

#### Testimony of General Dmitri Volkogonov

On November 11, 1992, the Committee received testimony from Gen. Dmitri Volkogonov, retired, military adviser to Russian President Boris Yeltsin and co-chairman of the Commission.

Gen. Volkogonov made a preliminary statement which noted that while all Soviet leaders from Khrushchev to Gorbachev said that this problem did not exist, the new democratic government of Russia has said that the problem of U.S. POWs in Russia did exist and continues to exist today. Gen. Volkogonov stated that he had spoken with President Yeltsin on the eve of his departure for Washington,

and that President Yeltsin wished to present the Committee with a statement. That statement follows:

The intergovernmental commission established by decision of the U.S. and Russian presidents for the purpose of determining the fate of American citizens missing in action in World War II and later is evidence of the new nature of Russian-U.S. relations. The commission is headed by Colonel General Volkogonov and Ambassador Toon.

Over a short period of time the commission has done a great deal of work in studying Russia's enormous state and agency archives, including those that had been closed to the public until recently, from the ministry of security, the ministry of defense, the foreign intelligence service, the ministry of internal affairs, the foreign ministry, and military intelligence.

It has questioned dozens of participants and witnesses of the events involving American citizens on the territory of the former USSR. During the plenary meetings held in March, May, and September of this year, the U.S. side was given documents on American citizens who found themselves on the territory of the former USSR in World War II and the Cold War period, and some documents that contained information on several U.S. citizens who had been taken prisoner during the Korean and Vietnam Wars.

The commission has found evidence of American citizens staying in camps and prisons of the former USSR, and discovered shocking facts of some of them being summarily executed by the Stalin regime and in a number of cases being forced to renounce their U.S. citizenship. Some of them still reside on the territory of the former Soviet Union. Their names and addresses have been identified and communicated to the U.S. side.

A number of former U.S. citizens have stayed in Russia voluntarily after World War II and still reside here. Of course, in a democratic Russia they have the right to decide about their lives themselves, all their rights are fully guaranteed.

As a result of the work done, one may conclude that today there are no American citizens held against their will on the territory of Russia. However, all the questions have not been fully answered. There are cases that still require additional examination. For my part, as Russia's president, I express the hope that the Joint Russian-American Commission will continue its work and that it will be able to find answers to the outstanding questions.

Gen. Volkogonov stated his desire to make three essential points. First, the Russians fully understand the moral significance of the possibility that Americans might still be living on the territory of the former Soviet Union. Second, the issue is of significance in Russia because for many decades, human lives and individuals were considered nothing more than statistical data in the Soviet Union. Accordingly, the search to determine the fact of Americans missing in action in the former Soviet Union is an example to the Russians of how the government needs to be concerned with the fate of individuals, and thus the issue has enormous humanitarian, moral and legal significance for Russia. Third, conditions in Russia are difficult, and the issue of whether or not reform will continue in Russia remains under very great doubt. Therefore, the U.S. should recognize the significance of the fact that the Russian government and President Yeltsin are paying such close attention to the issue.

In his written statement, Gen. Volkogonov described the conclusions of the investigations conducted by the Joint Commission to date:

1. No U.S. citizens are currently being detained within the territory of the former USSR. The conclusion is based on a thorough analysis of all archival documents, interviews with witnesses, and on-site inspections of possible American housing sites.

2. A group of Americans is living in Russia as either political refugees from the USSR period or individuals voluntarily remaining in Russia. A list of these individuals as well as their addresses, and an agreement to meet with representatives of the American contingent of the Commission have been obtained and the Russian side is prepared to provide this list. In addition, one American, Marcus Lee, a Florida businessman, was arrested in Moscow in the spring of 1992 and is currently being detained at Lefortovo prison, charged with attempted export of contraband icons.

3. Thousands of American citizens traveled overland across the former USSR beginning with the Second World War. The majority of these were Americans liberated by the Red Army from Nazi camps and subsequently repatriated (22,454). The second major group consisted of American pilots forced to land within the USSR and interned here (730). There were also several dozen individuals who were detained in Germany, in Austria, in the USSR and other socialist nations for "espionage" as well as a few pilots from American aircraft shot down over the USSR. The Commission has succeeded in accounting for virtually all of these individuals. The Russians are convinced that they are not presently located (with the exception of those who have died) within the territory of the USSR.

4. The Russians were successful in identifying the burial sites of virtually all U.S. citizens who died in the USSR during the Second World War, with the exception of a few who died en route to or in prison-of-war camps or those buried in mass graves. The Russians intend to continue their efforts to identify the remaining burial sites of U.S. citizens in these areas.

5. The Russians were less successful in obtaining information on U.S. citizens missing during the Vietnam or Korean Wars, events taking place outside the Soviet Union. Some documents were located concerning the Korean War, including information on the numbers of prisoner-of-war camps for Americans in Korea; their location; and, the number of prisoners housed in these camps. Some interrogation materials and fragmentary evidence on 71 American servicemen captured in Korea were found. Unfortunately, virtually nothing has been found to date on the Vietnam War. The only documents concerning the Vietnam War located to date relate to the fate of nine American deserters sent by the KGB to the USSR and on to neutral countries. The Russians have not been successful in recovering anything new or significant from conversations or eyewitnesses or participants in these events.

6. The Russians have appreciated the assistance of the U.S. side of the Commission for its willingness to provide assistance in searching for Russian prisoners and MIAs in Afghanistan. The Russians believe approximately 100 of them are still alive and that many of these are being held under inhumane conditions in prisons belonging to warring Afghani groups. The Russians, while appreciating the assistance offered to date, believe the U.S. could do more to assist in the liberation of Russian prisoners-of-war in Afghanistan.<sup>295</sup>

Gen. Volkogonov testified that the six Americans recorded as having been in captivity in the Soviet Union in 1954 were held in separate camps and classified as special prisoners. Each was arrested in Europe for espionage or intelligence activities on behalf of the United States. At the time, any foreign citizen who was detained was automatically charged with espionage, according to Gen. Volkogonov, whether or not there was any substance to the charge. With respect to the fates of the six prisoners, Gen. Volkogonov testified:

---

<sup>295</sup> Submitted for the record of the Select Committee's hearing, 11/11/92

. . . two people, Hopkins and Clifford. . . were held for eight years and subsequently shot. This is Mr. Ogins, who served eight years under an espionage sentence and then after his sentence expired he should have been released, but Abakumov, who was then Interior Minister, reported to Stalin that this was a person who had seen too much and proposed that he be liquidated, and Stalin gave the order allowing him to be executed. . .

Three of them were given back, were released to American representatives in Berlin. Subsequently, two died, one took Soviet citizenship, and the fate of another is still unknown.<sup>296</sup>

Gen. Volkogonov provided to the Committee the names of Americans now living in Russia who are political refugees or voluntarily remaining in Russia. He also cited American citizens living in the former Soviet Union who were American citizens from childhood, but who ended up in the Soviet Union in the 1930's and were then forced to renounce their U.S. citizenship and become Soviet citizens. Many of these individuals passed through the prison camps and some died there. Some made their way back to the United States eventually. The Russians have identified five of these people now living in Russia, each of whom is elderly, and each of whom wishes to receive help in locating and contacting relatives in the United States.

Gen. Volkogonov also testified concerning the possibility that a secret camp exists or existed for American prisoners in Russia:

If you had asked me that question before 1985, I would have allowed for the possibility that such a secret camp could have existed. However, since 1985, such large and dramatic changes have taken place in our country that I can no longer imagine that it would be possible for such incidents or events to be concealed. . .

If there were a secret camp, or a jail, or even a single American held against his will secretly, we would know about it sooner or later. The moral climate in our country makes it, I believe, psychologically impossible for this information not to come to light.

I believe we will still find more information about the fate of Americans who were in the Soviet Union. We may find their graves or more information about their tragic fate. Not all the documents have yet been examined, but I can nearly exclude the possibility that we will find

---

<sup>296</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

any live American being held in Russia against his or her will.<sup>297</sup>

In closing, Gen. Volkogonov stated that he believes joint efforts will be necessary for another three to six months to complete the process of determining the fates of all American citizens located within the former Soviet Union, including those who have emigrated and those who have died. Gen. Volkogonov also said that:

It is possible that some may be disillusioned with the results of our efforts. However, we are convinced that we have done everything possible on this side to answer all questions submitted to us. You should also keep in mind that conducting this work is difficult while attempting to maintain the course of reform. The Government of Russia and President Yeltsin, personally, in spite of his severe work load and difficult problems, continue to devote enormous attention to this effort. President Yeltsin views the work of the Commission as a "test" of trust and willingness to work together and to forget forever the times when we were enemies.<sup>298</sup>

Gen. Volkogonov's Letter of December 17

The Committee received a letter from Gen. Volkogonov dated December 17, 1992. The letter includes the following:

While working in the Presidential Archive, I made it a point to go through all documents which may have contained information on American POWs, including correspondence between Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, Kim Il-song and Chou En-lai, as well as correspondence with Soviet Ambassadors to Korea, China and Vietnam. These documents do not contain any evidence of American POWs being sent to the USSR.<sup>299</sup>

U.S. POWs and Korea

#### Official Assessments

Defense Department efforts to analyze materials received by the Commission remain in progress. Gen. Loeffke told the Committee during his testimony that the effort to reach conclusions has been

---

<sup>297</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

<sup>298</sup> Submitted for the record of the Select Committee's hearing, 11/11/92

<sup>299</sup> Letter to Select Committee from Gen. Dmitri Volkogonov, Dec. 17, 1992

complicated by the official deceptions that characterize Soviet history:

They have lied to us, and they have said openly that they have lied to us. So we know if you develop that historically, they did keep some in World War II, they did keep them in the shootdowns, because they've already said that, that they had them. So if you develop that line, you could go in and say that we believe that they did that in Korea also. . . [the Defense Department is] holding a very conservative view until we can come to some very hard facts. . . [But] it's all possible. . .

300

The Russians have admitted that they interrogated U.S. POWs during the Korean War period. Testimony has differed, however, about whether the interrogations occurred in North Korea, near the Chinese border, or whether some occurred within the borders of the Soviet Union, as well. As Gen. Loeffke testified:

Al Graham and I were questioning this Colonel, and at the end of an hour and a half I asked if I could record this on tape, and we did, and he on tape said yes, I interrogated American POWs in Russian uniform. And he did it more than once. And he said his colleagues did it, too. . . His latest version, it is in Korea. And in all fairness to the Russians, he was in the Far East, and he says the Khabarovsk area. (Khabarovsk being a Russian base in Russian territory) So the Khabarovsk area is larger than the city of Khabarovsk. So it could have been in defense of him saying another area just besides the city, but he did mention a specific base which is in Russian territory.<sup>301</sup>

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Alan Ptak testified that, as of November, 1992, the Defense Department was still evaluating the information it had received concerning the possibility that some U.S. POWs may have been transferred to the Soviet Union or to China during the Korean War.

#### Assessment of Committee Investigator

Beginning in May, 1992, Al Graham, a Committee investigator, was posted to Moscow to undertake interviews, archival research, and related investigatory work under the aegis of the Commission. During that time, he arranged for and conducted interviews with Russian officials, citizens, and retired officers who served in

<sup>300</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92.

<sup>301</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92.

Southeast Asia and Korea. During the Select Committee's hearing on November 10, 1992, Mr. Graham testified that Soviet military officers interrogated some U.S. POWs during the Korean War and that some of these interrogations may have taken place on Soviet territory.

According to Mr. Graham, one problem experienced by U.S. investigators in Russia was that several high-ranking Russian officials whom they interviewed subsequently changed their testimony:

. . . perhaps the most flagrant case of turnaround during a reinterview concerns a well-known Russian colonel, scholar, and renowned Far East expert, who was stationed at Khabarovsk from 1950 to 1954. This individual was asked by the chief of the general staff to review all documents on Korea. . . currently supposedly in their hands.

During the first interview with him conducted on August 19th, 1992, he told five Joint Commission representatives -- four U.S., one Russian -- that Soviet military specialists had been given approval to interrogate American servicemen in Korea, and that some American servicemen with experience, seniority, and specific specialties were selected for transfer to the U.S.S.R. for further interrogation.

He mentioned that in the confluence here between Russia, Manchuria, China and North Korea, there was . . . a naval base called Posyet, which served as a transit point for the movement of Americans north by rail or plane to Khabarovsk, the Far East military district headquarters. He maintained that the number of Americans processed thorough Khabarovsk was in the hundreds and they were under KGB control, both during and after the interrogations. He did not know their fate after the interrogations.

He personally claimed to have interrogated two American POW's. One he recalls was a Lieutenant Colonel Black. Efforts were made according to the Colonel to recruit and gain cooperation of Americans. (During) a follow-up interview of this individual, on September 29, 1992, at which General Loeffke was present, he admitted he received a phone call from a Foreign Intelligence Service representative the night before. He then considerably modified his previous testimony, denying any knowledge of an American POW named Black and the fact that American POW's from the Korean War were interrogated by Soviets at Khabarovsk.

However, he did admit interrogating two American POW's in North Korea and asserted that there were anywhere from 10 to 25 Soviet interrogators involved in this process, indicating a large number of American POW's were interrogated during the Korean War.

He now maintained that the interrogation point, which was in existence for at least 18 months, was located at a juncture between North Korea, China, and the U.S.S.R. borders. He did not completely rule out that it may have been on Soviet territory.<sup>302</sup>

According to Mr. Graham, immediately following the first interview with Col. Korotkov, the Russian side produced an additional witness who confirmed the use of questionnaires for obtaining information from American POWs in Korea, but who insisted that the interviews had been carried out primarily by Koreans in Korea. This witness said that no American POWs from the Korean conflict were taken to the USSR. Mr. Graham's conclusions, based on the conflicting statements received, was that:

Although we have no direct evidence to prove it, there appears to be a strong possibility that at least a handful of U.S. POWs, possibly more, were transferred to Soviet territory during the Korean War.

The Russian side will likely stick to its current line until the body of evidence gathered through a vigorous interview program forces the government and security services to re-evaluate their position.

Although doubtful that such individuals could have survived the rigors of the Soviet camp system this long, it is theoretically possible that one or more could still be alive. It is more likely that some former POWs. . . who chose to cooperate with the Soviets for whatever reason could be alive in Russia and do not desire their presence to be known.<sup>303</sup>

#### Research and Analysis of Paul M. Cole, RAND Corp.

On November 10, 1992, the Committee received testimony from Dr. Paul M. Cole, an analyst with the International Policy Department of the RAND corporation. RAND has undertaken a project through the National Defense Research Institute, a federally-funded research and development center. Originally, the project was to review information concerning the fate of American POW/MIAs in Korea. In

<sup>302</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

<sup>303</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

April, 1992, the project was expanded to include a study of evidence that American servicemen and civilians may have been transported to the Soviet Union or its allies during World War II, the early Cold War, or the Korean War.

Although the project is not yet complete, Dr. Cole was able to provide the Committee with an overview of the work done to date, as well as some conclusions. With regard to the Korean War, Dr. Cole concluded the following:

Concerning Korea, the record on individual MIA/POW cases is extremely detailed, and was originally organized chronologically and geographically before being reorganized alphabetically. The original chronological and geographic databases are now being recreated, and few questions would remain unanswered once the effort is completed.

Two groups of Korean War prisoners remain unaccounted for: prisoners who made it alive to a camp, and those who did not. Those who made it alive to a camp, but were not repatriated, are known as POW, body not recovered, or POW/BNR. The location and number of more than 2,000 POW/BNR remains can be estimated with great certainty, although the state of the remains is unknown. Prisoners who did not survive the time between capture and arrival at a camp, characterized by Dr. Cole as "post-capture killed, body not recovered" or PCK/BNR, should not in his view be characterized as POWs. Approximately 900 or more PCK/BNR's occurred during the Korean War, with the remains of those who died last located in scattered locations throughout North Korea.

The location of approximately 3,500 MIAs may never be determined because the U.S. has not been able to determine where they died. By contrast, the location of remains left in burial sites, UN cemeteries, and aircraft crashes on North Korean territory can be stated with precision.

Since 1953, the U.S. has received nearly 900 sets of unidentified remains from North Korea, collected by the North Koreans in a manner that has precluded association with any individual MIA, with the result that all of these names are still on the full list of 8,177, with the individuals buried in Hawaii without identification.

American POWs were transferred to the territory of Communist China during the Korean War to be interrogated by Russians and Chinese. The majority of these POWs were returned to camps in North Korea; those known to be held as political prisoners were repatriated in the mid-1950s.

There is no documentary evidence suggesting Americans were left behind in China; however, interrogations and interviews offer some testimonial support for such allegations.

American POWs were interrogated by people identified by the POWs as Russians, but only a small percentage of U.S. POWs reported this type of contact. Evidence shows that perhaps two dozen repatriated American POWs were successfully recruited by foreign intelligence services. U.S. authorities were aware of this soon after the Korean War. Seven American missionaries who spent three years in a North Korean prison camp were repatriated in May 1953, through China, Moscow and Berlin, after having been held as internees. Circumstantial evidence suggests that Americans were transferred from Korea or China to the territory of the Soviet Union, however, to date this evidence is hearsay which is not supported by corroborative documentary evidence.<sup>304</sup>

In response to questions, Dr. Cole stated that there is evidence, consisting of TFR interviews with prison guards and others, that some U.S. POWs may have been transferred to the Soviet Union during the Korean War. However, Dr. Cole expressed caution about making any firm judgments based on the information provided:

In this last trip to Moscow the Commission was presented various documents, some of which didn't even relate to POWs. But as a gesture, they were handed over to Ambassador Toon and to the commissioners. Well, right in those documents that were given to us in Russian and translated, it talks about how the information can be either changed, distorted and so forth, in order to keep the truth from anybody who might fall upon the documents. Now these documents go back to World War II, specifically I believe it was 1949. But nevertheless, there is a pattern here of deception on the part of the Russians, with a lot of their documentation. So in my judgment, we have to be very very careful before we make a judgment about an occurrence, or something like that, until we have documentary evidence, archival evidence, and sources.<sup>305</sup>

In response to further questions, Dr. Cole testified that the total number of U.S. POWs who might have been transferred to Soviet or Chinese territory was certainly less than 100. He also noted that one of the documents provided to the U.S. by the Russians on this

<sup>304</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

<sup>305</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

subject related to an Australian; and that other documents were interrogation transcripts that had been made by the Chinese and then summarized by the Russians. In addition, most of the individuals who had been interrogated by non-Korean officials were ultimately repatriated.

Dr. Cole testified that the RAND review of POW/MIA issues related to the Korean War was also subject to ambiguities because of inaccuracies in the original casualty data and because casualty reporting methods changed over time.

In addition to the losses in captivity and the difficulty of documenting the fates of American POWs who lost their lives as a result of criminal mistreatment by the Korean Communists, post-war records in the U.S. are, to quote Dr. Cole, "contradictory, ambiguous, inconsistent, or a mixture of any of these." According to Dr. Cole:

In 1991, the Department of Defense stated in testimony before Congress that 389 U.S. servicemen who had been POWs in North Korea had not been repatriated or otherwise accounted for by the Korean People's Army and the Chinese.<sup>306</sup>

Yet according to Dr. Cole, casualty status data maintained by the U.S. government contradicts these figures. In fact, he says, the list of 389 contains the names of 197 MIAs, 180 Americans who may or may not have ever been prisoners, and one case which has in fact been resolved. According to Dr. Cole, "prisoner status means that the individual was lost under circumstances that were consistent with a probability of live capture. There is no evidence in many cases that those listed as POWs were ever seen alive in a POW camp." Dr. Cole notes, for example, that the majority of the 188 Army names on the list belonged to individuals who were lost during the first eight months of the Korean War. Given the brutality of the Koreans in this period, and the conditions of imprisonment for U.S. POWs at this time, according to Dr. Cole, "the likelihood of survival for this group was very low."

RAND also reviewed information concerning the alleged transportation of U.S. POWs to the USSR from Korea. It is well documented that there was a significant Soviet presence on the ground in North Korea during the war. In addition, some returning U.S. POWs and Army personnel reported having been questioned by Russian officers in North Korea or China. A 1974 Air Force assessment of the Korean War POW experience, quoted by Dr. Cole, described Soviet interrogations of U.S. POWs in Korea as follows:

<sup>306</sup> Submitted for the record of the Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92.

Interrogators of three nationalities, Chinese, North Korean, and Caucasian (presumably Russian) questioned USAF personnel during the Korean conflict. The preponderance of interrogators were Chinese who, after their entry into the conflict in late October of 1950, took over the responsibility for POW from the Koreans. Evidence indicates that the Koreans reluctantly gave up this responsibility, and that often tense feelings rose concerning who was to have custody of a new POW. Not infrequently, POWs reported that they were captured by North Koreans and turned over to the Chinese only after much heated discussion and sometimes near violence between the two groups. In some cases, a POW remained in North Korean custody for prolonged periods of time.<sup>307</sup>

The most detailed discussion of the interrogations now available is contained in the recent interview by Dr. Cole of Victor Alexandrovich Bushuyev, Deputy Chief of Intelligence for the 64th Soviet Air Corps. On September 16, 1992, Mr. Bushuyev made the following statement:

We had contacts with the American POWs, mainly the pilots. We weren't interested in anybody else. I was responsible for organizing the interrogations and for processing all of the information received during the interrogations.

How were the interrogations organized? All arrangements, the structure of the interrogation, its content etc., were completely in the hands of the Chinese. We prepared questions in advance. Then we gave the questions to the Chinese. They asked the questions while interrogating the American POWs. When I was there, I believe all American POWs were completely in Chinese hands on the territory of North Korea.

All American pilots, with no exception, would be interrogated in the town of Sinidju. It was the very northern most point in Korea, near the Yalu river across from An' Dung where we were stationed. There was a special building there--the interrogation point. Americans would be brought there. We could see it from An'Dung. We would go there about twice a week to accommodate the prisoners. Sometimes there were just a few of them so we didn't need to go.

---

<sup>307</sup>Analysis of the Korean War Prisoner of War Experience HQ USAF SEAsia PW Analysis Program Report A10-2, March 1974, Appendix One, 25.

I was responsible for the interrogations of the POWs, but neither I nor the translators ever saw any of the POWs with our own eyes. Contact on our level was completely prohibited. We only had to get questions ready and then receive the answers.

We would enter the building from a different side before the POWs were brought there. We would go to our room and would sit there very quietly. Only then would they bring in the POWs. We had no visual contact. We would sit behind the wall, a thin wooden wall, and the translators would sit with us. We heard everything. The interrogations were in English, or course.

We were prohibited from seeing the Americans . . . The Main Intelligence Directorate in Moscow would give us questionnaires: ask this, ask that, whatever we thought was interesting. I don't want to offend the American pilots, mainly we would deal with the pilots, but they were of no value. They didn't know anything. They were average pilots, and good athletes.

I was there for more than one year, the most tense period. Practically all the POWs went through my hands, not in person but their files and interrogation materials. Several hundred of them. But, again I want to say that none of them was any serious value to us. We knew twice as much as they could tell us. . . Practically all of the American POWs belonged to the Chinese. The war was conducted not by the Koreans but by the Chinese and Soviets. The Koreans were under pressure and had no rights. They would just load and unload stuff, build roads, that sort of thing.

There was no need to bring Americans to Russia. Military personnel, location of bases and all that were already known. We had no questions of this sort. We had the planes as well, all their parts, so it didn't make any sense [to take pilots to Russia]. If someone had asked for political asylum we would have, but I haven't heard of any such cases. As far as I know, our counterintelligence people didn't express any particular interest in the pilots. We would have known this.<sup>308</sup>

Regarding the issue of post-capture deaths of American MIA-POWs in the Soviet Union, Dr. Cole has stated the following:

---

<sup>308</sup>Paul M. Cole's interview with Viktor Alexandrovich Bushuyev, Deputy Chief of Intelligence, 64th Air Corps, Moscow September 16, 1992.

I have interviewed two Soviet military advisers in Korea who had contact with two Americans POWs who were not repatriated. The first, tentatively identified as First Lieutenant Niemann, was definitely seen and perhaps interrogated by Soviet military advisers. Niemann, who is on the RAND and TFR lists, is listed in several records as deceased.

Another Soviet military adviser recalled having contact with "Lt. Colonel V. Black" in order to arrange an interview with Pravda. Colonel Vance E. Black of California, who has not been accounted for since he was shot down in May 1951, was seen alive by an American POW in Pyongyang in March 1952. Lt. Colonel Vance E. Black may be the "V. Black," who was identified in the Pravda article and seen by a Soviet military adviser.

According to a retired KGB Major General, Soviet intelligence wanted to recruit agents. George Blake's decision to work for the KGB, whether it was the result of recruitment or simply a walk-in, gave the KGB additional incentive to find other potential agents among the UN prisoner-of-war population. Army G-2 analyses of repatriated American POWs turned up an alarming number of cases that fit this pattern. In June 1954, the U.S. advised the Air Force that "evidence had been uncovered which concerned the assignment of Sabotage and Espionage missions to repatriated American prisoners of war during "Big and Little Switch," and that quite recently new cases of this type have been discovered." No evidence has yet been obtained that points toward a similar North Korean or Chinese interest in recruiting agents. There have been reports over the years that American POWs were used as guinea pigs in Sino-Soviet biological experiments. None of this has been documented thus far.

Intelligence reports located in the U.S. archives are nearly silent on the issue of whether American MIA-POWs were transferred to the territory of the USSR. If this activity took place, it was not discussed in Eighth Army G-2 daily reports or annual summaries. If this activity took place it was not widely known to repatriated POWs. Thus far only one repatriated POW affidavit has been located that mentions this activity.<sup>309</sup>

In this affidavit, repatriated POW John T. Cain said that he had been told by a Nationalist Chinese officer that a U.S. helicopter pilot with the rank of Second Lieutenant had been taken to Russia

<sup>309</sup> Submitted for the record of Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

in March, 1952. The Captain did not know the branch of service, and had communicated this information to POW Cain through "sign language, in broken English, and by pictures drawn on the ground then erased."

In the early and mid-1950's, according to Dr. Cole, the U.S. Government took the position that Americans may well have been transported from Korea or China to the territory of the USSR. For example, according to press reports, in May 1954, the U.S. Department of State delivered a note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry accusing the Soviets of having transferred American prisoners to the territory of the Soviet Union from Korea. The Soviet Government's rejection of the U.S. note was the first public notice that the U.S. had made such a protest. As Dr. Cole stated, "reports were apparently collected through U.S. intelligence and diplomatic channels that U.S. POWs during the Korean War were seen in Soviet camps."

Yet, the following year, the coordinated inter-agency position of the United States took precisely the opposite position, concluding:

With regard to the question of United States personnel captured in Korea, the Department of Defense has informed us that all American servicemen, missing or unaccounted for in that conflict, have been presumed dead. In close cooperation with the Department of Defense, however, we intend to continue to seek information from the Communists about their fate. Further, we have no evidence that any United States personnel captured in Korea were ever taken to the Soviet Union.<sup>310</sup>

As Dr. Cole stated:

There has been no official explanation that squares these two contradictory positions. The possibility that American POWs were moved from Korea or China to the territory of the USSR cannot be ruled out. Thus far, no documentary evidence has been found to support such a position. Circumstantial evidence (viz., missing POWs, Sino-Soviet intelligence cooperation, Russian presence in Korean POW camps) and eyewitness testimony (former prisoners, Soviet military sources) point to the possibility that some American POWs may have been taken to the USSR. The motives for this activity have not been established.<sup>311</sup>

<sup>310</sup>Letter from Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton to Congressman Vorys, February 10 1955.

<sup>311</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

### Testimony of Gen. Volkogonov on Korea

In response to questions from the Committee, Gen. Volkogonov said that he had found no evidence to indicate that large numbers of U.S. POWs had been held in the Soviet Union during the Korean War. As he testified:

I have examined an enormous number of documents, including the documents of Stalin, Beria, and all the special services, and these are documents which would have contained evidence of American prisoners being taken through Soviet territory.

I want to bring your attention to one document emphasizing that the leaders of these secret agencies, the KGB, the NKVD, did not lie to one another. They told the truth to one another in the totalitarian system because it was extremely dangerous for them not to do so. They may have deceived America or the Soviet public, but among themselves they were forced to tell the truth.

And here is a document giving evidence to the following. This is a document of February 4, 1954 of Interior Minister Sergei Kruglov, written to him, indicating that in special prisons on the territory of the Soviet Union there are six American citizens being held in special prisons and camps of the ministry of internal affairs. This document was never intended to be made public. It was top secret, and it contains the names of these persons, but again, was purely for the internal use of the Interior Ministry.

And this was immediately after the war in Korea. Despite all of our work--and we have many archivists working, dozens of experts searching, on their own time on a volunteer basis, a great many archives. Despite this, we have found no confirmation of the presence of other American citizens located on the territory of the Soviet Union.<sup>312</sup>

Gen. Volkogonov testified that apart from the February 4, 1954 document, the Russians have found only one other document concerning Korean-era U.S. POWs. This document concerned two U.S. airmen from a helicopter forced to land in North Korea, in behalf of whom the U.S. Embassy in Moscow requested Soviet assistance. According to Gen. Volkogonov, the Soviet government decided not to respond to the note. The Russians have no information on the fate of these two men.

<sup>312</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

With respect to the location of interrogations of U.S. prisoners during the Korean war, Gen. Volkogonov has told the Committee:

Based on testimony by G.I. Korotkov, who participated in interrogations of American POWs from the Korean War period, interrogations were conducted in an especially equipped site at a junction of the Korean, Chinese and Soviet borders. So far we have been unable to determine the exact location of this site. The Soviet side was not engaged in transporting American POWs to this site. Probably they were brought by Korean servicemen, who then took them away after interrogations.<sup>313</sup>

### Testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Phillip Corso, USA, Ret.

On November 10, 1992, the Committee heard the testimony of Lt. Col. Phillip Corso, USA, Ret., a member of the National Security Council staff during the Eisenhower Administration. Lt. Col. Corso was head of the special projects division of the Far East Command during the Korean War, in the G-2 section, with responsibility for keeping track of North Korean POW camps. During the closing days of the war, Lt. Col. Corso participated in discussions on the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war (the "Little Switch" operation), and the full exchange of prisoners ("Big Switch").

Lt. Col. Corso testified that at the end of the exchange of sick and wounded in the Little Switch Operation, he prepared a document showing that all U.S. sick and wounded were not returned, and that about 500 prisoners who were not returned would be in danger of dying if they did not receive treatment. Lt. Col. Corso testified that U.S. officials brought this to the attention of the presiding Chinese general who responded simply by snapping a pencil in two and doing nothing. According to Lt. Col. Corso, the U.S. concluded that approximately 8,000 prisoners who should have come home during Operation Big Switch did not. Lt. Col. Corso drafted statements to be given to the United Nations by Dr. Charles Mayo and Henry Cabot Lodge. As Col. Corso testified:

Dr. Charles Mayo gave the statement on bacteriological warfare, and Ambassador Lodge on the United Nations prisoners of war. And we found out that at the time the Chinese, under Russian tutelage, had a detailed, scientific process of Pavlovian type experiments which they were conducting on our prisoners.

We knew about this information, but we were hindered from sending agents to the North to find out more about this

<sup>313</sup> Letter to Select Committee from Gen. Volkogonov, Dec. 17, 1992.

because this was handled mostly by OPC, which was a unit of the CIA.

Now, during my tour in Korea, I compiled the evidence, I was receiving this daily, that prisoners had not been returned from North Korea and had been sent, in fact, to the Soviet Union. The war was still going on at the time.

The information that I had was compiled, and I was amazed to hear that there was no evidence in the archives on this. There were actually hundreds of reports. The reports came from prisoner of war interrogation reports of North Koreans, prisoners of war, Chinese prisoners of war, and defectors, and some photographs that we took, our reconnaissance planes took.

These reports were compiled and kept in files, and I'd say offhand there must have been 300 or 400 of these reports easily in my file of knowledge from prisoners of war and so forth that our prisoners had been sent up through Manchuria to Man-chou-li (by train). There they were transported or changed. There they were changed because of the gauge and sent to the Soviet Union. I had very definite information on two train loads. . . from Chinese prisoners of war, North Korean prisoners of war, civilian defectors, and photographs. We had some photographs of the camps.<sup>314</sup>

Lt. Col. Corso estimated that each of the two train loads of U.S. POWs contained about 450 prisoners, for a total of 900 POWs transported to the Soviet Union. He stated that he had some inconclusive information as to the possibility of a third, similar trainload. In all, Lt. Col. Corso said he had 200 to 300 reports about these 900 POWs or related information. Eventually, he was asked to brief President Eisenhower personally on the situation, in a five-minute meeting which took place in mid-1953, or possibly as late as 1954. This meeting took place while Lt. Col. Corso was serving on the staff of the National Security Council. As Lt. Col. Corso testified:

I had a call from my principal, C. D. Jackson, one day, who was special assistant to the President. He said, get over, we have to go see the President. Bring your prisoner of war report. My prisoner of war report that I handed him was one page. I walked in the office. The President was in the Oval Office, the three of us, and I saw him, and he said, I understand you have a report on prisoners of war going to the Soviet Union? I told him, yes, that's what I'm here for.

<sup>314</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

I compiled this report not only here but from information in Korea, which I said before, that up to 1,200 we suspect, but about 900 certainly did go there. Our information is solid, as solid as intelligence information can be, because that's the nature of intelligence.

I handed [President Eisenhower] the report, and he read it. And he had a very serious look on his face. . . This was not a pleasant meeting. It did not last long. . . He said, Colonel, he said, do you have any recommendations, because in the military, generally the writer of the report has to make a recommendation to his superior who then decides on what to do with it.

I said, yes. The nature of this report---these men will never come back alive because they will get in the hands of the KGB who will use them for their purposes. Espionage, play-backs, or whatever. This is not uncommon in the intelligence business. Once they fall in their hands, there's little hope of them coming back.

And I told him, Mr. President, you are aware of the system of the KGB, how they use prisoners of war and defectors? And he said, yes, I am. He said, is your recommendation not to make it public? I said, my recommendation is not to make public the part--the KGB operation. It's difficult to understand at its best. It hasn't been revealed. The part on prisoners, that I don't know.

So, the President said, well, I accept your recommendation. . . he said, well, I agree, we cannot give it to the families. Then I said, Mr. President, though, may I send a copy of this report to the Department of Defense? He said, yes.<sup>315</sup>

According to Lt. Col. Corso, the effort to locate and retrieve U.S. POWs held by the Communists during the Korean War were impeded by the U.S. policy of not making strident and confrontational statements directed at the Soviet Union, North Korea and China. Lt. Col. Corso testified that "The big policy was the policy of fear. Fear of general war. That was the policy that was stopping us." Lt. Col. Corso added that the families were not told because:

[Y]ou'd have to tell the families that these boys were going to be tried, used, exploited for NKVD operations which were espionage, sabotage, and take their identities. And that we felt would have been damaging to

<sup>315</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

the families, but it's hard to explain, sir. . . They were going to be exploited in a very sinister way. As far as telling them they were alive, sir, I put in a speech at the United Nations that 1,800 prisoners of war had gone to the Soviet Union, had been transferred to the Soviet Union. Now, there was no mention that they were dead or not dead, but that was put in the statement and released, and he gave me permission to put that in.<sup>316</sup>

According to Lt. Col. Corso, he is the only person alive who participated in the decision not to tell the families the information concerning U.S. POWs in the Soviet Union. The Committee has not been able to find any documentary corroboration of his information.

#### Testimony of Colonel Delk Simpson

The testimony of Col. Delk Simpson (USAF-Ret.), a former U.S. military attache in Hong Kong, also supported the possibility that large numbers of U.S. prisoners were transferred to Soviet territory during the Korean war period. Col. Simpson testified that he had received and passed on to U.S. Air Force Intelligence headquarters in 1954 an eyewitness account concerning the transportation of approximately 700 American prisoners from Manchou-li, China into Siberia. According to Col. Simpson's source, a number of the prisoners were black soldiers.

Col. Simpson testified that he has worked since his retirement in 1961 to bring this issue to the attention of the government, including visits to offices in both the executive and legislative branch. Col. Simpson said that he had learned that DIA considered him to be "senile" and that the prisoners he had reported were French from the French-Indochinese War, being taken to Siberia for return to France.

As Col. Simpson testified:

It was not until six months ago that I came to understand the possibility of why I received such official inaction. At that time, I met Colonel Corso, and Colonel Corso told me that in 1953, he was the author of a policy while on the White House staff to abandon all prisoners being held by the Russians. He said the policy was approved by President Eisenhower. Senator, it is incomprehensible to me that anybody would make such a decision to send our boys to a sure death.<sup>317</sup>

<sup>316</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

<sup>317</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

Col. Simpson testified that his original source was a Polish man trying to get to Australia, who was afraid the U.S. was going to try to stop him. Col. Simpson promised to keep his name and destination secret. He sent the information as a classified report to the Pentagon, and never received a response.

#### Testimony of Sgt. Steve E. Kiba

The case of Sgt. Steve E. Kiba demonstrates conclusively that, whether or not prisoners were transferred from North Korea to the former Soviet Union, at least some were transferred to the People's Republic of China (PRC). Sgt. Kiba was interned in China for 32 months as a POW during the Korean War. An Air Force pilot, Sgt. Kiba was transported to Red China about three days after his capture on January 12, 1953, and remained there until his release on August 4, 1955. Throughout his time as a POW in China, he experienced degrading and harsh conditions. As Sgt. Kiba testified:

They were sadistic and barbaric. . . threatened me with all kind of horrendous tortures, and they even did some of them. . . They told me I would never go home unless I cooperated. And they threatened to keep me for life. And they kept some of my friends for life. They're still there.<sup>318</sup>

Sgt. Kiba testified that American POWs were abandoned after the 1953 cease-fire, and that he was one of them, but that others, unlike him, never returned. He stated that either he or others in his crew saw ten to fifteen caucasians whose fates remain undetermined. As he testified:

It is a known fact that we abandoned American servicemen after [World War II, Korea, and Vietnam] and let their families down. I know we abandoned some because I saw some of them.

President Harry Truman was the first President to leave Americans behind. Then President Eisenhower abandoned American POWs after the Korean War in North Korea, Red China and the Soviet Union. In a press conference on April 29, 1959, President Eisenhower acknowledged that not all American POW's were repatriated after the Korean War ceasefire.<sup>319</sup>

According to Sgt. Kiba, the Communists he met while he was in captivity demonstrated to him that they were sadistic and needed no reason to keep Americans, because "a Communist is different." As he

<sup>318</sup>Testimony, Nov. 10, 1992

<sup>319</sup>Testimony, Nov. 10, 1992

testified, "for almost 40 years, I've been trying to inform the American people and the news media of the heinous crime of enslaving the bodies and minds of our courageous fighting men by the godless communists." Mr. Kiba said that in the final analysis, he could understand why he was so badly treated by the Communists, but he could not understand why his own government had asked him to remain silent after his return about the others he had seen in China while he was a POW.

#### State Department Testimony on North Korea

Until recently, the Government of North Korea has provided little cooperation to the United States in accounting for missing U.S. servicemen despite its obligation to do so under the armistice agreement that ended the Korean War. As a result, no archival research in North Korea has been possible. A series of diplomatic initiatives over the past five years, however, give grounds for hope that progress may be possible in the future. As Charles Kartman, director of the Office of Korean Affairs, U.S. Department of State, told the Committee:

In 1988. . . we announced a modest policy initiative aimed at enhancing the prospects for resolving the problems of the Korean War, by drawing North Korea out of its isolation. As part of that process, we opened a diplomatic channel with the North Koreans throughout respective embassy political counsellors in Beijing. At our first meeting in 1988, and subsequently on many occasions in that channel, we told the North Koreans that in order to improve relations with us they should take steps in several areas, including Korean War POW/MIAs.

In 1990, on Memorial Day. . . North Korea returned five sets of remains to a Congressional delegation headed by Representative Sonny Montgomery. In June 1991, they handed over 11 more sets to Senator Smith, who had participated in arrangements for this action. Senator Smith used this occasion to reinforce our position on the importance of regularizing the process.

On both occasions, the North Koreans made it plain that they hoped to derive some political benefit from their actions. . .

In January of this year, Undersecretary of State Kanton discussed with a high-level North Korean delegation in New York the full range of issues, focused of course on our concerns regarding the North Korean nuclear program, but including the MIA issue. Then in April [1992], North Korean President Kim Il Sung, in an interview with the Washington Times, said that North Korea was prepared to resolve the MIA issue in a humanitarian manner.

In May [1992], the North Koreans returned 30 sets of remains in Panmunjon directly to the United Nations Command. The North Koreans said explicitly at the time that they were willing to discuss formal arrangements to return further remains to the United Nations command. .

We have asked the DPRK to give us any available information on POW's and MIA's. In reply, we have only been told that there is not a single POW in the DPRK. We have raised this issue with both Russia and China repeatedly this year, and will continue to do so with them and with North Korea. . . the best answers will come from a longer-term process, which will bring about not only the return of remains, but also the resolution by other means--archival research for example--of questions surrounding the fate of Korean War MIAs.<sup>320</sup>

#### Testimony of Mr. Robert Dumas

On November 11, 1992, the Committee received testimony from Mr. Robert Dumas, whose brother, PFC Roger A. Dumas of Company C, 19th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division, was captured northeast of Anju, North Korea on or about November 4, 1950. Mr. Dumas testified to his belief that a large number of POWs were retained by the Koreans and are still there, working on collective farms.

Furthermore, Mr. Dumas, who has had personal contact with senior North Korean officials at the United Nations for several years, including the Ambassadors, said that only a comprehensive approach, involving all outstanding issues, could bring results on the POW issue with the North Koreans.

Mr. Dumas testified that he met with the North Korean Ambassador in New York in July 1992 and the Ambassador said,

Bob, all you want is your brother home. That's all. And he said talk to the man in the White House, get somebody to sit down with us, and let's go over the whole thing, the whole category. Let's go over everything, the whole category.<sup>321</sup>

Mr. Dumas then related for the Committee a meeting he attended in New York on December 9, 1987, with the Reverend Jesse Jackson and Ambassador Pak Del Yan of the DPRK. He said that Reverend Jackson opened the discussion with:

<sup>320</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92.

<sup>321</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

Mr. Ambassador, if you have live prisoners in North Korea right now, I will come to North Korea on Christmas Eve and bring some home alive. And in the springtime, if you have any remains, we will go back in the spring and exhume those with an organization of human rights people from our side and your side.<sup>322</sup>

Mr. Dumas continued, "And the first thing the Ambassador said, 'yes, Reverend, that would be good for both our countries.'"

Mr. Dumas interpreted this discussion to be an admission by the North Korean Ambassador that his country continues to hold U.S. POWs. The Committee staff has requested an opportunity to discuss this meeting with Rev. Jackson, but such a discussion has not taken place.

#### Testimony of Serban Oprica, Former Rumanian Engineer

Mr. Dumas' belief that American POWs are laboring in North Korean collective farms was consistent with the testimony of Serban Oprica, a former Rumanian engineer now living in Hartford Connecticut. Mr. Oprica worked for the Romanian government in North Korea during 1979 and 1980, assisting in the construction of a television production factory in Pyongyang. Mr. Oprica testified that, in late October or early November, 1979, he saw a group of Caucasians whom he believed to be American POWs. The sighting occurred during a bus ride in the countryside. Mr. Oprica testified:

We see a land like a camp where vegetables, and my attention was to--because I saw a person with a European face, with blue eyes very close the bus. And I was very shocked. And everybody on the bus was shocked. And I was looking behind him (and) I saw 7 or 10 peoples with Caucasian face. And behind them, I saw more people working the camp. . . They were dressed with North Korean dress, like Chinese, but they worked in the camp and was dark color.<sup>323</sup>

According to Mr. Oprica, the men were not guarded. In his deposition, he specified that he saw no less than five and as many as fifteen other Caucasians in the immediate vicinity of the bus and as many as 50 others in the distance. All wore the same gray drab clothes and were working in a farm field, without restraints.

Mr. Oprica testified that at another place in North Korea, at a museum, he and his wife saw parts of American soldiers in alcohol,

<sup>322</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

<sup>323</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

which were used as a means of frightening people. These body parts included limbs, hands, and heads, and were displayed in the vicinity of American armament items, including uniforms and flags.

Mr. Oprica also remembered witnessing an altercation between a Rumanian and a North Korean while he was on an outing to the west coast port city of Nampo. Mr. Oprica remembers hearing the Rumanian angrily accuse the Koreans of holding American POWs from the Korean War. Mr. Oprica said that the Rumanians had spent a longer time in Korea than he had were certain that American POWs were still being held by the North Koreans.

Mr. Oprica was debriefed by U.S. Army intelligence in 1988 in behalf of the DIA, and by the FBI, but he believes that little or nothing was done with the information he provided.

#### U.S. POWs from World War II

##### RAND Project / Cole

The RAND research on World War II, conducted by Dr. Paul Cole, focused on the European theater of operations, looking into the question of how many Americans, "liberated" from German POW camps by the Soviets, were not repatriated.

RAND found that 76,854 Americans were estimated to be in German POW camps as of March 15, 1945, but that the total number of American POWs recovered from German POW camps was 91,252, nearly 14,000 more than expected. Moreover, Soviet forces liberated a substantial number of these POWs -- 28,662 according to U.S. records; but only 22,554 according to Soviet records, a difference which Dr. Cole attributed to poor Soviet record keeping.

In the years that followed, several dozen, and possibly as many as several hundred, inquiries were made by the United States government on behalf of U.S. MIAs, usually based on requests from family members. The Soviets responded by creating an American Missing Persons File at its National Archives, which included some of this correspondence, as well as files derived from Missing Air Crew reports and Enemy Evasion Aid reports, some of which covered crewmen who had been repatriated to the United States. As Dr. Cole found:

There is no question that many bomber crews survived after parachuting or crash landing on territory controlled by Soviet forces. Many of these crewmen were repatriated. U.S. and Soviet records suggest, however, that an undetermined number were not. The U.S. Embassy at Moscow's efforts to obtain information about American citizens held on the territory of the USSR were severely limited by the Soviet position that some American citizens were considered by Soviet authorities to be

Rumanians, Hungarians, other eastern Europeans, or even citizens of the USSR. In these cases, the Soviet government always refused to give the U.S. Embassy even the slightest bit of information in response to inquiries concerning people the Soviet authorities considered to be non-U.S. citizens.<sup>324</sup>

Dr. Cole found no evidence to support charges that thousands of American POWs liberated from Nazi German POW camps were never repatriated. Moreover, his research raises questions even about the relatively few individuals identified by the Russians as U.S. POWs who were never repatriated by the USSR. As Dr. Cole testified:

Some explanations of what happened to unrepatriated American POWs do not hold up well under scrutiny. In December 1991, the Senate Select Committee on MIA-POW Affairs visited Moscow. During this visit, Gen. Dimitri Volkogonov gave the U.S. delegation a list, containing the names of fourteen Americans who died [who] were alleged to have died in Soviet custody during World War II. There is no information concerning the sources used to compile this list. The list does not correspond to unaccounted-for POW records of the Adjutant General. There is no correlation between this list and the mandate of the Joint U.S.-Russian Commission on MIA-POWs either.<sup>325</sup>

Dr. Cole then reviewed the efforts in the late 1940's and early 1950s, which by 1956 had resulted in the release from Soviet block captivity of nineteen American citizens. There was little subsequent activity in this area until December 5, 1991, when the U.S. submitted data to the Russian government "concerning certain individuals who could have been detained in the Soviet Union in the 1950's." Russian President Yeltsin later advised that "two of the people the U.S. side inquired about . . . were returned to U.S. authorities nearly 36 years ago." Another individual about whom the U.S. requested information had his remains recovered, identified, and buried at his family's request in the United States in 1957. There was no record with respect to the other individuals identified by the U.S.

On July 30, 1992, Gen. Dmitri Volkogonov, chairman of the Russian Delegation to the U.S.-Russian Commission on MIA-POWs, published an article in Izvestia listing the names of 39 American citizens who had been illegally detained by the Soviet government. According to Dr. Cole, however, none of the 39 was an American POW.

<sup>324</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

<sup>325</sup> Select Committee hearing 11/10/92

In summary, the initial phase of the Rand review, while incomplete and inconclusive, tends to discredit the idea that a substantial number of U.S. POWs were held by the Soviet Union following World War II and not repatriated.

In this regard, Dr. Cole took issue with the authors of Soldiers of Misfortune and Moscow Bound concerning the number of POWs the Red Army "liberated" from German POW camps and failed to repatriate. His conclusions:

The number of American POW's who were not repatriated from German POW camps in World War II appears to be less than 200. Assertions that tens of thousands of American POW's were abandoned are "inconsistent with the historical record."

U.S. and Soviet Archives suggest that fewer than 100 American POW's, perhaps 50 or fewer, were held on the territory of the U.S.S.R. after World War II.

An undetermined number of American air crews--not POWs--were detained by the U.S.S.R. after making forced landings on territory it controlled. Most, if not all, of these crews were repatriated from the U.S.S.R. Some others may not have been repatriated from Soviet-occupied territory, but answering this question requires further research.

The U.S. government located the graves of hundreds of American servicemen on Soviet-controlled territory. These were not POWs; most were on the territory of Soviet-occupied Germany. Records show few of these remains were recovered from the territory of the U.S.S.R.<sup>326</sup>

#### Sanders, Sauter, and Brown

John M.G. Brown and James D. Sanders, assisted by Mark A. Sauter, have conducted years of research in U.S. archives, searching for information relating to U.S. and allied POWs who fell into the hands of the Soviet Army as it pursued the rapidly retreating Wehrmacht across Eastern Europe in 1945. Thousands of soldiers were moved by rail, truck and foot eastward, not westward, and most ended their cross-country journey at the port of Odessa, on the Black sea, there to await transport by sea to their homelands. This much is not in dispute. What is in question is how many of these soldiers were not allowed to board ship, but were destined for the vast Gulag of the Russian-Siberian interior. Mr. Sanders and Mr. Brown estimate that between 20,000 and 23,500 were POWs of the Germans and became prisoners of the Soviets.

<sup>326</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

It is Mr. Brown's theory that Communist mistreatment of POWs--that is, retaining them as hostages for political purposes--can be traced to the behavior of the Bolsheviks. According to Mr. Brown, the Bolsheviks kept at least 60 American soldiers they captured during the Allied intervention of 1918-1919 at Archangel, and a few from the Siberian front. In his view, this was a prelude to the retention by the Soviets of thousands of soldiers taken from the German POW camps after World War II.

Mr. Sanders furnished the Committee with a critique of Dr. Cole's research in a letter on November 15. Pertinent excerpts follow:

Let me start by stating that the World War II portion of Dr. Cole's report is hopelessly incompetent. Any investigator/analyst/historian researching a possible Government cover-up of historic proportions, would begin by testing the official Government history against the available data. Dr. Cole, however, failed to do this.

Instead, he relied exclusively on the RAMPs Report (Recovered Allied Military Personnel) to formulate his working hypothesis. Since the RAMPs report, completed in 1946, is the official Government version of the recovery of POWs, a competent historian would first demonstrate that the official history is correct. It is incorrect in virtually all critical areas.

Cole quotes the RAMPs disinformation line that only "76,854 were estimated to be in German POW camps." Here are the correct confirmed American POWs held by the Germans:

European Theater	76,474
Mediterranean Theater	20,171
North African Theater	<u>1,667</u>
total	98,312 <sup>327</sup>

Mr. Sanders went on to say that his archival research turned up "Battle Casualties of the Army," which support his figures. He also asserts that his research shows that the U.S. actually expected 106-107,000 POWs to be returned, which included between 8,000 and 9,000 men carried as MIA but not definitely known to be in captivity. On May 19, 1945, a document found by Mr. Sanders--signed by Gen. Eisenhower--shows that 105,000 returnees were expected.

<sup>327</sup> Letter to Select Committee from James D. Sanders, 11/15/92

How many returned? Dr. Cole, using the RAMPs report, says 91,252. Mr. Sanders says that his research shows that the number did not exceed 85,000.

Mr. Sanders letter continued with its summary of his findings:

Between February and April 1945, 5,159 Americans should have been evacuated through Odessa. . . . Only 2,858 were recovered, however. At least 2,301 Americans disappeared. A June 1945, State Department study in the MIS-X files confirms this, stating that 5,200 Americans should have come out through Odessa.

On May 19, 1945, Eisenhower informed General George C. Marshall, stating that an estimated 25,000 Americans were still held by the Red Army. It should be noted that this message was sent during the height of the hostage negotiations that were in progress in Halle, Germany. Only 4,165 Americans returned from Soviet control after that date. . . . We lost 2,500 out of Poland and the Ukraine between February and March 1945, and 21,000 along the western front during May 1945, for a total of 23,500.

<sup>328</sup>

#### Cold War Incidents

##### Joint Staff Report on Cold War POWs

Early in 1992, President Yeltsin said publicly that some American airmen lost during the Cold War period were captured and held prisoner in the Soviet Union. In response, the Joint Staff for POW/MIA matters was tasked to collect all the available information on Cold War losses. Working with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the CIA, the DIA, the NSA, and the State Department, the Joint Staff reviewed U.S. Government files for communications between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, China, and North Korea concerning the issue. In addition, the Joint Staff worked with service casualty officers at the various services to review what families were told and what information they knew. In all, the Joint Staff found 133 men who were missing or captured by the Soviet bloc during the Cold War. As Captain John P. Gay, director of the Asia/Pacific Division of the J-5, Joint Staff testified:

We defined the parameters of what we wanted to look at, and we opted for 1946 all the way through 1991. . . . We collected all the data, generating a computer-based data report. We submitted it to the Secretary of Defense on the 25th of June. We made one minor update to that report since that time. To the best of my knowledge, prior to us

<sup>328</sup> Sanders letter.

collating all this data, there was no Government-wide effort to include all the Cold War data into a single report, from 1946 through 1991. I'm convinced that we made as comprehensive and as complete a look as we possibly could have. . .

In my examination of all the material associated with Cold War losses, I see, saw nothing that would support that any of the 133 missing or captured were held in the Soviet Union, China, or Korea. However, as many of you know, because of the circumstances surrounding some of these incidents, this possibility--and I stress that, possibility--can certainly not be ruled out, because of the circumstances surrounding the crashes.<sup>329</sup>

In summary, the Joint Staff found no evidence that any previously unacknowledged Americans had been captured and imprisoned during the Cold War period by the Soviet Union, China or Korea, but that this possibility could not be ruled out because of the nature and circumstances of some of the incidents involved.

#### Defense Department View

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Al Ptak testified that U.S. investigative efforts have focused on 10 incidents between 1950 and 1965 in which shootdowns took place, involving 90 crew members who remain unaccounted for:

Despite the lack of conclusive evidence, we do not rule out the possibility that members of these crews may have survived the loss incident long enough to be rescued by Soviet units. U.S. debriefs from the 1950's provide second-hand evidence that individuals matching the descriptions of members of a few of these crews were sighted in Soviet prisons; however, we lack conclusive evidence of such prisoners.

The U.S. has provided the Russians with highly specific data, including the names of the service members involved, the dates of their flights, their last known locations, and their aircraft types, for each of the ten incidents. To date, little information has been received from the Russians in response, despite continuing commitments of cooperation. Beginning in September, 1992, representatives of the Russian Border Guards were included in discussions with the U.S. members of the Commission, and the Commission is continuing to seek information from the archives maintained by them.

<sup>329</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

#### Joint Commission Visit to Ukraine

In December, 1992, the Joint Commission visited Kiev, Ukraine. During a meeting with Ukrainian officials, the U.S. side turned over lists of all known citizens of the former Soviet Union captured in Afghanistan and of all known former Soviet citizens who had been resettled in the United States. Ambassador Toon also held a press conference asking Ukrainians to come forward with information concerning U.S. POWs and MIAs. Ukrainian officials stated their willingness to investigate their records and archives and to share any information they find with the United States.

During the visit, an official of the DIA pressed the Ukrainians concerning ten incidents in the Cold War in which Americans were lost and did not return. One of the incidents occurred in 1965, at a location that would be within the Ukrainian national territory. Ukrainian officials uniformly stated that all records had been taken to Moscow on the orders of Soviet officials of the central government. Nevertheless, they promised to research whatever files and archives remained in the Ukraine and to pass on the results.

#### RAND Project / Cole Testimony

Dr. Cole had this to say about Cold War losses:

During the early period of the Cold War, the U.S. Government in the 1950's systematically collected live sighting reports of American citizens, military and civilian, in Soviet bloc control. This information provided the basis for dozens of U.S. requests for information and protests to the Soviet Government. Between 1945 and 1959, U.S. government protests resulted in the repatriation of at least nine American citizens held in the Soviet Union.

Between 1945 and 1969, at least 23 U.S. military aircraft were shot down by Soviet forces. On at least three occasions, live crew members were repatriated. During the 1950s, the U.S. government believed that some crew members were imprisoned by the Soviet Union and made many protests to the Soviets on their behalf.

Other protests were made on the behalf of American civilians not permitted to leave the Soviet bloc.

The U.S. also kept detailed records on the whereabouts of American defectors in the Soviet bloc, the majority of whom lived in East Germany or Czechoslovakia. Few lived

in the Soviet Union, and some U.S. defectors were imprisoned by the Soviets as suspected spies.<sup>330</sup>

#### Family Members and Task Force Russia

TFR and some members of families who have lost servicemen in Cold War situations take a more positive view on the possibility of survivors. One of the most intriguing and convincing cases that can be made showing Soviet duplicity in retaining members of U.S. air-crews shot down by Soviet fighters during the Cold War involves the USAF RB-50, tail number 47-145A, which was attacked by two MIG-15s on July 29, 1953, over the Sea of Japan. The sons of one of the crew, 1st Lt. Warren Sanderson, have made an intensive search for the truth regarding possible survivors. One of the sons, Bruce W. Sanderson, of Fargo, North Dakota, testified before the Committee.

Bruce Sanderson has enjoyed the full support of and considerable assistance from TFR, including personal attention from Gen. Loeffke and Col. Herrington in his research and visit to Russia, where he participated in interviews with Russian sources and was given access to Russian archives. He has been partially successful in obtaining U.S. Government records involving the case, but the search for relevant documents is incomplete.

Facts that make this case particularly important are:

- . The Soviets admitted that they shot the aircraft down.
- . Survivors, beyond the sole individual who was rescued by a USN ship, were seen in the water by search and rescue aircraft.
- . North Korean patrol boats were seen in the area, moving to and away from the crash-site.
- . The co-pilot was rescued 22 hours after the crash, 17 miles from the coast.

Mr. Bruce Sanderson provided the Committee with a possible insight into what might have happened to his father and to other American servicemen who flew missions to collect intelligence along the Soviet frontiers during the Cold War. He told the Committee that he located a Russian citizen who was personally involved in the interrogation of American servicemen in the U.S.S.R. from 1950 to 1954. According to Mr. Sanderson, this is what he was told:

He also reaffirmed the information from the first meeting that all U.S. personnel under Soviet control were photographed, finger-printed, and given Russian names, that these men were then moved frequently from camp to

camp. It was common practice to create a false death certificate or record when a prisoner was moved. . .  
331

Jane Reynolds Howard presented testimony concerning her search for the facts concerning her husband's loss over the Baltic Sea. Robert D. Reynolds (USN Class of '45; graduated in June 1944 because of the war) was in a Navy PB4Y2 "Privateer" shot down by four Soviet MIGs on April 8, 1950. U.S. searches found no survivors and all 10 of the crew were presumed dead.

Mrs. Howard testified that she had originally accepted the Navy's account of her husband's death. But 16 months ago, she finally learned, through an article in the Los Angeles Times, that her husband's true mission was not "training," as the Navy had told her at the time. This led her to consider the possibility that Robert Reynolds had been captured and to begin a search for answers.

She traveled to Russia where she was assisted by the TFR during a 10-week visit. There, she conducted an intensive search, including the use of media and photos of her husband as he would appear at age 70. She does not know if her husband survives, but she is absolutely convinced that he was captured by the Soviets.

A third family-member, Mr. Gregg Skavinski of Virginia, testified about the case of his uncle, MSgt William R. Homer, who was aboard a USAF RB-29 when it disappeared over the Sea of Japan on June 13, 1952. The Air Force recorded the loss as an "accident, a non-battle casualty." But Mr. Skavinski testified to information that two radar blips were seen approaching the plane just before it disappeared; that a Russian radio transmission discussed the rescue of a member of the crew; that an empty six-man life raft, that might have been from the RB-29, was sighted; and that Soviets reportedly interrogated an American aviator in Manchuria about Major Sam Bush, the commander of the RB-29. What was the Soviet interest in Major Bush, Mr. Skavinski speculated, if he was at the bottom of the Sea of Japan?

In summary, the book is not closed on the missing from the Cold War. There can be little doubt that much more information lies in the archives and in the recollections of the ex-Soviets who participated in these events. TFR faces a formidable challenge in ferreting out the truth.

#### The Vietnam War

The Committee examined reports and allegations that U.S. prisoners were interrogated by Soviet military and intelligence officials

<sup>330</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

<sup>331</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92

during the war in Vietnam and also that some U.S. POWs may have been transferred to the Soviet Union during that conflict.

#### Defense Department Testimony

Assistant Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Al Ptak testified concerning efforts by the Commission to determine whether there is evidence that U.S. prisoners were transferred to the Soviet Union during the Vietnam war:

Despite having vigorously examined every lead, to date we have no conclusive evidence supporting claims that U.S. POWs were transferred to the Soviet Union. It is also important to note that some of these key individuals, including the former Soviet Ambassador to Laos, have refused to be interviewed by the Commission.<sup>332</sup>

To date, the Commission has found no documents indicating that any U.S. POWs from the Vietnam War were interned in the Soviet Union, or that Soviet personnel participated in interrogations of U.S. POWs during the Vietnam War.

#### Assessment of Committee Investigator

Committee investigator Al Graham testified that:

As with the Korean War, the Russians are very sensitive to their possible role in the Vietnamese War. Although they claim that they did not take [part] in any interrogations in Vietnam and that no U.S. POWs were transferred from Vietnam to the Soviet Union, there is at least some circumstantial evidence that such interrogations did take place and that at least a few U.S. POWs may have been transferred from Vietnam to the Soviet Union.

If so, there is a good chance that some of them could still be alive. Again, there are possibly several former U.S. POWs who might have cooperated with the Soviets and who might not wish to be found. In such cases, it would probably be worthwhile for representations to be made to the Russian government at the highest level that such individuals would not be persecuted by the U.S. and that on humanitarian grounds, it would be quite useful to be able to resolve these cases.<sup>333</sup>

---

<sup>332</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/10/92

<sup>333</sup> Select Committee hearing, 11/11/92.

#### Testimony of Bui Tin

During its first set of hearings, in November, 1991, the Committee received testimony from Bui Tin, former Senior Colonel in the Vietnamese People's Army. During the latter part of the Vietnam War, Col. Bui Tin had been the official spokesman for the North Vietnamese Army. According to the Colonel:

At that time, I had the right to read all the documents and the secret telegrams from the politburo on this (POW) issue. In addition, I had special authorization from the General Vo Nguyen Giap, then defense minister to go to any camps, to meet with any officers, and to interview any POWs and read their files.<sup>334</sup>

Col. Bui Tin testified that he believed some U.S. prisoners were interrogated in Vietnam by Soviet and Cuban military intelligence officers and that the purpose of this questioning was to obtain information about their knowledge of advanced aircraft technology. He said he never heard that any U.S. POWs were transferred to the Soviet Union.

#### Other Reports

A number of those who have written books about POW/MIA-related issues, including John M.G. Brown, Thomas Ashworth, Mark Sauter, James Sanders, and Monika Jensen-Stevenson have asserted or speculated that some Americans captured during the Vietnam War were transferred to the Soviet Union. For many, the principal source for this allegation has been Mr. Jerry Mooney, a retired USAF Msgt who served a long career in communications intelligence.

In addition to the testimony of Mr. Mooney, the Committee received several reports that Americans were transferred to the Soviet Union during this period:

. Trung Hieu, a North Vietnamese who has sought political asylum in the United States, was interviewed by Committee staff in June 1992. In an interview, Hieu said that the entire crew of a downed B-52 was turned over to the Soviet Union in 1972; but he backed away from his assertions during his sworn deposition. (Mr. Hieu, by virtue of his occupation as a photographer for the Ministry of Culture, may have had access to reports of this kind, but it is doubtful that he would have had personal knowledge.)

. Terrell "Terry" A. Minarcin was also in communications intelligence in the Air Force. Mr. Minarcin told the

---

<sup>334</sup> Select Committee hearings, 11/7/91, pp. 466

Committee that he tracked "special flights" of Soviet aircraft in 1977 that carried American POWs to the Soviet Union.

Jan Senja, a retired Maj. Gen. in the Czechoslovakian Army, has testified in a deposition and stated in interviews that American POWs were transported to the Soviet Union, transiting Prague. He said he had personal knowledge of the transfer of up to 90 such POWs through Prague. Gen. Senja defected from a high-level position in the Ministry of Defense--where he would have had access to such information--in 1968, and is now an employee of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

The Committee found no information to corroborate the reports of Trung Hieu or Mr. Minarcin.

In December, 1992, during a visit by the Joint Commission to Prague, Ambassador Toon asked Czech officials whether they had heard of the allegations made by Jan Sejna. None of the officials denounced or discredited Sejna. All promised to research their archives, but referred the U.S. delegation to the Ministry of Interior for answers. The Federal Minister of the Interior, Mr. Petr Cermak said that the allegations must be taken seriously, that the communists were capable of anything, and that his Ministry would turn over to the U.S. Government everything it found concerning Czechoslovakia's involvement in the Korean and Vietnam Wars.<sup>335</sup>

#### Mooney Testimony

Considering the fact that Jerry Mooney was the principal source cited by those who assert that American POWs were "Moscow Bound," his testimony was remarkably equivocal on the subject. He testified and presented the Committee with a volume of affidavits on January 22, 1992. The most definitive part of his testimony, as it relates specifically to American POWs going to the USSR, was elicited through questioning by Sen. McCain:

Senator McCain: . . . Mr. Mooney, I believe you said on a television program that there were several movements of American POWs to the Soviet Union, is that correct?

Mr. Mooney: I have never said that sir. What I have said is that there was a tentacle Moscow-bound. The men were

<sup>335</sup> Joint Commission officials were assured, during the December, 1992 visit, that the breakup of the Federal Czechoslovak Republic into two countries would not affect cooperation with the U.S. on POW/MIA matters. Czech Interior Minister Cermak said that all research assignments on the subject would be taken over by his Ministry.

collected. There was a connection by the "friends." We knew where they were transported within North Vietnam. I have no knowledge of Laos, and we knew where they went. We knew where the "friends'" primary prison camp was and we knew how they were transported from North Vietnam over to Sam Neua, Laos, which we designated as Tentacle MB. I never saw an American prisoner being transported out of Southeast Asia and I have never said that. . .

Senator McCain: My question is, do you have information or do you believe that American POWs were taken to the Soviet Union?

Mr. Mooney: I have no direct information, but considering the Tentacle Moscow-bound nature of Sam Neua, I would consider it a probability and, as I have said many times, they would go only if they were broken.

Senator McCain: So you believe that some Americans were taken to the Soviet Union?

Mr. Mooney: Under those conditions, sir.

Senator McCain: I am not sure I understand your answer.

Mr. Mooney: Well, sir, let me--

Senator McCain: You either believe that some were taken to the Soviet Union or you do not believe some were taken to the Soviet Union, Mr. Mooney. I think it's a pretty straightforward question.<sup>336</sup>

Mr. Mooney then explained why he believed that flights of IL-14s carried American POWs from a prison camp northwest of Vinh to Sam Neua. He said the Soviets had no need for POW labor, but "were after minds." The flights to Sam Neua were unusual in the secrecy with which they were conducted; there was no air-to-ground communications. "But," Mr. Mooney said, "we did not know if they went on beyond Sam Neua. We did not know. I have no knowledge of that."

Further discussion of Mr. Mooney's testimony and the Committee's investigation concerning it may be found in the "Intelligence" chapter of this report.

<sup>336</sup> Select Committee hearing, 1/22/92

## Activities in Moscow

### Joint U.S.-Russia Commission

#### U.S. Delegation to the Commission

Malcolm Toon, the Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1976 to 1979, is chairman of the U.S. delegations. The other members of the American delegation are:

KERRY, John (Senator, D-Mass);  
SMITH, Robert (Senator, R-N.H.);  
MILLER, John (Congressman, R-Wash);  
PETERSON, Pete (Congressman, D-Fl.);  
KAUZLARICH, Richard (Department of State);  
QUINN, Kenneth (Department of State);  
PTAK, Al, (Department of Defense);  
CLIFT, Dennis (Department of Defense);  
PETERSON, Trudy (National Archives; Ad Hoc mbr.);  
ROSS, Edward (Department of Defense, Exec. Sec).

#### Russian Delegation to the Commission

Col. General Dmitri Volkogonov, is chairman of the Russian delegation. Dr. Vladimir Kozlov, Deputy Chairman of the Russian Archives, has served as the Deputy Chairman. Other members of the Russian delegation are:

AMBARTSUMOV, Yevgeniy (Act. Chm. Int'l Affairs Comm, SS)  
ARZHANNIKOV, Nikolay Mikhaylovich (DC, Human Rights, SS)  
VENKOV, Igor Nikolayevich (Col. Dir. Hist. & Mem. Ctr. GS)  
KALININ, Yuriy Ivanovich (Col. Min. of Internal Affairs)  
KOVALEV, Sergey Adamovich (Chm. Human Rights Comm, SS)  
KRAYUSHKIN, Anatoliy Afanasyevich (BG, Min. of Security)  
LEZHNIKOV, Gennadiy Lukyanovich (Col. Dir. MVD Info. Ctr.)  
MAZUROV, Vyacheslav Petrovich (Col. Foreign Intel Serv)  
MIRONOV, Vladimir Fedorovich (Consultant, Min of Jus.)  
PODRAZHANETS, Iosif Nikolayevich (Acting Chief, No. Amer DirMFA)

#### Plenary Meetings

The Joint Commission's inaugural meeting was held in Moscow from March 26-28.

This was followed by a "Working Group" delegation led by Mr. Ed Ross which met in Moscow from May 27th to 29th. At this session, Gen. Volkogonov gave the American side free rein to contact and interview as they saw fit. This resulted in about a dozen interviews with former colonels and generals who had served in Vietnam. At this time, Gen. Volkogonov provided the American side

with 21 documents which primarily dealt with World War II and the Cold War periods.

A full Joint Committee meeting was held between September 21-24 with Ambassador Toon and Gen. Volkogonov in attendance. At that time, Gen. Volkogonov explained President Yeltsin's statement before the U.S. Congress on the possibility of live Americans in Russia as being based on the revelation of Mr. Hamilton in a Soviet psychiatric hospital. Gen. Volkogonov later admitted that the David Markin story also played a role. During this Joint meeting, ten archival directors gave their reports. They all claimed not to have found any information indicating U.S. soldiers were sent to the USSR from Korea or Vietnam or that Soviets took part in interrogating American POWs from these wars. When it was pointed out that oral interviews were not consistent with President Yeltsin's statements, Gen. Volkogonov pledged to continue the interviews of former Soviet military personnel with Vietnam and Korean experience. Gen. Volkogonov also admitted at this time that he had not been through the GRU or KGB archives.

#### December 1992 Meeting

During the Joint Commission's Plenary session in December, Gen. Volkogonov, stated three Russian positions:

No Americans are detained against their will in Russia and that is believed to be the case throughout the former Soviet Union;

The Russian side has established the fate of over 23,000 U.S. personnel held after World War II and considers this issue now closed;

The Russian side considers the remaining work of the Commission to be the resolution of questions concerning the Cold War era.

The Russian side of the Commission provided a number of documents to the U.S. side, including a list of cases of persons who had been in Russia but were later returned; a document listing four POW camps in Korea during the war and the number of persons held in each; a list of 109 Americans who did not return from the Korean War but who Russian research indicated were not in Russia; and a document containing data on the Cold War incidents.

Gen. Volkogonov stated categorically that there has never been a KGB General named Gregoriyev. Thus, any report attributed to this man is false. Volkogonov reviewed the many files that had been researched in response to U.S. requests, including more than 40,000 files of the Ministry of Public Health. None of these investigations has produced information that U.S. persons were held in Russia.

Ambassador Toon agreed that the World War II issue could be considered finished, although not all U.S. members of the Commission agreed. For example, the Commissioner from the National Archives raised several outstanding issues from World War II, which the Russians have not satisfactorily addressed.

After a U.S. Commissioner referred to "strong evidence" that American POWs had been taken to the Soviet Union during the Korean War, the Russian side said they found no evidence in their archival research that this had taken place.

In working group interviews, two retired Russian Colonels, veterans of the Korean War, indicated that it was plausible that a limited number of American specialists had been taken from Korea to Russia in connection with efforts to defeat radars used by U.S. F-86 Sabre Jets during the war. They did not, however, state categorically that U.S. personnel had been taken to Russia. One retired Colonel indicated that Russian archives still hold all the answers to U.S. questions.

Gen. Volkogonov told the U.S. Commissioners that answers to POW issues connected with the Korean War would be found in the War Museum in Korea, which he had visited six years earlier, and in China. He also stated that political turbulence in Russia was overtaking the work of the Commission and that there continued to be opposition within the Russian Government to its work. He restated President Yeltsin's support for the Committee, however, and proposed another meeting in the spring of 1993. The two agenda items he raised are the Cold War incidents and investigation of remains recently found on Sakhalin Island. He proposed that the Joint Commission publish a booklet on its work and on its findings, with supporting documentation.

#### Task Force Russia

Task Force Russia (TFR) was formed on June 29, 1992. Its basic mission has been to field a Task Force capable of collecting, analyzing and using information provided from Russian archives and citizens to achieve the fullest possible accounting of American POW/MIA personnel. The Task Force has a complement of 40 people based in Moscow and Washington, D.C.

**Personnel.** Col. Ed Pusey was named the first chief of TFR's Moscow office on September 1, 1992. He presently supervises a staff of 8-10 people including a Deputy, an historian, an archivist, three field interviewers, an interpreter, an administrative NCO, an administrative clerk and a secretary. The Senate Select Committee representative also works out of the TFR Moscow Office which is presently located on the 5th floor of the Old Embassy Building.

**Mission.** The principal mission of the TFR Moscow Office staff is to achieve the fullest possible accounting of American POW/MIA

personnel in Russia through the collection and analysis of information provided by and obtained from Russian archives and citizens.

#### **Objectives.**

- . Organize an effective research, interview and analytical team in Moscow;
- . Develop a prioritized research-interview plan supporting TFR's requirements and priorities;
- . Continue archival research and personal interviews in full cooperation with the Russian side of the Joint U.S.-Russian Commission on POW/MIA;
- . Satisfy Russian concerns, particularly those of the military and security services pertaining to the mission and personnel makeup of TFR;
- . Assist Russian counterparts, whenever possible, in overcoming shortages in personnel, funding, equipment, and information (when lacking) related to mission accomplishments;
- . Reduce perceived barriers between General Volkogonov's commission and the MOD, General Staff, GRU, KGB and other governmental entities pursuant to TFR's requirements;
- . Obtain Russian agency acquiescence in TFR's mission;
- . Maintain and improve upon the positive development of the US-Russian relationship in POW/MIA affairs as well as for the long term with emphasis on the Russian military;
- . Satisfy the priorities up and down both U.S. and Russian "chain of command;"
- . Develop and maintain cooperative work relationship with AmEmb and DAO Moscow;
- . Provide respectable work environment and personal care for TFR's Moscow Office personnel.

**Russian Joint Office.** The United States requested that a physical joint office be established for the purpose of conducting interviews. The proposal was formally raised at the Joint Commission meeting on May 28th. On June 8th, Gen. Volkogonov announced that the POW/MIA Team, consisting of Al Graham, Col William Saxe, and Mr. James Connell, would be permitted to conduct interviews at the Joint Office which was to be located at Ilyinka, 12, near Staraya Ploshchad [Old Square] the former headquarters of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

## Joint Interview Program in Russia

**Background.** Committee investigator Al Graham was posted to Moscow in May, 1992 to represent the Senate Select Committee and work under the aegis of the Joint Commission on POW/MIA affairs. One of his principal tasks while in Russia was, in conjunction with TFR-Moscow team members, to arrange for and conduct interviews with Russian officials, Russian citizens and retired officers who may have served in Southeast Asia during the Korean and Vietnamese Wars and therefore might be knowledgeable about possible U.S. POW/MIAs. Often, as a consequence of these interviews, other leads were developed.

The majority of interviews have been conducted at Ilyinka 12, the former headquarters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The Committee investigator found that some interviewees were intimidated by this location and somewhat reluctant to reveal all they knew, and many believed the room and telephone to be under surveillance by Russian authorities. Since mid-to-late October 1992, some interviews were held elsewhere to respond to these problems.

Initial interviews were scheduled in early June. Interviewees, at that time, were drawn from the Soviet Vietnamese Veterans Association and a few parliamentarians. Others later learned of and responded to the inquiry as a result of media appeals on Kiev and Moscow TV, and Ambassador Toon and Gen. Volkogonov's TV broadcast on June 28, 1992. Advertisements were also placed in a number of newspapers. Other interviewees were developed from citizens writing, calling or walking in either the American Embassy or the Joint Office at Ilyinka 12.

The interview program has been the major source of forward progress. Russian authorities have provided the Committee with a substantial number of archival documents, mostly concerning World War II. However, this archival effort has yielded very little to date that is verifiable on American POWs during World War II and virtually nothing new about Korea, Vietnam and the Cold War.

By contrast, the interview results moved the Russians to admit that they were involved in interrogating American POWs in Korea and Vietnam. Moreover, although the Committee has no direct evidence to prove it, there appears to be a strong possibility that at least a handful of U.S. POWs, possibly more, were transferred to Soviet territory during the Korean War.

Based on the Committee's experiences with the Russians to date, the investigators believe the Russian side will likely stick to its current line until the body of evidence gathered through a vigorous interview program forces the government and security services to reevaluate their position.

**Interviews with Russian Officials.** These included interviews with Russian active-duty servicemen, GULAG officials, Security service personnel, doctors, archivists, historians, linguists, and parliamentarians.

**Interviews with Russian Citizens.** These consist primarily of interviews with retired military officers, foreign service officers and correspondents who served in Southeast Asia, as well as with former prisoners who served in the GULAG and ordinary citizens who had knowledge of possible Americans on Russian territory.

**Retired Military Officers:** The first interviews were conducted by Committee staff investigator Bob Taylor during his trip to Moscow on February 17th, 1992 with Senators Kerry and Smith and his subsequent visit on March 26-27, 1992 during the Joint Commission meetings. On those occasions, he succeeded in interviewing mostly retired senior Soviet officers who had served in Vietnam. The story that emerges from these interviews was that Soviet soldiers were forbidden to have any contact with American POWs, were not armed and did not take part in interrogations of American prisoners. However, this testimony was contradicted by one former colonel who said that the non-contact rule was not strictly practiced and others who admitted that they knew of a Soviet officer sitting behind a screen during an interrogation of an American. These sources added that questions to ask POWs were passed to the Vietnamese from higher Soviet commands. The Committee was also told that there was a Soviet Analytical Team in Hanoi which exploited the information learned from the interrogations.

Col. Gen. Vladimir Abramov, former Commander of the Soviet force in Vietnam, told the Committee in March that the Vietnamese provided him with a report on every American pilot captured. He said, however, that his office kept no files or records on the individual POWs. This information, however, may have been forwarded to Moscow, he thought.

During a second interview with Gen. Abramov on June 1, 1992, the General denied having told investigators during the earlier meeting that he had received a report on every American pilot captured in Vietnam. He also denied saying that a high-placed Vietnamese friend told him at a May 1975 reception in Vietnam that there were still American servicemen being held in Vietnam as that time.

Perhaps the clearest case in which Russian testimony changed during the course of the investigation came during a re-interview with Col. (ret) Gavriil Korotkov, who was stationed in Khabarovsk from 1950-54 and reported directly to the Commander of the Far East Military District. During the first interview with him, conducted on August 19th, 1992, he told five Joint Commission representatives that Soviet military specialists had been given approval to interrogate American servicemen in Korea and that some of the senior, more experienced Americans as well as those with specific

specialties were selected for transfer to the USSR for further interrogation. He asserted that the Soviet Naval Base at Posyet served as the transit point for the movement of Americans North [by rail or plane] to Khabarovsk. Col. Korotkov further maintained that the number of Americans processed through Khabarovsk was in the hundreds and that they were kept under KGB control during and after the interrogations.

He claimed not to know their fate after the interrogations. Col. Korotkov said he personally interrogated two American POWs on Russian soil. One was a Lt. Col. Black. Efforts were made, according to Col. Korotkov, to recruit and gain cooperation of Americans. He stated that interrogation reports were sent to the Far East Military District Headquarters, the 7th Directorate of the Main Political Directorate and the GRU. He further maintained that Col. Gen. Shtykov, the Soviet Ambassador to North Korea at the time, prepared reports for Stalin's eyes only.

In a follow-up interview, on September 29th, 1992, Col. Korotkov modified his previous statements. He now denied that American Korean War POWs were ever interrogated by Soviets in Khabarovsk. He categorically denied ever interrogating an American POW named Black but did admit to interrogating two American POWs in North Korea. He also asserted that there were between 10 and 25 Soviet interrogators involved in this process, indicating that a large number of American POWs may have been interrogated during the Korean War. Although not completely ruling out the fact that these interrogations may have taken place on Russian soil, he now maintained that the interrogation center existed for at least 18 months and was located at a non-demarcated juncture along the North Korean, Chinese and Soviet borders. He also declared that a 150 question questionnaire used to interrogate American Korean-war POWs was prepared in Khabarovsk. Col. Korotkov added that similar type questionnaires were used to interrogate American POWs during Vietnam. A possible explanation for the modifications in Col. Korotkov's statements is that he received a call the night before the interview from an official of the Foreign Intelligence Service (formerly the KGB).

On December 16, 1992, Col. Korotkov testified at a meeting of the Joint Commission that approximately 100 U.S. POWs were interrogated by Soviets during the Korean war era and that possibly "tens" of these were taken by the special forces to the Soviet Union. Col. Korotkov said that the Soviets tried "to get first-hand information from them and then to turn them."

According to Col. Korotkov, the Soviets employed fear, pressure and appeals to material interests in their effort to "turn" prisoners. He also said that it was common for the American prisoners to change their names and that it is likely some died in the Soviet Union under names different than their own.

Col. Korotkov characterized the Korean-era U.S. POWs with whom he came in contact as "great patriots" and said:

They were assured, cocky, convinced that someone would come and get them. Among the (Soviet) specialists, we discussed how difficult it was to work with the Americans. The tone of our conversation was that American were self-assured, they never gave up hope.

Additional testimony on these subjects was received from a number of other retired Soviet officers:

- Col. Aleksandr Semyonovich Orlov (Ret.), who was brought forward on the initiative of the Russian side of the Joint Commission. Col. Orlov said he had no knowledge of American POWs having been taken to the USSR. He did say, however, that he had received special MVD[KGB] permission to interview a certain LTC Black in Pyongyang in July, 1951 primarily for propaganda purposes. Col. Orlov acknowledged that questionnaires were routinely used in obtaining information from American POWs in Korea but that the interrogations were principally carried out by the North Koreans.
- Col. (ret.) Viktor Aleksandrovich Bushuyev, former intelligence analyst in North Korea with the 64th Air Defense Corps, told investigators that the Soviets had access to the interrogations of hundreds of American pilots. He claimed not to know if the Soviet officials had taken part in the actual interrogations.
- Col. (ret.) Georgiy Kuzmich Plotnikov, assistant Soviet military advisor to North Korea for 7 years, testified that a high-ranking North Korean officer told him in 1953 that some American POWs were sent to the Soviet Union. Moreover, he asserts that he personally interrogated a captured American captain from the 24th Infantry Regiment at a small POW camp on the Yalu River in 1952. Col. Plotnikov said that he conducted the interrogation while dressed in a North Korean major's uniform.
- Col. (ret.) Valeriy Ivanovich Ukolov, said in an interview that he witnessed an American pilot being captured in the Russian town of Port Arthur in the summer of 1952.
- Col. (ret.) Leonid Ivanovich Ambrosov, Chief of Staff of an anti-aircraft battalion in Vietnam from September 1965 to August 1966, stated that he had no knowledge of Russian participation in the questioning of American prisoners. He did say that the Russians may have provided some questions to the North Vietnamese to be asked of captured Americans. He does not know what happened to the resulting interrogation reports.

Walk-ins: A number of individuals have come voluntarily to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. Information provided by these individuals have included an account of an alleged American POW, David Markin, whose case is discussed later in this report. Other information has been provided by naturalized American citizens and by Russian citizens who had previously spent time in the GULAG. In addition, three Vietnamese nationals living in Moscow handed over dog tags, ID cards, photographs, bone fragments and body parts of alleged Americans. Two of the three did this out of humanitarian concern, while the third claimed to know where the remains of at least 20 Americans were located in Vietnam and asked \$75,000 for each set of remains. All of this material was turned over to American experts for verification and analysis.

Write-ins: Since June, 1992, approximately two dozen letters or telegrams have been received from citizens of the former Soviet Union. Many of the writers claim to have knowledge about Americans in Soviet prison camps or psychiatric hospitals. Others claim to have information about grave sites where Americans are allegedly buried. The writers are being contacted by members of the Commission for the purpose of obtaining additional data. Several have asked for guarantees or assurances from the highest authorities against recriminations before they speak with the Committee.

Recently, the flow of letters to the Commission has slowed to a trickle. This may be because publicity on the POW/MIA issue has died down or that all letters sent to the Joint Commission on American POW/MIAs are now initially screened by the Office of the President for Letters and Appointments.

Call-ins: Most of the call-ins received so far resulted from television programs on which Ambassador Toon, Gen. Volkogonov, and Committee representatives appeared. After the Toon-Volkogonov appearance on June 28, 1992, six people called the Ilyinka-12 "Hot Line." Likewise, several people called this number after Ambassador Toon's press conference in Khabarovsk on September 25, 1992. Committee representative Graham, TFR Moscow officer director Pusey and other POW/MIA team members have frequently appeared on TV in Moscow and other cities throughout the former Soviet Union asking those with information to call Ilyinka 12 or the Embassy. Newspaper advertisements have also resulted in call-ins with information.

#### Summary of Requests to the Russians

##### Correspondence Files

Correspondence has been sent to the Russian side of the Joint Commission since early September 1992. These letters serve two general purposes. The first is to provide the Russian side with specific data from the U.S. side on individual servicemen or the

circumstances surrounding Cold War incidents. The second is to request meetings, interviews with particular people or types of people, and access to archives. To date, requests for interviews with specific individuals have met with little or no success.

##### Archival Research

Structure of Russian Archives. The Archives in the former Soviet Union and Russia are not under the same kind of unified control that we have at the Federal level in the United States. Archives of the Soviet government could be found in a large number of archival institutions, and many of the main ministries kept their archives indefinitely in their own facilities and under separate departmental control.

The Soviet Union did have an archival agency which was supposed to have administrative control over archival institutions throughout the USSR. This agency was called the Main Archival Directorate or "Glavarkhiv." Even this body, however, did not secure control over the archives of such major ministries as the KGB, Foreign Affairs and Defense. After the August 1991 coup, President Yeltsin was quick to see the importance of securing the archival records and removed the leadership of "Glavarkhiv." In its place, he established the Committee of Archival Affairs of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, called "Roskomarkhiv," with control over various archival institutions, including the older bodies of imperial and pre-revolutionary archives. Some ministries, however, have remained outside its ambit and others have been slow to transfer records.

Visits and Trips to Archives. The U.S. members of the Joint Commission have made a series of visits to Russian archives to enable staff to better understand the structure of the archival system and to appraise the prospects for finding material relevant to the POW/MIA search.

It has become apparent to the American team that the archival institutions now coming under the administrative umbrella of Roskomarkhiv are more forthcoming and willing to cooperate than the officials who were responsible for the ministerial archives in the security and defense establishments. These older archives contain substantial amounts of material that might be relevant to the movement of American POWs from German camps into Soviet hands and Soviet territory in the closing days and the aftermath of World War II.

Archival Research Agreements. To ensure progress on all fronts, the Commission staff decided to seek the Russian archivists' help in exploiting these earlier records by entering into research agreements whereby staff archivists would be paid for working extra hours on the POW/MIA project. By late November, four research agreements had been approved and two of them were operative. These agreements cover the Central State Military Archives, the Central

Historical Documentary Collection, the Military-Medical Museum and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. All of the research agreements are for initial trial periods of either 60 or 90 days, after which the American side will evaluate results to determine whether continuation of the effort is justified.

#### Documents Requested

Among the kinds of documents that the U.S. has requested are:

**World War II.** Lists of Americans liberated from German POW camps and transported into Soviet territory, especially records that indicate medical treatment or death and burial, and records that indicate sentences for crimes, charges and conviction, and transportation to camps on Soviet territory.

**Cold War.** Reports of aircraft shootdown incidents, including rescue and retrieval operations, reports of sightings, interrogations, and treatment of air crews, recordings and films of shootdowns, log books plus any reports that may be discovered in files of political and diplomatic reaction to such incidents.

For the entire Cold War period, the U.S. has also sought, so far without success, access to records of psychiatric hospitals (or any hospitals under control of the KGB, MVD and predecessors) and those of prison and labor camps. In addition, there is a project underway to compare fingerprints from the FBI collection with those in the collection of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. With respect to the fingerprint files, high hopes have been reduced by the perception that in both collections such files are regularly purged of older records on actuarial terms. The U.S. seeks to have access to the records of the Border Guards for the entire Cold War period because such units may have played a significant role in shootdown incidents during the Cold War period.

**Korean War.** Any documents that indicate the role of Soviet civilian or military officials in the control, interrogation, or transportation of U.S. POWs wherever located, or in the shootdowns of U.S. aircraft during that conflict, or any documents in Russian files that contain information about control, interrogation, or transportation of U.S. POWs in North Korea or China.

**Vietnam War.** Any documents that indicate the role of Soviet military or civilian officials in the control, interrogation, or transportation of U.S. POWs wherever located, or in the shootdown of American aircraft during that conflict, or any documents in Russian files that contain information about control, interrogation, or transportation of U.S. POWs in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia or China.

#### Documents Received

Russian researchers have discovered relevant materials on the POW/MIA issue which they have released to the American side. Early in the process, Gen. Volkogonov and his aides released batches of materials during Joint Commission meetings. More recently, the flow of documents has increased and become more regular.

Documents received thus far from the Russians are too numerous and varied to be summarized effectively in this report. They are listed, analyzed and described in the series of reports printed bi-weekly by the U.S. Army's Task Force Russia, copies of which may be obtained by Members of Congress from the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for POW/MIA Affairs. In very general terms, the documents have concerned Americans of other than military origin who were caught up in the throes of World War II or who deserted or otherwise sought political refuge in the Soviet Union, as well as some lists of U.S. military men and some diplomatic exchanges concerning repatriation efforts or shootdowns. Little of this information has been new to the U.S. side.

Some documents, however, have provided new and useful information. For example, interrogation reports on American POWs which the Russians professed to have received from the Koreans revealed that at least ten men who were heretofore entirely unaccounted for lived long enough to be interrogated. Unfortunately, their fates have still not been determined.

#### Assessment of Archival Research

The following preliminary judgements can be made based on the Committee's review, thus far, of Russian archival documents:

- . Soviet archivists did an excellent job of record-keeping, and current research efforts have barely scratched the surface of what is potentially available throughout the vast archival system of the former Soviet Union. Even the strategic "fires" and other destructions that have taken place do not seriously detract from completeness;
- . The traditional archival community is ready and willing to respond to American inquiries, especially in return for fair compensation;
- . Officials of the Security and Defense Ministries are currently more resistant to U.S. inquiries, but this may change if the political situation becomes more stable;
- . The time schedule for gradual disclosure of information about American POW/MIAs may be determined as much by the internal political requirements of the Russian regime as by the needs of Americans for that information;

- . It could take many years to carry out a comprehensive program of research within the centralized and regional archives of the former Soviet Union, even if the political atmosphere is hospitable to such an effort;
- . The Russian archival material passed to the American side of the Joint Commission appears thus far to constitute a carefully-controlled release of information by the Russian government to convince the U.S. side that the Soviet Union did not capture, detain, interrogate, move or eliminate U.S. POW/MIAs.

#### POW/MIA Family Member Efforts in Russia

Committee and TFR representatives in Moscow have met with the relatives of several American POW/MIAs who might possibly have been on Russian territory at one time. The Committee/TFR staff also made arrangements for the family members to meet with Robert Strauss, U.S. Ambassador to Russia, and with Gen. Volkogonov and other Russian officials. The family members asked the Russian authorities to help find information on the fate of their loved one. TFR members also passed on correspondence from about two dozen individual family members requesting any additional documentation that the Russians may be able to find concerning their missing relatives.

#### Repatriation of U.S. Citizens Buried in Russia

The Committee notes that a report on the ABC television program "20/20" that four Americans are still buried in Odessa is not accurate. The remains of at least three, and possibly all four, of the individuals have been repatriated.

TFR is looking into the alleged existence of graves of American servicemen from World War II on Iturup Island in the Kuriles. Accordingly, correspondence has been sent to the Russian side requesting a check of the archives of the Far East Military District, the Pacific Fleet, the Central Army, the Foreign Intelligence Service and the Ministry of Interior [MVD] for any information on the location of U.S. graves.

#### Mutual Cooperation

The effort to find POW/MIAs is a two-way street. The United States Government may be able to overcome some of the reluctance of the Russian Security Services by addressing similar Russian POW/MIA issues where possible. The U.S. should strive to provide the Russians with more information from our records on Soviet MIAs from World War II, Cold War incidents and Afghanistan. Genuine reciprocity may lead to greater progress.

#### Russian Inquiries on Afghanistan Veterans

The Russian side has asked the American side for information concerning 19 former Soviet soldiers who served in Afghanistan and are currently living in the west, and for information on servicemen presently held captive in Afghanistan. In September, Ambassador Toon provided a document to the Russian side listing Soviet POWs from the Afghan War who resettled in the West.

#### Soviet Submarine Incident

The Russian side has also requested information on the fate of Soviet submarine 574 which sank in the Pacific Ocean in March of 1968. On September 21, 1992, Ambassador Toon handed over a document to the Russians listing three crew members from this submarine. Moreover, the CIA has provided the Russians with copies of a film made during the "Glomar Challenger's" raising of sections of this submarine in August of 1974.

#### The Case of "David Markin"

An individual named Viktor Pugantsev claimed to have spent 1982-1986 in labor camp PL-350/5 near Pechora (some 900 miles northeast of Moscow) with an alleged downed U.S. pilot from the Korean War called David Markin (Marken).

According to Mr. Pugantsev, Mr. Markin told him that he had been shot down about 40 years ago in North Korea, after which he and 50 other U.S. POWs were flown to the Soviet Union. According to the story, Mr. Markin spent the next three decades in one prison or psychiatric ward after another, ending up in PL350/5 in 1982. He was apparently sent to Soviet psychiatric hospitals when he told people he was an American. While there, he claimed to have been put in a straitjacket, given drugs such as aminazin and an unknown drug which caused his hands to "twist inward."

Mr. Pugantsev described the American as a tall, frail, polite, soft-spoken, psychologically-broken and stooped 60 year old, who had a shaven head, scars on his left shoulder and left forearm and a name tag on his prison uniform identifying him as "Markin, D." Although, Mr. Markin kept a low profile in camp, Mr. Pugantsev said he was treated worse than other prisoners and was harassed by guards for minor infractions like wearing his cap askew. Three such reprimands earned him a stay in the "solitary-confinement box" where, according to Mr. Pugantsev, he spent a good deal of time. Mr. Pugantsev maintained that Mr. Markin was still alive at the same camp in 1989.

The Committee and TFR personnel launched an intensive investigation into this matter despite the fact that no David Markin (or any close approximation) appeared on U.S. Government lists of unaccounted for from Korea. Commission investigators flew to

Pechora on June 18, 1992. No person or record found there confirmed Mr. Pugantsev's claims. After the disappointing trip to Pechora, Mr. Pugantsev identified another inmate, Vladimir Bageyev, who might be able to confirm his story. Committee investigator Graham flew with a Russian foreign service officer to the city of Elista to interview Mr. Bageyev. Mr. Bageyev confirmed that there was an individual by the name of Markin in Pechora and that this individual matched the description given by Mr. Pugantsev.

In response to this news, Gen. Volkogonov arranged to bring the Director of Operations for the Pechora camp to Moscow to meet face to face with Mr. Pugantsev to determine the truth. Although the meeting took place, the differences in the respective stories could not be resolved. During the course of the discussion, however, additional names of other inmates and camp officials who might be able to provide more information on this matter were disclosed. Seventeen individuals were identified, including 8 officers, 7 inmates and 2 doctors. Five of the eight camp officials provided virtually identical written statements to the effect that there were no Americans at PL350/5 during their tour there. U.S. investigators asked to see the camp hospital records because Mr. Pugantsev, Mr. Bageyev and Mr. Markin were reportedly in the hospital at the same time. The official reply to this request was that the records were destroyed in a fire that took place between August 30 and September 1, 1989.

At the Committee hearings in November, Gen. Volkogonov discounted Mr. Pugantsev's story and suggested that he was motivated by a desire to emigrate to America. Mr. Pugantsev, on the other hand, has told investigators that he has been harassed and threatened as a result of his testimony. He claims that he was summoned to appear at the Security Service [former KGB] office in his native town of Chernovtsy in the Ukraine and queried about his contact with the Moscow POW/MIA team members. According to Mr. Pugantsev, he was told "not to stick his nose where it did not belong." The Committee has continued concerns over reports pertaining to "David Markin."

#### Future Actions

#### Levels of Cooperation

The interview program pursued by the American side of the Joint Commission has been extremely pro-active while the Russian side's response has been reactionary at best. The U.S. side has received little response to correspondence requesting that specific individuals be made available for interviews. Part of this problem may be due to the fact that Gen. Volkogonov has only two assistants. It might expedite things greatly if the number of staff people on the Russian side were increased.

The level of cooperation from the Russian side has not met the standard of official statements. For example, a long-standing

request to interview 20 intelligence and security service [former KGB] officials who served during the Korean and Vietnamese War eras was made in early June. The request was kicked back and forth between Col. Kobaladze, the Bureau Chief for Public Affairs of the Russian Intelligence Service and Col. Mazurov, the Foreign Intelligence Service representative on the Joint Commission. Finally, after several months, Col. Kobaladze replied by expressing surprise that his superiors wished to answer a type of request that the CIA would not have. He then informed Committee investigators that of the 20 people we requested to interview four were dead, four were unlocate-able, six had no knowledge of American POWs, two worked for other agencies [MFA & MOD], another never worked for them, one was in England during the entire war effort, one could not be identified and one refused to be interviewed due to illness.

There are a number of other examples of a failure to provide basic information about individuals despite the fact that the information must be readily available to the Russian side. For months, the Russians said they were unable to provide information concerning one individual who, when finally located through U.S. efforts, was found to live scarcely a kilometer from the hotel where the TFR team is housed.

Media appeals for people with information on American POW/MIAs to come forward have also met with limited success. Due to doubts about long term political stability in the country, some citizens may feel reluctant to speak out. Several potential interview candidates have requested assurances and guarantees from the highest authorities before they would talk to investigators. Others may be afraid to become involved with foreigners, either because of the sensitive nature of their employment or because of a general apprehension based on what has happened in the past to Russians who had contacts with foreigners.

#### Trips and Visits

The Russian side has agreed to a 48-hour notice policy for on-site inspections of any camp or archive. Future plans are to visit those camps where Americans were reportedly held.

#### Planned Interviews

The interview program is critical to developing the body of evidence necessary to open the doors to the official records. Interviews, especially of retired officers, have provided the most lucrative source of new or significant information to date. One key to such an effort is publicity. Therefore, the United States needs to publicize widely the efforts of investigators and the desire to obtain additional information.

### Follow-up Action Leads

These include finding and interviewing several former KGB generals, military officers and pilots who are alleged to have been involved in or to have known about the possible transfer of American POW/MIAs during the Korean War and the war in Vietnam. It also may be worthwhile exploring if any of the ex-Republic archives, especially those dealing with KGB documents, might have been capped.

### Investigation of Individual Leads

With the break-up of the former USSR, many of the individuals who need to be interviewed and many of the archives of importance are now beyond Moscow's control. More time and effort should be placed on developing parallel programs in some of the other Republics. Moreover, since much of the information developed to date points to the KGB as the institution most likely to have been involved in arranging transfers and escorting Americans onto Soviet soil, the United States may want to look into which former Republic archives containing KGB records were capped after the coup and whether we can gain access to these records.

### Conclusions

#### Gen. Volkogonov's Assessment

Gen. Volkogonov contends that, to his knowledge, no Americans are currently being held against their will within the borders of the former Soviet Union.<sup>337</sup> Although the Committee has found evidence that some U.S. POWs were held in the former Soviet Union after WW II, the Korean War and Cold War incidents, we have found no proof that would contradict Gen. Volkogonov's contention with respect to the present. However, the Committee cannot, based on its investigation to date, rule out the possibility that one or more U.S. POWs from past wars or incidents are still being held somewhere within the borders of the former Soviet Union.

#### World War II

The Committee found that the Russians have been particularly successful in producing World War II archival documents, and is pleased to report that the fate of some American military and civilian personnel from the World War II era has been determined through recent investigations in Russia. Moreover, archival

<sup>337</sup> Gen. Volkogonov did not mean to include in this contention any Americans who might legitimately be under arrest for recent violations of civil or criminal law. For example, at the time of the Select Committee hearing, one American was under arrest for dealing in contraband religious icons.

documents provided by Russia indicate that several hundred U.S. POWs were held against their will on Soviet territory at the end of World War II. In almost all cases, these were individuals who had been born in, or who had previously lived in, the Soviet Union, and who could, therefore, be considered Soviet citizens by the Soviet Government. Many of these individuals served in the Armed Forces of Germany, fought against the Soviet Army and were captured in combat. Some U.S. civilians from this era survived terms in concentration camps and are still alive today, living freely either in one of the former Soviet Republics or in the United States.

#### Cold War

There is evidence, some of which has been confirmed to the Committee by President Yeltsin, that some U.S. personnel, still unaccounted for from the Cold War, were taken captive and held within the former Soviet Union. This information involves several incidents stretching across the former Soviet Union from the Baltic Sea to the Sea of Japan.

The Committee is pleased to report that Task Force Russia has been actively investigating these cases and is keeping surviving family members fully apprised of its progress to date. The Committee notes, however, that progress is, in large part, dependent on cooperation from Russian authorities. In the Committee's November, 1992 hearings, our investigator in Moscow testified that the U.S. was "intentionally being stonewalled" by the Russians on the subject of Cold War incidents, despite pledges of cooperation from President Yeltsin and Gen. Volkogonov. The Committee, therefore, urges the Joint Commission to place special attention and focus on obtaining further information on the fate of those U.S. personnel who are believed to have been taken captive during the Cold War.

#### Korean Conflict

There is strong evidence, both from archived U.S. intelligence reports and from recent interviews in Russia, that Soviet military and intelligence officials were involved in the interrogation of American POWs during the Korean Conflict, notwithstanding recent official statements from the Russian side that this did not happen. Additionally, the Committee has reviewed information and heard testimony which we believe constitutes strong evidence that some unaccounted for American POWs from the Korean Conflict were transferred to the former Soviet Union in the early 1950's. While the identity of these POWs has not yet been determined, the Committee notes that Task Force Russia concurs in our assessment concerning the transfers. We are pleased that this subject was raised by the U.S. side in December, 1992 at the plenary session of the Joint Commission in Moscow.

The Committee further believes it is possible that one or more POWs from the Korean Conflict could still be alive on the territory of

the former Soviet Union. The most notable case in this regard concerns a USAF pilot named David "Markham" or "Markin", who was reportedly shot down during the Korean Conflict. According to several sources, this pilot was reportedly alive in detention facilities in Russia as late as 1991. Although Task Force Russia has thus far been unable to confirm these reports, we note that the investigation is continuing.

#### Vietnam War

The Committee is aware of several reports that U.S. POWs may have been transferred to the Soviet Union during the Vietnam War. Information about this possibility that was provided by a former employee of the National Security Agency (NSA), Mr. Jerry Mooney, was thoroughly investigated and could not be substantiated. The Committee notes that Mr. Mooney testified that he personally believed prisoners were transferred to the Soviet Union but that he had "no direct information" that this took place.<sup>338</sup> Other reports concerning the possibility that U.S. POWs were transferred from Vietnam to the former Soviet Union deserve further investigation and followup.

With respect to interrogations, the Committee has confirmed that one KGB officer participated directly in the questioning of an American POW during the Vietnam Conflict. More generally, Soviet military officers have told the Committee that they received intelligence from North Vietnamese interrogations of American POWs and that the Soviets "participated" in interrogations through the preparation of questions and through their presence during some of the interrogations. It is possible that American POWs would not have been aware of the presence of Soviet officers during these interrogations. The Committee has also received information that Soviet personnel operated certain SAM sites in Vietnam which shot down American aircraft during the war.

The Committee notes that the cooperation received to date from Russia on POW/MIA matters has been due largely to the leadership of President Boris Yeltsin. During a visit to Washington last summer, President Yeltsin declared that "each and every document in each and every archive will be examined to investigate the fate of every American unaccounted for." Although there is still much work to be done, Russian officials deserve credit for providing access to archival material, for cooperating in efforts to solicit testimony from Russian veterans and other citizens and for their willingness to disclose certain previously undisclosed aspects of the historical record. The ultimate success of the Joint Commission will be judged, however, on whether the U.S. side is able to obtain full support for its interview program and archival research from

<sup>338</sup>Committee hearing, Jan. 22, 1992

all levels of power and authority throughout the former Soviet Union.

President Yeltsin has made a heroic effort to demonstrate his own commitment to full cooperation and Gen. Volkogonov has done a great deal, with limited resources, to meet this standard. Unfortunately, the level of cooperation from within the Russian military and intelligence bureaucracy has been less extensive and has, at times, seemed intentionally obstructive. This may well be due to the uncertainty of the current political situation in Russia. It is vital, therefore, that U.S. officials, both in Congress and the Executive branch, continue to demonstrate to Russian authorities that America attaches a high priority to cooperation on this issue and to ensure that any problems that might develop are raised with the Russians promptly and at a senior level.

The Committee also recommends strongly that the U.S.-Russia Joint Commission be continued and that efforts be made to gain the full cooperation, as needed and appropriate, of the other Republics of the former Soviet Union.

#### Information from North Korea and China

As part of the Committee's investigation into the fate of those Americans still missing from the Korean Conflict, the Committee Vice-Chairman traveled to Pyongyang, North Korea from December 19-21, 1992. This trip was especially significant in that it was the first time a United States Senator had traveled to the North Korean capital. Also, for the first time, a State Department official traveled with Senator Smith to Pyongyang, in addition to two staff members working with the Committee. The trip itself was a follow-on to an earlier trip made by Senator Smith to Korea in June, 1991.

The timing of the trip was important in that just a few weeks earlier, the Committee had held the first in-depth Congressional hearings on American POW/MIAs from the Korean Conflict in more than 35 years. In view of the fact that the North Korean Government has provided virtually no information on 8,177 unaccounted for Americans in the last 40 years,<sup>339</sup> the goal of the trip was to establish a dialogue which would encourage North Korea to move the accounting process forward on a humanitarian basis. A second goal of the fact-finding trip was to gain information from North Korea on reports which had surfaced during the Committee's November hearings on the fate of some American POWs.

The Committee is pleased to report that Senator Smith was successful in achieving both of these goals during the trip.

<sup>339</sup> The Committee notes, however, that over the past two and one-half years, North Korea has repatriated the remains of 41 American servicemen.

Meetings were held with Supreme Assembly Speaker Yang Hyong Sop, Deputy Foreign Minister Kang Sok Ju, and a staff of ministry officials who appeared knowledgeable on POW/MIA issues. The atmosphere was cooperative and it was the sense of Senator Smith and his delegation that North Korea is prepared and willing to move forward on this humanitarian issue without any preconditions. As a sign of good faith, the North Koreans allowed Senator Smith and his delegation to visit their war museum in Pyongyang, although the request had been made only hours earlier. This was the first time any American official had visited the museum. At the museum, Senator Smith was able to view photographs of POWs, documents, letters, personal effects and captured weaponry from U.S. servicemen. Senator Smith's delegation was also permitted to photograph and take notes concerning many of the items in the museum. Important new information was also learned from North Korean officials concerning China's involvement with American POWs.

The principal Committee findings and recommendations concerning this trip are:

Although the North Korean officials with whom Senator Smith met denied that any American POWs had survived to the present day in North Korea, the Committee cannot exclude the possibility in view of intelligence information which has been received by the United States in recent years. Specifically, the Committee shares Senator Smith's frustration during his trip at not being able to investigate unconfirmed reports that a small number of American POWs may be teaching English at a military language school on the outskirts of Pyongyang. The Committee, therefore, urges the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to cooperate fully in the investigation of these recent reports, in addition to other live-sighting reports which have been received by the United States during the last few decades.

It is likely that a large number of possible MIA remains can be repatriated and several records and documents on unaccounted for POWs and MIAs can be provided from North Korea once a joint working level commission is set up under the leadership of the United States. Accordingly, the Committee strongly urges the Departments of State and Defense to take immediate steps to form this commission through the United Nations Command at Panmunjom, Korea. The Committee also encourages President-elect Clinton, upon taking office, to appoint a high level representative to sit on the commission. The Committee further believes that the proposed joint commission should have a strictly humanitarian mission and should not be tied to political developments on the Korean peninsula.

Comments made by North Korean officials during the trip substantiated indications that many American POWs had been

held in China during the Korean Conflict and that foreign POW camps in both China and North Korea were run by Chinese officials. In addition, North Korean officials confirmed that propaganda photos showing POW camps with large numbers of U.S. personnel had, in fact, been taken in China, not in North Korea as purported by the propaganda publications. The Committee notes that other information from both high level Russian intelligence sources and from several U.S. intelligence reports corroborate the comments made by the North Koreans.

Given the fact that only 26 Army and 15 Air Force personnel returned from China following the war, the Committee can now firmly conclude that the People's Republic of China surely has information on the fate of other unaccounted for American POWs. The Committee, therefore, strongly urges the Departments of State and Defense to form a POW/MIA task force on China similar to Task Force Russia. The Committee also strongly urges the Department of State to raise this matter at the highest levels in Beijing. In this regard, we are pleased that the first round of talks was held in January, 1993. We believe that a proposed POW Task Force on China will need to have several additional rounds of talks with the Chinese in order to search for and receive POW information in China over the coming months.

For the surviving families of those Americans still missing from the Korean Conflict, the perception has been that determining the fate of their loved ones is a task that has not been vigorously pursued by their government. We note that this perception has been fueled by past intransigence and lack of information from North Korea and China. In addition, accounting for POWs and MIAs from the Vietnam Conflict has received far greater media attention in America. The Committee can therefore understand why the Korean Conflict has often been labeled the "Forgotten War" by veterans and POW/MIA family members.

However, in view of the Vice-Chairman's recent trip to North Korea, the Committee believes that a dramatic breakthrough has been achieved in terms of establishing a dialogue and gaining access to new information on POWs and MIAs. Consequently, there is now a window of opportunity which the Committee believes should be fully exploited by the United States on behalf of the families of those Americans still missing from the Korean Conflict.

## CONCLUSIONS AND A LOOK AHEAD

The U.S. Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs has accomplished most of the goals and tasks that were assigned to it by the U.S. Senate at its creation. However, as with any assignment to review matters occurring over a 20-year period and involving thousands of individuals, there remain areas of inquiry that still must be completed. These areas fall into the following broad categories:

### Chapter 10

### Retrospective

#### Russia

The Committee recommends that the U.S./Russia Commission continue to pursue those leads which involve the countries of the former Soviet Union, including, but not limited to:

- . Interview Vladimir Churkov, head of the KGB 6th Division (Southeast Asia) during the mid- to late-1970s. It was General Kalugin's testimony that Gen. Churkov would be the most knowledgeable individual as to whether U.S. POWs were held in Vietnam after 1973. The Senate Select Committee has not been able to obtain an interview with Gen. Churkov.
- . Re-evaluate the testimony of General Kalugin versus the testimony of Oleg Nechiporenko. Gen. Kalugin testified at his deposition that U.S. POWs in Vietnam were interviewed by KGB agents (Nechiporenko) after 1973 and possibly as late as 1976. Oleg Nechiporenko told Senators Kerry and Smith in Moscow that he interviewed a POW in 1973. He also said he prepared a questionnaire for use by the Vietnamese. Both the CIA and the Vietnamese confirmed the KGB interrogation of the CIA agent.
- . Interview the Soviet Ambassador to Laos (1973). Gen. Kalugin testified that this Soviet Ambassador was very knowledgeable about this matter. He stated that if such POWs were kept, the Soviet Ambassador would almost certainly have known. The Senate Select Committee has been unable to schedule an interview with the Ambassador.
- . Continued pursuit of the KGB, GRU and Soviet Military Archival records. The records of these organizations, if made available to the U.S., will assist in finally determining whether any Vietnam-era POWs were taken to the former USSR.

#### Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia

The Committee recognizes that many answers to the questions it posed this year lay in Southeast Asia and recommends that the Department of State, the Department of Defense and the Joint Task Force for Full Accounting (JTF-FA) continue to work with the

governments of these countries to find answers. These matters should include:

- . The continued pursuit and evaluation of information from the Vietnamese archives;
- . The continued pursuit and evaluation of information from and about Lao official records
- . Interviews of former Pathet Lao leader Prince Souphanouvong and former Pathet Lao spokesman Soth Petrasy concerning their war-time statements that they (Pathet Lao) were holding U.S. POWs in Laos. The Senate Select Committee was unable to obtain permission from Prince Souphanouvong or from Mr. Petrasy for an interview. Neither individual felt able at this time to add to the statements they had already made.
- . Access to and evaluation of the information available on Lima Site 85. The Senate Select Committee was unable to obtain Lao permission for JTF-FA to examine the site of this incident. The Lao military commanders who are knowledgeable about the fate of the Americans who were present when the intelligence site was overrun should be interviewed.

#### China and North Korea

The Committee recognizes that the Governments of China and North Korea continue to hold information concerning the fates of U.S. servicemen. The Committee recommends the following:

- . Continued pursuit of information from museums, archives and government officials in North Korea that was begun by the Committee;
- . The formation of a commission similar to the U.S./Russia Commission to work with the Government of China;
- . The formation of a commission similar to the U.S./Russia Commission to work with the Government of North Korea.

#### The Department of Defense

The Committee recognizes the accomplishments of the Department of Defense but also recommends the following areas of continued pursuit:

- . Continuation of the JTF-FA approach to information gathering in Southeast Asia;
- . Declassification and release to the public (in cooperation with Garwood's attorneys) of all records that relate to PFC Robert Garwood;

- . Full analysis of the Operation Homecoming debriefs. The debriefs should be reexamined to answer finally and with absolute certainty that no POWs remain unaccounted for who were in the prison system. The Senate Select Committee was not allowed to do an independent examination of the debriefs because of promises made to returning POWs by DoD at Homecoming.

- . Interview of former South Vietnamese President Thieu. President Thieu should be interviewed to determine how much information the South Vietnamese military intelligence had concerning American POWs in both North Vietnam and Laos.

- . Continued analysis and evaluation of the 4500(+) photos received from the Government of Vietnam;

- . Continued analysis and evaluation of all material received from the Vietnamese archives;

- . Continued support of the Vessey initiatives.

#### Inter-Agency Group

The Committee believes that an inter-agency coordinating body for POW/MIA policies is needed and that the IAG for POW/MIA Affairs ably fulfills this role. However, the Committee is disturbed by the lack of formality in IAG record-keeping and believes that, at a minimum, that the minutes of discussions at such meetings should be maintained.

In addition, although the IAG should consult regularly with the League and other POW/MIA family organizations, the Committee believes that the role of the IAG and issues of membership on it should be reviewed by the new Administration.

#### Department of Justice

The Department of Justice was very supportive of the Committee and was able to accommodate almost all of its requests. There are areas, however, which will require continued independent investigation, such as:

- . Evaluation of previous referrals from the Committee to the Department of Justice to assess the appropriateness for prosecutions of fraud cases;

- . Review of the materials to be provided to the Department of Justice from the December Oversight hearing;

- . Evaluation of any new referrals coming at the end of the Committee life.

### Watergate Tapes

The Committee was denied access to the Watergate tapes and strongly believes it is in the public interest that Congress pursue that information.

### Progress on Declassification

All records used by the Committee in the Office of Senate Security (U.S.-407) have been declassified, except for National Security Agency records<sup>73</sup>; these are to be declassified soon, according to the NU.S.A.<sup>74</sup>

Approximately one-sixth of the 1.5 million pages of material ordered declassified by the 1991 McCain Amendment to the DoD Authorization had been declassified by publication date. That law gave DoD until November 1994 to establish libraries of POW/MIA information correlated to unaccounted-for servicemen for their families, and a library of uncorrelated information for all concerned citizens.

### Information about the Committee

Copies of the Committee Report and hearing transcripts will be available from the Government Printing Office beginning in February 1993. They also are available through the U.S. Government Depository Libraries located at most colleges and listed in the attached directory.<sup>75</sup>

Non-published Committee records will be available to the public through the National Archives beginning in early February 1993. These include staff materials, memoranda of conversation, notes and other documents that may include incorrect data, discredited theories, incomplete pieces of information, or staff opinion, however; the Committee's judgments, after consideration of all evidence available to United States Senators, is reflected in this Report.

Other information and judgments should not be accorded credibility simply because of its presence in the Committee's working files; the staff was structured to provide the Committee's Members with the strongest arguments on all sides of each issue, and their comments must be taken in toto.

---

<sup>73</sup>CDO letter to Committee, Dec. \_\_\_\_, 1992

<sup>74</sup>NSA letter to Committee, Dec. \_\_\_\_, 1992

<sup>75</sup>Directory of U.S. Government Depository Libraries

**MEMBERS' FLOOR STATEMENTS**

Some of the statements Committee members made on the Senate floor are appended. For statements made after publication date, please check the Congressional Record.

**Annex**

**Members' Floor Statements**

STATEMENT OF JOHN KERRY, CHAIRMAN  
SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON POW/MIA AFFAIRS  
JANUARY 25, 1993

On January 13, after more than a year's work and investigation, the Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs released its final report.

That report did not resolve fully the POW/MIA issue, nor was it intended to. But I believe that it, and the body of the Committee's work, have done much to heal the wounds of distrust and division that have characterized this controversy for 20 years.

The Members of the POW/MIA Committee are of differing backgrounds, temperaments and ideologies. Some Members had devoted years of effort to studying POW/MIA matters; others had only a general familiarity with the issue. Some came to the issue with emotions forged in the personal experience of service in Vietnam; one was a former POW.

If anyone had predicted at the outset that these eleven men and one woman would come together at the end of fourteen months to add their names to a single document on this most emotional and controversial of issues, that person would not have been believed. And, in fact, our investigation was characterized, at times, by sharp disagreement about fact, focus and process. Up until the very end, there was a possibility that we would not agree on the final report. And that report does cite a lack of unanimity on a few significant issues.

But I am convinced that the final product of this Committee's work reflects the combined strengths of its Members, and that we were able to transform our differences of perspective into a tool for digging out the truth.

There is not a single significant finding or recommendation in the report that was not subject, at some point, to challenge or questioning from within the Committee. Key sections were the subjects of lengthy debate. Any thesis that could not stand up in the face of evidence gathered by the Committee was excluded; and only those findings that could be supported, after consideration of all available information, were left in.

The result is a report that I believe is as close to the full truth as we could hope to come. Because we were so demanding, and because POW/MIA family members and activist groups were so demanding about declassification, this report reflects the sum total of what the US Government knows about the POW/MIA issue, particularly as it relates to the Vietnam era. No longer can anyone fairly claim that knowledge on this issue has been locked away; or that there exists a conspiracy of silence; or that the basic parameters of truth are in doubt.

We know, as a result of our investigation, that there were not 2,264 Americans whose fates were truly unknown following the Vietnam War. This is the number of Americans who went to Southeast Asia and who have not returned either alive or dead. But we know that the vast majority of those Americans died during the war--pilots who crashed over water, soldiers injured beyond recognition in combat, servicemen buried in graves that were subsequently destroyed by allied bombing, airmen killed in the remote jungles of Laos or Cambodia. For most of these 2,264, although there is not proof positive in the form of a body that they are dead, there is also absolutely no evidence that they survived or were taken captive.

For a small number of these 2,264 Americans, perhaps around 100, the story is somewhat different. In some cases, individuals were known to have been taken captive. Others were known to have survived crashes and to be alive on the ground. Others disappeared in circumstances where the possibility of survival and capture was very real. Even here, however, the number of Americans known for certain to have been taken captive is quite small and--in some of these cases--there are indications that the individual may have died or been killed at the time of their incidents.

Although the Committee, unlike previous investigations, uncovered evidence that a small number of Americans may have survived in captivity after Operation Homecoming, there is, in my view, no reason to believe that any Americans remain alive today. Yes, the possibility exists that a prisoner or prisoners could be held deep within a jungle or behind a locked door under conditions of greatest security. But there is no evidence of that, and it is hard to conceive of a reason for it. Moreover, the nations of Vietnam and Laos are becoming more and more open. Foreign businessmen, diplomats, tourists and aid workers have poured into both countries, especially Vietnam. But neither these foreigners, nor any of the thousands of individuals who have worked in the Lao or Vietnamese prison systems have come forward with a confirmed report that an American not yet accounted for is being held alive. Moreover, the Select Committee conducted an exhaustive review of files, records, photographs and other materials without developing a single, solid lead indicating that an American is currently being held in captivity. We are operating, and we should continue to operate, on the presumption that one or more Americans may still be held alive; but we cannot say that we have found evidence in the form of live-sighting reports, signals or imagery intelligence or other sources that make us optimistic about that possibility today.

Although we have reached some important conclusions based on our own analysis of the evidence, the Select Committee was not intended to serve as final judge and jury of the POW/MIA issue. Our principal task was to get the facts on the table so the American people could decide for themselves. That's why we put such an emphasis on declassification, it's why we insisted on

open, public hearings; and it's why we have included such a wealth of information in our report. It is inevitable that different people will view the data differently. The important thing, however, is that the information is now available; and that a process for following up effectively on this and possible future revelations is in place.

It is ironic--and revealing--that more Americans are now officially working on the POW/MIA issue than at any time since the end of the war. According to figures received by the Committee, the Defense Department is now spending \$100 million annually on the problem. Teams of investigators are based in Hanoi and Bangkok and are increasingly being granted access to Laos, as well.

The fact is that we can do more now because we are being allowed to do more now. Particularly over the past 12 months, there have been dramatic improvements in the level of cooperation from Vietnam. I personally find little mystery in Vietnam's motive for this cooperation, for it is clearly in their best interests to establish economic and political ties to the west now that their allies and trading partners within the old Soviet bloc have disappeared. Obviously, current cooperation does not erase the memory of 20 years of broken promises, noncooperation and outright lies. But we remove the incentive for the Vietnamese to change if we refuse to recognize change when it occurs. And the evidence that there has been real change in the area of POW/MIA cooperation is abundant. Within the past year, Vietnam has given:

- o permission for U.S. investigators to carry out short-notice investigations of many live-sighting reports;

- o permission for U.S. investigators to use U.S.-owned, maintained and operated helicopters in the course of investigations within Vietnam;

- o grants of access to certain highly-secure prison and defense ministry buildings for the purpose of investigating live-sighting reports;

- o guarantees of full access for U.S. investigators to political and military archives containing POW/MIA related information;

- o access to certain key archival documents and personnel that had been long-requested, and long-denied by Vietnam;

- o access to thousands of photographs of American wartime casualties;

- o access to Vietnam's military museum, including hundreds of material objects once owned by American servicemen that might contain clues about the fate of missing Americans;

- o amnesty for any Vietnamese citizens illegally holding American remains who come forward with them;

- o a commitment to cooperate in the conduct of an "oral history" program that would seek to record information from Vietnamese military officials, soldiers and civilians who might have information about the fate of missing Americans;

- o promises of full cooperation from Vietnam in working with Laos and Cambodia to investigate discrepancy cases involving servicemen lost in parts of those countries controlled by North Vietnamese forces during the war; and

- o permission for POW/MIA families, if they so desire, to come to Vietnam and evaluate the investigation process.

Although some have dismissed the significance of these recent developments, the fact is that there is little left for us to ask of Vietnam that we have not already been granted or promised. Obviously, we cannot, given the history, simply take Vietnam at its word. We must insist that the promises that have been made will be kept. But I personally believe that--if those promises are kept, and if we maintain our own commitment to the issue--we are now on track with a process of accountability, investigation and cooperation that will resolve the POW/MIA issue to the best of our ability to do so.

In this connection, I think it is particularly helpful when representatives of veterans groups and the POW/MIA families are able to visit Southeast Asia and talk directly to the leaders of the governments involved. The Vietnamese have made it clear that they welcome such visits and that they believe it is useful for those directly affected to be in a position to understand and evaluate the investigatory efforts now being made.

Because of certain controversies that arose while our Committee was drafting its report, one additional point needs to be made. The POW/MIA issue should be above partisanship. The Americans who are missing did not risk their lives for a political party, but for a country. The process of investigating their fate becomes invalid if we allow it to be colored by concerns of party affiliation or historical reputation. Moreover, the two major political parties contributed amply and in roughly equal measure to the decisions, deceptions and divisions of the wartime period.

Four years ago, in his Inaugural Address, former President Bush said that:

Our great political parties have too often been far apart and untrusting of each other. It's been this way since Vietnam. That war cleaves us still. But, friends, that war began in earnest a quarter of a century ago; and, surely, the Statute of Limitations has been reached. This is a fact: the final lesson of Vietnam is

Ret

that no great nation can afford to be sundered by a memory.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BOB SMITH

The recent campaign demonstrated how hard it is--even for the former President--to live up to those sentiments, but also how important it is that we do so. Our nation faces a multitude of challenges today at home and abroad. How well and how aggressively we respond to these challenges has nothing to do with the divisions of generation and outlook that characterized our nation a quarter century ago; and everything to do with our ability now to pull together in a single direction.

The Select Committee's unanimous report is an indication of what is possible when diverse Americans focus on what is agreed rather than what divides; and on future recommendations, rather than past rationalizations.

As Chairman of the Select Committee, I am proud of the Committee's work and proud of its staff and Members. The POW/MIA issue has not been resolved, but the ball has been advanced far down the field. The families of those missing, not only from Vietnam, but from previous conflicts, have reason to believe that their government is now doing what it should to find out what it can.

I am personally grateful to all those who served on the Committee, Vice-Chairman Bob Smith, and Senators Hank Brown, Tom Daschle, Chuck Grassley, Jesse Helms, Nancy Kassebaum, Bob Kerrey, Herb Kohl, John McCain, Harry Reid and Chuck Robb. I do not know of a Committee that has worked harder or with greater commitment than this one. The conclusion of the Committee does not mean that we will cease working together to see that remaining POW/MIA work is done--either by the Executive branch or through appropriate Congressional oversight. Our commitment continues even if the Committee does not.

Finally, I must close with a tribute to the POW/MIA families. They are, at bottom, what this investigation has been all about. Their persistence through years of partial neglect and inexcusable secrecy, has been validated by the work of the Select Committee. They said there was more to the story than had previously been told and they were right. Even more important, their dedication to finding the truth about their loved ones reflects something very deep and very good about the human character. Let no one ever be blamed for believing in his or her heart that the conventional wisdom is wrong. It is, after all, the questioners, not the complacent, who advance our state of knowledge; and those who remember, even when the memories are painful, who keep honor and loyalty before us all our lives.

Let me begin by thanking the staff, who -- in the closing days of this investigation have really been tough people staying up all night until the wee hours of the morning trying to get documents typed and accomodating the views of Senators.

There have been some difficult times throughout the course of this investigation, and I want to single out two members of the opposition party, who in extremely difficult times, did seek me out and talk to me. One is Harry Reid and the other is Tom Daschle who sat next to me throughout the hearings. I appreciate their advice during the more challenging and trying moments in our investigation.

And of course, to the chairman -- John Kerry and I were thrown together by the discretion of our leaders. We did not know each other, and we took the time to try to get to know each other. And the interesting thing is when things got very difficult, and many times they did, we turned to each other, not against each other. Have we had differences, yes, we have. The American people have had differences.

But when it came down to getting a report written, nobody threatened to walk out. We extended our hands to each other and we shook hands and we were able to do it. And Senator Kerry deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the fact that we were able to come to this agreement that we have today.

Is every single thing in the report what I would have written myself? Of course not. But where there were differences, I had the opportunity to express those differences in the report. You cannot be any fairer than that. And I commend the chairman for his strong leadership in getting us to this point.

This investigation was bipartisan, indeed non-partisan, throughout the last year. Members did not sit at one side or another at the hearings depending on their party affiliation. There was absolutely not one word uttered of partisanship throughout all the hearings, public and private. The private conversations, informal procedures, I never heard a word of partisan debate on the central issues in our investigation.

Our work represents the most comprehensive investigation that was ever done in the history of this issue, and hopefully that will be our legacy. In fact, we started by reviewing other investigations that have been done in the past, and we built upon those.

Our goal was to know what our own government knew, and to get that out to the American people. We did not and could not

expect to get all of the answers from the Vietnamese or the Lao or any other government. But we could expect to get information from our government, and I believe we've done that to the greatest extent possible during the last year.

Hearing records, depositions, government documents, extensive declassification -- that is our legacy. The President of the United States, George Bush, and especially Brent Scowcroft, Dick Cheney, and Robert Gates were extremely cooperative. They went out of their way to make documents available to us that had never before been seen by Members of Congress.

Did we see everything? Was it complete? We certainly believe the review of materials was extensive, although there will always be doubt on whether we saw everything that was truly pertinent to resolving our questions.

Americans can take pride in the fact that this issue has now been opened to scrutiny, more so than at any time in the last 40 years. We did not close the books. We opened the books.

This committee was formed because there was distrust. We tried to allay that distrust by getting the books opened. The issue has been an emotional and a contentious one for the past 20 years in Vietnam, and longer than that in Korea and the Cold War. It has been contentious and emotional for veterans and families, and it was contentious and emotional for the committee members as well.

I would like to briefly lay out some observations on key areas in our report:

1. Paris Peace Accords -- We are here today because Vietnam and Laos did not fully comply with the Paris Accords and the Laos Cease-Fire Agreement in 1973. That is the primary reason we are here. If they had complied fully, I think the issue would have been resolved, and we would not be here 20 years later. We are also here today because in 1973, Americans had become weary with the war, there were anti-war protests, Congress voted to cut off funds and it did not support legislation such as the Dole Amendment. We are also here today because by March, 1973, Watergate was consuming the attention of the President. In this framework, I am convinced Dr. Kissinger tried his best to negotiate an agreement and implement accords with an intransigent enemy who exploited the American political situation. And they did it well.

So, in this environment, did we get a full accounting? The answer is no. But there is no doubt that everyone is united today in demanding the fullest possible accounting from Vietnam and Laos.

2. State of the Evidence on POWs in S.E. Asia -- This was the most contentious area of the investigation. We knew it would be contentious, so we tried to conduct the most thorough examination of the intelligence ever done to see if consensus could be reached on the question of evidence of live POWs after 1973. Staff investigators worked thousands of man hours investigating every single available lead that we could find. For the most part, we were successful in pursuing the majority of leads. The exceptions are noted in the report.

Based on our review of all available intelligence information, the Committee unanimously agreed that there is evidence that indicates the possibility of survival (of American POWs) after Operation Homecoming. As of today, we also agree that there is evidence that some POWs may have survived to the present...and some information still remains to be investigated. However, at this time, there is no compelling evidence that proves Americans are still alive.

In the Final Report, readers will note that there is a majority and minority view on the state of some of the evidence which the Committee explored -- mainly the live-sighting reports analyzed by our investigators using basic techniques such as plotting relevant sightings on a map to look for patterns and clusters. These reports and the analysis by Committee staff will be available for the public at the National Archives.

The essence of the minority view on this portion of the investigation is that the Committee staff analysis indicates to me and to Senator Grassley a strong possibility that some American POWs could still be alive. I would also stress that my conclusion on the intelligence is based on all-source information, to include signals intelligence, imagery, and the live-sighting/hearsay reports. I also agree with Senator Grassley that in the case of one possible symbol which corresponds to a known MIA's authenticator number, the benefit of doubt should go in favor of the individual. This case is especially disturbing in view of the fact that the possible symbol is located only 400 feet from a secure detention facility in northern Vietnam.

Finally, concerning intelligence reports which have not yet been fully investigated in Vietnam or Laos, the question we were faced with as Members is "What do you believe?" It is my judgement that many of the live-sighting reports of Americans in captivity are compelling and appear credible. The sheer volume of this evidence cannot be summarily dismissed when one considers the fact that in Laos alone, we have not visited any detention facilities.

I also find the live-sightings from Robert Garwood who returned from Vietnam in 1979 to be very credible. Even the Vietnamese have confirmed many of the details concerning Garwood's movement and prison visits in northern Vietnam, to

include his work in 1977 to repair a generator at a prison complex in Thach Ba Lake on the outskirts of Hanoi. In typical fashion, I believe DIA used pending convictions against Garwood upon his return to the U.S. as a basis for discrediting his reports about other American POWs. They have also consistently stated, as recently as June, 1992, that no such prison as Garwood described at Thach Ba Lake ever existed, even though the Vietnamese have confirmed Garwood's description of the facility. These actions by DIA have often been referred to as the "mindset to debunk" possible information on live American POWs.

3. Defense Intelligence Agency -- As noted in the Executive Summary, several Members of the Committee, including the Chairman and myself, have formally expressed our concern that some individuals involved with DIA's POW/MIA activities have, on occasion, been evasive, unresponsive, and disturbingly cavalier. I hope that this situation will be reviewed by the new Administration to ensure that we have dedicated personnel who are objectively committed to finding the truth about our POWs and MIAs.

4. Past Wars -- The public should realize that the findings of the Committee concerning evidence of Korean War POWs who did not return contradicts statements by U.S. Government officials in recent years that there was no evidence to suggest POWs from these wars did not come home. The Committee found strong evidence that some American POWs were transferred to the Soviet Union during the Korean War. The Committee has also firmly concluded that China surely has information on the fate of unaccounted for POWs from the Korean War.

Finally, based on its investigation and review of intelligence information, the Committee cannot rule out the possibility that one or more POWs could still be held against their will in North Korea and on the territory of the former Soviet Union. Concerning the Cold War, it is important to note that the evidence is convincing that some unaccounted for American servicemen lost during the Cold War were actually captured and held in the Soviet Union. Their fates are unknown. We are hopeful that a continuation of the U.S./Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIAs along with the very recent increased level of cooperation from North Korea and China will result in answers to these questions.

5. Vietnam and Laos -- The Executive Summary describes in detail the overall judgement of the Committee concerning the level of cooperation on POW/MIA matters from Vietnam and Laos. We are pleased with recent cooperative efforts by Vietnam, although disappointed that it took 20 years to get to this point. In Laos, we are disappointed by what we believe is a general lack of access to allow investigation of live-sighting reports and discrepancy cases. We strongly encourage Lao leaders to match the new level of cooperation our investigators are now experiencing in Vietnam.

6. Families -- Certainly the families of unaccounted for POWs and MIAs have had the most at stake following past military conflicts. They have literally been on a rollercoaster ride perpetrated by a historical lack of cooperation from Communist governments and difficulty in securing information from our own government. It these families that have consistently motivated me during the last 8 years to help them in their search for answers. "Not Knowing" and uncertainty can be even more difficult than knowing that death of a loved one has occurred. We rightly pay tribute to these families in our Final Report. Moreover, we have urged our government to centralize and declassify POW/MIA records to ensure families and the public have access to what our Government knows.

The Committee has worked tirelessly during the past year to open this issue to the American public so together we can all try to seek the truth on our POWs and MIAs. We owe no less to those who make the ultimate sacrifices on behalf of their nation's freedom, as well as to their families and their comrades who fought with them.