

in the Hoa Hao—my wife, I should mention, was teaching there at the Hoa Hao Buddhist University in Long Xuyen for 1 year—it appeared that local accommodations had been made, in return for Communist respect for the essential autonomy and self-government of the Hoa Hao.

Now, as you say, since there has been so little mention of them, since the spring of 1975, it raises a question in my mind whether that original wartime agreement has been respected, given the Communist propensity to want to consolidate central control, one of course has a doubt.

The important thing from the perspective of human rights, though, is, if they have moved against the Hoa Hao in some sense to try to incorporate them more into the national community, how? I don't know. I haven't the slightest idea. The case with the Cao Dai is more complex. They were perhaps more politically divided internally. There were groups of them that had accommodated quite well some time ago with the revolution.

I also had friends in that group that viewed the oncoming victory with neither trepidation nor affection, but again, we have heard very little about them.

Mr. DERWINSKI. In other words, going back to your own statement here, the total lack of information, you interpret to mean merely that things are quiet with these sects as opposed to my possible interpretation that they have had the iron hand descend upon them.

Mr. TURLEY. Well, I think if one is going to guess, you want to know, first of all, how are these groups likely to act in the present situation, and second of all, given the record of the past, how is the government likely to handle what they do? And I think that the Hoa Hao are capable of offering resistance to the government, or at least succor to those groups that have been operating in the Mekong Delta since the spring of 1975. This, of course, would give the government reason to retaliate in some form.

On the other hand, the government has shown a great deal of skill in the north earlier in coming to terms with these groups and offering a mixture of positive and negative incentives to gradually first attract the lower classes. You may have to get rid of the leadership for a time, so you separate the leaders from the led, and you get more access to local communities, and gradually loosen up the hold of the local authorities over these people, so they can be attracted into supporting the government, with a minimum of outright coercion.

I would make that sort of generalization on much of what has happened in the north in the past, and the seeming lessons they have learned from their own experience, but it all depends on who is in local command. It depends on the degree of resistance that these groups have shown to central rule. There are a lot of imponderables, and I would be the last one to say, this must be what is happening. I wouldn't.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Father.

Father GELINAS. Since it is mentioned that there is little information regarding the Hoa Hao, I think the little bit that we have could be made public. The New York Times has published, in September 1976, mention of a letter written by the daughter of the leader of the Hoa Hao, Luong Trong Tuong, a letter which was sent to the French press, in which she pleads for the release of her husband, of her brother, of

her uncle, and of her 72-year-old father from Chia Hoa prison, in which she claims that the entire Hoa Hao leadership and tens of thousands of followers have been arrested since June 1975. Of course, no answer was ever given to this letter, but I don't see why she would plead for the release of her father and husband and brother if they were free or with her.

The Hoa Hao certainly, as Dr. Turley has said, are a strongly united group. They have always shown independence, so it is very likely that the Communists would feel the need to crush them, but all the sources that we have is that their leadership is gone. It has been wiped out.

Now, regarding the Buddhists, there is much more information. The self-immolation by fire of 12 Buddhist nuns near Cam Ta was made public, and actually, the day this document came out of Vietnam, a prominent lay Buddhist leader was arrested, and has never been heard of since. He probably is the one who did smuggle this information outside of the country, and here I would like to add something to correct possibly a wrong impression.

Mention has been made many times of the persecution against Catholics. It is true that the government is trying to deprive the Catholic Church of any authority over the people. First of all, all orphanages, schools, hospitals, dispensaries, leprosarium, have been taken away from the church. There are about between 200 and 300 priests presently in jail. The official list at the Vatican is 176, but that list is already many month old, and there are certainly more now in jail.

Six bishops are in jail. So, they are trying to control the church, but the point I want to make is, if you compare the Catholic Church with the Buddhist Church, one should admit that the Catholic Church is in a privileged position. Their treatment of the Buddhists is much harsher than the treatment of the Catholics.

For instance, most—not all, but most—Catholic Churches in the city of Saigon are still open to the cult. This is not true in the provinces. In many, many instances the church has been closed down because they need a building, because there is no priest, or they don't allow the priest to go, or for many reasons, but in the city, most churches are open, while most Buddhist monasteries, most Buddhist pagodas have been closed.

Another instance, the Feast of Christmas has been celebrated with the permission of the Government, and even with the encouragement of the Government. When I was there, some priests had to go to the police station and were very seriously blamed because they did not put up enough fuss for the Christmas celebration. We were told to put more lights and more decoration and all that. So, they are permitting some cults and even encouraging, of course, for propaganda reasons, probably, but the Hsinh Nhat Phat Giao, the feast of the birthday of Buddha, which is the equivalent Buddhist feast, was simply suppressed.

A small notice in the Tin Sang, in the newspaper, saying that this year the birthday of Buddha will be celebrated by a stronger effort to work on this day, that is all, meaning, there is no holiday. So, they certainly are giving—yielding more to the Catholics because they are international, and they are afraid of the bad propaganda that they might get if they persecute the Catholic Church openly.

Well, the Buddhists, not being international, at least not as closely knit, not as well organized, are being crushed with less harm on their public image.

Now, the last fact on this subject, there was a special political session for the Catholic priests at the end of January 1977, and it was said openly that by the end of the 5-year plan, by 1982, Christianity will have ceased to exist. They explained that Christianity, the purpose of Christianity was to bring in the Kingdom of God, happiness, paradise, and by 1982 this will have been brought to Vietnam, so there will be no more need for Christianity.

This was published in the "Cong Giao Va Dan Toc" of February 6, 1977.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I have no further questions.

Mr. FRASER. Ms. Forsythe mentioned a second newspaper that she understood was operating at the time she left. Is that still going, do you know?

Father GELINAS. Yes; the Tin Sang is the one newspaper, she said correctly, which is not officially the government newspaper, but it does publish the same news as the government newspaper, with the same bias and the same editorials.

Mr. FRASER. I am not that familiar with Communist regimes, but in the Soviet Union there is both a government and a party newspaper.

Father GELINAS. Ivestia and there is another one, yes.

Mr. FRASER. Is there that same duality in South Vietnam?

Father GELINAS. The Saigon Giai Phong is a very dry paper which, to force the comparison, looks almost like the Congressional Record or something. [General laughter.]

I mean, it just publishes the official things. That is all. So, no one reads it. [General laughter.]

I am sorry. While the Tin Sang—

Mr. FRASER. We are very sensitive about that.

Father GELINAS. While the Tin Sang has more the shape of the normal newspaper, but it is certainly Government-controlled. For instance, there is one feature of the Tin Sang which is borrowed from the Western press. They have letters of the readers. These letters, I am convinced, because I have read them for 15 months daily, they are made up by the newspaper in order to answer the mass of criticism. There is always an answer to the letters, but anyhow, it does make the newspaper slightly more attractive.

Ms. FORSYTHE. To answer your question, however, there is a third publication. Saigon Giai Phong is a party document which is, as Father Gelinias says, unbelievably dry. Then there is also a governmental paper, and those are published by various governmental organizations. There is a women's paper and a students' paper and a workers' paper and a city paper, and so on and so forth.

Tin Sang is in another category again, and as I understand it from conversations that an AFSC delegation had with No Cam Duc in this past February, they view their role as one of helping to make a bridge between the new Government and the people. They want to discuss policies. They want to—they have an editorial page called Heaven and Seas, kind of offering critiques. I don't think there is any question

that that paper is certainly under scrutiny by the Government and could be closed down. I don't think it will be at this point.

Mr. FRASER. Father, I have the impression that the Catholic Church has continued to function in North Vietnam through these years. I don't know the degree of freedom of action, but I do have that very clear impression.

Father GELINAS. It is true. There are three churches which are opened in the city of Hanoi. There is one in Bui Chu. There is one in Phat Diem. There is a number of churches that are still open in Vietnam. They are crowded. People go to church. Of course, it is very difficult to preach, because there is always someone noting the sermons, and you have to walk on eggs, so to speak, not to insult the Government, or not to say something that would not be Marxist.

There is no school. There is no permission to teach religion outside of the church building itself. What you do during mass, provided you don't go against Government policy, you are allowed to do it, but all contact with the youth is cut off. Things, for instance, like confessions or spiritual directions, are not permitted, because this is secret conversation, and it could be treason. It could be plotting against the Government.

So, even in the south this is looked at very severely.

The one basic means of the Government to control the church is very simply the decree, which has been published in the south as well as in the north, that no priests or bishop can be ordained or appointed without specific first permission of the Government. Because of this, the number of priests in the north has gone down. No one can be ordained, or very, very few, only those that are lenient and approved, and the priests are very old, and they are harmless for the Government.

So, they are letting religion die. In the south, we have asked for permission for ordination. In the first months of Communist control in Saigon, we did have an ordination, in which I participated. We had four new priests, because they were not yet completely established, but after that, they strengthened their control, and it is feared now that it will be very, very difficult to have any new priests.

Mr. FRASER. Well, of course, the purpose of our inquiring into the state of affairs with respect to human rights in South Vietnam or in Vietnam is to see whether whatever we think we know should influence U.S. policy towards Vietnam. Now, unlike most countries, we have no diplomatic relations.

I would like to ask just on that point alone what the view of the panel is, whether the United States should establish—should recognize Vietnam and exchange diplomatic personnel.

Father GELINAS. Well, I may answer the first, because I am not an American. I am talking from the outside. Possibly I am the less well-informed on American policy.

Mr. FRASER. In that regard, maybe I should ask you, what is the status between Canada and Vietnam?

Father GELINAS. There is an Ambassador, a Canadian Ambassador, to Vietnam.

Mr. FRASER. There is recognition then.

Father GELINAS. And there is a group of people who are preparing the Embassy in Ottawa. In other words, the Vietnamese do not have their Ambassador, but they have charges d'affaire. They have people in charge.

As far as I understand, at least since the Carter administration—I am talking from the outside—the impression is clearly that American policy is not strictly political. I mean, contrary to other countries, America seems to have definitely made it known that its policy will be founded on principles of respect for the dignity of the human person, and not only on political interests.

Well, if this is true, and I think it is, and it is very honorable for this country that it is, if this is true, I think it is out of the question that one could ignore a situation where 23 million people are under a dictatorship which oppresses them, where no international body, be it the Red Cross or Amnesty International or the United Nations, is ever allowed to inspect the jails, the prisons, or even to walk down the streets, where no news can come out or go in the country, where there are these horrible reports of a situation.

I think if we are sincere, and if there is a reasonable reason, a reasonable cause to believe that there are 300,000 innocent people in camps who may never come out of it, if there is reasonable cause to believe that there are literally millions of people being scheduled for deportation to the so-called new economic area, officially, the Vietnamese Government has published the total aim is 8 million city-dwellers who will be relocated to new economic areas. We know the situation in these areas.

If all of this is true, if there is no freedom of protection from the law, with the law, all these basic—no possibility of reunification of families and so on, well, then I think that it is—there is no choice. The choice is already made.

Mr. FRASER. Well, let me pursue that for a moment, though. I have been a vigorous advocate of the position of the Carter administration, but so far as I know they have never advocated the use of diplomatic recognition as one of the tools or responses to the human rights situation, as a general policy, now, because in the case of Cuba, for example, there has been a suggestion that they should let some of the political prisoners out of jail as well as getting the troops out of Angola.

In any general discussion, the question of diplomatic recognition has not arisen. Part of the question, of course, arises from the fact that we have diplomatic recognition of China and the Soviet Union, Cuba and all these other—not Cuba, but all the other Communist countries. You would advocate, I gather, that a failure to observe internationally accepted standards of human rights ought to be the basis for withdrawal of diplomatic recognition or—

Father GELINAS. No—

Mr. FRASER [continuing]. Or delay in extending it?

Father GELINAS. None, none of this. I am very sorry. I did not understand your question. I thought you meant, should America do something to try to improve the situation of civil rights in Vietnam. I did not understand that you meant, should we recognize Vietnam or not.

Mr. FRASER. No; that was just my question.

Father GELINAS. If it is your question, I think that everything should be gained by recognizing Vietnam. The more Vietnam is in with the club of civilized countries, so to speak, the more they will have to watch out what they do at home. I am sorry to say it so coarsely, but I mean that if you leave them alone, then they can crush their people much more. If they are in the open light, if they

belong to the United Nations, for instance, if they are recognized by America and all that, then this can only force them to be a little more considerate, at least to hide, to disguise their crushing of human rights.

So, I am for recognition.

Mr. FRASER. And exchanging of diplomatic personnel.

Father GELINAS. And exchanging of diplomatic personnel, yes.

Mr. FRASER. What about the other two? I assume that you would think that that is what the United States should do?

Ms. FORSYTHE. Yes. I would not only say that, of course, I think my testimony has made it very clear that I would go beyond that.

Mr. FRASER. Well, I want to get to that next.

Ms. FORSYTHE. All right.

Mr. FRASER. Dr. Turley, you would also—

Mr. TURLEY. I have reached the same conclusion for somewhat different reasons and by a different route. My own problem when entertaining this question is, first of all, determining exactly what human rights are. I just finished reading the State Department's recent publication on human rights, and when you read that relative to what we know is happening in Vietnam now, it is difficult to interpret precisely what some of these statements mean in context, what they should mean, and I think it is a difficult thing to assess.

Second of all, I ask myself, how are these rights as written here understood by the Vietnamese, and there are—

Mr. FRASER. Well, let me break in there. Let's say that demonstrably they were violating internationally accepted standards. You say there is some difficulty in applying those standards, but let's say that in your mind you thought they were violating them. Would that then persuade you that we should not recognize Vietnam and not send diplomatic personnel?

Mr. TURLEY. No; because at that point I would certainly have to concur in the conclusion of Father Gelinias that if that were the case, it is simply one more argument why we should have diplomatic relations with them, that we should want someone there.

Mr. FRASER. So, whether you see a clearcut set of violations or not, you would still recognize Vietnam?

Mr. TURLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. FRASER. Well, that disposes of that question.

Mr. TURLEY. All right.

Mr. FRASER. Let me then go to the next question. Would you extend economic assistance? Now, let me separate them. There are different kinds here. One would be emergency humanitarian assistance, medicines, emergency food for genuine famine. That would be one kind of assistance, which you might call humanitarian. The other would be more in the nature of development assistance, which we thus far, to my knowledge, have never provided to a Communist country, but I am curious as to what—in those two categories, how the three of you would view—what you would recommend as the U.S. policy.

Mr. TURLEY. Well, I would support it.

Mr. FRASER. Which?

Mr. TURLEY. Both, in some measure, I suppose. I think there are two considerations. I think basically because it is in our interest to do so. I am well aware that there is an argument based on a sense of moral obligation, and whether one believes in that, I think the reality of the

situation is that we are going to give aid or not give aid on the basis of our national interests, and it is to that point that I would address myself, and there are two grounds on which I think it is in our national interest. First of all, the Vietnamese have demonstrated by any variety of actions over the past 2 years or so a desire to diversify their international relations, diplomatic, economic, political, and otherwise, and one of their reasons for doing so is to retain the maximum degree of independence they can from the Soviet Union, with which, as you may be aware, relations are quite close at this moment.

Mr. FRASER. Let me add a third component, permitting normal commercial trade. So, that would be three things—humanitarian assistance—well, let's start and take them perhaps, normal trade, humanitarian assistance, development assistance.

Mr. TURLEY. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Now, take the three categories. You would proceed with all three, then, I would assume.

Mr. TURLEY. Yes. I think that the more linkages we form with Vietnam, the more ties of whatever nature, the more free it will consider itself to operate independently of the Soviet Union. Given the dynamics of power in Southeast Asia, I think it is to our interest to see that the Vietnamese act as independently as they can.

They have that general thrust in their policy, and I think that we could help it along a little bit. I do not think there is any such thing as Titoifying Vietnam at this time in history, but it is certainly possible to increase Vietnam's capabilities for autonomous action, and that is in our interests as well.

Second, a point which has a moral component as well, we often think about giving aid to Vietnam as giving aid to the Vietnamese Government, but there is the fact that there are many Vietnamese in Vietnam, still in Vietnam, not refugees, who feel that we had made a commitment to them, and they remain there. They have suffered the same hardships as the ones who adhered to the Communist side, and if we feel that we have any kind of obligation left over from our earlier commitments, certainly it is to them and we have some capacity to alleviate their hardships. I think that this will redound over the long run to our benefit, our self-respect, to our reputation worldwide, again, of course, which is in our national interest in addition to demonstrating a basic interest in other human beings.

So, on all three counts, humanitarian assistance, trade, and development, I think that there is room for us to form some kind of relationship. Dimensions is another question entirely.

Mr. FRASER. The what?

Mr. TURLEY. The dimensions of those things is another question entirely.

Mr. FRASER. You wouldn't use the reparations argument?

Mr. TURLEY. No.

Mr. FRASER. Father Gelinias.

Father GELINAS. No; certainly not the reparations argument, but I would say that on principle, I certainly favor any assistance to the—that would relieve the misery of the Vietnamese people, but not assistance that would strengthen the arm of a government that oppresses these people.

So, if there was any way of sending assistance that would truly reach the people and make life better for them, one should not hesitate to do this. Unfortunately, the Communist government has made its point of view very clear, that they will not accept any assistance except to the Government. They will not accept any control of assistance, any presence of an inspector, any obligation to make reports that can be checked.

Now, I think the policy of the United States, because of the power that this country has, and because of its wealth, the policy of the United States should be, in order to be consistent with its policy on human rights, we are ready to assist and we are willing to assist the misery of these people, but we will do it when you give us permission to check and make sure that this money or these things reach the people. The answer of the Communists will be, then, we don't need your money, but this answer they cannot hold on forever. After a while they will yield on small beginning of American inspection or presence by a third country or any other way, and then we will have won a lot, because the fate of the people will be bettered.

I think America has a very strong arm there. They need American know-how, American goods, American assistance, and they will refuse it, trying to have it on their own terms, but if we hold our point very clearly, then maybe on the long run they will start yielding, and we will have done something for the people.

Mr. FRASER. What about ordinary commercial trade? Would you remove the embargo?

Father GELINAS. I don't know. Really, this is beyond my competence, to know what the Government should do with its businessmen. Certainly I would not encourage trade in arms or in anything that would make the government stronger, better equip the police to crush the people, but other trades, really, I don't know. I could not say. I could not answer. Assistance as a government, because this people is now in a terrible state, not because of American presence in the past, for my conviction, but because of the oppressive rule of the government, but the result is the same. The people are suffering. So, if we could relieve this suffering and at the same time improve the faith of the people, we should do it by any means, but it will be difficult. They will not yield before quite a few years. They will yield when they have to.

Mr. FRASER. Ms. Forsythe.

Ms. FORSYTHE. Yes; I would like to say that certainly I would be delighted if diplomatic relations were opened. I believe that the reconciliation process that is happening in Vietnam in some ways needs to happen between our countries as well. That could go a long way in healing a lot of the wounds that GI's in this country still feel. I have met them on speaking tours and so forth. It would be good to heal some of that pain, I think.

Second, I would be very delighted if the U.S. Government could move quickly to send humanitarian aid to Vietnam. UNHCR, a food and agricultural organization, has established that there is a serious food problem in Vietnam, partially created because of the tons of Louisiana rice that were being shipped from this country until May of 1975 are no longer there, and because people are—it is just taking a

long time to get the country back together again, for whatever reasons.

People are hungry, and they need our support. We send relief to Romania after an earthquake. It would seem entirely appropriate to send relief to Vietnam.

I would agree that it is very important for us to have some kind of control or check on these things. UNICEF certainly has a representative in Vietnam, and any shipment that comes in from UNICEF or the UNHCR is overseen by their people in Hanoi. Their shipments are checked out, and they follow the shipments.

American Friends Service Committee has sent very modest amounts of postwar relief aid, and those have been checked up by delegations that visit periodically to check and see that our supplies are going where they ought to be going. Of course, that is something that we are concerned about.

The latest delegation brought back a report that they honestly feel that goods and services are being distributed in Vietnam in a way they have never been distributed before, unlike the predominant experience I had in my early days in Vietnam, where goods would come to the hospital and find their ways back into the streets, where hospital administrators and government officials just became very fat cats, literally off the people's backs.

The thing I experienced was a very different situation in the 6 months I was there, and it has been confirmed by visits since that time. Certainly Tom Hoskins, who worked in the Da Nang Hospital, had a very vivid firsthand impression of that.

The third point was developmental assistance, I think. Is that right?

Mr. FRASER. How about ordinary commercial trade?

Ms. FORSYTHE. Commercial trade. I feel quite free and easy—a number of businessmen call AFSC knowing that we have contact with Vietnam and wonder what we can do, and we always say, well, that is a Presidential order, I believe. Or is that a congressional—I think the trading—

Mr. FRASER. I think it is congressional, but I am not certain.

Ms. FORSYTHE. Well, in any case, I think that would be a very positive step forward, to get another part of normalization. I would hope that would happen very quickly. It seems that it might happen easily.

The third question is that of developmental aid, and again, I think that would hopefully come in succession, that that would be something to be talked about eventually between officials here in the United States and in Vietnam, that you all would want to work that out together. Certainly these things are always in discussion.

Mr. FRASER. Would any of you favor grant or sale on commercial or concession terms of military equipment to Vietnam?

Father GELINAS. Oh, no.

Ms. FORSYTHE. Well, I don't approve of that for Iran either.

Mr. TURLEY. That would depend on what use the military equipment was going to be put to and what we got in return, I suppose. These things are all negotiable.

Mr. FRASER. Do you see at the moment any reason why we should?

Mr. TURLEY. No.

Mr. FRASER. I have come to the end of my questions. Do any of you have any last comments you would like to put on the record?

Ms. FORSYTHE. Yes; I do. I guess the thing I would like to say finally is that Mr. Fraser, a lot of us have been really glad that you have been pursuing the human rights question. It has been very important to us. Certainly, in AFSC, it has been something that we have been carrying for a long time, and I think the concern first came up in—certainly not first came up, but has a resounding ring for us in the situation in Vietnam under Chou. It is a very important question. I think that Secretary of State Vance has given us some good ways of talking about human rights, and we certainly are young in understanding fully all the ramifications of human rights, and how our understanding of human rights is going to affect our foreign policy.

My hope is that we are going to continue looking at Vietnam, and not just throw it away and forget about it. We certainly have had a long history of involvement there. I hope that our deep concern for those people can be shown now. I hope it can be shown by some immediate aid of rice that is going to bring immediately relief to people who are in a lot of trouble, and I hope that can carry on into the future.

Father GELINAS. Well, in my last statement, I agree with Ms. Forsythe that certainly America, who has done so much, spent so much, and given so much of its blood for Vietnam, should continue to take a great interest to find out what is happening there, and since in this inquiry at least one thing comes out, the fact that there seems to be some violation of human rights, and there is a need for more information, I think it would be a logical step to take to start a full investigation to get the facts.

Vietnam is not just any other country. It is a country that has been fighting alongside this country, and that has been mixed up in the history of America for the last 10 years very closely. There seems to be a tragedy there. The means do exist to see the truth. After all, there are 140,000 Vietnamese here. There are over 1,000 of them who have lived under the Communists and have finally run out.

It would be tedious, it would be long and possibly expensive to check the personal stories. These 100,000 people get letters from home. They can't be all liars. They can't be all criminals. One could find out what is actually going on in Vietnam, and I think it is most important that the picture, a clear, objective, nonpassionate, nonideological picture be found. The cause of human rights certainly would be better served, and the policies of this country would be run more—with more light, with more information.

So, I would suggest that this thought could be considered, the possibility of going full course to find out what is happening in Vietnam, and I suggest bringing in the Vietnamese witnesses by the hundreds, if need be, checking their stories. After all, we have modern methods to find out if someone is obviously lying or seems unreliable, to find out if someone is really telling the truth when he says that his father is an innocent and he is in jail, and his mother, and his village has been wiped out, and this and that.

So, there is certainly something tragic happening there. The mere fact that there are over 100,000 refugees in Thailand now under the care of the United Nations who have taken their life in their hands to run away from Indochina, the three countries, show that there are tremendous things happening and terrible things happening there.

I think it is a duty to find out what is happening. This would be my suggestion.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Turley.

Mr. TURLEY. Yes; only two very brief remarks.

First of all is that in considering human rights in Vietnam, one thing we haven't done is to first itemize what those rights are. One of them, I think, surely, is very clear and understood equally by all people, and that is the right to move freely from one country to another, especially for the purpose of reuniting with your relatives, and this is a theme that I touched on in my opening remarks, and I would like to end on it.

It is a right which this country can expedite. I don't think that we alone can bring it about. Obviously, it needs Vietnamese cooperation. But it is one of the things I think that we should be working for, and I would urge you to see what can be done to move things along in that direction.

The second point is that should we ever think it is relevant for us to take a position on relations with Vietnam on the basis of what we perceive to be violations of rights in that country, I would only urge you to ask yourself first of all what practical effect will such a position by us have, not on our relations with Vietnam, but in Vietnam itself, and act on your own answer.

Mr. FRASER. Well, I want to thank you all. We are examining the kinds of questions you raised with respect to a large number of countries. I think most of our attention has been devoted to the problem of military assistance to governments which appear to be highly coercive or repressive. I think generally we have found that the problems of economic assistance are more complex, and all of you have touched on some of the elements involved there as to whom the aid reaches and what the effect may be on the country if we provide the assistance.

Well, this has been a very useful afternoon. We really appreciate the time you have given us, and your testimony has been very helpful. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 4:51 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned scheduled to reconvene on Tuesday, June 21, 1977, at 2 p.m.]

HUMAN RIGHTS IN VIETNAM

TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1977

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2:15 p.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Donald M. Fraser (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FRASER. The subcommittee will come to order.

Today, the Subcommittee on International Organizations continues its review of allegations of human rights violations taking place in Vietnam under the present government.

Since the establishment of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in 1975, the United States has had no diplomatic or commercial relations with that country. However, in light of the initial steps taken toward possible normalization of relations between the United States and Vietnam, it is important that we remain informed of the situation in Vietnam.

We are pleased today to hear testimony from:

Mr. Don Luce, codirector of Clergy and Laity Concerned, who returned from a visit to Vietnam several weeks ago;

Mr. Theodore Jacqueney, formerly with the Agency for International Development in Vietnam, who is presently directing a projected human rights magazine;

Ms. Margaret Meinertz, director for southern Asia of the Church World Service, and Dr. Paul McCleary, executive director of Church World Service, both of the National Council of Churches; Ms. Meinertz and Dr. McCleary, who returned from a visit to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam this month, have jointly submitted a written statement;

Mr. Nguyen Van Coi, formerly provincial representative of Quang Duc Province in Vietnam, escaped by boat from Vietnam around October 1976 and arrived in the United States in December 1976; Mr. Coi is accompanied by Ms. Le Thi Anh; we have provided an interpreter for Mr. Coi.

In light of the number of witnesses today, we would appreciate it if witnesses could limit their oral testimony to as close to 7 minutes as possible, in order to allow for subsequent questions and answers.

We will begin with Mr. Luce.

**STATEMENT OF DON LUCE, CODIRECTOR, CLERGY AND LAITY
CONCERNED**

Mr. LUCE. I was in Vietnam from the 19th of April until the 4th of May with Pat Patterson, who is the executive secretary for Indochina of the United Methodist Church, Ron Ridenhour, who was a gunner in Vietnam, a U.S. soldier in Vietnam, and later disclosed the My Lai massacre, and Martha Winnaker, who is the codirector of the Indochina Resource Center on the west coast in Berkeley.

I come back from Vietnam with a strong impression of a government and a whole people working together to build a society that is equal and provides food, housing, and medical care, education and other necessities for people.

As a group we went to Vietnam, partly to investigate, at least to our own satisfaction, some of the charges on violations of human rights. I would like to go through just a few of these specific charges we had heard before going and what we found.

First, the charge that the North Vietnamese run the south.

We met with the president of the Fatherland Front for Saigon. We met two provincial chiefs. We met several district and village chiefs, cooperative heads, National Assembly people representing the southern area, and many others. All of these people were southerners, people who were born in the south, who had lived in the south for many years. We found a very clear policy in South Vietnam of southerners representing their own areas. I would also say that it is true that there are northern technicians who have come south. But I think we have to understand that in the context that thousands of people were killed, particularly technicians were killed, during the Phoenix program, which we were part of.

We have to understand it in terms of the context of so many doctors and other people leaving in 1975 on U.S. boats.

The second charge that "Third Force" leaders who were alined with neither side have no role in the new government. This is just not true. I met with many of the former "Third Force" leaders in Saigon that I knew, and they are officially involved in the new government, as well as having important posts in other kinds of work in Saigon. Madame Ngo Ba Thanh is a professor of international law and was the chairperson of the Women's Movement for the Right To Life during the war years, and is now a member of the National Assembly. She is involved in writing Vietnam's new constitution.

Among other things, as a lawyer, she has been involved in visiting the reeducation centers to assure that high standards of treatment for people in the centers are maintained. Huynh Tan Mam, who is the former student leader, Father Huynh Cong Minh, and the Buddhist Superior Nun Huynh Lien are also members of the National Assembly.

The third charge, that daily newspapers are not published in the south and that Tin Sang, which was Saigon's most popular paper, had been closed, or that production had been cut back.

I bought several papers in South Vietnam, southern papers. Tin Sang is sold on the streets in Saigon. It is also sold in Da Nang, in

Nha Trang, and several other cities we traveled in. The writers for Tin Sang newspaper are the same writers that were writing for that newspaper 5 years ago, and they include Nguyen Huu Thai, Ho Ngoc Nhuan, Nguyen Huu An, Tran Ngoc Bau, Ly Chanh Trung, and many others. It is the same paper and it is being published by Ngo Cong Duc, who was the former publisher during much of the war years and was in political exile in the United States, and I believe many people here met Ngo Cong Duc at that time.

Another charge, that religious life in Vietnam has been virtually destroyed by the Communists.

We were concerned about this and we went to church while we were there. We went to the Tan Dinh Church at 5 in the morning. There were more than 1,000 parishioners there. We found that it was not true that religious life had been destroyed, or virtually destroyed.

We met with the archbishop of Saigon. We met with the cardinal in Hanoi. We met with Buddhist leaders, and many others.

Another charge, that reeducation centers are political prisons. I talked with many former friends of mine. They are still friends, many friends of mine, who had spent from very short to rather long periods in the reeducation centers, and I asked them particularly questions about food, about visits, about treatment of themselves and other people in the reeducation centers.

Their answers were that the reeducation centers are much closer to the actual Vietnamese word, which is work study center, then to reeducation in the context that we think of it. There was adequate food, they had family visits. None of the people that I talked with knew people in the reeducation centers who had been mistreated, either physically or mentally.

I think that in hearings like this it is important for us to look also at our own relationship, our own country's relationship, to the people of Vietnam, particularly when we, as a country, are depriving Vietnamese of basic human rights.

What I found was that the denials of basic human rights for Vietnam people are much more a matter of policy by our own Government than they are things that are happening in Vietnam. Specifically, food is a basic human right.

Article XXV of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights assures people of adequate food or it states that everyone has a right to a standard of living adequate for health and well-being, and so on.

During the war years, 20 percent of the forests were destroyed, 6 percent of the cropland was destroyed by the defoliation. That land is very slowly coming back into production. But as we traveled the 500 miles from Da Nang down to Saigon, the hillsides to our left and right are still bare from the defoliation; so that when there was drought in central Vietnam, followed by rains, those rains led to floods.

There are still unexploded mines in the fields. There are something like 30 billion pounds of U.S. munitions that were expended on Vietnam. Defense Department experts estimate that 1 to 2 percent of these munitions probably have not exploded. That means some-

where between 300 million and 600 million pounds of unexploded munitions are still in the ground.

Farmers look for the mines with sharpened bamboo sticks. That is, they prod the sticks into the soil trying to find the mines.

As a country, during the war years we provided Vietnam from 300,000 to 500,000 tons of rice. Now when there is a tremendous need for food in Vietnam, as a country, or as a government, we have not provided any food to the Vietnamese.

Medical care is a basic human right of people. One of the things that our Army left behind is a tremendous incidence of venereal disease. We talked with the head of social welfare and the Vietnamese found in the U.S. Embassy a list of the names of more than 300,000 women who were listed there for "military leisure." That is, they were women who worked in the bars and brothels or were temporary wives for the U.S. soldiers.

The Vietnamese, in terms of the venereal disease tests, have found that 64 percent of these women have had venereal disease. Yet, we refuse to provide the penicillin which the Vietnamese need to cure the venereal disease left behind by the U.S. Army.

A country and a home are basic human rights. There are thousands of Vietnamese who live in the refugee camps in Thailand, the boat people off Thailand or Malaysia, and so on.

I think as a country we have very cynically used the refugees from Vietnam to prove somehow that we were right in fighting that war all along. We have used them in an anti-Communist propaganda sense. We have not helped to provide food. We have not provided the adequate food, housing, clothing, and so on for these people. So we used them, and at the same time have not helped them. There is no one in Vietnam who is in as bad shape as are the boat people off Malaysia and so on.

If we are really concerned about people, it seems to me that our first concern ought to be about the basic needs, both of the boat people, the people in the refugee camps, and the needs of food and medicine for the people in Vietnam.

If we are really concerned about finding out what is going on in Vietnam, it seems to me that we should have a policy to allow Vietnamese to come to the United States. And I am speaking now of Vietnamese citizens who are citizens of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Clergy and Laity Concerned, my organization, has invited Vietnamese religious leaders to come to the United States. Yet, even though dozens of Americans have been able to go to Vietnam, to travel freely around Vietnam, and I did go to the marketplace by myself—I visited Vietnamese friends by myself and was free to travel where I wanted in Vietnam—a Vietnamese Buddhist monk cannot come to the United States. We have to ask ourselves why are we so afraid of what a Buddhist monk or nun would say in Washington, D.C.?

I think we need to open up and allow the Vietnamese to come here. The final point I want to make refers to the question of Vietnamese who are here being able to go back to Vietnam, and also to the question of a concern that I think many of the Vietnamese in Vietnam have, and that is we know from the Pentagon Papers and from many other

sources that the U.S. Government left intelligence agents behind in North Vietnam in 1954. These agents were given the tasks of disruption, blowing up bridges, for example, to "prove" that there was dissention in the north. They were given the task of carrying out propaganda within the north to try to get propaganda to the rest of the world to discredit the government there.

I believe that it is important that this committee should ask the CIA and the DIA and all of the other intelligence agencies if they left agents behind or are involved in infiltrating agents into Vietnam. I think that in terms of being able to encourage the Vietnamese to allow Vietnamese families to return to Vietnam to visit their own families there, it is important that we ask the CIA, the DIA and all other intelligence agencies to publicly state that they will not use returning Vietnamese as a way of infiltrating intelligence agents back into Vietnam.

I think that we have to understand that we force leftist governments all around the world into a position where they have to be concerned about their own security because we have used our CIA and other intelligence groups to infiltrate those areas and so on.

I am concerned both that many reports that come out of Vietnam are originated from agents that we left there, and that that increases the difficulty for Vietnamese in this country to return to their own country, because the Vietnamese just do not know how our country might use those people.

Finally, I would say again that I came back from Vietnam with a very optimistic feeling about a society there which is working very hard to rebuild. I found a very equal distribution of food. I found a very deep concern about human rights of everyone.

[Mr. Luce's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY DON LUCE, CODIRECTOR, CLERGY AND LAITY CONCERNED

We return from Vietnam with a strong impression of a government and a whole people working together to build a society that is equal and provides food, housing, medical care, education and other necessities of life for everyone. In a two week period, it is impossible to investigate every aspect of life in Vietnam. We were, however, able to satisfy ourselves that many of the charges raised against the new Vietnamese government are not true.

The Vietnamese are working against almost insurmountable obstacles. The countryside from Da Nang to Saigon is still marked by destruction—brown defoliated mountainsides, bomb craters, areas leveled and scarred by bulldozers, deteriorating U.S. bases full of rusting jeeps and tanks, cities still overcrowded with refugees forced there during the war years and living in make-shift shacks—and the stories of so many relatives and friends dead from the war or still missing.

We went to Vietnam hoping to investigate and lay to rest, at least to our own satisfaction, some of the charges of violations of human rights there. The charges and the results of our investigations there include:

Charge.—That the North Vietnamese run the South. We met the President of the Fatherland Front for Saigon, two provincial chiefs, several district and village chiefs, cooperative heads, National Assembly people representing the south, and many others in the south. All were Southerners. There is a clear policy of assuring that local people represent their own areas. We found no domination from the north. It is true that there are northern technicians and managers in the south. But thousands of Southerners were killed during the Phoenix Program; more than 100,000 others left on U.S. boats and planes in April 1975 when the U.S. left Vietnam.

Charge.—That the former “Third Force” leaders who were aligned with neither side have no role in the new government. This is not true. Madame Ngo Ba Thanh, a former professor of International Law and Chairperson of the Women’s Movement for the Right to Life, is a National Assembly member and very involved in writing Vietnam’s new constitution. Huynh Tan Mam, the former student leader, Father Huynh Cong Minh, and the Buddhist Superior Nun Huynh Lien are also members of the National Assembly. We found the former members of the “Third Force” very much a part of both the government and the cultural life of the South.

Charge.—That daily newspapers are not published in the south and that *Tin Sang*, Saigon’s most popular paper, had been closed, or production had been cut back. I brought back several different papers published in the south, including the April 26, 1977 issue of *Tin Sang*. *Tin Sang* is published by Ngo Cong Duc, its former publisher who was once President of the Publishers Association in Saigon during President Nguyen Van Thieu’s days. The writers of *Tin Sang* include almost all of its former writers: Nguyen Huu Thai, Ho Ngoc Nhuan, Nguyen Huu An, Tran Ngoc Bau, Ly Chanh Trung. *Tin Sang* and several other papers are sold on the streets, where I bought copies, and sold throughout the provinces. The papers are available to everyone.

Charge.—That religious life in Vietnam has been virtually destroyed by the Communists. We found the church very much alive in Saigon. On May 1, we went to the 5 a.m. service of the Tan Dinh Catholic Church. There were more than 1,000 worshippers there. It is true that the state has put parochial schools (seminaries are, of course, operated by the church) and orphanages under government control to assure uniformity of education and to prevent the institutionalization of children through their adoption by families. But it is not true that the religious community is not allowed to play a part of social services. The staffs at the former religious institutions remain almost unchanged. The nuns still wear their habits and remain in place in the orphanages. Religion is not taught during school hours; however, religious activities and studies do take place in the churches and pagodas.

Charge.—That re-education centers are political prisons. The people with whom we talked, and who had spent considerable time in the centers, said that food had been adequate, family visits permitted and none of them was aware of physical or mental mistreatment going on in the centers. The accurate translation of the Vietnamese term would be “work-study center” which the Vietnamese we met feel is a more descriptive term of what happens than the Western translation “re-education center.” The former deputy commander of the old Saigon Armed Forces, Nguyen Huu Hanh, spent several months in the work-study program. He said that he was amazed at the good treatment he received. The program gave him the time to think through his own involvement in the war. He told of studying at Ft. Bragg and participating in seminars with U.S. military officers on how Vietnam could serve as a training ground for counter-insurgency tactics. He talked about the work-study program this way:

“Our country faces struggles and must work out unity. I couldn’t imagine carpet bombing by the U.S. in the north until I saw it. My own ancestral graves have been plowed up; my grandparents’ graves destroyed. Our Vietnamese soil has been turned upside down; our people forced from their homes into the ‘prosperity camps.’ All this was done by the puppet government in Saigon advised by the U.S. I know about re-education myself since I served the old regime since 1946. I’m concerned about friends in the centers, but in my first meeting with the PRG forces, they told me of their concern that the more than one million soldiers of the old Saigon forces might live in peace as citizens. Now more than a million have gone through political studies. We Vietnamese consider them members of one family. All non-commissioned and most commissioned officers have returned home, i.e. 95%. The former Saigon Defense Minister was ill and is now at home. Many division generals are also at home. Work-study involves two points: true labor and true political education. It is not torture or retaliation. It is to change to the view that work is good, even glorious. In every country some cases occur which must be settled by the authorities. For 28 years I was a general in the Saigon army. I appealed to the troops to lay down their arms when liberation came. Now we are united, one nation, but we see the violations of the old regime. I hope that we can sit down with the U.S. at a table and erase the past.”

Madame Ngo Ba Thanh has a Masters Degree in International Law from Columbia University and was one of the first women members of the International Commission of Jurists. She was jailed by the former Saigon government for protesting conditions in the prisons at that time. She talked with us about visiting a work-study center:

"I went to the center as a representative of the Lawyers' Association concerned that peoples' rights should not be violated and ready to protest if they were. Because we are now dealing with 'collective membership,' I was worried about what people might do. A number of newsmen (15 or 20) went with me. The high police officer who had imprisoned me was shocked to see me though I was there to demand change of his conditions if necessary. I said to him, 'Don't be uncomfortable, we were both slaves, you as police and I as prisoner. Now we are all citizens. Please come out soon to help us do the work that needs doing to rebuild.' People in the camp were healthier and better provided for than many people outside. They had food, exercise, education, rest. Mostly what they do is education. Under the neo-colonialism of the past 20 years our people were indoctrinated against communism. Now since liberation we can learn who the Viet Cong really are and what their purposes are. We can understand better what our involvement in neo-colonialism was in the past, like the people in work-study camps study the political system, growing vegetable gardens, learning the value of physical labor. In this process they discover themselves. When they get out of the centers depends on them. Of course, a police torturer takes more time. At this point in history there is no more exciting place to work than Vietnam, for we are moving into socialism in a peaceful way."

Ron Ridenhour, the former U.S. soldier in Vietnam who disclosed the My Lai massacre, asked the province chief of Long An this question:

"These are the people who ran the Tiger Cages, defoliated the land, and bombed your villages. Why haven't you executed them? Why haven't you put them on public trial?"

"If we were to execute these people," the province chief replied, "their children would never forget. We have to give leniency in return for crimes, so that the crimes can be done away with completely. Otherwise there will be feuds and retribution in the future. We want to be remembered as the government which brought about reconciliation, not the government which carried out the Nuremberg trials to pass down death sentences. We want to be remembered as the government which rebuilt Vietnam from the rubble of the war * * * not the government which shaved the heads of its former prostitutes and sent them onto the streets as public spectacles. It takes love and compassion to rebuild, not anger or hate."

The bloodbath which our government predicted did not occur. The public trials and public degradation which most governments use after long bitter wars against their former enemies as a way of getting revenge and creating a type of political unity did not occur. While there may have been examples of individuals taking things into their own hands and mistreating others, we found no evidence of systematic mistreatment of people. Government policy is to enable all citizens to participate constructively in the future of the country.

Perhaps the greatest tragedy of the human rights argument is that it is used to cover up the fact that the United States is directly denying basic rights to Vietnamese people. In hearings on human rights in Vietnam, it seems appropriate to look, too, at our own country's relationship to the rights of people in Viet Nam.

Food is a basic human right.—Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family including food, clothing, housing and medical care * * *." During the war years, the U.S. military destroyed much of the land of Vietnam (20% of the forests and 6% of the crop land through defoliation alone). Large areas are still denuded from defoliation and the rains quickly run off the barren mountainsides causing erosion and floods. The land is pock-marked with mines, and unexploded munitions continue to kill both people and buffalo. More than 30 billion pounds of U.S. munitions were expended on Vietnam.

Defense Department specialists estimate that from one to two percent of these shells, bombs, rockets, etc. fail to explode. Thus, it can be estimated that between 300 million and 600 million pounds of "live" explosives remain in the soil. The cities are still overcrowded from the U.S. Government policy of "forced urbaniza-

tion." All this is further complicated by cold weather in the north and drought in the center.

The Vietnamese have carefully divided what little food they have to prevent starvation. But people are hungry. In fiscal year 1974, the U.S. Government shipped a total of 516,851 metric tons of American grain to Vietnam. Yet despite the wealth and stockpiles of grain in America, this year we have refused to provide any food aid to the Vietnamese.

Medical care is a basic human right.—The U.S. army left behind a tremendous problem of venereal disease. The Vietnamese do not have the capacity to produce the high-quality penicillin needed to cure the VD we left behind. Madame Duy Linh, head of social welfare in Saigon, worries about where she will get needed penicillin when the present supply runs out in three months. A list of the names of 300,000 women registered for military "leisure" was found in the U.S. Embassy after liberation. Mrs. Duy Linh told us that 64% of the former prostitutes in Saigon had venereal disease.

The overcrowding in the cities has caused a high incidence of TB. The unexploded munitions continue to cripple people. And, yet, our government so directly responsible for these medical problems refuses to provide medical care.

A Country and a home are basic human rights.—Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: "Everyone has the right to a nationality. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality." The U.S. government encouraged the mass exodus from Vietnam. It cynically used the refugees to "prove" the anti-Communist fears of the Vietnamese. Many people use the present flow of refugees out of Vietnam to support the charge of denial of human rights in Vietnam. Yet the U.S. (and all other countries in the world) refuses to provide a home for the thousands of boat-people and those crowded into the cities, especially those put into Thailand's camps for the Vietnamese.

There are no people in Vietnam who suffer the deprivation of the boat-people off Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, Hong Kong and Japan—people without a country.

If we have a deep concern about the human rights of the Vietnamese people, should we not begin by providing food and medicine? Should we not begin by providing a country and a home to the homeless?

We began this statement by saying that it is difficult for us in a two week period to report on every aspect of life in Vietnam. But we do feel that it is important to note that at least seven different groups involving more than 25 different Americans have visited Vietnam this year alone. The American visitors include people who are conservative, liberal, and radical. They are religious leaders, labor leaders, Congressmen, scholars, journalists, and social welfare workers. Four of these groups included Americans who speak Vietnamese. The reports from every one of these groups have been positive. We should be encouraged by the openness of the Vietnamese to receive us and to allow those of us who speak Vietnamese to wander unescorted through Saigon, Hanoi, Da Nang, Nha Trang, Qui Nhon, Quang Ngai and many other places, big and small, to talk with whom-ever we wanted.

We ask ourselves why the U.S. Government does not extend the same privilege to Vietnamese who might want to come here. Clergy and Laity Concerned has invited a group of Vietnamese religious leaders to the United States. We have requested assurances from the State Department that visas would be granted to the Vietnamese invited by U.S. church leaders. The State Department has advised me by telephone to tell them to travel to Hong Kong and apply for a visa with an expectation of a reply within about two weeks. Hardly a warm welcome!

We thank the committee for this opportunity to testify. We come here with an optimism about the concern that the Vietnamese have for all their people. We sincerely hope that America will commit itself to fulfill our responsibility of helping the Vietnamese to rebuild their devastated country and to provide a home for the overseas Vietnamese who are presently without a country.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you Mr. Luce.

Mr. Jacqueney.

STATEMENT OF THEODORE JACQUENEY, DIRECTOR, DEMOCRACY INTERNATIONAL¹

Mr. JACQUENEY. For more than a year, reports of human rights violations have been filtering out of Vietnam, provided by a steady stream of eyewitnesses.

Vietnamese Government claims of humane "reeducation schools" and "full restoration of civil liberties" are challenged by cruelly different first-person accounts of massive detentions and widespread prison miseries.

The Vietnamese Government says that those still detained in reeducation centers, forced labor farms and prisons are former military and civilian officials, and many are.

But many other prisoners were prominent "Third Force" opponents of former Saigon regimes. Many were advocates of a compromise peace and democratic liberties during the war, people who were once the victims of Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu's police and prison atrocities. They are again detained now—sometimes in the very same prisons.

Also interned are largely nonpolitical artists, writers, journalists, poets, lawyers, law professors, doctors, and dentists.

Distinguished judges and other respected civil servants who took no part in the war effort or in civilian repression, are also in detention.

Many prisoners are my personal friends.

Some of the Third Force prisoners are people the chairman of this subcommittee, Representative Donald Fraser, met personally in Saigon in February 1975.

I was in Vietnam at that time as a journalist.

I observed the chairman's admirable efforts to seek out and talk to opposition democrats, human rights attorneys actively defending political prisoners, and compromise peace advocates who urged an end to U.S. support for the tyrannical Thieu regime.

I even observed how Representative Fraser accepted an invitation to dine with a large gathering of opposition leaders, even though Thieu staged a dinner to conflict with the opposition's event.

A Vietnamese senator then active in Vietnam's liberal Catholic opposition to the Thieu regime who attended that dinner, Senator Le Chau Loc, is in the room today.

Representative Fraser, I regret to say that many others who dined with us that evening are now imprisoned.

When will those in Vietnam's detention centers and prisons be released?

Hanoi officials announced recently that they would be free in "perhaps 5 more years," increasing the prison terms they stated last year, when government officials said "maybe 3 more years."

¹Theodore Jacquenev worked in Vietnam for the U.S. State Department's Agency for International Development, resigning in disagreement with U.S. support for Nguyen Van Thieu's 1971 reelection. He then worked to publicize Thieu regime repression and political prisoner abuses as a daily newspaper editorial page editor and as head of an ex-AID employees Vietnam issues protest group. Recently he has been directing Democracy International, a project to launch a new human rights magazine, which has just been adopted by the Council on Religion and International Affairs, publisher of Worldview magazine, and is now working on fund raising projects to institutionalize CRIA/Worldview human rights projects.