

nize that the decision of the Vietnamese Government was that people should not be taken to war crimes trials and executed, but rather, that there should be an attempt through discussion to come out with people who would be involved in the rebuilding of the country.

We met with the province chief of Long An Province, and one of the people in our group said, look, these are the people—we were talking about some of the people in the camps—these are the people who bombed villages. They are the people who ran the tiger cages. They are the people who carried out the defoliation. Why have you not executed them?

And the province chief's reply, and I will read this because I think it is important to get it accurate, he said:

If we were to execute these people, 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 out to the streets as public spectacles. It takes love and compassion to rebuild; not anger or hate.

And the people whom I met who had been through the reeducation centers felt very much that that was the attempt—to bring the country back together, to get rid of the anger, to get rid of the hate, and to have a country that was working together to rebuild.

Mr. FRASER. All right. Ms. Meinertz, I think you related the experience of going to the reeducation camp in Quang Thi Province.

Ms. MEINERTZ. Tay Ninh.

Mr. FRASER. When did you go there?

Ms. MEINERTZ. May 29th.

Mr. FRASER. This May?

Ms. MEINERTZ. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. I was struck by the fact that you said originally there were 1,000 and there are still 500.

Ms. MEINERTZ. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. In testimony the other day, it was suggested that maybe only 5 percent of those who had been through the reeducation camps were still in them, but your figure would amount to 50 percent.

Ms. MEINERTZ. Some of that has to do with the consolidation of camps as camps are closed.

Mr. FRASER. I see.

In other words, presumably, the original 1,000, there are still not 500 there of that 1,000. They had come from other sources as well?

[Ms. Meinertz nods in the affirmative.]

Mr. FRASER. I have just one last question.

As with any country, we look at what happens in the country as being in a way their problem, not ours, although it is in a way ours too, as a part of humanity.

Mr. JACQUENEY, what is your view about diplomatic recognition? Should we recognize Vietnam and exchange ambassadors?

Mr. JACQUENEY. Yes; I tried to indicate that in my testimony.

Mr. FRASER. I gathered so, but I wanted to be clear about it. I would suppose that Mr. Luce, you do, and Ms. Meinertz and Dr. McCleary.

[Mr. Luce nods in the affirmative.]

[Ms. Meinertz nods in the affirmative.]

[Mr. McCleary nods in the affirmative.]

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Coi, do you believe that the United States should recognize Vietnam and exchange ambassadors?

Mr. COI.¹ First, I would like to thank you for letting me speak here today. You have, in turn, listened to Mr. Luce and Mr. Jacqueney talk about the situation in Vietnam.

I, myself, would like to present to you today my personal experience, what I have seen and heard.

First of all, after the Communists took over South Vietnam, I have lived there for 17½ months. Of those 17½ months, I have lived 5 months outside and the rest in prison. This is to show you that not only I know about life in prison camps, but also, I have seen with my own eyes life outside, in society.

First, I would like to present to you the life of the people in South Vietnam nowadays. Mr. Luce's view of the Communists is the view that we had of the Communists in Vietnam before we lost Vietnam, before the Communists took Vietnam over. Gentlemen, before the Communists took Vietnam over I also thought like Mr. Luce, that I could live with the Communists.

The proof of this thought was that after the country was lost, until the 30th of April, instead of running outside the country, like many other people, I did stay in Vietnam. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Communists are a very secretive people, that you cannot understand them just looking at them from the outside.

If, on a visit to Hanoi or Saigon, the Hanoi authorities take you on a tour of the countryside, then you think that the regime is good, that the country is in good shape. But don't forget you can see only what the authorities want you to see, hear what they want you to hear.

Mr. Luce's view of the whole situation is only a view from the outside. I would like to show you the inside of the situation. I would like to talk to you about the truth as I see it from my heart, with the blood and the tears of the Vietnamese people.

On behalf of thousands of Vietnamese former soldiers who have sacrificed for the country, I would like to present to you the daily life of the Vietnamese people after the Communists took over, April 30, 1975, after General Minh declared the surrender, the Communists took over the whole country. Immediately after that, the Communists declared a 10-point policy in South Vietnam.

In substance, that 10-point policy said the revolution has expelled the American imperialists and had destroyed the authorities in South Vietnam. The revolution was of the people, by the people and for the people. The revolution is for the people to live in harmony. The revolution would not touch the property of the people. The revolution would be lenient to the people who have cooperated with the old regime. And the revolution appealed to those people who have cooperated with the old regime to come out and cooperate with the new government.

¹ Mr. Coi's replies to questions were interpreted in English by an interpreter, Ms. Nguyen Cumble, from the Library of Congress.

In fact, at the beginning, many people were suspicious so very few presented themselves to the new authorities. However, there were a few, a small number of people, who came out and presented themselves. Those people were given a paper to prove that they had reported, and could go home without any difficulty.

So the rumors spread about the fact that those who reported did not get into any difficulty, and people gradually came out and reported.

After seeing that almost all of the people who were supposed to be reporting came out, the Communists gave a second announcement. That announcement appealed to those people who had reported to join reeducation programs. In that announcement it was stated very clearly, officers of the rank from major to generals, citizens from the rank of director to ministers, the elected officials from provincial representative to provincial counsellor, all of those people have to bring with them food enough for 30 days. Officers from the rank of second lieutenant to captain, civil servants from the rank of chief of bureaus to elected officials from the village chiefs to hamlet chiefs, all of those people should bring along food enough for 15 days.

The third remaining group included enlisted men up to the rank of warrant officers, agents, and ordinary civil servants. They should bring along with them food enough for 7 days.

Based upon that announcement, those people told themselves, since the most serious crimes were only punished by 30 days of reeducation and the lightest crime was punished by 7 days of reeducation, so everyone came out and reported in order to go to the reeducation camps.

However, in reality, those people who had joined the camps went for an indefinite time and at the time I left Vietnam on the 15th of October 1976, few of them had come home.

After they had put in most of the remnants of the Vietnamese Army and the anti-Communist people in the prison, the Communists have applied the following policies regarding the people in Vietnam.

Families of people who have worked for the old regime from the ranks of captain up, among the civilians from the elected officials from the rank of provincial representatives up, all of those families suffer the confiscation of all of their property, houses and land, because the Communists pretended that all of those properties were the result of those families taking them from the people of Vietnam.

As for the wives and families of the remnants of the South Vietnam Army, they were exiled to new economic zones. After that, the Communists applied the policy of eliminating private properties.

Mr. FRASER. We have a vote underway on the floor so we will have to take a brief recess and we will return.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Mr. FRASER. The subcommittee will resume its sitting.

When we recessed to vote, Mr. Coi was responding to a question.

We have another vote and we will have to take another recess. We will be back in a few more minutes.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Mr. FRASER. The subcommittee will resume its hearing.

When we recessed for the second vote, Mr. Coi was responding to a question.

Mr. Coi, do you want to proceed?

Mr. Cor. I sincerely thank the chairman and the gentlemen on the committee for having given me the time to talk at length about the problem in Vietnam. I think it is necessary that I answer the question that Mr. Chairman has asked me, the question being should the United States establish relations with North Vietnam and exchange ambassadors?

My answer is strongly the following: The United States should not establish relations with North Vietnam, and the reasons are the following.

The political tradition of the United States and the American people, being the respect of human rights and liberties—whereas, the Government of North Vietnam does not respect human rights and liberties. Then, the United States should not establish relations with a country whose principles go against the principles upheld by the United States.

The reason I say the United States should not establish relations with the North Vietnamese are because on the grounds of human rights, because I have the following proofs to give you.

When Hanoi took South Vietnam over, the South Vietnamese people were deprived completely of their freedom. The first freedom that they were deprived of was the freedom of religion.

Apparently, Hanoi does recognize that Vietnam has four main religions: Buddhism, Cao Dai, Catholicism, and Hoa Hao Buddhism. But this is only for the form.

As to the content of the policy, basically the Government put pressure on the people to abandon their religions.

For example, the Catholic Vietnamese usually would have the portrait of Jesus in their house. Now at the same time, the Communists want the Catholics to put alongside the picture of Ho Chi Minh. But if that same Catholic family would do away with the Holy Cross or the picture of Jesus and just leave the statue of Ho Chi Minh, they would be praised by the authorities and they would be given many advantages, such as either being given food coupons or being able to move around freely. (Every Vietnamese is required to secure a permit to go from one place to another.)

Therefore, many Vietnamese people, in order to be left alone in order to obtain peace, they must take away the picture of Christ or Buddha in order to please the new authorities.

Those who are stubborn and keep having statues of Christ and Ho Chi Minh alongside together, those are said to be not making any progress yet.

I would like to give you a concrete example of the violation by the Communists of the freedom of religion. These are acts that the Communists have committed toward the Hoa Hao Buddhists in the Mekong Delta.

As I have told you before, after taking over South Vietnam, the Communists have imprisoned the Hoa Hao leaders on the grounds that they have been working as CIA agents for the United States. After having imprisoned them, the Communists have forced the leader of this sect, who was Mr. Tuong who was then in Chi Hoa Prison to sign a letter promising to disband the Hoa Hao sect.

After that, on the basis of this disbanding of the Hoa Hao sect, the Communists confiscated the temples and the reading facilities of the Hoa Hao.

I don't want to take too much of your time. I would like to present to you the second example of violations of human rights by the Communists, and I list the policy that the Communists had toward the remnants of the South Vietnamese army.

Being a former prisoner of the Communists and a parliamentarian of the former South Vietnamese regime, I would like you to know that they have treated the soldiers of the old regime very severely and have treated them like animals.

I, myself, after nearly 1 year as their prisoner, with my hands cuffed and my feet manacled for almost 6 months, with every day eating only two bowls of rice with a few grains of salt, every day I could eat like that two times—I did not have medicine when I was ill. Many people, prisoners like me, died in the forced labor camps.

At the time I escaped, many people were dying in the camps.

So the two examples I have just given you, I am sure that you must know partly about the policy of the Communists toward the Vietnamese people in South Vietnam.

I would like to ask you, please, don't give the Communists more strength in order to be able to mistreat and torture the people and the remnants of the former Vietnamese Army in South Vietnam.

I also would like to talk about one reeducation camp in Tay Ninh that one of these gentlemen has talked about earlier.

In fact, the Communists are very cunning. The camp in Tay Ninh was considered as a model. They detained there only the people they considered not dangerous and to those people they gave a number of privileges for foreign delegations coming for visits. Then they would show to the visitors that this is one of the regular camps that they have.

Actually, "reeducation" camps set up by the Communists were slaughterhouses beyond description.

I would like today to tell you about the plight suffered by the prisoners who belonged to the former army of the South Vietnamese Government.

I say this to you in order to ask you to look for means to help them. And in order to verify what I said, as truth, I would like to suggest that you invite the Vietnamese people who have just escaped the camps in Vietnam to come before this committee and testify to you about what they have been going through. Please invite them in the hundreds and listen to them in order to see whether they would talk like I do today. They are the ones who have been there—in the camps. Not Mr. Luce or Ms. Meinertz.

As far as I am concerned, if any of you in this room, if you want to know very exactly clearly, I am ready to go back to Vietnam with you to show to you where the Communists bury people and where they detain people.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I do not wish to take too much of your time. I would like to stop my presentation here and I am ready to answer any of your questions.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you.

Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I defer to you, Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. First of all, I suppose it is good to have votes in between. It gives me an opportunity to relax and bury some of the thoughts and feelings that you want to express as you sit and listen.

First of all, I would say, Mr. Jacqueney, you are certainly a breath of fresh air.

I was telling the chairman, one of the most frustrating experiences I have had is sitting at all of these hearings on all of these countries, because all of us have some preconceived idea, some biases, opinions, et cetera. But I try my very best to come with a pretty open mind so that if there is anything substantial, I can digest it and make a decision.

But I must say that in every hearing it is the same thing over and over again. We have those who come with their heads in the clouds and no feet on the ground. We have those who are so emotionally involved. You are the first person in all of the hearings I have sat through to this point who came ready to condemn the bad situation in human rights, no matter who it involved.

Normally, we are the bad guys and the other guys are the good guys, and yes, we make mistakes. The beauty of our country is that we are allowed to make mistakes. Most countries aren't. And we make more mistakes because people participate in the process of government.

But let me again say that you are a breath of fresh air and I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. JACQUENEY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GOODLING. I can only say, you know, the beauty of well-intentioned thinking people, that's great, but so ineffective.

The Christian religion and the Methodist Church have been very important to me in my life. We are totally ineffective in this country and throughout the world, as all Christian churches, simply because we are not realistic, we are totally idealistic. We do not really grasp the situation. We have our ideologies and our philosophies and we are going to gear everything to meet those ideologies and philosophies and not really end up solving any problems.

Do you know, we have been told in these hearings from very reliable sources, that there are somewhere between 50,000 and 300,000 people in these reeducation camps. Over and over and over again we have been told, with a realistic figure somewhere between 100,000 perhaps 150,000 or 200,000, probably anywhere from 50 to 100 camps.

And what I do not understand, and I will get to that question as to why they want to leave, and I will specifically pose that question in the very near future, my hope is when we are finished with all of this, there will be more Jacqueney testimony that someone can sink their teeth into, so that we really know what it is we are supposed to do.

I noticed when you talked about establishing a relationship with Vietnam, et cetera, you attached some strength to it. You very specifically said we don't blindly go in that we are going to cure all of the evils and ills and all of them are going to come rushing to American ideals, whatever they may be, simply because we have established a relationship.

I will start, I guess, with Mr. Luce.

We do agree with one thing in your statement, Mr. Luce. There was one page where you said 2 weeks didn't give you an opportunity to see everything. I am sure of that. I did not realize that we are the inventors of venereal disease and the spreaders. Our major contribution, I guess, is the spread of venereal disease.

I was really surprised with the statement you have here. One of the problems we run into again—I am attacking my own religion—we either don't study history or we don't pay any attention to it or we get so concerned with our own philosophies and ideals and so on, that the actual history somehow gets distorted.

You make a point: "We found the church to be very much alive in Saigon. There were thousands of worshippers there." And then you go right on and say exactly what the Communist Party has done over and over and over again: "It is true that the state has put parochial schools and orphanages under government control, to assure uniformity of education."

You don't have to worry about churches. You go behind the Iron Curtain, sure, there are still some in operation, 60, 80, 70, 90 years old. The kids aren't there. If you want to do anything, you want to spread a philosophy, as has been done in the past, get the youngsters, indoctrinate them, take them away from those church-schools, et cetera.

And I just do not understand how—not only that. It has always been the Communist philosophy and a Communist move to slowly get into these matters and make changes.

You again repeated over and over again, twice at least, the statement that they were so surprised they were not killed, and then you answered that question simply by saying they couldn't kill them.

That's no way to take over and indoctrinate them with your philosophy because then you get the children hating them, rather than being able to indoctrinate them.

You answered the question over and over again.

Let me ask you specific questions, about three, and most of them will take very simple answers.

Some time ago I read where the Clergy and Laity Concerned organization had this kind of philosophy today:

What we are about today is not simply an end to the war in Vietnam but a struggle against an American imperialism. Our task is to join those who are angry and to hate the corporate power which the United States presently represents and to attempt in our struggle to help liberate our own nation from its reactionary, exploitive policies.

Would you say, does that summarize today that philosophy, or has that philosophy changed?

Mr. LUCE. I do want to go back to comment on two of your earlier comments. One is quoting me on something that I don't think I said, and the other one—

Mr. GOODLING. Please, do. I don't want to quote you on what you didn't say.

Mr. LUCE. All right, if I may go back.

First, in terms of the question of whether we were the inventors or spreaders of venereal disease in Vietnam—

Mr. GOODLING. I didn't say that you said that.

Mr. LUCE. Yes, I know that, and I am not saying that we were the inventors.

What I am saying is that we did spread venereal disease.

Mr. GOODLING. We carried it there and spread it?

Mr. LUCE. I think one of the tragic things that happened there was that the U.S. Army, for example, provided medical attention to the U.S. soldiers who got venereal disease. They did not provide medical attention to the Vietnamese women who either caught it from American soldiers—

Mr. GOODLING. I have no qualms with that argument. Did we carry it there primarily? Was it something new?

Mr. LUCE. When I arrived in Vietnam in 1958, venereal disease was a rare thing in Vietnam. The family structure was such that it was not a major problem.

Mr. GOODLING. Sort of like it used to be in the United States.

Mr. LUCE. What we did in Vietnam was by forcing the farm people off their farms into the refugee camps, many of the women, in order to live, had to go to work in the bars and brothels. And one of the effects of that was to tremendously increase the rate of venereal disease.

As I mentioned, the rate which the social services have found among people who did work for U.S. soldiers as prostitutes has been 64 percent.

My point was and still is that we spread to a large extent, venereal disease in Vietnam; therefore, should be concerned about it and should help to cure it.

Mr. GOODLING. I have no qualms with that we should be concerned about it. I am merely trying to see if we brought it to South Vietnam.

Mr. LUCE. I think that most of the women—

Mr. GOODLING. That I would have trouble believing.

Mr. LUCE. Venereal disease has existed in many, many places. I think that the question which I am raising and which the Vietnamese are raising is that most of the women who got venereal disease would not have it today had it not been for the U.S. soldiers who were there.

Mr. GOODLING. That would probably be true of the U.S. soldiers, too.

Mr. LUCE. Right, and I am very sorry that they went there and I am sure that you are today, too.

Mr. GOODLING. Under the circumstances, because of certain people back in the country, yes.

Mr. LUCE. In terms of the churches and the history, I talked about going to a church in South Vietnam with a thousand people who were going there. North Vietnam has been under the present Communist government since 1954. Much of North Vietnam since much before that.

The biggest problem which the church in North Vietnam had to deal with was the bombing of the churches. There is still a strong Catholic Church in North Vietnam. As you probably know, the Archbishop, Trinh Nhu Khue, in Hanoi, was recently made a Cardinal by the Vatican, so that the Vatican itself has recognized the importance of the Catholic Church in the northern part of the country.

Mr. GOODLING. How many young people are attending those church services in North Vietnam and are attending Catholic schools?

Mr. LUCE. When I went to the National Cathedral in Hanoi, and this was in 1974, and at that time, by the way, I went with a Bishop

Andrew Grutka, who was the bishop of Gary, Ind., who has been very conservative on the issue of communism—there were about 1,000 parishioners attending the National Cathedral in Hanoi. We visited churches in a large part of North Vietnam and one of the conclusions that Bishop Grutka and Bishop Paul Washburn, of Chicago, came back with, is that the church in North Vietnam at that time is alive and is functioning and that people go.

The other point which I was making is that the people who were involved in teaching in Catholic schools are still the same teachers. That is also true of the orphanages and so on.

For example, when we visited the orphanages—

Mr. GOODLING. Except you also said in your testimony, if I remember correctly reading it, they are now teaching what the Government has determined should be taught. You did not specifically say it in that manner, but you alluded to the fact that they have taken away the opportunity to have these private religious schools.

Mr. LUCE. The difference is that the religious education which goes on in Vietnam today goes on in the churches and in the pagodas.

I think one of the misconceptions which I would like to clear up now, which I did not get into in the testimony, is, for example, some people have charged that the nuns could not wear their habits and so on, and one of the things that I did was to photograph in the orphanage the Mother Superior there in her habit.

The one thing I wanted to correct was that, I believe, you quoted me in saying that the religious leaders there were so surprised that they were not killed.

Mr. GOODLING. No; I didn't say that the religious leaders—you made a statement that people, it may not have been you; it might have been one of these [indicating]—that the people were surprised that they had not been killed, the people in the reeducation centers.

Mr. LUCE. The surprise I have seen has come from the Americans. For example, the U.S. State Department officials.

Mr. GOODLING. Someone made the statement that people in the reeducation centers had been surprised that they were not killed.

Mr. LUCE. I have seen U.S. officials who, prior to the end of the war, out of the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office, they were predicting that 1 million Vietnamese would be killed. One of the officials there had a book which looked like a telephone directory and he claimed had the names of 1 million Vietnamese who would be killed.

Mr. GOODLING. That is the same propaganda used to continue and perpetuate the situation that we are now getting on the other side of the story. Of course they would say something like that.

Mr. LUCE. The people were not killed and I believe we should be very happy about that.

Mr. GOODLING. Let's get to that. If the people were not killed, would you please tell me, and then perhaps Mr. Jacqueney can tell, I do not understand—from 60 to 70, I don't know how many young people I had from Vietnam in my home over summers who came as exchange students. Many of them had been North Vietnamese, many had been children of principals of high schools, elementary schools, teachers, this kind of thing. Why in the world did they flee to South Vietnam? And then answer this question for me, which I think Mr. Jacqueney touched on.

We are told that of all of the people that are trying to get out, and we are told that there are all sorts of people who are trying to get out, are losing their lives, many of them, in this attempt to get out. Why are they trying to get out? I don't understand it.

There are people whose culture keeps them there, the families keep them there, everything keeps them there, but they are trying to get out. Why?

Now three of you have painted the most beautiful picture. Everything is going hunky dory, ice cream, cake, and candy, things like that. Why are they trying to get out? Why do the people from North Vietnam flee to South Vietnam?

I don't understand it.

Mr. LUCE. If we can go back through 1954 when people went from north to south, and also, there were many people who left the south and went to the north in 1954, which is one of the things we don't mention. But in North Vietnam, in 1954, there was a tremendous amount of propaganda which our Government was involved in spreading.

For example, most of the people who went south were Catholics. One of the things which was done in North Vietnam, and I saw photos of this, was to build statues of the Virgin Mary with tears falling down her face, underneath written, "I have gone south; please follow."

Now this was very simplistic propaganda which our country was involved in.

Mr. GOODLING. And hundreds of thousands of people saw that out in the rice paddies and all over the area?

Mr. LUCE. Which was built in the Phat Diem and Bui Chu area, which were the major Catholic areas.

Mr. GOODLING. Are we in Vietnam now painting these pictures? Why are they trying to get out now?

Mr. LUCE. We were in Vietnam at the end of the war and we were spreading the same thing. If you want to come today and ask why some Vietnamese are leaving Vietnam—

Mr. GOODLING. I get the impression from very reliable sources that there are a lot of people still trying to get out of Vietnam.

Mr. LUCE. I think the reason that the people are leaving is that most of them are people who lived very well in Vietnam.

Mr. GOODLING. Wait a minute. The people who lived very well, a great number of those people, we saw to it that they got out.

Mr. LUCE. There were also a lot of people who lived very well who either didn't want to go or couldn't get out before.

Mr. GOODLING. You or some people were also telling me that a lot of these people were anti-Thieu, anti-involvement, et cetera. They should be ideal people to stay there.

Mr. Jacqueney. would you answer that question?

Mr. JACQUENEY. I would like to respond to two subjects that you raised because other people have been discussing them, too: The question of people not being killed, and that kind of thing; and the second thing I would like to respond to is, you talked about my discussion of the sophisticated relationship between human rights concerns, on the one hand, and legitimate humanitarian assistance on the other.

As far as the question of people being killed, I think Mr. Coi said, and I take a kind of shorthand and I was taking what he was saying, that many people in the prisons are killed. And from my interviews, I

have heard this over and over again. There is a vast difference between conditions in different camps. I think that has to be stated categorically.

You can talk to people who had very mild times in some camps. I have talked to a lot of people like that. On the other hand, I have talked to lots of people with gruesome descriptions of what went on in the camps, and many have died.

As one former prisoner put it, people now do not perish from torture or beatings but from overwork and disease. Ex-prisoners described deaths from malnutrition, beri-beri, dysentery, exhaustion induced by forced labor, casualties from required mine field sweeping and suicides.

Former internees also report widespread vision loss, infectious skin diseases caused by long-term, closely packed, dark, hot, filthy living conditions. These are some of the kinds of conditions in many reeducation detention camps.

Where forced labor is not required, paralysis is reported to be prevalent, caused when prisoners are stuck into cramped cells with no exercise, no sanitation and poor food.

Former prisoners also consistently report witnessing cases of reeducation camp insanity brought on by repressive living conditions and the camp authorities' incessant demands for self-criticism, confessions, requiring pages of detailed personal and family biography and political views over and over and over again.

I mean I could continue at much greater length but I draw your attention to my Worldview article, which reports what former prisoners say about their condition, and if you see that, it is even grimmer than what I have been talking about there in very brief, outline form.

Mr. GOODLING. The point I was trying to make at the very beginning is what I would like to do is get facts, not colored by either someone's pro-Vietnam war stance or someone in opposition to the Vietnam war stance.

I would just like to have facts and not—when we talk about camps, as I said, I don't know how many camps are there but I am led to believe there are somewhere between 50 and 100.

Mr. JACQUENEY. The first thing I want to say is I learned in Vietnam when I was there working for the Agency for International Development, the first time I was there, that if it is a figure about Vietnam, it is bound to be a lie. And I think that that is still true.

As Americans, we like to deal with specific figures. You can't do that in Vietnam. The estimates that I consider in some kind of ball park range, as you said, from 50,000 to 500,000. The latest Vietnamese—let me just start. Don has some other figures, I know—but the latest Vietnamese Government figure which is authoritative, of which I am aware, was given to the Far Eastern correspondent of *Le Monde* on April 24 or 25, the correspondent cites a figure of 60,000. This is an increase of the figure of 50,000, which was cited in February of this year by the Vietnamese Ambassador to Paris. But it is less than the 200,000 figure cited by a Vietnamese official last spring.

A number of American analysts seem to go along with the 200,000 figure. A number of European journalists, who used to sympathize with the National Liberation Front, including Tiziano Terzani and

Jean Lacouture, seem to put the figure in excess of 600,000. Andre Gelinas seems to use the figure 500,000.

Those are ball park figures. I am told when Don was in Vietnam, he was told the figure was 10,000. I don't understand how, at approximately the same time, a Vietnamese official could have told the Le Monde correspondent 60,000 and Don 10,000.

The question is, of course, which officials, I suppose, and you might want to go into that with him. But those are ball park figures.

There is another thing which is important which I want to bring to the attention of all of you, and that is this :

One week ago Monday, on June 13, a group of us who are concerned about these issues of human rights in Vietnam had a meeting with Allard Lowenstein, U.S. Representative to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, and a former Member of Congress, and afterwards, I talked to him privately. I asked him whether existing human rights statutes would cover humanitarian assistance to Vietnam, in the event that such bilateral assistance were ever to be offered—I know it is not the sentiment of the Congress now.

And it was Mr. Lowenstein's judgment, not his advocacy, but his judgment, that possible future United States aid to Vietnam would not fall under existing human rights statutes because they would be the subject of special bilateral negotiations. Mr. Lowenstein directed me to Congressman Fraser's staff and I asked an aide on the staff the same question. The gentleman told me that he had helped write the statute, but he was not sure, and he was going to look it up. We haven't had a chance to talk since, so I don't know in what direction that is going.

But I talked to a number of other people who are familiar with the statutes and they apparently feel that there is a possibility that there are two loopholes, first, because of the special bilateral negotiations aspect pointed out by Mr. Lowenstein, and second, there also could be a loophole in that humanitarian assistance which is supposed to reach people directly can occur, even if there are human rights violations by a government.

So I draw this to your attention in terms of testimony I offered earlier, connecting humanitarian aid to Vietnam to greater Hanoi attention to our human rights concerns, in a sophisticated but determined manner that could work. These two loopholes in the legislation ought to be looked into at the time that you reconsider the subject of humanitarian aid to Vietnam as I hope you will.

Mr. GOODLING. The problem I run into constantly with the whole humanitarian aid effort is it is very difficult to vote against something you believe very strongly in, and my problem is, how do we get it to those 50,000 or 100,000 or 200,000, et cetera, in those prisons?

Our efforts in the past, other than church groups or other organizations actually working independently, it has been difficult to get it to those who have been truly in need. It is a real problem, the whole humanitarian aid.

One other question you did touch on, the MIA's, and of course, total emphasis should not be on the dead, except that if you are a member of one of those families, it consumes a lot of your waking hours and probably semisleeping hours also, and it is a human rights issue, in my estimation, which should be dealt with.

I read a report from some correspondent who was recently there who said that in his estimation there are just storage places of bodies that eventually will be trickled out little by little by little.

In my estimation, that is a real human rights violation. You are talking about something very important, which is life. I am not talking about, yes, we were very guilty.

Well, we thought when we started, I suppose President Kennedy did, that he was doing the right thing and something good. Now that is all over and if, really, everyone wants to put this whole issue behind, it seems to me that would be a real start.

And I was wondering, do you see it in the same light as this correspondent where they probably do have and are very knowledgeable of many MIA's who are no longer living and will be trickled out little by little, as we have been witnessing in the last couple of years?

Mr. JACQUENEY. You are asking for a judgment.

Mr. GOODLING. I am asking for an opinion.

Mr. JACQUENEY. An opinion about which I probably do not have competence, but my judgment would be, since they are trickling out some new MIA information, that they must have more. They obviously had some that they did not reveal earlier, so maybe they have a few more names or remains.

As far as having massive files and all of this, that defies rationality, considering the circumstances of the war and the terrain and all of that. I just would doubt strongly that they have those kinds of things.

I really do want to draw your attention to the last phrase I had in the paragraph discussing the MIA problem. I did conclude that paragraph with the phrase, "as important as that may be."

Looking for more MIA's information is important. I said something like "as important as that may be."

Mr. GOODLING. I wasn't faulting your statement.

Mr. JACQUENEY. I said that it was important, but what I tried to say, and forgive me if I was not clear, is that, sure, it is important to find these bodies. If it were my brother or a friend of mine, I would want to know. But it should not be the only thing, and right now, it appears to be the only thing, and it seems to me that that is wrong.

Mr. GOODLING. I would agree it is wrong, but on the other hand, I would think that if I really wanted to bring about these relationships, and I were a part of the Vietnamese government, I would wipe that out very quickly because I would very quickly release all of those bodies.

Mr. JACQUENEY. I join you in the hope that they do.

Mr. GOODLING. It is certainly a human rights effort on their part, which would at least take away an awful lot of excuses.

Mr. JACQUENEY. I just hope that those who are concerned—legitimately, properly, decently concerned about finding the full accounting of the MIA's,—would also devote some of their attention to the just human rights cause of trying to get some of the live political prisoners released, those who want to leave Vietnam and join families here, to get them permitted to leave.

It seems to me that the men who died, died for something, believing in something, and I would imagine that they would want their families and Congressmen such as yourself, who are involved in this reasonable, just cause, to work also in the cause of releasing prisoners.

Mr. GOODLING. I have no other questions.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, always we have a situation where all of our panelists are quite informative and we could spend hours debating with them but we run out of time, and it requires shortcuts.

So I have just one or two questions.

Mr. Coi, do I understand correctly that there is a systematic persecution of the Buddhist sect to which you belong.

Mr. Coi. Yes, sir, there is definitely a persecution of the Hoa Hao sect.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Does this also consist of efforts to break down the discipline or the normal functioning structure of the group?

Mr. Coi. Actually, between the Hoa Hao sect and the Communist sect there has existed real hatred, because in 1955, the Communists killed the founder of the Hoa Hao sect. The founder of the Hoa Hao sect's name was Mr. Huynh Phu So. So he was killed at the hands of the Communists. And since then the hatred did exist between the two groups.

Mr. DERWINSKI. What about the nominal leaders through this period? What has happened to them?

Mr. Coi. Mr. Huynh Phu So has disappeared. The Hoa Hao keep their lines and they used their land where the sect was founded. They used that land to be the center of the faith, and they have been maintaining their order.

Even though the founder has died, the leaders who came after him succeeded in maintaining and developing the faith.

The last leader of the Hoa Hao was Mr. Luong Trong Tuong that I have already mentioned to you before.

Until the time the Communists took over completely South Vietnam on April 30, 1975, one more time they arrested and detained the leader of the Hoa Hao sect. The charges against him were that he, under cover of religion, worked actually as an agent of the CIA and spied for the United States. The Communists had a very clear intention of destroying the Hoa Hao sect because they know that the Hoa Hao people have had a tradition of loving freedom.

Therefore, besides the fact that they arrested and imprisoned the leaders of the Hoa Hao sect, 18 persons in Chi Hoa prison and thousands others in the provinces they forced Mr. Tuong to sign the decision to disband the sect, and at the same time they confiscated every facility that would be used for the propagation of this faith, pagodas, reading rooms, schools, and temples.

Before the day I left Vietnam in October of 1976, the Communists have forced Mr. Tuong, who was taken out of prison under guards, they had him standing in front of the people in areas where there were Hoa Hao believers. Then standing in front of those people, Mr. Tuong had to confess that "he had received money from the U.S. imperialists," which was absolutely untrue. While Mr. Tuong was making that confession in front of the people, he was in very ill health, he was 74 years old. Several times while he was talking to the people, he fainted. My wife and relatives were there and they saw him. After that, the Communists took Mr. Tuong back to prison.

At the present time, the Hoa Hao believers are having very many difficulties with the Communist authorities. Their movements are re-

stricted. North Vietnamese soldiers come to live in their home to watch them. There are regiments of them. This should be proof to show you that the Communists are out to destroy the Hoa Hao Buddhists.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Thank you.

Subject to whatever time restrictions there are, I have a few more questions.

Mr. FRASER. There is another vote, so we must take a short recess. We will be back in a few minutes.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Mr. FRASER. The subcommittee will resume its hearing.

I think we are safe from any more recesses.

Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I will try to be brief, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. McCleary, is the doctor medical or doctor of divinity?

Mr. McCLEARY. Doctor of divinity.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I should know better than to try to discuss theology with a doctor of divinity, but in this statement, which was, a joint statement by you and Mr. Haines and Ms. Meinertz, there is a point here that I would like to clarify. It is page 5.

It reads as follows:

The Government expects the church, like all institutions, to contribute to the cohesion and stability of individuals in the society. The church here, as in many countries of the world, must struggle in the year to come for a theological understanding of what its role in the new society will be.

I would like to be corrected if I misinterpret, but it is almost as if you are saying in this case the Socialist Republic of Vietnam can properly have a church group adjust its theological position to the broad outlines of state policy.

Is that what you are saying or do I misinterpret it?

Mr. McCLEARY. It happens this particular statement was written by Ms. Meinertz and perhaps she would like to have the privilege of answering it first.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Fine.

Ms. MEINERTZ. We were talking about institutions of the church, which in Vietnam, as in most Socialist countries, become government responsibilities. And not only in Vietnam but in a variety of places around the world, these traditional institutional manifestations are no longer a part of church life. It is a struggle—and this is true of many countries and will be true for a long time in Vietnam—to think through what the role of the church is in a situation where the traditional church institutional role mandates feeding and clothing, now assumed by government.

Related to that point, we talked about the schools. For instance, I live in New York City and I would love to send my child to a public school. But unfortunately, in my particular situation, the church is the only place where the kind of care I need is provided. In places where the worshiping community becomes the only surviving manifestation of the church, understanding the root of that vitality requires a renewal of understanding of what the church is as separate from its institutions.

If you want to get into deep theology on this, I defer to Dr. McCleary; it is a complicated process.

MR. DERWINSKI. I understand exactly what you have just told me. That is not what your statement said. Your statement said that the church, as in many countries of the world, must struggle for years to come to a theological understanding of what its role is.

Now, we had Father Gelinas here last week who told us that church entities such as orphanages, leper asylums, and so on were all being closed. This is the pattern all over the world when the Communists take over. The church functions, except for worship, are eliminated and then eventually, as is the case of Mainland China, there is nothing left but the one church to serve the diplomatic community in Peking.

But that is not what your statement said. It spoke specifically of coming to a theological understanding. Now that is not what you are trying to say today.

MS. MEINERTZ. That is what I am trying to say. I am not an expert on China, but if the only surviving church in China is one for foreign diplomats, then the church has not survived in China.

Cuba is going through this struggle of finding out what the role of the church is without its institutional manifestations.

MR. DERWINSKI. Let me rephrase the question. What I am really trying to get to is, are you saying in this statement that you accept the dictated, limited role of a church in a totalitarian country?

MS. MEINERTZ. I don't accept a prescribed role for the church by any government. But the church lives in society and the benefit for individuals that the church can be is a social expression.

So in this country, for instance, the church is not felt along—

MR. DERWINSKI. Let's speak of Vietnam. I am talking specifically of what is going on in Vietnam.

Using your term, are churches in Vietnam being forced to come to a theological understanding?

MS. MEINERTZ. I don't think they have begun to undertake this challenge yet. We inquired about any changes and learned that religious education is still run by the churches. It is not run by the state. Regular education is run by the state, but seminaries are operated by the churches.

We asked about changes in curriculum they were instituting as a result of the change in government, if any. The Catholic Archbishop was describing the fact that one change would be that people, in turning to the priesthood, would also have to go to work and experience manual labor. Obviously, in serving a parish in a society for which production is very important, the church feels that this needs to be a part of priests' experience for understanding and effective service.

MR. DERWINSKI. Who feels it?

MS. MEINERTZ. The archbishop of Saigon.

MR. DERWINSKI. That is because of government regulation.

MS. MEINERTZ. Emphasis, certainly. But if all that happens is that the church adopts the government style, then there is no church, and that becomes a theological problem.

MR. DERWINSKI. It is more than a theological problem. It wins out peoples freedom of religion, doesn't it?

MR. GOODLING. Totally.

MS. MEINERTZ. Maybe you can be clearer?

Mr. DERWINSKI. If a religion, to barely survive, just to keep its doors open, must totally subordinate itself to some governmental regulation, it is really not religion any more, is it? It is just a facade.

Mr. McCLEARY. I don't think the issue is that the government is forcing the church to rethink its theological position. But the fact that there is social change taking place in our society. Historically, quite dependent upon social institutions as an expression of its ministry, the church no longer has those because the state has assumed that role to care for all its citizens. The church no longer fulfills that function, but the church has a very valid function to fulfill in that society, even if it doesn't have a hospital or school.

For example, the Christian church existed until the Dark Ages without any social institutions, and it was in that period that the monastic order came into being. And the church-school did not come into existence until 150 years ago. There were no church schools, no Sunday school.

So that the church as a worshipping community has always existed. In some societies, it has been reduced to that form again. But the church hasn't come to understand the nature of that role alone because it has taken on other accouterments, other functions. Again, in Vietnam, it has now been reduced to being a worshipping community. But it has to rethink the meaning of that to make it a meaningful expression.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Let me try one more time, then, Doctor. Are you saying, as in a case such as this where the church has been reduced in its operations, the church has been substantially limited, that you accept this as an understandable historic development? You find nothing wrong with it?

Mr. McCLEARY. Yes, I do.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes; you do find something wrong with it?

Mr. McCLEARY. No; I do not find that necessarily a problem. I would accept that.

For example, we visited with the church leadership in Burma en route to Vietnam. They said 15 years after their schools were institutionalized, they were grateful it had happened. They had been freed of a great burden. At the time they regretted it, but they found a new life and vitality because they didn't have the large institutions to manage.

So that what is happening in terms of social institutions is not necessarily affecting the total life of the church. The church can exist without social institutions.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am afraid while at divinity school you took a side course in evasiveness. Obviously, I cannot pin you down. We have jumped from Burma to the Dark Ages and you still haven't answered my question, which is do you approve of what the Government in Vietnam is doing to the churches?

That is my question.

Mr. McCLEARY. You are asking for an opinion and I would say that what has happened to the churches in Vietnam is detrimental to their fulfilling the function of being the church. They can be the church, the fullness of the church, within the context of the limits that they have to operate in Vietnam, just as they are in Russia and just as they are in Cuba, and to what degree it does exist in China.

The church does not have to have social institutions to be the church, in other words.

Mr. FRASER. May I just ask a question?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Of course.

Mr. FRASER. Dr. McCleary, I don't know about Vietnam, but in the Soviet Union, as I recall, one thing seems clear, and that is if you are an active worshiper, if you go to church, you have got problems in terms of your career. That is, it is not helpful to your career. You are unlikely to be able to get a membership in the Communist Party, which is an important thing if you are to become an elite and progress.

In other words, there is real pressure.

Moreover, the Communist Party, while it concedes that the Constitution allows free expression, the doctrine is a party doctrine and there are political and economic constraints put upon the community.

I would think that, clearly, people in the Soviet Union who do want to pursue their religious beliefs feel this way, that those are very real constraints on them, real pressures, which have the effect of diminishing the community.

Now maybe it will survive, nonetheless. Mr. Derwinski's question was—take the Soviet Union. I would be interested because I know more about the Soviet Union. Would one say that that is a good thing or is it all right that the Soviet Union is doing that, that it is making it difficult?

Mr. McCLEARY. I would not be in a position to make that kind of a value judgment on the Soviet Union. In terms of the conversations we have had—

Mr. FRASER. Let me put it more generically. If a state puts pressures on people who pursue their religious beliefs, is that in general a good thing for a state to do?

Mr. McCLEARY. I don't think you give me many alternatives for an answer.

Mr. FRASER. I don't know. You may have some theological way of dealing with this.

Mr. McCLEARY. I would simply say that I am not sure that those manifestations have yet surfaced in Vietnam.

Mr. FRASER. Well, that may be.

Mr. McCLEARY. At this point, the leadership of the Buddhist community, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Protestant Church are aware these were the church leaders, archbishops and so on and seem supportive of the present political situation, the present government, and did not give indication that these kinds of pressures existed upon them, or that there were restraints on their activities.

Mr. FRASER. They didn't feel threatened?

Mr. McCLEARY. No.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Karl Marx once said that religion was the opium of the people. Any country where the Communists have secured power, whether it be in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and I presume that this will be the case in Mozambique and Angola soon, they have stamped out all organized religion, especially the dominant religion, whether it be Moslem or a Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, et cetera. This is obviously the trend that has developed already in Vietnam. Therefore, that gets back to the statement which I interpret as meaning acquies-

cence by your group of three to the choking off by the state of religious viability.

Mr. McCLEARY. I would not agree with that. We did not perceive that the state was choking off the life of the church.

We found unexpectedly to a 6 a.m. mass at a Roman Catholic Church. It was filled. We met with the religious leadership and their indication was not that they were under these types of pressures. We asked the archbishop how many persons he had going into full-time vocations? He said there were over 100 studying in a major seminary to go into the priesthood, that they were not decreasing in terms of the size of the church, but he felt that they were now growing.

Mr. GOODLING. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Of course I will yield.

Mr. GOODLING. Specifically, the Christian religion—if, in Vietnam, the Christian religion is allowed to function as a church but the state will tell them what it is that they are—how they are supposed to speak, react, what the Christian religion is supposed to do, then personally, what good is the church?

I preach every Sunday that if just saying you are a Christian doesn't change the way you live, the way you act, the things you do and your ability to express yourself and your opportunity, what good is it?

Yet, I am told, basically, they can go to church. I suppose they can go to church and they can go home. I don't see anything. It appears to me that every other activity—I am not saying you have to have some kind of social mission, but you have to have an opportunity to reflect what it is you believe, and if you don't have that opportunity because the government doesn't give it, as all of the other countries which have been mentioned here, I just don't understand. Why bother about 1,000 people going to church if it isn't going to carry over into their everyday life, into their government?

Mr. McCLEARY. I thought that what I was saying, by the statement in terms of the church attendance, that unless they found it to be a meaningful experience, even if there were pressure, then they would have ceased going. Hence, there must be some translation of that meaning into everyday life.

Mr. GOODLING. But you don't really believe that. I don't know if you have a church now. If there are 200 people in that church, there are 100 who are coming because that's what they've done all their lives—they aren't coming because of any meaningful experience, I am sure. It has become a way of life. It is part of their life, whether they are Methodist or Presbyterians, or whatever they are. No matter where I go, it is pretty tough to turn most of them on.

Mr. JACQUENEX. I would like to suggest a question or ask one, if I can. Don Luce speaks excellent Vietnamese and I wondered whether either of the two of you (Ms. Meinertz and Mr. McCleary) speak Vietnamese?

Ms. MEINERTZ. No.

Mr. McCLEARY. [Nods in the negative.]

Mr. JACQUENEX. In that case I wondered who functioned as your interpreter? Did you see the archbishop in the presence of other Vietnamese officials? Did the archbishop perceive you to be friends of the Vietnamese Government?

I would wonder how he might have couched his answers based upon those kinds of questions.

Mr. McCLEARY. Church World Service is a Protestant relief and development agency and we have been involved in Vietnam for over 20 years, providing assistance to both the north and the south, and we have continued to do so.

During the course of these years we have expended more than \$13 million in Vietnam.

Now our trip comes out of a history of relationship and not with simply a one term or brief visit. So that there is a long history of relationship with Vietnam. At the time that the Government of the South collapsed, Church World Service had a staff of 140 in South Vietnam.

So there was an extensive program in existence related to the churches at that time. So we are speaking out of a context of a long background of knowledge and understanding of Vietnam, as well as relationship.

So that, while there are points which we did not have a Vietnamese speaker, we had persons who were in Vietnam a month before we were who were in our service there married to Vietnamese who speak Vietnamese, had been there for 10 years, visited his family, so that there is a history of relationship that validates what we are saying.

If I might make one comment about our testimony. It did focus almost entirely on the visit to a reeducation camp, and I would simply like to clarify that in the sense that we felt that rather than attempt to report on the larger scope of the trip, being among the very few Americans who had an opportunity to visit a reeducation center, that we perhaps had something unique that we could add to the testimony that has already been given.

Mr. GOODLING. How many did you see?

Mr. McCLEARY. We saw one, and that is a point I would like to speak to. What Mr. Jacqueney has said is quite true in regard to Vietnam, and that is there are no statistics available. The country has been in chaos because of the war for a long period of time and the broad overview is just not available.

Mr. GOODLING. So you don't know whether it was a minimum security, maximum security, or what?

Mr. McCLEARY. That is right. On the other hand, if you don't have the overview, you speak to the particular, and we were only in one camp and what we said was that we could not draw general conclusions from one case. But this is what we saw in one case.

So either argument is faulty. When you cannot speak with accuracy to the overview, you don't have adequate information, and when you can only speak to one specific case, that argument is faulty because you cannot generalize it and say this is what all are like.

What we did try to do, then, was to move from that since you cannot affirm the general nor the particular, neither of those arguments, and say that there are certain signs that we saw in the life of that society that might be helpful to point to in terms of human rights. And that is in terms of the reconstruction that is going on, there is an attempt to restore the cultural values and the statement spoke to that in terms of prostitutes, the restoration of family life and so on, the restoration of cultural values exist.