AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

CONTINUED HUMAN RIGHTS ATTACKS ON FAMILIES IN CHINA

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JULY 9, 2012

Serial No. 112–168

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/ or http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

74–959PDF WASHINGTON : 2012

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
RON PAUL, Texas
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
GUS M. BILIRAKIS, Florida
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
BILL JOHNSON, Ohio
DAVID RIVERA, Florida
MIKE KELLY, Pennsylvania
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
ANN MARIE BUERKLE, New York
RENEE ELLMERS, North Carolina
ROBERT TURNER, New York

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
BRAD SHERMAN, California
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
DENNIS CARDOZA, California
BEN CHANDLER, Kentucky
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
ALLYSON SCHWARTZ, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY, Connecticut
FREDERICA WILSON, Florida
KAREN BASS, California
WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island

YLEEM D.S. POBLETE, *Staff Director*
RICHARD J. KESSLER, *Democratic Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey, *Chairman*

JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
ANN MARIE BUERKLE, New York
ROBERT TURNER, New York

KAREN BASS, California
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida

CONTENTS

Page

WITNESSES

Pastor Bob Fu, founder and president, ChinaAid Association 9
Ms. Reggie Littlejohn, founder and president, Women's Rights Without Frontiers 23
Mr. Steven Mosher, president, Population Research Institute 33
Mr. T. Kumar, director of international advocacy, Amnesty International 41
Ms. Yanling Guo, victim of China's population control policies 43

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

Pastor Bob Fu:
- Letter from Chinese scholars on the repeal of the family planning law 12
- Prepared statement 17
- Documents relating to the capture of and fines levied against Ms. Guo translated into English 57

Ms. Reggie Littlejohn: Prepared statement 27
Mr. Steven Mosher: Prepared statement 36
Ms. Yanling Guo: Prepared statement 45
The Honorable Christopher H. Smith, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey, and chairman, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights: Material submitted for the record 67

APPENDIX

Hearing notice 76
Hearing minutes 77

CONTINUED HUMAN RIGHTS ATTACKS ON FAMILIES IN CHINA

MONDAY, JULY 9, 2012

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH,
AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2 o'clock p.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Christopher H. Smith (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. SMITH. The subcommittee will come to order and good afternoon to everyone. China's one-child policy has been in effect since 1979, is state sponsored murder, and it constitutes massive crimes again humanity. The Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal properly construed forced abortion as a crime against humanity. Nothing in human history compares to the magnitude of China's 33-year assault on women and children. Abortion is a weapon of mass destruction and millions have been exterminated.

Today in China, rather than being given maternal care, pregnant women without birth-allowed permits are hunted down and forcibly aborted. They are mocked, they are belittled and they are humiliated. In recent days, the exploitation and forced abortion at 7 months of Feng Jianmei has sparked global outrage and deep concern for her welfare and for that of the women in China. As a matter of fact, I would note parenthetically, in early July, the European Parliament condemned China's one-child-per-couple policy with its reliance on forced abortion.

While Feng remains in a hospital she calls a prison, her husband Deng has been beaten. Feng's gross mistreatment, however, is far too commonplace. Feng Jianmei was forced to undergo an abortion on June 2, 7 months into her pregnancy. Many reports indicate that local officials in northwestern Shaanxi Province held Ms. Feng for 3 days, blindfolded, and coerced her to consent to the abortion. With the supposed consent, it took five men to hold her down and administer the drug that induced the 48-hour labor. The injection was given directly to the child's head. Ms. Feng's husband, Deng, posted graphic photos of his wife and the dead baby online; embarrassing the government. Deng Jicai, Mr. Deng's sister, and her brother and sister-in-law, had refrained from speaking to the media but decided to speak to German reporters who traveled to Shaanxi when the government did not produce investigation results as promised.

Ms. Deng reported to the media that the local government organized a backlash against the family members, calling them traitors and keeping them under surveillance apparently angered over the family contact with journalists. Local residents took a long bus ride to the hospital where Ms. Feng was recovering from the abortion and demonstrated with banners like, "beat the traitors soundly," and "expel them from the township." Family members claim that the demonstration seemed to be a campaign organized and funded by local authorities, but made to look like a spontaneous public gesture.

Mr. Deng reportedly was also beaten and labeled a traitor for speaking about the crime committed against his wife. The China Daily reported that there was no legal basis for the fine of $6,300 for the second pregnancy that Ms. Feng refused to pay. The local government also has admitted that Ms Feng's legal rights were violated. Publicity surrounding the forced abortion prompted the firing of two local government officials and warning or demerits being issued against five others. Mr. Deng escaped from the hospital where both he and his wife were being forcibly detained. He traveled to Beijing and hired a lawyer to sue the local government. Mr. Deng's location is now unknown, but it is believed that he is in hiding. And of course, Ms. Feng is still being held in the hospital.

Their lawyer, Zhang Kai, said recently that he sent a legal request on behalf of the Feng's husband asking local police and prosecutors to investigate criminal infractions in the case. Deng is also seeking unspecified compensation from the government.

The widespread circulation of the photos posted by Mr. Deng has prompted renewed debate in China and the world regarding the one-child policy, possibly including within the government itself. Researchers with a center affiliated with China's State Council, the equivalent of China's cabinet, argued in an essay published in the China Economic Times newspaper on July 3 that China should adjust the one-child policy as soon as possible to head off a potential demographic crisis.

The Wall Street Journal on July 6 also reported that a group of prominent Chinese scholars issued an open letter on Thursday calling for a rethink of the one-child policy. The group argued that the policy in its current form is incompatible with China's increasing respect for human rights and need for sustainable economic development. The letter comes less than a month after Feng's photo and story ignited the public anger.

"The birth-approved system built on the idea of controlling population size as emphasized in the current 'Population of Family Planning Law' does not accord with provisions on the protection of human rights contained the nation's constitution," the authors of Thursday's letter wrote, adding that the rewriting of the law was "imperative."

The list of signatories to Thursday's letter included several high profile figures, including Beijing University sociologist Li Jianxin and Internet entrepreneur James Liang. "This is a time during which people all over the world have realized that there are problems with the [one-child] policy," Mr. Liang, the co-founder and chief executive of a Chinese online travel site, told The Wall Street Journal. Mr. Liang has spent the past 5 years pursuing a Ph.D. in

economics at Stanford and just published a book challenging the notion that China has too many people. Mr. Liang said he has felt a recent opening up of discussion around the one-child policy.

Mr. Liang also advocates a complete dismantling of the family planning system rather than a two-child system put forward by others. He said he initially became interested in the one-child policy when he came across research showing that innovation and entrepreneurship are dominated by young people. He said he feared a shrinking of the population of young people would hamper the country's efforts to evolve beyond being merely the world's factory.

"From an economic perspective, the one-child policy is irrational," he wrote. "From a human rights perspective it is even less rational."

Today we will hear testimony from Guo Yangling who will tell us how she, like Feng, suffered a brutalizing late-term abortion. She notes that heading out to breakfast, she was stopped by an older woman in her 50s and asked if she had a birth permit. Again, without a birth permit, a child simply cannot be born. "Then two staff members from the Family Planning Commission came and asked me where I was from, and where I lived, and what my name was. I tried to walk away but they wouldn't let me go," she will say. "Help," she said, "somebody help," but no one came to help. Then two vans arrived, the doors opened, and she was put into the van.

And she said on her way while she was complaining, they stuffed a rag into her mouth to gag her. She then went on to say that when she got to the second floor of the abortion mill, there were a number of female victims sitting on the benches in the corridor, their eyes filled with tears of anxiety, terror and sadness. "A woman dressed in white and wearing a surgical mask told me to get on the delivery bed immediately. I refused," she said, "so they pinned me down on the bed by force. After the person in white pressed my belly with her hands and felt the position of my baby's head," she goes on to say, "she stuck a big long fatal needle into the abdomen." And then she said, "my unborn baby had been murdered and I lost heart." She will be testifying today before this hearing.

This is the grim reality of the one-child-per-couple policy: Broken women and dead babies. As we have known for three decades, there are no single moms in China, except those who somehow evade the family planning cadres and concealed their pregnancy. For over three decades brothers and sisters have been illegal. Anyone in this room, anybody who might hear about this hearing, anybody in the world who has a brother or sister, not so in China, they are illegal. The mother has absolutely no right to protect her unborn baby from state-sponsored violence.

The price of failing to conform is absolutely staggering. If you have an out-of-plan illegal child, your other child, if there is one, could be denied education, health care, marriage and the fines, again, are unbearable. Ms. Feng was told she had to pay a $6,300 fine or else her child would be killed at 7 months, sometimes that fine, called a social compensation fee, goes as high as 10 times the combined salaries of the mother and the father.

Her trauma, women in China like Feng and Guo is incomprehensible and it is a trauma she shares to some degree with every woman in China. The World Health Organization says something on the order of 500 women per day in China commit suicide. Unlike any other country in the world, these women are suffering the trauma of being forcibly aborted and many take their own lives.

The result of this policy is a nightmarish, brave new world, with no precedent in human history. Where women are psychologically wounded, girls fall victim to sex selection abortion. In some provinces, 140 boys are born per every 100 girls. And most children grow up, as I said before, without brothers, or sisters, or aunts, or uncles, or cousins.

Over the years, I have chaired 37 congressional hearings focused in whole or in part on China's one-child policy. At one, the principle witness was a woman named Wuijan, a Chinese student attending university here in the United States who testified how her child was forcibly murdered by the government. She said the waiting room was full of moms who had just gone through a forced abortion. Some moms were crying, some were mourning, some moms were screaming. One mom was rolling on the floor with unbearable pain, she testified. Then Wuijan said it was her turn, and she described through tears what she called her "journey in hell."

At another hearing right in this room in the mid 1990s, a woman who was the director of the family planning clinic in Fujian province said that by day, she was a monster; by night a wife and mother of one. Harry Wu arranged for her testimony. It was very difficult to get her into this country, and when she told her story, you could have heard a pin drop.

Women bear the major brunt of the one-child policy not only as victimized mothers, but again, because girls are selected; sex selection abortion is huge in China with a catastrophic impact on the girl child as well as this gendercide that has lead to an unimaginable increase in human trafficking.

Some of you may know I am the author of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000. Well, this year's TIP released on June 19 points out that China's birth limitation policy coupled with a cultural preference for sons creates a skewed sex ratio in China which served as a key cause, I repeat, a key cause of trafficking of foreign women as brides for Chinese men, and for, of course, prostitution.

The report goes on to say that the government took no, that is to say, the Chinese Government, took no discernible steps to address the role that its birth limitation policy plays in fueling human trafficking in China with gaping gender disparities resulting in shortages of female marriage partners.

On June 26th, an op-ed in The People's Daily, the official paper of the Chinese Party, shed light on this emerging demographic catastrophe that is in China. The article entitled "Leftover Men to Be a Big Problem," admits there is a "bachelors crisis" that will "trigger a moral crisis," these are their words, "of marriage and family." We have heard that before, many of our witnesses have spoken to this, in some cases for decades, that there is a huge disparity of males to females. Nicholas Eberstadt, the world renowned demog-

rapher, has said what are the consequences for a society that has chosen to become simultaneously more gray and more male.

Let me just say, finally, last August, Vice President Joe Biden visited China and told an audience that he was fully aware and fully understood the one-child policy, and he was not second-guessing the state of China for imposing it. I would say, first, to my colleagues, what would the public reaction be if the Vice President or any public official, House, Senate or White House or anywhere else in the world said that he fully understands and is not second-guessing copyright infringement? A gross violation of intellectual property rights? Or torture? Or religious persecution?

The one-child-per-couple policy is the most egregious and vicious attack on women ever in its scope, pervasiveness, and it is done with impunity every day. Ms. Feng's case is one of tens of millions that happened over the last 30 years. I would just say that I am concerned as well that we continue to fund organizations like the U.N. Population fund.

In May 1984, 28 years ago, I offered the first amendment ever to a foreign aid bill to deny funding to any organization, including the U.N. Population Fund that are complicit with China's forced abortion policy or its involuntary sterilization policy. It passed, and that language matriculated into the Kemp-Kasten Amendment after Jack Kemp of New York offered it through an appropriations bill.

After all these years, it is astonishing that policymakers remain indifferent or supportive of these massive crimes against women and children. The Obama administration has long enabled this policy by its silence and financial support to the tune of $165 million over the past 3 years to UNFPA, an organization that supports, plans, implements, defends, and whitewashes these crimes against humanity.

I have met with the leaders of the Chinese population program, I remember Peng Peiyun on one particular trip, and she launched into a defense of their program claiming that the UNFPA was in town, was there and they defended it, and said it was a totally voluntary program.

Finally, in 2000, I wrote a law called the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001. Section 801 of Title VIII of that Act is still in effect today. It requires the Secretary of State not to issue any visa to, and the Attorney General not to admit to the United States, any foreign national whom the Secretary finds based on credible and specific information to have been directly involved in the establishment or enforcement of forced abortion or forced sterilization. Owing to a glaring lack of implementation, only a handful of abusers of women have reportedly been denied visas to the United States. That, too, must change.

I would yield too my good friend, Ms. Bass, for any openings comments that she would make.

Ms. BASS. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this hearing covers a topic of international concern for which this committee has, as you recounted, received testimony on a number of occasions. And you have certainly been outspoken on China's one-child policy. And I know that several of today's witnesses have, on numerous occa-

sions, expertly argued the China's one-child policy raises considerable concern and is absolutely egregious.

Today's witnesses have also drawn our attention to numerous other human rights violations with respect to women in China. It is my hope that today's hearing will speak not nearly on behalf of the countless women in China, of course, who endured grave harm to their minds and bodies, but on behalf of women and girls everywhere who are under threat each and every day, who live in perpetual fear, and who must endure unimaginable pain and suffering, due, for no other reason, than because of their gender.

You will recall in 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. At this hearing, Secretary Clinton unequivocally condemned the forced abortion and sterilization practices in China. She said at that hearing, "I consider any governmental imposition that imposes government policy on women to be absolutely unacceptable. And I feel strongly about forced sterilization, forced abortion, or any other egregious interference with women's rights."

The Secretary State spoke clearly on practices that I, too, find deplorable and, frankly, unacceptable. I believe the women and men at the State Department have worked and will continue to work with the Chinese to address this very serious human rights issue. And I was actually surprised to hear of the comments of the Vice President, because, actually, I have heard very much the opposite from him as well as from the administration in terms of their considering the one-child policy to be absolutely deplorable.

The measure in health, the society is based on how we treat our citizens and the people found within our borders, while these words have been said time and time again, these words and their meaning are critically important to all our societies, whether we are American or Chinese. It is a measure of the society before us and of a future society where peace, freedom and justice is an idea worth achieving. It is a reminder that while governments, no matter how powerful, may make and carry outlaws, it is people who are the truest measure of these laws.

While nations should be able to set policies and laws that are in the best interest of its people, nations must do so with the deepest respect and in accordance with international standards and with an eye toward observing always human rights.

These human rights instruments that have been passed before by the United Nations among many others are more than mere words on a page. They were crafted after much deliberation from expert scholars, civil societies and the aftermaths of events that made us question the very essence of our humanity, such as the convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women are the international covenant on civil and political rights. These instruments are fundamental to prevent atrocities of all forms from taking place today and into the future. They are our guides to a global society that, despite cultural difference, uphold inalienable rights that cannot be undermined or struck down. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Bass, thank you very much for your opening statement. I would like to yield to Ann Marie Buerkle, gentlelady from New York.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you also to our witnesses for being here today. Your courageous efforts to bring attention to human rights abuse in China are exemplary and future generations will be indebted to you for your courage and your devotion to the cause of creating a free and fair China. Thank you very much for being here.

Over the course of the past decade, China's rapid advancement has fascinated people around the globe. It seems every day, there are more and more reports about China's increasing strength. Today, there is no doubt that China is a major player on the world stage and challenges America's leading role in world affairs. Sadly, there is an ugly underbelly to China's impressive assent. Our fascination with China's advancement is matched by our horror of China's human rights abuses. While China's economic and technological development has sped forward, civil and human rights in the nation have remained very backwards.

The story of Ms. Feng is heart-wrenching. Seven months into her pregnancy, the 23-year-old Ms. Feng was forced to undergo a horrific abortion procedure. Her case is a perfect demonstration of both the general persecution Chinese citizens face at the hands of the Chinese state, and the particular atrocious practices of governmental officials who have resorted to forced abortions and sterilizations to comply with China's one-child policy.

There is no question that China is becoming a leader in the global community and therefore it is up to the global community to hold China to a human rights standard. We cannot stand by while China continues to commit human rights abuses. For this reason, it is essential that the Obama administration pursues Ms. Feng's case to a proper and just conclusion.

The case that she presents to America is an opportunity for America to take a lead in condemning China's abominable practice of forced abortions. As a Nation, and as a world, we must demonstrate the courage to assert what is right and to help this horrific phenomenon. I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Ms. Buerkle. I yield to Chairman Joe Pitts, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for permitting me to sit with your panel today, and thank you to the witnesses for coming forward with your testimony. I would like to, first, thank you for holding this important hearing, Mr. Chairman. Just a few weeks ago, when I received the first report on forced abortion performed on Feng Jianmei who was 7 months into her pregnancy, I immediately took to the House floor to decry this horrible practice and violation of human rights and this instance of violation of the human rights of this young lady.

Although China's Central Government denies culpability for forced abortions by blaming them on the local officials that act outside the law, China's one-child policy is undeniably the culprit. The Central Government's coercive policy relating to childbirth has led to the stigmatization of having multiple children. This is especially the case for having a baby girl.

In recent years, the effects of China's one-child policy are finally being manifested by China's precarious population growth and gender gap. It now seems that consensus in China is building toward

reforming the policy. Advocates for reform make arguments relating to China's economic prowess and its demographic future. I advocate that China break with the policy to put forced abortion to an end so that it might live up to its human rights obligations.

China must end the policy at the Central Government level and hold those issuing forced abortions responsible for their crimes. The government can start by seeing that justice is done in the case of Feng Jianmei and her baby girl.

Again, I thank Chairman Smith for holding this important hearing and I look forward to hearing the testimony of our witnesses today and I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. I would thank Chairman Pitts for joining us and for his leadership on human rights for many years, especially as it relates to China. Without objection, I do recognize myself for an additional 2 minutes just to, again, point out that a picture is worth a thousand words. And the picture of Ms. Feng's baby having been aborted at 7 months gestation, and then crudely put next to her in the bed is a picture that has awakened the conscience and the concerns of people around the world. That picture, sadly, is replicated and has been done over and over again, tens of millions of times throughout China, but in this case, there is a picture, and now it is posted and people are finally, at long last, seeing the gruesome reality of China's one-child-per-couple policy with its reliance on forced abortion, which is cruelty beyond words. And that is what that picture has helped to spark. Hopefully people within the Government of China itself will look at that, because it is has made its way throughout all of China as well and realize that that kind of barbaric behavior toward children and mothers and women is absolutely unacceptable in any civilized society.

I would like to now, having completed my opening statement, just make a statement for the record: I would like to point out for the record that the written testimony of T. Kumar from Amnesty International, who has been before this committee many times before had not been presented to the subcommittee, the subcommittee was not notified about Mr. Kumar's participation at the hearing until last Friday evening. He was not noticed publicly until 11:52 a.m. today. Therefore, without objection, in this exceptional circumstance and pursuant to rule 6(b) of the committee rules, Mr. Kumar's statement, as well the written statement of all our witnesses, will be submitted for the record if he would like to submit one. Welcome, Mr. Kumar.

I would like to now introduce our distinguished witnesses beginning first with Pastor Bob Fu, who was a leader in the 1989 student democracy movement in Tiananmen Square, and then became a house church pastor that he founded along with his wife. In 1996, authorities arrested and imprisoned them for their work in China. After their release, they escaped to the United States, founded the ChinaAid Association; ChinaAid monitors and reports on religious freedom in China and provides a forum for discussion among experts on religion law and human rights in China. Pastor Fu is frequently interviewed by media outlets around the world and has testified before congressional hearings, including the Congressional-Executive Commission on China hearing held a few weeks ago where we were able to hear directly from Chen Guangcheng.

Then we will hear from Ms. Reggie Littlejohn, who is founder and president of Women's Rights Without Frontiers, an international coalition that opposes forced abortion, gendercide and sexual slavery in China, and frankly, anywhere else in the world where it occurs.

She has legally represented Chinese refugees in their political asylum cases as an attorney, and testified before the European and British Parliaments, the White House and Congress. Ms. Littlejohn has served as an expert on China's one-child policy for ChinaAid, and Human Rights Without Frontiers has issued several groundbreaking reports about the incalculable suffering caused by the coercive enforcement of the one-child policy.

Then we will hear from Mr. Steve Mosher, who is the president of the Population Research Institute, and the author of numerous books on China. I have read three of his books, including A Mother's Ordeal, and it brought great insight to me and to anyone else who took the time to read those powerful books.

In 1979, he became the first American social scientist permitted to conduct field research in China since the Communist Revolution. He was the man who broke the story of the one-child-per-couple policy. Frontline, 60 Minutes, the Beijing bureau chiefs of The Washington Post and others back in the early 1980s relied on his breakthrough research about what women were experiencing as the direct result of the horrific one-child-per-couple policy. He has worked on human rights issues ever since and has brought great insight to this issue.

We will then hear from Yanling Guo who was forced by the Chinese officials to undergo a forced abortion at 8 months. Her husband was subjected to a forced sterilization as well, as well as torture and multiple imprisonments. They have three children and have been fleeing Chinese authorities for 21 years. They are now in Bangkok and have applied for refugee status through the UNHCR.

And finally we will hear from Mr. T. Kumar, who is Amnesty International's Director for International Advocacy. He, too, has testified before the U.S. Congress on numerous occasions to discuss a broad array of human rights abuses. He has served as a human rights monitor in many Asian countries, as well as in Bosnia, Afghanistan, Guatemala, Sudan, and South Africa.

He also served as director of several refugee ships and camps. T. Kumar was a political prisoner for over 5 years in Sri Lanka for his peaceful human rights activities. Amnesty International adopted him as a prisoner of conscience when he was incarcerated. He started his legal studies in prison, and eventually became an attorney at law and devoted his entire practice to defending political prisoners.

Pastor Fu, if you would begin.

STATEMENT OF PASTOR BOB FU, FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT, CHINAAID ASSOCIATION

Pastor FU. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, thank you so much for organizing this timely hearing today. Again, I am very grateful this committee gave the platform to really make those vulnerable voices heard.

On June the 2nd, in Zeng Family town in the city of Ankang of Shaanxi Province, Ms. Feng Jianmei, more than 7 months pregnant, was abducted by local government officials and taken to a hospital where she was forcibly aborted of her unborn baby.

On June 6, local family planning officials and government officials in Changsha, Hunan Province, dragged Ms. Cao Ruyi, who was 5 months pregnant to a hospital, beat her and were about to force an abortion on her. However, due to the immediate advocacy of ours and especially a timely letter from Mr. Chairman, Congressman Chris Smith to the Changsha Government in Hunan Province. I still remember I received your phone call even on the Sunday, Sunday morning in the church. As well as the efforts of the international community, Ms. Cao Ruyi and her unborn baby are safe for the moment.

On June 19, a pregnant Hu Xia of Zhengjiamen village of Shangche, Hubei Province, was forcibly taken to People's Hospital by local officials and given an injection to induce a miscarriage. Two days later, she delivered that nearly 8-month fetus.

These three cases in June alone expose the government's rule in forced abortions in China, shocked the international community and set off a wave of criticism. However these cases are only the tip of the iceberg; numerous forced abortion tragedies occur every single day in China. The massive violation of the rights of women and their unborn babies through government action and by legal means in the implementation of China's forcibly enforced one-child family planning policy has been going on for over 30 years already.

The international community is late in expressing its concern and criticism. In this context, even more does U.S. Congressman Mr. Smith, Mr. Chairman, deserve or respect for your long but persistent cries and efforts to end China's forcibly enforced one-child policy. Your contribution will be remembered in the history of human rights in China and the world.

I will give a brief introduction to the Feng Jianmei's case. On June 11, after Mr. Huang Qi a veteran political dissident from Sichuan Province, who himself suffered tremendous persecution over the years, was the first to post Feng Jianmei's story on his Web site called the 64Tianwang, accompanied by that picture that you just showed on the screen. It attracted worldwide attention and condemnation. Feng Jianmei, a villager from Zhenping County, Ankang City, Shaanxi Province was abducted by the officials and taken to the hospital by June 1 while her husband, Deng Jiyuan was working out of town. On June 3, her 7-month-old unborn baby was forcibly aborted. Upon learning of Feng Jianmei's case Mr. Zhang Kai, a young, well-known Chinese Christian lawyer, wrote on his blog publicly announcing that he was willing to take on this case.

Mr. Yang Zhizhu, a former law professor at the China Youth College of Political Sciences, who has long been concerned about, and has condemned the one-child policy, also started to take part in this rights defense case. In the face of powerful condemnation from the international community, China's official media reported on June 15, that Ankang City officials in Shaanxi province had visited the forced abortion victim Feng Jianmei and her family the pre-

vious evening and apologized to her, and said they would hold accountable the officials who were involved.

On June 22, the government retaliated by beating Feng Jianmei's husband, Deng Jiyuan, and putting him under surveillance. On June 24, the government sent people to display a banner in front of their home that read, "beat up traitors, run them out of Zeng family town."

After dinner that day Deng Jiyuan shook off his tails and escaped. In the following 3 days, about 83 hours, he avoided multiple closely guarded government checkpoints. And on the night of June 27, boarded a train in Shiyan City, Hubei Province. After he arrived in Beijing on the morning of the June 28, he met with lawyer Zhang Kai and Professor Yang Zhizhu and signed papers authorizing them to be his legal representatives in filing lawsuits and applying for state compensation.

The Zhenping County official director, the newly appointed mayor of the Zeng family town and village official from Yuping Village where Deng Jiyuan lives went to Beijing, and on July 1 at 3 o'clock p.m., they met and talked with lawyer Zhang Kai and Yang Zhizhu. They were hoping to see Deng Jiyuan in person. During the meeting, the village officials continued to claim that abortion was not a big deal where they are from.

On July 7, lawyer Zhang Kai sent a legal letter to the Public Security Bureau and Procuratorate of Ankang City, Shaanxi Province, requesting them to place the case on file and start a criminal investigation.

The Chinese society and the international community should make every effort to end this ongoing tragedy of China's forcibly enforcing the family planning policy. That Feng Jianmei's case attracted such widespread concern from the Chinese public and the international community so quickly is attributable to three main factors: The larger context of the recent Chen Guangcheng incident, the photo showing the 7-month dead fetus and the despair on the mother's face, and the timely participation of many lawyers, including Christian lawyers in China. This is the result of the united efforts of people inside and outside of China who stand for justice.

On July 5 the European Parliament voted on and passed a resolution on the forced abortion scandal in China in response to the tragedy of Feng Jianmei's forced abortion, strongly condemning the human rights abuses committed in the enforcement of China's one-child policy. This is a historic step made by the international community in attaching great importance to the rights of women and children. On the same day in China, in response to Feng Jianmei's case, five prominent Chinese scholars and another 10 of corporations, including corporation leaders, issued an open letter cosigned by other influential academics to the National People's Congress and its standing committee.

The cosigners were 10 others from of China's top universities, including Beijing University, Qinghua University, China's People's University, Chinese University of Political Science and Law, Beijing Normal University. The letter asked legislators to completely revise the population and the family planning law to repeal restrictions on citizens' reproductive rights, and to abolish the birth approval system and the system of social child raising fees.

Mr. Chairman, I want to request to put the record of this open letter by these brave 15 scholars, and because of the time restraints, we are not able to complete the translation this morning, we will make sure by tonight we will send you the translation of these very important open letter.

Mr. SMITH. Without objection, so ordered, and we will keep the record open until we receive the English translation.

[The letter referred to follows:]

Citizen Proposal to Launch Immediate Overhaul on
"Law of Population and Family Planning of the People's Republic of China"

Family Planning is a fundamental state policy established by the Chinese Constitution of 1978 and that of 1982. It was produced under special circumstances of the Chinese society at the time. Prior to the year 2001, China had no clear or specified legal standard for family planning. Not until 2002, with the implementation of "Law of Population and Family Planning", did this policy truly enter a "legally based" stage. However, in the formulation and execution of this law, there are still many problems; some are quite serious. On the one hand, some contents of the legislation violate the Constitution and legal principal or spirit; on the other hand, there still exist human rights violations and illegal administration.

A few incidents, from the "First Case of China Family Planning" in Changli of Hebei Province reported by media several years ago, to the recent event of "Feng Jianmei being forced for an induced labor in Ankang of Shaanxi Province", have aroused widespread concerns across the whole society. As a matter of fact, these occurrences have exposed some of the limitations and legislative defects in the "Law of Population and Family Planning" currently practiced by our state. With the clause of human rights added to the Constitution in 2004, a general awareness of human rights has been growing strong among our citizens. In light of this, based particularly on coordination of China's population with the sustainable socio-economic development, respect for the objective law of development of things, and truthful reflection of the "human oriented" core of comprehensive mankind development, we hereby recommend that the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress initiate the important work of comprehensively revising the "Law of Population and Family Planning" as soon as possible.

First, the existing "Law of Population and Family Planning" emphasizes population control. Therefore, the birth examination and approval system built on such basis is not only inconsistent with the protection of human rights provisions in our nation's Constitution, but also in conflict with the relevant clauses of the Administrative License Law. The Constitutional Amendment of 2004, confirming that "the State respects and safeguards human rights," provides a clear Constitutional basis for the protection of human reproductive right. The universality, morality and importance of this reproductive right all reflect its meaning and value as a basic human right. Each of these can find its individual interpretation from the International Covenants on Human Rights and our country's legal levels. Article 13 of our Administrative License Law stipulates that the administrative licenses do not have to or aren't required to be established for all of those, being citizens, legal persons or other organizations, who can decide for themselves. The reproductive right is reflective of the subjectivity of personal and family status. Therefore, acknowledgment of reproductive right as a basic human right and repeal of the current fertility approval system not only embody the fundamental spirit of respecting human rights in our Constitution, but also agrees with our existing Administrative License Law.

Second, Article 18 of "Law of Population and Family Planning" has limitations in authorizing regulations. For the specific provision on the second and more children bearing, the law authorizes stipulations made by the National People's Congress or its Standing Committee

of each province, autonomous region and municipality. In reality, specified regulations towards delayed marriage and childbearing, the number of births and fertility intervals all differ significantly from place to place. This, in fact, has caused inequality of citizens' reproductive right due to different reasons based on household registration, identity and geography. Moreover, certain policies made by some places have seriously deviated from the Constitutional and legal principal and spirit by violating citizen's reproductive right. We believe this authorization specification is overly broad, which has become one of the root causes to unfairness in implementing the existing birth policy. Therefore, we propose abolishment of the authorization regulations that limit the number of births in the existing "Law of Population and Family Planning"; instead, focus on the protection of citizen's birth right and reproductive health right.

Third, the existing "Law of Population and Family Planning" Article 41—"Citizens who give birth to babies not in compliance with the provisions of Article 18 of this Law shall pay a social maintenance fee prescribed by law"—is unreasonable for its lack of legitimacy and contradiction to the basic nature of birth right as a human right. As stated earlier, birth right is a basic human right, reflecting the respect and protection of citizen's autonomy and rights of family, which shall not be restricted by any person or government. The collection of social maintenance fee is undoubtedly an unjustified restriction on the citizen's birth right, impeding citizens from exercising that right. By eliminating or abolishing the system of social maintenance fee, it not only embodies the protection of birth right as a fundamental human right, but the unfair and unequal phenomena during implementation under the current social maintenance fee system can also be avoided.

Fourth, the existing "Law of Population and Family Planning" Article 42— "Where the person who should pay the social maintenance fees in accordance with the provisions prescribed in Article 41 of this Law is a state functionary, he shall, in addition, be given an administrative sanction in accordance with law; with regard to a person other than the state functionary, a disciplinary measure shall, in addition, be taken against him by the unit or organization where he belongs"—is a serious violation of the legitimate rights and interests of a citizen. To use violation of birth control as a reason to punish a state employee with an administrative sanction or others with a disciplinary measure violates not only citizen's birth right, but also the principals regarding proportionality as well as improperly associated prohibitions under the public law. Hence, we recommend this provision be repealed.

Fifth, the appropriate policy on population and family planning may have positive significance for the whole society's interest. However, the "Law of Population and Family Planning" for the purpose of population control, along with individual place's relevant provisions on "Population and Family Planning Regulations", not only violates the principal and spirit of our Constitution and laws, but also dissatisfies the needs for the sustainable socio-economic development. We believe that, under the premise of full respects for citizens' birth and family rights, and by focusing on citizens' reproductive health right as a core, an interest-oriented reproductive mechanism shall be formulated to guide our citizens to freely and also responsibly carry out fertility. This should be the fundamental spirit to amend the existing "Law of Population and Family Planning", which requires stressing the service functionality of the government, forbidding forced abortion, prohibiting any infringement of citizens' rights and freedom in the name of family planning.

Sixth, the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress shall establish a review mechanism to investigate the legitimacy of the local "Population and Family Planning Regulations." It shall examine the relevant provisions of local "Population and Family Planning Regulations" that violate the legislature's purpose and principal of "Constitution," "Legislation Law" and "Law of Population and Family Planning", and then shall give appropriate solutions in order to truly embody the principal of fundamental law of the Constitution and the goals of human rights protection.

We believe that the modification of the "Law of Population and Family Planning" is bound to be carried out. This is not only needed for the building of a society where laws prevail and for human rights protection, but also urgently required in order to reduce the unlawfulness and unfairness currently existing in administrating family planning. We propose that the existing "Law of Population and Family Planning" be modified and improved as soon as possible, that the citizens' reproductive rights be truly respected and protected, and the historic transformation of family planning policy be completed successfully.

Initiators of the Proposal:

Zhan Zhongyue, Beijing University, Law School Professor; Doctor of Law

Li Jianxin, Beijing University Sociology, Department Professor; Doctor of Demography

Liang Jianzhang, Chairman of Ctrip; Doctor of Economics

Hong Xiuping, Principal of Hangzhou Gateway Language School

Huang Wenzheng, Senior Financial Strategist with a company in Beijing, Doctor of Statistics

Consenting Scholars countersigning the proposal:

Jiang Mingan, Beijing University, Law School Professor

Wang Guisong, People's University of China, Law School Associate Professor; Doctor of Law

Zhang Xiang, People's University of China, Law School Associate Professor; Doctor of Law

Wang Jianxun, University of Political Science and Law of China, Law School Associate Professor; Doctor of Law

Chen Zheng, Beijing Normal University, Law School Associate Professor; Doctor of Law

Wang Feng, Tsinghua University, Public Administration School Professor; Demographer

Yu Fengzheng, Beijing Normal University, Zhuhai Campus Law School Professor

Yuan Gang, Peking University, School of Government Professor

Liang Zhongtang, Professor of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences; former Expert Member of the State Family Planning Commission

Xu Jianming, Professor of Shanghai Number One School of Finance and Economics

Pastor FU. Thank you. Now in Feng Jianmei's case we see not only the great force of justice in Chinese society and the international community, but also that in a Chinese society where political corruption and a bankrupt moral ethics prevail, the Christian faith is providing strong support to the people's pursuit of justice and love. Also giving them the courage to stand up to evil forces. The forced abortion victim Feng Jianmei and her husband, Deng Jianmei, are both Christians. On the very night when Deng Jianmei fled to Beijing, he fellowshipped with lawyer Zhang Kai and Yang Zhizhu. As a Christian rights defense organization, ChinaAid in its 10 years of ministry has witnessed the Christian faith bringing great changes to the life of the Chinese people and the Chinese society. These changes will eventually bring forth a prosperous China that upholds justice, love and peace and actively shoulders its international responsibilities.

Feng Jianmei's tragedy is repeated hundreds and thousands of times each day in China. Recently, China Aid learned of more such cases. Guo Yanling who will testify later today, also a Christian, from Guangxi Province was persecuted by the government for having more than one-child and forced into exile for 21 years with her husband and three children. The wife of Wu Liangjie from Xianyou City, Fujian Province was abducted and held by the government. On April 6 this year, she was forcibly aborted of her more than 7-month unborn baby boy.

We at ChinaAid are willing to work with everyone in and outside of China to end this long and violent war against the millions of women and children in China. We call upon Congress and the administration to follow the examples of the European Parliament in taking specific measures and steps to help China and this cruel one-child policy, and the evil practices of forced abortion and forced sterilization. We urge the Obama administration to add this issue of human rights abuses and family planning to the agenda of bilateral talks on human rights and the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue. We ask the Senate and the House to pass a strong joint resolution to express the will of the American and Chinese people to work toward the abolishment in China of the one-child policy.

Finally, those abusive officials should be held accountable according to international law for their evil illegal behavior in harming women and unborn babies. The State Department should place travel bans on individuals like them who carry out China's forced abortion policies, and make sure that no U.S. funds go to assist China's family planning agencies.

And by the mercy and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, let us make concerted efforts for the arrival of that day. Thank you very much for hearing me.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you so very much for your leadership and your for your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Pastor Fu follows:]

Chinese society and the international community should work together to end China's forcibly enforced "one-child" policy

--- Government forcibly aborts Christian Feng Jianmei's seven-month unborn baby, husband later suffers government persecution

China Aid Association

Testimony before

U. S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs (COFA)

Hearing of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health and Human Rights on "Continued Human Rights Attacks on Families in China"

2 p.m., July 9, 2012,

Rayburn House Office Building, Room 2172, Washington, D.C.

This is what the Lord says: "A voice is heard in Ramah, mourning and great weeping, Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because they are no more." (Jeremiah 31:15)

On June 2, 2012, in Zeng Family town, Zhenping county, in Shaanxi province's city of Ankang, Ms. Feng Jianmei, more than seven months pregnant, was abducted by local government officials and taken to a hospital where she was forcibly aborted of her unborn baby. On June 6, local "family planning" officials and government officials in Changsha, Hunan province, dragged Ms. Cao Ruyi, who was five months pregnant, to a hospital, beat her, and were about to force an abortion on her. However, due to the immediate advocacy of China Aid Association, especially a timely letter from Congressman Chris Smith to the Changsha government in Hunan province, as well as the efforts of the international community, Ms. Cao Ruyi and her unborn baby are safe—for the moment. On June 19, pregnant Hu Xia of Zhengjiamen village, Shangche town, Jianli county, Hubei province, was forcibly taken to People's Hospital by local officials and given an injection to induce a miscarriage. Two days later, she delivered a dead nearly eight-month fetus.

These three cases in June that exposed the government's role in forced abortions in China shocked the international community and set off a wave of criticism. However, these cases are only the tip of the iceberg; numerous forced abortion tragedies occur every single day in China. The massive violation of the rights of women and their unborn babies through government action and by legal means in the implementation of China's forcibly enforced "one-child" family planning policy has been going on for over thirty years already. The international community is late in expressing its concern and criticism. In this context, even more does U.S. congressman Mr. Smith deserve our respect for his lone but persistent cries and efforts to end China's forcibly enforced "one-child" policy. His contribution will be remembered in the history of human rights in China and the world.

I. A brief introduction to the Feng Jianmei forced abortion case

On June 11, 2012, Mr. Huang Qi, a veteran political dissident from Sichuan province, was the first to post Feng Jianmei's story on his website "64Tianwang," accompanied by a picture showing the dead fetus by the mother's side. It attracted worldwide attention and condemnation.

Feng Jianmei, a villager from Unit 2, Yuping village, Zeng Family town, Zhenping county, Ankang city, Shaanxi province, was abducted by local officials and taken to a hospital on June 1 while her husband, Deng Jiyuan, was working out of town. On June 3, her seven-month unborn baby was forcibly aborted.

On learning of Feng Jianmei's case, Mr. Zhang Kai, a young well-known Chinese Christian lawyer, wrote on his blog publicly announcing that he was willing to take on this case. Zhang is known for having handled two cases

that shocked the nation, the famous "My father is Li Gang" hit-and-run case and the Qian Yunhui case in Zhejiang province, as well as the persecution case last October of Christians in the Tibetan capital of Lhasa. Mr. Yang Zhizhu, a former law professor at China Youth College of Political Sciences who has long been concerned about and has condemned the one-child policy, also started to take part in this rights defense case.

In the face of powerful condemnation from the international community, China's official media reported on June 15 that Ankang city officials in Shaanxi province had visited the forced abortion victim Feng Jianmei and her family the previous evening and apologized to her, and had said they would hold accountable the officials who were involved.

On June 22, the government retaliated by beating Feng Jianmei's husband, Deng Jiyuan, and putting him under surveillance. On June 24, the government sent people to display a banner in front of their home that read: "Beat up traitors, run them out of the Zeng Family town". After dinner that day, Deng Jiyuan shook off his "tails" and escaped. In the following three days, he avoided multiple closely guarded government checkpoints, and on the night of June 27 boarded a train in Shiyan city, Hubei province. After he arrived in Beijing on the morning of the 28th, he met with lawyer Zhang Kai and Yang Zhizhu and signed papers authorizing them to be his legal representatives in filing a lawsuit and applying for state compensation.

The Zhenping county government office director, the newly appointed mayor of Zeng Family Town, and a village official from Yuping village, where Deng Jiyuan lives, went to Beijing, and on July 1 at 3 p.m., they met and talked with lawyer Zhang Kai and Yang Zhizhu. They were hoping to see Deng Jiyuan in

person. During the meeting, the village official claimed that abortion was no a big deal where they are from.

On July 7, lawyer Zhang Kai sent a legal letter to the Public Security Bureau and Procuratorate of Ankang city, Shaanxi province, requesting them to place the case on file and start an investigation.

II. Chinese society and the international community should make every effort to end the ongoing tragedy of China's forcibly enforced family planning policy

That Feng Jianmei's case attracted such widespread concern from the Chinese public and the international community so quickly is attributable to three main factors: the larger context of the recent Chen Guangcheng incident, the photo showing the seven-month dead fetus and the despair on the mother's face, and the timely participation of Christian lawyers. This is the result of the united efforts of people inside and outside of China who stand for justice.

On July 5, the European Parliament voted on and passed a "Resolution on the forced abortion scandal in China (2012/2712(RSP)" in response to the tragedy of Feng Jianmei's forced abortion, strongly condemning the human rights abuses committed in the enforcement of China's one-child policy. This is a historic step made by the international community in attaching great importance to the rights of women and children. On the same day in China, in response to Feng Jianmei's case, five prominent Chinese scholars and a number of corporations issued an open letter co-signed by other influential academics to the National People's Congress and its Standing Committee. The co-signers were 10 others from some of China's top universities, including Beijing University, Qinghua University, China People's University, Chinese

University of Politics and Law, Beijing Normal University. The letter asked legislators to completely revise the Population and Family Planning Law, to repeal restrictions on citizens' reproductive rights, and to abolish the birth approval system and the system of social child-raising fees.

In Feng Jianmei's case, we see not only the great force of justice in Chinese society and the international community, but also that in a Chinese society where political corruption and bankrupt moral ethics prevail, the Christian faith is providing strong support to the people's pursuit of justice and love, and is also giving them the courage to stand up to evil forces. The forced abortion victim Feng Jianmei and her husband, Deng Jiyuan, are both Christians. On the very night when Deng Jiyuan fled to Beijing, he fellowshipped with lawyer Zhang Kai and Yang Zhizhu and they studied and discussed the Bible together. As a Christian rights defense organization, ChinaAid in its ten years of ministry has witnessed the Christian faith bringing great changes to the lives of the Chinese people and Chinese society. These changes will eventually bring forth a prosperous China that upholds justice, love and peace and actively shoulders its international responsibilities.

Feng Jianmei's tragedy is repeated hundreds and thousands of times each day in China. Recently, ChinaAid learned of more such cases. Guo Yanling, a Christian from Guangxi province, was persecuted by the government for having more than one child and forced into exile for 21 years. The wife of Wu Liangjie from Xianyou county, Fujian province, was abducted and held by the government, and on April 6 this year, she was forcibly aborted of her more-than-seven-month unborn baby boy.

We at ChinaAid are willing to work with everyone in and outside of China to

end this long and violent war against millions of women and children in China. We call upon Congress and the Administration to follow the example of the European Parliament in taking specific measures and steps to help China end this cruel one-child policy and the evil practices of forced abortion and forced sterilization. We urge the Obama Administration to add this issue of human rights abuses in family planning to the agenda of bilateral talks on human rights and the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue. We ask the Senate and the House to pass a strong joint resolution to express the will of the American and Chinese peoples to work toward the abolishment in China of the one-child policy. Finally, those abusive officials should be held accountable according to international law for their evil illegal behavior in harming women and unborn babies. The State Department should place travel bans on individuals like them who carry out China's forced abortion policies, and should make sure that no U.S. funds go to assist China's family planning agencies.

By the mercy and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, let us make concerted efforts for the early arrival of that day.

China Aid Association
Founder and president Bob FU
July 9, 2012

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Littlejohn, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF MS. REGGIE LITTLEJOHN, FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT, WOMEN'S RIGHTS WITHOUT FRONTIERS

Ms. LITTLEJOHN. Thank you, Chairman Smith, and also members Buerkle and Pitts for the opportunity to be here. This feels like home to me right now because to my right is Bob Fu, and as you know, I started out as the expert on the one-child policy for ChinaAid and now I have my own organization. And to my left is Steve Mosher who broke this news to the West in the 1980s and whose book was one of the most important books that I read in deciding to become involved with this.

And, of course, T. Kumar and Amnesty International have taken a leadership role on all of this forced abortion in China condemning it on human rights bases.

I am also thrilled that the European Parliament has passed a resolution strongly condemning forced abortions and sterilizations globally and has called for a review to assure that funding it ceases from these various organizations.

Now as this committee is aware, there have been several cases that have happened in quick succession in June of forced abortions. Number one is the case of Feng Jianmei, whose photograph and story Women's Rights Without Frontiers actually broke to the West on our blog. We have heard some detailed testimony about this.

The next case is that of Cao Ruyi of Changsha City, Hunan Province, who also, at the same time, within a few days of the Feng Jianmei case, it was reported she, at 5 months pregnant, was being dragged out for a forced abortion and being fined the American equivalent of $24,000, an astronomical amount in China. And due to intervention of various organizations and Christopher Smith, she was able to get out of the clutches for the time being with a lesser fine, but she remains in jeopardy.

I also want to bring up the efforts of another outstanding organization, Women's Rights in China, President Jing Zhang who has been in touch with Feng Jianmei and Cao Ruyi and actually had arranged for Cao Ruyi and her husband to be in hiding right now.

Then there is the case of Hu Jia, June 19, 2012. It was reported in China's Southern Metropolis Daily that she was forcibly aborted at nearly 8 months. And the fact that this case was reported by a major Chinese newspaper indicates that there may be a turning of the tide inside of China that major news organizations now are willing to step in and condemn these abuses.

And then finally, there is the case of Zhang Wen Fang of Hubei province, her forced abortion occurred at 9 months, but it was in 2008. However, she stepped forward seeing the other women step forward and not only was she forcibly aborted at 8 months, but she had her uterus, her cervix and one of her ovaries removed. She been a successful business owner before this happened, and now she is completely disabled in a wheelchair. She said her son is like an orphan, her older child is like an orphan and she is dependant on her aging mother.

Now why is it that all of these cases have sprung forth so quickly? Is it that there has been a crackdown in China? There are more forced abortions happening right now? No, I do not believe that's

the case. Forced abortion in China has been happening for decades. And it is not that there is a sudden crackdown. I believe that the reason that these cases have emerged has to do with the fact that just 2 weeks before the first cases emerged, Chen Guangcheng came to the United States. Chen Guangcheng is the moral towering figure over this entire issue and has sacrificed more than anyone else on behalf of the women and babies of China and his miraculous escape, his coming to the U.S. Embassy, the whole drama that ensued there that finally ended up with him coming to Newark, New Jersey on May 19 is something that gripped the world, but also China.

And instrumental to, I believe, both Chen Guangcheng's release and to the publicity within China that resulted in these cases coming forward was the efforts of Voice of America. Voice of America stands alone as the voice of the West being able to penetrate and get over that firewall in China. I have been interviewed for Voice of America over 10 times, I can tell you that the first time I was interviewed, many people called in and said they never heard of Chen Guangcheng or don't believe that forced abortion is happening in China. And by the time that Chen Guangcheng was coming to the United States, everybody knew who he was and everybody know about the reality of forced abortion in China.

And so I believe that this ability to reach the Chinese people with the truth through Voice of America was instrumental both in building the movement insides of China's free Chen Guangcheng, and also giving women the courage inside of China to come forward, because if the miraculous could happen, if Chen Guangcheng could escape as a blind sick man from Dongshigu Village with a broken foot and make his way to the Embassy and come to the United States, if the impossible can happen for him, then it can happen for the women in China. That is why I believe that these women have come forward.

Now at the same time, there has been an international movement in the one-child policy and that has to do with the publicity that has been generated by the West. And Congressman Chris Smith has stood head and shoulders above anybody else in this, hearing after hearing after hearing about Chen Guangcheng and about the one-child policy. And as I mentioned to Congressman Smith last week, there was a very similar case that came out in the hearing on November 10th, 2009, Wang Li Ping was also forcibly aborted at 7 months, we also had a picture of her lying on the bed next to her forcibly-aborted baby, it was equally heart rending. And then there was also the case of Lu Dan who died during forced abortion at 9 months.

Those two cases were in my original report in 2009, they are equally serious as the current cases and yet it never made it into the mainstream media. Why? I believe it is the incremental effort of Congressman Chris Smith, all of these hearings, the people sitting around me, Voice of America and other media, case by case, hearing by hearing, press release by press release, getting the word out, getting the word out, getting the word out, to the point now where we have a major international movement which could actually lead to the end of this horrific policy.

So leading that charge right now is the European Parliament of all places. I have testified twice at the European Parliament. In fact, when I was there in 2008, I was told I was the first person ever to have testified there exclusively on the one-child policy. In 2008, I was one of a dozen experts, I had 8 minutes. In 2011 when I testified again, I had 1 hour and 15 minutes and I was the only person testifying. That is an indication of the growth and importance that this issue has taken over the years because of all of our efforts.

So they have now passed a resolution strongly condemning forced abortion in China, specifically naming Feng Jianmei and also specifically admitting that they are funding programs that do population control or family planning in China and asking for an inquiry to be made to make sure these programs—which would include the UNFPA and IPPF—are not complicit with forced abortions. I am very excited about this inquiry because I firmly believe that any unbiased inquiry is going to reveal complete complicity between the UNFPA and International Planned Parenthood, and forced abortion in China. You cannot help the Chinese Communist Party with their population control program without being complicit with forced family planning. And I have to say when we see forced abortions and forced sterilization, infanticides happening all over the place, on one hand and on the other hand, we hear silence from organizations like UNFPA and IPPF, silence is complicity.

Furthermore we have now seen within China a building movement, and the first of which is that according to the China Economics Times, several researchers in the Developmental Research Center, a prestigious government-affiliated think tank, have cited the coming demographic disaster as a reason to move away from a one-child policy and they have now proposed a two-child policy.

I just want to say I do not think that a two-child policy is the answer to the one-child policy. And if China moved to a two-child policy, you are not going to be hearing Women's Rights Without Frontiers declaring victory. There are two problems with a two-child policy: Number one, in the countryside of China today, they already have a two-child policy in the sense that if your first child is a girl, you can have a boy and that—you can have a second child. And the way that is interpreted by many couples is they have a second chance to have a boy, and that is where this gendercide comes in. Demographers have found that for the first child, they are willing to let nature take its course, but when they have a girl and they have one child left, that is where you get on the second child 140 boys born for every 100 girls born on average. And there are two provinces in China, Jiangsu and Anhui, where on that second child, there are 190 boys born for every 100 girls born. So, that is gendercide, the sex-selective abortion of baby girls that happens in the context of a two-child policy.

The second reason I don't think that a two-child policy is a solution to the one-child policy is that, for me, the issue is not whether the government allows a woman to have one child or two children; the issue is that the government is telling people how many children they can have and enforcing that limit coercively. So even if there is a two-child policy, women are still going to have to have

a birth permit, and they will still be subject to forced abortion if they don't have one on that first and on that second child.

The second group calling for reform within China is a group of very prominent and brave scholars who have criticized the one-child policy on the basis that it violates human rights. And one of their leaders, James Liang, is calling for the abolition of the one-child rule. And I just salute his courage.

Now, Women's Rights Without Frontiers has come up with six policy recommendations, and they are all in my testimony. I just want to highlight one of them, which is that we should pass—we would encourage Congress to pass an act concerning United States corporate responsibility in China. I just think that this would be absolutely essential. We are talking about governmental efforts from our Government to their government, and we have—Women's Rights Without Frontiers has a number of recommendations on that front, and I think that they are all very important; however, I think that there is a major role that United States corporations can play.

I would like to recall to this committee the testimony of Ping Liu, who testified actually before this very committee on September 22, 2011, and she testified to the fact that she had five forced abortions. She couldn't have contraception because she had a kidney problem, so she just kept having abortions.

But what she talked about, and this was in the 1980s, is that in her factory they had this surveillance system. They had family-planning officials like a department in the factory, and they had collective punishment, so that if one woman on her floor or in her group were pregnant, the entire group would be punished. So all of the women were watching each other. They were basically exposing each other for forced abortions. Every month women had to undress, and in the nude they had to present themselves before family-planning officials to demonstrate that they weren't pregnant.

So what I would like to know is are these practices still going on in China? This testimony is on practices from the 1980s. We don't have any more recent testimony on this. I would like to find somebody who is a recent person that has come over from China and has experienced what happens in factories. But I would also be very surprised if U.S. or other foreign factory owners—whether the women in those factories get a free pass on the one-child policy because their factory happens to be owned by a foreign country or a foreign corporation.

It might be very difficult to investigate this, very risky, but I think it would be a great thing for the United States Congress to pass a corporate responsibility act for corporations that are doing business in China to say that they will not comply even with Chinese law to the extent that that law would cause them to commit crimes again humanity, including, but not limited to, forced abortion.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Littlejohn follows:]

1919 Gunston Way, San Jose, CA 95124 310.592.5722
English: www.womensrightswithoutfrontiers.org
Chinese: www.nvquan.org

Feng Jianmei and International Outrage – An Update Concerning Forced Abortion in China

Testimony of Reggie Littlejohn, President
Women's Rights Without Frontiers
July 9, 2012
Continued Human Rights Attacks
On Families in China
House Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights

Thank you, Chairman Smith and Members of the Subcommittee, for the opportunity to testify today regarding the case of Feng Jianmei, as well as several other alarming cases of forced abortion that have arisen recently in China. I am also thrilled that the European Parliament has passed a resolution strongly condemning forced abortions and sterilizations globally, and has called for a review to ensure that the funding it provides for family planning in China is not used for coercion.

The case of Feng Jianmei is one of several that have emerged in swift succession, most of these following on the heels of blind activist Chen Guangcheng's May 19 arrival in the United States.

Linyi City, Shandong Province. March 2012. A photo of a forcibly aborted full term baby drowned in a bucket, submitted anonymously, circulated on Weibo, the Chinese version of Twitter, and in the West. The infant reportedly cried at birth, but was drowned in a bucket by family planning personnel.[1] Blind activist Chen Guangcheng comes from Linyi and was still under house arrest at the time news of this forced abortion broke. This incident demonstrates that forced abortion up to the ninth month of pregnancy still occurs in Linyi, as first disclosed by Chen in his report of 2005.[2]

---

[1] Kathleen Gilbert. "Photo of a baby aborted in China at 9 months in forced abortion circulates on internet, sparks outrage." 4/3/12 http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/photo-of-baby-aborted-in-china-at-9-months-in-forced-abortion-circulates-on/

[2] Congressional-Executive Commission on China Hearing of December 6, 2011, releasing the Chen Guangcheng Report. http://www.womensrightswithoutfrontiers.org/?nav=congressional_hearing_2011

Cao Ruyi, Changsha City, Hunan Province. June 2012 and ongoing. Five months pregnant, Cao Ruyi was detained by Family Planning Officials, who beat her husband and attempted to forcibly abort her. They demanded that she pay the Chinese equivalent of approximately $24,000, or face forced abortion. Because of international pressure, this amount was reduced and Cao was allowed to leave the hospital, but she remains in jeopardy. Jing Zhang, President of Women's Rights in China, has arranged for Cao Ruyi and her husband to remain in hiding until their baby is born.[3]

Feng Jianmei, Ankang City, Shaanxi Province. June 2, 2012. Breaking within days of the case of Cao Ruyi, Feng Jianmei was forcibly aborted at seven months when she and her husband, Deng Jiyuan, could not pay a 40,000 yuan fine ($6300). Officials tried to force Feng into a car, but she escaped to her aunt's house. They broke through the gate, so she fled to the mountains, where officials found her hiding under a bed. Her husband told The Economist, "They laughed when they found her."[4] After forcibly aborting her baby, officials laid the bloody body of her dead daughter next to her in the bed. The story and photograph, which WRWF broke to the west on June 12, 2012, immediately went viral, sent shockwaves around the world, and ignited a firestorm of outrage.[5]

In the aftermath, the local Ankang City government apologized, several officials were given administrative demerits, and one reportedly was terminated. The sincerity of these gestures, however, is questionable, given the fact that at the same time, protests were organized outside Feng's family home. Protesters carried a large banner reading "Beat the traitors, drive them from the town." According to local media reports, these protests were organized by local authorities, in retaliation for Deng's interview with a German journalist. At this time, Deng disappeared for several days, during which time Feng did not know where he was.[6]

Deng has since reappeared, having traveled to Beijing to seek legal help. He is calling for justice, including both monetary compensation and criminal prosecution of those responsible for forcibly aborting Feng.[7]

As of an Associated Press report, Feng was still in the hospital on July 6 – more than a month after her forced abortion.[8] Earlier, she had said that she was ready to leave the hospital and felt that remaining hospitalized weeks after the forced abortion felt like "prison."[9]

---

[3] Jing Zhang. "China's One Child Policy – Two Cases." American Spectator, 6/15/12. http://spectator.org/archives/2012/06/15/chinas-one-child-policy-two-ca

[4] "The Brutal Truth: A shocking case of forced abortion fuels resentment against China's One Child Policy." 6/23/12. http://www.economist.com/node/21557369

[5] Reggie Littlejohn, "BREAKING: Chinese Woman Forcibly Aborted at Seven Months." 6/12/12 http://www.womensrightswithoutfrontiers.org/blog/?p=667

[6] "China punishes officials over late-term abortion case." 6/27/12. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-china-18605767

Josh Chin. "Mom Cites Pressure in One-Child Saga." 6/28/12 http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303561504577492413851079538.html

[7] Father in China forced abortion case demands criminal prosecution, seeks compensation. 7/6/12 http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/father-in-china-forced-abortion-case-demands-criminal-prosecution-sues-for-compensation/2012/07/06/gJQAx4GLRW_story.html

[8] Father in China forced abortion case demands criminal prosecution, seeks compensation. 7/6/12 http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/father-in-china-forced-abortion-case-demands-criminal-prosecution-sues-for-compensation/2012/07/06/gJQAx4GLRW_story.html

[9] Josh Chin. Mom Cites Pressure in One-Child Saga. 6/28/12 http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303561504577492413851079538.html

Feng's case has become symbolic of the heinous human rights abuses suffered by the women of China at the hands of the Chinese Communist population control machine. Feng's forced abortion and the subsequent persecution of her family, however, have not been in vain. Feng was specifically cited by the European Parliament in its resolution condemning coercive family planning.

Hu Jia, Jianli County, Hubei Province. June 19, 2012. China's Southern Metropolis Daily reported that Hu Jia was forcibly aborted at nearly eight months. This case was reported by a major Chinese newspaper, indicating the growing discontent with the policy inside China and the courage of the Chinese news media to report it.[10]

Zhang Wen Fang, Hong Hu City, Hubei Province (2008) – Inspired by the outrage generated by the case of Feng Jianmei, Zhan Wen Fang stepped forward to report that she had been forcibly aborted at nine months in 2008. Along with her baby, family planning officials removed her uterus, cervix and one ovary. Previously a successful business owner, she is now confined to a wheelchair and dependant on her aging mother. She states that her older child is "like an orphan," without much support from her. She came forward stating, "I would like to ensure that no more families ever have to go through what I have been through, to be butchered like this."[11]

Pressure builds in Europe and the United States

This spate of barbaric cases has focused criticism against coercive family planning in China.

European Parliament. In a striking blow against China's One Child Policy, the European Parliament last week passed a resolution strongly condemning forced abortion and involuntary sterilization in China and globally, citing Feng Jianmei. Specifically, the resolution, 2012/2712 (RSP) "strongly condemns the decision to force Ms. Feng to have an abortion and condemns the practice of forced abortions and sterilizations globally, especially in the context of the one-child policy." The resolution further states that "the EU has provided, and still provides, funds for organizations involved in family planning policies in China," and "urges the Commission to ensure that its funding of projects does not breach" the European Parliament's commitment against coercive population control.

I have twice addressed the European Parliament on the One Child Policy, and I know how passionate the MEPs are, both from the pro-life and the pro-choice perspectives.[12] The fact that these forces were able to join together to condemn forced abortion is a masterpiece of coalition building. As WRWF's message has been from the beginning, whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, no one supports forced abortion, because it is not a choice.

---

[10] Patrick Burke. "Another Forced Abortion Case Reported as Abuses Under China's 'One-Child' Policy Get More Attention" 7/2/12
http://cnsnews.com/news/article/another-forced-abortion-case-reported-abuses-under-china-s-one-child-policy-get-more

[11] "Chinese woman comes forward with forced abortion story" 7/3/12
http://www.allgirlsallowed.org/another-woman-comes-forward-harrowing-story-forced-abortion

[12] I am told that in 2008, I was the first person to address the European Parliament on the issue of the One Child Policy. This 2008 address comprises the chapter on the One Child Policy in the book, "Human Rights in China After the Olympic Games," currently available on Amazon.com
http://www.amazon.com/Human-Rights-China-After-Olympics/dp/1443610567/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1247847877&sr=1-1

Additionally, it is significant that the European Parliament has acknowledged that it provides funding for family planning in China, and urged the Commission to ensure that this funding is not associated with coercion. For decades, the UNFPA and International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) have worked hand in hand with the Chinese population control machine, which is coercive. They are funded by many nations, not only in Europe but the world over, including the United States. I have no doubt that any unbiased investigation by the European Parliament or any other governmental body will reveal that these organizations are complicit with coercive family planning in China.

I hope that this courageous action by the European Parliament will serve as a model for governments all over the world, including the United States, to join the outcry against forced abortion in China -- and to stop funding it.

U.S. State Department. On the domestic front, State Department spokesman Victoria Nuland, condemned forced abortion while expressing concern for the case of Cao Ruyi. "We've seen the reports that a Chinese woman is being detained and possibly pressured into a forced abortion by Chinese family planning authorities after purportedly violating China's one-child policy," she told reporters during a press briefing. "We have reached out to the authorities in Beijing to ask about this issue." Nuland reiterated that the U.S. strongly opposes "all aspects of China's coercive birth limitation policies," which they have deemed a serious human rights abuse. [13]

Center for Reproductive Rights. In an encouraging development, Nancy Northup, President of the Center for Reproductive Rights, wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times, referencing the case of Feng Jianmei and condemning forced abortion in China.[14] This was a courageous act on Northup's part. If NARAL, Planned Parent, NOW and the UNFPA truly stand for choice, they will join Northup in condemning forced abortion in China. If they do not condemn forced abortion, they do not stand for choice.

WRWF urges both the State Department and the Center for Reproductive Rights to back up their words with effective actions. [15]

---

[13] Alexandra Ludka and Gloria Riviera. "Forced Abortion in China Prompts Apology and Three Officials Suspended." 6/15/12 http://abcnews.go.com/International/forced-abortion-china-prompts-apology-officials-suspended/story?id=16579517#.T_e2WXAio7A

[14] Nancy Northup. Letter to the Editor, New York Times, "Forced Abortion in China," 7/4/12. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/05/opinion/forced-abortion-in-china.html

[15] Concerning backing up words with actions, it is appropriate here to mention ardent pro-choice feminist, Cori Schumacher, the 2011 reigning Women's World Longboard Surfing Champion. Schumacher boycotted the 2011 World Tour because one of the events was to be held in China. Citing Women's Rights Without Frontiers and the November 10, 2009 hearing before the United States Congress Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission (called by Rep. Chris Smith), Schumacher wrote the following to the Association of Surfing Professionals (ASP):

"I have deep political and personal reservations with being a part of any sort of benefit to a country that actively engages in human rights violations, specifically those in violation of women. The ASP's reconnaissance of possible sites in China for events last year and its first ASP event in China followed an important US congressional hearing on China's "One Child Policy," a policy sanctioned by the Chinese government that is implicated in gendercide, sexual slavery, forced sterilization and forced abortions. (http://www.womensrightswithoutfrontiers.org/index.php?nav=congressional)"

Cori Schumacher, "Women's Rights Without Frontiers; Standing her Ground," Curl Magazine, 12/17/11 http://corischumacher.com/tag/womens-rights-without-frontiers/

Pressure Builds Within China

In the wake of these cases, it was reported last week that two brave groups within China have called for the reform or relinquishment of the One Child Policy. According to the China Economic Times, several researchers in the Developmental Research Center – a prestigious, government-affiliated think tank -- cited the coming demographic disaster caused by low birth rates combined with an ageing population as the reason for China to move to a two-child policy. "The longer we wait, the more vulnerable we will be," they stated.[16]

While I agree that China is facing a nearly-irreversible demographic disaster caused by the One Child Policy, I do not agree that instituting a two-child policy is the answer to the problems created by the One Child Policy. First, a two-child policy encourages gendercide, the sex-selective abortion of baby girls. In areas where couples can have a second child if the first is a girl, gendercide is rampant. According to a 2009 study by the British Medical Journal, the average birth ratio in China is 120 boys for every hundred girls born. But for second births, that number jumps to 143 boys for every hundred girls. In two provinces, Jiangsu and Anhui, for the second child, there were 190 boys for every hundred girls born.[17]

The central issue in the One Child Policy, moreover, is not whether the government allows couples to have one or two children. Rather, it is the coercion with which this limit is enforced. Even with a two-child policy, women will still be subject to forced abortion if they get pregnant without a birth permit.

Last week a second call for reform came from a prominent group of scholars who criticized the policy on the basis that it violates human rights and works against economic stability. Fifteen brave intellectuals signed an open letter urging that re-writing of family planning law was "imperative." One of their leaders, well-known Internet entrepreneur James Liang, is calling for the abolition of the one-child rule.[18]

Policy Recommendations

Members of the U.S. Congress are encouraged to:

- Adopt a resolution condemning forced abortion and sterilization in China and urging the Chinese Communist Party to dismantle the coercive population control machine, in light of recent cases, bringing family planning in conformance with the 1995 Beijing Declaration, the 1994 Cairo International Conference on Population and Development, and CEDAW.

- Urge the Chinese Communist Party vigorously to investigate and criminally prosecute Family Planning Officials and others responsible for the forced abortions of Feng

---

[16] Josh Chin. "Think Tank Calls China to Adjust One-Child Policy" 7/3/12 http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304211104577504360440496118.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

[17] Wei Xing Zhu, Li Lu and Therese Hesketh. (2009) BMJ: China's excess males, sex-selective abortion and one child policy: analysis of data from 2005 national intercensus survey. http://www.bmj.com/content/338/bmj.b1211.abstract

[18] Josh Chin. Another High-Profile Call to Revisit China's One-Child Rule, 7/5/12 http://blogs.wsj.com/chinarealtime/2012/07/05/another-high-profile-call-to-revisit-chinas-one-child-rule/

Jianmei, Hu Jia and Zhang Wen Fang. Give Cao Ruyi permission to have her second child. Return all fines paid by these women and compensate them and their families for their injuries.

- Urge the Chinese Communist Party to cease the use of all quotas for abortion and sterilization, which quota system leads to coercion. Urge the Chinese Communist Party to delink financial and professional advancement from meeting population control quotas, thus removing the incentive for coercion.

- Investigate UNFPA and IPPF for complicity with coercive family planning in China. If complicity is found, funding should be cut.

- Pass an act concerning the responsibility of U.S. corporations doing business in China, that they should not be complicit in coercive family planning in their factories.

- Press for the freedom of blind activist Chen Guangcheng's nephew, Chen Kegui, who has been wrongfully detained on charges of attempted murder. Chen Kegui and his family were violently attacked by local authorities when it was discovered that his uncle had escaped. Chen Kegui acted in self defense.

- Pass a "China Democracy Promotion Act," which would enable the President to deny entry into the U.S. for Chinese nationals who have committed human rights abuses against people in China, including anyone who has participated in the imposition of China's coercive birth limitation policy. This Act would be similar to H.R. 2121, proposed in 2011 by Rep. Chris Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Ms. Littlejohn, for your testimony, and your recommendation, I think, is a good one. We are looking into it. You have raised this before, and I thank you for that.

I would like to now ask Steve Mosher if he would proceed.

STATEMENT OF MR. STEVEN MOSHER, PRESIDENT, POPULATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. MOSHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this important meeting, and, Congresswoman Buerkle and Chairman Pitts, for taking the time to attend. I appreciate your interest in this issue. I believe that every minute of attention that we can focus on China's one-child policy saves lives in China.

I would like to focus on one particular aspect of the one-child policy, and that is the support that it receives, financial and otherwise, from international organizations, chiefly the United Nations Population Fund. In fact, I have entitled my testimony "China's One-Child Policy and the U.N. Population Fund: A Deadly Partnership" because I believe it is the case, and I believe we have collected evidence in an unbiased inquiry of the U.N. Population Fund's continued involvement in forced abortion and forced sterilization. Let me tell you what I mean.

Thirty-two years ago I was an eyewitness to the forced abortion of several dozen women, who, like Feng Jianmei, were 7, 8, and even 9 months pregnant. Now, the Chinese Government at the time, this was in 1980, echoed by the U.N. Population Fund, claimed that these were local aberrations, these were overzealous local officials, and certainly this was not in any way supported by or encouraged by national policy. This was not true then, and it is not true now.

Beijing continues to vigorously pursue its one-child policy, ignoring human rights violations, the skewed sex ratios, the labor shortages, the massive infanticide and sex-selective abortion of baby girls. And China continues, after all these decades, to be supported in these atrocities by the U.N. Population Fund, and supported in very, very specific ways. Now, let me detail the U.N. Population Fund's involvement.

I know that you, Mr. Chairman, remember in the late 1990s, the U.N. Population Fund was very proud of the fact that it was setting up model birth control counties in China. In fact, it wrote a letter to the U.S. Congress—the then-head of the U.N. Population Fund wrote a letter to the U.S. Congress saying in those counties there will be no abuses. In these 32 counties where they were taking over the management of the birth-control program, the program would be fully voluntary. It would be untainted by coercion. There would be no targets and quotas. There would be no abortion as a method of family planning. Women would be free, the letter said, to voluntarily select the timing and spacing of their pregnancies.

Now, several years later, 5 years later to be exact, the U.N. Population Fund added another 40 counties to the list of model birth control counties, so there are now 72 model birth control counties run by the UNFPA, or so it claims, in China. And in those counties, it claims, there are no abuses of the kind that we have heard this morning.

Well, we at the Population Research Institute, and I personally, have visited five of these model family-planning counties where the UNFPA officials are supposedly in charge of the program and where there are no violations: Fengning County in Hebei Province; Luan County in Hebei; Wenshui County in Shaanxi; Sihui County in Guangdong. The list goes on. And in those counties we found forced abortions. We found targets and quotas for abortions and sterilizations. We found cases of late-term abortions. We found all of the abuses that have characterized China's family-planning program, one-child policy, from the beginning in these counties where the program is managed by the U.N. Population Fund.

So I believe on the basis of our inquiry, it is very clear that U.N. Population Fund officials who are managing these programs, and who are trained by the U.N. Population Fund, and who may, in fact, be paid by the U.N. Population Fund, are, in fact, overseeing a program of forced abortion, forced sterilization, late-term abortion, infanticide, and all the rest.

I believe there is compelling evidence to suspend funding to the UNFPA this time not on a temporary basis, but this time by law and permanently.

A couple of other things that I will just mention in passing. The population-control authorities in China, echoed by the U.N. Population Fund, have long claimed that minorities, because of their minority status, because of their limited numbers, are exempted from the one-child policy. The county, Fengning County, in northern Hebei Province that we visited and collected evidence in, in fact is a Manchu autonomous county. It has a majority of Manchus living there. The Manchus that we talked to said, no, we have the one-child policy imposed on us, just like our neighboring Han Chinese do.

Secondly, the punitive fines which exist in model family-planning counties, couples who give birth to a second child, one document from a model family-planning county says, will be assessed a fine from five to seven times their annual income. Those who illegally give birth to a third child will be assessed a fine from seven to nine times their annual income. And those who give birth to four or more illegal children—I don't know how they do it, but the rule is there—will be assessed a fine extrapolated from the above schedule of multiplists. So it could be 10 or 12 or even higher times the annual income.

There is child abduction and child trafficking in these model family-planning counties. We were told by local officials, "At the present time, if you don't pay the fine, they come and abduct the baby you just gave birth to and give it to someone else"; give it in some cases to local orphanages, which then adopt these babies out and make a profit on that transaction as well. So we have child trafficking as part of the program.

This morning, a friend of mine sent me another story about women or couples who are "selling their second children." Pregnant with an illegal child, realizing that they couldn't afford the fine, realizing that they would be, when located by the population control officials, taken in by force and forcibly aborted, they were looking for people to give their children to, to sell their children to.

Now, the government professes to be shocked by this development of selling unborn babies to the highest bidder and determined to stamp it out. This is the height of hypocrisy. It is hypocritical for the Chinese Government to complain about the buying and selling of babies, because it is the Beijing regime itself that has turned babies into commodities by putting a price on their heads, a price of tens of thousands of dollars on their heads, and allowing them to be sold by state-run orphanages.

I will only mention one specific case. We interviewed a woman in China who, in order to throw the population control police off her scent, gave—went when she was 6 months pregnant to a neighboring village, gave birth to the baby safely there, left it in the custody of a cousin of hers, and then on the way back home, knowing that she was going to be visited by the population control police, stopped by an abortion clinic and, after paying a small bribe, was given the dead body of a baby girl who had been aborted the day before, brought home the corpse to her house.

As soon as the population control officials heard that she had returned to her village, they came to either collect the money or collect the baby. She held the corpse of the dead baby girl out, didn't say a word. And they said, oh, your baby died, and left. That illustrates the extremes to which couples in China have to go to protect their children.

So conclusions, there are three. First, China's one-child policy constitutes the longest-running and most far-reaching violation of human rights the world has ever seen, both in the sheer number and in the duration of the human rights violations. Four hundred million Chinese children, give or take a few tens of millions, are dead because of this policy which has left their mothers wounded in both body and spirit and killing themselves in large numbers.

Second, the one-child policy is, as it has always been, coercive not by accident, but by design. The abuses we have talked about today are not occasional missteps by overzealous officials, they are the very lifeblood of the program. The one-child policy, like all political campaigns launched by the Chinese Communist Party, is deliberatively coercive. The extraordinary pressure that the highest levels of the Chinese Government put on lower level officials to collect fines and meet quotas can have no other outcome than brutality, cases like Feng Jianmei's.

And finally, the U.N. Population Fund has been complicit in China's one-child policy from the inception of the one-child policy. It does not merely turn a blind eye to abuses, but it facilitates them in various ways. This is nowhere more clearly illustrated than in the U.N. Population Fund's model family-planning counties, model birth-control program, where UNFPA-trained officials oversee the enforcement of the one-child policy, and where human rights abuses are nonetheless rampant.

And I have just one policy recommendation, Mr. Chairman. I would repeat what I said to you probably back in 1983: The U.N. Population Fund should be defunded; this time, however, the cuts should be permanent.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Mosher follows:]

China's One-Child Policy and the UNFPA: A Silent but Deadly Partnership

Steven W. Mosher
President
Population Research Institute

Testimony Submitted to the Subcommittee on Africa, Human Rights and International Programs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives

July 9, 2012

The UNFPA and the One-Child Policy

Beijing continues to vigorously pursue its infamous one-child policy, ignoring the massive human rights abuses that this entails, the skewed sex ratios that have resulted, and the labor shortages that it has produced.

Over the past three years, PRI's investigative teams have spent several weeks in China visiting UNFPA Model Birth Control Counties. During this period, the teams spent over 80 hours interviewing several dozen witnesses to, or victims of, China's coercive one-child policy. Over 30 hours of testimonies were recorded on audiotape, and approximately 5 hours of testimonies were recorded on videotape. Additional photographic evidence of birth control directives was obtained.

The term Model Birth Control Counties originated with the UNFPA, which in 1998 formally communicated to the U.S. House of Representatives that it had reached an agreement with the Chinese government to take over the management of birth control (*jihua shengyu*, in Chinese) programs in 32 counties. In these Model Birth Control Counties, the UNFPA assured the Congress that the program would be "fully voluntary" and untainted by coercion.

It is important to note that UNFPA also made even more specific guarantees. It stated that in these counties that (1) targets and quotas have been lifted, (2) "women are free to voluntarily select the timing and spacing of their pregnancies", and (3) abortion is not promoted as a method of family planning.[1] Several years later, maintaining that the original program had been a success, the UNFPA added another 40 counties to the list of model birth control counties, bringing the total to 72.

The goal of PRI's independent investigative teams was to carry out an in-depth analysis of several UNFPA "model birth control county" programs. We deliberately limited our recent visits to counties that had been included on the original 1998 list, where the UNFPA would have had more than a decade to end abuses and bring the birth control programs into line with generally accepted international standards of human and parental rights.

The county programs selected for investigation were:

Fengning Manchu Autonomous County, Hebei province.
Luan County, Hebei province.
Wenshui County, Shanxi province.
Sihui County, Guangdong province.
Lipu County, Guangxi province.

Our complete report will be published shortly.

Our conclusion is that the UNFPA is directly responsible for forced abortions and forced sterilizations in China. But how can it not be, when investigations of counties where it claims to have stopped such abuses produce evidence that such abuses continue?

Here I summarize two important findings of our research. First, contrary to the claims of the Chinese government, minorities appear not to be exempt from the one-child policy. Second, the extraordinary police powers given to the population cadres have resulted in numerous abuses, including the abduction and selling of "illegal" children.

Minorities Are Not Exempt from the One-Child Policy

Fengning Autonomous Manchu County, in northern Hebei Province near what used to be called Manchuria, is officially designated as a UNFPA "Model Birth Control County." Many of its residents are of Manchu descent, hence its designation as a "Manchu Autonomous County." From the beginning of the one-child policy, the Chinese government has maintained that the policy does not apply to minorities like the Manchus, the Uyghurs, and the Tibetans. Members of such groups, instead of being restricted to one child, are supposedly allowed to have two or even three. The rationale is obvious: Imposing a one-child policy on a minority group would shrink its numbers over time, and could even prove genocidal. The outside world has generally bought into this generous-sounding claim.[ii]

PRI conducted interviews with several dozen Manchus and Han Chinese. We conclude from these interviews that the one child policy is just as rigorously enforced in this UNFPA county as in other non-UNFPA counties. Moreover, we conclude that the same childbearing regulations that are enforced on the Han Chinese are also enforced on the Manchu minority. For example, we interviewed a Manchu dairyman who, despite being a member of a minority group, was only allowed to have one child:

> PRI: "Do you have any children?"
> Manchu man: "We have one child, a son. He is in school right now."
> PRI: "Would you like to have more children?"
> Manchu man: "Of course we would like to," he shrugged. "But that is not allowed."
> PRI: "What happens if you have an illegal child?"
> Manchu man: "It depends on your income, but it can run into the tens of thousands of Chinese Yuan."
> PRI: "And you are Manchus?
> Manchu man: "Yes, we are."

The Chinese government claim that all minorities are exempt from the one-child policy, which the UNFPA has at various times repeated, is false. This is relevant because that UNFPA is also helping to fund "family planning" services not just in Fengning but in other minority regions as well.[iii] This provides, *inter alia,* yet more evidence that the UNFPA's claims that it is a moderating force in China do not accord with the reality of its complicity in coercion.

Child Abduction, Child Trafficking, and the One-Child Policy

It is well known that those who violate the one-child policy have sometimes been subjected to coerced abortions or, if they have already given birth, have been forced to pay punitive fines *and* have been sterilized. But it has also recently come to our attention that Chinese villagers who cannot afford to pay these fines have their "illegal" children abducted and sold by Chinese population control officials.

The birth control regulations posted in one town warned that those who violate the one-child policy shall be contracepted or sterilized:

> Under the direction of the birth control bureaucracy and the technical personnel (assigned thereto), those married women of childbearing age who have already had one child shall be given an IUD; *those couples that have already had a second or higher order child shall be sterilized.* (Italics added.)

This sterilization directive was confirmed in conversation with villagers. One woman, a Chinese minority, told us that the consequence of having a third child would be that the government "would take measures to sterilize you."

The fines now imposed on violators of the one-child policy are, by any standards, enormous. In one UNFPA "Model Birth Control County," we photographed a billboard of birth control regulations that warned:

> Those who illegally reproduce ... will be assessed, when their illegal behavior is discovered, a "social compensation fee" based on a unit calculated from a year's salary for urban dwellers and based on a year's income after expenses for rural dwellers;
>
> Those who illegally give birth to one child, will be assessed a fine 3 to 5 times their annual income; those who illegally give birth to a second child will be assessed a fine from 5 to 7 times their annual income; those who illegally give birth to a third child will be assessed a fine from 7 to 9 times their annual income; those who give birth to 4 or more illegal children will be assessed a fine extrapolated from the above schedule of multiples; Those who illegally take in a child, have an extramarital birth, have an out of wedlock birth, both parties involved will be assessed a "social compensation fee" according to the above schedule of (income) multiples.

That these fines were actually imposed was clear from our discussions with ordinary Chinese. We were told again and again that violators are fined "tens of thousands of *renminbi*," or "20,000 or 30,000 *renminbi*." These are enormous sums of money by Chinese standards. One woman reported that she and her husband had been forced to take out a 10-year loan to pay the 25,000 *renminbi* fine that had been assessed for each of her two illegal daughters. To pay off this "child mortgage," her husband had been forced to go to work in the city.

When we asked what would happen if a couple couldn't afford to pay the fine, we were told that offenders would be visited by population control officials who would "seal off" their homes, and possibly even destroy them, as punishment for non-payment.

In Lipu county, another UNFPA Model Birth Control County, located in northern Guangxi province, we were told by a village officials that "At the present time, if you don't pay the fine, they come and abduct the baby you just gave birth to and give it to someone else."

This practice of child abduction has recently been confirmed by the Chinese government. According to a report in the *Caixin Century* magazine, authorities in the southern Chinese province of Hunan have begun investigating a report that population control officials had seized at least 16 babies born in violation of strict family planning rules, sent them to state-run orphanages, and then sold them abroad for adoption. "Before 1997, they usually punished us by tearing down our houses for breaching the one-child policy, but after 2000 they began to confiscate our children," the magazine quoted villager Yuan Chaoren as saying.

The children, reportedly from Longhui county near Hunan province's Shaoyang city, had been abducted by who accused their parents of breaching the one-child policy or illegally adopting children. The local family planning office then sent the children to local orphanages, which listed them as being available for adoption, the report said, adding the office could get 1,000 *renminbi* or more for each child. The orphanages in turn receive $3,000 to $5,000 for each child adopted overseas, money that is paid by the adoptive parents. The magazine reported that al least one migrant worker said she had found her daughter had been adopted abroad and was now living in the United States.

It is worth noting that these two reports come from the same general area of China and occurred in neighboring provinces. Lipu county, where we heard about the practice of abducting and selling "illegal" children, is located in northern Guangxi province not far from the Hunan border, while Shaoyang is located near the southern border of Hunan not far from the Guangxi border.

Local officials deny any involvement in child trafficking. But it is well known that the so-called "job responsibility system" requires them to rigorously enforce the one-child policy, and that their

success (or failure) in this area will determine future promotions (or demotions). Abducting and selling an "illegal" baby or child would not only enable an official to eliminate a potential black mark on his record, it would allow him to make a profit at the same time. In this way the one-child policy, through its system of perverse and inhumane rewards and punishment, encourages officials to violate the fundamental right of parents to decide for themselves the number and spacing of their children.

Child trafficking has occurred in other countries that offer children for adoption, most notably in Cambodia, Nepal and Vietnam, where the abuses are so rampant that the U.S. has put a moratorium on adoptions. It may be time to consider a similar moratorium on adoptions from China.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to make three points.

First, China's one-child policy constitutes the longest-running and most far-reaching violation of human rights the world has ever seen. Four hundred million Chinese children are missing because of this policy.

Second, the one-child policy is coercive not by accident, but by design. The abuses that we have talked about today are not occasional missteps by overzealous officials--as they are sometimes characterized by Chinese officials--but are the very lifeblood of the program. The one-child policy, like all political campaigns of the Chinese Communist party, is coercive by virtue of its fines, its targets, its quotas, and by the extraordinary pressure that the highest levels of the Chinese government put on lower-level officials.

Third, the U.N. Population Fund has been complicit in China's one-child policy from the first, not merely turning a blind eye to abuses, but facilitating them in various ways. This is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the U.N. Population Fund's "model county program," where UNFPA-trained officials oversee the enforcement of the one-child policy, and where abuses are rampant.

The U.N. Population Fund should once again be defunded, Mr. Chairman, this time permanently.

---

[i] See: "UNFPA's County Program in China: Providing Quality Care, Protecting Human Rights," UNFPA, August 10, 2001.

[ii] If you Google "China's One-Child Policy and Minorities," as I have, you will find dozens of sites blithely repeating Beijing's mantra that the policy does not apply to minorities. I had doubted this claim from the beginning, and for good reason. Back in the eighties, I collaborated with an American doctor who documented the forced abortion and sterilization of Tibetan women who threatened to violate the one-child policy.

[iii] See MDGF-1692: The China Culture and Development Partnership Framework, accessed on June 21, 2009, at http://sdnhq.undp.org/opas/en/proposals/suitable/189. Here the U.N. Population Fund in involvement in a project to promote family planning among minorities. Their goal is and "Increased proportion of clients seeking MCH/FP counseling services in program locations."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mosher, thank you very much for your incisive testimony and for your decades—again, having been the man that broke the story itself.

And I would note parenthetically, and I think the subcommittee members are aware of this, Stanford University actually retaliated against you. It was so bad, I will never forget it, the Wall Street Journal did an editorial in your favor, and it was entitled "Stanford Morality." And it talked about how, in the interest of having access and the continued programs with China, they were willing to throw a human rights whistleblower who documented exactly what he saw and broke the story to the world—to put you in a—to deny you the ability to get your doctorate there. So thank you for that bold and tremendous leadership.

I would like to now yield to T. Kumar from Amnesty International and welcome him back to the committee.

STATEMENT OF MR. T. KUMAR, DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL ADVOCACY, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Mr. KUMAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, Amnesty International would like to thank the committee collectively and you personally to inviting us and for all of the leadership you have done to lead human rights abuses around the world, and also Members of Congress who are here. Thank you very much.

Amnesty International have documented human rights abuses in China over several decades, and one of the issues we documented is the one-child policy and abuses connected to it to enforce those policies. We have documented what other victims have previously said: Forced abortion, forced sterilization, and also family members have been caused or imprisoned or detained in reeducation-through-labor camps for objecting, or to exert pressure on the women who have been pregnant so far. We also have documented when some women tried to petition against forced abortion and sterilization cases, they have been detained in reeducation-through-labor camps and also imprisoned there for quite some time.

So overall, what we have seen is this practice of enforcing one-child policy has contributed to numerous human rights abuses not only to these women, but also to the family members.

Due to pressures by you as well as other leading governments around the world—and I will say you are the main champion—the Chinese Government took a very important step about 10 years ago. In 2002, they passed a new law pretty much humanizing or saying that they want to make sure that no human rights are violated in the process of enforcing the one-child policy. It is not that they got rid of the one-child policy or anything else; they said, you know, it should not be used for detaining or any other form of abuses.

That was a landmark turnaround. We thought then that the abuses would be stopped. But to our disappointment, despite that particular law that was passed, to this day what we are seeing is the same abuses are continuing there. There is no political will from the government. This particular law came into effect primarily because of international pressure. So what says to us, to ev-

eryone, is that when the pressure is there, it has its impact. That is what this hearing also is going to achieve.

Even according to the law they should have arrested certain officials who have been committing these abuses, but from Amnesty International's point of view, we could not able to find a number of cases of officials who have been detained or imprisoned. So by raising this issue, we want to see what can be done from an accommodation point of view.

There is an opportunity that is coming out in 2 weeks' time. China-U.S. human rights dialogue is going to be taking place in Washington July 23–24. That is an opportunity for the U.S. Government to raise this issue, as well as other issues, with Chinese authorities. This is something you can take the leadership in exerting pressure on the administration to make sure that human rights is being discussed in a meaningful manner.

Every year U.S. Government discusses human rights with China, but to our knowledge, discussion for the sake of discussion is taking place. It is not part of the mainstream dialogue that is being taken care in the name of security and economic data. So we would urge the U.S. Congress to urge the administration to include human rights as part of the dialogue of security and economic dialogue. It should be called security, human rights and economic dialogue, where human rights enjoys part and parcel of the whole issue of other importance that U.S. plays in terms of dealing with China.

Before I close, I just want to highlight other human rights abuses that are taking place. The reason is that it is all interrelated. No one human rights abuses can stand alone if others systems are in place. For example, even one-child policy will not stand alone if others, like the reeducation-through-labor system, is not there, if freedom of expression is there. So as a result, we have to address in a holistic manner, by giving importance to certain issues that can be highlighted, like one-child policy should.

The reeducation through labor, there are almost 0.5 million people who have been detained without charge or trial. That figure varies because we don't know exactly what happens there. But the conservative figures we have come up is that system of reeducation through labor sent chills through the citizens where they can be locked up without charge or trial.

Secondly, the lawyers, the legal profession, faces enormous pressure from the government if they speak out on human rights-related issues. That also falls under this one-child policy issue or forced abortion. They can't take a position on this, so that issue also should be raised.

Religious persecution, even though it is not directly involved, I would urge that the religious persecution issue is also at the top of the agenda for the U.S. Government when they deal with China. That penalty—again, I mean, you can argue whether the death penalty has decreased there or not. To this day China executes more people than the rest of the world combined despite all the amendments they brought in to reduce the number of sentences and executions.

And finally, two more regions. One is Xinjiang and Tibet. In Xinjiang, Mr. Chairman, you knew, Rebiya Kadeer's two children

are in custody. It should be raised at every meeting that the United States has.

In Tibet, the issue of Panchen Lama, who was selected 15 years ago by the Dalai Lama, still not to be seen, and the situation is getting worse.

So in closing, Amnesty International urges you to ensure that during the upcoming dialogue, the U.S.-China human rights dialogue, human rights is discussed in a serious manner, and if they fail, then Congress should exert pressure to make sure that human rights is part and parcel of security and economic dialogue.

Thank you very much for inviting us.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Kumar, thank you very much for your testimony.

I would hope, as you indicated, that the dialogue would be of some meaning. The problem has been is that it is often a gabfest with very little relationship to deeds. And the people who engage in it, listen and talk. These issues, if they are brought up, certainly are not brought up with the seriousness that they need to be brought up with.

I think, you know, especially in light of the worsening instability of China because of its demographic nightmare that it is experiencing, the missing girls and the aging population vis-à-vis young people, that that instability, as Valerie Hudson testified here at a hearing we had last year, portends a very, very dangerous future for China internally that could very quickly become an expression of war or war actions internationally. She pointed out in her testimony that Japan and Taiwan were the two most likely victims of that kind of instability on the short and intermediate term. And, of course, others could be at risk futurewise. So it ought to be incorporated.

To date, it is in my experience, and I would love to be proven wrong, that when these issue are brought up, they are brought up as an obligatory—if they are brought up—obligatory mention rather than a heartfelt expression of solidarity with the women of China, as well as with their children, including their unborn children.

But thank you for that very strong point. It is a good one.

We do have our next witness via telephone.

Ms. Guo, you have got the floor. And thank you for testifying. Bob Fu will be translating for you. And, again, we deeply appreciate your willingness to speak.

STATEMENT OF MS. YANLING GUO, VICTIM OF CHINA'S POPULATION CONTROL POLICIES

[The following testimony was delivered telephonically through an interpreter.]

Ms. GUO. Honorable Congressman Chairman Chris Smith and honorable members of the committee, friends for Chinese human rights, human rights in China, the following is my account that I was forced to abort my baby. The year was 1995. I was already 8 months pregnant. At that time I was staying at my sister's house. It was in the morning on the day that the incident happened, and I was heading out to buy breakfast. I was dragged by the family-planning officials. Then I was forcibly dragged into a car, a van, by these family-planning officials. In the van, I was crying out and

asked for help. Help, somebody rescue me, save me. But they grabbed me and held me down, and I had a cloth used to wipe cars stuffed into my mouth.

I was then taken to the second floor of the hospital. As I was in the hospital, I saw a number of female victims sitting on the benches in the corridor and waiting to be forcibly abortion—for forced abortions. Later on, I was pinned down on the bed by force by these family-planning officials. And the person in white pressed my belly with her hands and felt the position of my baby's head. And she stuck a big, long, fatal needle deep into my abdomen.

After about an hour later, because of my poor health, the baby was born by dragging. So at that point the person guarding me went to fetch a person and pull the baby out and put it on a small table less than 3 feet from me. It was a baby boy, my son. My son.

[The following testimony was delivered telephonically through an interpreter by Mr. Deng on behalf of Ms. Guo.]

Ms. GUO. By then my unborn baby had already been murdered. After that, the Chinese Communist Party's family-planning officials captured me, and then I was forcibly sterilized. I was beaten and without any strength to work anymore, I had to flee.

I just want to seek justice after these wounds. Those officials didn't even admit any mistakes and what they have done to me. Not only that, I was also handcuffed by these family-planning officials. They used electric shock batons and electrified my hands. And I was imprisoned twice for this, for violations of China's one-child policy. And we were forced to pay heavy fines, and even our house was destroyed. In order to flee from the dangers, we had to escape. So we have been wandering around outside for 21 years. We finally managed to get to Thailand without any living supplies.

I do hope the United States Government and all friends sitting around here today help us to seek justice and find justice, and find justice, and to really find justice for the Chinese women; and also to help the many babies, wounded babies; and remove this evil family-planning system, and restore our human rights, and support us with humanitarian aid.

I also want to thank you once again for all your help. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for today's opportunity you gave to me.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Guo follows:]

A Personal Account of Being Seized by the Family Planning Commission of China's Communist Party and Forced to Have an Abortion

Guo Yanling

Testimony before

U. S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs (COFA)
Hearing of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health and Human Rights
on "Continued Human Rights Attacks on Families in China"

2 p.m., July 9, 2012,
Rayburn House Office Building, Room 2172, Washington, D.C.

(English translation provided by China Aid Association)

Honorable Chairman Chris Smith and honorable members of the Committee, friends for human rights in China,

The year was 1995; I was eight-months pregnant and was lodging at #16 Zheng Street, Yaotouling, Jiangnan District in Nanning City. At this address was a small street-side barber shop operated by my younger sister and her husband. Past the shop's front room was a bedroom where a bed had been added. This was my place of refuge. (It was governed by the "hostel" neighborhood committee).

It was around seven in the morning on the day that the incident occurred. Heading out to buy breakfast, I turned left and walked about seventy meters to a T-junction, then turned right and arrived at the Community Supply and Marketing Cooperative (which was not open then) that was kitty-corner across the street. I was stopped by an older woman in her 50s who asked me if I had a "birth permit." I said no. When she looked at people, this older woman's eyes were half-closed (probably a congenital problem). Looking around, I saw that there were people guarding the nearby intersection, and I realized misfortune was in store. Then, two staff members from the Family Planning Commission came and asked me where I was from, where I lived and what my name was. I gave no reply to these questions and this confrontation and standoff with them continued for over ten minutes. I waved and yelled for a ride from the motorbikes that were passing by without break but none would come. I tried to walk away but they wouldn't let me go. At this time I appealed to the crowds gathering around to watch by yelling: "Help, somebody!" But no one came to help. Then two vans arrived, their doors opened and people sitting inside. At this point the Family Planning Commission staff members standing by urged me to get in quickly. I refused and said, "I don't know who you are, why you are asking me to get into your vehicle and where you are taking me?" They said, "You will know after you get in." At this critical juncture I called for help a second time: Help! Somebody please help me now! But still no one came to help. At this moment, a male Family Planning Commission worker said, "It's

useless to yell anything. Whoever dares to rescue you will be taken as well." Thus, with nobody daring to come to my aid, I was pushed forcibly into the van.

On the road, in an attempt to save my baby who would soon be arriving in this world, I reached my hand for the van door. They grabbed me and held me down on the van floor, yanking my hair and trampling my limbs and body. For the third time I screamed again "murder," only to have a cloth used to wipe cars stuffed into my mouth. I had no clue where they were taking me. But I had heard previously about pregnant women seized by the Family Planning Commission for forced abortions and of babies delivered during such trips being thrown out of the vehicle into wild fields. As we were approaching our destination, they released me. After I got out, I was brought to the second floor of the building. There, I saw a number of female victims sitting on the benches in the corridor, their eyes filled with tears of anxiety, terror and sadness. In my panic to escape, I hurriedly started back down the same stairs, but a few steps down I could see guards at the bottom so I had to turn back. At this point the Family Planning Commission workers downstairs had discovered my attempt to escape, and came after me. Back upstairs, they found a woman dressed in white and wearing a surgical mask who told me to get on the delivery bed immediately. I refused, so they pinned me down on the bed by force. After the person in white pressed my belly with her hands and felt the position of my baby's head, she stuck a big, long, fatal needle deep into my abdomen (possibly where the baby's head was)..... "Stop thrashing around!" she ordered, then left.

By then, my unborn baby had already been murdered and I lost heart. Was there any point in trying to escape now? After a while, I felt my abdomen begin to bloat. In about an hour (I was not wearing a watch then) half of my baby's body emerged. I had always been in poor health, and not having had breakfast that morning made me even weaker to deliver the baby. At this point, the person guarding me went to fetch a person in white who pulled the baby out and put it on a small table less than three feet away from me. It was a baby boy, with no tears, no cries and no mother's cuddle, he was just left lying there naked and all alone. A while later the person in white, with some effort, removed my placenta which, together with the dead baby, was stuffed into a transparent plastic bag. They left without a single word.

About a half hour later, seeing nobody at my bedside, I got up. I saw that by the neighboring bed was a small table with the dead body of a male newborn. I turned to the woman lying on the bed and said, "You delivered a baby boy." The woman said, "This baby would have been born in a day or two. I was abducted from my home in the countryside. I could have escaped if not for my mother-in-law who consulted a fortune-teller who said I was pregnant with a girl. She asked me more than once to abort my baby. When the people from Family Planning Commission showed up, I hesitated, and so I was captured. Thinking about it now, I'm full of regret."

As I sat on the bench in the hallway after coming out of the delivery room, I longed to see my

baby again before leaving. I noticed then a person in white going down the corridor carrying a bag. The person went around a corner, and then walked back. I waited a bit before going off to search. Oh! What I saw totally broke my heart. It wasn't just a couple of dead babies but a big basket full of the dead bodies of newborns and trash. I couldn't tell which one was mine. Right there, my heart filled with a need to avenge my son. I walked back to seats in the hallway to identify those killers in white. But these white uniformed murderers all wore facemasks with only a pair of watchful eyes exposed. They moved around in a strange pattern, showing up suddenly only when needed to commit the crime, never making a sound during the criminal act, and leaving immediately after each killing. This behavior indicated they knew what they were doing! At this point, hungry, exhausted, sad and angry, I had no choice but to leave this butchering ground. Later I learned that this living hell was the Second People's Hospital of Nanning City, formerly known as "Dongfanghong [East is Red] People's Hospital."

The day that I was abducted in the street, if the Family Planning Commission and the hospital had known it was my third pregnancy, I would have been also sterilized at the same time. I refused to give them my name and address lest they do me more harm. As I left that evil place in the middle of the day, not a single person asked me any questions, nor did anyone give me any medical help. In this way, my experience of being seized by the Chinese Communist Party and forced to abort my child took place without any trace of a written record. I don't want to say too much about this, but our Father in heaven understands me!

I'm from a poverty stricken mountain area and went to school only for a few days in first grade. (the other children picked on me because of my father's bad political background). With no more schooling, I was later was married off in the city. As I am unable to write, I authorized Du Yiliang to write this oral "testimony" on my behalf. I hereby swear to its truth as a fully responsible Christian.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you so very much for your courage in testifying. And again, through your tears, we are again reminded of the horrific impact this barbaric policy has had on not just the children, but on the mothers.

Pastor FU. Mr. Chairman, allow me to just add a few words about Ms. Guo's case. I was here this morning trying to test the quality of the phone call, and Ms. Guo's husband told me a story that happened last night that explains, you know, the price and the toll, the trauma that had been done permanently almost to women like Ms. Guo.

He told me, he said last night as Ms. Guo was preparing to testify today, her husband heard very strong weeping, crying in the restroom. And later on her husband described to me that Ms. Guo walking out of the restroom with her arms like this as if holding a baby. And her husband said, "Honey, why do you do this?" and she said she was in the restroom and saw her son. She said, "Our son is back"; not only their 8-month son, she said she saw many hundreds of thousands of babies following her.

And I think, you know, it is traumatic. I mean, you can tell if you read the rest of her testimony, not only she herself experienced, but she saw, you know, many other women around her that very day, and she saw actually a bag of trash of babies in the trash can, and she couldn't identify to say goodbye to her dead son.

Certainly, you know, I hope with her testimony and the hearing today, it could become a reality that more and more, hundreds and maybe thousands of babies could be rescued as a result of her testimony today. So that is my prayer. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Fu, thank you so very much. You know, it just underscores the trauma that goes on for years and is lifelong, and Ms. Guo is dealing with that still in the hospital. And people today as we meet, it is happening to them. It is so grossly underappreciated by Congress, by the White House, and by Parliaments around the world, although there is hope with the European Parliament recently taking its action, just how traumatized these women really are, when we have pointed out the number of suicides, far in excess of any other nation on Earth.

I remember I met with Peng Peiyun, a woman who ran the program for years, and brought up an article that had been in The New York Times and pointed out—it started off about how this woman was essentially clinically depressed over what she had experienced. And she just said it was rubbish, it was just nonsense, it was just made up; that the women of China do not have those problems. Of course, she also said there was no such thing as a forced abortion either in the People's Republic of China. So she certainly was lying and deceiving, but just completely discounted the impact on women like we just heard.

In previous hearings when we have had women who had suffered the cruelty of forced abortion, without exception they have been unable to finish their testimonies.

During the Clinton administration, in this room, I had invited women who were on the Golden Venture program that President Clinton had changed our asylum policy from to preclude asylum protections for women fleeing forced abortion. He did it by Executive Order, and when he did that, these women had credible cases

before the administrative law judge, but when the policy was changed, they were in no man's land and were being not coerced, but compelled in many ways to go back to China. And lawyers were fighting to keep them here.

Well, I invited them to testify. To get them here we almost had to resort to a subpoena because they did not want them to tell their stories. But a woman sat right where Reggie Littlejohn is sitting, who found an abandoned baby girl, made that girl her own, and the family-planning cadres knocked on her door and then forcibly aborted her because she had her one. She could not finish her testimony, nor could the others, just like we heard. Wujian, in 2009 when she testified, broke down several times.

So I think, if anything, if the press could convey and if lawmakers could better understand the trauma that women are suffering, the helplessness that they feel is without parallel—to have their babies not only stolen, but then murdered by the state. And they feel there is nothing they can do to stop it.

So I would like to thank our panel. I have a couple of very brief questions, and then I will yield to my distinguished colleagues.

I am wondering if you could tell us what you think we can do to mitigate any further retaliation against Ms. Feng, her husband, and the lawyers who are taking up her case. I have been amazed and in awe over these lawyers in China who take up cases, and then like Chen—Chen Guangcheng—and then they themselves become subjected to punitive actions, including incarceration and torture. You can go through the long list of very brave men and women. I am wondering what we could do. I mean, this woman and her husband and the lawyers now, but certainly those two and their family have been traumatized. How do we prevent further retaliation against them as we have already seen the beginning manifestations when the so-called townspeople showed up to call them betrayers? Would anyone like to take that?

Pastor FU. This is the update about the lawyer situation. I was able to talk with a lawyer, Zhang Kai, who has signed the agreement to represent Feng Jianmei and her husband, Deng Jiyuan's case. He says so far he only received one phone call from the security officer from the Domestic Security Squad Division and a gentle warning. He has not received a sort of visible, direct threat for taking up this case. And, of course, the local officials even went to Beijing. And remember what had happened to Chen Guangcheng on numerous occasions in the past when he escaped to Beijing, and Chen Guangcheng was abducted, kidnapped, by the officials from the Linyi or Shandong Province right in front of Dr. Yang Zhizhu, a professor of law and himself a lawyer, and they were beaten.

So I think we should continue to raise this case. And certainly as Mr. Kumar suggested, this month, July 23 and 24, during the human rights dialogue with China, I think Secretary Clinton should raise this case during the dialogue.

With regard to Ms. Guo Yanling's case, we received her cry-out petition after the Chen Guangcheng case was exposed. And she and her husband actually with their three children escaped to Thailand August 7 last year and registered in the UNHCR, the High Commissioner on Refugees, in Bangkok. And, of course, after this hearing she is exposed, and I would hope that this committee and the

Congress and the administration, especially the Bureau for—the PRM, Population, Refugee and Migration, should pay attention and send a priority one request to the United Nations—the refugee bureau, refugee agency in Bangkok to let them at least speed up their process of approval for their refugee protection. I think these are the things we can do immediately to help protect them.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mosher, you mentioned the UNFPA model birth control counties, and I think what is, again, underappreciated by most is the obsession level with regard to promoting population control in general, and in China particularly. I remember Harry Wu wrote a book called "Better Ten Graves than One Extra Birth," and what he was merely putting as the name of his book was a big slogan that he had a picture of, as you pointed out. You have a number of—you have taken pictures of those slogans that are really part and parcel of the policy—"Better Ten Graves than One Extra Birth."

I just read a very interesting book called, "Unnatural Selection," I wasn't fully aware until I read the book just how sex selection was included as a way of lessening population. If you kill the baby, the girl child in the womb, she will never be a mother and will never give birth to children who will lead to an increase in population. A staple, a mainstay of the population control movement propaganda, and China swallowed that hook, line and sinker with its one-child policy and then the consequences of sex-selection abortions.

I wonder if you could speak to, elaborate on this—you know, when you talk about these—and I remember in 1985, there was a hearing on the one-child-per-couple policy which brought out of a lot of the information you had provided that led to 60 Minutes stories and other things. There was a 1985 hearing run by the majority—I was a minority Member then—and our witnesses were telling us, it's all over basically. I don't exaggerate. It was basically the high tides of China's population control program had reached its zenith, and now it was going toward normalcy. And, of course, Michael Weisskopf's three-part expose in The Washington Post completely obliterated that thesis for that hearing. But we have heard that over the years, over and over again. These were injustices, if they ever occurred, of the past.

When you talk about these model birth control counties, it reminds me of Srebrenica in a whole different context, a place that the U.N. called a "safe haven" during the terrible war in Yugoslavia, and it became a mustering zone for the killing of about 8,000 men with full acquiesce by the Dutch UNPROFOR peacekeepers.

Maybe not a good analogy, but it is certainly similar, because at the bottom, at the core of those model counties, they are still implementing the government policy of one child. Could you just elaborate on that, if you could?

Mr. MOSHER. Well, I think you are perfectly correct in pointing out the repeated attempts to convince the outside world that the policy is undergoing modifications and some changes, and the abuses are a thing of the past. Once you hear that five or six times, it loses credibility. And the most recent efforts, of course, which appear to originate separately from the government, among aca-

demics and so forth, are the first real sign of hope that I have seen in the past few decades.

Government bureaucrats who respond to criticism are simply trying to defuse foreign criticism. They are not going to make fundamental changes in the program, and to see the beginnings of Chinese civil society now reacting, and at great personal risk, as the attorneys do, as some people in the media do is very heartening. It doesn't mean that the battle is over, but perhaps now the program is entering its final years.

We shouldn't forget that the Chinese Government has pledged to continue the program until 2050. That is a long time in the future. We also shouldn't forget that every Chinese leader beginning with Deng Xiaoping, through Jiang Zemin, through Hu Jintao has endorsed the policy, which means that it is not an issue that local-level officials or middle-level officials can discuss with impunity because the center has set a policy, and their job is to follow that policy.

I have long thought that much of what comes out of China in terms of modification of the one-child policy is simply done for reasons of saving international face.

Secondly, I have also believed that one of the reasons why for decades the Chinese Government authorities have ignored the slaughter of little baby girls is because they understand that this contributes to the solution of what they consider China's overpopulation problem, because the tens of millions of young men who are unmarried and who will never marry because their brides have been killed in utero or after birth will not contribute to population growth in the future. They will not have any children. So if you eliminate a woman, you eliminate all of the children that she would have had and all of her children's children on down through the generations.

Finally, going back to the point that Reggie made about going from a one-child policy to a two-child policy or three-child policy, the problem here is that the government has taken control of all of the reproductive systems in China. It has usurped the authority of parents to decide for themselves the number and spacing of their children. This did not begin in 1979 or 1980 with the one-child policy. This began in the early 1950s in which there was a discussion held between Chairman Mao and his senior officials as to whether or not it was the proper role of government in China to dictate how many children should be born in that country; whether or not it was the role of the state not just to control all the means of production under the high tide of communism, but also to control the means of reproduction, which is to say the male and female reproductive systems of all Chinese. And the decision that was made by Chairman Mao in the early 1950s was that the state had a legitimate role in controlling reproduction, and in the 1950s he exercised that role by encouraging the Chinese to have larger families. And then, of course, things came full circle.

But the problem here is the state has taken over control of reproduction. This is a fundamental human right, and until the Chinese state decides it has no business interfering with the reproductive systems of couples in China, the problem will continue. Whether or not there is an end to the one-child policy, whether or not there is

a move to a two-child policy or three-child policy, the fundamental problem lies here.

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Buerkle.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The testimony that we just heard is a—you know, we sit here almost in the abstract and discuss this issue. But when you hear the anguish in that woman's voice about the loss of her child this many years later, as a mother of six, I can only just begin to appreciate her grief. So, thank you, Pastor, for allowing her testimony to be translated today, and, again, thank you to all of you for your willingness to be here and defend human rights.

My questions are directed to anyone who would be willing to answer or able to answer.

One of the things we hear are the apologists who say that, well, the vast majority of Chinese women support this policy. Can any one of you speak to that? And also we hear that the policy only affects urban dwellers or government workers, and so if you could flesh that out for us, I would appreciate it.

Ms. LITTLEJOHN. Well, with respect to your second question, it is interesting because some people say, oh, well, that only happens in the urban centers, or that only happens in the countryside. So you are talking about the people who say it only happens in the urban centers, and I want to point out a case that came out in March of this year. It was an anonymous posting, but it was a posting—and I think many people will remember this—it was an image of a full-term baby floating in a red bucket. That happened in Linyi. That is where Chen Guangcheng is from. A woman had given birth. She had been forcibly aborted at 9 months. I guess the needle slipped and passed the baby's head because the baby was born alive, cried, and that baby was drowned in a bucket. And there was a picture that was posted on Weibo and went all over the world.

Now, Chen Guangcheng comes from the countryside of China. He comes from Dongshigu Village. If you want to read some of the most horrific cases you have ever read in your life, just read the Chen Guangcheng report, which I posted and also broke to the West in the hearing on September 22, 2011, of this subcommittee. That all happened in the countryside. Women aborted, 7, 8, 9 months.

Men, there is a man that was killed. There was a man who committed suicide; a grandmother and her brother were forced to beat each other; whole families, extended families, that were brought in because of a family-planning violation of one person in their family. Because of implication, they were all brought in and tortured together and forced to pay 100 yuan a day in family-planning learning fee tuition.

All of this happened in countryside. Homes were destroyed. And yet things have been happening in the city as well. There was a case that happened I think it was in October 2010 of a woman in Xiamen—this was broken by al-Jazeera—who was forcibly aborted at 8 months. It happens in the cities, and it happens in the countryside. It happens everywhere in China.

Ms. BUERKLE. I will just follow up, and then please feel free to answer. Some will say the Chinese accept this policy. That is what

I would like you to speak to as well. Just what is their feeling about this, and have they accepted this policy?

Pastor FU. To say or claim that the majority of Chinese women support the cruel one-child policy is a flat-out lie. I think no women in China will be happy to see their wombs being owned by the family-planning officials from the day of their marriage to the day really they were forcibly sterilized. Every woman has a book, a book recorded. Every month they have to undergo mandatory and forcibly undergo a physical check to see whether they are pregnant, whether there are any signs of pregnancy. Of course, once they are found escaping, then the whole family, the neighbors, other relatives will be in big trouble. So no woman will support that kind of policy. Yes, it is a lie.

Ms. BUERKLE. Just one last question, Mr. Chairman.

I guess my question is to all of you. How can we best combat and call attention to this? Whether it is the American community or the global community, what can we do to combat any apathy, or ignorance, or just a disregard of this tragic policy?

Ms. LITTLEJOHN. Well, having hearings is really at the top of the list. I think this kind of thing really does help publicize public policy. I would also like to remind this committee of an Act that was sponsored by Congressman Chris Smith, H.R. 2121, the China Democracy Promotion Act of 2011. I think Congress could pass an Act like this, and what that would do, it would enable the President to deny entry into the United States for Chinese human rights abusers. I think that that would be a major thing.

And I would also mention that part of ending the policy is giving people within China the hope that it can end and helping them to continue to be informed about this. And again, I want to lift up Voice of America, which is constantly under attack, and getting, I understand right now, that they have cut the funding for interpreters so that people who speak English can no longer appear, so I will not be able to be on there, Congressman Smith will not—only Chinese speaking people will be able to appear on Voice of America. That cuts out a lot of Americans to be able to speak into China about these issues.

So that's another thing to keep the visibility going on within China as well, and Voice of America is the major organ for that.

Mr. MOSHER. I would return to the point of delegitimizing China's one-child policy by taking funding away from China that comes to it from the International Planned Parenthood Federation, which has been active in China since 1979, the U.N. Population Fund which has also been active in China from that same year. The fact that the Chinese Government gets funding for its one-child policy from prestigious international organizations that are, in part, funded by the United States is used by the Chinese Government to justify and explain the program to the Chinese people. The government says to the people if the United Nations, which represents the collective views of the people around the world, thinks that we are doing a good thing by embarking on the one-child policy, they say who are you to resist, or who are you to think it is a bad idea?

So we need to end that source of support for the one-child policy, and I believe that will embolden a lot of people of China to speak out where they haven't before.

Mr. KUMAR. Coming back to your first question of the support among women. When there is no need to forcibly abort a—you know people support, why do they have to force it? So that pretty much nullify that particular argument.

Coming back to the issue of how best to begin to address this, of course, all the recommendations we support but after sitting here and listening to this testimony from Bangkok, I think the angle of what happened to women who undergo this from the—is missing. That should be brought to light, how a woman who have been forcibly aborted, not abortion, this is forcibly aborted, feels and undergoes the pain and suffering, that should be brought in. I will say that that will have a immediate impact on people around the world and everyone. So I would recommend that you try to hold a hearing only for women who have gone through this experience, forced abortion basically, I am not going to complicate with other issues. Try to find the women who we just heard from Bangkok, that will have an impact here because you have to have impact here as well, not only in China. Thank you.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you, I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. A few final questions, why has the U.N. system so failed the women of China? As I think all of you know, we have tried and under both Reagan and Bush, and Bush, defunded the UNFPA only to have its supporters, particularly in the European Union and elsewhere, seek to fill the gaps, if you will, and increase their funding which, again, sends that message that Mr. Mosher just conveyed to us that "who are you to question this when the UNFPA is here?"

And I have seen that myself, as I indicated earlier, when the UNFPA is pulled out as a defense against all critics and they simply say it is a voluntary program, and that is the end of the story. So we have, in this year's foreign operations appropriations bill, there will be a defunding on the House side. In all candor, the Republicans will seek to take out funding for the UNFPA. The Obama administration will oppose it vigorously, as will the Senate, and at the end of the day, we are less likely to get a cut or an elimination of the funding for the UNFPA, that doesn't mean we are not going to try.

I think to be complicit in these crimes against humanity, in my opinion, suggests that the UNFPA itself ought to be at the Hague answering for such crimes and complicity in such crimes. And that story will come out someday, and we know it, but the Chinese people, I think will, especially the women of China will be extraordinarily chagrinned and angered that the U.N. played such a pivotal role in their repression. We will try, I can assure you, we will try, and we will try hard to do that.

Let me ask you, if I could Ms. Littlejohn, you mentioned H.R. 2121 a bill that I have introduced. We need, I believe, and your thoughts on this, to do more under current law and I wrote it so I know it is there. It is the Admiral James W. Nance-Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Act, Fiscal Years 2000, 2001; it is still in effect.

It requires that a visa be denied to those who are complicit in these crimes and of forced abortion and forced sterilization.

We have found after doing some investigations of this that a total number of 18 individuals, since its enactment back in 2000, have been denied entry into the U.S., which is a very poor and ineffective compliance record.

I would note parenthetically that I am the author of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004, where we have a similar provision about denying entry visas to those coming in from Belarus. And there are some 200 people on a list who are human rights abusers who were denied entry.

I think our next step really needs to be the promulgation of lists and the invitation to those who know abusers to come forward with their names so that the State Department, so that the U.S. Government will deny visas to the United States based on these crimes against women. So that is a follow up item I think we really need to go forward with.

And finally, with regard to trafficking, the Chinese Director of the Ministry of the Public Security Anti-Trafficking Task Force stated in the reporting period that the TIP Report covered, "The number of foreign women trafficked to China is definitely rising" and that, "Great demand from buyers, as well as traditional preference for boys in Chinese families are the main culprits fueling trafficking in China."

So what many of us have predicted for years is now coming to fruition in a very, very terrible way with more women from outside the country being brought in and being abused. Any of your thoughts on that? It seems to me that if this policy is not immediately and irrevocably reversed, and it will take time to reverse its consequences, this problem of human trafficking will only be exacerbated and China will become the ultimate magnet for the buying and selling and the commodification of women in the world. Your thoughts?

Ms. LITTLEJOHN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with you and am very glad that the TIP Report is finally including this after we have been pressing this issue for years.

I just want to bring forth the plight of North Korean girls, because there is definitely a confluence between the vacuum of women, and China just basically sort of sucking up women from many of the surrounding countries, and the way that it is violating international refugee law in this sense.

As you know, if human rights is worse anywhere in the world than in China, it is North Korea and people risk their lives to get over that border. Sometimes young women and girls they come over the border into China thinking that they have finally escaped a horrific situation and they might be able to find some kind of safety in China, and then they immediately get snapped up in the sexual slavery trade. And these young girls can get beaten, they can get raped, they can get murdered, and there is nothing they can do, there is no one they can appeal to, because if they then go to the authorities and say, look, I have been trafficked, help me, the Chinese authorities will say, oh, you are an illegal economic migrant and repatriate them to North Korea in contravention of

international refugee law, and these girls can end up in the North Korean death camps or possibly executed.

I have heard credible reports of members of their families being executed as well. So this is something that I would like to highlight in the context of the way the one-child policy is causing devastation to women and girls internationally, especially in North Korea.

Mr. SMITH. Pastor Fu.

Pastor FU. I just want to actually elaborate on the issue of how or why there has been silence even from some women's organizations on this forced abortion issue. And I, of course, came from China without knowing a lot of American politics and before I was already receiving accusation that somehow to help rescue Chen Guangcheng, maybe even a part of the right-wing conspiracy. I don't even know this term.

This is not a political issue, this is not a partisan issue, this is women's, children's rights issues, this is life and death issue. I think it should not be regarded as American domestic political issue. And we cannot play them, or even drag them into the U.S. political field. The women like Ms. Guo, they are crying out, they have nowhere to go. And if we just use—whatever way if this issue is regarded as part of the U.S. politics, and I think it sent a very chilling signal, I think, indirectly actually played by the Chinese Government, and to make more women and children into more miserable conditions. I think I would urge those women organizations like the National Organization for Women to come up.

Really these are the women's issues, these are their sister issues. It should not be regarded as a political issue, to pay attention on these issues and to stand up and speak up for these vulnerable women, millions of them suffering in China because they are pregnant with their second, third baby. And they are dragged, you know, like pigs, and Ms. Guo, her testimony, she shared about—we have actually received this thick stack of documentation showing how she was captured, arrested with official stamps and to say that one town she was forced to pay a fine already after escape to another township, they force her to pay another fine and she cannot pay, she cannot afford to pay when she was imprisoned.

It was well-documented, so I have already sent to the committee for the translation of these documentation. I also want to request that it be put as part of the record.

Mr. SMITH. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

Baning County People's Court, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region

Administrative Verdict

(2000) Ba Xing Cai Yu Di No. 524

Application executor: Baning County Family Planning Bureau
Legal representative: Liang Shangbin, director of the Bureau

Respondent: Du Yiliang. Male of Han ethnicity. Peasant. Residential address: Jitouling, Shatian Development Zone, Baning County

Respondent: Guo Yanling: Female of Zhuang ethnicity. Peasant. Residential address: same as above.

On August 11, 2000, this court received… (illegible)

Baning County People's Court, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region

Detention Decision Statement

(2000) Ba Fa Ju Zi Di No. 1292-1

Detainee: Guo Yanling, female born on July 15, 1963. She is of Zhuang ethnicity and resides at Jitouling, Shatian Development Zone, Baning.

While executing the case of collecting the fee for extra childbirth coded as (2000) Ba Ji Sheng Zheng Zi Di No. 25056, this court has found through its investigation that the respondent Guo Yanling refused to implement the obligation defined in the verdict of this court coded (2000) Ba Xing Cai Zi Di No. 4 (illegible).

Pursuant to Clause 6 of Article 102 of Civil Procedural Law of the People's Republic of China, it is decided as follows:

Guo Yanling shall be detained for 15 days.

If there is an objection to this decision, one may apply for a reconsideration at Nanning Municipal Intermediate People's Court either orally or in writing within three days from the next day of receiving this decision statement. During the reconsideration, the execution of the decision shall not be affected.

September 11, 2000
Seal: (illegible)

Baning County People's Court, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region

Notice of Execution

(2000) Ba Zhi Zi Di No. 1292.

Du Yiliang,
Guo Yanling,

This is to notify you that the decision statement of collecting the fee for extra childbirth coded (2000) Ba Ji Sheng Zheng Zi Di No. 25056 issued by the executing entity Family Planning Bureau of Baning County has already become valid and is legally binding. However, you people refuse to implement or refuse to implement entirely the obligations stated in this legal paper. Pursuant to Article 66 of the Administrative Procedural Law of the People's Republic of China, Article 97 of the Supreme People's Court's Explanation on Some Questions on the Execution of Administrative Procedural Law of the People's Republic of China and Article 220 of the Civil Procedural Law of the People's Republic of China, this court has decided that you must finish implementing the obligations stated in the legal paper by September 11, 2000. In the meantime, you must pay the interest on the debt due to the delay or pay a late fee. If the obligation is not implemented by the due date, it shall be implemented in a compulsory manner, which shall incur an executing fee of 215 yuan. The actual executing fee is 1,000 yuan. Altogether, it is 1,215 yuan which shall be paid by you.

September 11, 2000
Seal: Baning County People's Court

Baning County People's Court, Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region

Notice of Detention

Ba Fa Ju Tong Zi Di No. 1292.
September 11, 2000

This is to notify you that pursuant to Clause 6, Article 102 of the Civil Procedural Law of the People's Republic of China, we hereby detained on September 11, 2000 Guo Yanling who resides at Jitouling, Dashatian. Currently, she is being detained at Administrative Detention Center of Baning County Public Security Bureau.

_____ Family member (or work unit)

Appendix: List of Sealed and Seized Property

September (illegible), 2000
Seal: (illegible)

Serial No.	Name of property	Features and description	Amount
1	Cash in Renminbi	One hundred yuan only	(illegible)
2	Cash in Renminbi	Fifty yuan only	(illegible)

Person whose property is sealed or seized: (signature) Guo Yanling
Executed by: Li Jiangquan
Clerk: Lu (illegible)

This list exists in two copies. One copy shall be given to the person whose property is sealed or seized or his or her adult family members. The other copy is for record and filing.

Receipt of criminal's property September 12, 2000

Name:	Guo Yanling
Residential Address:	Dashatian
Description of property:	Living expenses
Amount:	One hundred yuan
Signature of receiver:	Jing
Signature of deliverer:	(illegible)

Receipt of criminal's property September 13, 2000

Name:	Guo Yanling
Residential Address:	Dashatian
Description of property:	Living expenses
Amount:	One hundred yuan
Signature of receiver:	Mu
Signature of deliverer:	Du Yiliang

Receipt of criminal's property September 13, 2000

Name:	Guo Yanling
Residential Address:	Dashatian
Description of property:	Living expenses
Amount:	Seventy yuan
Signature of receiver:	Wei
Signature of deliverer:	Du Yiliang

Unified Receipt for Administrative Payment in Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region

No. 2130257

July 3, 2000
Extra childbirth fee: 3,000.00 yuan
Three thousand yuan
Seal: Family Planning Bureau of Xincheng District of Nanning Municipality
Received by: Tan (illegible)

Certificate of Household Registration and Grain and Oil for the First Child in Nanning City, 2000.

As Du Yiliang and his wife Guo Yanling have had an extra childbirth (1997), they are hereby punished for this. According to family planning policy, a birth control measure has been taken and the fine has been paid in full. Please process household registration and grain and oil procedure for them.

Name of the child: Du Zhiquan
Date of birth: December 23, 1997.

September 3, 2000
Seal: Xincheng District Family Planning Bureau of Nanning Municipality

---

Birth Certificate

Name of the new-born baby: Du Zhiquan **Date of birth:** 6:30, December 23, 1997
Place of birth: Nanning, Guangxi (illegible)
Physical condition: healthy **Weight:** 2950 (illegible)
Name of mother: Guo Yanling **Nationality:** China (illegible)
(illegible)
Name of father: Du Yiliang **Nationality:** China (illegible)

Birth serial number: 4501055 (illegible)

Seal on the left: Ministry of Health of People's Republic of China.
Seal on the right: (illegible)

Application Form of Marriage Certification for Transient Population

Name:	Guo Yanling	**Gender:**	Female	**Ethnicity:**	Zhuang
Date of birth:	1963	**ID No.**	952128630715310		
Work unit:	None				
Household registration filed at:		48, Linjiang Street, Nanning City			
Marital status:	Married				
Spouse's name:	Du Yiliang				
Children					
Names of child	**Gender**	**Date of birth**	They have paid in full the fine for childbirths beyond the quota	Sterilization performed in May (illegible)	
Du Hao	Female	December 1985			
Du Huan	Female	October 1987			
Du Zhiquan	Male	December 1997			
Reason for going out of town	Labor	**Place where they have gone:**	Guangdong		
Allowed to process the certificate September 12, 2000			Seal: (illegible) September 18, 2000		

Date of issue of the certificate: September 18, 2000
Valid until: September 18, 2003.
Certificate No.: 5500222360

Unified Receipt for Administrative Payment in Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region

No.0875…(illegible)

May 31, 1999

(illegible) Guo Yanling

Family planning fee for out-of-quota second childbirth on October 30, 1989
Amount: 300.00 yuan

Note: The family planning fee for out-of-quota childbirth has been paid in full. May 31, 1999

300.00 yuan

Received by: Huang Ti (illegible)

Birth Control Certificate
Of
Married Women of Child-bearing Age of Nanning Municipality

Technical Instruction Institute of Family Planning of Nanning Municipality

---

Name: Guo Yanling (Photo)
Gender: female
Date of birth: 37 years old.
District with jurisdiction:
Address of work unit: Zhongshan Road, Linjiang Road
Children she currently has: male: (illegible) female: 2
Name of surgical operation: female sterilization
Date of operation: May (illegible) 1999
Work unit performing the sterilization: Technical Instruction Institute of Family Planning.

Zhongshan Road Lower Section Neighborhood Committee of Xincheng District, Nanning Municipality

Certificate

This is to certify that Guo Yanling is a resident residing at 48, Linjiang Street. She had a sterilization operation in May 1999.

Seal: Taoyuan Road Neighborhood Committee of Xincheng District, Nanning Municipality

July 25, 2000

Decision of Xincheng District Family Planning Bureau on Canceling the No. 85 Decision of Collecting Fees for Extra Childbirth in 2000

Du Yiliang and his wife Guo Yanling are the residents in Taoyuan Neighborhood Committee of our District. On December 23, 1997, they gave birth to a boy (extra childbirth beyond quota). The boy is named Du Zhiquan. As this couple covered up the fact that they… (illegible)

Decision Statement of Detention
Liangqing District People's Court of Nanning Municipality

(2006) Liang Zhi Zi Di No. 116

Detainee Guo Yanling:

While executing the case of the two respondents Du Yiliang and Guo Yanling vs. Liangqing District Population and Family Planning Bureau of Nanning Municipality, it is found out the respondents Du Yiliang and Guo Yanling refused to implement the obligations as defined in the administrative verdict coded (2000) Ba Xing Cai Zi Di No. 524 issued by Baning County People's Court. Pursuant to Item 6, Clause 1, Article 102 of the Civil Procedural Law of the People's Republic of China and in reference to the stipulations as defined in the Supreme People's Court's stipulations (pilot program) on Several Questions concerning the Execution of Work by the People's Court, it is decided as follows:

The respondent Guo Yanling shall be detained for 15 days.

Should there be an objection to this decision, one may apply for a reconsideration at Nanning Municipal Intermediate People's Court within three days from the next day of receiving this decision statement. During the period of reconsideration, the execution of the decision shall not be affected.

September 7, 2006.
Seal: Liangqing District People's Court of Nanning City
Chief Justice: (illegible)

Receipt of Fine for Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region (illegible)

No. 7300147
December (illegible) 2000.

Name of work unit or individual who are fined: Du Zhiquan
Reason for fine: violation of household registration management
Residential address of the person fined: Basang Village
Amount of fine: Fifty yuan. 50.00.

Handled by: illegible

Appendix: A List of Sealed and Seized Property

September 7, 2006

SERIAL NO.	NAME OF PROPERTY	FEATURE AND DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY
1	Deposit booklet of Industrial and Commercial Bank	Account No.—(illegible)	One
2	Deposit booklet of Agricultural Bank	Account No.—(illegible)	One
3	Savings account card of Construction Bank	Account No.—(illegible)	One
4	Deposit booklet of Industrial and Commercial Bank	Account No.—(illegible)	One
5	Deposit booklet of Construction Bank	Account No.—(illegible)	One
6	Deposit booklet of Agricultural Bank	Account No.—(illegible)	One
7	Deposit booklet of Construction Bank	Account No.—(illegible)	One

Person whose property has been sealed or seized or his or her adult family members: (illegible)
Persons who execute the law: (illegible)
Clerk: Lu Bimei
Note: This list exists in two copies. One copy shall be kept by the person whose property has been sealed or seized or his or her adult family members. The other copy shall be kept as record.

Decision Statement of Canceling Detention Ahead of Time
Liangqing District People's Court of Nanning Municipality

(2006) Liang Zhi Zi Di No. 116

Detainee: Guo Yanling **Gender:** female **Ethnicity:** Zhuang
Date of birth: 1963 (illegible) **Native place:** Nanning
Work unit:
Residential address: Jitouling, (illegible) Nanning City
The detainee Guo Yanling refuses to implement the obligations stated in a valid legal document. This court has made the decision on September 7, 2006 to detain Guo Yanling for 15 days. The decision has been implemented by the Public Security Bureau. During the detention, Guo Yanling's health (illegible)… Pursuant to Clause 3, Article 104 of the Civil Procedural Law of the People's Republic of China, this court has decided to cancel the detention of Guo Yanling ahead of schedule.

Chief Justice: Lin Zhenming
September 13, 2006

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mosher.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I came back to the United States from China almost as politically naive as my good friend, Bob Fu, never having been interested in domestic politics where abortion to population control was concerned until I was forcibly confronted with it in China. And my first thought in the early 1980s was to go to the National Organization for Women. And I did and I talked with Eleanor Smeal, who was the head of the National Organization of

Women. And I presented her with documents about forced abortions in China, pictures that I had taken and so forth, and she looked sober-faced at my presentation, my evidence. And then she said, well, I am personally opposed to forced abortion, but China does have a population problem and that was the end of it. They would not do anything.

Now maybe their views today would be different. Maybe the compilation of evidence that you and Reggie and others have brought together over the years will convince them to overcome their reticence to condemn forced abortions in China and everywhere. We should continue to go to everyone, all people in goodwill and encourage them to take action against this. It is true that in the United States, if you did a poll on forced abortion, you would probably find over 90 percent of Americans oppose forced abortion. We find that 86 percent of Americans oppose sex-selective abortion, which is happening in China at epidemic levels.

So this shouldn't be a political issue not because of the partisan divide, but it is a simple matter of human rights that women should not be forcibly aborted, that the little girls should not be eliminated simply because of their sex after birth and before birth. And I think on that ground we will finally find consensus.

Ms. LITTLEJOHN. May I just add to that? I think there are grounds for hope here, Women's Rights Without Frontiers from the very beginning have been saying this is a human rights issue. When it comes to forced abortion, whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, you don't support it because forced abortion is not a choice. And several people from the pro-choice movement have come forward recently, Victoria Nuland from the State Department, in the case of Cao Ruyi, said we have seen reports of the Chinese women as being detained and possibly pressured into a forced abortion and that we oppose forced abortions.

Then Nancy Northup, from the Center for Reproductive Rights, wrote a letter to The New York Times, dated July 4th of this year saying that she opposes forced abortion and specifically citing Feng Jianmei. I think this is a breakthrough. This is the first time one of these pro-choice groups has come through and finally said we oppose forced abortion. And in this regard, I just want to mention the forerunner of all this, who was Cori Schumacher who about a year ago, it was the 2011 reigning world women's longboard surfing champion, and an ardent pro-choice feminist, and she boycotted the 2011 world women surfing championship tour because one of the events took place in China. Citing the testimony before Lantos Commission which you chaired in 2009 and citing the Web site of Women's Rights Without Frontiers, she said she will have nothing to do with a country that is forcibly aborting women.

So I just think that that is great. She was a forerunner of this, so I see that now finally, perhaps because of this confluence of forced abortion cases that have recently come out, the pro-choice people are finally seeing the light forced abortion is not a choice.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Mr. Kumar.

Mr. KUMAR. I would recommend that as I mentioned earlier, that it is important to bring the issue that this is forced abortion, and in the impact it has on women and of course, we should keep on pushing the administration to keep this as one of the priorities, opportunities as mentioned earlier of upcoming dialogue. Thank you, thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. I would just disagree with you in terms of keep it as one of the priorities, I would say make it one of the priorities, but we disagree. I would like to ask unanimous consent that a report by the Laogai Research Foundation, Harry Wu's foundation called Human Rights, Abuses Caused By the One-Child Policy As Seen From Official Documents be made a part of the record. Without objection so ordered.

[The report referred to follows:]

Human Rights Abuses Caused by the One Child Policy

As Seen from Official Documents

There are several paths to expose violations of human rights on the one-child policy. First, the personal accounts and protests by the victims of the policy, such as Mao Hengfeng of Shanghai and Yang Zhizhu of Beijing. Secondly, there is the research conducted by activists, such as the cooperative investigation conducted by Teng Biao in Beijing and Chen Guangcheng in his hometown of Linyi City, Shandong Province. Last but not least, is the lesser-known collection and analysis of official Communist Party documents on the One Child Policy by human rights and research groups, such as the Laogai Research Foundation.

The Laogai Research Foundation was funded in 1992 when the Chinese communist authorities were ruthlessly implementing the one-child policy. The Foundation was keenly aware that this is an important human rights issue that cannot be neglected, so it started to collect official documents and other files from all levels of government in China. Gao Xiaoduan, a family planning cadre from Fujian Province, provided the Foundation with a wealth of firsthand information. In the past two decades, the Foundation's collection keeps growing, on the basis of which, a number of research reports and studies have been published by the Foundation.

The files we have collected include not only the general regulations promulgated by the government organs at national and provincial levels, such as: *Decision on the Strengthening of Family Planning work and Strictly Controlling Population Growth by CPC Central Committee and State Council, the Population and Family Planning Law of the People's Republic of China* (2002); *Management Approach for Migrating Populations (1991)*; *Management Approach for Family Planning Work of Migrating Populations (1998)*; *Social Compensation Fee Collection and Management Methods (2002)*; and the *Population and Family Planning Regulations* of several provinces and major cities, as well as specific guiding policies, documents, forms, bills and other types of files from various counties, districts, townships and communities. The latter type more clearly demonstrates how the government implements the so-called "basic national One Child Policy" at all levels - at the expense of committing serious human rights abuses.

I. The communist authorities launch a "people's war" at all levels, to forcibly implement the "One Child Policy"

1) Forced termination of pregnancy, forced abortion and forced sterilization are designated to family planning officials as "assigned tasks"

This can be illustrated by a document issued by Jieshi Township, Zhuhai, Guangdong Province.

Notice of Autumn Centralized Services for Birth Control by CCP Committee of Jieshi Township, Guangdong

1.Time span: August 26 – September 30, 2003
2.Task requirements: 2,458 guidance tasks are given to the whole township, among which 1,369 are sterilization (274 are sterialization of those who have two girls), 818 are IUD insertion, 108 are induction of labor followed by infanticide, and 163 are abortion. It is required that all villages and communities of the township thoroughly complete these tasks on time and meet the required quantity.

2) To encourage Party and administrative officials at all levels to harshly carry out the One Child Policy by using one-vote veto

Simply put, "one-vote veto" means an official's political achievements are determine by the one and the only factor, namely, the successful implementation of one-child policy. If population control is not successfully carried out, the head official of an administrative area, as well as other relevant cadres, will lose their chances of being promoted.

LRF's collection includes a document issued in 1990 by the CCP Committee of Qunazhou City, Fujian Province, entitled "*The Decision on Further Strengthening Discipline in the Implementation of One-child Policy*", in which it is clearly stated that, "the one-vote veto should be resolutely implemented in order to strictly carry out the family planning policy."

The practice of one-vote veto continues to this day. The *Regulation of the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone on Population and Family Planning (Draft),* issued a few months ago, still adheres to this practice.

3) To treat Policy offenders with hostility, such that coerced sterilization and abortion become a routine means of punishment

The government of Yonghe Township of Jinjiang City, Fujian Province issued a document in 1996 entitled *Notice to Strengthen Family Planning Management*. The documents describes that sterilization will be applied to the mother or father if: 1) they give birth to a child but fail to report it, 2) if the mother fails to have IUD insertion within four months of giving birth, and 3) if the couple fails to register for an Only Child Certificate after giving birth to a son, 4) if the mother has two children before the age of 35. From this it is evident that sterilization is not only a measure taken to prevent "extra" births, but is also essentially a means of punishment.

4) To mobilize various powerful agencies to cooperate in a "concerted effort" to deal with the offenders

In 1989, Yongchun County of Fujian Province issued a document requiring the Industry and Commerce Administration, Public Security Bureau, Grain Bureau, Organization Department, Bureau of Labor, Bureau of Personnel, etc. to work together in the management of birth control. According to the document, the Administration for Industry and Commerce is forbidden to issue a business license to the offender(s); the Public Security Bureau is forbidden to accept rural-to-urban population registration transfer applications and applications to go abroad; and the Grain Bureau is forbidden to allocate grain or oil for newborn.

Many people believe that in recent years, China's family planning policy has become more

humane, but *The Regulation of the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone on Population and Family Planning (Draft),* issued only a couple of months ago, shows that the barbaric practice of "concerted efforts" or "joint management" across numerous government departments is still common.

This document requires the authorities of the Shenzhen City Public Security Department, the Human Resources and Social Security Department, the Department of Civil Affairs, the Department of Housing Construction, and other sectors of power, to make a collective effort to control population growth and punish offenders.

5) To get everyone involved in the "war" by requiring a "guarantee" of pregnancy eligibility and punishing the "guilty"

Official documents show that government of Yonghe Township, Jinjiang City, Fujian Province, established a "guarantee system" of birth control. Any couple who applies for a maternity permit must be "guaranteed" by people from their village, meaning that they attest that the couple has not had any children which would disqualify them from receiving a permit. If anything happens against the birth control laws and regulations, the guarantor(s) will be jointly and severally liable.

A page from the Birth Control Guarantee documents of Yonghe Township in which a group of villagers guaranteed that a couple in their vilalge did not give birth to any children from November 1993 to August 1997.

In some places, policies are introduced to encourage people to become informants and turn in "offenders" who try to conceal pregnancies or children from the authorities. This has greatly tarnished social ethics in communities. In 1998, the government of Quanzhou City, Fujian Province, issued its *Notice to Establish Reward Reporting System*, encouraging people to engage in mutual monitoring and reporting by offering rewards.

This situation still exists today. Hengxian Country of Guangxi Province issued a document in 2005 entitled *Notice on Implementation of Reward Policy for Reporting Violations of Population and Family Planning Management*, which listed the reward amounts for reporting each type of violation. Reporting of an unplanned pregnancy, for example, would be rewarded with a sum of money as much as 2,000 RMB (over 300 USD).

II. CPC authorities at all levels punish offenders with harsh economic measures

1) Fines

Fines have been a major economic punishment of the compulsory one-child policy. *Social Compensation Fee Collection and Management Methods*, issued by the central government, is the principal document by which economic punishments are handed down to violators. In addition to this, local governments throughout the country drafted their own regulations to make exorbitant monetary exactions from the offenders.

In LRF's collection, we have a lengthy record of *Fines Collected from One-Child Policy Offenders of Yonghe Township*. The record shows that in 1989, the Township government

collected over 1.8 million RMB, over 1.97 million RMB in 1990 ... and 3.6 million RMB in 1996.

Although the Chinese government has become economically stronger than it was in the past, extracting money from One Child Policy offenders is still a common practice throughout the country. Even in the most developed cities, such as Shenzhen, collection of so-called "social compensation fees" remains rampant. The *Regulation of the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone on Population and Family Planning (Draft)* issued a few months ago allows government officials to wantonly plunder the wealth of the people in the name of implementing government policy.

There are numerous fine for different types of unplanned births: pregnancy earlier than regulation permits, "extra" births, births that occur closer together than allowed interval timespan, births by unwed mothers, unlicensed births, child adoption in excess of the allowed number of children... just to name a few. The 1998 *Reports of Individual Cases of Birth Control in Yonghe Township, Jinjiang City of Fujian Province* show that simply for adopting children without formally reporting it to the government, many couples are punishable with a fine as much as 10,000 RMB (over 1,500 USD).

A page of 1998 *Reports of Individual Cases of Birth Control in Yonghe Township, Jinjiang City of Fujian Province*

Fines are not limited to unplanned births; there are various other "offenses" which may lead to harsh economic penalties, such as failure to have a pregnancy check (women are required to have regular exams to verify they are not pregnant and are using birth control), failure to register a newborn, possessing fraudulent birth or identification documents, guarantor liability, and mistaken or improper following of provisions, and so on.

The Communist authorities have even requested that all relevant persons sign contracts, opening a door to future penalties for breach of the contracts:

For example, in 1998, Chongqing authorities issued a document, requesting couples of reproductive age to sign contracts with birth control authorities. If the couples failed to turn up for a pregnancy test, or failed to obey birth control policies, they must pay the penalties. In addition, migrant workers must sign a contract to ensure that they will not violate the birth control policy during their temporary residence in other places.

Other economic and administrative penalties include:

a) Confiscation of business license or driver's license

As is shown in the document below:

"After July 1, 1990, should any residents who engage in business exceed the birth quota, Industry and Commerce, Traffic Control, and related departments shall confiscate the offender's business or drivers license."

The Decision on further Strengthening Discipline in the Implementation of One Child Policy, by

CCP Committee of Quanzhou, Fujian Province, 1990.

b) Inability to obtain employment

In many places, candidates must submit their proof of birth control when applying for recruitment and employment. If any violations are discovered, the applicant will most likely be rejected. Below is the Susong County, Anhui Province recruitment reporting family planning certification form. Candidates for employment must fill out the form to verify approved birth control and ensure no violations have been committed before they take the employment exam.

Birth Control Proof for Recruitment of Candidates of Institutions, Susong County, Anhui Province

III. Family planning is a protracted human rights disaster

The mandatory One Child Policy, which has continued for 30 years, is a protracted human rights disaster. The authorities deprive men and women of their reproductive rights by means of legally requiring willful abortion, forced or induced abortion, ligation, serialization and other extreme measures. They even deprive babies of their right to live through acts of infanticide. These destructive procedures have caused a series of social, economic and ethical consequences. In addition, there are other significant examples of human rights violations:

1) Deprivation of personal freedom

Local governments hold the offenders and even their families in custody, in the name of taking part in classes to study relevant policy. Documents of *Analytic Report of Case Studies of Only Child Policy in Quanzhou, Fujian Province,* show that when a couple of reproductive age could not be found, the local government forced the man's father to take the "class" for more than four months:

Analytic Report of Case Studies of Only Child Policy in Quanzhou, Fujian Province

Another page of document shows a woman named Lu Xiuti is "detained in family planning office because of birth before marriage."

Analytic Report of Case Studies of Only Child Policy in Quanzhou, Fujian Province

Former family planning cadre Gao Xiaoduan's photo shows a cell with iron bars used to detain family planning violators and their relatives. Many villages and towns use this tactic to coerce violators into having abortions or paying hefty fines.

2) Destruction of property

"Demolish the house, if the offenders refuses to be serialized, or confiscate their cattle if they refuse to have abortion" – this is one of the famous One Child Policy slogans known throughout the country. Testimonies of many victims and witnesses confirm that it rings true. However, such brutalities are rarely found in official documents. Nevertheless, among our collections we do have some evidences of this nature.

One document of the *Analytic Report of Case Studies of Only Child Policy in Quanzhou, Fujian Province* shows that "demolishing the house" is a means of punishment commonly used by the family planning department:

Analytic Report of Case Studies of Only Child Policy in Quanzhou, Fujian Province

3) Violations of women's privacy

Absolute surveillance of unplanned birth makes it possible for officials to invade many areas of personal life. The infringement of women's privacy is particularly shocking. In accordance with the provisions of the local government, women of childbearing age must report their menstrual cycle to the authorities and have the condition of their IUD and pregnancy status checked at intervals. According to the documents we collected, the family planning office of Yonghe Township, Jinjiang City, Fujian Province, requests that women of productive age have their IUD and pregnancy status checked at certain times. The women must bring their identification and photo to the service station. There will be a fine of 50 Yuan if they go to the station one day late, and a fine of 2,000 Yuan if they refuse to go, plus additional "necessary administrative measures".

Notice of Double Check-ups, Birth Control Committee, Yonghe Township (1996)

The following is a document named *Notice of Forth Double Check-up* issued by Yonghe Township, Jinjiang City, Fujian Province. It requires each village make a record for women who must have IUD and pregnancy checked, and put on file details of each checkup for further investigations.

Notice of Fourth Double Check-ups, Yonghe Township, Jinjiang, Fujian Province (1997)

IV. Conclusion

To conclude, while the shocking personal testimonies of One Child Policy victims cannot be ignored, the evidence provided by the analysis of these official government documents indisputable. With these documents, we can clearly see how the policy has led to human rights violations in every facet of people's daily lives, and how this policy is bringing incurable damage to the country's population structure, economy, social ethics and culture.

The full report can be accessed at the following location:

http://laogai.org/sites/default/files/One_Child_Policy_in_CCP_Documents_2012 Report.pdf

Mr. SMITH. And I would like to thank our very distinguished panel and our very distinguished guest from Bangkok who testified via phone for her contribution today, for, again, reminding us the consequence the one-child-per-couple policy has had on women in her case going back to 1995 in her case, and Feng's case going back just a few weeks ago. I would like to thank you all for your tremendous testimony. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:22 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Material Submitted for the Hearing Record

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515-0128

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH, AND HUMAN RIGHTS
Christopher H. Smith (R-NJ), Chairman

July 9, 2012

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, to be held in Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building **(and available live via the Committee website at http://www.hcfa.house.gov)**:

DATE: Monday, July 9, 2012

TIME: 2:00 p.m.

SUBJECT: Continued Human Rights Attacks on Families in China

WITNESSES: Pastor Bob Fu
Founder and President
ChinaAid Association

Ms. Reggie Littlejohn
Founder and President
Women's Rights Without Frontiers

Mr. Steven Mosher
President
Population Research Institute

Ms. Yanling Guo
Victim of China's population control policies

Mr. T. Kumar
Director of International Advocacy
Amnesty International

By Direction of the Chairman

The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202/225-5021 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON *Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights* HEARING

Day *Monday* **Date** *July 9, 2012* **Room** *2172 Rayburn*

Starting Time *2:00 p.m.* **Ending Time** *4:22 p.m.*

Recesses [*0*] (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____)

Presiding Member(s)

Rep. Chris Smith

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session [✓]
Executive (closed) Session [ ]
Televised [✓]
Electronically Recorded (taped) [✓]
Stenographic Record [✓]

TITLE OF HEARING:

Continued Human Rights Attacks on Families in China

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Chris Smith, Rep. Karen Bass. Rep. Ann Marie Buerkle

NON-SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: *(Mark with an * if they are not members of full committee.)*

*Rep. Joseph Pitts**

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes [✓] **No** [ ]
(If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*

Letter from Chinese scholars on the repeal of the family planning law
Documents relating to the capture of and fines levied against Ms. Guo translated into English
Report from Laogai Research Foundation on human rights abuses caused by the one-child policy

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____
or
TIME ADJOURNED *4:22 p.m.*

Subcommittee Staff Director

○