

TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1989 TIANANMEN SQUARE PROTESTS AND MASSACRE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH,
GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHTS, AND
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————
JUNE 3, 2013
—————

Serial No. 113-69

—————

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

81-341PDF

WASHINGTON : 2013

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

EDWARD R. ROYCE, California, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey	ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DANA ROHRBACHER, California	BRAD SHERMAN, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
TED POE, Texas	THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
MATT SALMON, Arizona	BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	KAREN BASS, California
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina	WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
ADAM KINZINGER, Illinois	DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
MO BROOKS, Alabama	ALAN GRAYSON, Florida
TOM COTTON, Arkansas	JUAN VARGAS, California
PAUL COOK, California	BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER, Illinois
GEORGE HOLDING, North Carolina	JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III, Massachusetts
RANDY K. WEBER SR., Texas	AMI BERA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	ALAN S. LOWENTHAL, California
STEVE STOCKMAN, Texas	GRACE MENG, New York
RON DeSANTIS, Florida	LOIS FRANKEL, Florida
TREY RADEL, Florida	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
DOUG COLLINS, Georgia	JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina	
TED S. YOHO, Florida	
LUKE MESSER, Indiana	

AMY PORTER, *Chief of Staff* THOMAS SHEEHY, *Staff Director*
JASON STEINBAUM, *Democratic Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH, GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHTS, AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey, *Chairman*

TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	KAREN BASS, California
RANDY K. WEBER SR., Texas	DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
STEVE STOCKMAN, Texas	AMI BERA, California
MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina	

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESSES	
Mr. Wei Jingsheng, president, Wei Jingsheng Foundation	6
Ms. Chai Ling, founder, All Girls Allowed	10
Yang Jianli, Ph.D., president, Initiatives for China	23
David Aikman, Ph.D. (former Time magazine bureau chief in Beijing)	34
Sophie Richardson, Ph.D., China director, Human Rights Watch	38
LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING	
Mr. Wei Jingsheng: Prepared statement	8
Ms. Chai Ling: Prepared statement	14
Yang Jianli, Ph.D.: Prepared statement	25
David Aikman, Ph.D.: Prepared statement	36
Sophie Richardson, Ph.D.: Prepared statement	40
APPENDIX	
Hearing notice	68
Hearing minutes	69
The Honorable Steve Stockman, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas: Prepared statement	70
Written responses from Mr. Wei Jingsheng to questions submitted for the record by the Honorable Steve Stockman	72

TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1989 TIANANMEN SQUARE PROTESTS AND MASSACRE

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2013

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 3:59 p.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Christopher H. Smith (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. SMITH. Hearing will come to order. And good afternoon to everyone. Today, this week, the world remembers the dream that was and is the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989. And deeply honors the sacrifice endured by an extraordinarily brave group of pro-democracy, Chinese women and men who dared to demand fundamental human rights for all of China and for all Chinese. Twenty-four years ago today, the world watched in awe and wonder as hundreds of thousands of mostly young people peacefully petitioned the Chinese Government to reform and to democratize. China seemed to be the next impending triumph for freedom and democracy, especially after the collapse of dictatorships in the Soviet Union and among the Warsaw Pact nations. But when the People's Liberation Army poured into and around the square on June 3rd, the wonder of Tiananmen turned to shock, tears, fear, and a sense of helplessness.

On June 3rd and 4th, and for days, weeks, and years, right up until today, the Chinese dictatorship delivered a barbaric response: Mass murder, torture, incarceration, the systematic suppression of fundamental human rights, and cover-up. The Chinese Government not only continues to inflict unspeakable pain and suffering on its own people, but the cover-up of the Tiananmen Square massacre is without precedent in modern history. Even though journalists, live television, and radio documented the massacre, the Chinese Communist party line continues today to deny, obfuscate, and to threaten anyone who deviates from the line.

In December 1996, General Chi Haotian, the operational commander who ordered the murder of the Tiananmen protesters, visited Washington, DC, as the Chinese Defense Minister. See, he had gotten a promotion. Mr. Chi was welcomed by President Clinton at the White House with full military honors, including a 19-gun sa-

lute. A bizarre spectacle that I and others on both sides of the aisle strongly protested. Why do I bring this up? Minister Chi addressed the Army War College on that trip. And in answer to a question said, "Not a single person lost his life in Tiananmen Square," and claimed that the People's Liberation Army did nothing more violent than the pushing of people during the 1989 protest. Imagine that. "Not a single person lost his or her life." Are you kidding? The big lie, that big lie, and countless others like it, is the Chinese Communist party line.

As chair of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee that handled human rights at the time, I put together an emergency hearing within a couple of days, on December 18, 1996, with witnesses who were there on the square, including Dr. Yang, a leader and survivor of the massacre, and including Time Magazine bureau chief, Dr. David Aikman, two of today's witnesses. We also invited Minister Chi Haotian, or anyone else from the Chinese Embassy who might want to come and give an account. He and they refused.

I guess Minister Chi thought he was back in Beijing where the big lie is king and no one ever dares to do a fact check. A few days ago, the U.S. Department of State asked the Chinese Government to "end the harassment of those who participated in the protests and fully account for those killed, detained, or missing." The response? The Chinese Foreign Ministry acrimoniously said that the U.S. should "stop interfering in Chinese internal affairs so as not to sabotage U.S./China relations." Sabotage Sino-American relations because our side requests an end to harassment, because we request an accounting? Sounds to me like they have much to hide.

President Obama, as we know, is scheduled to meet with Chinese President Xi Jinping on Friday and Saturday to discuss security and economic issues. A robust discussion of human rights abuses in China must be on the agenda and not in a superfluous or superficial way. It is time to get serious about China's flagrant abuse. The Chinese Government's appalling record should make us question even the topic that is at hand: Can a government that crushes the rights and freedoms of its own people be trusted on trade and on security issues?

China today is the torture capital of the world. And victims include religious believers, ethnic minorities, human rights defenders, like Chen Guangcheng and Gao Zhisheng, and political dissidents. Hundreds of millions of women have been forced to abort their precious babies, pursuant the draconian one-child policy, which has led to gendercide, the violent extermination of unborn girls simply because they are girls. The slaughter of the girl-child in China is not only a massive gender crime, but it is a security issue as well. A witness at one of my earlier hearings, Valerie Hudson, author of a book called "Bare Branches" testified that the gender imbalance will lead, inevitably will lead to instability and chaos, and, as she posited, even war.

She said that the one-child policy has not enhanced China's security, but demonstrably weakened it. The abnormal sex ratio of china does not bode well for its future, and notes that Nick Eberstadt has famously phrased, "What are the consequences for

a society that has chosen to become simultaneously both more gray and more male?"

I hope policymakers both here in Washington and elsewhere pay close attention to our witnesses because Tiananmen Square and the massacre that followed there was a tipping point, and the lessons learned and employed ever since by the Chinese Government require much better understanding and due diligence on our part and a more effective response on our part. We still don't get it, what happened, post-Tiananmen Square.

One of our witnesses, Dr. Yang, will testify that soon after Tiananmen, the Communist Party embraced the ubiquitous code of corruption to enrich the elite at the expense of the general public believing that, as he says in his testimony, economic growth means everything to the survival and the sustainability of the dictatorship. All of this, as he says, was made possible, thanks to the Tiananmen Square massacre and the political terror that was imposed on the country in the years following.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle and Americans throughout this country and really people who believe in freedom around the world will never forget what took place in Tiananmen 24 years ago. The struggle for freedom in China continues. Someday, the people of China will enjoy all of their God-given rights. And a nation of free Chinese women and men will someday honor, applaud, and thank the heroes of Tiananmen Square and all of those who sacrificed so much and so long for freedom. I would like now to yield to my friend and colleague, Ms. Bass, for any opening comments.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chairman, thank you for convening today's hearing. I think it is pretty remarkable to hear you say that you were here when this happened and that you held the hearing a few days later.

As you noted, this week marks 24 years since the world watched the bravery and courage of the Chinese people and the violent events that took place in Tiananmen Square in 1989. Like most people around the world, I remember exactly where I was when those events took place. That is why the images of Tiananmen Square are forever etched in our memories. It is important to note that there were other protests taking place across China as students and demonstrators of all ages took to the streets, and there was very little coverage about what was happening outside of Beijing.

There were images of those brutalized, those bloodied, and of those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in their demand for greater freedoms, government accountability, and an end to corruption. Yet it is the image of a man standing in front of a line of tanks that we remember so well. This lone protester embodied that of all demonstrators in China and for many around the world in the days, years, and more than two decades since. That one seemingly plain individual could stand with such strength is and will ever be a remarkable and truly humbling moment.

I will always remember this image because of what it represents, the struggle of people everywhere against insurmountable odds, yet it was a brave individual who showed that a simple act of protest was bigger and more powerful than propaganda, instruments of war, and unspeakable violence. I want to thank today's witnesses

for participating in this hearing and reminding this committee of the important events of Tiananmen Square in the summer of 1989.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Ms. Bass.

Like to now yield to Mr. Meadows.

Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank each of you for being here today to testify. I look forward to hearing your testimony and certainly the lessons that we need to continue to learn as we address human rights across not only in China but across the world. It is hard to believe that it is some 24 years ago that we are now looking back at Tiananmen Square. And yet the tragedy is one that should not easily be forgotten. It is one that we must keep fresh in our minds. It is one that we must learn from. Obviously, the protests there was sparked by the death of a reformer, someone who called for greater government transparency, freedom of speech, economic reforms. And, you know, that is a story that we have seen before.

You know, China itself has freed up much of its economy, it has seen explosive growth. But yet, the human rights record is still abysmal. We need to make sure that we hold them accountable. We wouldn't stand for that here in our economy. And as we are part of a global economy, we can't stand for it in some of our greatest trading partners. In the Middle East in the last 2½ years, we have seen unrest happen across the Middle East following what some would call the Arab Spring. But really, in a large part, that unrest has the same underlying premise as Tiananmen Square: An oppressed people will eventually rise up, and they should.

That is why this hearing is crucial. And the lessons from Tiananmen Square have clearly not been learned in China or abroad. And so I look forward to hearing your testimony and what we can learn from what has happened and what is happening and what hopefully will happen in the future and how we can highlight this particular problem to bring the end to the oppressive actions that continue to take back. And with that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, very much, Mr. Meadows.

Mr. Stockman.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I request that I can give you my remarks so you don't have to sit through the whole thing.

Mr. SMITH. Without objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. But I want to say one thing, though. I remember watching on television, as many people have. And it was really heart-rendering and warm when I saw the replica of the Statue of Liberty and everything it stood for. And all I can say is when we saw the tanks rolling in and as they brought the—basically, I understand they were drugged, hyped-up people from outside of Beijing in to roll over those people as they were screaming for help and screaming for the rest of the people to cry out for freedom, I mean, I just—I—it broke my heart.

And for all those that are still fighting for freedom in China, they represent one-quarter of this world population. And yet we seem to turn our backs on them again and again. And I am glad that the people here in this room stand up for freedom and stand up for those, and I will always remember that photograph. Yield back the balance of my time. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Stockman.

I would like to now introduce our very distinguished panel. Beginning first with Mr. Wei Jingsheng, who has served two jail sentences, totaling more than 18 years in China, for his pro-democracy, pro-human rights work. A father of the democracy world movement, it was Wei Jingsheng who literally posted an essay, the fifth modernization, which he entitled "Democracy." And he had the courage to literally sign it—a lot of those postings were anonymous—he signed his, and for that he was incarcerated. I met with Wei very briefly when he was briefly let out in 1994.

When the Chinese Government was seeking to get the 2000 Olympics, they eventually got Olympics later on, but they thought releasing one high-profile political prisoner would be enough to make possible their getting the 2000 Olympics. That is how highly regarded he was, and is, to this day, for his democracy promotion and human rights promotion.

In 1998, he founded and became the chairman of the Overseas Chinese Democracy Coalition, after he was exiled, of course. He is also President of the Wei Jingsheng Foundation and the Asia Democracy Alliance. He has written numerous articles and regularly speaks about human rights at a number of fora and in the media.

We will then hear from Ms. Chai Ling, who was a key student leader in 1989 at Tiananmen Square during those very fateful days. When the military brutally crushed the protest on June 4th, Chai Ling was named to the government's list of the 21 most wanted students. She escaped from Beijing 10 months later. She secretly was hidden in a cargo box for 105 hours to escape China as she made her way to Hong Kong.

She has since gotten an MBA from Harvard. She also is the founder of a group called All Girls Allowed, which speaks on the behalf of the girl-child who is so viciously victimized inside of China as part of the one-child-per-couple policy. She also co-founded the Jenzabar Foundation, which supports humanitarian efforts for student leaders.

We will then hear from Dr. Yang Jianli. Dr. Yang is also a Tiananmen Square massacre survivor, and was held as a political prisoner in China from 2002 to 2007. He is a founder of the Initiatives for China/Citizen Power for China, Foundation for China in the 21st Century, and founder and organizer of Interethnic/Interfaith Leadership Conferences for the online publication of China E-Weekly. He co-authored a democratic constitution for China in 1993, and co-chaired The Geneva Internet Freedom Declaration in 2010. He has been elected to the Top 100 Chinese Public Intellectuals in each of the past 4 years. He has also represented Mr. Liu Xiaobo at the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize award ceremony. And we welcome him and thank him for his very influential writing and leadership.

We will then hear from Dr. David Aikman, who reported for 23 years for Time Magazine in more than 50 countries, including China. In 1989, he was in China reporting on student democracy protests and was present when the Tiananmen Square massacre took place. Dr. Aikman was born in the United Kingdom, but in 1992, became a U.S. citizen. He left Time in 1994 and has since written several books and newspapers columns and lectured at nu-

merous places around the world. He is currently a professor of history at Patrick Henry College. And, I would note, when he was with Time Magazine in Beijing, he was the bureau chief.

We will then hear from Dr. Sophie Richardson, who is the China Director at Human Rights Watch. Dr. Richardson is the author of numerous articles on domestic Chinese political reform, democratization, and human rights in many Asian countries. She has testified before the European Parliament and the U.S. Congress, including my subcommittee. I thank you and welcome you again. She is the author of "China, Cambodia, and Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence," an in depth examination of Chinese foreign policy since 1954's Geneva Conference, including rare interviews with policymakers. So thank you all for being here. I would like to now turn to Mr. Wei Jingsheng.

**STATEMENT OF MR. WEI JINGSHENG, PRESIDENT, WEI
JINGSHENG FOUNDATION**

[The following testimony and answers were delivered through an interpreter.]

Mr. WEI. It has been 24 years since the June 4th massacre. I want to testify here about people's view on this massacre after 24 years and the impact on Chinese politics due to people's widespread view.

The current widespread representative view of the Chinese people is different from the view more than 20 years ago. At that time, the most widely hold view was to ask for the redress of the June 4th massacre from the Chinese Communist Party. However, now more than half of the people's concern is not the issue of redress but the investigation of the people responsible for the crime and the demand for the Communist Party to plead guilty for this massacre.

This change of attitude illustrates that people have gradually lost the illusion to the Communist Party. So-called redress is the wrong thing to be corrected. In the past, people asked for redress because they still had the illusion about the Communist Party and having misconception that Communist regime is a reasonable government. Now people have their changed their minds. This change illustrates that the people no longer consider Communist regime as a reasonable government. In other words, the Chinese Communist Government has seriously lost its legitimacy in the eyes of the Chinese people.

Within the Communist leadership, the view regards the massacre 24 years ago is also changing. There are often rumors that the new leadership will redress June 4th massacre. This is a certain basis to political rumors in China; the Communist Party has the habit of using rumors for political struggles. Thus some of those rumors are often very accurate, which can reflect the closed-door struggle within the Communist Party.

Every year before the anniversary of June 4th, the Communist Government is very nervous. To prevent people taking to the streets, the regime dispatch a large number of police and puts dissidents under surveillance and house arrest. This action alone results in lots of pressure over the Communist Party. The main cause of this pressure is due to the public opinion of the Chinese people.

The pressure of the public opinion from the international community is another important reason. Over the years, those two pressure has become important reasons for the poor image of the Chinese Communist Government, both inside of China and internationally. This is a serious burden to the Chinese Government and is considered to be one of the several reasons for people to incite revolution.

When the Communist leaders who participated in the massacre were still in power, those leaders consider this burden as what they must bear. But now the leaders who did not participate in the massacre has come into power and they consider as an extra unnecessary burden. Under the premise that the burden distresses them both diplomatically and internally, removing this burden and reducing the hidden risk of social instability has become an issue that the new leadership clique must consider.

Some in the Chinese Communist leadership will naturally think of imitating successful international experience to ease people's lasting resentment against this massacre by way of redressing and reparation for the June 4th massacre, thus reduce the instability factors made by the previous leaderships. But other people in the leadership clique consider concessions to the people as reducing the authority of the Communist Party that will bring new instability. So they oppose the redress and reparation. Those two views are causing new conflicts within the Communist Party, and have increased the division within the Communist leadership.

Of course, to the Communist Party, this seems not the most urgent and the biggest problem now. As China's economic crisis looms, as its intentions with the neighboring country intensify, improving the image and reduced domestic social pressure by June 4th redress, is not a particularly pressing problem. It now appears that the Communist regime still considers this as a historical problem that can be resolved by suppression.

For the time being, they do not have the motivation to solve a historic problem completely. The guilty accountability and reparation of the June 4th massacre may have to wait until the collapse of the Communist regime in China.

Thank you to the chairman and thank you to all the representatives.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Wei, thank you very much for your testimony and for your extraordinary leadership.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wei follows:]

Testimony about the 24th Anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen Square Protests and the June 4 Massacre at the Hearing Held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives

-- Wei Jingsheng

June 3, 2013 3pm

It has been 24 years since the June 4 Massacre. I want to testify here about people's views on this Massacre after 24 years, and the impact on Chinese politics due to people's widespread view.

The current widespread and representative view of the Chinese people is different from the view more than twenty years ago. At that time, the most widely held view was to ask for the redress of the June 4 Massacre from the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). However, now, more than half of the people's concern is not the issue of redress, but an investigation of the people responsible for the crime, and a demand for the Communist Party to plea guilty for this Massacre.

This change of attitude illustrates that people have gradually lost illusions to the Chinese Communist Party. A so-called redress is a wrong thing to be corrected. In the past, people asked for redress, because they still had illusions about the CCP and had the misconception that the Communist regime is a reasonable government. Now people have changed their minds. This change illustrates that people no longer consider the Communist regime as a reasonable government. In other words, the Chinese Communist government has seriously lost its legitimacy in the eyes of the Chinese people.

Within the Communist leadership, the view regarding the Massacre 24 years ago also is changing. There are often rumors that the new leadership will redress the June 4 Massacre. There is a certain basis to political rumors in China; the Communist Party has the habit of using rumors for political struggles. Thus, some of these rumors are often very accurate, which can reflect the closed-door struggle within the Communist Party.

Every year before the anniversary of June 4, the Chinese government is very nervous. To prevent people taking to the streets, the regime dispatches a large number of police, and puts dissidents under surveillance and house arrest. This action alone results in a lot of pressure over the Communist Party. The main cause of this pressure is due to the public opinion of the Chinese people; the pressure of public opinion from the international community is another important reason. Over the years these two pressures have become important reasons for the poor image of the Chinese government

both inside China and internationally. This is a serious burden to the Chinese government, and is considered to be one of several reasons for people to incite revolution.

When the Communist leaders who participated in that Massacre were still in power, these leaders considered this burden as what they must bear. But now the leaders who did not participate in the Massacre have come into power, and they consider this as an extra unnecessary burden. Under the premise that this burden distresses them both diplomatically and internally, removing this burden and reducing the hidden risk of social instability has become an issue that the new leadership clique must consider.

Some in the Chinese Communist leadership will naturally think of imitating successful international experience, to ease people's lasting resentment against this massacre by way of redressing and reparation for the June 4 Massacre, thus reducing the instability factors made by the previous leaderships. But other people in the leadership clique consider concessions to the people as reducing the authority of the Communist Party that will bring new instability, so they oppose redress and reparation. These two views are causing new conflicts within the Communist Party, and have increased the divisions within the Chinese leadership.

Of course, to the Communist Party, this seems not the most urgent and the biggest problem now. As China's economic crisis looms, as its tensions with the neighboring countries intensify, improving their image and reducing domestic social pressure by a June 4 redress is not a particularly pressing problem. It now appears that the Communist regime still considers this as a historic problem that can be resolved by suppression. For the time being, they do not have motivation to solve historical problems completely. The guilt accountability and reparation of the June 4 Massacre may have to wait until the collapse of the Communist regime in China.

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Ling, Chai Ling.

**STATEMENT OF MS. CHAI LING, FOUNDER, ALL GIRLS
ALLOWED**

Ms. CHAI. Well, thank you to the honorable Chairman Chris Smith, and to all the honorable Members of Congress, thank you for your support with us in this difficult journey and battle. And particularly, Congressman Chris Smith, thank you for your tireless effort to uphold human rights for all the people in China, around the world. I am deeply honored to be given the opportunity to share the message of hope and redemption through Christ Jesus on the 24th anniversary of Tiananmen Square tragedy and massacre. My message is a summary of lessons learned from a 47-year life journey, of growing up in China, having led the Tiananmen Square movement, and now living in and observing America for the past 23 years. The longer, fuller version of these lessons are in my book called, "A Heart for Freedom."

My message is for all the distinguished Congressional leaders and the foreign affairs policymakers like yourself, and also for American President Obama and China's new President Xi Jinping, who will meet on the West Coast in a few days. It is also for church leaders in both countries, and also for Tiananmen Square students, dissidents, victims, our families, and for the people at large. I believe, despite the constant terrorism threats coming from the Middle East and the turbulence around the rest of the world, a godly partnership between America and China holds the key to a peaceful, stable, and prosperous world. To understand this truth and lesson from the Tiananmen Square massacre is the beginning of forging this partnership. Allow me to now elaborate on my view here.

It feels like yesterday, on the morning of June 3, 1989, Beijing, China, the sun was rising over the newly set up tents, which I ordered them to set up to house thousands of protesting students. Tiananmen Square was waking up to a soft female announcer's voice declaring the arrival of a new China. As a team of soldiers came across the Golden Water Bridge to raise the Chinese flag, for a moment the students, the soldiers, the flag in the square, the rising sun and the misty pink, blue sky all coexisted in peace and harmony in great anticipation of hope for a new China.

That night all of this was brought to an end by a brutal massacre all of you witnessed. Ms. Bass, as you have said earlier, you remember exactly where you were, and so do we. I was there with my last 5,000 students standing in the square, surrounded by tanks and troops. We stood until the last hour when we had to leave the square, about 5 o'clock to 6 o'clock a.m. in the morning. There was much loss, death, injury, and imprisonment for all sides: Students, citizens, and soldiers. It is a wound that even 24 years later remains wide open in so many millions of Chinese people's hearts, and some are still paying the price with their loss and grief, like the mothers of the victims.

Others are paying with their freedom, such as Liu Xiaobo, Bao Tong, Tan Zuoren, and many others still in prison. And I and many others today are paying the price of living in exile, unable to go back to our country where we grew up, for the past 24 years. And

after 10 months in hiding, after being put on—after the massacre, I was put on a most wanted list and eventually came to America.

I spent 20 years tirelessly searching for the truth behind the massacre. I tried to understand what had caused it to happen, what could have been done differently to stop it, and what was the hope for China? It was not until December 4, 2009 when I finally give my life to Jesus, I found both. It was in pain and sorrow I discovered the truth behind the massacre. It was Deng Xiaoping's unhealed pain and unperceived fear of reality that conspired to justify by killing. I learned that Deng Xiaoping, the Premier who ordered the massacre, had his memory triggered by the peaceful student movement at Tiananmen Square, which reminded him of his pain and suffering during the cultural revolution and other previous political movements. I learned that a few other elder leaders were also triggered by the same kind of pain and suffering. And they all joined the conclusion that if we do not stop the movement, we will have nowhere to back down, and risk breaking our families and losing our loved ones.

And so Li Peng, the Prime Minister in China at that time, together with the military, executed this massacre and used brutal force to gun down those peaceful protesters which they labeled anti-revolutionaries who aimed to overthrow the government. Because I was in such a key place, having played such a key leadership role in leading the Tiananmen movement, from my perspective, their perception and decision point could not be further from the truth. As a student leader, I had very little interest in either joining or overthrowing the Chinese Government.

At the time, I was already applying to study in America. All I wanted was to be safe, to not have to relive the injustice, humiliation, defamation, isolation I suffered when I tried to overcome an earlier attempted rape by a college classmate. Many other students in Tiananmen Square were inspired by similar desires for simple justice and freedom from fear. Feng Congde, a key student leader of the movement, was motivated to overcome his own fear and terror he experienced when he was imprisoned for 18 hours in 1987. And Li Lu was there to overcome his grandfather's fate, who died as a rightist in prison under Mao's regime.

But the unhealed pain and misperception led Deng to believe only a massacre would rescue and secure their power. Deng was convinced that the only option was to kill his own people. A decade before 1989, he was also the same leader who ordered China's one-child policy out of fear that it was needed in order prevent starvation. Many Chinese people still believe, subscribe, and defend the policy as of today.

Unfortunately, exaggerated concentration of power without any democratic process allowed one person, Deng, to order both the killing that took place in Tiananmen Square, and the even larger and ongoing massacre against innocent women and babies through the brutal one-child policy.

It was in November 2009, at your hearing, Congressman Chris Smith, that my eyes were opened up to the truth and brutality of the one-child policy when Wu Jian testified how she was dragged out from her hiding place and her baby, you know, had poison injected into her tummy. Her baby struggled and died, was chopped

into pieces, taken out of her body, and my eyes were opened up and I realized I was trying to overcome the trauma I sustained under the Tiananmen massacre on my life. And there is today still an ongoing Tiananmen massacre taking place daily under China's one-child policy, harming the most vulnerable unborn children and their mothers.

In the past 30 years, over 400 million babies were killed through forced and coerced abortions. Later on, I came to realize three of those 400 million babies were mine. The root is the killing of people to solve a problem, the common way the Chinese Government has been using over and over again, based on not understanding and respecting the sanctity of life. I never learned what "sanctity of life" meant, so I Googled it. And the word came back: It means the state or quality of being holy, sacred, or saintly, having ultimate importance, inviolability. And that is what it meant. How precious life is and should be treated.

So it was in that moment I realized we were confronting something much bigger than what I had previously understood, much bigger than the Chinese Government and individual leaders. We are confronting a huge evil that could kill 400 million babies yet still make the entire world almost blind to this horrific crime. The evil one's scheme was exposed by a few faithful leaders and individuals. Congressman Chris Smith, yourself, and Congressman Frank Wolf, thank you for all of your effort in the past 30-plus years fighting against both the one-child policy and also defending the victims of the Tiananmen massacre. And it was your extraordinary perseverance and dedication to defend many, and your leadership and perseverance and dedication to defend human rights for all people that became the key that led me to the truth.

It was this revelation of the true face of evil that led me to God through Jesus Christ on December 4, 2009, and helped me discover the true hope for China and for the people and for the leaders and for the victims and for myself. Congressman Chris Smith, you said earlier it was a sense of hopelessness of the evil that one felt that day when the massacre took place. Well, we all reacted with shock and horror. Even if we fight back, we still deep in our heart have a sense of hopelessness. Not until I found God, who is much bigger than that, we finally were able to receive and embrace that hope. Many of you grew up in America and heard the story that God created Heaven and earth; God created man and woman.

And—in his image. But man and woman distrusted and disobeyed God. And through this sin, humanity fell. Jesus came to the earth and offered his life on the cross by obeying God all the way to death, and humanity was therefore redeemed through us accepting Jesus as our God and Savior. However, when we came from China, came to America, we never heard or were allowed to hear this truth. Many leaders in China do not know this precious truth. Had we known in 1989 that our struggles were not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers against authorities, powers of the dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil, and had the leaders accepted this truth, we may have been able to avoid the Tiananmen massacre, we may have been able to end the one-child policy.

It is not too late to start a new beginning. God is not slow to keeping his promise. And some understand this as slowness, instead of his patience with us, not wanting anybody to perish but for everyone to come to repentance. And this is the same hope I have for America as well.

And so—I know my time is limited. So I would like to say, as President Obama, President Xi Jinping meet together, I have a few very concrete requests for them: To reverse the anti-revolutionary turmoil “dong luan” verdict against Tiananmen Square’s peaceful protesters, to end the one-child policy in China, to end gendercide in China and in America, to end abortions in China and in America, to end the imprisonment of political dissidents Liu Xiaobo, Bao Tong, Tan Zuoren, and others, and to end the persecutions of churches and believers in China and in America.

And I do, at this time, when many people after 24 years have now seen the Tiananmen massacre being ended and to be—the verdict being reverse, may be in process of giving a hope, but we know we have a hope and a future that cannot be shaken because God has promised that he will wipe every tear from our eyes and there will be no more death, no more sorrow, no more crying of pain: All these things will be gone forever. And all who are victorious will inherit all the blessings. And I will be their God and they will be my children. So with this promise, my prayer today is, Father God, do it swiftly. In Jesus’ name we pray. Amen.

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Chai, thank you very much for your testimony. And again thank you for your extraordinary leadership over these many years.

Ms. CHAI. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Chai follows:]

Ling Chai
Founder & President
All Girls Allowed – In Jesus’ Name, Simply Love Her

Monday, June 3, 2013

Testimony to
The Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and
International Organizations,
and The Committee on Foreign Affairs,
in the U.S. House of Representatives

A Message of Hope through Jesus

To the Honorable Chairman Chris Smith, and to the Honorable Members of the
Committee on Foreign Affairs,

Thank you Chairman Smith, for your tireless effort to uphold the human rights of
all people in China, and in the world. I am deeply honored to be given the
opportunity to share a message of hope and redemption through Jesus on the 24th
anniversary of the Tiananmen Square tragedy and massacre.

My message is a summary of lessons learned from a 47-year life journey of
growing up in China, having led the Tiananmen Square movement and now living
and observing America for the past 23 years. The longer and fuller version was
documented and published in my book: *A Heart for Freedom*. (published in
October 2011)

My message is for the distinguished Congressional leaders and foreign affairs
policymakers like yourselves. It is for American President Barack Obama and
China’s New President Xi Jinping, who will meet on the West Coast in a few days.
It is also for church leaders in both countries; for the Tiananmen Square dissidents,
victims and their families; and for the people at large.

I believe that despite constant acts of terrorism, threats in the Middle East, and
turbulence around the rest of the world, a godly partnership between America and

China holds the key to a peaceful, stable and prosperous world. To understand the truth and lessons from the Tiananmen Square massacre is the beginning of forging such a partnership. Allow me now to elaborate on my views here.

The 1989 Tiananmen Square Massacre

It feels like just yesterday, on that morning of June 3rd, 1989, in Beijing, China, the sun was rising over the newly set up tents that housed thousands of students in peaceful protest. Tiananmen Square was waking up to a soft female announcer's voice declaring the arrival of a new China, as a team of soldiers came across the Golden Water Bridge to raise the Chinese flag. For a moment, the students, the soldiers, the flag and the square, the rising sun and the misty pink blue sky—all co-existed in peace and harmony in great anticipation of hope for a new China. That night, all of this was brought to an end by a brutal massacre.

I was there, with my last five thousand students standing in the Square, surrounded by tanks and troops. We stood until the last hour when we had to leave the Square, about 5 to 6 am on the morning of June 4th. There was much loss, death, injuries, and imprisonment for all sides: students, citizens, and soldiers. It is a wound that even 24 years later remains wide open in so many millions of Chinese people's hearts. Some are still paying the price with their loss and grief, like the mothers of the victims; others are paying with their freedom, such as Liu Xiaobo, Bao Tong, Tan Zuoren; and I and many others are paying the price of living in exile.

After 10 months in hiding for being put on China's most wanted list, I came to America. I spent 20 years tirelessly searching for the truth behind the massacre and the hope for China. It was not until December 4th, 2009, when I gave my life to Jesus, I found both.

The Truth Behind the Massacre

In pain and sorrow, I discovered the truth behind the massacre: unhealed pain and misperceived fear of reality conspired to justify by killing. I learned that Deng Xiaoping, the premier leader who ordered the massacre, had his memory reminded by the peaceful student movements at Tiananmen Square, which reminded him of his pain and suffering during the Cultural Revolution and other previous political movements. I learned that a few other elder leaders were also reminded by similar pain and sufferings from the Cultural Revolution, and that is why they agreed with Deng's conclusion: *"If we don't stop this (movement) we will have nowhere to back down and we will risk breaking our families and losing our beloved ones"*.

And then Li Peng, the Prime Minister of China at the time, was upset by Zhao Ziyang's labeling him as young and inexperienced. This in turn caused him to determinately follow Deng's decision to execute, together with the military, the massacre in order to crack down on what they labeled an anti-revolutionary movement whose aim was to overthrow the government.

From my point of view, their perception and decision points could not have been further from the truth. As a student leader, I had little interest in either joining or overthrowing the Chinese government. At the time, I was already applying to study in America. All I wanted was to be safe, to not have to relive the injustice, humiliation, defamation and isolation that I suffered when I had tried to overcome an earlier attempted rape by a college classmate. Many other students at Tiananmen Square were inspired by a similar desire for justice and freedom from fear. Feng Congde, another key leader of the movement, was motivated to overcome the fear and terror he experienced when he was imprisoned for 18 hours; Li Lu was there to overcome his grandfather's fate, dying inside China's prison as a "rightist" under Mao's regime. **But the unhealed pain and misperception led Deng to believe only a massacre would secure their power. Deng was convinced the only option he had was to kill his own people. He also ordered the One-Child Policy out of a fear that it was needed in order to prevent starvation. This exaggerated concentration of power without any democratic process allowed one person, Deng, to order both the killing that took place in Tiananmen Square and the even larger and ongoing massacre of innocent women and babies through the brutal one child policy.**

In November 2009, at another hearing chaired by Congressman Smith, my eyes were opened up to the truth and brutality of this One-Child Policy. I realized then that while I was trying to overcome the trauma of the Tiananmen massacre in my life, there was today a daily Tiananmen Square massacre under the One-Child Policy, harming the most vulnerable unborn children and their mothers. In the past 30+ years, over 400 million babies were killed through forced and coerced abortions. Later on, I came to realized that three of these of the 400 million babies were mine. **The root of the killing people to solve problem based on not understanding and respecting the sanctity of life. Google the word "Sanctity" brings back these explanation as "The state or quality of being holy, sacred, or saintly. Ultimate importance and inviolability."**

In that moment, I realized we were confronting something much bigger than what I had previously understood, much bigger than the Chinese government and individual leaders. **We are confronting against a huge evil that could kill 400 million babies yet make the entire world blind to this horrific crime. The evil one's scheme was exposed by a few faithful leaders and individuals. Chairman Smith, your extraordinary perseverance and dedication to defend human rights for all people is the key that led to the truth!**

It was the revelation of the true face of evil that led me to God through Jesus on December 4th, 2009, and helped me discover the true hope for China—for the people, for the leaders, for the victims and for me.

The Hope and Redemption of China

Many of you grown up in America may have heard the story: God created heaven and earth, God created man and woman in His image, but man and woman distrusted and disobeyed God and though this sin humanity fell. Jesus came to be to earth and offered his life on the cross by obeying God all the way to death, humanity was redeemed through us accepting Jesus as our God and savior. Many of us never were allowed to know this truth. The leadership of China 24 years ago may not know this truth or did not accept this truth but imprisoned and persecuted those who believe. When we protested their corrupt and evil policies we did not know how far we have also fallen short of God's righteous standard. One thing we know for sure, both sides are earnestly searching for the truth to govern a righteous nation. If we can only see, "our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms. (Ephesians 6:12, NIV), and see and understand what Jesus had done 2000 years ago to give each of us eternal life, how much killing lives grieves the God who created us and loves us, we would not have seen the Tiananmen Square massacre or the massive killing under the one child policy.

But it is not too late to start a new beginning that will take the first steps to right the wrongs done in Tiananmen Square and to end the one child policy. For Jesus' grace is sufficient for us. **(2 Corinthians 12:9)**. "The Lord is not slow in keeping his promise, as some understand slowness. Instead he is patient with you, not wanting anyone to perish, but everyone to come to repentance." (2 Peter 3:9, NIV)

June 4, 2013: A New Day

It is my hope that both President Obama and the new President Xi will accept this truth: "For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life." (John 3:16 NIV) Because Jesus did it 2000 years ago for us, we are not only given hope, but also freedom, prosperity and peace. That means a new free China and a China whose leaders will no longer need to fear revolt or losing control. No more massacre for each life was fearfully and wonderfully made by God (Psalm 139:14); no more One-Child Policy for God is our provider he will meet all our needs as Jesus said in Matthew 6:31-33: "So do not worry, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?'"³² For the pagans run after all these things, and your heavenly Father knows that you need them.³³ But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well."

And even better, the eternal joy is ours (psalm 16).

While from the Founding of the Republic, the United States of America has been a country that proclaims this truth saying: **In God We Trust and One Nation under God**, we have not always lived up to this pledge. Instead we trust first in our own understanding and strength. The employees of the Government may be resistant to lift high the name of Jesus, the name of God and Jesus was systematically removed from schools, companies, media, daily conversations and dialogues, etc. even one major political party wants to strip God out of the party platform. In the recent and distant past the first thing a President did entering the Oval Office in the morning was to pray and read the Bible. But here in Congress, I believe we need to look for the secure foundation of our Faith in God to bring a moral, righteous message to remake our world closer to the image God intended. I know this kind of message is not shared often in the U.S. Congress recently, which I deeply regret. But I understand how many who hear my words will feel them foreign or strange in this setting. I understand and am deeply pained by it because it has taken much too long for me to find this precious truth in America.

In the past 20+ years, I searched everywhere in America. I searched unceasingly, tirelessly, relentlessly. For if I didn't find the truth and answer, the screaming and pain in the depth of my soul would not allow me to rest. I searched for truth in Buddhism because it was Buddhists who courageously rescued me; I searched for truth in the overseas democracy movement as we tried to keep the dream alive; I searched for truth in elite American degrees because that is the hope and dream of millions of Chinese and American families; I searched for truth through testifying and working in Congress, interning at the U.N., and studying public affairs, diplomacy and democracy, since many thought the cure for China was a democratic system; I searched for truth in the American media because many believed that with freedom of speech came ultimate freedom; I searched for truth while working at a top management consulting firm and investment banking firm, for these are the top jobs for the most successful students in America; I searched for truth in my internet startup, because entrepreneurship is how dreams are fulfilled and wealth is made and jobs are created; I searched for truth through building a happy family with houses, children, and dogs, since that is the epitome of the "American Dream." Today I can testify with confidence, I have achieved much and I have been given much, but I did not find hope and freedom until I came to know God through Jesus. Then, and only then, I found true lasting freedom for myself, my family and my dearly beloved countries: China and America. As Jesus said: "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me". John 14:6

The Hope for America

Because the God I have come to know is not just a God of word but of power, I am not alone in arriving at this conclusion. Today, out of the debris of the Tiananmen Square massacre, there have emerged tens of millions of Jesus-believers in China who have discovered the same truth that I have. The testimony of Zhao Xiao, a Chinese government economist, is very telling. Zhao was sent to America by a Chinese government think tank to search for the secret of America's success. After the short era of stability following the Tiananmen massacre and prosperity led by reforms in 1992, China was faced with growing corruption and a growing gap of rich vs. poor, challenges that plague China today. Zhao was sent to find truth and bring back hope.

An atheist at the time, Zhao found God in America. As he wrote in his essay, “Free Economy with or Without Church”, with his permission, I will paraphrase his findings: “.... What are the biggest differences between America and China? Was it that they differed in buildings and skyscrapers? No. Was it that they differed in wealth? No. Was it that they differed in science and innovation? No. Was it that they differed in market economy? No. Was it that they differed in political system? No. At the end, it was because they differ in the quantity and presence of churches, which appear everywhere in every corner of America’s cities, towns and suburbs. It was the fear of God that compared to China kept America’s crime rate lower and relative government corruption down. It was the church and the belief of God that kept America hopeful, peaceful and prosperous, compared to China’s economy where people often got rich not because of hard work and innovation, but through open robbery by power and connection. China had no good faith or rule of law in business activities, where people lied and deceived each other for profit, with no fear of facing God’s judgment.

It does take a mirror to see what we are and what we have. America is at risk of losing her most precious and priceless treasure—God Almighty through Christ Jesus, and all the blessings, protections and prosperity that come with believing in God. As a new American citizen myself who was treated kindly even when I was an alien, I must speak truth in love in return.

The Foundation of a Godly Partnership between China and America

The cornerstone of any godly partnership between China and America must be built on a foundation of faith in God, in the way of Jesus Christ. “What does the LORD require of you? To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God.” (Micah 6:8)

So, President Xi Jinping, unlike Deng Xiaoping, you don’t need to use terror and massacre to maintain order. All you need is the love of Jesus. For whoever believes in Jesus is called to love. Even the slightest hatred in our hearts is not pleasing to God. And the peace of God will come if we sow justice. “The fruit of that righteousness will be peace; its effect will be quietness and confidence forever.” (Isaiah 32:17)

It is after understanding this precious truth that I am testifying about this hope for China and for America. It is after understanding this truth that I am urging the leaders of both countries, political and church leaders, and Jesus-believers, to end the following:

- To reverse the Anti-revolutionary turmoil (Dong Luan) verdict against the Tiananmen Square peaceful protesters
- To end One-Child Policy in China;
- To end gendecide in China and in America;
- To end abortions in China and in America;
- To end the imprisonment of political dissidents Liu Xiaobo, Bao Tong, Tan Zuoren, and more;
- To end the persecution of churches and believers in China and in America.

Failing that, the word spoken by President Abraham Lincoln is stern warning, as he said during his second inauguration speech: “Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman’s two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, ‘the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.’”

Will there be a day when China and America must shed all blood and lose all wealth through war and destruction in order to satisfy the judgments of God? The question is, what makes you think it will not happen, unless we stop and repent for the shedding of innocent blood and acts of injustice in both China and America?

Will that be the future we want to leave to our children?

We don’t have to. Jesus has given us a great future into eternity. Twenty-four years in the wilderness is much too long. It is time to enter the promised land of freedom!

I remember on the 20th year anniversary Congress woman Nancy Pelosi hugged me at our memorial event and said to me, "Can you believe it is 20 years, we are still protesting?!" I agree! None of us could or want to believe it has been this long and maybe longer.

To many who are still suffering, 24 years waiting for justice has been much too long and the waiting can be discouraging. But we have the hope for a future and we are confident that future is worth waiting because God has promised in His word: "Look! I am creating new heavens and a new earth, and no one will even think about the old ones anymore." (Isaiah 65:17, NLT). "God will wipe every tear from their eyes, and there will be no more death or sorrow or crying or pain. All these things are gone forever. (Revelation 21:4, NLT). "All who are victorious will inherit all the blessings, and I will be their God and they will be my children. (Revelation 21:7, NLT)

With this promise, my prayer today is the following : "Father God, do it swiftly." In Jesus' name we pray, Amen!

Mr. SMITH. I would now like to yield to Dr. Yang.

STATEMENT OF YANG JIANLI, PH.D., PRESIDENT, INITIATIVES FOR CHINA

Mr. YANG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee for hosting this important and timely hearing. On the night of June 3, 1989, the Chinese Government ordered People's Liberation Army to clear Tiananmen Square, the center of the peaceful democracy movement that had been carried out by student and civilians in China's major cities for nearly 2 months. It is now 3:40 in the morning on June 4th in Beijing. Exactly 24 years ago when in the early hours of June 4, 1989, troops opened fire on an armed students and civilians and cleared the square. During these hours, I was on Chung Lang Avenue near the square and saw with my own eyes more than 30 people killed, including 11 students run over by tanks.

As a survivor, I have testified before U.S. Congress on the massacre three times, including the 1996 hearing hosted by you, Mr. Chairman, when China's Defense Minister Chi Haotian visited Washington. Today I will not repeat what I said previously about what I saw during the massacre. Instead, I will try to deliver a few messages concerning the unresolved Tiananmen issues and other related questions.

First, let me pass along a message from Ms. Ding Zilin, the head of the Tiananmen Mothers. Here is the letter:

"Dear Chairman, I want to first, on behalf of Tiananmen Mothers, express my deep gratitude to you and U.S. Congress for your concerned support for the families of the victims of the Tiananmen massacre. Since 1995, the Tiananmen Mothers have written 36 open letters to the two Congresses of China and China's leaders calling for the reversal of the government's verdict on the Tiananmen incident and demanding truth, compensation, and accountability. But we have not received any reply from the government. We ask U.S. Congress to urge President Barack Obama to demand of President Xi Jinping in their June 8th summit that China fulfill its international and domestic obligations according to the standards of humanitarian principles and universal values and bring the crimes against the humanity committed by Deng Xiaoping, Li Peng, and others, in 1989, to trial and reach a just, fair resolution as soon as possible.

"The Chinese Government took the lives of our children 24 years ago. And it has deprived us of the right to freely mourn our beloved. Please ask President Obama to urge President Jinping to respect our basic rights as human beings. In the past 24 years, 33 members of the Tiananmen Mothers have passed away yearning for justice. And the rest are aging in despair. Age does creep. For us, time is particularly precious. It is in nobody's interest for President Xi to continue to be locked in his Chinese dream. Instead, we hope he awakens to the stern reality and address this stain on the modern history of China. Sincerely, Ding Zilin on behalf of the Tiananmen Mothers."

End of the letter.

What can we say today about basic facts concerning the tragedy? According to human rights in China, more than 2,000 people died in various Chinese cities on June 3rd and June 4th and the days of immediately following. The Tiananmen Mothers have documented the names of 202 victims in addition. In the followup to June 4th, more than 500 people were imprisoned in Beijing's Number 2 prison alone, and an unknown number were imprisoned in other Chinese cities. An additional unknown number were executed. However, the total number of dead, wounded, imprisoned, and executed remains unknown because the Chinese Government has refused to carry out a thorough investigation of events. The government's persecution of the Tiananmen participants continues today. Hundreds who escaped China in the aftermath of the Tiananmen massacre have been blacklisted from returning home, six of them have died overseas, and unknown numbers could not pay their last visit before they parents passed away or attend their funerals.

Wu'er Kaixi, a student leader of 1989, has not been able to see his parents for 24 years. Much less documented is the lives of the ordinary participants and the Tiananmen prisoners. They and their family members have endured unspeakable suffering in the past 24 years. Most of them constantly subject to harassment and surveillance have found it extremely difficult to hold a regular job and to support their families. Some of them were later forced to leave the country. Today, one who recently came to United States is with us.

I want to emphasize here that Tiananmen event is not just a one-time event. For the 24 years following the massacre, China has never stopped its human rights violations. In considering its record, we need look no further than these individuals, groups, events, and policies. Liu Xiaobo and his wife Liu Xia, Wang Bingzhang, Gao Zhisheng, Liu Xianbin, Chen Wei, Chen Xi, Guo Quan, Ding Jiayi, Zhao Changqing, Hada, Nurmemet Yasin, Yang Tianshui, Dhondup Wangchen, Zhu Yufu, Tang Zuoren.

Tibetans, Uyghurs, Mongolians, house churches follow forced abortions, forced evictions, and forced disappearances, black jails, and the list can go on and on.

I urge U.S. Congress and the Government to stay alert to these severe human rights violations and put pressure on the Chinese Government to change their ways. In February 2011, Colonel Ghadafi justified his blood actions by pointing to what China did to those people on Tiananmen Square. This shows how ignoring crimes in one place only encourages them to spread elsewhere. The good news is that the U.N. suspended Libya's membership on the Human Rights Council for killing its own people. This same human rights standard should be applied by the U.N. to all of its member countries, including China. The Tiananmen Mothers and the meetings of victims of the Chinese dictatorship rightfully ask the United States to strongly oppose in a vote against the China regaining membership in the U.N. Human Rights Council and to encourage other democracies to similarly vote against it. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Yang, thank you very much for your leadership, for your very concrete suggestions, and for reminding us that the Tiananmen Square massacre continues to this day.

[The prepared statement of Yang Jianli follows:]

Written Statement Presented at Subcommittee Hearing on Tragic
Anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen Square Protests and Massacre

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations
June 3rd, 2013

by YANG Jianli

Founder and President of Initiatives for China/Citizen Power for China

Mr. Chairman and other members of the Subcommittee,

Thank you very much for hosting this important hearing on the 24th anniversary of the 1989 Democracy Movement and the Tiananmen Massacre. In this written statement, I review the lessons learned and address the unfinished business of the 1989 Democracy Movement which was violent suppressed by the Chinese government. I also analyze the current political situation, current fights for human rights and prospects of democratization in China.

The pro-democracy movement of 1989 stood against government corruption and stood for democracy and freedom. It has been one of the greatest sources of inspiration for continued struggle for these goals and even today's grassroots protests against government corruption and unjust government policies.

This movement was widespread but ended in bloodshed.

Over the past 20 some years after the Tiananmen Massacre, the CCP regime has established a two China structure, and one of the two Chinas, which I call China, Inc.

Let's see how the China, Inc. has been formed.

The Tiananmen massacre created a strong sense of fear and dismay of general politics among ordinary people in China. Any room for a public system of checks and balances against governmental abuse of power was taken away.

It also created a sense of fear and crisis within the Communist regime because it had brought unprecedented public awareness to human rights and democracy. Although the Chinese Communist regime cracked down on that movement, life was no longer the same for the rulers. The regime had to face a completely different domestic and international environment and had resort to new tactics to meet its "overwhelming" need for stability.

The subsequent disintegration of The Soviet Union and the Eastern European Bloc cast an even heavier cloud over the heads of Chinese Communist officials. "How long can the red flag continue to fly?" They all started to doubt. Here, the doubt had two layers of implications. The first was, for how long can the communists stay in power and what would happen after they were gone? The second was, what does the ongoing, market-oriented economic reform have to do with communist doctrine?

Shortly after Deng Xiaoping's famous Southern Inspection Tour 1992, Communist officials at all levels realized three realities: First, the Chinese Communist Party's stay in power has nothing whatsoever to do with communist ideals. Second, "economic growth means everything;" that is, continued economic growth is the last, best hope to keep the CCP ship afloat. Third, In order to uphold the one-party dictatorship, it had to rely on capitalizing on the dark and evil side of human nature: spoiling the elite in exchange for their loyalty. Therefore the corruption of the powerful elite now became accepted, endorsed, and even demanded.

With the understanding of these three realities, the communist officials developed an undocumented but almost unanimously accepted code of conduct—or rather, code of corruption. So, every piece of governmental power is on sale in the market and every corner of the market is invaded by political power.

Officials in nearly all government agencies spend most of their energy beefing up GDP, engaging in power arbitrage, bribing their superiors, and seeking luxurious personal perks. They are doing this because it is a natural choice for them, probably the only choice. They gain enormous financial and materialistic benefits without taking any political risk. As a result, the Communist Party elite, who used to label themselves "the vanguards of the proletariat class," have either turned themselves into get-rich-overnight capitalist, or become brokers, patrons, and backers of domestic and foreign capitalists. All this was made possible thanks to the Tiananmen massacre and the political terror that was imposed on the entire country in the years following since, as a result, the entire society had lost the willingness or ability to check and balance the political power.

In such a political environment, political power was dancing a full-swing tango with capital operation. Low human rights standards, low wages, lack of environmental protection regulations and enforcement, and the illegality of collective bargaining all contributed to creating a golden opportunity for domestic and international speculative capitalists. As a result, "money" quickly courted "political power." Business venture takers go to any length to seek out someone in power to serve as backers so that they can grab market opportunities without fair competition. They also use political connections to shed any and all legal and social responsibility. In a sense, the Chinese Communist Party, which used to be China Inc.'s sole shareholder, has now opened up its equity and offered its shares for capitalists to purchase.

The CCP's 16th National Congress published a new Party Charter that welcomed capitalists as Party members. As a result, capital has become the greatest advocate of the current system. For the past two decades, the marriage of power and capital in China has been an ongoing soap opera that shows no signs of being cancelled. This marriage is also extended to Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan, and the international community writ large.

While the shares of China, Inc. are open for domestic and foreign capitalists to purchase, they were offered to China's intellectuals as free, performance-related stock options. The regime knows that in addition to economic growth, there is something else that also means everything to its survival; that is so-called "political stability." In order to sustain such stability, the CCP regime offers all kinds of bribery incentives to buy off anyone and everyone of importance and influence in society. The bribery list includes bureaucrats at every level of governmental, military officers, and business leaders, who the regime deems direct relatives. The list also includes: college professors, journalists, publishers, authors, art performers, high-profile athletes, and so on. The government pays all these people off in the form of salaries, bonuses, state-covered expenses, free medical insurance, subsidized housing, free pension plans and so on. Laws and policies more and more favor this group of people in exchange for their recognition and acceptance of the political status quo. Their income and perks add up to wealth that is disproportionately higher than that of ordinary workers, farm workers, clerks, and small business owners. The gap is much larger than that in any other country in the world. Such a policy of co-opting and buying off potential opposition is quite effective in conjunction with the high-pressure purges and persecution after the Tiananmen massacre. The cruelty of political reality created terror in the minds of intellectuals as a psychological deterrent. As time went on, fear turned into the cynicism, becoming increasingly indifferent to what was right and what was wrong. Indifference and hypocrisy rapidly became a new fashion that all the modern Chinese intellect tried to follow. This, coupled with a piece of the action in China Inc., made many intellectuals—who had once been independent and once been considered the conscience of the society—soften up their position against the post-Tiananmen status quo.

In summary, China, Inc. is formed by

1. Red Capitalists, through
2. Marriage between Power and Capital
 - taking advantage of:
 - low human rights standards
 - low environmental protection
 - low wages
 - banning collective bargaining power
3. China Inc. shares open to domestic and foreign capitalists
4. China Inc. shares free to intellectuals

In today's China, power (political elite), capital (economic elite) and "intellect" (social and cultural elite), are bonded together with corruption as the adhesive to form an alliance that maintains the existing political order. This alliance owns and runs China, Inc., dazzling the entire world with its wealth, might and glory. With China's vast geographic size and population, the shareholders of China, Inc. have impressed many observers with their prodigious wealth accumulation and astonishing growth rates, making those same observers believe China stands as an alternative model for modernization to democracy. By the same token, these shareholders also control all the channels of the information flow and dominate the public discourse. They can make their voices loud enough so the outside observers believe that they represent China, that they are China—the whole of China.

The truth is, there is another society named China, a society constituted of over a billion Chinese who are virtually laborers working for China, Inc.

There you go, on one side of the coin is the elite Corporate China; and the other side is what we call “the China of shitizens.”

Of course, you cannot find the word “shitizen” in any official language. Here is an illustrative Chinese story: On October 29, 2008, 8:00 pm, a governmental official, Party secretary Lin, violently harassed an 11-year-old girl in front of her parents on a busy street in Shenzhen, one of the most “modernized” cosmopolitan cities in China. When the girl’s parents tried to stop him and passersby protested against him, he shouted “How dare are you get in my way? Do you guys know who I am? I am a representative from the central Ministry of Transportation in Beijing. I ranked as high as your mayor in the government. You guys are as dispensable and worthless as a piece of shit in front of me.” The incident and Secretary Lin’s language quickly circulated on the internet, and since then numerous people have sarcastically begun calling themselves “Chinese shitizens” to show their discontent and despair.

Here is how China, Inc. and the under China diverge:

1. China Inc. possesses all of the political, economic, and social and cultural resources in China.

2. The rules of the games at all levels in China are set by China, Inc. who also officiates the games. The outcome of any conflict between elite society and shitizen’s society involves no suspense. In just two decades, China achieved the polarization of the country with unprecedented speed. Data show that at present, 0.4% of China’s households possess 70% of the national wealth. (Wen Jiabao) The material wellbeing and luxury enjoyed by this 0.4% is second to none in the world. However, the billion shitizens of China benefit very little, if any, from the fruit of this economic growth. Recently, a Chinese scholar named Liu Zhirong did thorough research on world salary levels and on social security safety nets. He found the following: China’s minimum wage is only 15% of the world’s average, ranking 159th globally. The minimum wage’s contribution to GDP also ranked 159th globally, behind 32 African countries. On the opposite end of the spectrum is China’s Tax Misery Index (tax burden minus benefits received). It has ranked 2nd or 3rd for several years in a row. These data do not take any undocumented—but heavy and widespread—fees or uncompensated property takeovers into account.

3. Shitizens are by no means citizens, as they are unable to enjoy basic benefits or constitution-warranted civil rights. In China, discriminations against them are open, legal, institutionalized, and all-inclusive, spreading into the fields of politics, business, culture, and education. For example, the institutionalization of the so-called HUKOU (local residency restriction) imposes discrimination against migrant workers in the cities. Their children cannot receive normal public education. The Electoral Law expressly states that one ballot cast by a rural farm worker counts as ¼ of the ballot cast by a city resident. But these are just statutory discriminations. The reality is that the powerless people, whether they live in urban or rural areas, have no say whatever in any local, regional, or national public affairs that may directly affect their interests. With the judiciary system as it is constituted under dictatorship, people have no recourse to have their grievances redressed when their interests are hurt and/or their rights violated.

4. The elite's monopoly over power, capital, and information, and its insularity, makes mobility between the two Chinas nearly stagnant. For many years, right after the founding of the People's Republic of China, people in the grassroots were allowed to move upwards through military service and higher education. Now the elite China relies more and more on blood relations to maintain the stability of the ruling group. The commonly accepted way to gain a position in the government and in the military is purchase it with a large sum of cash. But this is just a transaction between a member of the political elite and a member of the economic elite. The underclass can seldom go anywhere by virtue only of their personal talents and hard work.

5. The two Chinas no longer speak a common political language. The official language continues to use the rigid official political terminology to make clear the government's intent to maintain the existing political order. Under the cover of such rigid language, the unspoken rules of a mafia operating by the codes of the jungle governs all transactions. Because the official language is so false, lofty, and meaningless, so far removed from actual public life, it is almost impossible for the ordinary people to use it to express their opinions. They have to seek another language. Since all the traditional media are tightly controlled by the ruling elite, they resort to cyberspace, creating numerous new concepts and new words in cyberspace that gained the acceptance of the general public. For example, "don't be so CCTV" (don't be so hypocritical), "TG" (initials for Tu Gong meaning "uncivilized or barbarian communists" in Chinese), "river crab" (homophone for the political buzz word "harmony"), "top movie star" (nick name for premier Wen Jiabao, who likes to weep in front of TV camera from time to time). The isolation of the two languages underlines the existence of the two mutually isolated societies in China.

6. The two Chinas have almost no common political life. Political participation channels for non-elite Chinese nationals are completely blocked. The government tried to use the hollow language and ceremonies of patriotism to bridge the gap with less than satisfactory results. Events like the Olympics, National Day and the World Expo are just pastimes for the elite. During these events, the government shows extreme distrust for its people, who are kept out by means of de facto martial law. The two Chinas are so divided that it is difficult for ordinary people to meet and talk to a government official of as low level as a town manager.

7. Emotional division. While the China, Inc. is disdainful of the under China, the latter grow more and more distrustful of the former. The phenomena of so-called "hatred towards the rich" and "hatred towards officials" clearly demonstrate this mentality. In recent years, China's official media has adopted a new phrase: "conflicts caused by non-stake holders." It refers to the fact that more and more bystanders are participating in public riots.

To maintain the two-China structure, the Chinese government, over 20 some years after the Tiananmen, has built a monstrous "stability sustaining system" which has an operating budget exceeding China's national defense budget established a gigantic stability-preserving system.

Let's see how it has been developed.

Since the Tiananmen massacre, corruption has become one of the CCP's important strategies to survive because no Party officials at any level would be loyal to the regime if they were not

given the privilege to corrupt. Such a predatory regime has caused unprecedented infringement of the basic rights of the ordinary people, resulting in increasing frequent protests.

Currently in China, there are about 200,000 public protests with more than 100 participants each year—or once every 3 minutes. The government has no effective way to handle these other than increasing the police force to prevent the protests from becoming trans-regional. Every province has set up branches in Beijing, staffed with police officers and hired thugs and gangsters to intercept petitioners. These branches also run their own private detention centers. For the last years, the manpower, equipment, budget, and salary of policing has grown tremendously. Based on experts' estimates, there are at least 550,000 to 600,000 People's Armed Police and various other forms of police and para-police on the payroll. The Chinese local governments run more and more like mafias. They hire local gangsters to become their hatchet men and informants. In a recent interview with the official Xinhua News agency, the assistant sheriff of Kai-Lu County, Inner Mongolia, disclosed that there are 12,000 informants to help the police maintain stability in this county whose population is only 400,000. Some experts said that in first-tier cities such as Beijing or Shanghai and ethnic minority areas such as Tibet and Xinjiang, the number of spies is even greater. Extrapolating for the Kai-Lu County ration, there are at least 39 million informants nationwide. This coupled with 550,000-600,000 police force forms a heavy net of police over the people.

I must reemphasize that I use the two "Chinas" argument to show China's structural reality: the division between the elite groups and the general public. For some individuals in society, the boundaries of the two "Chinas" are not clearly marked, and not every member of society has a clear awareness of which China they belong to. In addition, the simple-benefit analysis is not enough. For example, some human rights lawyers and other opposition leaders, like Liu Xiaobo, the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize winner, could enjoy "elite Chinese" status, but they cross the border, trying to overcome the barrier that is similar to that between the colonial and the colony. They are trying to construct a reasonable society in line with universal values of public political life.

But the Chinese government is afraid of the possible integration between the two Societies based on justice. Such integration is against the current interest of the stockholders of China, Inc. That is why the CCP regime has always tried to contain and persecute those who (democracy advocates) believe and work for such integration. Some of them have been sent into exile overseas, others were put in jail. Still others were followed, monitored, or put in house arrest. It is a long-term strategy to guard against the democratization of China by eradicating, harassing, and eliminating citizen advocates.

Another strategy is to control, compress and eventually block the space for public expression of opinions. Internet is on top of the government's hit list. Any forum of public opinions could serve as a launch pad to start a process of breaking the boundary between the two "Chinas", therefore eventually leads to the collapsing of the elite China. The CCP regime is fully aware its significance, and are making every effort to put a tight grip over the internet.

This is how I use two-China analysis as the framework to summarize the Chinese communists' general strategies of maintaining authoritarian rule and resisting the democratization. On top of

the traditional lies and violence, the CCP regime has developed new tactics. It is comprised in the shape of a dragon:

Here you go.

The body: sustaining economic growth at all costs to maintain the regime's ruling legitimacy

Two wings: appeasing the elite with corruption and suppressing the powerless with rogue police

Two claws: purging democracy advocates like Liu Xiaobo and blocking public opinion.

Nevertheless, it is not enough to just see the severe division of the two societies of China. We need to stand in a more elevated position to envision the emerging of a new, democratic China, the third China. Although this third China did not take shape, there are many signs indicating its coming.

It usually takes four factors to be present at the same time to change a country from an autocracy to a democracy: 1) the robust, general disaffection from people; 2) split in the leadership in the autocratic regime; 3) viable opposition, viable democracy movement; and 4) international support.

Let me look at these factors.

First. CCP' dragon-shaped one-body, two-wing, and two-claw strategy has split China into two exclusive societies. This is what some experts called the rigid stable structure. But rigid human society ever has a sustainable stability. If such a society is stable for the moment, it is only because a crisis is in the cooking and new opportunity is on the horizon.

China's Stability Sustaining System treats every citizen as a potential enemy, and it has successfully made them enemies—dissidents, independent intellectuals, land-lease peasants, victims of forced demolitions and eviction, victims of forced abortion, veterans, migrant workers, Tibetans, Uyghurs, Mongolians, Christians, and Falun Gong practitioners, you name it. The CCP regime does not lack enemies.

Second. Compared to the under China, which is more diversified, the elite China seem to have common and consistent interests. But the consistency is based on bribery and buy-offs of multi-faucet interest groups, with intrinsic flaw in the foundation. Fierce internal power struggles have never ceased since the founding of the communist party. Perhaps the only achievement in China's political system in the past 30 years is the establishment of the "two-term, 10-year, one-generation" term limit system. Many observers predicted that such a system would ensure long-term stability for the CCP regime, wishfully believing that this system helped the CCP find a way out of the pit of power discontinuity that has plagued all dictatorships in history. The Bo Xilai event, however, mercifully burst that bubble. People within the Party have begun to challenge this power succession system. The cracks are only widening.

Third. The concept of democracy has prevailed in the minds of the general public, thanks to the dozens years of efforts made by the pro-democratic activists both in and outside of China. The most important sign of this is the recent intellectual awakening, evidenced by the return of the democracy debate, which has occupied a central place in the public discourse around China's leadership change. More and more intellectuals, who were generally co-opted by the regime not long after the Tiananmen massacre and acted as its defenders for many years, have come to realize and acknowledge Chinese democracy movement's contributions, ideas, and beliefs, which are embodied in Charter 08. Recognition by intellectuals that the status quo is unsustainable is always the first, and vital, step toward changing it.

In the meantime, the ordinary people are becoming more mature, more skillful, and more aggressive in fighting for their own civil rights. The China, Inc. can sure ignore the grievance of the society, but the people will eventually unite themselves to form organized rebellion if individual petitions yield no results. Among the people, there is a subgroup called the netizens, those who use the internet a lot, nearly 5 hundred and fifty millions of them. Although the Chinese authorities impose strict control over the media, the existence of the Internet paved a way for the people's awakening and networking. In the cyberspace language, the communist regime is rapidly losing all its moral asset while the people are constantly seeking opportunity to group together in a skillful way. The netizens constitute an "information elite" that cannot be all bought off. They will play a leading role in future organized activities. Generally speaking, as the non-governmental forces grow and the civil protests escalate, struggle for power among different factions with the communist regime will become public. Especially, once the external pressure reaches a critical mass, the rivalry factions with the CCP will have to take the citizen force into serious account and seek or use the latter's support. This means a decomposition of China, Inc.

That said, I want to emphasize that we need an overall, viable pro-democracy movement to force the dictatorship to crack open. A long-term resilient movement will reach critical mass when idealists like Liu Xiaobo join forces with the self-motivated public or the disaffected with the status quo.

A milestone to meet that objective would be the formation of a group of civil leaders able to represent the general public and to at least partially disrupt the current political order -- a group that would catch attention and support of the international community and carry out and to call for effective negotiations with the government. That was most needed but lacking in our 1989 Tiananmen movement. But we are moving, perhaps slowly but surely, toward that goal.

Last but not least, international support.

Many friends in the international community are skeptical about the Chinese people's demand for freedom and democracy. Let me propose the following thought experiment for you to judge for yourselves.

Imagine that you visited China, taking with you a copy of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Arbitrarily choose any citizens on the street. Show the document, asking them with the language they understand whether they want the rights listed there. What would you expect them

to say? Would you for a second believe they would say "No, I do not want these rights"? Of course, you wouldn't. You see, you understand the Chinese people through understanding yourselves: Nobody wants to be a slave. In this regard, the Chinese people are no different than other people in the world. The thirst for freedom and dignity is indeed universal.

The people of China have long ago begun the search for dignity, justice, goodness, fairness, equality, freedom, and brotherhood. They have produced a few major pushes towards these goals in this generation. In the 1989 Tiananmen democracy movement, the Chinese people courageously stood up against government corruption that in the words of **Charter08**, has "corrupted human intercourse." They stood up for democracy and freedom. The image of a lone man standing in front of a string of tanks has inspired the entire world, and our fallen brothers' spirits have been one of the greatest sources of inspiration for continued struggle for these noble goals today in China.

No one can predict with precision when the moment of dramatic opening for change will come in China. Virtually every one of the sixty some peaceful transitions to democracy in the past few decades have come as a surprise to the US. One reason is that diplomats, academics, and policy makers generally do not pay attention to what is happening with students, workers, farmers--- with the street level society and culture of the world's not-free countries.

The people of China are obviously experiencing revolutionary change. Above all else we must maintain our faith in my compatriots that we can and will join the vast majority of the world's peoples who now live in free or at least partly free countries. An opening for change could come in the next few months or it may take a few more years. Of course it will never come without collective efforts, including those from the international community. So we must persevere and keep the faith and be ready.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Aikman.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID AIKMAN, PH.D. (FORMER TIME
MAGAZINE BUREAU CHIEF IN BEIJING)**

Mr. AIKMAN. Mr. Chairman and honorable members. Twenty-four years ago today, one of the most brutal assaults by any government in modern history on peaceful protesters began around 10 o'clock p.m. in the evening Beijing time. By the time the assault was over several hours later, hundreds, perhaps thousands of innocent civilians, including students, had been murdered by bullets to the Chinese People's Liberation Army, or crushed under the attacks of tanks and armored personnel carriers. How do we know? Because scores of Chinese and foreign eyewitnesses photographed the event and reported on it. I was one of them.

The killing of innocent civilians is always a tragedy and sometimes it is a crime. Most countries in the world have been guilty of this at different times in their history, including my own country, the United States. Over a few centuries, we treated with great cruelty Africans brought over to this country as slaves and Native Americans. But we came to recognize these faults and to express contrition and an apology for them and even asked forgiveness for them.

China is a great civilization and culture and has contributed innumerable blessings to the human community. China has also suffered much in recent centuries from foreign invasion and aggression. The result is that Chinese feel a deep sense of grievance when information about past and present injustices is suppressed. That sense of grievance is alive in China today about the events of June 3 and 4, 1989. What does it say about a great nation that it has to forbid Internet searches for the words, "Tiananmen incident," or "June the 4th," or even "candle," or most incredibly, even the numerals "5, 3, 5," which point not to May having 35 days but to the date June the 4th?

How can the authorities in power in China hope to have the respect of the world when they go through these medieval contortions to suppress information about China's own history? All the truth-respecting people all over the world are asking for is for China to start being honest about its own past and present, and to investigate in a transparent manner what happened 24 years ago. China claims that hooligans were responsible for June the 4th. That is nonsense. Some hooligans, no doubt, were present, just as some hooligans perhaps were present when Martin Luther King, Jr. set in motion the civil rights March on Washington in 1963. But only a complete idiot today would assert that the civil rights March on Washington was an event organized by hooligans.

China today its experiencing a multitude of protests by citizens experiencing injustice. That multitude is growing annually at a rate that even alarms the Chinese Government. Sooner or later, if not addressed honestly those grievances will coalesce into a social and political movement which could cause a national turmoil in not just China, but in some of China's neighbors. For the sake of honesty, of sanity, and even regional peace, the Chinese authorities need to tell the world the truth. China claims to respect truth because it respects science, which requires truth to be respected. It

will be a tragedy if China continues to hobble along, dragging its civilization and its recent history behind it, like an injured war veteran. Greatness of civilization requires truth, honesty, and modesty, not continued countenancing of lies like the Soviet regime of Joseph Stalin. Every Chinese and everyone in the world will feel a sigh of relief if China begins to be honest about its internal grievances, especially those stemming from June the 3rd to 4th, 1989. A wise man said 2,000 years ago, "You will know the truth and the truth will set you free."

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Aikman, thank you very much for your testimony and for being here today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Aikman follows:]

COMMENTS TO HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH, GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHTS, AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

By David Aikman, June 3 2013

Mr. Chairman and honorable members, twenty-four years ago today one of the most brutal assaults by any government in modern history on peacefully protesting protesters began around 10.00 p.m. in the evening, Beijing time. By the time the assault was over several hours later, hundreds, perhaps thousands of innocent civilians, including students, had been murdered by bullets of the Chinese People's Liberation Army or crushed under the tracks of tanks and armored personnel carriers. How do we know? Because scores of Chinese and foreign eyewitnesses photographed the event and reported on it. I was one of them.

The killing of innocent civilians is always a tragedy, and sometimes it is a crime. Most countries in the world have been guilty of this at different times in their history, including my own country, the United States. Over a few centuries we treated with great cruelty Africans brought over to this country as slaves and native Americans. But we came to recognize these faults and to express contrition and an apology for them, and even ask forgiveness for them.

China is a great civilization and culture and has contributed innumerable blessings to the human community. China has also suffered much in recent centuries from foreign invasion and aggression. The result is that Chinese feel a deep sense of grievance when information about past and present injustices is suppressed.

That sense of grievance is alive in China today about the events of June 3 and 4 1989. What does it say about a great nation that it has to forbid Internet searches of the words "Tiananmen Incident" or "June 4," or even "candle", or, most incredibly, even the numerals 535, which point not to May having 35 days but to the date June 4? How can the authorities in power in China hope to have the respect of the world when they go through these medieval contortions to suppress information about China's own history?

All that truth-respecting people all over the world are asking for is for China to start being honest about its own past and present and to investigate in a transparent manner what happened 24 years ago. China claims that hooligans were responsible for June 4. That is nonsense. Some hooligans no doubt were present, just as some hooligans perhaps were present when Martin Luther King Jr. set in motion the Civil Rights March on Washington in 1963. But only a complete idiot today would assert that the Civil Rights March on Washington was an event organized by hooligans.

China today is experiencing a multitude of protests by citizens experiencing injustice. That multitude is growing annually at a rate that even alarms the Chinese government. Sooner or later, if not addressed honestly, those grievances will coalesce into a social and political movement which could cause a national turmoil in not just China, but in some of China's neighbors. For the sake of honesty, of sanity, and even regional peace, the Chinese authorities need to tell the world the truth. China claims to respect truth because it respects science, which requires truth to be respected. It will be a tragedy if China continues to hobble along dragging its civilization and its recent history behind it like an injured war veteran. Greatness of civilization requires truth, honesty and modesty, not continued countenancing of lies like the Soviet regime of Josep Stalin. Every Chinese and everyone in te world will feel a sigh of relief if China begins to be honest about its internal grievances, especially those stemming from June 3-4 1989.

A wise man said two thousand years ago, "You will know the truth and the truth will set you free."

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Richardson.

**STATEMENT OF SOPHIE RICHARDSON, PH.D., CHINA
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH**

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee. It is always a pleasure to be here. Thank you so much for your devotion and your leadership on these issues; to you, in particular, Mr. Wolf. I am used to being humbled in this room; I am especially so today by being on this panel. It is a little hard to add to or improve upon what has already been said. I think my task this afternoon is to try to put some of the events in a little bit of historical context. And it is really a fairly basic idea that Chinese Government denial and repression about Tiananmen in 1989 make it impossible for the wound of Tiananmen to heal and for people inside and outside China to trust the Chinese Government.

We see in Tiananmen the origins or pathologies of many of the human rights abuses and broader problems that continue to plague China today. What did Tiananmen mean in 1989? Different things to different people. At a time when it seemed there could be a real possibility of political reform, it meant that people actually could challenge the government, that they could try to exercise key rights to expression, assembly and association, that they could try to influence a political process that still allowed them no formal role, and for some of the of the lions of Tiananmen, some of whom are sitting here today and who of some of whom continue to fight for their rights from towns and campuses and jails across China, this was the formative experience.

The Chinese Government's reaction, on the other hand, made starkly clear that despite some vague signs of reformist impulses on the economic front, no dissent was to be brooked on political matters, a position that hasn't changed much today. For the international community, the events of June 4, 1989 were shocking insight into what the government was like at a point in time when there had been somewhat limited contact the end of the Cold War began to wane, there was some debate, particularly about whether the Chinese Government could or would be more than a trading partner.

What does Tiananmen mean now, 24 years later? I think the Chinese Government's active efforts to wholly expunge Tiananmen from the history books and persecute survivors and victims' family members, let alone to provide justice, means that China simply cannot in some ways move forward. And that until the government is willing to investigate those events, it also has to be viewed with profound skepticism as a partner.

For Chinese activists, so many of the issues at stake then inform their work now, whether it is rule of law, holding officials to account, transparency, corruption, the right to protest. And many of them continue to confront precisely the same kinds of problems: Official obstruction, coverups, injustice, and denial. It is hard to offer a generalization about what Tiananmen means for Chinese people today, because as many panelists have described, it is very difficult to know about the events themselves. The Washington Post had an extraordinary article this morning. I would recommend all of you to reading it. It is an effort to speak to survivors about how they

have—whether they have broached the subject with their children. And there is one paragraph I would like to read because I think it quite nicely summarizes the conundrum they face. William Wan wrote,

“For most parents, it comes down to a choice between protecting their children from the past or passing on dangerous and bitter truths about the authoritarian society they continue to live under.”

For the international community, I think Tiananmen continues to be, especially for governments who either seek to or feel obliged to have closer ties with the Chinese Government, Tiananmen becomes a very uncomfortable truth. It’s there, it hasn’t been dealt with, they don’t want to have to talk about it. Some of them issue statements, some of them try not to. Periodically the EU tries to detach its arms embargo from accountability for Tiananmen. But there isn’t a clear path forward or a clear message from all of those governments on how to deal with the legacy.

What can be done about this? We are, of course, deeply appreciative of the efforts made by Members of Congress, although it is certainly my hope that as interest amongst members in China generally grows that more people will take an active interest in human rights issues as well. And while we certainly appreciate the—I think it’s appropriate to describe them as elegiac statements that the State Department issues on the anniversary, I think it is not easy for them to do that. I think they face resistance from other parts of the administration. And that that alone is certainly not enough.

I think the question really remains from President Obama on down whether the U.S. is going to help fight the long, hard fight for truth and justice and accountability for Tiananmen and for other human rights abuses. We are at a point in time now where the U.S. has pushed hard for accountability and justice in various parts of the world. We now have a U.N. Commission of Inquiry Into Human Rights Abuses in North Korea.

We have the Magnitsky Act. And yet we are left wondering what exactly is on President Obama’s human rights agenda for later in this week when he meets with President Xi. Will he ask for the release of political prisoners, as was once absolutely standard practice? Will President Obama explain to Xi Jinping that Shandong officials who have been responsible for tormenting Chen Guangcheng and his family members shouldn’t bother trying to apply for visas to come to the United States under the new executive order. Will President Obama ask Xi Jinping to investigate the events of Tiananmen, and perhaps most important in this week, to allow victims’ family members to mourn their dead.

Xi Jinping has spoken about coming to the United States to try to establish a new relationship with the U.S. I think it is going to be very difficult to do until such time as the Chinese Government seeks to establish a new relationship with its own people, one in which it is finally willing to answer their questions about 1989. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Richardson follows:]



Human Rights Watch

[China: New Leadership Should Address Tiananmen Legacy](#) (1)

Commitments to Rule of Law Empty Without Justice for Past Abuses

May 31, 2013

(New York) – President [Xi Jinping](#) [2] and other senior [Chinese](#) [3] leaders should demonstrate their commitment to the rule of law by acknowledging the government’s responsibility for the massacre of unarmed civilians 24 years ago, and by allowing commemorations of the anniversary, Human Rights Watch said today.

More than two decades after the deadly crackdown, the Chinese government continues to deny wrongdoing in the suppression of the Tiananmen protests. The government has covered up the killings, failed to bring to justice the perpetrators, persecuted victims and survivors’ family members, and maintained tight control over freedoms of assembly and expression.

“Chinese leaders continue to try to simply expunge Tiananmen from the history books,” said [Sophie Richardson](#) [4], China Director. “But the new leadership can choose to act differently and distinguish itself from its predecessors. A good start would be to ensure that family members and activists can commemorate the events of 1989 without fear of reprisals.”

In the run-up to this month’s 24th anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen massacre, the Chinese government has tightened control over activist relatives of victims. Zhang Zianling, a member of the Tiananmen Mothers, a nongovernmental group made up of relatives of people who disappeared or were killed during the crackdown, was barred from leaving for Hong Kong to attend an event ahead of the anniversary. Other outspoken activists are also targeted during this “sensitive period.” For example, [Tang Jingling](#) [5], a Guangzhou rights lawyer, was taken away from his home by the police, according to media and nongovernmental organizations’ reports.

The Chinese government has stifled any discussion of the demonstrations and aftermath in the mass media and educational institutions, and systematically censored the internet for date signifiers, including 6/4 and 89 – and even obscure references designed to avoid scrutiny, such as the fake date of “May 35.”

According to media reports, in recent weeks the General Office of the Chinese Communist Party’s Central Committee issued a document on the “seven taboos,” a gag order to universities directing them to avoid discussions of certain subjects, including “universal values” and the

Party's past wrongs. Another document issued jointly by the Party's Central Organization department, Propaganda department, and the Ministry of Education's party committee at around the same time calls on universities to strengthen the "ideological education" of young lecturers. University students played a major role in the 1989 protests.

The Tiananmen crackdown was precipitated by the mass gathering of workers, students, and others in Beijing's Tiananmen Square and in other cities in April 1989 to peacefully demonstrate for a pluralistic political system. The government responded to the intensifying protests in late May 1989 by declaring martial law and authorizing the military to use deadly force.

On June 3 and 4, 1989, Chinese military opened fire and killed untold numbers of unarmed civilians, many of whom did not participate in the protests. Following the massacre, the government arrested thousands of people on charges of "counter-revolution" and other criminal charges, including disrupting social order and arson. According to the research body Dui Hua, the last of those jailed for "counter-revolution" for more than two decades [6] have only just been released.

The Chinese government has refused to account for the massacre or hold any perpetrators legally accountable for the killings. The government initially maintained that the crackdown was a valid response to a "counter-revolutionary incident," and stressed that some protestors attacked army convoys and burned military vehicles, resulting in casualties. It has refused to conduct an investigation into the events or to release data on those who were killed, injured, disappeared, or imprisoned, though it now refers to the incident as one of "political turmoil" (*zhengzhi dongluan*) rather than "counter-revolutionary" activity. The group Tiananmen Mothers [7] has established the details of 202 people who were killed during the suppression of the movement in Beijing and other cities.

After the massacre, the government passed the 1989 Law on Assembly, Procession, and Demonstration (the Assembly Law), which outlines a series of restrictive requirements that effectively bar citizens from exercising the right. For example, under the regulations, all demonstrations must be approved by the police. In practice, however, police in China rarely approve public protests, particularly ones that seem likely to be critical of the government. In the lead-up to the 24th anniversary, activists were detained [8] and harassed for applying to hold public assemblies to commemorate the occasion.

For many young participants in the pro-democracy protests in 1989, the events left an indelible mark on their lives and spurred them to become long-term activists, for which they have paid a high price. Liu Xiaobo [9], a lecturer turned protest leader in 1989, became one of China's best known dissidents and is now serving a 12-year sentence in prison for "inciting subversion." His wife, Liu Xia, is under unlawful house arrest in the couple's home in Beijing. Chen Wei, a student leader of the 1989 protests, went on to document human rights abuses in Sichuan Province and was sentenced in December 2011 to nine years in prison for "inciting subversion."

Chen Xi, a university staff member in Guizhou Province and a protest leader in 1989, became an organizer of the Guizhou Human Rights Forum and was imprisoned in December 2011 for ten

years on charges of “inciting subversion.” All three experienced their first imprisonments in 1989 as part of the government’s nationwide crackdown on the pro-democracy protests.

“Government denial and repression make it impossible for the wound of Tiananmen to heal [10],” Richardson said. “Justice and accountability have been critical to resolving countries’ tragic histories all over the world – the question now is whether Xi Jinping is brave enough to face that challenge.”

Source URL: <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/05/31/china-new-leadership-should-address-tiananmen-legacy>

Links:

- [1] <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/05/31/china-new-leadership-should-address-tiananmen-legacy>
- [2] <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/02/28/china-letter-xi-jinping-outlining-issues-reform-during-china-national-peoples-confer>
- [3] <http://www.hrw.org/asia/china>
- [4] <http://www.hrw.org/bios/sophie-richardson>
- [5] http://wqw2010.blogspot.hk/2013/05/blog-post_1770.html
- [6] http://duihua.org/wp/?page_id=7759
- [7] <http://www.tiananmenmother.org/>
- [8] http://wqw2010.blogspot.hk/2013/05/blog-post_7472.html
- [9] <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/02/27/china-new-global-effort-free-liu-xiaobo>
- [10] <http://www.hrw.org/en/node/83112>

© Copyright 2013, Human Rights Watch



Human Rights Watch

The Tiananmen Legacy II

Ongoing Persecution and Censorship

May 13, 2009

Ongoing Persecution of Those Seeking Reassessment

The Chinese government continues to persecute those who seek a public reassessment of the bloody crackdown. Chinese citizens who challenge the official version of what happened in June 1989 are subject to swift reprisals from security forces. These include relatives of victims who demand redress and eyewitnesses to the massacre and its aftermath whose testimonies contradict the official version of events. Even those who merely seek to honor the memory of the late Zhao Ziyang, the secretary general of the Communist Party of China in 1989 who was sacked and placed under house arrest for opposing violence against the demonstrators, find themselves subject to reprisals.

Some of those still targeted include:

Ding Zilin and the Tiananmen Mothers: Ding is a retired philosophy professor at People's University in Beijing whose 17-year-old son, Jiang Jieliang, was killed in central Beijing on June 4, 1989. Ding has since become the spokesperson and driving force behind the Tiananmen Mothers, a loosely organized group of around 150 family members of other June 1989 victims. Security forces routinely subject Ding to detention, interrogation, and threats demanding silence from her and other Tiananmen Mothers members ahead of "sensitive" dates, particularly June 4. "China has become like an airtight iron chamber and all the demands of the people about June 4, all the anguish, lament and moaning of the victims' relatives and the wounded have been sealed off," reads a petition by the Tiananmen Mothers, signed by 127 people and submitted to China's parliament in March 2008.

Jiang Yanyong: Jiang is a 77-year-old army surgeon who treated some of the victims at Beijing's 301 Military Hospital in the immediate aftermath of the June 1989 military assault. Jiang first gained public prominence in 2003 for exposing the government's cover-up of the country's outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome, or SARS. In March 2004, Jiang wrote a letter to China's parliament, the National People's Congress, urging a reassessment of the government's position on the Tiananmen Massacre. The letter exposed the brutality of the June

1989 massacre, including the People's Liberation Army's use of "fragmentation bullets of the kind banned by international convention." Jiang subsequently told foreign media the government's response to that letter was to dispatch state security forces to abduct him from his office, hold him for seven weeks at an army guesthouse, and subject him to "study sessions." After being allowed to return home, Jiang was placed under house arrest for several months and barred from overseas travel. In March 2009, Jiang wrote a letter to Chinese President Hu Jintao demanding an apology for the period he spent in detention in 2004 and the subsequent months of house arrest.

Zhang Shijun: Zhang is a 40-year-old former soldier who took part in the military crackdown in Beijing on June 3-4. In March 2009, Zhang published an open letter to Chinese President Hu Jintao urging an official re-assessment of the "June 4 tragedy, the event in China's recent history that causes bitter weeping and choking back tears." Zhang was detained by security forces shortly after his letter was made public, and remains under detention in an undisclosed location.

Sun Wenguang: Sun, a 75-year-old retired professor in Jinan City, Shandong province, was assaulted on April 4, 2009, by five plainclothes thugs who appear to have been working at official behest. He was en route to Jinan's Martyrs' Park to mourn Zhao Ziyang, the Chinese Communist Party secretary-general who tried to prevent the use of force by the military in June 1989. Zhao was stripped of his position following the crackdown and spent the last 15 years of life under house arrest in Beijing. The assault on Sun, which left him with three broken ribs, occurred just minutes after he had evaded some 20 uniformed police who attempted to prevent him from leaving the university campus where he lived.

Tiananmen's Survivors: Exiled, Marginalized and Harassed

The Chinese government is particularly hostile toward those individuals it has identified as part of the leadership of the 1989 Tiananmen student protests. Student leaders who served time in prison or fled China in the aftermath of the bloody crackdown of June 1989 have become unwilling exiles. Several of those former protest leaders have been turned back from China by Chinese immigration officials even when trying to visit aging family members they left behind or to attend their funerals. Student organizers who stayed in China remain subject to tight surveillance and harassment despite having served long prison terms for their participation in the protests of June 1989. Perhaps most tragically, survivors maimed or handicapped in the June 1989 military assault in Beijing and other major cities continue to face pressure from state security forces to lie or stay silent about the causes of their injuries.

Tiananmen survivors who continue to suffer due to the role they played in the student protests in 1989 include:

Wang Dan: A former Beijing University student leader who topped Beijing's Tiananmen most-wanted list until his arrest in 1989, Wang received a four-year prison sentence in 1991, was released in 1993 when China was bidding to host the Olympics, was re-arrested in 1995 for "subversion" and was sentenced to an 11-year prison term in 1996. Wang was sent to the United States in 1998 on medical parole and has been barred from return by Chinese immigration officials who have refused to issue him a new Chinese passport. In 2008, Wang launched a

campaign to urge the Chinese government to allow him and other blacklisted former Tiananmen protest leaders to return to China in line with Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which specifies that, "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

Han Dongfang: Han was detained in June 1989 for his role in the Tiananmen protests and for organizing China's first independent trade union since 1949, and was subsequently held for 22 months in prison without charge. In 1992, the Chinese government permitted Han to go to the US for medical treatment, but subsequently cancelled his passport and has refused his multiple efforts to return to China without disclosing the legal basis for those refusals. Han is based in Hong Kong, where he researches labor-rights abuses and publishes the *China Labor Bulletin*.

Ma Shaofang: In June 1989, Ma was 10th on the Chinese government's list of most-wanted dissidents and served a three-year prison term for his role as a Tiananmen student protest organizer. Two decades later, Ma, now a Shenzhen-based businessman, continues to be subject to police monitoring of his movements and activities. On October 13, 2007, Ministry of State Security officers warned Ma not to attend a writers' conference in Beijing during the 17th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party. In a blog posting in which Ma recounted the encounter, the State Security officers warned that, "If you get into trouble, we will be there and it won't be good for you."

Fang Zheng: A 42-year-old former student at the Beijing Academy of Physical Science, Fang had his legs crushed on June 4 under a tank while pushing a female student protester out of the tank's path. Fang was subsequently expelled from school after refusing to publicly deny the source of his injury, but went on to become China's wheelchair discus and javelin champion in 1992 and 1993. However, Fang's Tiananmen connections prompted the Chinese government to bar him from competing in the Far East Games for the Disabled in Beijing in 1994 despite his promise not to discuss with foreign journalists the cause of his injury. Fang told a reporter from Singapore's *New Paper* in September 2008 that he maintained public silence and avoided travel to Beijing around the 2008 Beijing Olympics due to promises from government security forces that he would be given a job if he kept quiet and stayed away Beijing ahead of during the Games. "I will wait and see what they have to offer, since I have nothing more to lose," Fang said.

Censoring History

The Chinese government continues to systematically erase from the public record any mention of the events of June 1989 that do not conform to the government's assessment of the bloody crackdown as a "political disturbance."

China's online censors quickly remove any references to the 1989 crackdown, and internet search engines in China are carefully calibrated to filter out any images or references to the deaths of unarmed civilians for search requests on topics including "Tiananmen Square" and "June 4." Web searches for such terms typically yield "page could not be found" messages, and generally do not inform the user that the search has been censored.

Under dictates of China's official Propaganda Department, the domestic print media are forbidden to publish articles on the events of June 1989 inconsistent with the government's version. In 2003, then-US Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton pulled her memoirs from sale in China after it was revealed that her Chinese publisher had without her approval omitted her references to the 1989 democracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square.

Like individuals who speak publicly about Tiananmen, media outlets that do so are also punished. In June 2007, the Sichuan province daily newspaper the *Chengdu Evening News* reportedly sacked three editorial staff after the paper ran a classified ad which paid tribute to the families of victims of the Tiananmen Massacre. Copies of the paper which carried the one-line ad with the words "Saluting the strong mothers of the victims of 64 [a reference to June 4]" were quickly pulled from circulation.

On March 31, 2009, Beijing Public Security Bureau officers briefly detained Jiang Qisheng, 61, deputy chairman of the Independent Chinese PEN Centre and a former Tiananmen Square student protester, due to concerns that he was writing an article to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Tiananmen Massacre. "They said not a single article was allowed this year for the 20th anniversary," Jiang later told the *South China Morning Post*.

In 1995, former Tiananmen student protester and political activist Li Hai was sentenced to nine years in prison on charges of violating state secrets laws for compiling a list of names of those killed in June 1989. Li spent the majority of his jail term in solitary confinement.

One result of this official chokehold on information about June 1989 is a profound lack of public knowledge of one of the most important events in China in living memory. At least three foreign news organizations including a US Public Broadcasting Service program, *Frontline*, have conducted informal surveys over the past 10 years, asking groups of university students and Beijing residents to identify the context of the photograph-iconic outside of China-of "tank man," an unidentified Beijing citizen who on June 5, 1989, stood down a column of 17 army tanks near Tiananmen Square. Few if any have been able-or willing-to do so.

Human Rights Watch Recommendations

To the Chinese Government:

- The Chinese government should issue an immediate amnesty for those still imprisoned on charges related to the events of June 1989 and launch an independent review of their cases to determine possible miscarriages of justice in terms of violations of due legal process. The government should absolve and compensate those individuals determined to have been unfairly or illegally imprisoned.
- The Chinese government should immediately permit the unimpeded return of Chinese citizens exiled due to their connections to the events of June 1989.
- The Chinese government should respect and enforce citizens' rights to freedom of speech and expression and cease the detention and harassment of individuals who challenge the official account of the events of June 1989.

- The Chinese government should permit an independent inquiry into the events of June 1989. Such an inquiry should be open to the public, allow the participation of victims' families, including the Tiananmen Mothers, and the substance of its proceedings and conclusions should be made public in a complete and timely manner. Such an inquiry is obviously impossible until the government stops harassing and silencing the victims of the events of June 1989 and takes substantive steps to preserve the historical record of what transpired at that time. When these prerequisites have been met, the Chinese government should issue and uphold explicit public guarantees that participants will not be subject to official reprisals.
- The Chinese government should initiate a mechanism for victims of the violence of June 1989 and/or their family members to claim official compensation for their losses.
- The Chinese government should launch criminal proceedings against any government and military officials who gave the orders for and/or participated in the use of lethal force against unarmed civilians in Beijing and other major cities in June 1989.
- The government should amend its recently released National Action Plan for Human Rights to include specific references which stipulate respect for the rights of the victims of June 1989 and their families.

To the International Community

- The European Union should resist calls to lift its arms embargo until the Chinese government completes an independent public investigation of the crackdown and holds accountable those government and military officials responsible for the use of lethal force against unarmed civilians. In addition, the EU should insist on a general amnesty for all those jailed for all forms of peaceful protest in China. Those convictions should be reviewed and overturned if there were procedural safeguards or lack of evidence of serious criminal acts.
- Governments, particularly those that have bilateral human rights dialogues with the Chinese government, should make their concerns about the 1989 crackdown and its legacy a touchstone of its engagement with the Chinese government on human rights, and establish measurable benchmarks and timelines for the Chinese government to address the rights abuses, past and present, connected to the events of 1989.
- Foreign governments should urge China to amend its recently released National Action Plan for Human Rights to include specific references which stipulate respect for the rights of the victims of June 1989 and their families and actionable targets and deadlines to ensure those rights are respected.
- Foreign governments should publicly observe the 20th anniversary of the events of June 1989 by opening their embassies in Beijing to the general public on June 3-4, 2009, as safe zones where Chinese citizens could access uncensored information about the events of June 1989, and engage in discussions about those events and their legacy.
- Those countries with bilateral human rights dialogues with China should make these recommendations a key component of their human rights engagement with China in 2009.

Member states of the Berne Process for human rights engagement with China should reconvene on or around June 3-4 to discuss means to adopt and implement these recommendations.

Source URL: <http://www.hrw.org/news/2009/05/13/tiananmen-legacy>

Links:

[1] <http://www.hrw.org/news/2009/05/13/tiananmen-legacy>

© Copyright 2013, Human Rights Watch

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Richardson, thank you very much. You know, let us pick up on your last point about the upcoming summit on Friday and Saturday with President Obama and President Xi. What will President Xi's takeaway be if human rights are not robustly discussed, if individual cases like, you mentioned, Cheng Guangcheng are not brought up? Cheng Guangcheng sat right where Dr. Yang is sitting, just a few weeks ago and made a passionate appeal for his nephew and other family members who are being retaliated against. His nephew is really a surrogate for him. He is now free, relatively speaking, and his family, immediate family, but the other members of his family are being tortured, including his nephew. And Liu Xiaobo, a fellow Nobel Peace Prize winner, just like President Barak Obama, continues to languish in prison and, you know, his wife pretty much under house arrest.

It seems—as you said, it used to be standard practice that there would be political prisoners, religious prisoners and others who would be released when summitry would occur. It seems to me that at the very least, our side, our President needs to make a very strong and aggressive—diplomatic, but aggressive appeal for these people who are suffering with such impunity.

Anyone like to handle that? Dr. Yang?

Mr. YANG. Yeah. This hearing is timely, because we all know there is going to be a summit between President Obama and President Xi. I strongly believe that President Obama should set the tone of U.S.-China relations in this summit for his new administration and for the new leadership of China.

This is a crucial moment to signal to the leadership of China that the quality of its relationship with the United States largely depends on how it treats its own citizens and on whether it leads by the universally accepted human rights norms for its international and domestic policies.

Failure on President Obama's part to speak up and address the human rights concerns will send the wrong message to the leadership, the new leadership, of China about U.S. priorities, and it may encourage the new leadership, the new Chinese leaders, to allow the human rights abuses to continue.

While we don't oppose the United States vigorously engaging with China, with Chinese Government, on other issues, including economic relations, treaty relations, North Korea and other security issues, we believe and hope President Obama will engage with some vigor on human rights concerns. So I think it is a very good opportunity for him to raise the very important cases of prisoners, as Mr. Chairman just mentioned: Cheng Guangcheng, Liu Xiaobo, Wang Bingzhang, Gao Zhisheng. All these prisoners of conscience, we are not forgetting them. And President Obama should raise the cases in the meeting.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. Mr. Wei?

Mr. WEI. I think that in the past few decades, the human rights diplomacy of the United States has established a very reputable image of the United States. Not only with good image, it has also produced a very effective result, which ultimately resulted in the collapse of the Communist clique. And Representatives here maybe still remember since the passage of PNTR, the permanent normal

trade relations, with China, the human rights in China situation has been rapidly deteriorated.

I think from the perspective to have a good new image of the United States or to establish this soft power for United States, the United States should really holding up this ticket of human rights again.

I agree with Dr. Yang that right during the meeting between President Obama and President Xi, we really should do something regarding human rights; however, I feel more important for the United States Congress and the administration to design a new strategy and to put human rights on the front line and for the future.

President Obama said that human rights and the universal value is a big advantage for United States. If so, why don't you take this advantage up front instead of waste your time with the Communist regime for other issues? So I hope more that the United States will have a new strategy, a new policy. I had European politicians ask me, what is the diplomacy of the United States? They don't have one. Because if you do not take advantage of your universal value, then indeed you do not have advantage diplomatically.

Mr. SMITH. Let me say briefly, when Wei Jingsheng was let out of prison in order to get the 2000 Olympics, I was actually in Beijing and had dinner with him. He said something that I will never forget. He said when American officials—any official, but especially American officials, especially the President of the United States—speaks precisely, transparently, but boldly about human rights, they beat us less when we are in the Laogai, or the gulags of China. When you are vacillating, weak and dismissive of the human rights agenda, they beat us more. It gets right down to that level, to the prison guards and to the prison wardens.

And I am wondering, you know, for us to miss an opportunity to speak out boldly and aggressively on behalf of these dissidents, who are being tortured, harassed, and degraded in every way imaginable, for us not to take that, would you, the other panelists, agree with Mr. Wei's assessment that we need to have a more muscular human rights policy?

And secondly, Dr. Yang, you made mention in your statement, and I thought it was very, very interesting, that 60 peaceful transitions to democracy have come as a surprise to the United States, because policymakers did not pay attention to the students, to the victims, to the activists, but we were focused like a laser beam, regrettably, on the political elite, who have very little regard for the human rights of other people.

You also made a point, and I thought it was very profound, and I said in my opening that economic growth means everything; that they have inculcated in China among the elite a corruption that is indescribable, and that is what keeps them afloat, as you put it in your testimony, your written testimony. And I wonder if any of our panelists would like to speak to that.

The conventional wisdom is that if we somehow trade more with China, they will matriculate from dictatorship to democracy, but as you have laid out, Dr. Yang, precisely the opposite has been occurring, especially since most favored nation status, now PNTR, was granted. You said that we are actually keeping the dictatorship

afloat; that they have carved out the elite, they reward the elite, and through corruption and through gross human rights abuse, especially through torture, they are able to keep the dictatorship intact. If you would like to speak to that.

Mr. AIKMAN. Yeah. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

I think the Chinese Government would learn a lot by taking a few pages out of the history of South Africa. When the South African apartheid regime fell, many Black Africans were very, very angry at the way they had been treated by the regime that had just been overturned, and so what the South African Government decided to do was to have a truth and reconciliation committee.

One of the things that is clear when you study China and modern Chinese history is the Chinese Communist Party is terrified of the Chinese people. They think that they may be thrown out of power for not being sufficiently nationalistic. They—and the Chinese people are terrified of the Communist Party and the power that they have.

The only way out of this dilemma of absolutely polar opposition and fear is for some sort of reconciliation committee to come into place and to begin to examine the charges the Chinese people feel they have to lay at the base of the Communist Party and have the Communist Party be held accountable for those crimes which they have committed.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I actually just wanted to add a quick point onto your question about what happens if there is no really audible human rights-related intervention from President Obama this coming weekend. I think it is actually two different problems. One is that it would—it conveys such a lack of seriousness of purpose to fail to take that opportunity. I can't help but wonder for an administration that has said repeatedly in public that it takes a whole-of-government approach to promoting human rights issues, I can't help but wonder, you know, what was on Jack Lew's agenda a couple of weeks ago, what was on Tom Donilon's agenda, what were the human rights issues they were taking up in this whole-of-government approach? It is very hard to know that.

And if you say that you were going to make vigorous human rights diplomacy a part of all of your interactions, and then it is awfully hard to know what those were, it is very easy for Xi Jinping to walk away and say, I didn't get challenged about anything. Why should I take any of this terribly seriously?

And that has a related problem, which I think is ratifying a sense of incredible exceptionalism that the Chinese Communist Party holds up. The Chinese may have signed on to international human rights covenants, but it is different. It gets to proceed on these matters its way. And to not be challenged on that, I think, only reinforces that sense. And so it is incredibly important to finally push back hard and clearly in a way that is audible not just to the kinds of people who are sitting in this room, but to a much broader audience in China, which is looking for some kind of leadership and some kind of responsiveness to speak to the kinds of problems they are dealing with every day.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Mr. WEI. I just want to put some addition. In the past, lots of American officials, including congressional Representatives, when

they were dealing with the Chinese Communist Government, they felt a lot of those officials were very hard, like a piece of iron board, and they seemed to have the same opinions.

In the first 20 years after June 4th massacre in 1989, indeed that was a sort of that situation, but in the past 4 years or so, even within the Communist Government, there are people stand out and talking about human rights and universal values. So we should let President Obama know this is a good opportunity, because if there is a voice for human rights, then we could hear even more for human rights talks from the Chinese Government. So if we talk about human rights now, emphasize that, then it will have more impact to those officials within the Communist leadership, which also would have more impact to the people inside of China.

Ms. CHAI. I would like to add a few words.

Mr. SMITH. Please.

Ms. CHAI. I do believe that this Friday when President Obama meets with President Xi, not only does he need to emphasize the human rights importance for China, but it is crucial and necessary for American security to do so.

And I want to remind all of us that President Abraham Lincoln, in his second inauguration speech about lack of justice to free the slaves, had called the severe casualty and loss in the war, saying,

“Fondly we hope, fervently do we pray that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if it be God’s will that it will continue until all the wealth piled up by the bondsman’s 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lashes shall be paid by another drawn with a sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.”

There is a rumor that China today finished their first submarines. They are in the process of making five more. And America has the most submarines in the whole world, 16 of them. Is China going into an arms race against America?

God gave us a blueprint for how we can achieve peace. I know today we use the words “human rights,” and “democracy” to replace the fundamental truth of God, but I think it is really important for us to go back to that. In Isaiah 32:17, God said, “The fruit of their righteousness will be peace. Its effect will be quietness and confidence forever.” So the path to peace is to act justly, love mercy, walk humbly with the Lord our God.

And the crucial timing for President Obama to uplift and honor the tradition of faith America is founded upon, one Nation under God, is because this is the first beginning of President Xi Jinping’s legacy. He is eager to learn, he is eager to build the right relationship with America. America must stand strong not just for this country, but for the world.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Dr. Yang? And then I will go to Mr. Meadows.

Mr. YANG. At this point I want to address a myth, widely believed myth, in the international community. Actually I have been amazed by this well-entrenched myth, you know, believed by world leaders, the policymakers and the scholars. The myth goes as fol-

low: That because China will punish those taking a strong stance on human rights with its growing economic power, affecting their all-important treaty relations with China, the human rights issue should take a back seat. That is a myth. But this myth is anything but tested. There is no past evidence to show it.

We should ask—I list a lot of questions here. We should ask, what do—do you think, the world leaders, China will do in response to a strong human rights stance? Do you really believe that China will quit treaty with a country whose goods it needs because the country demands better treatment of its citizens? How much will affect your economy, for example, United States economy, and are you willing or able to accept this are to come? How much will it affect China's economy? And what does it mean to this regime?

We all know that the only source of legitimacy for this regime to continue is economic well-being, so I think that is the last thing that they would try to jeopardize.

Questions are, will China be willing or able to accept a cost? So let us calculate how much we spent on the Iraq War, which toppled a dictator. If China really retaliates against this country with its economic power, how much are we willing to pay to help topple China's dictatorship? How much less the American taxpayers will pay for the spending of defense if China becomes a democracy? So we should consider these questions.

I found this is—you know, some fear is self-imposed fear. We have to test it. This means to break it. I, too, have past experience to show otherwise. I just give you a couple of examples.

Number one, Liu Xiaobo was awarded the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize. The Chinese Government came out, fought to sanction Norway for this award, and just 4 days after award ceremony, December 14th, China and Norway struck an oil deal despite tensions. That is in the title of Wall Street Journal, and I read the first paragraph, okay: Beijing, China, oil field services limited. A unit of one of China's largest oil companies has signed a long-term oil-drilling contract with Norway's Statoil, demonstrating that Beijing's fury over the award of a Nobel Peace Prize to jailed dissident Liu Xiaobo may not stop major commercial deals.

And most recent example is Cheng Guangcheng. Both the Congress and the executive branch took a very strong stance on his case last year, getting him successfully to United States. What happened afterward? We still have a normal relationship, treaty relationship. Nothing affected the relation of the two countries.

And for Oslo, I went back in May 2011 to check. I come to a staff member in—you know, who is dealing with trade with China about the quota of salmon importing—imported to China. He told me officials, Chinese officials, who told him how to get around of the—you know, the sanction. So they have to go through Hong Kong to avoid the sanction.

So I think this is—this myth we have to test to break.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much.

Mr. MEADOWS.

Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank each of you for your testimony and obviously highlighting this on an ongoing basis. The chairman has been very vocal for a number of years on

human rights violations and how we need to continue to not only highlight that, but address it.

And I guess my concern with this hearing today is that I have been in this very room hearing a number of issues over the last months, whether it be child abduction, whether it be human trafficking, whether it be a one-child policy, a number of human rights violations and religious freedom violations not only in China, but in a number of countries, and yet finding a way to make that part of our negotiations or part of our foreign policy is very difficult to put in.

And so, Dr. Yang, you mentioned that it had to have an economic component. And I would be interested, Dr. Richardson and Dr. Aikman, for you to comment on that. How do we highlight it more than just having President Obama mention it this week in terms of—that it is important? How do we get beyond the rhetoric and make sure that we let them understand that it is a critical thing that we are wanting to emphasize and have corrected?

Dr. Aikman, you can go first.

Mr. AIKMAN. Well, I go back to South Africa. In the pressure to get South Africa to change its policy of apartheid and to abandon it, there were various very strict trade regulations that American companies were willing to agree to force the South African Government to change its policy toward Black South Africans, and these policies were very effective. So I think on a smaller scale, American States and cities and corporations could put selective pressure on parts of the Chinese Government that deals with foreign trade to force them to adopt a more humane human rights policy.

Mr. MEADOWS. Okay. Dr. Richardson?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I have a long list of suggestions, but I will give you my top three.

Mr. MEADOWS. Okay.

Ms. RICHARDSON. There are certain issues for any government that are discomfiting and they desperately want to avoid having to talk about in public, so you can, you know, retrofit this depending on which government you are talking about. But I think there are three or four issues for the Chinese Government that simply have to be made inescapable topics of conversation at every single senior-level summit, regardless of whether it is about a security issue, an intelligence issue, a trade issue, you know; and it should be some combination of issues related to ethnic minorities, individual cases, or certain key aspects of the rule of law. And it is not difficult to figure out how to fit that into a whole-of-government approach.

I am actually a proponent of a whole-of-government approach partly because often—you know, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs bureaucrats from China are very good at thwarting those conversations. Try to have that conversation with a different part of the Chinese Government, Ministry of Justice, the public security, and it is a very—I think it tends to be a very different conversation, in some cases much more effective. But doing that well requires that the President instructs Cabinet members to do this and creates an expectation that they will follow through on it, and they will be expected to report back.

Look, I think there is also much to be said for the idea of setting out benchmarks on certain key issues. You know, there shouldn't be endless rounds, for example, of labor dialogues that don't have built into them specific concrete steps that the Chinese side needs to take in order for there to be another round of dialogue. And our single biggest complaint about the human rights dialogues is that having them at all, wholly apart from whether they are useful, has become the deliverable in and of itself; that simply to get one scheduled and to take place becomes the goal rather than to insist on certain kinds of changes being made.

Mr. MEADOWS. So what you are saying is set a benchmark and then say we want to see these concrete—these three or five or six concrete steps toward reaching that benchmark needs to be part of our foreign policy?

Ms. RICHARDSON. Right. I mean, imagine, you know, there were some functional equivalent of the WTO for human rights issues. Right? I mean, there are standards that must be met, and if one party doesn't adhere to those, there are consequence. Right? I mean, obviously we are not going to establish WTO for human rights issues, but it is the same logic, that in order to have the next phase of a discussion, you have to show some commitment, some seriousness of purpose and some willingness to change, not that these dialogues just become an endless series of diplomatic interactions in and of themselves.

Mr. MEADOWS. One of—one of the things that we look at, and Dr. Aikman mentioned South Africa, but one of the issues that we have is really one of stability, that their government right now wants to have this stable environment as there is a free flow of information via the Internet. And obviously the sanctioning of that creates, I guess, more freedom of speech, which creates perhaps an unstable environment within China or the Chinese Government.

Where—should those be—should that be one of the benchmarks that we look at is Internet freedom and the ability of free speech within—and promoting that as part of their human rights? Dr. Yang?

Mr. YANG. I have a very specific suggestion for the congressional resolution. Maybe my ideas were wild, but I have been thinking a measure, a tax benefit. And China is huge, of different provinces, although the governments of different level all have the nature, same nature, but the violations vary from place to place. So we may each year single out a number of provinces where the human rights record is really bad, and those who are doing business, American businessmen doing business in these provinces, will not enjoy a tax benefit, whatever they are, and encourage internal competition on human rights record.

Mr. MEADOWS. So what you are saying is there is enough of a difference in human rights violations within provinces within China—

Mr. YANG. Yes.

Mr. MEADOWS [continuing]. That you can set that up?

Mr. YANG. Yes. So there is a variation we can take advantage of, and we will encourage the provincial leaders to compete for human rights record.

Mr. MEADOWS. And I see some nods there from Dr. Richardson and Dr. Aikman. You would concur with that?

Mr. AIKMAN. Yes. I think it is quite compatible with China's disparate state governments competing with each other for foreign business to be able to reward those provinces that are more favorable to human rights by giving them economic benefits and by withholding them from the really strict regimes in other provinces.

Mr. YANG. Yes. The local government officials, you know, we have two criterion, two criterion for the promotion of local officials: One is GDP; the other is stability. So GDP is a very important thing for all the local officials.

Mr. MEADOWS. So which provinces would be most problematic when it comes to human rights?

Mr. YANG. You know, Beijing, of course, is very problematic, and Sichuan is another one. In Sichuan we have Liu Xianbin, Chen Wei, Chen Xi, all sentenced recently to 10 years. They are all participants of the Tiananmen Square movement. And after they released, they resumed their activism and being arrested again and sentenced to long prison terms.

So we can do the study very easy to come up with a record for each province. And if it is possible for the Congress to introduce such bill, I think it will help China to improve human rights very effectively.

Mr. MEADOWS. And, Mr. Chairman, if you would, can I have one more question, please?

So if you could comment, each one of you, and discuss perhaps the relationship between human rights and a democratic government versus the government that is there now. Are they mutually exclusive, or do we have to—do we have to have that? And I will start down on your end, Dr. Richardson.

Ms. RICHARDSON. You have hit upon a personal pet peeve of mine. I mean, look, it is black letter international law that governments are meant to be formed by free and fully enfranchised periodic elections. And last time I checked, the leadership transition that just took place was the function of denying 850 million people the right to vote, not premised on soliciting their views. The fact that the U.S. and many others failed to note that, as they regularly do around the world, is, to me, yet another example of Chinese exceptionalism.

Do we know, if the Chinese people were allowed to vote freely tomorrow, who or what they would choose? I think that is—I think that is very hard to say. But is this—is the current permutation or could it be legitimately called a representative government? No.

Mr. MEADOWS. Dr. Aikman.

Mr. AIKMAN. Yeah. I think there are many components to a free society. Free elections are obviously very important, but the rule of law is even more important. If you have a society which has innumerable elections and doesn't have the rule of law, the protection of property rights, the protection of the right of free speech, free—the right of religious expression, you can have all the elections in the world, and you won't have freedom. China needs to be held to account on standards of the rule of law as much as standards of political democracy.

Ms. CHAI. Yes. I would like to make a comment. You know, God said man does not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God.

I do feel in the past 24 years, the U.S.-China relationship was mostly based on economic relationships, on bread, and not on the value and the word of God. And I do believe the leaders of China are eager to search for what would be the system that could really secure and create a just nation.

The Tiananmen movement started on the eve of the death of reform leader Hu Yaobang, and he advocated for three reforms: Economic reform, political reform and spiritual reform. But unfortunately Deng Xiaoping only wanted one reform; that is, economic reform. We know today, looking back, it did not work. The most beautiful thing is not only we know it did not work, they know it did not work.

It was when I learned one of the Chinese Government's supported economists, Zhao Xiao, came to know Christ Jesus, it was very powerful. He said in a recent meeting with me, in 1992 after 1989, they had the Tiananmen massacre, there was extreme leftist control against the whole country. That was just—everybody went into depression. And so Deng Xiaoping started, you know, to visit the south and started the reform.

So there were a lot of people getting more wealthy, and the country became prosperous. However, by the time they reached 1997, they realize that they still have a problem, and the gap between rich and poor became enlarged, and the corruption became even more vicious than ever. And so he was sent out by the Chinese Government's think tank to America to search for what would be the right way to build up this country. And he had a great conclusion. He said—he said as an atheist at that time, Zhao found God in America.

He wrote his essay, "Free Economy With or Without Church." With his permission, I paraphrase his findings. He said, what are the biggest differences between America and China? Was it because they differ in buildings, skyscrapers? No. Was it because they differed in wealth? No. Was it because they differed in scientific innovation? No. Was it because they differed in the market economy? No. Was it because they differed in political system? Well, not really. And so at the end, it was because they differed in the quantity and presence of the churches, which appear everywhere in every corner of America's cities, towns and suburbs. It was a fear of God. And that was absent in China.

And the fear of God kept America's crime rate lower and relative governmental corruption down. It was the church and belief in God that kept America hopeful, peaceful and prosperous compared to China's economy, where people often got rich not because of their hard work and innovation, but through open robbery, with power and through connections.

China has no good faith rule of law in business activities, because there is no fear of God. Particularly when they have power, they feel they can do whatever it takes. So certain people would lie and deceive each other to make quick buck. And there is no fear of facing God's ultimate judgment.

That is the value, how America was founded. That is the value Americans unfortunately do not talk so much about everywhere, not in the media, not in the educational system, not in the economy, not in business, not in the government, not in foreign policy.

To my deepest regret, it took me 20 years, 19 years after coming to America to finally come to find Jesus Christ through my own home country's Christian hero, who endured persecution, who suffered in prison three times where God exhibited miracles through his suffering.

One time he was in prison, he refused food and water for 74 days. We knew it was a physical miracle that he survived, he did not die. God enabled him to live to tell the story. The third time he was in prison, his legs were broken, but he heard God tell him to go. At 8 a.m. in the morning, he was able to walk through three metal gates and got to freedom, and he arrived to a place where the address had been given to him in his dream, and there the brothers and sisters received him and said, Brother Yun, the Lord told us you will be coming here today. We have prepared for you a hiding place. Within ½ hour he was able to go to the safe place. Then, only then, he realized his legs were fully healed.

Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you. Thank you.

Ms. CHAI. And it was this kind of experience—

Mr. MEADOWS. I am out of time, so I am going to—

Ms. CHAI. Sorry.

Mr. MEADOWS [continuing]. Yield back to the chairman, but thank you so much.

Ms. CHAI. You are very welcome. Thank you.

Mr. MEADOWS. And I appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Stockman.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yeah. I have a question, and I don't know if it has been asked. I apologize, Mr. Chairman. I had to run down to a function.

I want to know from our standpoint what we can do to facilitate more freedom of expression in China. So often, I think, to be honest, we are naive about what to do, and I think we do the wrong thing, and we typically stick our foot in our mouth or whatever. And I want to know from your standpoint if you could all just give a quick summary of what we should be doing, because I think that would help the chairman, myself, and others.

I apologize for our ignorance, but we just look from the outside. And as you were a Time correspondent, I read your magazine at that time, and that—your magazine, by the way, has changed dramatically, but that is where we get our information. So we don't know what to do. And I apologize for that standpoint, but we need your feedback on that.

Mr. AIKMAN. Well, forgive me for being the first to respond. It is a good question.

I always think that the best thing for people to do when a country exercises oppression and denial of free speech over its own people is every time a representative of that country comes outside of his country or her country, and you have a chance to speak to that person, complain, complain, tell them this is wrong, this is not right, this is against civilization, it is against decency, it is against truth. You claim to want to have a great civilization. How can you

have a great civilization if you constantly suppress truth? Grow up. And I think you have to be very aggressive about this.

Mr. WEI. I think it is very important to bring freedom, especially Internet freedom, such as this resolution Representative Smith was talking about, Global Online Freedom Act. That is really important, and that is a very solid way to push for the progress of freedom in China, because nowadays the Chinese Government use Internet to make their suppression, but meanwhile the Chinese people also use Internet, and they put the pressure back to the Chinese Government. That is the most powerful way.

However, due to lack of freedom on Internet, so therefore, when the government is competing with the Chinese people, the Chinese people are put in disadvantage than the government. There are lots of people whose blogs or speech on the Internet are very welcomed by the people; however, those speeches were immediately deleted by the Chinese Internet police, and so therefore, this effect is very limited.

Mr. STOCKMAN. But isn't some of the technology you speak of sold by the United States to China's suppression of the Chinese people by Yahoo, Google and other companies?

Mr. WEI. We know there are lots of American companies, Internet company, doing business in China; however, they do accept this restriction from the Chinese Government, and therefore, they have a sort of censorship, which bring inconvenience for the Chinese citizens.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, by the way, you can put me on your bill. I appreciate that.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Dr. Richardson, do you have any comments on how we could improve our communication?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I think the only suggestion I would add to that, partly because I think there has been tremendous interest shown particularly by Chinese Internet users in everything from photographs of Gary Locke buying his own coffee to, you know, the posting of tax returns of senior U.S. officials online, the more people like you make yourselves available for Web chats, make sure that important discussions get translated into Chinese—we are obviously big fans of the language services that make it possible for people inside China to listen to VOA and RFA—I think demonstrating how we—how people in the U.S. Use those mechanisms both to hold our own officials to account, but also to communicate with people who are interested in talking to people like you to normalize that idea is really useful and helpful.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Actually, I watch CCTV, and I am probably one of the few people who watch it.

Go ahead. You two.

Mr. YANG. There are a lot of things actually you can do. I support Mr. Wei's idea. Internet is very important for people to communicate to remain connected in China. And the U.S. Government has some funding to support development of a software with which the Chinese back inside China can get around a firewall, but I heard that very small percentage of the money actually put into good use. So I don't have the number.

Mr. STOCKMAN. It is shocking our Government would waste money.

Mr. YANG. Yeah.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Never heard of that before.

Mr. YANG. I think Congress should continue to push for that and to get more funding for the development of a software.

Number two, I think there is some idea we should promote; that is, reciprocity. All the Chinese officials, scholars, whether, you know, they have opinions or views in line with the government or not, they can express it freely here, they can publish their papers here, you know, they can run Web sites and everything here without censorship. But when the U.S. officials travel in China, usually their speeches are censored. I think, Mr. Chairman, you have personal experience there, right?

So I think, of course, complete reciprocity is impossible, but we have to promote this kind of idea. We have to insist that when the delegation of officials, scholars from this country travel in China, their speeches, their communications should not be censored. So that is the reciprocity idea we should promote.

Ms. CHAI. Yes. I am really grateful you are willing to stand up for those voiceless people, for the people who cannot act on their own behalf. So thank you.

And it reminded me of a story, what can we do to make things effective for the leaders in China to receive the message we want them to receive? And here in Colossians 3:17, it says, "Whatever you do, whether in word or deed, do it all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him."

I remember Bob Fu, who is not present here, and who is a believer, defending the prosecuted churches in China; he told me a story of a congressional leader, I forgot his name, that when he called on behalf of a few church believers who were being persecuted in China, the Chinese Embassy said, it is our internal affairs. It is not your problem. And this congressional leader said, it is my problem. They are my brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus. And there was such a strong silence from the Chinese leaders' side. I believe that word can be such a strong message, have such a heart, such value.

I also heard a story when recently a senior Chinese leader was visited by people who believed in Christ Jesus, and when lunch was served, when they prayed, the Chinese leader in turn was in tears. He said, "I have never heard people pray for me and my family in such a way, and especially I never saw anybody pray even for the people who make the food." So when we truly live into our beliefs, people really notice.

Dr. Aikman has been advocating for the South African model for China, you know, forgiveness and truth and reconciliation. I also studied about that part, the history, what caused that. I know I studied Desmond Tutu's book about reconciliation. I read it from cover to cover. And also President Nelson Mandela. And when Nelson Mandela came out from prison after 40 years, his first words were, I forgive them.

And we have to have the spirit of Jesus Christ, because he forgave us; therefore, we are all equal sinners. We can forgive each other. It is only then on that basis we can have true reconciliation.

And last June 4th, I made a statement and sent out to the Chinese newspapers and the Chinese community, saying, "I forgive them. I forgive the leaders who ordered the massacre." And today I am going to say that again: I forgive them.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank you. And also—

Ms. CHAI. And I know—

Mr. STOCKMAN. Go ahead.

Ms. CHAI. I know also that God dearly loves his children, and God is here waiting for them to know.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I know the home churches are growing very quickly.

Ms. CHAI. Supposedly 125 million people.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yeah. A lot of them I know in Guanju are—the leaders that are very wealthy are Christians. And the only word—I am not great in Chinese, but the only—one of the few words I know is "xie xie." So thank you so much for coming.

Ms. CHAI. Thank you.

Mr. STOCKMAN. And I just thank again the chairman for his wonderful leadership on this. And we continue to struggle for freedom, and I appreciate all your efforts. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Weber.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Stockman, that is not the only word you know in Chinese, is it?

I will direct this question to, I guess, everybody on the panel. Will the emergence of the free market, the free market, foster less government oppression and more human rights?

Why don't we start down here, Dr. Richardson.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Well, we are a couple of decades into the reform era, and as several people have noted, we have seen—

Mr. WEBER. Chinese leaders get wealthy?

Ms. RICHARDSON. Well, we have seen extraordinary economic growth, but in some, I think, indirect ways has given some people in China more control over their daily lives, although I think that mostly means in a practical sense that people can live outside of certain kinds of state constraints.

Mr. WEBER. I mean, obviously there are different levels of it, because you are talking about—or Dr. Yang was, about provinces—

Ms. RICHARDSON. Right.

Mr. WEBER [continuing]. That actually some have less human rights violations, and you want to hit them with a different—American companies with a different tax code. Is that what I understand?

Mr. YANG. Sure.

Mr. WEBER. Okay.

Ms. RICHARDSON. But I would just add that I think alongside that economic development, that alone has brought with it some fairly uncorrected, serious human rights abuses, in addition to being a model that is essentially imposed on certain parts of the country who have no ability to benefit from it and who have no ability to opt out of it, such as in Tibet or in Xinjiang. So I think a rising GDP isn't necessarily indicative of a greater compliance with the rule of law. And as several people have mentioned, there—

Mr. WEBER. Well, Dr. Aikman pointed out earlier that the greatness of society depends on truth, honesty, and modesty. I kept waiting for him to say truth, justice, and the American way.

But the truth of the matter is in China, those officials define their own truth. Now, you said they believed in scientific truth, but what Ms. Chai there is describing is the ultimate truth, the moral truth of the universe. If China doesn't believe in moral truth, and they get to define their own truth, then I would submit to you that of the two, the moral truth, that of the Lord Jesus, as she is pointing out, is indeed tantamount in having a sweeping—and I don't want to start preaching up here—but having a sweeping revival in China, and then we usher in human rights, we usher in sanctity of life.

And let me just ask you all a question. Of these five institutions—let us take the Christian Church; let us take the free market that I just talked about, the free market in China; let us talk about world opinion; let us talk about U.S. policy, that would be us; and let us talk about the Chinese people—of those five, what is your opinion, which is the most able to influence the Chinese Government? I will go back through them: The Christian Church, the free market that we talked about, world opinion, U.S. policy, or Chinese people. Most influential.

Mr. AIKMAN. Mr. Congressman, if I may respond, I think history has shown, amongst other things, that capitalism is completely compatible with authoritarian government. The Nazis managed to have a very authoritarian government and a very successful capitalist system. So capitalism was thought for a long time to be the catalyst for real freedom, but it didn't prove to be so in China.

I think you have to change the thinking, the spiritual values of the civilization that contains them. And China will never, ever become a great power and a respected power unless it changes its moral values and accepts freedom, and reconciliation, and the values of truth and justice. I think nothing will happen unless those things take place.

Mr. WEBER. Dr. Yang?

Mr. YANG. Yes, a free market, generally speaking, helps reduce government's repression, but the problem with China is there is no free market there. There is no free market there. There is tremendous government intervention in the market, in the economy. If you have a friend here who are doing business in China, ask him to tell you the truth of what they are doing there. The first thing—the first order of business they have to do is to try to find a relationship in the government.

So there is no free market. There is a big gap between the wealthy and the poor. That is not outcome of market; that is outcome of politics.

Mr. WEBER. But to create that kind of free market where actually that gap gets closed, and, in reality, as John Kennedy said—

Mr. YANG. Of course, I think the five things that you just pointed out all help to influence China. All—and the Chinese Government, but ultimately the most important factor is Chinese people themselves.

Mr. WEBER. So how do we get them more involved in taking this fight to the government leaders?

Mr. YANG. So, you know, what we are doing today is, you know, one of the most important things we do. We should voice—you know, help to voice—give a voice to those who—who cannot have a voice in China and try to apply pressure to the China Government so that they will give some space that the people’s voice can grow in China.

Ultimately the most important thing is the Chinese people themselves. They have to grow democracy forces, and democracy forces must become transformed into a viable opposition. And for all this, without international support, our work will become much, much more difficult.

Mr. WEBER. Is that happening?

Mr. YANG. Yeah, it is happening.

Mr. WEBER. So—and then now you come in behind it and say world opinion is very important.

Mr. YANG. Of course, world opinion—

Mr. WEBER. We have to stand up and say we support.

Mr. YANG. Of course. China is open. China cannot close its door. So China is open. We get all information from the outside world, so the Communist leaders, they understand how democracy works. A lot of people have a misunderstanding, thinking that they don’t know, you know, how democracy works, why democracy is good for the people of China, because—you know, sometimes it is because they are—simply because they do know, they know very well how democracy works, they resist the democratization.

Mr. WEBER. Sure.

Mr. YANG. So I think world opinion is very important, too. All the five factors you point out are important, but, you know, ultimately we need people to grow, and we need a group of leaders who can transform the group—

Mr. WEBER. Who can evangelize those people.

Mr. YANG. Yeah.

Mr. AIKMAN. Literally.

Mr. YANG. Literally.

Mr. WEBER. And we will move over to Ms. Chai.

Ms. CHAI. Thank you so much for your faith and your word of encouragement. I just rejoice in the fellowship you are sharing with us. I want to hear more and more U.S. leaders like yourself lift the name of Jesus up.

You listed the five things that can influence the leaders of China, but I couldn’t write them fast enough to list all of them. My general impression is, all of them are idols, and there is only one truth: That is Jesus Christ. And how do we convey that? Again, God gives a word of strategy. He said in Revelation: They triumph over him, which the evil—

Mr. WEBER. By the word of their mouth and their testimony.

Ms. CHAI. Amen.

Mr. WEBER. Amen.

Ms. CHAI. Amen, Jesus.

And we have got to share our personal testimonies of how God’s grace saved us, because the leaders of China, they are just like us. They are created in God’s image, and they have a heart searching for truth.

And I—my heart broke, because I—in 1989, in May, before the massacre happened, I went to search for Deng Xiaoping. I wanted to tell him that we are not against him. We have no animosity toward him. We wanted reform, we wanted peace.

Mr. WEBER. Is the church growing in China?

Ms. CHAI. Yes.

Mr. WEBER. You said 125 million?

Ms. CHAI. Absolutely.

And I stayed until—we stayed until 6 a.m. at Tiananmen Square. I stayed at Tiananmen Square because I heard a rumor that America would come if the massacre took place, or something. America did not come. After 10 years, escaping to America, I was devastated to realize America did not come. But I am rejoicing: God had come to China.

Mr. WEBER. His kingdom is not of this world.

Ms. CHAI. Amen. And his kingdom cannot be shaken.

Mr. WEBER. Let's move over to Mr. Wei.

Ms. CHAI. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. WEI. So-called with the free market, then you can get more human rights and democracy. That is just an excuse made up by big American companies who want to do business in China, yet they do not want to pay a price for human rights.

Mr. WEBER. Does he usually have this problem of speaking his mind? Go ahead.

Mr. WEI. When there is no rule of laws, and to do business, one is totally reliant on some people in power, and then this country would never have a real, true free market.

More than 10 years ago when we have this debate of permanent normal trade relations we have talked about, even we start the trade, and what we would have is just a true big capitalist class in China, but not a free market. You could only get a true free market and also a sizable middle class when there is rule of law, and there is free speech, as well as there is fair treatment.

So let me emphasize what I just mentioned earlier. To have true freedom in China, you must have a free speech by the Chinese people, and that we already have a sizable netizen presence on the Internet, and they could put a lot of pressure over the Chinese Government.

Mr. WEBER. Let me say this. I am going to be through. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your indulgence. Back to Dr. Aikman, who said that the Chinese Government fears being thrown out of power, as I recall, because they don't display enough nationalism—

Mr. AIKMAN. Yes.

Mr. WEBER [continuing]. Or something to that effect. And so how do we get it—and I understand the importance of the Internet, and Ms. Chai, the free market is used by God to further people's countries.

Ms. CHAI. I agree.

Mr. WEBER. He lifts some up and he puts others down, by the way.

Ms. CHAI. I agree. Worshiping free economy alone, by God this is an idol.

Mr. WEBER. You and I are on the same page, sister.

Ms. CHAI. Thank you.

Mr. WEBER. What I wanted to say is what we need to be able to support—the Chinese people are going to have to—they are going to have to rise up and they are going to have to make this their aim and their goal and make it known to the government that, the Chinese Government, that they won't stand still for it. We are going to have to do our part, whether it is with trade sanctions or whether it is with encouraging evangelism, whether sending missionaries over there—sometimes I think they need to send missionaries over here—and we also need to be sure that we can encourage the Internet so that the word gets out more and more and more. But I think we need of a marriage, if you will, a partnership of policy, world opinion, Internet, and the Chinese people taking the lead in making their government to understand that this will no longer be tolerated. Is that fair?

Mr. AIKMAN. If I could comment, I think one thing the Chinese people don't want to see is a violent upheaval in their own society.

Mr. WEBER. When you say “Chinese people,” Doctor, government or all Chinese?

Mr. AIKMAN. All Chinese, I think. I visited China in 1993, and I talked to many Chinese intellectuals, some of whom had studied in the United States and Europe. And I said to them, don't you want to have political democracy in your country? And they said yes.

Mr. WEBER. But not at the price of bloodshed.

Mr. AIKMAN. But not quickly, not quickly. Because the explosion of anarchy that would emerge from people who have no experience at self-control in a political environment, no idea that you have to restrain yourself and allow other people to have their opinions. Without those constraints among the people, I don't think you are ever going to have a safe democracy in China.

Mr. WEBER. Was it Franklin who said, “He who trades security for liberty will soon have neither”?

Mr. AIKMAN. That's correct, quite correct. I do not agree with that opinion.

Lots of people did not realize that the Chinese people had to be divided into three major classes. Those super rich people are less than 1 percent. Of course, they do not want see any change in China because they really enjoy their lives. The 10 percent of so-called middle class, their life is reasonable. And they are not happy with the Communist rule. However, indeed, for their own sake, they do not want see China into chaos.

However, the very majority of Chinese who are very poor who cannot afford to send their children to school or have the medical care and whatever, they want to see China in chaos because that is opportunity to topple the Chinese Government and to have a new government to try. Those three classes are totally different. They do not have a common language.

Unfortunately, when the foreign journalists or foreign people went to China, the Chinese Government carefully arranged you to meet with the first class and second class, instead of third class. And the very importantly, this third class, all they could speak out of their mind is on the Internet.

And the very reason for the Chinese Government even within the government, people saying we have to reform is because they knew

if they do not reform, the people will revolt and they will topple down the government. So, therefore, I know this friend, he is indeed a good person, try to know China better. But when you are in China, at least to listen to the taxi driver, to know what they are talking about.

Mr. WEBER. Public opinion. Listen, I have gone way too long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much. Let me thank our very distinguished panelists for their lifelong leadership on behalf of Chinese human rights, rule of law and basic freedoms. You know, I would say to Dr. Aikman, I know you were talking about a very swift transfer of power. But obviously all Chinese people demand an immediate freedom from torture, cruel and degrading treatment. They demand an immediate freedom from religious persecution, which would include the Christians, the Muslim Uyghurs and the Falun Gong, who are tortured and treated with impunity in China today. They seek immediate freedom from coerced population control and forced abortion; immediate freedom from censorship and surveillance of people. I think the number that you put, Dr. Yang, was 39 million informants nationwide in your testimony. There must be freedom from the exploitation of labor, where only a few benefit from the labor of the many. There are so many other freedoms that need to be immediate and durable and sustainable.

So I want to thank each and every one of you for your testimony. Our hope, I think collectively, is that President Obama will be very robust and very clear in his representations on behalf of human rights; particularly on the behalf of some of those who have been long suffering in the Laogai and in jails of China, to be free.

He has a huge opportunity. As I think Chai Ling said, President Xi is brand new. He will be listening. What he hears ought to be what really animates the United States of America and so many other free countries, and that is that human rights are indivisible and they are every person's—every man, woman, and child's birthright. It belongs to them.

So thank you for your testimonies. And this hearing is adjourned. [Whereupon, at 5:07 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X



MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations
Christopher H. Smith (R-NJ), Chairman

May 30, 2013

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be held by the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations in Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live on the Committee website at www.foreignaffairs.house.gov):

DATE: Monday, June 3, 2013

TIME: 3:00 p.m.

SUBJECT: Tragic Anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen Square Protests and Massacre

WITNESSES: Mr. Wei Jingsheng
President
Wei Jingsheng Foundation

Ms. Chai Ling
Founder
All Girls Allowed

Yang Jianli, Ph.D.
President
Initiatives for China

David Aikman, Ph.D.
(Former Time magazine Bureau Chief in Beijing)

Sophie Richardson, Ph.D.
China Director
Human Rights Watch

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, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations HEARING

Day Monday Date June 3, 2013 Room 2172 Rayburn HOB

Starting Time 3:00 p.m. Ending Time 5:07 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

Electronically Recorded (taped)

Executive (closed) Session

Stenographic Record

Televised

TITLE OF HEARING:

Tragic Anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen Square Protests and Massacre

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Meadows, Rep. Bass, Rep. Stockman, Rep. Weber

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

Rep. Wolf*

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.)

Statement of Rep. Stockman
Questions for the Record from Rep. Stockman

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____

or
TIME ADJOURNED 5:07 p.m.

Gregory B. Simpkins
Subcommittee Staff Director

**Never Again: Remembering the Tiananmen Square Massacre
Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 3, 2013**

By Congressman Steve Stockman (TX-36)

The world held its breath on June 4, 1989, as Chinese citizens demanded their freedom. Tiananmen Square was packed with people just like you and me. And all across China, millions were challenging Communist tyrannical rule.

Never before had the Chinese people dared express their desire to be truly free; never before had the Chinese people stood together in Tiananmen Square and in locations all around the country with the simple, peaceful message of freedom.

For a moment, the dictatorship seemed unsure how to act. Allow real freedom? Brutally crush the demonstrations?

In the end, the dictators chose slaughter and imprisonment for the brave advocates of freedom. Then the propaganda began, sealing off the truth and injecting lies. Today, many Chinese youth have little idea their parents almost succeeded in bringing them freedom.

Our government shamefully never forced the butchers of Tiananmen to pay a price for their crimes against humanity. Indeed we reward their brutality. One example—the US invited China to participate in naval training exercises with the US Navy—teaching them tactics they might use against us in their scheme to seize the South China Sea.

Today, China only appears free. Their economic prosperity is a mask which disguises the tyranny which remains never more than a gunshot away from anyone who dares repeat that simple, peaceful message of freedom; so eloquently spoken in Tiananmen Square in 1989.

The Chinese Communist Party still maintains its iron grip on power. Ideas are censored with an iron fist, and the regime cracks down brutally at even the slightest hint of dissent. Their internet is censored by armies of workers to keep any mention of freedom and democracy away from the Chinese people.

It is easy to turn a blind eye. To ignore human rights violations as if they only matter at home; to pretend their expansionistic dictatorship is no threat; that their hacking has no effect on our prosperity or defense; that their unsafe food need be of little concern; that supporting freedom is a concern only within our own borders; and that China's aid to Iran's and North Korea's atomic weapons programs could never result in those bombs being used on the cities of our allies or our own.

History proves otherwise. Appease tyranny; pretend it isn't there; call it by politically-correct names, and pay the price. Weakness always encourages tyranny and aggression.

On the anniversary of the Tiananmen Square freedom rallies and massacre, let us pause and remember those who gave their lives and liberty to try to bring freedom and democracy to all Chinese citizens.

To the Chinese government; I call on you to allow the truth about the struggle for freedom in Tiananmen Square to be freely discussed; to admit how many were killed and imprisoned; and how many remain in prison or suffer discrimination today. I call on you to release all political and religious prisoners; allow open and free elections; and grant full freedom of speech, press and religion. You seek recognition as an equal with the free world; you must first become a free nation to earn such recognition.

To the Chinese people, I encourage you to demand your fundamental human rights. Beyond economic rights, you have the rights to freedom of speech; religious freedom; to elect the leaders of your choice and form political parties; to not have the internet censored; and to enjoy all other human rights as do citizens of free nations.

To President Obama, I encourage you to increase the pressure, both diplomatically and publicly, on China to join the community of free nations by forever ending restrictions on fundamental human rights; including freedom of speech, press and religion; and to allow open and free elections.

After the Holocaust, the world pledged "never again." Let's stand for freedom, and again take that pledge to support and assist everyone in China and around the world to achieve full human rights. Then there will never again be a massacre like in Tiananmen Square.



**QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD OF THE HONORABLE STEVE STOCKMAN WITH
RESPONSES FROM MR. WEI JINGSHENG**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH, GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHTS, AND
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS;
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS;
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

“TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1989 TIANANMEN PROTESTS AND MASSACRE”

June 3, 2013

1. What actions would be most useful for Congress to take to help advance human rights in China?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: The campaigns on the Internet launched by the Chinese netizens have already caused a great shock to the Communist regime. It is similar to the trend of the Jasmine Revolution in Egypt and Tunisia. But, with the help of US business, the Chinese government has much better Internet control ability than any other country. If in the arena of Internet freedom we could limit the censorship of the Communist government, as well as limit US business support to the Chinese Communist Party, then it will be a great help to all the freedoms of the Chinese people.

2. What actions would be most useful for the President to take to help advance human rights in China?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: Same as the above. The President of the United States also can appeal for individual cases. The pressure will be a very direct help to the victims.

3. What actions would be most useful for individual citizens in the US to take to help advance human rights in China?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: The American people should call on the US Congress and the US President to do something and to contribute to China's opposition groups. Donations to the Chinese opposition that amount to even less than ten percent of donations to animal welfare would greatly improve the human rights situation in China. Only the Chinese opposition groups are really applying pressure against the Communist regime. Many other so-called human rights organizations have not been concerned with China issues for several years now, due to their concern for donations. Many American business enterprises have investments or joint ventures in China. To avoid offense to the Communist regime, they will not make donations to the enemy of the Chinese Communists.

4. What would be the result if China's internet censorship system, the “Great Firewall” were defeated or broadly bypassed?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: The Chinese Communist Party is relying on the media to deceive the Chinese people. When it is unable to deceive the majority of people, it will collapse in six months to a year. The US Congress should urge the State Department to spend money on breaking through the Internet firewalls set up by the Chinese authoritarian regime. This will be more effective than the annual increase of hundreds of billions of dollars in military spending. It would be the modern equivalent of Voice of America and Radio Free Asia, and even better.

5. What is the greatest Achilles' heel of the Chinese Communist Party?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: The revolt and awakening of the lowest level of people in China, will be the basis for the downfall of the Communist Party. The internal struggle within the Chinese bureaucratic class will be the trigger for large-scale rebellion.

6. Were many Tiananmen Square prisoners killed for organ transplants?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: I do not have reliable information on this, thus I am unable to comment on this specific question. However, for decades now, the Chinese prisons have been harvesting organs from executed prisoners. Political prisoners would not be spared the same fate.

7. Would you consider the repression of the Tibetan people and the destruction of the Tibetan culture to be genocide?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: Of course that is a genocide. Although the Communist Party's repression against the Han Chinese and destruction of the Chinese culture is also a genocide; but for Tibetans, Uyghurs, Mongolians and other ethnic minorities, the Communist Party's genocide action is more obvious and serious.

8. What would likely be your punishment if you made the same statement you made to this committee in China?

Wei Jingsheng's Answer: I was put in prison for 18 years due to similar remarks. Thus I expect that probably at least 18 more years of jail time will be waiting for me for the statement I made to this committee, if it is not more serious.