

OPEN FORUM: PUBLIC PERSPECTIVES ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES IN CHINA

ROUNDTABLE

BEFORE THE

CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON CHINA

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

DECEMBER 9, 2002

Printed for the use of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.cecc.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

85-358 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2003

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) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON CHINA

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

Senate

MAX BAUCUS, Montana, *Chairman*
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
DIANNE FEINSTEIN, California
BYRON DORGAN, North Dakota
EVAN BAYH, Indiana
CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
BOB SMITH, New Hampshire
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas

House

DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska, *Co-Chairman*
JIM LEACH, Iowa
DAVID DREIER, California
FRANK WOLF, Virginia
JOE PITTS, Pennsylvania
SANDER LEVIN, Michigan
MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
JIM DAVIS, Florida

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

PAULA DOBRIANSKY, Department of State
GRANT ALDONAS, Department of Commerce
D. CAMERON FINDLAY, Department of Labor
LORNE CRANER, Department of State
JAMES KELLY, Department of State

GREG MASTEL, *Acting Staff Director*
JOHN FOARDE, *Deputy Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
Foarde, John, deputy staff director, Congressional-Executive Commission on China	1
Adler, Alan, executive director, Friends of Falun Gong, Tenafly, NJ	2
Fu, Christina, spouse of Yang Jianli, imprisoned in China, Brookline, MA	4
Senser, Robert A., editor, Human Rights for Workers, Reston, VA	5
Oyunbilig, executive director, the Inner Mongolian People's Party, Gaithersburg, MD	6
Mower, Joan, communications coordinator, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Washington, DC; accompanied by Brian Mabry, senior advisor for external relations, Voice of America, Washington, DC	8
Ciping, Huang, the Overseas Chinese Democracy Coalition, Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars, Senior Optical Engineering Consultant, Whitehouse, OH	10
APPENDIX	
PREPARED STATEMENTS	
Adler, Alan	26
Fu, Christina	27
Senser, Robert A	29
Oyunbilig	30
Mower, Joan	31
SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD	
Nunez, Kery Wilkie	33
Togocho, Enhebatu, president, Southern Mongolian Human Rights Information Center	34

OPEN FORUM: PUBLIC PERSPECTIVES ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES IN CHINA

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2002

CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE
COMMISSION ON CHINA,
Washington, DC.

The open forum was convened, pursuant to notice, at 2:31 p.m., in room SD-215, Dirksen Senate Office Building, John Foarde (deputy staff director) presiding.

Also present: Greg Mastel, acting staff director and chief trade counsel, Senate Finance Committee; Susan Weld, general counsel; Matt Tuchow, Office of Representative Sander Levin; and Tiffany McCullen, U.S. Department of Commerce.

OPENING STATEMENT OF JOHN FOARDE, DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR, CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON CHINA

Mr. FOARDE. Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon, and welcome to the open forum. I would ask you to take your seats, please. The panelists who are here in the room, if you could join us at the panel table.

Once the panelists have taken their seats, I would ask you to turn your name tags around and have them face us so we can be sure we are addressing the right person.

Again, good afternoon and welcome to the Congressional-Executive Commission on China's open forum. We are delighted that our panelists are here and that people that are here attending in the audience are here with us this afternoon.

This is the final public roundtable in the open forum format that we will have in this calendar year. But because we have considered it a very successful format, I am sure we will be having several next year along with our regular issues roundtables and the formal hearings that the Commission holds from time to time.

I would like to introduce, immediately to my left, to your right, the acting staff director of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, Greg Mastel, who masquerades in his other life as the chief trade counsel for the Senate Finance Committee and works for Senator Max Baucus. Greg, thanks for joining us today.

And immediately to his left, to your far right, Susan Roosevelt Weld, who is the general counsel of the Commission.

I would like to introduce our panelists, briefly, then we will do our usual procedure, which is to proceed from the window to the wall. We are obviously missing one, which is Dr. Greg Kulacki from

the Union of Concerned Scientists. I am sure he will join us, and when he does we will give him a chance to make his presentation.

Mr. Alan Adler is the executive director of Friends of Falun Gong USA. Ms. Christina Fu is from the Medical School at Harvard and is here in her own capacity today as the spouse of Yang Jianli, imprisoned in China. She will explain during her presentation.

In the middle is Mr. Robert Senser, Editor of Human Rights for Workers here in the Washington area. Next to him, is Mr. Oyunbilig, the executive director of the Inner Mongolian People's Party, also from here in suburban Maryland. And Ms. Joan Mower, who is the communications coordinator for the Broadcasting Board of Governors here in Washington.

The open forum works on the principle that we give you 5 minutes to make an oral presentation, and when each panelist has had a chance to make his or her presentation, we then open it up to questions from staff on this side of the table, again, for 5 minutes each until we have gone through a couple of rounds.

And as long as the conversation is good we will keep it going, and when we are pretty much out of steam we will call it off, or when 4:30 comes, whichever is first.

So, pending Dr. Kulacki's arrival, I wonder if Mr. Alan Adler would like to open up the proceedings? You have lights in front of you that my colleague, Anne Tsai, is going to control.

After 4 minutes, the yellow light will go on and that is your signal to wrap up your formal presentation. You can pick up some themes, if you would like, during the questions and answers.

So, Alan, if you would go ahead, please.

**STATEMENT OF ALAN ADLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
FRIENDS OF FALUN GONG USA, TENAFLY, NJ**

Mr. ADLER. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is Alan Adler and I am the executive director of Friends of Falun Gong USA, a nonprofit human rights organization established by concerned citizens who support the freedom of belief of people who practice Falun Gong.

With the abolition of the annual review of China's most favored nation [MFN] status, and with China's accession to the World Trade Organization [WTO], we would expect this esteemed Commission to aggressively advocate for basic freedom of belief in China.

Unfortunately, reading this Commission's 2002 Annual Report, one gets another impression, at least in terms of the Falun Gong. Falun Gong was only mentioned in passing in various sections of the report when it should have, instead, been a focal point.

Why does Falun Gong deserve more attention and advocacy? The sheer numbers of people affected make the persecution of Falun Gong the number one religious freedom violation in China today, and perhaps in the world.

According to the reports from the Chinese Government's own statistics, prior to the ban there were 70 to 100 million people practicing Falun Gong in China. That is a group larger than most nations.

When you consider that their family members, friends, and co-workers are also victimized, the numbers are absolutely staggering.

The group of people affected becomes comparable to the population of the United States.

This brutal suppression has targeted everyone from school children to judges. Some reports state that roughly half of all prisoners held in China's forced labor camps are Falun Gong adherents.

Based on one estimate, this would put the number of Falun Gong in the camps at 2 to 3 million. Chinese police and guards routinely brutalize Falun Gong prisoners by raping women, binding people in torture devices for weeks on end, stripping them and leaving them outside in below-freezing temperatures, holding them in cages too small for their bodies, repeatedly and severely beating them, and so on.

In recent months, we have received reports almost daily of people being tortured to death. There are event accounts of children in schools being forced to memorize poems denouncing Falun Gong, and of people being made to trample the photograph of the Falun Gong founder in order to enter train stations.

Officials are given bonuses and promotions for successfully persecuting Falun Gong. This persecution has permeated every level and every facet of China's society.

When one considers the gravity of this situation, the amount of media attention Falun Gong has received, and the extensive support of local and state governments, it becomes clear that this Commission and the Federal Government need to do more. You have a responsibility to put Falun Gong at the forefront when it comes to human rights and rule of law issues in China.

I would like to make the following recommendations: That the Commission make Falun Gong a focal point in its work in future reports; that the Commission advise our President to speak out. He has met with Jiang Zemin three times this year, but has yet to make a public statement in defense of the largest persecuted group in China.

That the Commission recommend a Senate hearing on this topic. The House has held a number of hearings and has recently lent unanimous support to House Resolution 188, yet the Senate has been curiously passive.

The Chinese Government does not admit that they have a human rights problem, much less that they need to change. It is extremely difficult to engage in fruitful dialog to educate or to reason with a government that flatly denies and routinely whitewashes the grave violations that are occurring. Bold public international pressure may be the only true, effective means of change.

Additionally, one of this Commission's recommendations was that corporations work to bring about change by giving recommendations to relevant Chinese Government entities.

I have done business in China for over 30 years and have employed tens of thousands of people there. I have improved workers' rights to the best of my ability.

However, I know that even one semi-public statement, such as posting my company's human rights policy in Chinese, would bring that factory to the immediate attention of the Public Security Bureau and the repercussions would be disastrous.

This is just a simple illustration of the pressure that corporations are under to comply with the repressive environment.

I feel that the idea of developing a long-term collaborative relationship between government and business is not a realistic approach. Corporations can do little to change the situation without strong support and advocacy on the part of our government. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Adler appears in the appendix.]

Mr. FOARDE. Thank you very much, Alan.

Our next speaker is Christina Fu.

**STATEMENT OF CHRISTINA FU, SPOUSE OF YANG JIANLI,
IMPRISONED IN CHINA, BROOKLINE, MA**

Ms. FU. I am Christina Fu, wife of Yang Jianli. On April 26 this year, my husband was detained in Kunming, China, during a peaceful visit to his native country. Today marks the 227th day of his detention, and his whereabouts remain unknown.

My husband is the president of the Foundation for China in the 21st Century, through which he promotes the cause of democracy in China. As a veteran of the 1989 Tiananmen student movement and an outspoken advocate for human rights in China, he testified before the Congress twice in 1989, and again in 1996.

It is commonly known that he is one of the 49 prominent dissidents who have been blacklisted by the Chinese Government and denied entrance to China since 1989.

My husband is a permanent legal resident of the United States, but has remained a citizen of China. His decision to travel to China this spring was the result of his growing concern about under-reported labor unrest and his strong belief that he has the right to go to his own country. That is guaranteed by international treaties.

After my husband was detained and was being held in a hotel room, guarded by Chinese police officers, he spoke with me by phone. We spoke again the next day on the morning of April 27.

Since that day, we have been unable to communicate with him. In the past 7 months, our family has been greatly concerned for my husband's well-being and safety. We have done everything we could to obtain information about him, but our basic rights were denied.

We submitted 8 written requests, made more than 20 calls to the Chinese Embassy in Washington, DC, and made 6 visits to the various offices in China. I arrived in Beijing on May 23 and was expelled on the same day. My husband's brother traveled to Beijing four times from his home in Shandong Province to learn where my husband was being held, and tried to arrange for legal representation.

No lawyers in China would accept this case, since there was no official record of arrest or a trial date. Chinese authorities and the Public Security Ministry, the State Security Ministry, the Foreign Ministry, and the Beijing Public Security Bureau would not provide any confirmation.

We have been in close contact with the U.S. State Department, which has been very supportive. Despite their active involvement in the case, they have also been unable to obtain even the most basic information.

Chinese law requires notification of detention within 24 hours. Chinese law imposes a 37-day limit on detentions without a warrant. Chinese law requires that the detainee be permitted rapid access to legal counsel. China has not honored its own law with respect to my husband's case.

He has not been permitted to communicate with anyone since his detention 7 months ago. Such an extended period of isolation from the outside world surely constitutes inhuman, cruel, and degrading treatment.

Just today, my attorney, Jared Genser of Freedom Now, filed a petition to the U.N. High Commission on Human Rights' Working Group on Arbitrary Detention describing the violations of Chinese and international law in my husband's case. The petition will be attached with my statement.

I am hopeful and appreciative of the many people working on my husband's behalf. I would particularly thank the more than 40 Members of Congress from the Senate and House, Republicans and Democrats, who have written a total of 21 letters to both the Chinese and United States Governments to appeal for my husband's release.

Supportive letters were also written by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, President Lawrence Summers of Harvard University, 34 faculty of Harvard University, Chancellor Robert Berdahl of the University of California at Berkeley, and many others.

Their efforts have given me much courage and hope during this very difficult struggle. Their help will have a direct impact on my husband's fate. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to inform the Congressional-Executive Commission on China of my husband's case and to appeal for help.

It is also my hope that this Commission will continue to show concern about my husband's case and take advantage of the coming human rights dialog with China to press for my husband's release so that joy and peace will return to my children and my family. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Fu appears in the appendix.]

Mr. FOARDE. Thank you, Ms. Fu.

Our next speaker is Bob Senser.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. SENSER, EDITOR, HUMAN RIGHTS FOR WORKERS, RESTON, VA

Mr. SENSER. First of all, thank you very much for this opportunity to explore a crucial issue: How to evaluate or to assess progress made in China.

I would like to emphasize the importance of using a standard that relies on basics. Jacek Kuron, a Polish intellectual who was also leader of the Solidarity movement, has provided a guide that meets this test. More than 12 years ago, at a conference not far from here, he outlined the two essential characteristics of totalitarianism.

First, a monopoly of organization, a monopoly, in theory, so total, Kuron said, that if citizens gather freely and discuss freely a matter as simple as roof repairs on a block of condo apartments, this constitutes a challenge to the central authority.

Second, a monopoly on information. Everything in print and in the electronic media has to be steered by the central authority. "As a practical matter," Kuron added, "this ideal, this model, cannot be followed in all of its fullness."

Of course, Chairman Mao went a long way toward doing so before his successors changed course. Unfortunately, although short of Mao's terrible extremes, the two basic elements of totalitarianism survive in modern China.

As a practical matter, the regime has made selective exceptions to imposing the model in full. One exception that fascinates me is the American Chamber of Commerce in China, headquartered in Beijing. It enjoys the freedom to organize. Its members number more than 1,500, representing more than 750 companies, small and large, throughout China.

It enjoys freedom of information through a monthly magazine, through comprehensive analytical reports, through its Web site. The Chamber distributes its views not only among its own members, not only internally, but externally to many more people outside its ranks, including government officials at various levels.

Some of these views are cautiously critical of the Chinese Government. Take its annual white paper on the climate for business in China. In analyzing labor conditions, for example, the Chamber praises positive developments benefiting business, but it also publicizes a series of complaints, such as that labor costs in China remain higher than those of many Asian countries and are rising steadily.

Or take its latest report on China's compliance with WTO accession agreements. It praises China's serious commitment to meeting its WTO obligations, but also expresses many specific concerns in some areas where China may not yet be in full compliance with WTO commitments.

On its Web site, in Chinese and in English, the Chamber publicly offers many other details on how it exists and how it acts as an enclave of non-totalitarianism in China. Indeed, that enclave offers an instructive model for what China must do to free itself fully from the shackles of totalitarianism.

Now, in singling out the Chamber, I am, of course, not objecting to freedoms enjoyed by American and other foreign business people in China. It is just that their freedom stands out in such glaring contrast to how thoroughly, often brutally, the regime in China denies these same freedoms to its own citizens, including its working men and women in factories, fields, and offices. Such grossly unfair, discriminatory treatment cannot long endure.

Thanks for this opportunity.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Senser appears in the appendix.]

Mr. FOARDE. Thank you very much, Bob.

Our next speaker is Mr. Oyunbilig from the Inner Mongolian People's Party.

STATEMENT OF MR. OYUNBILIG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE INNER MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S PARTY, GAITHERSBURG, MD

Mr. OYUNBILIG. First of all, I thank the Commission for giving me this opportunity to speak on the human rights situation in Inner Mongolia. My name is Oyunbilig. I came to the United States

from Inner Mongolia in 1995 and now I am staying in the United States as a political asylee.

Due to the limited time, I will get straight to the point. However, I do need to point out that the southern part of the Mongol land and its people have always been a part of the Mongol Nation that came to exist in the 13th century, and that is where the name Inner Mongolia came to be.

In 1947, the Chinese Government set up the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region against the will of the Mongol people. Since then, individual human rights have been deprived from the Mongols in Inner Mongolia, along with their political and civil rights as a people.

For more than half a century, the Mongols in Inner Mongolia have witnessed the most horrifying events in our people's history: Mass killings of innocent civilians, total destruction of the religious establishments, calculated and forced cultural assimilation that brought the Mongol culture and traditions to the brink of extinction, and catastrophic destruction of the grasslands, just to name a few.

Now I will present two cases as testimony to what we are very concerned about today. The first one, is the case of Mr. Hada and Mr. Tegexi. In 1992, Mr. Hada, Mr. Tegexi, and other Mongol students and intellectuals established the Southern Mongolian Democracy Alliance [SMDA].

The goal of SMDA was to promote and preserve the Mongolian language, history, and culture in Inner Mongolia and to strive for civil and political rights for the Mongols.

In December 1995, Mr. Hada, Mr. Tegexi, and over 70 members and supporters of SMDA were arrested after they organized peaceful demonstrations and student strikes at universities against the Chinese Government's oppressive policies toward the Mongols in Inner Mongolia.

On December 6, 1996, Mr. Hada was charged with crimes of inciting separatism and was sentenced to 15 years in jail. Mr. Tegexi was accused of similar crimes and was sentenced to 10 years in jail. Today, Mr. Tegexi's whereabouts are totally not known.

According to Mr. Hada's wife, Ms. Shinna, he has been tortured by prison guards constantly and suffers from a number of physical illnesses. Ms. Shinna was also arrested several times for giving interviews to foreign media, including Voice of America [VOA] and Radio Free Asia [RFA].

The bookstore they owned was shut down and left Ms. Shinna and their son Weylas, with no reliable sources of living. In 2001, Mr. Hada's 16-year-old son Weylas was expelled from school without sufficient explanation from the school.

Later, in December 2001, he was arrested for alleged robbery and sentenced to 2 years in jail, again, without proper trial. According to Ms. Shinna, prison guards also beat Weylas several times.

The second case concerns the Chinese Government's ongoing effort to evict and relocate Mongol herders by force. In recent years, sandstorms originating from the north have become a big problem for China as they grow in calamity and frequency. Beijing is one of the major cities hit by the sandstorms because of its close proximity to Inner Mongolia.

Government officials in Beijing had long ignored the problem until they were exposed to the threat of sandstorms. However, they put the blame on the Mongol herders and their animals instead of on their own policies toward Inner Mongolia.

Since the early 1950s, the Chinese Government moved millions of Han Chinese into Inner Mongolia as an attempt to make the occupation of Inner Mongolia a fait accompli.

Most of these Han Chinese are peasants, and their only means of life is to cultivate the land. Unsited for agricultural cultivation that strips the land of its topsoil, the Inner Mongolian steppes were turned into patches of desert after only a few years of farming, the consequences of which are threatening China's capital now.

The Chinese Government started a program to forcibly relocate Mongol herders 2 years ago under the pretext that the main reason for the sandstorms is over-grazing. According to the Xinhua News Agency, the program will resettle about 650,000 people in 6 years, and most of them are Mongol herders. One of the nine prefectures of Inner Mongolia already declared a total ban on livestock herding.

We have heard many reports from Inner Mongolia indicating that Mongol herders were asked to sell off their livestock and were forced off from their pastures into unfamiliar territory and an unknown lifestyle without any support from the government.

Members of the Commission, Mr. Hada and Mr. Tegexi are two of the few political prisoners who are serving 10 or more years of prison terms in China. I would like to ask the Commission and the U.S. Congress to bring up their cases during their future contact with Chinese officials.

I also ask you to urge the Chinese Government to stop the relocation program that is aimed at the Mongol herders and provide adequate support and subsidy for those who have already have been displaced.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Oyunbilig appears in the appendix.]

Mr. FOARDE. Thank you very much, Mr. Oyunbilig.

Our next speaker is from the Broadcasting Board of Governors, but I am afraid I might have mispronounced your last name. So would you give it to me correctly?

Ms. MOWER. It is Joan Mower.

Mr. FOARDE. Mower.

Ms. MOWER. You can say Mower.

Mr. FOARDE. Mower is better. Mower it is. Joan Mower. Thank you, Joan.

STATEMENT OF JOAN MOWER, COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATOR, BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS, WASHINGTON, DC; ACCOMPANIED BY BRIAN MABRY, SENIOR ADVISOR FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS, VOICE OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. MOWER. Thank you very much.

I am the communications coordinator with the Broadcasting Board of Governors [BBG], which is an independent Federal agency supervising all U.S. non-military international broadcasting, including Voice of America and Radio Free Asia.

I note that in a recent op-ed piece that Senator Baucus and Congressman Bereuter wrote, they said that VOA and RFA provide many ordinary Chinese with their only source of objective, uncensored news. That is true.

Your bosses also say, "We believe the audience will only grow if we increase funding and improve programming." Again, that is true. But audiences will grow much greater if we can get rid of one problem, one major problem, which is jamming of all of our broadcasts into China.

We work with the Federal Communications Commission and we have determined that virtually all VOA and RFA short-wave radio transmissions into China, in the Cantonese, Mandarin, Tibetan, and Uighur languages, are jammed. That means virtually all of them have problems getting in.

Unfortunately, jamming seems to be on the rise, even though we are seeing increased commercial and diplomatic contacts between the United States and China. In Lhasa, for instance, Tibet's capital, it is almost impossible to get a good VOA reception in Tibetan, even though we are broadcasting on three to five frequencies, depending on the time of day.

As has been widely reported, the Chinese are also blocking our Internet sites, *www.voa.com* and *www.rfa.org*. We are not alone in that. Harvard Law School just reported there are 19,000 sites that the Chinese are blocking.

But it is really a problem as we try to provide the Chinese with news over this very popular and fast-growing Internet. We also have e-mail subscription services that are blocked.

You might ask, why is this a problem? Well, like all Americans, we believe that everyone is entitled to factual, uncensored information. In fact, our mission is to promote and sustain freedom and democracy by broadcasting accurate and objective news and information about the United States and the world. So, it is a human rights issue.

Second, it is a big issue for the United States Government because the Chinese are not getting a clear view of what the United States policies and our policies are.

We have a recent survey that showed 68 percent of urban dwellers in China consider the United States their country's No. 1 enemy. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that that is not a good thing. At a time when we have got a war on terrorism going on, to have 18 percent of the world's population ill-informed about the United States, about our culture, about our democracy and our freedoms, that is not good.

On a related issue, we consider the Chinese actions incredibly unfair. While China is blocking and jamming our information and news, we are allowing CCTV, which is the government television channel on many cable systems across the United States, and China Radio International, is also broadcasting on a mix of AM and FM radio stations in our country.

Of course, we are a country that supports freedom of information, so we would not have it any other way. But there is something patently unfair with us allowing them to have basically access to all of our outlets, while we are unable to broadcast into China.

At the same time, Voice of America and Radio Free Asia are severely restricted in the number of journalists that work in China. We are trying to get two more visas. We only have two journalists currently working in Beijing on a full-time basis, but China will not give us additional visas to put people into China. This is at a point where the United States also allows the Chinese Government to have at least 40 journalists working unfettered in our country.

So what can be done? At a minimum, we have approached the Bush Administration. They are very supportive of us and we are hopeful that they will raise this agenda diplomatically so that we might get some action.

We also work with the FCC to file harmful interference reports with the International Telecommunications Union. We have been doing this since August 2000. The Chinese have recently acknowledged these reports that we file. They claim, somewhat disingenuously, that, "Oh, the problem is, we are mixing signals, that they come on our signal." But our engineers say that that is basically not true.

It costs us a lot of money to overcome jamming. We spend about \$9.5 million of taxpayers' money to go in on 100,000 hours of VOA and RFA broadcasting, which means we have all different kinds of transmissions just to get into the country.

Finally, we are working with research, experimenting with different proxy servers and mirror Internet sites to try to get through the Bamboo Curtain. But what really needs to happen, is we need to have a concerted congressional-executive strategy to deal with this issue, to raise it in the public's mind at hearings, discussions, put it on the agenda, and let us really focus on what is happening there with Radio Free Asia and Voice of America.

Thanks very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Mower appears in the appendix.]

Mr. FOARDE. Thank you, Joan.

Our next speaker is Huang Ciping, who wears a number of hats and represents a number of very fine organizations. Most recently, she has taken on a senior role at the Wei Jingsheng Foundation, and we are very happy to have you today.

STATEMENT OF HUANG CIPING, THE OVERSEAS CHINESE DEMOCRACY COALITION, FEDERATION OF CHINESE STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS, SENIOR OPTICAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANT, WHITEHOUSE, OH

Ms. HUANG. Thank you very much. To the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, I would like to talk about the Olympic Games in Beijing in 2008. I am the secretary general for the Overseas Chinese Democracy Coalition, and I thank you very much for providing me this opportunity today at this forum to speak up for the suppressed Chinese people with regard to their human rights and religious rights.

I am asking you to pay attention to the Olympic Games in 2008 with regard to Chinese human rights conditions. When conditions permit, I hope you could cooperate with the International Olympic Committee in an effort to push for Chinese human rights improvement instead of deterioration.

This speech is a collective cooperation and response from several Chinese organizations which include the Overseas Chinese Democracy Coalition, the Committee to Investigate Religious Persecution in China, the Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars, and the Wei Jingsheng Foundation.

Because we did not have the opportunity to present to you in last month's roundtable about the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games, we are here to present our opinion and the concerns regarding the Olympic Games which will be held in Beijing in the year 2008.

This opinion represents the views of many of our fellow Chinese, including the underground Chinese Christians persecuted in China, which are in very bad shape, and we really urge you to pay attention. We urge the international community to pay attention as well.

Last year, as most of us know, unfortunately, the rights of hosting the 2008 Olympic Games was offered to the dictators of the Chinese Communist Government, just as what has happened in 1930 to Nazi Germany, and in 1980 to the former Soviet Union.

We wanted this honor to go to a democratic China. Unfortunately, at the present situation, the Chinese Government has been suppressing the Chinese and there is not much hope for democracy in China at this time.

From history we have learned that when the glory and reputation of the Olympic Games are used for evil identity and evil attention, the people will suffer. World peace will be in jeopardy as well.

Nevertheless, the International Olympic Committee [IOC] decided on Beijing to be the hosting city. The resentment of people in Beijing has been widely reported because of all the face-lifts ordered by the Chinese Government.

In particular, we are concerned that that fact has been used by the Chinese Government as an excuse to further suppress the Chinese people, especially Chinese Christians.

We have obtained a secret document from the Chinese Government that, in the name of welcoming the success of receiving the award of the 2008 Olympic Games, instructs officials to maintain social order, to severely attack "illegal rallies, gatherings, and all other activities that disturb social order." Those kinds of secret documents have been used to suppress the religious people, including the Christians.

Hereby, we urge the CECC to pay close attention in this form of human rights abuses in China in the noble name of the Olympic Games. Whenever possible, we wish you could try your best to present our views to the IOC and to the whole world, and to enforce such a monitoring process, together or separately.

Since July 2000 we have been, and still are, appealing to the IOC to establish a human rights monitoring committee or establish such a functionality in a similar fashion as the CECC to reveal the Chinese human rights conditions prior to the Games with the capacity of revoking the hosting rights.

Also, although we have not been able to reach our goal and we feel that human rights condition in China has been deteriorating since, we still push for such a goal. We hope the CECC will maintain a close relationship with members and leaders of the IOC and set up a good example in this regard.

Thank you very much.

Mr. FOARDE. Thank you very much, Huang Ciping. We will come back to some of those themes in the question and answer session.

I would call, if he is in the room, on Dr. Greg Kulacki. If you are here, you can come forward.

[No response].

Mr. FOARDE. Evidently he is not here, so we will go right to our question session. As I said before, each of the staffers up here will have the opportunity, if they wish, to pose a question to one or all of you. We will have 5 minutes each to ask the question and hear the answer.

I think I will begin by asking for some clarification on some points from Alan Adler, if you please. Is the Friends of Falun Gong an organization of practitioners of Falun Gong or people who are not practitioners, but are friendly to that movement?

Mr. ADLER. They are not practitioners.

Mr. FOARDE. As a friend of people who practice Falun Gong in China, would you describe Falun Gong as a religion or as something else?

Mr. ADLER. I would not describe it as a religion. It is based on ancient Chinese exercises, Qi Gong, its cultivation practice. It is a very simple way for people to remain fit. The principles of truthfulness, benevolence and forbearance are elaborated and explained in a book. It seems to be a very simple thing. I often describe it as just an advanced form of Tai Qi.

Mr. FOARDE. So there is no belief system or no worship, as such?

Mr. ADLER. Absolutely not.

Mr. FOARDE. It is simply a physical and spiritual cultivation practice.

Mr. ADLER. There is a lot of respect for the man who brought this public, an enormous amount of respect. We find it to be a profound doctrine. Friends of Falun Gong does not really advocate for the practice, although we find it is very socially redeeming and good for the people who do it.

Mr. FOARDE. So, just to clarify, you are not a practitioner yourself, for example?

Mr. ADLER. I am the one exception, probably, or one of the few exceptions. I volunteer my time. I believe, as soon as there is some funding and others can do what I do and they can hire someone, I will stop.

Mr. FOARDE. You have been doing business in the PRC for quite some time, according to your statement.

Mr. ADLER. Yes.

Mr. FOARDE. You do not seem very positive about the idea that government, business, and perhaps other interested parties in the United States could cooperate on a strategy to try to advance the types of issues that would help obtain for Falun Gong practitioners in China, for example, freedom of association, freedom of expression, et cetera, unless I misunderstood you.

Mr. ADLER. I think you did.

Mr. FOARDE. All right.

Mr. ADLER. I do not believe that corporations can do it by themselves. We need a lot of government support. We would like to hear the Senate, hear the President, hear people, or give us some sort of mandate or regimen to follow.

When I go in and I try to post my human rights policies, I just cannot. It is impossible. Everything has to be verbal. I have no way of monitoring it. I really do not feel that I have my government's support. The factories that I do business with would be out of business very quickly if I posted a doctrine in Chinese providing them any sort of safety.

Mr. FOARDE. I have a couple of seconds left, so let me try another question. To Christina Fu, please.

Has the Chinese Government said formally, either to Dr. Yang Jianli or to you, that he is on a blacklist that would not permit him to travel to China?

Ms. FU. No.

Mr. FOARDE. No. So there has never been any formal statement of that?

Ms. FU. No. There is no formal or written statement from the Chinese Government.

Mr. FOARDE. Has his passport been revoked, or has he tried to apply for a Chinese passport since he first came to the United States as a student?

Ms. FU. I do not remember when exactly he did it. I know the blacklist was revealed in 1994 by Human Rights Watch and Human Rights in China, and there was a press conference on a right to return to China and a right of freedom to go back to the homeland. So, it was quite public.

Mr. FOARDE. These are things, of course, that our Commission members very much support, the right of freedom to travel, and certainly the right and the freedom of the Chinese people to return to China if they are studying abroad or visiting abroad.

In the case of Dr. Yang Jianli, he has never formally tried to apply for a passport or to get his own travel document to return to China?

Ms. FU. I do not remember when exactly he submitted a form. I know the Chinese consulate did not even give him a chance for that.

Mr. FOARDE. How did he travel to China back earlier this year when he went? What did he use to travel? Did he use his green card?

Ms. FU. He did carry his green card and he used that.

Mr. FOARDE. What did he use to enter China?

Ms. FU. As far as I know, he used a friend's passport.

Mr. FOARDE. So a passport that did not belong to him.

Ms. FU. Yes.

Mr. FOARDE. All right. I am almost out of time, so we will go on. Greg.

Mr. MASTEL. Ms. Fu, you mentioned that your husband went to China to investigate labor unrest. Can you tell us a little bit more about what brought him to China, what he was looking into?

Ms. FU. I actually do not know what exactly he was thinking. But for the 3 months before he left Boston, he had been constantly talking with friends on the phone or in his office about this not-reported or under-reported labor unrest. He was very concerned because we heard that almost 70 percent of workers were laid off in that part of China.

Mr. MASTEL. Ms. Mower, do you have any estimate now of how large your listenership is in China?

Ms. MOWER. I do not. Let me ask Brian Mabry, who works at VOA. It is about 5 million, which is large, but it is not that large for China. Not nearly as large as it could be.

Mr. MASTEL. In your testimony you mentioned some technological approaches to try to counter jamming. Can you explain a little bit more about that? Is there any potential for that to be an answer to some of your problems in China?

Ms. MOWER. What I was referring to was actually what we're doing with e-mail servers and mirror Internet sites. In talking to the engineers—and I would have to get back to you on this—I do not know what you can really do to stop jamming.

I understand that jamming is all kinds of things, like Chinese opera at strange hours. You will be listening to the station and you will hear thuds, or you will hear Chinese opera.

I do not know what you can really do to stop it, other than go in on other frequencies. Of course, we follow all of the ITU regulations. It is all done by the international organizations to make sure that we are on the legal frequencies that are granted to us.

Mr. MASTEL. You were talking about what you are doing on the computer.

Ms. MOWER. Yes. Again, I am not an engineer and I am not an Internet expert. I am basically the PR person. So, I would be happy to provide a paper for you on that. We actually do have those, and I can get your e-mail and I will get you that this week.

Mr. MASTEL. But it sounds like you do not foresee much potential there.

Ms. MOWER. I think there are actually some very promising things that we are doing with the Internet. I think there are mirror sites, and I think we have just hired a new contractor who is doing some exciting work in trying to make sure that we can find sites that are blocked and get our stuff in.

So, I think we are actually working on some interesting things, I just do not know the details of them. But I will get those for you.

Mr. MASTEL. Thank you.

Mr. SENSER, your testimony about the American Chamber of Commerce in China was very interesting. If in fact the Chinese are allowing more access by the Chamber, why do you think that is? I mean, obviously they criticize the Chinese Government, too. Why do you think they see them as a less threatening category than others?

Mr. SENSER. Well, that is a very interesting point here. The Chinese Government obviously feels they have an ally that will continue to support the enormous infusion of American resources into China. For example, \$400 million a day, every day of every week of exports from China imported into the United States.

That is a big chunk of help. If Adolf Hitler had it, he would have gone beyond the support he got from German business and he would have turned to American business, too.

Mr. MASTEL. But I guess my question is—I actually read the report you referred to from the Chamber of Commerce which criticized the Chinese in a number of respects in terms of the WTO accession.

As you say, totalitarian governments are not fond of tolerating dissent. Why would these critiques be all right, and why would the Chinese be willing to tolerate these critiques?

Mr. SENSER. Well, first of all, I tried to show that they are rather mild. The Chamber has to do something to defend its own interests, and they are doing that, but the support that China is getting makes it bearable.

Mr. MASTEL. One last question, quickly, and it is probably a long question for Mr. Adler. Maybe you can give me a short assessment. As someone who is a friend of Falun Gong and a long-time businessman in China, I have always been curious as to why the Chinese Government took such interest in Falun Gong. It seemed to always be, to me, for lack of a better term, exercise movement as well. Why, in your opinion, has it become such a focus of the Chinese Government?

Mr. ADLER. I believe it is directly attributable to a twisted, paranoid leader. There is not much more to it than that. For some reason, his jealousy or whatever motivated him, he picked Falun Gong. There is no other reason. These are good people, just trying to be better people. They are basically not against the government. I never understood it either.

Mr. FOARDE. Susan Roosevelt Weld.

Ms. WELD. Thanks a lot. If I can just follow up on that, do you see any change in the leadership's attitude after the change in leadership at the 16th Party Congress?

Mr. ADLER. I think it is possible that the 16th Party Congress might have made it even worse. He seems to have retrenched himself and we see very little change coming from it.

Ms. WELD. Thank you very much.

I have a question for Ms. Fu. Did your husband make efforts to go back to China legally before this time when he used the friend's passport?

Ms. FU. The only time he showed me a piece of paper was when he applied for a visa to Hong Kong in 1996 using his American travel documents, and he was rejected.

Ms. WELD. He was refused. Thank you very much.

Now, this is a question for Mr. Oyunbilig. I am wondering several things. One, is the pace of government-sponsored Han migration to Inner Mongolia keeping up at the same level now as it was in the past? How is the pace of that going on?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. According to the latest census, the pace has somewhat slowed down. But I think that is mainly due to the fact that there are already so many people in Inner Mongolia, about 25 million.

Before 1950, there were only a few million Mongols. The Mongolian population was more than 80 percent, 90 percent before 1950. Now the Mongolian population is less than 20 percent.

Also, 18 out of 100 of the poorest counties in China are located in Inner Mongolia, so that may stop a lot of people from going to Inner Mongolia.

There are still a lot of people going to Inner Mongolia from other provinces because recently there has been a huge natural gas reserve that was discovered right in my hometown. All of the people

who are working on that are Han people from inland China. The Mongols are not getting any jobs.

Ms. WELD. Another question for you. In educational matters, is the Mongolian language used in the schools? Or what are the rules as to using Mongolian language in the schools and selling books, and so on?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. There are still schools using the Mongol language to teach. But enrollment is not very good right now because if you go to a Mongolian school, if you graduate only from a Mongolian school, you cannot get a better job because your Chinese language is not good. In China, if you do not speak Chinese well, there is no chance of getting any jobs.

Also, if you graduate from a Mongolian high school, it is really hard for you to get to a good university and pursue a better education. So, enrollment is now very low and a lot of young people do not speak the native language any more. That is very disturbing for us.

Ms. WELD. Thank you very much.

Now, Ms. Mower, I want to ask you, the 5 million figure you gave us was for a radio audience.

Ms. MOWER. Yes. Right. VOA and RFA.

Ms. WELD. How about hits on the Internet sites, for those people who are able to get into it? I mean, what is the total?

Ms. MOWER. Brian, do you have those?

Mr. MABRY. The best number we can give you, we cannot talk Internet hits, but we send about over 300,000 e-mails daily with a news summary that is getting out there.

Ms. WELD. Yes, I have seen that.

Mr. MABRY. On hits, there is such a wide variance in numbers, we cannot agree on what constitutes a hit and whether it is coming from China or whether it is coming from anywhere else in the world.

Ms. MOWER. Right. And we have got two different sites, both VOA and Radio Free Asia.

Ms. WELD. Right. Thank you very much.

I was thinking, Huang Ciping. I was wondering, as far as the Olympic Games go, whether there could be any interlock between the freedom of information, such as Ms. Mower talks about, and having the Olympic Games in China. Is there any requirement one could put on China to allow no jamming of such things as Voice of America and Radio Free Asia at the time, certainly, of the Olympic Games?

Ms. HUANG. Yes. That is what we felt like. There are two documents that we filed with the international committees, particularly the IOC, with regard to our detailed requests. Of course, the CECC could help us to achieve this. In particular, especially before the games and during the games, the Chinese Government would use order as an excuse to round up dissidents, et cetera.

But when they were trying to gain the rights to host the games, they promised they would protect people's rights. So we feel very strongly that the international community must keep the Chinese Government in line with their promises, including that they must guarantee not to restrict people's mobility during the games, and that includes political dissidents.

Another thing is about information flow. You must allow free broadcasting, at least during the games, which sometimes you would see. That had happened before, and this is the opportunity for doing so.

Ms. WELD. Thank you.

Mr. FOARDE. The next questions will come from our friend and colleague, Tiffany McCullen, who works for Grant Aldonas, the Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, and one of our commissioners.

Tiffany.

Ms. McCULLEN. Thank you. Alan, actually, I have a question for you. You mentioned wanting government support for, was it human rights issues in China? I was not exactly sure.

Mr. ADLER. Yes.

Ms. McCULLEN. If that was the case, then what type of support do you think would be helpful, if you have anything in mind?

Mr. ADLER. Well, I am here specifically recommending human rights for Falun Gong practitioners, although it probably applies to others. We feel that the most important thing would be to have our President say something.

He has met with Jiang Zemin three times this year. There is a lot of dialog. He has not uttered the words "Falun Gong," has shown no support. The people over there who are suffering take great comfort when they know that their suffering is not going unnoticed.

We think, also, raising public awareness here on the persecution over there, the staggering numbers. We have had some success in the House, but no hearings in the Senate, no resolutions. It is as though Falun Gong persecution does not exist in the Senate. If they do not speak up, the Chinese Government seems to brutalize these people unfettered.

Ms. McCULLEN. Thank you.

I have one question for Joan. Joan, I was wondering, have you all done any studies to find out how many people actually use short-wave in China? Also, is there any way that you are able to advertise the services that you offer in China so people are aware of them?

Ms. MOWER. I think we probably have estimates on short-wave users, which I will also get for you. I am sure we have got that.

In terms of advertising, no, we are unable to advertise. In fact, there was a recent case in which we were going to put a program on. I cannot remember what it was. Anyway, they asked us to remove the VOA logo, which kind of defeats the purpose, but not really. So, no, we do not advertise.

Ms. McCULLEN. All right. Thank you. That is all I have.

Mr. FOARDE. Our next questioner is our friend and colleague, Matt Tuchow, who represents Congressman Sander Levin.

Mr. TUCHOW. My first question is for Mr. Adler also. I was wondering, the Falun Gong movement seems to be particularly well organized. I was wondering, is there any sort of political committee of Falun Gong, either here in the United States or with regard to Chinese affairs? How is it so well organized?

Mr. ADLER. I do not know that it is so organized. It appears organized because I think of the organization of the Chinese Govern-

ment and their persecution. So I think, really, all that is going on, is that we are able to report and able to get the information into China.

There are several programs that help us get the information so the persecution, at least in China, is being reported. I think over here there is just a group of volunteers who are not organized. Most of us met in Washington, DC.

We came here because we knew what Falun Gong was, and there was nothing wrong with it. I think that we are just people of good conscience. We just came here. That is where we began to meet, and we communicate through the Internet in terms of any progress we might be able to make. But there is no organization. I am strictly a volunteer. I will relish the day when I can just go back to my full-time, paying job.

Mr. TUCHOW. In China, I believe there have been several incidents where TV programming was—I do not know if it was blocked or there was Falun Gong information placed on this. Can you explain what that was and whether that emanates from the Falun Gong movement's leadership, or what?

Mr. ADLER. No. What happened, was they were able to somehow climb up and get into the cable lines and broadcast for about a half an hour. When they were able to do that, it was reported. It was reported over the Internet and through e-mails, through telephones.

Other people thought, that's a great idea to let the people in China actually know what is happening. It's a one-sided thing there with propaganda. I think, when people are able to see a good thing work, they just, all over the country, started to do it, and will continue to do it, I assume.

Anything that works and is successful in combating this brutal persecution seems to be picked up by all those who can do it. Most of them end up going to jail and worse because they get caught. There is no way of doing it without getting caught. They have all received stiff prison sentences.

Mr. TUCHOW. And, finally, with regard to corporate social responsibility in China, my understanding is a number of companies that source from China have codes of conduct which they require their suppliers to follow, and they even include compliance with internationally recognized human rights standards.

Do you do that with your suppliers in China?

Mr. ADLER. First, I have never seen any of those documents, and certainly have never seen any of them in Chinese, and have never seen any of them posted anywhere.

The most that I have seen, is that some of the socially responsible mutual funds have posted their human rights things in terms of what companies they will invest their fund's money in.

But I think any company that posts human rights policies, internationally accepted human rights policies that protects the workers, that place will be closed very quickly and they will be out of business. I would like to see it, though, if you know of any.

Mr. TUCHOW. Do you have any other suggestions of how American companies should promote human rights in China?

Mr. ADLER. I basically feel, as a free trader, that through trade it will work eventually. That is just my own personal opinion. But

not without strong government support. I think there has to be continued dialog. I find what is happening, is they are selling to, besides the United States, many of the other countries.

The other countries sort of look to us for moral leadership and there is none being given. A little bit in the House, but as far as the President, our President speaking out, clearly, at least on the Falun Gong issue, it has not happened.

Mr. TUCHOW. I have a quick question for Christina Fu. With regard to your husband, have you or anyone else in your husband's family received any written arrest warrant yet?

Ms. FU. No.

Mr. TUCHOW. And has anyone in your family been able to visit him in his detention or arrest?

Ms. FU. No.

Mr. TUCHOW. No. All right. Well, I see the yellow light is on.

Mr. FOARDE. Thank you for ceding the floor, anyway, seeing that the inevitable is coming up.

Let me follow up with Christina Fu, please. I just want to be clear. The authorities have said absolutely nothing formally to your family, either in China or to you here.

Ms. FU. There was a phone call.

Mr. FOARDE. There was a phone call.

Ms. FU. Yes. To my husband's brother on June 21. It was the local police from Linyi City in Shandong Province. They phoned his brother and told him that Yang Jianli was formally arrested on June 2 and was being held in the Beijing Public Security Detention place. After that, Jianli's brother went to Beijing, went to a detention place, and visited two offices. They could not find him.

Mr. FOARDE. So your family does not really know whether Dr. Yang is there in Beijing in the public security detention or anything else.

Ms. FU. That is right.

Mr. FOARDE. And you have received nothing.

Ms. FU. I have received nothing.

Mr. FOARDE. Is it your understanding that Chinese law requires a formal notice to the spouse or family member when someone is arrested like this, formally arrested?

Ms. FU. Yes. Under the Criminal Procedure Law, Article 64.

Mr. FOARDE. But you have received nothing.

For Bob Senser, please. You used, and explained why you were using, the AmCham in Beijing as an example of an organization that—I am probably putting more words in your mouth than you actually said—but it really has essentially extraterritorial privileges because it is able to organize itself and petition the government for redress of complaints and things of that sort.

I am just wondering if there are other foreign organizations, either chambers of commerce or other ones in China that you are aware of that have more or less the same privileges as the AmCham seems to have, in your view.

Mr. SENSER. The short answer to that is "yes." This includes, for example, in areas where there are known sweatshops, publicized and documented sweatshops, whose managers are Koreans and Taiwanese.

They have the contracts with American companies and they are able to meet, probably informally, and lobby their interests, which in one case included making sure that fire inspections were not made of their factories. We used the example of the Chamber and there are similar organizations, business organizations.

But I think we cannot be too pessimistic. There are a lot of possibilities for progress. I guess I used the AmCham as a template for what is possible. I understand recently the Lion's Club was officially recognized. Now, this is a Lion's Club of China.

In other words, some of these organizations are getting that privilege, too, of organizing themselves. There are NGOs and lawyers groups of Chinese working on these problems.

So there is a possibility for change coming from Chinese sources, too, and not just because of American pressure, although I agree with the point that external pressure is very important, as it was in South Korea and in Taiwan.

Mr. FOARDE. The Chinese labor activist, Han Dongfang, has been advocating for some time that on the specific question of workplace health and safety issues in China, that workers be allowed to actually do what is in the new workplace health and safety law, and that is establish worker safety committees in their factories.

How optimistic are you that this might be able to happen, given that you see that there is some progress or some reason to hope for progress, but still nothing like full ability to organize on the part of workers and the ability to represent themselves?

Mr. SENSER. It is a very good move, and a very smart move. It is half a loaf, but it is a very good idea. Han is not alone in pursuing that. In mainland China, Chinese lawyers are pushing that. After all, who can be against increasing awareness on health and safety, and who is a better source of knowing what is going on in the plant than the workers?

Mr. FOARDE. My time is almost up, so I will pass it on to Greg.

Mr. MASTEL. Thank you.

Mr. Oyunbilig, if I understand your answer to the last question correctly, are 80, 90 percent of the population of Inner Mongolia now Han Chinese? Is that correct?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MASTEL. Tell me a little bit about what the ultimate objectives of your organization are. If, in fact, Mongols are a minority now in Inner Mongolia, in an ideal world, what would you like to see? What changes would you like to see? Are you seeking independence?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. Seeking independence may be our dream or our ultimate goal, but it does not seem very practical at this moment.

First of all, I would like to see that basic human rights in Inner Mongolia are respected, and the Mongols are getting what the Chinese Constitution states.

Inner Mongolia is still called the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, according to the Chinese Constitution. The autonomous region and its people deserve civil, political, and otherwise autonomous rights. So, I would like to see those rights materialize.

Mr. MASTEL. I see. So to summarize, you are just saying you would like to see the Mongol people have the rights that they are granted under the Chinese Constitution.

Mr. OYUNBILIG. That is the first thing.

Mr. MASTEL. All right.

What are the next steps?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. The next step. The constitution of my organization states that we strive for the independence of Inner Mongolia, but that is my organization. That is the ultimate or higher dream.

Basically why we say that is because it seems like we have been trying with this autonomy for many years and it did not bring us any good. The situation is getting worse and worse, and basically our people are pushed aside and our culture and tradition are near extinction.

Mr. MASTEL. Now, the Han influx that you talked about. I think you alluded, though, that part of that is a result of the Chinese Government policy or policies. Are those policies continuing today? Do you expect that number to go up in the future?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. It is continuing and there is no sign of lessening. I think this is due to history. Also, according to some other parts of the world, this situation will still continue until that country becomes a democracy.

So, I am kind of pessimistic because this is a relationship with two people, and democracy is somewhat different. They will start to respect the rights, but they will not give those rights to the minority people without fighting or striving for it.

Mr. MASTEL. But it sounds like the Han population in Inner Mongolia is now well-established. I mean, if China were to become a democracy tomorrow, that would still be a reality in your region. Is that correct?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. Yes. What I am saying, is the current situation will still continue even if China becomes a democratic nation. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. MASTEL. I see. So if Inner Mongolia were autonomous, it would still be overwhelmingly a majority of Han Chinese.

Mr. OYUNBILIG. That is correct, yes.

Mr. MASTEL. All right.

Mr. Adler, you talked a lot about the need for the U.S. Government to take a stand in favor of Falun Gong. Tell me a little bit more. How do you think that would help, and why do you think it would help?

Some would argue that, in fact, China would simply ignore those stances. The Chinese tend to ignore those kinds of stances, and the rhetoric on the part of the United States would not have much impact. I do not agree, myself, but I am curious to hear your opinion.

Mr. ADLER. I do not agree that it would not help. I think this is a real grass-roots effort of people that are fighting to uphold freedoms in China, and the message gets through. Whatever support they get from outside is just a tremendous relief to them.

It has been 3 years now for the persecution, and basically the President has not really spoken up on its behalf. So, we have only seen what happens when they do not speak up. I personally feel that if they did mention it and shine the light on it a little bit, it would only help.

Mr. FOARDE. Susan.

Ms. WELD. Great. I had another for Mr. Oyunbilig. I wonder, do they have village elections there? Have you heard about whether the village elections law is being implemented in Inner Mongolia?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. I have not heard.

Ms. WELD. The other thing is, in the foreign-invested enterprises in Mongolia—I assume that there are some—is there any sense that they would agree to hire a certain percentage of Mongolian people? It sounds as though you are saying, in the development of the natural gas reserves, they are only hiring Han men.

Mr. OYUNBILIG. That is correct. Actually, there are a number of international corporations—because Inner Mongolia is very rich in natural resources, a number of foreign corporation companies partnering with Chinese corporations to do it.

They are not allowed to independently go into China, 100 percent foreign-owned. We are not allowing that. Companies such as Exxon Mobil are doing this drilling. But I have not heard that there is such a policy like U.S. affirmative action. We never heard of such a policy.

Ms. WELD. Thank you very much.

This is a final question for Mr. Senser. I just read an interesting piece of yours about the toy factories. I wonder if you could give us a little summary of what your findings were in that respect.

Mr. SENSER. Actually, my article relies on other people's research. In spite of codes of conduct—at least in this area there are codes of conduct—they are consistently being ignored, with some exceptions. Remember, the codes have been around now for 10 or more years, and they have not shown the promise that they were originally held up for.

Part of the article deals with the Chinese Government-run labor movements, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions [ACFTU]. The point is that the evidence from China itself is that this is an arm of the government, and that one of its main jobs, by law, is to "support the People's democratic dictatorship."

So, the reason to make that point these days, is that in many parts of even the United States, but also in Europe, there is an effort to have a rapprochement with this organization for various reasons. It allegedly represents so many people.

Some of the incentive is that, because China has a large workforce which is really an extended workforce for Europe and the United States, they say, well, somebody should speak up for those workers.

Ms. WELD. Right.

Mr. SENSER. But the question is, by having an official contact with this arm of the Party, does it do any good for that purpose? The answer is, "it does not." There is no evidence that it does. This is not to say that there are not good people within the ACFTU.

There is evidence that some people in the ACFTU want to defend rights or want to get better legislation and so on. But then there are a lot of good people in the U.S. Labor Department but they are not the AFL-CIO, so there is a distinction to be made. It is not a question of who is good or bad, but who represents legitimate interests of the workers.

Ms. WELD. And if progressive legislation on labor were to happen in China, can you think of which level of government it would come

at? For example, there have been national laws, which seem to be approved but not enforced. I wonder if there are provincial laws or local laws which are being passed which might be useful.

Mr. SENSER. Legislation on labor affairs, as on other affairs, exists on many different levels, even though the signal comes from the central authorities. But there is room for improvement, not only of the laws, there is an effort by at least one international NGO to stimulate the government to enforce those laws.

In fact, there is U.S. Government funding for that initiative. Whether it is going to be effective is another question. Just changing the law does not change anything, unless there is enforcement by the Chinese Government itself.

Ms. WELD. Thank you very much.

Mr. FOARDE. Matt.

Mr. TUCHOW. Yes. I have a follow-up question for you, Mr. Senser. How do you feel that foreign businesses that are doing business in China should promote workers' rights?

Mr. SENSER. That is a very good question. It is one I have asked myself as a critic of some of what is going on in China. What would I do if I were in some role in business there? I do not see that happening. It could not happen for various reasons. But I think that one of the things I would be very concerned about is the health and safety of my people.

See, part of the confusion is, American corporations hire people directly on their own payroll, but then they also have people working for contractors who make deals with local authorities, even police, and who use that factory with Taiwanese or Koreans as managers.

So, I would want to be worried about the health and safety of those workers, too, to hear their views. That would be a very practical thing that I think should be done. There is some movement to do that by at least one large American corporation that I am familiar with.

Mr. TUCHOW. Mr. Oyunbilig, could you tell us your personal circumstances in seeking political asylum in the United States? Do you feel that you have suffered persecution in China on account of your political or other views?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. Yes. Because of my political views and my involvement with the Inner Mongolian underground movement, it put me in danger so I came to the United States. I still continue my work on Inner Mongolia's human rights and other issues we are concerned about.

Mr. TUCHOW. Did you suffer any persecution in China?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. Not physical persecution. I was not in jail or such kind of persecution, but I feel I am threatened.

Mr. TUCHOW. Is there a problem of child labor in Inner Mongolia?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. The problem with child labor is not a particular problem in Inner Mongolia, it is in the whole of China in general. There is a child labor problem.

Mr. TUCHOW. I understand there is a cultural affinity with Korea. Is there Korean investment in Inner Mongolia, and if so, how is that affecting, if at all, human rights in Inner Mongolia?

Mr. OYUNBILIG. There is not much Korean investment in Inner Mongolia. Most of them are going to the independent State of Mongolia, which is Outer Mongolia, because the investment conditions and policies there are much nicer than in Inner Mongolia.

Mr. TUCHOW. All right.

Finally, for Huang Ciping. I had a question about the 2008 Olympics Games. Practically, knowing what you know about the Chinese Government, what do you think the most effective techniques of leveraging the Olympic Games to promote human rights would be? What would be practical?

Ms. HUANG. Well, I still think a practical way is, in some ways, similar as the most favored nation status, that if you threaten to revoke their right, then they would behave better. That is a common practice. You should know, in dealing with the Chinese Government, if you are tough, then they will take some lessons.

So I do think that is why we strongly advocate to have a committee in charge of monitoring human rights conditions in China similar to this Commission, that if you were to ever to say, well, we will revoke your trade privilege, then the Chinese Government will behave much better.

Mr. FOARDE. It is almost 4 o'clock and you have all been very generous with your time. So, I would like to bring this session to a close by making just a couple of comments.

First, to pick up on a theme that Ms. Huang Ciping raised in her original presentation. Any time that the Commission has a hearing or a staff roundtable, or one of these open forums, if you cannot appear but would like to submit a written statement that becomes part of the record, we would always be delighted to have it and it would be part of the record.

So occasionally we have to make some decisions about how many witnesses or panelists we might have at a given hearing. But if you have views on the subject of the hearing, we would be delighted to hear them or to have them for the record in a written statement. Normally we would like it within a few days of the event so we can get it into the printing process.

In saying that, I hope that you would all stay involved with us and keep up on what we are doing, and when you do have views, we would like to hear them.

Thank you all, this afternoon, for sharing your time with us and your thoughts. I particularly appreciate my friend and colleague, Greg Mastel, sitting in on behalf of Senator Baucus. On behalf of Senator Max Baucus, our chairman, and Congressman Doug Bereuter, our co-chairman, this brings this open forum to a close.

We will see you all again next year. Have happy holidays. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 4:01 p.m. the open forum was concluded.]

A P P E N D I X

PREPARED STATEMENTS

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ALAN ADLER

DECEMBER 9, 2002

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is Alan Adler, and I am the Executive Director of Friends of Falun Gong USA. Friends of Falun Gong USA is a nonprofit human rights organization established by concerned Americans who support the freedom of belief of people who practice Falun Gong.

With the abolition of the annual review of China's most favored nation status and with China's accession to the WTO, we would expect this esteemed Commission to aggressively advocate for basic freedom of belief in China. Unfortunately, however, reading this Commission's 2002 annual report, one gets another impression, at least in terms of the Falun Gong. Falun Gong was only mentioned in passing in various sections of the report, when it should have instead been a focal point. Why does Falun Gong deserve more attention and advocacy? The sheer numbers of people affected make the persecution of Falun Gong the No. 1 religious freedom violation in China today, and perhaps the world. According to reports from major media and the Chinese Government's own statistics,¹ prior to the ban, there were 70–100 million people practicing Falun Gong in China. That is a group larger than most nations. And when you consider that their family members, friends, and coworkers are also victimized—some are fined, some are jailed, and others are forced to turn in their loved ones—the numbers are absolutely staggering. The group of people affected becomes comparable to the population of the United States.

This brutal suppression has targeted everyone from schoolchildren who do the practice, to grandparents who rely on it to maintain their health, from military commanders, to doctors, to professors, and even judges. Some reports state that roughly half of all prisoners held in China's forced labor camps are Falun Gong adherents.² Based on one estimate, this would put the number of Falun Gong in the camps at 2–3 million.³ Chinese police and guards routinely brutalize Falun Gong prisoners, raping women, binding people in torture devices for weeks on end, stripping them and leaving them outside in below-freezing temperatures, holding them in cages too small for their bodies, and so on. In recent months, we have received reports of people being tortured to death almost daily. Chinese authorities have confiscated and shredded or burned millions of Falun Gong books, and there are even accounts of children in schools being forced to memorize poems denouncing Falun Gong, people being made to trample the photograph of the Falun Gong founder in order to enter train stations, and China's cutthroat college entrance exams now contain questions criticizing the practice. Officials have been given bonuses and promoted as a result of their efforts to persecute Falun Gong.⁴ This suppression has permeated every level and every facet of China's society.

It is well known that Falun Gong is currently No. 1 on the Chinese Government's hit list. When one considers the gravity of this situation, the amount of media attention Falun Gong has received, and the extensive support of local and state governments, it becomes clear that this Commission and the Federal Government more broadly need to do more. You have a responsibility to put Falun Gong at the forefront when it comes to human rights and rule of law issues in China.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I would like to make the following recommendations:

- *That the Commission make Falun Gong a focal point in its work and future reports.* Falun Gong speakers should be invited to a greater number of events and

¹ Seth Faison, "In Beijing: A Roar of Silent Protestors" (The New York Times, April 27, 1999). Joseph Kahn, "Notoriety Now for Movement's Leader" (The New York Times, April 27, 1999). Renee Schoof, "Growing Group Poses a Dilemma for China" (The Associated Press, April 26, 1999). Bay Fang, "An Opiate of the Masses?" (U.S. News & World Report, February 22, 1999).

² Australian Broadcasting Corporation, "Calls for End to China's Falun Gong Re-Education Camps" (July 4, 2001).

³ The Laogai Research Foundation estimates that currently there are between 4 and 6 million prisoners held in China's forced labor camps (laogai). <http://www.laogai.org/chinese/aboutus.html>

⁴ See, for example, Tamora Vidaillet, "Shandong Boss Dark Horse for China Leadership" (Reuters, November 5, 2002); Ian Johnson, "Death Trap: How One Chinese City Resorted to Atrocities to Control Falun Dafa" (Wall Street Journal, December 26, 2000).

hearings, and a section of next year's report should be dedicated to Falun Gong, if the situation remains as is or continues to worsen.

- *That the Commission advise our President to speak out.* He has met with Chinese President Jiang Zemin three times this year but has yet to make a public statement in defense of the largest persecuted group in China. Some believe that quiet, behind-the-scenes diplomacy is most effective. I feel that behind-the-scenes diplomacy plays into the hands of China's closed, paranoid regime. The world must hear about this issue and know that others care. The words of the President are needed. His Congress has condemned this persecution and asked that he do so as well.⁵ We are still waiting.

- *That the Commission recommend a Senate hearing on this topic.* The House has held a number of hearings and has recently lent unanimous support in the form of House Resolution 188, yet the Senate has been curiously passive.

I'd like to leave you with a few comments. From what I have seen, the Chinese Government does not admit that they have a human rights problem, much less that they need to change. It is extremely difficult to engage in fruitful dialog, to educate, or to reason with a government that flatly denies and routinely whitewashes the grave violations that are occurring. Bold, public, international pressure may be the only truly effective means of change.

Additionally, one of this Commission's recommendations in its annual report was that corporations work to bring about change by giving recommendations to relevant Chinese Government entities.⁶ On a personal note, I have done business in China for over 30 years and have employed tens of thousands of people there. I have improved workers' rights to the best of my ability. However, I know that even one semi-public statement, such as posting in a factory my company's human rights policy in Chinese, would bring that factory to the immediate attention of the Public Security Bureau and the repercussions would be disastrous. If I were held responsible for the posting, would I be allowed back into China? Would the translator of the document be spared? This is just a simple illustration of the pressure that corporations are under to comply with the repressive environment; one small move brings great risk. I feel that the idea of "developing a long-term collaborative relationship between government and business" is not a realistic approach. Corporations can do little to change the situation without strong support and advocacy on the part of our government.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHRISTINA FU

DECEMBER 9, 2002

(This statement was last revised on February 6, 2003).

Christina Fu I'm Christina Fu, wife of Yang Jianli. On April 26th this year, my husband was detained in Kunming, China during a peaceful visit to his native country. Today marks the 227th day of his detention and his whereabouts remain unknown.

My husband is the president of the Foundation for China in the 21st century, through which he promotes the cause of democracy in China. As a veteran of 1989 Tiananmen student movement and an outspoken advocate for human rights in China, he testified before the Congress many times. On June 21 and July 7, 1989, after my husband fled China, he testified before the Congressional Human Rights Committee his eye witness of the Tiananmen Massacre, and testified in front of the United Nations on July 8, 1989. On April 5, 1991, my husband appeared in the Congress hearing testifying China's worsening human rights record. In December 1996, he testified again on "the Hearing of China's Human Rights." In May 1997, he testified before the Congress on the Chinese government's persecution of Christian in China.

My husband is a permanent legal resident of the United States, but has remained a citizen of China. He came to the U.S. in 1986 as a student, and his passport expired in 1991. Since 1993, he tried many times to get a new passport from the Chinese consulate general in New York. I remembered traveling to New York with him a number of times to visit the Chinese consulate. As soon as the people inside the consulate heard my husband's name, they told us to go away. No one even wanted to talk to us.

After my husband was detained in China, on May 8, 2002, I called the Chinese consulate in New York and spoke to Mr. Wang Hai-Tao, a consul in charge of the

⁵This is in reference to H. Con. Res. 217, H. Res. 188, and numerous Dear Colleague letters.

⁶Congressional-Executive Commission on China, 2002 Annual Report, Page 7, bullet 3.

affairs for overseas Chinese, told me that “if we do not give him (Yang Jianli) a passport, he should not go back to China.” On June 14, when my husband’s mother and two sisters visited the Chinese Embassy in Washington DC, the first secretary and consul Mr. Wang Yi-Gong told them that “our government cannot give Yang Jianli a passport based on what he was doing in the United States. What he was doing here even you may not know.”

It is commonly known that my husband is 1 of the 49 prominent dissidents who have been blacklisted by the Chinese government and denied entrance to China since 1989 (please refer to the attached report by Human Rights in China, January 6, 1995).¹ According to the HRIC report, the Chinese government’s “re-entry Blacklist” was issued confidentially by the Ministry of Public Security to all border control units in China in May 1994. My husband’s name was listed in the third category with other 17 people. In this category, it says “in accordance with relevant instructions from the Party Center: if subject attempts to enter China, to be dealt with according to circumstances of the situation.” (That is, border authorities are to seek immediate instructions from above on how to handle the case, while presumably keeping their charges either in isolation or under close surveillance.) For this category, the duration of detention was not specified.

My husband’s decision to travel to China this spring was the result of his growing concern about the under reported labor unrest and his strong belief that he has the right to go to his own country, that is guaranteed by international treaties. The “International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,” signed by the Chinese government in 1998 but has not ratified by the Congress of People’s Representatives, states that “no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of the right to enter his own country.” (Article 12, item 4.)

After my husband was detained and was being held in a hotel room guarded by Chinese police officers, he spoke with me by phone. We spoke again the next day on the morning of April 27. Since that day, I have been unable to communicate with him.

In the past 7 months, our family has been deeply concerned for my husband’s well-being and safety. We have done everything we could to obtain information about him, but our basic rights were denied. We submitted 8 written requests, made more than 20 calls to the Chinese Embassy in Washington DC and made 6 visits to the various offices in China. I arrived in Beijing on May 23 and was not allowed to enter the country. I was sent to Canada on the same day.

My husband’s brother traveled to Beijing four times from his home in Shandong province to learn where my husband was being held and try to arrange for legal representation. No lawyers in China would accept his case since there was no official record of his arrest or trial date. Chinese authorities at the Public Security Ministry, the State Security Ministry, the Foreign Ministry, and the Beijing Public Security Bureau would not provide any confirmation.

We have been in close contact with the US State Department, which has been very supportive. Despite their active involvement in the case, they have also been unable to obtain even the most basic information, such as where my husband is being held and how he is being treated. Since July, the State Department has more than once requested a written notification from the Chinese government, but nothing has happened.

Chinese law requires notification of detention within 24 hours; Chinese law imposes a 37-day limit on detentions without a warrant; Chinese law requires that the detainee be permitted rapid access to legal counsel. China has not honored its own laws with respect to my husband’s case. He has not been permitted to communicate with anyone since his detention 7 months ago. Such an extended period of isolation from the outside world surely constitutes inhuman, cruel and degrading treatment. Just today, my attorney Jared Genser of Freedom Now, filed a petition to the United Nation High Commission on Human Rights, Working Group on Arbitrary Detention describing the violations of Chinese and International law in my husband’s case. The petition will be attached with my statement.

I remain hopeful and appreciative of the many people working on my husband’s behalf. I would particularly thank the more than 40 Members of Congress from Senate and House, Republicans and Democrats, who have written a total of 21 letters to both the Chinese and U.S. governments to appeal for my husband’s release.

Supportive letters were also written by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, President Lawrence Summers of Harvard University, 34 faculties of Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Chancellor Robert Berdahl of University of California at Berkeley and many others. Their efforts have given me much courage and hope during this very difficult struggle. Their help will have a direct impact on my husband’s fate.

¹This document is retained in Commission files.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to inform the Congressional-Executive Commission on China of my husband's case and to appeal for help. It is also my hope that this commission will continue to show concern about my husband's case and take advantage of the upcoming human rights dialog with China to press for my husband's release so that joy and peace will return to my children and my family. Thank you all very much!

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. SENSER

DECEMBER 9, 2002

HOW TO ASSESS CHINA'S PROGRESS

More than 12 years ago I attended a conference on democracy sponsored by the National Endowment for Democracy and hosted in the House Foreign Affairs Committee room, just down the road from here. It was an exciting time. Among other historic events, Solidarity had been legalized in Poland just a few weeks earlier, and so it was natural that the lead-off speaker was someone from Poland—Jacek Kuron, a leading advisor to the Solidarity movement. As the conference program pointed out, Kuron was the person “most responsible for developing the strategy of building civil society” in Poland.

I was greatly impressed with the conceptual framework of Kuron's remarks—his outline of the essential characteristics of totalitarianism. Drawing on his own personal experience in the struggle against a repressive regime, Kuron identified “a monopoly of organization” as the key element of totalitarianism. This monopoly, he said, “is so total that if its citizens gather freely and discuss freely a matter as simple as roof repairs on a block of flats [or condominium apartments], this constitutes a challenge to the central authority.” The second most important characteristic of a totalitarian state, Kuron said, “is a monopoly on information, meaning that every printed word—not to mention the electronic media—is centrally steered by central authority.” As a practical matter, he quickly added, this model is an ideal that cannot be implemented in all its fullness.

Kuron's model of totalitarianism is a useful tool for making a serious assessment of any country at any time, and it is especially useful for making judgments about one particular country, the People's Republic of China, at this particular time. A powerful country daily becoming ever more powerful, China is in the midst of historic change, dramatized by a double transition, first, to a new generation of leaders at the top of the country's Party/state command structure, and second, to a new global role in the international political economy as a leading member of the World Trade Organization.

Chairman Mao went a long way toward imposing the totalitarian ideal on China, and caused unbelievable horrors before his successors changed course. Unfortunately, although well short of the Mao era extremes, the essential characteristics of totalitarianism survive in modern China. The regime still tenaciously holds on its monopolies of organization and of information—even as it “opens up” in significant ways. But, as a practical matter, Beijing has made selective exceptions to its implementation of the totalitarian model. Let me briefly describe one that fascinates me.

Consider the thriving existence of an organization called the American Chamber of Commerce in China [AmCham-China]. It is headquartered in Beijing, but its influence reaches beyond the capital city. Its membership comprises more than 1,550 persons representing more than 750 companies, small and large, with operations throughout China. It is a “forum” for exchanging information inside and outside its own ranks, even with China Government officials at various levels. That information covers a lot of ground. Its annual White Paper, a comprehensive survey (in English and Chinese) of the “climate” for American business in China, provides exhaustive details on both the positive and the negative features of that climate. Its analysis of labor conditions, for example, praises “positive developments . . . benefiting both international and domestic business,” but also contains many complaints, such as that “labor costs in China remain higher than those of many Asian countries, and are rising steadily . . . [without a] corresponding improvement in the competitiveness of the Chinese labor market.” The full text of the White Paper is available on the Web. Among the Chamber's other activities are these:

- Publishing a business magazine, AmCham China Brief, 10 times a year. It reaches a readership estimated at 5,000, including not only 1,500 business executives, but also Chinese and U.S. Government officials, foreign diplomats, and directors of other chambers of commerce in the Asia-Pacific region.

- Monitoring and publicizing China's compliance with its World Trade Organization (WTO) accession agreements. Its WTO Implementation Report, released this fall, praises China's "serious commitment to meeting its WTO obligation," and also expresses "many specific concerns . . . [about] some areas where China may not yet be in full compliance with WTO commitments." The Chamber will continue this monitoring, and is planning to issue an annual public report for the rest of China's 5-year WTO implementation period. There you have some details (culled from <http://www.amcham-china.org>) on an enclave of non-totalitarianism in China. In fact, that enclave offers a non-totalitarian model of how freedom of organization and freedom of information can be exercised in China, if permitted by the government. It also outlines the kinds of openness that China must attain to free itself fully from the shackles of totalitarianism.

In singling out AmCham-China, I am of course not objecting to the fact that American business people, like the business people of many other foreign countries, have successfully organized themselves and are actively pursuing their interests in a collective fashion, even to the point of lobbying the Government of China. It's just that their freedoms so glaringly contrast with how thoroughly, often brutally, China denies these same freedoms to its own citizens, including its working men and women in factories, farms, and offices. This policy has a historical antecedent, nowadays in universal disrepute, called colonialism, a system whose central failing was to grant foreigners greater rights than a country's own people. It eventually inspired revolutions. Will the neo-colonialism of the 21st century do likewise?

In an article he published in Hong Kong in 1994, just before he was again jailed, China's famed human rights advocate, Wei Jingsheng, protested against the discriminatory policy of granting foreigners various rights, privileges, and preferences denied to China's own people. "The citizens of this country will not put up with such unfair treatment for long," he warned. "We know from history that at times of great social change, unfair phenomena can easily change to the opposite extreme. That is, while it is the Chinese citizens who are treated unfairly; in the future it may be the foreigner."

China has experienced no such unfairness to foreigners. But remember, it took time before colonialism to become recognized as grossly unfair and to be rejected as intolerable. And 21st century communications and technology can speed up history.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF OYUNBILIG

DECEMBER 9, 2002

Members of the Commission, Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, I thank the Commission for giving me this opportunity to speak on the human rights situation in Inner Mongolia. My name is Oyunbilig. I came to the United States from Inner Mongolia in 1995 and now I'm staying in the United States as a political asylee.

Due to the limited time, I'll be straight to the point. However, I do need to point out that the southern part of the Mongol land and its people had always been a part of the Mongol Nation that came to exist in 13th century and that's where the name Inner Mongolia came to be. In 1947, the Chinese Government setup the "Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region" against the will of the Mongol people. Since then, individual human rights have been deprived from the Mongols in Inner Mongolia, along with their political and civil rights as a people. For more than half a century, the Mongols in Inner Mongolia have witnessed some most horrifying events in our people's history: mass killings of innocent civilians; total destruction of the religious establishments; calculated and forced cultural assimilation that brought the Mongol culture and tradition to the brink of extinction; and catastrophic destruction of the grassland, just to name a few.

Now, I'll provide two cases as testimonies to what we are very concerned about.

The first one is the case of Mr. Hada and Mr. Tegexi. In 1992, Mr. Hada, Mr. Tegexi, and other Mongol students and intellectuals established the Southern Mongolian Democracy Alliance (SMDA). The goal of the SMDA was to promote and preserve Mongolian language, history and culture in Inner Mongolia and to strive for the civil and political rights for the Mongols.

In December 1995, Mr. Hada, Mr. Tegexi, and over 70 members and supporters of the SMDA were arrested after they organized peaceful demonstrations and student strikes at universities against the Chinese Government's oppressive policies toward the Mongols in Inner Mongolia. On December 6, 1996, Mr. Hada was charged with crimes of inciting separatism and was sentenced to 15 years in jail. Mr. Tegexi

was accused of similar crimes and was sentenced to 10 years in jail. Today, Mr. Tegexi's whereabouts are not known.

According to Hada's wife, Ms. Xinna, Hada has been tortured by the prison guards constantly and suffers from a number of physical illnesses. Ms. Xinna was also arrested several times for giving interviews to foreign media, including Voice of America and Radio Free Asia. The bookstore they owned was shutdown and that left Ms. Xinna and their son Uiles with no reliable sources of living. In 2001, Hada's 16-year old son Uiles was expelled from school without sufficient explanations from the school. Later in December 2001, he was arrested for alleged robbery and sentenced to 2 years in jail, again, without proper trial. According to Ms. Xinna, prison guards also beat Uiles several times.

The second case concerns the Chinese Government's on-going effort to evict and re-locate Mongol herders by force.

In recent years, sand storms originating from the north have become a big problem for China as they grow in calamity and frequency. Beijing is one of the major cities hit by the sand storm, because of its close proximity to Inner Mongolia. Government officials in Beijing had long ignored the problem until they were exposed to the threat of sand storms. However, they put the blame on the Mongol herders and their animals, instead of on their own policies toward Inner Mongolia. Since the early 1950s, the Chinese Government moved millions of Han Chinese into Inner Mongolia as an attempt to make the occupation of Inner Mongolia a fait accompli. Most of these Han Chinese are peasants and their only means of life is to cultivate the land. Unsited for agricultural cultivation that strips the land of its topsoil, the Inner Mongolia steppe would turn into patches of desert after only a few years of farming, the consequence of which is threatening China's capital now.

The Chinese Government started a program to forcefully relocate Mongol herders 2 years ago under the pretext that the main reason for the sand storms is over-grazing. According to the Xinhua News Agency, the program will resettle about 650,000 people in 6 years and most of them are Mongol herders. One of the nine prefectures of Inner Mongolia already declared a total ban on livestock herding. We have many reports from Inner Mongolia indicating that Mongol herders were asked to sell off their livestock and were forced out from their pastures into unfamiliar territory and unknown lifestyle, without any support from the government.

Members of Commission, Mr. Hada and Mr. Tegexi are two of the few political prisoners who are serving 10 or more years of prison terms in China. I would like to ask the Commission and the U.S. Congress to bring up their cases during the future contact with Chinese officials; I also ask you to urge the Chinese Government to stop the relocation program that is aimed at the Mongol herders, and provide adequate support and subsidy for those who already have been displaced.

Thank you very much.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOAN MOWER

DECEMBER 9, 2002

CHINA'S JAMMING OF U.S. INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

The Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) is the independent Federal agency that oversees all U.S. nonmilitary international broadcasting, including the Voice of America (VOA) and Radio Free Asia (RFA).

Our mission, quite simply, is to "promote and sustain freedom and democracy by broadcasting accurate and objective news and information about the United States and the world." In China, however, we face a serious problem in fulfilling that mandate because Beijing is working hard to prevent the news we report from getting through to the Chinese people.

Even as China is actively trying to expand its role in the global marketplace, it is isolating its people, cutting off the free flow of information and denying citizens reliable and credible news from the United States, among other places.

The BBG, which monitors jamming with the assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, knows that virtually all of VOA's and RFA's shortwave radio transmissions directed to China in that country's languages are jammed. VOA broadcasts in Cantonese, Mandarin and Tibetan. RFA broadcasts in Cantonese, Mandarin, Tibetan and Uyghur.

Unfortunately, jamming seems to be on the rise, despite increased commercial and diplomatic contacts between the United States and China. In Lhasa, Tibet's capital city, for example, it is impossible to receive a good signal for VOA Tibetan, even though the service is on three or five frequencies, depending on the time of day.

As has been widely reported, the Chinese Government also is determined to censor the fast-growing internet by blocking sites, including those of VOA *www.voanews.com* and RFA *www.rfa.org*. Researchers at Harvard Law School recently concluded China has the world's most censored internet, with the government blocking up to 19,000 websites. Additionally, email subscription services are blocked. The BBG—along with, we hope, all Americans—is concerned about the Chinese Government's actions for a number of reasons.

First, it's a human rights issue: Everyone is entitled to factual, uncensored information.

Second, the Chinese people know woefully little about the United States—and that's not good. Surveys show a disturbing 68 percent of urban dwellers in China consider the United States their country's No. 1 enemy. By controlling outside media, the Chinese Government has manipulated the news and stopped the United States from telling its side of the story. As a result, some 1.2 billion people are ill-informed about our people, our culture, our democracy, our freedoms and our government policies.

Not only are the Chinese Government's actions wrong—they're unfair. While China jams VOA and RFA, the United States allows China's Government television, CCTV, on many cable systems across the country. China Radio International, China's Government radio, broadcasts unjammed on shortwave and on a number of affiliated AM and FM radio stations in the United States. Of course, as a country that supports a free exchange of views and ideas, we wouldn't have it any other way.

At the same time, the U.S. Government has granted more than 40 journalists from China's state-run media permission to live and work in the United States without restriction. The same cannot be said about China where American journalists work under more stringent restrictions. Moreover, the Chinese have refused to increase from two the number of correspondents working for U.S. international broadcasting in China.

So what can be done? At a minimum, the issue needs to be brought to the forefront of the public agenda. Top administration officials already have promised to raise the issue with the Chinese through diplomatic channels and other discussions so we're hopeful that there might be some movement on that front.

The BBG also has filed complaints of "harmful interference" with the International Telecommunications Union monthly since August 2000, claiming Chinese jamming violates radio regulations. China first acknowledged receipt of the complaints in July 2002, and again in August 2002. Failure to acknowledge complaints is itself a violation of radio regulations. China insists, implausibly, that what we hear as jamming is merely an accidental overlap of broadcasts on the country's highly congested airwaves. The BBG believes these responses are duplicitous at best. Chinese officials have not responded positively to a U.S. request to discuss frequency management.

To overcome jamming, the BBG generally broadcasts on different frequencies to reach a broad geographic region. U.S. international broadcasting spends about \$9.5 million annually to transmit about 100,000 hours of RFA and VOA programming to China. Costs could be slashed about 25 percent if China ceased jamming. China spends a comparable amount to counter U.S. transmissions.

Finally, both VOA and RFA continue to research and experiment with proxy servers and mirror internet sites to circumvent the bamboo curtain.

But the bottom line is this: the United States, now engaged in a global war on terrorism, cannot afford to have 18 percent of the world's population misinformed about our country. We need a concerted strategy involving Congress and the Executive branch to grapple with this problem—and to stop the jamming.

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KERY WILKIE NUNEZ¹

DECEMBER 9, 2002

SLANDER AND PERSECUTION OF FALUN GONG IN CHINA AND IN THE UNITED STATES:
LOSING THE RIGHT TO APPEAL

Under China's constitution, there is an appeals process. Yet Falun Gong practitioners who appealed peacefully by quietly meditating or displaying a banner were detained, beaten and even sentenced to long prison terms. Some were tortured and killed despite the fact that every single appeal Falun Gong practitioners made was peaceful and legal.

Practitioners outside of China took their appeals to the free world. While they received significant support from the international community, the Chinese Government has made it more difficult to appeal, even in the free world. To achieve this, they used slander, the creation of a blacklist, threats to family members of practitioners, intimidation of local officials who support Falun Gong, and harassment of practitioners abroad.²

While every single demonstration that Falun Gong does is peaceful and practitioners follow principles of "truthfulness-compassion-tolerance," Chinese authorities use slander to convince foreign governments that these innocent people may pose a threat. For example, in an effort to ruin the reputation of Falun Gong, the Chinese Government staged a self-immolation incident on Tiananmen Square in January of 2001. While none of the participants in the self-immolation were practitioners, the Chinese Government used the self-immolation incident as the centerpiece of its campaign to discredit Falun Gong.³ The International Education Development Bureau reported to the United Nations in August of 2001 evidence that the Chinese Government staged the self-immolation.⁴ Nevertheless, fabricated lies of this nature are used by the state-controlled media in China and are also shown by Chinese channels in foreign countries, including the United States.

There is also pressure on overseas practitioners not to appeal on behalf of Falun Gong. When practitioners in the United States tell people the facts about the persecution, their families in China are threatened. In America, practitioners' apartments have been broken into,⁵ people have been beaten up, a car filled with Falun Gong literature was firebombed, and phones are wire tapped. Even U.S. officials are pressured by the Chinese Government to rescind proclamations given to Falun Gong.⁶ On February 21, 2002, the Wall Street Journal reported "The Chinese Government, not content to persecute the Falun Gong in China, has [urged] local U.S. officials to shun or even persecute them right here in America. The approach . . . tends to combine gross disinformation with scare tactics and, in some cases, slyly implied diplomatic and commercial pressure."

In another effort to silence Falun Gong practitioners, the Chinese Government pressures foreign countries to deny them entry. For example, many practitioners, including U.S. citizens, were denied entry into Iceland during Jiang Zemin's visit. Once the general public learned of this affront to civil liberties, 3,000 Icelandic citizens demonstrated on behalf of Falun Gong and wrote apologies in their major newspapers. Unfortunately, citizens in other countries may not even know when their government cooperates with the communist regime. Last April, German media reported that Falun Gong practitioners were abruptly forced to clear their hotel

¹Mrs. Nunez is a Falun Gong practitioner and a legislative director for a national Hispanic organization. She may be contacted via email at kwilkie1@aol.com.

²For background information and media reports on the PRC's harassment of practitioners in America visit <http://www.faluninfo.net/specialreports/freedomunderattack>.

³Torture is Breaking Falun Gong: China Systematically Eradicating Group. Washington Post, August 5, 2001.

⁴International Education Development Bureau Statement before the United Nations Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Fifty-third session, Agenda item 6, August 2001. The regime points to a supposed self-immolation incident in Tiananmen Square on January 23, 2001 as "proof" that Falun Gong is an "evil cult." However, an analysis of the PRC's Government's newscast footage of the incident shows that the event was staged by the government.

⁵Beijing's Long Arms: How China is Suppressing Falun Gong in America, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com>, December 2002.

⁶Will Chinese Repression Play in Peoria. The Wall Street Journal, Thursday, February 21, 2002.

rooms. The Chinese Government's pressure is not limited to pressure on governments alone. For example, when Jiang Zemin visited the United States in October, Falun Gong practitioners lost their reservation of a ballroom at a hotel in Houston. Practitioners were planning a conference 1 day prior to the arrival of Jiang. The ballroom was canceled 45 minutes before their conference was to begin despite the fact that the practitioner making the arrangement had a signed contract in hand, which had been paid in full 2 weeks prior to the event.

Practitioners and supporters in America hope that the United States will take the lead in ensuring that the peaceful Falun Gong practitioners, who are unjustly persecuted by the Chinese Government, have the opportunity to appeal in the free world.

I recommend that the Congressional-Executive Commission on China do the following: Urge the U.S. Government to investigate and take legal action against illegal activities by Chinese diplomats concerning harassment of U.S. citizens and residents who practice Falun Gong; urge the U.S. Senate to hold a hearing on House Resolution 188 once it is reintroduced in the 108th Congress; and make Falun Gong the focal point of the Commission's work and future reports.

Thank you for accepting my written statement for the record.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ENHEBATU TOGOCHOG, PRESIDENT, SOUTHERN MONGOLIAN HUMAN RIGHTS INFORMATION CENTER

DECEMBER 9, 2002

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As you know, the mission of Radio Free Asia (RFA) is to bring uncensored and non-partisan news and information to Asian populations which might otherwise be denied such access by their governments. This is the essential criterion for the choice of RFA's broadcasts. There is also the implication that RFA as a U.S. Government sponsored organization secondarily seeks to encourage democratic values. One important virtue of RFA is that it beams its broadcasts in the native languages of the Asian populations it seeks to service. In the new millennium, information and news is a more critical part of the social and political functioning of nations and governments than ever before. When information and news becomes a political tool and falls under the control of a single agenda, the essential quality of this important function becomes distorted and in direct opposition to democratic values. RFA plays an important role in counteracting such distortions. Given this backdrop, it will be argued that RFA broadcasts in the Mongolian language are completely in line with the RFA mission and there is a vital need for such broadcasts. We begin by providing a brief picture of the extent to which disinformation is being used at the detriment of the Mongolian populations of China.

Chinese Government interference and censoring with the free flow of news and events has been well documented. In Inner Mongolia, all kinds of media such as TV, radio broadcasting, newspapers, Internet, and publications, especially those in Mongolian language, are strictly controlled by the Chinese Government. No independent agency exists dealing with news, press and publication nor is there any provision allowing for open dissent of government decisions or policies. Those who try to express their opposing political, ethnic, religious, cultural or historical opinions and ideas are subject to arrest and jail. According to incomplete figures of the Southern Mongolian Human Rights Information Center (SMHRIC), since 1990, at least a hundred different titles of books, magazines and other publications, 20 movies and videos have been banned; more than 70 Internet sites have been blocked; at least 40 bookstores, Internet cafés and reading clubs have been shut down; thousands of books, video tapes, CDs and tape recordings of Mongolian songs thought to be against national policies in one form or another have been confiscated from individuals and retail stores without any compensation. At least 100 Mongolian authors, writers, correspondents, editors and translators and other dissidents have been detained, arrested and sent to jail for alleged acts of government opposition (about the most prominent cases, please see the annex). The official government policy of sinicization of the Mongolian populations and regions causes them to see expressions of Mongol cultural identity as a threat and establishes the basis for official distortion and disinformation about these repressive actions.

The Chinese Government not only strictly controls all information sources but also regularly misinforms the Mongols about Western countries, especially the United States policies, society and culture. School textbooks emphasize that the U.S. is an "imperialist country, like a 'paper tiger', doesn't have any real power." School authorities stress that the only purpose of the United States foreign policy is "to

split our great mother country by using ‘sugar-coated bullet’ or ‘peaceful revolution.’” American democracy is said to be a “fake democracy whose beneficiaries are just a few rich people.” In colleges, students are forced to attend the so-called “political study” classes on every Thursday afternoon. Absences are not allowed. The main purpose of the “political study” is to indoctrinate the Mongolian intellectuals into believing that the best political system in the world is “the Chinese style socialist system.” They also describe American society as “a monster’s hole which is the darkest part of the world where people eat people.” Propaganda Committees at various levels give speeches or show movies, videos and slides stating that the U.S. is a society where violence and crime are spread everywhere and people have no social or moral values, therefore, people’s lives and property are not safe and everybody faces the threat of robbery and murder at anytime. They also say that in America, relationships between people are based on money and people don’t have any family connections, where everybody has at least one extramarital sexual partner. These and other distortions are intended to encourage a hostile attitude toward western countries, particularly the United States. For example, shortly after the 9/11 disaster, China’s largest official news agency, Xin Hua News, stated that in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region, especially the capital Huhhot City, Osama Bin Laden’s pictures and toys with his name became the best selling goods in many stores. This is a reflection of the relative success of the government disinformation campaign.

Official news about the Mongolians themselves is also similarly distorted in order to push the interests of the government. All kinds of publications and the media have taught people that Chinggis Khan is Chinese and that the Mongols are a part of the great Han Chinese (Zhong Hua Min Zu) Nation. They stress that not only Inner Mongolia but also the independent country of Mongolia was a part of the great mother Nation of China. Many publications insist that Mongolia should return to its “mother country of China” and some even go so far as to say that now it is time to take Mongolia back because most of the Mongolians are willing to “return to the embrace of their homeland China.” Similarly, news about native Mongols in opposition to official Chinese policies is suppressed. The government uses misinformation to push their political, economic and cultural agenda with little regard to historical truth or objectivity.

China has been condemned by human rights organizations and the international community in general for violations of civil and human rights. There is extensive documentation on their harsh suppression of non-Han Chinese cultural and ethnic expressions on the part of individuals and groups. But international attention has not been paid to their policies of disinformation and distortion of world and national events to the same degree, yet we would argue that these are as reprehensible as their human rights record. The substantial Mongol population in China of 5 million people are victims of this information distortion. The only way in which the total control of the media can be neutralized is through independent reporting and access to broadcasts such as RFA’s. We request that the Mongol populations of China be given access to RFA broadcasts in the Mongolian language. They too, like the Tibetans, Uyghurs and the Chinese should have the privilege of hearing clear and objective reporting that only the RFA can provide.

Thank you.

ANNEX

The followings are the most prominent cases about free press, free speech, and free assembly in Inner Mongolia:

- Banned books:

1. *Way Out of Southern Mongolia*—A Mongolian book by Mr. Hada, president of the Southern Mongolian Democratic Alliance, who was arrested in 1995 and sentenced to 15 years jail. This book has been banned since 1995;

2. *Kang Sheng and the False Case of Inner Mongolian People’s Revolutionary Party*—A Mongolian book, published in 1995, revealing the truth of the 10 years-long genocide against ethnic Mongolians during the Cultural Revolution, by Mr. Tumen, an ethnic Mongolian high ranking official who has been accused and put under house arrest after publishing the book. This book has been banned since 1996;

3. *Do Not Forget, Extinguished If Forget!*—A Mongolian book by B. Baabar, an Outer Mongolian author, promoting and protecting the traditional Mongolian culture and identity. This book has been banned since 1992;

4. *Ethnic Problems in Inner Mongolia*—A Mongolian book by Mr. Muunohai, an ethnic Mongolian prominent dissident who had served 8 years jail, using Marxism

to analyze the Chinese authorities ethnic policy in Inner Mongolia. This book has been banned since 1995;

5. *Prisoners Outside the Prison*—A Mongolian book by Mr. Unag, publishing some ethnic Mongolian dissidents' articles, has been banned since 1998;

6. *I Have Nothing Wrong, Never!*—A Mongolian poetry anthology by Mr. Chingdalai, expressing his strong desire to basic human rights and fundamental freedom, has been banned since 1999;

7. *I Am From Harahorin*—A Mongolian poetry anthology by Mr. Ulziitogtoh, describing his dream of freedom, has been banned since 2001;

8. *The Truth of the Cultural Revolution's "Unearthing the Inner Mongolian Revolutionary Party Members" and "Cracking Down Traitor groups" Movements in Inner Mongolia*—A book by Mr. Bayantai, revealing the truth of the Chinese Communist Party's massacre against ethnic Mongolian population in Inner Mongolia during the Cultural Revolution, has been banned since July 2002;

- Banned books:

1. *Voice of Southern Mongolia*—A Mongolian language magazine by the Southern Mongolian Democratic Alliance, publishing dissident's articles and human rights documents, has been banned since 1995;

2. *History of The Great Mongolia*—A Mongolian language magazine edited by the Mongolian scholars, publishing Mongolian history, has been banned since 1997;

3. *The Freedom-Seeking People*—A Mongolian language magazine by college students in Huhhot City, publishing ethnic Mongolian student's articles regarding freedom, has been banned since 1992;

- Banned movies and videos:

1. *The Great Mongol*—A documentary film made in Japan and translated into Chinese in Taiwan, showing the different version of Mongolian history, has been banned since 1992;

2. *Tsokht Taij*—A Mongolian movie made in Mongolia, describing the Mongolian hero Tsokht Taij who tried to unify Inner and Outer Mongolia centuries ago, has been banned since 1990s;

3. *Queen Manduhai Tsetsen*—A Mongolian movie made in Mongolia, telling the story of Queen Manduhai Tsetsen who tried to unify all of Mongolian tribes centuries ago, has been banned since 1993;

4. *A Beautiful White Yurt*—A Mongolian movie made by Inner Mongolian Film Making Corporation, has been banned since 1996 because one of the scenes in the film "over emotionally describes the relationship between Inner Mongolians and Outer Mongolians;"

- Blocked Internet sites and e-news:

1. www.innermongolia.org—website of the Inner Mongolian People's Party, the largest exiled organization established by Inner Mongolian political refugees in the United States. This site has been blocked since 1997;

2. *Southern Mongolian Watch*—an e-mail based magazine edited by the Southern Mongolian Human Rights Information Center (SMHRIC) publishing Inner Mongolian human rights situation and general human rights issues, has been blocked by the Chinese Internet police since 2001;

3. <http://www.caccp.org>—website of the Florida based Citizens Against Communist Chinese Propaganda (CACCP), has been blocked since 1998;

4. <http://www.taklamakan.org/multi-l>—a website regarding Southern Mongolian, Tibetans, Eastern Turkestan and Taiwan's issues, has been blocked since 2001;

5. <http://southernmongolia.hypermart.net/forum/mainpage.pl>—An Internet forum called "Southern Mongolian Forum" (later changed to "Inner Mongolian Cultural Salon") created by the Inner Mongolians abroad, has been blocked since 2001;

6. www.voa.gov and www.rfa.org—websites of Voice of America and Radio Free Asia have been blocked since they were created;

7. www.smhric.org—website of the Southern Mongolian Human Rights Information Center (SMHRIC), blocked since October 2002;

8. www.mongolculture.com—an Internet forum created by Inner Mongolian intellectuals in Inner Mongolia, discussing Mongolian cultural issues, has been blocked before the Chinese Communist Party's 16th National Congress in November 2002;

- Bookstores, reading clubs, and Internet cafés shut down:
 1. *Mongolian Study Bookstore*—a bookstore owned by Mr. Hada, president of the Southern Mongolian Democratic Alliance (SMDA), and his wife Mrs. Xinna, has been shut down and demolished by the authorities after the SMDA was cracked down in 1995;
 2. *Mongolian Students Reading Club*—a free academic association established by ethnic Mongolian students in Huhhot City, has been cracked down and announced as “an illegal organization” since 2001;
 3. *Blue City Internet Café*—an Internet café providing ethnic Mongolians with low price Internet access, has been shut down and announced as illegal business since 2001;
- Books, video tapes, computers and copy machines confiscated:
 1. Mongolian Study Bookstore’s all books valued at 200,000 Yuan (approximately 23,000 U.S. dollars) were confiscated by the authorities without any compensation after the crack down of the SMDA in 1995;
 2. Mongolian Students Reading Club’s more than 500 books and other facilities such as copy machine and computers have been confiscated after its crack down in 2001;
 3. Blue City Internet Café’s 47 computers, 2 copy machines and other facilities were confiscated by the authorities in 2001;
 4. According to the ethnic Mongolian victims, thousands of video tapes of “The Great Mongolia,” “Manduhai Tsesten,” and “The Great Mongol” have been taken back from the buyers and retail stores without any compensation;
 5. According to many ethnic Mongolian readers, thousands of Mongolian books such as “Kang Sheng and the False Case of the Inner Mongolian People’s Revolutionary Party,” “Prisoners Outside the Prison,” “I Have Nothing Wrong, Never!” have been taken back from the buyers and bookstores without any compensation;
 6. According to the November 7, 2002 report of the Chinese official news, Xinhua News, in order to welcome China’s 16th National People’s Congress, Inner Mongolian authorities have conducted a 10-month long so-called “Publication Market Cleansing Movement,” and confiscated and burned 50,000 books and magazines. The report also says, many book stores have been shut down;
- Ethnic Mongolian victims of the Chinese authorities’ violations against free speech, free press, and free assembly:
 1. Mr. Hada—Author of “Way Out of Southern Mongolia,” also the president of the Southern Mongolian Democratic Alliance, has been sentenced to 15 years jail. Currently, he is still serving his imprisonment in Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region No.4 Prison in Chi Feng City;
 2. Mr. Tegexi—Vice president of the Southern Mongolian Democratic Alliance and the editor of “Voice of Southern Mongolia,” has been sentenced to 10 years jail since 1995. Currently, he is still in a jail near Huhhot City;
 3. 70 members of the Southern Mongolian Democratic Alliance were detained respectively 6 months to 3 days in 1995 for the so-called “illegal association, illegal gathering, illegal lecturing;”
 4. Mrs. Xinna—Wife of Mr. Hada, co-owner of “Mongolian Study Bookstore,” had been detained three times for total length of 99 days for receiving Voice of America’s telephone interview in 1996;
 5. Hutsuntegus—A leader of the Ih Ju League National Culture Society who tried to legally register the organization, has been sentenced to 5 years jail for “illegal publishing and illegal propaganda.” In 1991, he translated and distributed a book called “Do Not Forget, Extinguished If Forget!;”
 6. Wang Manglai—Another leader of the Ih Ju League National Culture Society, has been charged 3 years jail for the same reason;
 7. 26 key individuals of the Ih Ju League National Culture Society were put under house arrest in 1991;

8. Ulaan Shovuu—A teacher at Inner Mongolian University, has been sentenced to 5 years jail for “passing on confidential document to foreigner” in 1991. In fact, the so-called “confidential document” is a document regarding the authorities’ violation against ethnic Mongolian basic human rights and fundamental freedom;

9. Zhang Haiquan—A Mongolian student at Inner Mongolian University was detained 5 months for writing a 4-word sentence, “Min Zhu Wan Sui” which means “Long Live Democracy!” on his classroom blackboard in 1992;

10. Unag—Author of “Prisoners Outside the Prison,” had been detained three times for more than 9 months and brutally tortured during the detention;

11. Chingdalai—Author of “I Have Nothing Wrong, Never!,” had been detained for 6 months in 2001 and brutally tortured by the police for expressing his desire to freedom;

12. Ulziitogtoh—Author of “ I Am From Harahorin,” had been detained for 3 months and now still being held under house arrest for expressing his “strong national sentiment” through the book;

13. Altanbulag and Badarangui—Two young musicians, was arrested in 2001 for “distributing the splittism materials.” In fact, the so-called “splittism materials” are some open letters by ethnic Mongolian dissidents.

