

ROUNDTABLE ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN CHINA

ROUNDTABLE BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON CHINA ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MARCH 25, 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

79-303 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2002

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
NANCY PELOSI, California
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

IRA WOLF, *Staff Director*
JOHN FOARDE, *Deputy Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
Opening statement of Ira Wolf, Staff Director, Congressional-Executive Commission on China	1
Quigley, Thomas E. U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	2
Marshall, Paul, senior fellow, Center for Religious Freedom, Freedom House ..	5
Aikman, David, foreign affairs consultant, and former Time bureau chief in Beijing	8
Kung, Joseph, president, Cardinal Kung Foundation	10
APPENDIX	
PREPARED STATEMENTS	
Quigley, Thomas E	34
Marshall, Paul	36
Kung, Joseph	39

ROUNDTABLE ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN CHINA

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2002,

CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE,
COMMISSION ON CHINA,
Washington, DC.

The roundtable was convened, pursuant to notice, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-215, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Mr. Ira Wolf (staff director of the Commission) presiding.

Also present: Mr. John Foarde, Deputy Staff Director; Mr. Geoffrey Gleason, Office of Congressman Wolf; Ms. Holly Vineyard, U.S. Department of Commerce; Mr. Robert Shepard, U.S. Department of Labor; Ms. Karen Finkler, Office of Congressman Pitts; Ms. Sharon Payt, Office of Senator Brownback; Ms. Teresa McNeil and Ms. Amy Gadsen, U.S. Department of State; and Mr. Michael Castellano, Office of Congressman Levin.

OPENING STATEMENT OF IRA WOLF, STAFF DIRECTOR, CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON CHINA

Mr. WOLF. Let us get started.

I would like to welcome everyone to the third of the public roundtables that we have been holding on behalf of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China.

Today we are going to look at religious freedom issues in China, and we have four distinguished members of our panel: Thomas Quigley, from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops; Paul Marshall from Freedom House; David Aikman, a consultant on foreign affairs and former Time bureau chief in Beijing; and Joseph Kung, president of the Cardinal Kung Foundation.

I would like to note that, although the title of today's hearing is religious freedom, we are actually focusing on the issues of freedom to practice Christianity.

We will have a roundtable on June 10, that will focus on Tibetan Buddhism, as well as Islam and Uighur Muslims.

Before we turn to today's panel, let me just note that the next roundtable will be on April 15, and we will be discussing the Internet and free flow of information in China.

Also, the next full Commission hearing, chaired by Senator Baucus and Congressman Bereuter, will be held on April 11. The topic will be human rights and legal reform.

We are going to follow the usual format today. Each panel member will have 10 minutes to make his presentation. The yellow light will go off at minute 9, and that means please try and finish off the last bit of your commentary.

After the four presentations, each of the staff members will have 5 minutes to ask questions. Then, depending on the time, we will continue going around until everyone is exhausted.

We will go from left to right and start with Tom Quigley.

**STATEMENT OF THOMAS E. QUIGLEY, U.S. CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC BISHOPS**

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you for this opportunity to offer some brief comments on the issue of religious freedom today, especially with reference to the Catholic Church in the People's Republic of China.

I will confine my remarks to several recent developments in China that directly touch on the role of the Catholic Church there.

First, some numbers. Out of well over a billion people, Chinese Catholics number between 8 and 12 million. The 12 million is probably safe; roughly 4 million in the open, registered church, roughly 8 million in the underground, or unregistered.

The government, of course, does not recognize the latter, so official figures have it that there are about 100 million believers in the country, less than 1 percent—which is a gross under-count—of which 4 million, according to the government, are Catholic.

The number of Catholics is small, growing at a very slow pace, but 12 million is still far larger than the roughly 3 million Catholics before the Communist takeover. As Dick Madsen, one of the best China church-watchers in this country likes to note, there are a lot more Catholics in China than there are in Ireland.

Let me frame these remarks by several fairly recent events. Last year, 2001, was significant in a couple of ways for the Church in China. Just over a year ago, in April, there was the Hainan Island collision and the downing of the U.S. spy plane, which, coming on the heels of the Belgrade embassy, plunged Sino-American relations very low indeed.

But then the plane business was resolved. Secretary Powell went to Beijing in July, and President Bush planned his State visit to China for October, coinciding with the APEC meeting in Shanghai.

Then came 9/11, which caused the State visit to be postponed, but the President still went ahead with a quick Asia trip in October, enabling him to meet briefly with Jiang in Shanghai, and then finally to have the postponed State visit just a month ago, in late February.

These United States-China visits have a bearing on the matter of religious freedom, because in both his October and February meetings with Jiang, Mr. Bush raised quite dramatically the issue of religion, including his own faith commitment, and pressed Jiang to grant religious liberty, to free Catholic clergy, especially bishops under detention, and to pursue dialog with the Vatican, as well as with the Dalai Lama.

The question of encouraging China's dialog with the Holy See is something that both the Vatican and our bishops' conference have consistently urged our government for some time.

The essential goal of the dialog is the restoration of normal relations between the Holy See and the People's Republic, relations which the Chinese broke off when they expelled the Apostolic inter-nuncio, Antonio Riberi, and arrested, imprisoned, and finally deported all the foreign clergy and religious in 1951.

But the more immediate, practical goal of such talks, aimed at allowing a Vatican representative to reside in Beijing, whether or not full diplomatic relations are restored, is the opportunity for the Vatican to explain and interpret the sometimes complex reality of the Church to the Chinese authorities.

Thus, when Bishop X is accused of breaking the law, simply because he declines to have his ministry governed and controlled by the CCPA—the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association—the Papal representative could at least make the case that the bishop’s arrest serves no valid purpose, that it can more likely lead to popular discontent than to dampen it, that it is in fact counter-productive to China’s desire to be fully accepted into the world community which places high value on the free expression of religious belief, and so on. And thus, by persistent diplomatic pressure, changes in this behavior might eventually be effected.

The other effect of 9/11 was, of course, China’s apparent signing on in the war on terrorism, resulting in the greatly improved United States-People’s Republic of China [PRC] relations, evidenced clearly in the Bush State visit last month. The President referred to the relationship as “constructive and cooperative.”

Now, a second set of events, these specifically of the Church, were the two Ricci meetings last October, one in Beijing and one in Rome. They were to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the arrival in Beijing in 1601 of the great Jesuit scholar and missionary, Matteo Ricci.

There was at that time a flurry of press speculations that these symposia would herald a major breakthrough in China’s relations with the church, even rumors that China was about to let the Holy See set up an apostolic delegation in Beijing.

The speculation was totally groundless, of course, but the Ricci events did produce one of the most dramatic developments in the centuries-long relationship between the Catholic Church and China.

On October 24, Pope John Paul II issued a statement to the Sino-logists then meeting at Rome’s Gregorian University on the theme of Encounters and Dialogue. In the course of a fairly long discourse tracing the story of Ricci’s contribution, the Holy Father turned to the present.

Then, after expressing the Church’s affection for the Chinese people and her desire to give service for the good of all the people, and noting the long line of generous missionaries and the many works of human development they accomplished down the centuries, especially in the fields of health care and education, he said the following.

History, however, reminds us of the unfortunate fact that the work of members of the Church in China was not always without error, the bitter fruit of their personal limitations and of the limits of their action. Moreover, their action was often conditioned by the difficult situations connected with complex historical events and conflicting political interests. . . .

In certain periods of modern history, a kind of “protection” on the part of European political powers not infrequently resulted in limitations on the Church’s very freedom of action and had negative repercussions for the Church in China. . . .

For all this, I ask the forgiveness and understanding of those who may have felt hurt in some way by such actions on the part of Christians.

This extraordinary apology by the Pope was met by basically embarrassed silence by the government. The spokesman for the foreign ministry was trucked out to repeat the standard mantra, the Holy See must break relations with Taiwan and the Vatican must not use religion to interfere in China's internal affairs.

Interfering in China's internal affairs is a code term for China's rejection of its own constitutional guarantee of religious freedom. It is China's denial of the Church's right to exercise its normal and customary role of appointing bishops as heads of dioceses all over the world, and thus a government's interference in the internal affairs of the Church.

Why were the authorities unable to react more positively to this quite extraordinary papal apology? For the same reason that they grossly overreacted to the October 1, 2000 canonization of the Chinese martyrs, as a smokescreen to cover over the existing divisions within the Party.

The overriding factor right now is the upcoming Party Congress this fall, which is expected to usher in a new, somewhat younger, leadership. Bishop Joseph Zen, Coadjutor of Hong Kong, holds out the hope that this new leadership, and the rising of a political class of even younger people, many of whom will have studied abroad, will gradually bring about genuine change. Gradually, perhaps over a period of 3 years, he thinks.

And change, openness, is the only way to avoid the bloody outcome that some foresee; "there are many unhappy people in China," the bishop notes.

In the meantime, religious expression continues to be either repressed, sometimes brutally, or controlled, although the controls over the registered Catholic Church are showing signs of wear and ineffectiveness. The vast majority of all the registered bishops have been reconciled with Rome, which the government obviously knows.

The power of the Patriotic Association is greatly diminished and given to sometimes desperate gestures, such as the staged ordination of bishops on Epiphany 2000, timed to coincide with the Pope's ordaining 12 bishops that same day.

What is the status of religious persecution of Catholics right now? Over the past months, we have been treated to a kind of good cop/bad cop reporting on the State of religion in China.

The Wall Street Journal, on February 6, claimed that "China is rethinking its heavy-handed politics and taking a more tolerant line on mainstream groups." But at the same time, we know of the secret documents smuggled out by officials of the State Security ministry and other government agencies that envision a still tighter crackdown on unauthorized religious groups.

And at the beginning of Lent this year, mid-February, the news agency of the Vatican's missionary congregation issued a list of some 33 Catholic bishops and priests known to have been arrested, or disappeared, or under house arrest.

The best-known of these, and the one for whom American ambassador Clark Randt has intervened, is Bishop James SU Zhimin of Baoding, a well-respected figure who has been repeatedly arrested, released, and re-arrested. His whereabouts is presently unknown.

Is the end game in sight? We will have to wait to see what the new leadership is like and, if more open to change, how long it will

take for them to consolidate their positions. It seems clear that Jiang's modest moves for change in 1999 lost out to the hard-liners.

His government now at least has acknowledged the merit of issuing human rights reports by putting out their own report on U.S. human rights record, detailing the many perceived violations of human rights in this country, including, as one chapter has it, "Wantonly Infringing upon the Human Rights of Other Countries."

Those of us who advocate for international human rights and religious freedom have our work cut out. I cite the instance of a recent and very detailed policy brief by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Rebalancing United States-China Relations." Amidst a wide-ranging list of issues discussed, there is not a word about human rights, still less about religious freedom.

Thank you.

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

Mr. WOLF. Thanks very much.

Next is Paul Marshall.

STATEMENT OF PAUL MARSHALL, SENIOR FELLOW, CENTER FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, FREEDOM HOUSE

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to join the roundtable on the issue of religious freedom in China. We commend the Commission for monitoring this issue.

We are alarmed by the mounting repression against the major unregistered religious and spiritual groups in China, including Protestants and Catholics.

As you know, Beijing controls the five authorized religions—Protestantism, Catholicism, Buddhism, Islam, and Taoism—by the Religious Affairs Bureau, controlled by the United Front Work Department, itself controlled by the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Other groups which are not included in that are either unregistered, or a group such as Falun Gong, which is banned completely.

In recent years, China has developed a new tactic of labeling religious groups as so-called "cults," and then cracking down on them. This intensifies the repression of non-approved religion.

With the introduction of laws regulating heretical cults on October 30, 1999, religious offenses can now be classified as threatening national security and possibly punishable by life sentences, or even death.

This tactic has been increasingly employed in the last 2 years. Government spokespersons maintain that these believers are not being repressed by restrictive religion laws, but instead are criminals, disrupting public and social order laws.

The result of these new laws and the move against so-called cults has been a marked deterioration in religious freedom in China over the last year, and in particular since Congress approved PNTR [Permanent Normal Trade Relations].

China has not ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and has not provided information or permitted access to religious leaders who are in detention.

This heightened crackdown may stem from frustration and political insecurity as authorities observe the astonishing revival of religion throughout China, particular in unsanctioned groups.

Thirteen million Protestants are now in the registered churches with the government, but unregistered Protestants may number over 50 million in house-churches.

Let me also add that, while this roundtable is focused on Catholics and Protestants, particularly this month I would just like to raise the situation of Falun Gong, which may at the moment be facing its worst repression ever.

As you know, following a television program in Changchun on March 5, there has been increased repression. According to Falun Gong spokespersons, “police have been ordered to ‘shoot on sight’ anyone giving out written materials for Falun Gong.”

In the city of Changchun, perhaps 5,000 or more practitioners have been arrested in the last 3 weeks, and perhaps 100 of them have died.

Moving on to Catholics and Protestants. I will be very brief on the Catholic situation, as we have two able spokespersons here. We are concerned that at least 33 Catholic bishops and priests are currently in prison under house arrest or under strict police surveillance.

The Vatican’s Fides News Service lists 13 bishops who have been arrested, as well as 20 priests, and says explicitly that its list is incomplete.

Among Protestants, one of the most striking cases is Pastor Gong Shenliang, who was sentenced to death on December 5 on charges of operating an “evil cult,” and on apparently trumped-up charges of rape and assault.

In a letter from one of the members of his church dated December 31, 2001, a woman describes the torture that was applied to them by police to pressure them to testify against Gong.

“Ma and her boy Longfen were both beaten almost to death. Li Enhui fell unconscious and was awakened with cold water and beaten again. They did this to her non-stop for 7 days and 7 nights. “On July 20,” last year, “we heard the news that Yu, who was arrested in Ma’s house, had been tortured to death.”

To try to arrest Gong, the police arrested 63 of his congregants, severely beating at least 25 of them and torturing them with electric cattle prods.

I will focus the rest of my remarks concerning China on what was revealed in secret Chinese Government documents, as I already mentioned, released in February of this year.

They detail an official crackdown against large, unregistered churches and other religious groups nationwide. Copies of the documents were provided to Freedom House by the Committee for Investigation on Persecution of Religion in China.

These seven documents, issued between of April 1999 and October 2001, detailed national, provincial, and local security officials’ role in repressing religion. They show that China’s Government, at the highest levels, aims to repress religious expression outside of its control and is using more determined, systematic, and harsher criminal penalties in this effort.

Hu Jintao, regarded as the successor to President Jiang Zemin, is quoted in them as endorsing the drive against the Real God Church. The Minister of Public Security is quoted as giving the order to “smash the cult quietly.”

Several of these documents focus particularly on measures to “smash” the South China Church and the Real God Church, which, Chinese authorities state, rivals Falun Gong in its reach and dangerous effects.

Other documents list several Christian churches, Falun Gong, the Unification Church, and other banned religious groups. They list 14 in all, describing them as evil cults.

The documents also note with palpable alarm that, for example, the Real God Church is growing rapidly throughout 22 of China’s provinces. One of the documents says that the inner circles of the Communist Party and government officials have secretly joined the church.

They also show once more that China, as an officially atheist state, still arrogates to itself the authority to define orthodoxy, determine dogma, and designate religious leaders.

The documents are often notable for their crudeness in understanding the religions they report to control. For example, one document uses the basic Christian doctrine that Christ is in every believer to accuse churches of “deifying” their leaders, a practice which they then define as “cult-like.”

They also show particular concern about public unrest over China’s entry into the World Trade Organization [WTO], and it ties this to Western support of democracy movements and religious groupings, especially Falun Gong. It accuses the Vatican of “still waiting for any opportunity to . . . draw the patriotic religious believers up to them and incite them to rebel.”

In Document 4, activities such as “praying for world peace,” ecumenical relations between churches, printing religious publications, or developing a diocesan, parish, and prayer group-like organizational structure, are all seen as dangerous.

They view with particular alarm ecumenical relations between the Protestant house-church Real God and the underground Catholic Church. The Real God Church is said to have ties with Tiananmen Square student protest leaders, as well as the Communist Party and the government.

Measure to be taken against the banned religious groups include surveillance, the deployment of special undercover agents, the gathering of “criminal evidence,” “complete demolition” of a group’s organizational system, interrogation, arrest, confiscation of church property, and homes at which meetings are held.

The second document repeatedly refers to the use of “secret agents” to infiltrate what it calls cults, underground Catholics, and also businesses, joint ventures, people with “complicated political backgrounds,” prestigious colleges and universities, and other organizations.

As the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended, we, too, would recommend that United States policy should press the Chinese Government to end its current crackdown on religious and spiritual groups; to reform its repressive legal framework and establish an effective mechanism to

hold officials accountable for religious freedom and other rights violations; to affirm the universality of religious freedom and China's international obligations, and also to ratify the international covenant on civil and political rights; fourth, to foster a culture of respect for human rights.

The United States Government's China policy should support and, as appropriate, fund religious freedoms and other United States advocates in China, as well as those, wherever they are found, who are promoting the rule of law, legal reform, and democracy there.

The United States Government should make sure that Tibetan and other ethnic minorities, as well as representatives of religious communities and other nongovernmental organizations, are included in exchange programs with China.

Through public diplomacy, the United States should directly explain to the Chinese people this message and the reasons for our concerns. Such efforts should include the expansion of Radio Free Asia and Voice of America broadcasts throughout China.

Since the United States permits Chinese media, including the official Chinese Central Television Company, access to American markets, we should ensure that United States media, including broadcast companies, are allowed a similar presence in Chinese markets.

Also, the United States Government should ensure that United States companies doing business in China do not engage in practices that would facilitate violations of religious freedom and other human rights, such as, for example, disclosing employees' religious or spiritual activities or affiliations to Chinese Government officials.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. WOLF. Thanks very much.

Next is David Aikman.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID AIKMAN, FOREIGN AFFAIRS
CONSULTANT, AND FORMER TIME BUREAU CHIEF IN BEIJING**

Mr. AIKMAN. China has been going through one of the most remarkable periods of growth in its Christian population of any country in the last 2,000 years, in the history of Christianity.

Mr. Quigley has already mentioned the expansion of the Roman Catholic Church from an estimated 3 million in 1949 when the Communist Party came to power in China, to an estimated 12 million currently.

The figure for Protestants, although this is based upon estimates and there were no reliable statistical firm notions, is even more startling. From a figure of less than three-quarters of a million, or around three-quarters of a million for all of China in 1949, Protestants have now increased to the point where the Three Self Patriotic Movement, which is the officially sponsored Protestant organization controlling permitted Protestant religious activity, says that there are about 20 million Protestants, of whom 15 or so are actually associated directly or are members of Three Self Patriotic churches.

But the Public Security Bureau of China has privately, and the State Statistical Office on other occasions, has released figures that give us reason to believe the number of Protestant Christians in China may approach 70 million.

That is an expansion of less than 1 million to 70 million since 1949, most of that growth having been in the period from 1980 to the current year, the reason being that the open-door policy inaugurated by Deng Xiaoping, China's Communist leader at that time in 1979, resulted in large numbers of clergy being released from prison and a sort of uncertainty about what the government's religious policy really should be. For a period of time in the early 1980's, there was quite a remarkable degree of unofficially approved freedom.

The growth of the Christian church has caused great perplexity in the Chinese Communist Party and in the leaders of the State Council, so much so that in mid-February there was a working meeting held by leaders of the State Council and the Communist Party in Beijing, attended by and addressed by President Jiang Zemin, Prime Minister Ju Rongji, and others, in which approximately the following was said. I am paraphrasing, of course.

According to Jiang Zemin, religion is an extremely important element in China. Some people interpreted this comment as the opening of a new period of liberalization by the regime authorities toward religious expression, but so far there has been no indication of anything like that at all.

In fact, one of the follow-up points made by President Jiang, who of course is also the head of the Communist Party, was that religion was so important, that the officials both of the State structure and the Party itself should focus very much on working to control it, or if you like, to cope with it.

In practice, what this has meant has been a number of different things in different parts of the country. The phenomenon of Falun Gong, which suddenly erupted into public view in April 1998, led to a serious crackdown upon all religious groups that were not registered with the government, but particularly on Falun Gong itself.

The manifestations of demonstrations by Falun Gong practitioners against the government led in turn not only to very harsh crack-downs on Falun Gong, but to the passage of a law against the religious cults that Dr. Paul Marshall has already referred to.

In practice, what this means, is that local Public Security Bureau officials, that is, policemen, decide whether or not something is a cult. So, for example, one of the groups that was singled out as a cult in some very interesting secret documents recently smuggled out to the United States were people who believed that you could pray against sickness, and this was something that Christians might actually want to do occasionally, and also that you could exorcise demonic spirits.

This was also considered cult-like, although, of course, it has been part of mainstream Christianity for the last 2,000 years. Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox all subscribe to some form of these practices.

What we can expect now, I think, is as has happened in the past, different regional groups, different provincial police leadership responding differently to religious phenomena in their own local

areas. It is evident that some parts of China have Public Security Bureau leadership that is more tolerant and more respectful of private religious practice than others.

Yet, some parts are extremely repressive. Hunan Province, for example, which has seen the largest Protestant growth of any part of China in the last 20 years, is particularly harsh upon the unregistered leadership groups in its midst.

I do not have any specific policy recommendations for the United States, except I share very much Dr. Marshall's recommendations for public diplomacy, at least at the very outset of U.S. official positions.

I think the Chinese Government and the Chinese people, insofar as this is possible, need to be informed not only of their obligations as signatories to international human rights conventions, but at the very positive advantages of having religious freedom.

Wherever religious freedom has been implemented, countries, by and large, have benefited enormously from it. I would say that is probably going to be as true in China as it is in the United States and many other countries.

Thank you.

Mr. WOLF. Thanks very much, David.

Mr. Kung.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH KUNG, PRESIDENT, CARDINAL KUNG FOUNDATION

Mr. KUNG. When I entered this country 47 years ago in 1955, China was a young Communist country. At that time, the Communists were already throwing the bishops, priests and their faithful into jail and labor camps.

Forty-seven years later, China is still a Communist country. China is still throwing the religious believers into mainland labor camps by the thousands. Although China has changed by opening its door to the outside world, the persecution of religious believers has never stopped.

This persecution has recently become so bad at a time when China is making significant economic progress, at a time when China has joined the World Trade Organization, and at a time when China professes fighting terror, while it continues to create its own terror among its own religious believers.

Since late 1999, the Government of China has destroyed 1,200 churches in one eastern province alone. An 82-year-old priest, Father YE Gongfeng was savagely tortured to unconsciousness and Father LIN Rengui was beaten so savagely that he vomited blood.

Underground Catholic seminarian Wang Qing was tortured for 3 days, being suspended by his wrists, beaten, and force fed with contaminated liquids that caused severe injury and illness.

Catholic priest Hu Duo suffered broken legs in police beatings. Even a 12-year-old could not escape the brutality. She told the interrogators that she had become a liturgy lector. As a result, she was beaten so savagely that she had to be hospitalized.

There is a tiny village called Donglu in Hebei. In that village, there is a shrine for the Blessed Mother. Each year, tens of thousands of pilgrims visited this shrine from all over China.

However, in May 1996, 5,000 Chinese soldiers, supported by dozens of armed cars and helicopters, destroyed and leveled that shrine. The government confiscated the statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary and arrested many bishops and priests.

Bishop Su Zhimin, the underground bishop of this shrine, was arrested at least five times in the past, and has already spent approximately 26 years in prison. He disappeared after he was last arrested in October 1997. We do not even know if he is dead or alive.

The auxiliary bishop of this shrine, Bishop An Shuxin, was last arrested in May 1996. He has been in prison for the last 6 years. We do not even know where he is. The pastor of this shrine, Father Cui Xingang, was also arrested 6 years ago in May 1996.

There are approximately 50 bishops in the underground Roman Catholic Church. Almost every one of them, not just 33 of them mentioned by Paul Marshall and Mr. Aikman, is either arrested, under house arrest, under strict surveillance, in hiding, or on the run. None of them has freedom to go around.

For instance, Bishop Jia Zhiguo, Bishop of Zhengding in Hebei, was just arrested 5 days ago. We do not know where he is. I had a press release, yesterday, come out. Obviously, there is severe, ongoing persecution of the underground Roman Catholic Church in China at this time.

The Communists took over China in 1949. After 7 years of severe persecution, the Communists failed to stamp out the Catholic Church. So, in 1957, the Chinese Communist Government created its own church called the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association, in order to replace the Roman Catholic Church in China and to have complete control of the church.

Although this Patriotic Association's Church calls itself "Catholic," it does not take its mandate from the Pope. It takes orders only from the Chinese Government. It is under the sanction of the Chinese Government, therefore, it is not persecuted.

To this day, the Patriotic Association continues to openly advocate independence from the Pope. Our Pope has refused to recognize this Patriotic Association, otherwise called the "Official Church."

In contrast, underground Roman Catholics have no public churches in China because they are illegal there. A Holy Mass, a prayer service, and even praying over the dying by Roman Catholics are considered illegal and subversive activities by the Chinese Government.

Religious services for the Roman Catholic Church can only be secretly conducted in private homes or deserted fields. The Chinese Government deems these private gatherings of Roman Catholics as illegal, unauthorized, subversive, and punishable by exorbitant fines, detention, house arrests, jails, labor camps, or even death.

Approximately 5 months ago, Chinese Government authorities arrested underground Bishop Lucas Li of Fengxiang and 18 underground priests, and closed an underground monastery and two underground convents. The reason? The Patriotic Association was coming to town.

The government is now forcing underground Roman Catholics to register with the Patriotic Association. Refusing to do so is now liable to sentencing to 3 years' labor camp.

Being ordained as an underground Roman Catholic priest and conducting evangelization without permission from the Chinese Government are now also considered a crime punishable by 3 years in the labor camps. This punishment is illustrated in a court paper dated April 13, 2001 and is attached at the back of my speech.

Let me say a few words about Cardinal Kung. In fact, no description of the persecution of religious beliefs is complete without mentioning him, because he is the symbol of persecution in China.

Cardinal Kung was the Bishop of Shanghai for 51 years, until he died 2 years ago on March 12. He was imprisoned for 32½ years, mostly under solitary confinement, because he refused to renounce the Pope.

Pope John Paul II secretly created Bishop Kung a Cardinal in 1979 while he was still in jail and proclaimed him publicly a Cardinal 12 years later in 1991 after he arrived in the United States. Cardinal Kung lived in the United States for 12 years.

When Cardinal Kung received his red hat in the Vatican, he received an unprecedented 7-minute standing ovation from 7,500 people. When he died, the Pope called him "this noble son of China and of the Church."

In an interview with the Chinese Press in New York on February 12, 1998, Mr. Ye Xiaowen, the director of the Religious Bureau of China, stated: "Gong Pinmei, "which is the Chinese name of Cardinal Kung, "committed a serious crime by dividing the country and causing harm to its people."

One month later in March 1998, the Chinese Government confiscated the passport of this then 97-year-old Cardinal Kung, officially exiling him and making him stateless.

Why is the Chinese Communist Government so fearful of this 97-year old Cardinal that it had to confiscate his passport to prevent his return to China? Even after his death, Cardinal Kung was still persecuted and insulted by the Chinese Government.

After the Cardinal's death, the Chinese Government issued a statement. It said, "Gong Pinmei was a criminal of China found guilty by the Chinese court. Kung committed a serious crime of dividing the country and dividing the church. History will judge him for his crime."

I believe that history will indeed judge. However, history will judge that Cardinal Kung was not a criminal. History will also judge that those religious believers who have been persecuted by the Chinese Government are also not criminals.

The criminals will be those who sent Cardinal Kung to life imprisonment. The criminals will be those who have been persecuting millions of Chinese religious believers who only want to practice their religion according to their conscience, not according to the choice of the government. The criminal will obviously be the Beijing Government.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kung appears in the appendix.]
Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Mr. Kung. I thank all of you.

We will now go in the order that everybody has arrived.

As economic reform takes effect in China and state-owned enterprises are disappearing, the social safety net that is inherent in them is also disappearing.

Resources of the Chinese Government are limited, to say the least, to act as a substitute. We are seeing some of the impact of that on the front pages of our own newspapers, as they report on the increasing labor unrest in China.

I note, in this book about the official Catholic Church in Shanghai today, a few of their activities. There is a home for the elderly; there is a school that trains disabled individuals in computers; and there is a home for senior citizens.

Is there any indication that there are elements in the Chinese Government who recognize that religious groups are able to provide for many of the social services that are so necessary as one aspect of civil society? Do you see any debate going on within the Chinese Government about this practical use of religious organizations?

Maybe, David, you could start out. I would be happy to hear from anyone.

Mr. AIKMAN. Yes. Sure. There certainly is a recognition of the role of charitable organizations. The official Protestant church in China, for some years, has had a charitable organization called the Amity Foundation, which has done similar kinds of things.

So even at an official level, there has been an appreciation of the fact that religious groups can perform social welfare functions that the State either cannot afford to fulfill, or does not wish to fulfill.

It is also clear that, at fairly high levels in the Chinese Government, there is an appreciation that this is actually a good thing. Christians privately, these actually non-official Christians, contributed huge amounts of money after the disastrous floods in China in 1999, I think it was.

But it is a two-edged sword for the Chinese Government. If you start permitting private charitable groups to operate, where do you draw the line?

The Chinese Communist Party, I am sure, every night goes to bed thinking about a famous quotation from Vladimir Lenin, who said, "Trust is good, but control is better." No Communist Party in history has ever been willing to allow social groups to arise that would challenge its claim to be the legitimate interpreter of history's currents.

That is as true of the Communist Party today in China, which seems at one level to have embraced capitalism, as it has been true, for example, in places like North Korea, which is far more Stalinist in its interpretation of how Communism operates.

Mr. WOLF. Paul.

Mr. MARSHALL. With registered churches, Protestant and Catholic, there is the possibility of social work, even youth camps, things of this kind, but it is restricted to them. So, I am not sure there is too much arguing debate about that, except, how far can it go?

In terms of debates within the Chinese Government, there are indications that there are debates about the crackdown on religions. Why is so much effort being put into repressing groups and people who are fully peaceful and, in most other respects, model citizens? I think Deng Xiaoping once remarked that Chinese Chris-

tians make very good Communists because they tended to work hard and be honest.

So, there are questions that, particularly on entry into the World Trade Organization, with worker unrest and things of this kind, why are we putting so much energy into repressing groups who are either doing breathing exercises in parks or getting together to sing hymns in houses? There are more important problems facing China. So, that debate does occur. There are questions about this type of crackdown.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Kung.

Mr. KUNG. I believe that the book you are reading is published by the Patriotic Association Church. And as the Patriotic Association Church is under the sanction of the Chinese Government, they can do whatever they want to do, as long as it is in line with the policy of the Chinese Government.

Unfortunately, the underground church is not allowed to do anything. They are not allowed to be worshipping, they are not allowed to do any pastoral work openly. Everything is under secret arrangement. Even with that, the underground church itself has charity work.

For instance, the bishop who was arrested 5 days ago, he operates an orphanage, taking care of 100 handicapped children, starting from babies to early teens. There is great stress of having to play games with the Chinese Communists, they know that this is an orphanage. It is sort of a "one eye open, one eye closed" approach.

Mr. WOLF. OK. Thank you.

Next is John Foarde who is Deputy Staff Director.

Mr. FOARDE. First of all, I would like to thank all four of our panelists today for your very clear, very eloquent, and very disturbing testimony.

Ira, I think I am going to reserve my questions until the end of our session, because we have a number of colleagues here that will want to ask questions of our panelists.

Mr. WOLF. All right. Sharon Payt, with Senator Brownback.

Ms. PAYT. Thank you, Ira. Also, thank you, panel, for excellent testimony.

As you know, Senator Brownback is deeply committed to religious liberty issues in China. The last thing he commented to me before he left for the break, was to solicit advice on long-term solutions for challenging religious persecution in China, and that is my request to you.

But before you start on that, and I know this is a rather large order, I would like to make a few observations.

First of all, we are also very concerned about Pastor Dengsheng Gong, and whether or not he is going to be executed in the dark, in a corner, when no one is looking and when the phone calls have stopped. This is our concern. Could you also address that? These are my two primary questions.

One observation. The first time I went to China, I met with the underground house church leaders. It was an incredible experience, because in my last 10 years of doing work in religious persecution advocacy internationally, I have never met such a self-sacrificial

group, more humble, more committed than I have in these underground religious communities in China.

They are really extraordinary people. I think they are hero of hero types, and they deserve every bit of advocacy we can give them. Of course, Senator Brownback is deeply committed to free trade, but we also believe that this poses both an opportunity and a responsibility to challenge the persecution practices in China.

One of the people that I met there, just finishing here quickly—actually, two. There was a man and a woman. They were both evangelists. They were itinerant evangelists in a non-denominational Christian church.

They had come from the north, I was in the south, so that they could shake the police, the Public Security Bureau. We were meeting underneath a tree, hidden somewhere in a park, way in the corner.

I asked what their life was like. They said, well, they were separate, even though they had been married. They came down together, but they lived separate lives. They lived on the road. They could not have a home.

He could not go back to see his mother. His mother was dying. He had not seen her in several years, because if he went back the Public Security Bureau would have picked him up. They knew that he was concerned about his mother.

They would always live on the lam. They would never be able to settle down. They could never stay longer than 1 week in a given village, because then the Communist committees would find out and turn them in. This is their life. This is how they anticipated they would die, too. This is the new underground church.

I just wanted to salute them, because I am leaving the Senator's office, after just a short 5 years of advocacy, and I wanted to thank you all for your amazing help.

And if you could answer the questions.

Mr. AIKMAN. Thank you, Sharon. Let me take the opportunity of thanking Sharon Payt for her extraordinary work on behalf of Christian believers, and other believers, undergoing persecution in many different parts of the world in her capacity as legislative aide to Senator Brownback.

I fully commend you for that and support your eloquent description of unregistered church leaders in China. It is, in a way, from a Christian point of view, like encountering people living out the book of Acts, the combination of, if you would like, divine leading, persecution, witnessing, miraculous events. It is an amazing phenomenon.

I believe in a polyphonic approach to China. There is nothing wrong with a sledgehammer, but there is also nothing wrong with a rapier, either. There is nothing wrong with a feather duster, if the feather duster sometimes works in certain circumstances as effectively as a sledgehammer or a rapier.

By polyphonic, I mean it is revealing that many of the senior house church leaders, at least the Protestant ones, and I am sure this is probably true in the Catholic case, too, supported American approval of China's entry into the World Trade Organization because they argued that the more open or the more accessible China as a society was, the less problems they ran into from the local au-

thorities. I would say that that is probably an accurate judgment, from their perspective.

But polyphonic involves, at times, speaking very loudly, sometimes speaking rather rudely. Rudeness is sometimes an effective way of getting a person's attention.

It certainly means the formulation of policies that would be encouraging to any Chinese organization not only to foreign corporations that are sympathetic to the practice of religious freedom, but also to Chinese Government agencies.

I think we should encourage corporations to invest in provinces that have better records of religious freedom than nearby provinces that do not. Thank you.

Mr. MARSHALL. Just on Pastor Gong, his case is a very important one, for a few reasons. One, obviously, he is still under a death sentence, though the implementation of that has been delayed. Whereas, members of other religious groups have been executed, the use of the death sentence against Christian groups is highly unusual. In the 1990's, that did not happen, except for possibly one case.

So, it would be a major repressive step if the Chinese Government then began to do that. So, for that reason, this is a particular case which the U.S. Government should keep raising. Otherwise, if he disappears from our sight, he may disappear from everybody's sight.

Ms. PAYT. How do we ensure or how do we monitor that effectively, making sure that he does not get executed some night when no one is looking.

Mr. MARSHALL. By continually raising the question and, I think, asking to see him. The Chinese Government does not like that. But keep raising the question. We would like to visit him, and other people, too.

Ms. PAYT. Thank you.

Mr. WOLF. I think Sharon's question about long-term recommendations for the U.S. Government is very important and of interest to all of us, so I hope you will weave it into some of the answers as we go along.

Next is Teresa McNeil representing Assistant Secretary Kelly.

Ms. MCNEIL. A question for Mr. Quigley. You mentioned that the bishop in Hong Kong had noted that control seemed to be showing signs of wear, and the Patriotic Church seems to be, perhaps, losing a bit of control. How would you account for that trend?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Well, it really receives almost no heartfelt support from the members within it. That is, the people in the registered church are not happy with the CCPA. It is a controlling agency.

The Bishops of the open church do consider themselves to be authentic bishops of the Catholic Church. They pray for the Pope regularly. They recognize they cannot be in visible union with him, although at least three-quarters, if not more of them, have in fact been quietly reconciled with the Holy See.

But one of the reasons the Patriotic Association fears the restoration of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and China, is that the Patriotic Association will become meaningless. It will be absolutely unnecessary if there is a way in which the universal Catholic Church can deal with the church in China.

So it is, in some ways, some would say, on its last legs. It is still going to be fighting. The ordination of the bishops at Epiphany 2 years ago was an example of that, a very ill-timed and kind of an aggressive way of rejecting the Vatican in a public way.

But the majority of the bishops are not of that mind. Once the situation loosens, once there is the possibility of a diplomatic presence, or at least a representative of the Vatican in Beijing, then I think you will see a more rapid weakening of the influence of the Patriotic Association.

I do not know if that is true with the Three Self Movement. I do not know how threatened it is by other forces within China or whether it is content to continue with the relationship it presently has.

Ms. MCNEIL. Thank you.

A question for Mr. Aikman. You talked a lot about regional differences, places where the authorities are either better able or more inclined to crack down. He also talked about how one of your recommendations might be that people are encouraged to invest in areas where there is less of a crackdown, there is more freedom.

Could you talk a little bit more about that? Do the areas where the authorities seem less able or inclined to crack down correspond with those areas of China that have been prospering in the last couple of decades?

Mr. AIKMAN. It varies. For example, Roman Catholics are very numerous in Hebei Province. That, of course, has been where the worst crackdowns seem to have taken place.

The Protestant house churches, the unregistered Protestants, have been strongest, as I have mentioned, in Hunan, which has not, by and large, been the focus of extensive foreign investment.

But if you go down to Fujian Province opposite Taiwan, for example, you have a huge amount of foreign trade and foreign investment, much of it by the Taiwan Chinese, by overseas Chinese, and all kinds of strange loopholes where you actually have Christian schools that are not part of the Three Self association. Protestant Christian schools are legally operating.

Now, whether or not Beijing knows, or Mr. Ye Shaowen of the Religious Affairs Bureau, I do not know. I hope they do not tell him.

So it is very strange. I would advocate something close to the equivalent of what the Sullivan rules were for American corporations doing business in South Africa during the apartheid regime, where you basically—and you have to do this by a combination of legal measures, perhaps government regulation, I am not sure what—but more often moral pressure within the corporation by shareholders saying, we do not want you to invest our company's capital in such and such a place because this is what has happened in that county of China in terms of religious believers and curtailment of belief or persecution.

On the other hand, we know that such and such a province has done a pretty good job, by and large. We encourage you to go there. Chinese provincial leaders are nothing if not extremely pragmatic.

I do not think it would take too much of this to begin to see the opening up at the provincial level of opportunities of religious free-

dom that did not previously exist because of a very subtle form of economic pressure.

Mr. WOLF. Next is Mike Castellano with Congressman Levin.

Mr. CASTELLANO. The first question is directed at Mr. Quigley. You discussed efforts by the Holy See to increase its presence, whether officially or unofficially, in China. I am just wondering if you sought U.S. Government assistance in that effort, and if so, how would you characterize that assistance?

Mr. QUIGLEY. That is a very delicate question. In fact, President Bush, as I mentioned in the testimony, did raise the issue and urged President Jiang to open dialog with the Vatican. There is a dialog of sorts. There have been some conversations, basically fruitless so far.

We, in our bishops conference, have encouraged the U.S. Government. We wrote to President Bush before both of those visits urging him to raise these kinds of questions.

On the other hand, I think we have to recognize that there is a potential down side to that, that if the Chinese authorities believe that, in fact, by opening up a dialog with the Vatican, they are being pressured by the United States Government, they may see this as less a religious issue and see it more in its political terms. It has its political aspect, obviously.

But we do encourage the quiet diplomacy of the United States in trying to present reasons why, as I mentioned in the testimony, it might be more in the interests of the Chinese to open up some kind of dialog with the Vatican, to allow for interpretation of what is going on within the church in China to be made by such a representative.

I think it is fair to say that the Chinese authorities, with their history of misrepresenting to a certain extent the history of Christianity in China in the past and not being, except for a few persons, well-versed on what is this thing, the Catholic church, the Protestant churches, and so on, and religion in general, that they are in need of a certain amount of education in the sense of learning more about what these groups represent.

So it will be to their advantage to have a more open relationship with somebody from the Catholic Church outside of the Chinese context. That is, someone from the Vatican.

Mr. CASTELLANO. Thank you.

This is for any of you all, picking up on Sharon's questions. We often hear about rule of law versus rule by law. It seems like China does a pretty good job on the rule by law side of the equation.

I am just wondering if there are any particular laws that are used that you think, the repeal of which, might assist the freedom of religion in China.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think, especially as mentioned before, the 1999 cult law. There was repression of unregistered groups before that, but the laws governing that were milder in American terms.

Part of the testimony which I did not read says it was sort of like a misdemeanor, where you could get a couple of years in prison. Now, it becomes a national security issue.

So laws of 1999 are a particular problem in ratcheting up the level of penalties against those groups designated as cults. Just to add, I do not believe you should designate any groups a cult, even

if you find their views weird. But many of the groups which are designated as cults in China would be mainstream religious groups in the United States.

Mr. WOLF. Thanks. Bob Shepard with the Department of Labor.

Mr. SHEPARD. Dr. Marshall, you noted in your conclusion that the United States Government should ensure that United States companies doing business in China do not engage in practices that would facilitate violations of religious freedom.

Without getting into specific companies, has that been a policy of the Chinese Government in any way to lean on companies or employees of companies?

Mr. MARSHALL. I am not sure there is a specific policy that stated, we will do this. But any person in China, and any company operating there, the Chinese Government would want it to report, would require it to report, any activities it sees which the Chinese Government says are illegal.

So, that would be an expectation of the Chinese Government. I know of no particular instances that have been publicized where that has been the case, but this would be an ongoing expectation. If it is, in fact, happening, I would like to make sure it does not happen and make this a stated policy.

As with the World Trade Organization, we expect this amount of activity to increase. There have been cases. There is one case, and I would need to go back and get the details, where someone was fired by a United States company for religious activities which the Chinese Government said were illegal. This is apart from any charges or whatever, it was simply a government determination about this person, so the company let them go.

Mr. SHEPARD. This is for any of you. It appears, based on the absence of any mention in any of your statements, that the expatriate communities in China seem to be more or less exempt from the treatment given to Chinese who are followers of religions. Is that true? I did not hear any mention of it.

Mr. AIKMAN. A friend of mine was the Consul General of a major western power, not the United States, in Shanghai in charge, as an organizer, of a group of international people living in Shanghai who had a worship service in a hotel which they had conducted for several months with no problem at all, with full permission from the hotel. The authorities knew about it.

All of a sudden, I think this was probably in the year 2000, one December day the police came in and said, this church service has to stop now. Now, this was foreigners.

To my knowledge, there were not any Chinese present. But for some reason, somebody had gotten offended by what was going on. It was demonstrating too much independence of religious activity. They were ordered to stop, and it was not resumed.

Mr. KUNG. I want to add something. There are at least more than 1,000 foreign priests in China teaching English, and they are not doing any pastoral work, anything like that. They are not even allowed to show their collars. If any one of those people starts evangelizing people, if they are found out, they will be kicked out so fast, before you know it.

Mr. SHEPARD. One final question. Are there other countries that have put religious freedom high on their agendas to the extent that

the United States has that you work with, or whose representatives you deal with?

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not know any country which has put as great as stress as the United States, or who has passed legislation in this regard. Countries such as the Netherlands and Ireland—this is often a thing they raise in international forums, so there is particular commitment there. But generally, it is the United States, which is far stronger.

I would just add one thing. This is not on religious freedom, per se, but on human rights in general. The French now have an ambassador for human rights. I was talking with him last month. He said, we do not like to say this, but we are adopting the American model and we have looked at it and think that it is fairly good. So, the United States, on this, is not out of line, but out front.

Mr. KUNG. I think the Vatican places freedom of religion at the top of its agenda.

Mr. AIKMAN. If I could just comment on the problem of certain countries. Unfortunately, part of the Chinese implementation of the cult law was based upon advice by European parliamentarians who have indeed conducted a crackdown on what they consider non-mainstream religious activity in Europe.

So sometimes the Chinese officials explain to foreigners who complain about their cults, well, listen, the French say it is all right, the Belgians say it is all right. So, if these modern Western countries do not like cults either, why are you complaining that we are doing the same thing?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Let me just add, I agree with all of the previous. I think it is worth noting that the salience of religious freedom, as an issue within the human rights community, is growing all the time.

When the major human rights organizations like Amnesty and Human Rights Watch, and so on, were founded, they paid almost no attention to religious freedom. That was not an issue. It was not on the table at all.

Partly because of the work of Paul Marshall's group and others, that has now become much more accepted and is, in fact, growing. So, I think other European countries, including the French, who in their cult laws decided they wanted to think of the Jesuits, perhaps, as a cult—

Mr. AIKMAN. Baptists.

Mr. QUIGLEY. And Baptists, and others, and the Russians have done very much the same thing, with simply misunderstanding or not understanding the nature of various kinds of groupings. But clearly, human rights and religious freedom issues have taken a major leap forward in the United States, as Paul said, much more than anybody else. But I think the rest will come along.

Mr. WOLF. I think that is an interesting comment. You can make the same argument on labor rights—that if you go back 5 to 10 years, it was not a significant theme in the human rights community, much to the chagrin of the labor movement in the United States. Now it is front and center with other human rights issues.

Next is Karin Finkler with Congressman Pitts.

Ms. FINKLER. Thank you all for your testimony.

Two questions. First, is how effective is it to ask to go visit prisoners? We have tried to do that before with little or no luck, so I would appreciate your comments on that.

Also, in terms of your observations of China over the past however many years, with what you see right now, what would you surmise is going to be the trend in the next 5 to 10 years in light of the current actions of the Chinese Government?

David, go ahead.

Mr. AIKMAN. I will start off. I am sure I am not alone in responding to this. I would say, keep knocking on the door all the time. Keep sending postcards and letters. If you send a postcard protesting the government policy of a Communist Party state, they are so bureaucratic, that somebody has to make a note of who it came from and what it said, and it infuriates them. There is nothing like infuriating a bureaucrat for changing or opening the door just a little bit. So, keep knocking, keep asking. Eventually, they will let you in.

The future of China? Boy, people have lost their careers by responding to that question. But China is very conscious that it is in the world spotlight in the years leading up to the Olympic Games in 2008. I personally very much supported that decision, for all kinds of reasons I will not go into now.

There is a big anniversary coming up. The year 2007 is the 200th anniversary of the first Protestant missionary, Robert Morrison, in China. The Chinese unregistered house churches very much want to honor that occasion. So, we are going to see all kinds of things happening.

There is some very interesting cooperation now between unregistered house church leaders and people at middle levels of the Three Self Patriotic Church, that is, the official Protestant church, which is not authorized by the head of the Religious Affairs Bureau, much less by the Communist Party.

I think this shows a moving together of the Three Self clergy who support unfettered religious activity, and the house church leaders themselves who obviously seek to move in that direction.

Mr. MARSHALL. Again, on requests to see prisoners, if they keep saying no, that means somewhere else they are going to have to say yes. If you just have a no, no, no, you are annoying somebody. So, that pressure will show at some point.

I will talk about not what the future is, but what some of the trends are now. I mean, in the last year or two you are seeing fewer controls on the registered churches. Their possibilities are opening up more, using a carrot to try and get the unregistered to join them. Then there is more repression of the unregistered, particularly those described as cults.

The other trend is also, as David mentioned before, this is uneven across the country. The Chinese Government has said, when bad things happen it is just local officials doing bad things. That is not the case. This is centrally directed and organized, but the locals often ignore it.

It is the fact that local officials do not go with the national campaign. There are areas, particularly in the coastal zones and in the south, where unregistered underground activity is, in some places, not cracked down on.

So you are seeing quite a few different lines going on at the same time. I think this indicates tensions and differences within the leadership dealing with religion. So, I think the real possibility is there to sort of help wean the Chinese Government away from arresting people who are engaged in peaceful activity and divert resources to the many real problems they face.

Mr. WOLF. Thanks. Mr. Kung.

Mr. KUNG. Very quickly. I think we are talking about knocking on the door and sending postcards. They are all important. But I think one of the very important ingredients we did not mention, is we are all religious believers right here and we really have to pray. Pray very hard for this.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you.

Holly Vineyard with the Commerce Department.

Ms. VINEYARD. Thank you all for coming in today.

I am wondering if you could comment on, if you have seen any changes in Hong Kong since 1997 since the hand-over.

Mr. AIKMAN. As a former pessimist about the future of Hong Kong under its new status as a special autonomous region, I have to admit, some of my worst fears have not been borne out at all. I think Hong Kong has done surprisingly well in terms of, by and large, most details of daily life have not come under the kind of control that we might have expected, or I certainly feared might be the case.

There are some problems with Hong Kong relating to the rule of law and the fact that the Hong Kong Government has basically decided to use the National People's Congress, in effect, as its ultimate supreme court, ignoring the Hong Kong constitutional provisions of its own supreme court with common law justices brought in from other common law jurisdictions. But I have been pleasantly surprised by the fact that Hong Kong has done quite well.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I usually take the more optimistic view. But on this one instance, in terms of Hong Kong, I just recently read interviews with both Bishop Tong, who is the auxiliary bishop of Hong Kong, and Bishop Zen, who is the coadjutor archbishop who will succeed when Cardinal Wu steps down. They each have commented that pressures are building in terms of turning over schools and other institutions of the church in Hong Kong.

Hong Kong is an area where there is a great deal of institutional presence of the Catholic and Protestant churches, and they are coming under some, not immediate, but foreseeable pressure to either give up their schools or get out of certain kinds of activities.

Mr. KUNG. One particular incident, along the lines of what Mr. Quigley is talking about, is about the right to live in Hong Kong for those immigrants to Hong Kong. As the Hong Kong Government says, if those children come to Hong Kong, no school will accept them.

Then the coadjutor bishop, Bishop Joseph Zen, told the government, if you do not accept them, the Catholic school has places for them. We will open a school and accept every one of them. This creates some sort of a reality to the Chinese Communists of how powerful the Catholic educational structure is in Hong Kong, because of the built-in educational system by the religious schools.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you.

Geoff Gleason, with Congressman Frank Wolf.

Mr. GLEASON. Thank you very, very much for being here this afternoon. I have a question related to today's editorial in the Washington Post that you probably saw, "Europe and Human Rights," if I can read this.

As the 6-week session got under way at the Human Rights session last week, none of the commission's 53 members was prepared to raise the subject of China, even though Beijing's record of political and religious oppression has grown only worse in the past year.

Fifty-three countries.

The editorial ends up, "Now European Governments have 6 weeks to show what their values are." But it just strikes me that there are 53 countries. What types of economic and other forms of intimidation are used? If each of you could comment on that, and maybe comment on this editorial.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I do not think I can make any useful comment on it. Precisely why are these countries today so reluctant to address the issue of China? It has been on the agenda for the U.N. for quite some time, the Human Rights Commission.

So, I cannot account for what has happened right now in terms of these countries that are reluctant to step forward on this issue. It has been similar with some other countries. The United States has, as was said earlier, taken the lead in raising human rights issues in the Geneva meetings. But I am simply at a loss to know why they are so isolated in this issue.

Mr. AIKMAN. I alluded earlier to what I consider a disturbing trend in European jurisprudence to narrowly define certain religious activities as cults. The French law basically left it open for the courts to decide whether a religious group could be held in contravention of anti-cult law by saying to a person, you are a sinner, because that imposes emotional stress upon a person, etc. You know all the arguments.

So, I think within Europe there has been a trend against the notion of religious freedom, or to put it in more specific terms, freedom of conscience that we in the United States have wholeheartedly embraced from generation to generation and still define as one of the core principles of liberty under the law within these United States.

Within Europe, you do not have that heartfelt tradition of celebrating religious freedom, freedom of conscience, that we have enjoyed in this country. I think it is exhibited in cases, like the reluctance of European legislators to bring this up.

In fact, somebody told me today that the European parliament had passed a law yesterday—I did not see this—which was very restrictive of certain rights of religious believers.

Mr. MARSHALL. Obviously, the answer is very complex in terms of countries' behavior. But one point needs to be borne in mind. The United States is much larger than any of these countries, so in many situations the United States, vis-a-vis China, in talking about economics, we have the clout to do various things that almost no other country does.

So, in terms of Germany dealing with China, they would say, there is no act that Germany itself could take which would have that much effect on China. So, it needs to be coordinated. And that

is extremely difficult. To do it within one country is hard enough, to coordinate others is very difficult.

So, lack of American presence and leadership is important, simply because the United States is bigger. People say, why does America throw its weight around? Well, it has weight. Everybody throws their weight around if they have got it. It is a question of whether you have it or not.

Mr. WOLF. Thanks.

John Foarde.

Mr. FOARDE. As I suspected when I reserved my questions, virtually all of the ones that I had jotted down during your testimony were posed by my colleagues here.

But there is one that I am interested in that is not necessarily on the same direct topic as the questions you have just answered. This is really for Mr. Marshall and Mr. Aikman.

Are there any continuities between the Protestant and evangelical groups that were seen in China before 1949 and the ones that are becoming more and more active today in China? For example, the Jesus Family, the Children of God, the Shouters. I take it there are a number of other ones. Anything that you could say to help us put this in an historical perspective would be really useful.

Mr. AIKMAN. Very definite continuity. All of the largest networks of Protestant unregistered Christians, the so-called house churches, can trace a lineage back to either a missionary, a Western missionary who was in a certain part of China, or to an indigenous Chinese church that operated before the Communists came to power in 1949.

One of the reasons for the rapid expansion of Christianity after 1979, was that the relaxation policy of Deng Xiaoping freed from prison literally thousands of Roman Catholic and Protestant clergy, who returned to their communities and took up where they had been active earlier as leaders of church groups. So, there is a definite continuity.

Finally, one of the most remarkable things about China in the Protestant church is the concept of "Back to Jerusalem." Chinese unregistered house church Christians believe their providential calling is to take the gospel back to where it started, Jerusalem.

Well, if you look at the map, you are basically looking at parts of the world which missiologists sometimes refer to as the 10/40 window, which have been traditionally and historically extremely hostile to the gospel.

But that movement, the Back to Jerusalem movement, was specifically founded in the 1940's by indigenous Chinese Protestant missionary sending agents in part of China.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have just three things. As David said, most of these groups trace their roots back before 1950. Second, when the Chinese Government says there are strange groups, there are strange beliefs, there are radical groups around, there are. One reason for this, of course, is these people are forbidden to have trained clergy. They cannot study and go to seminaries.

I am not sure the government should be saying what is orthodox. But if you do want more orthodox Christian views, why do you not let them have trained clergy, and read, and have access to books? You are creating the problem of weird beliefs, you, the government.

A third thing. I am not sure if it is of immediate political relevance, but given the sense of history, it is important in China. It also needs to be said that, as far as we know, the earliest Christians coming to China were Iranian. They were Nestorians, perhaps in the sixth or seventh century, maybe before, but at least they had put down roots and buildings at that point.

So, I think that is important to mention, particularly when Christianity is called recent or foreign. Obviously, it is foreign everywhere except Israel and Palestine. But this is nothing which comes recently to China. It is over 1,000 years older than Communism in China, for example.

Mr. WOLF. Thanks. We have moved so fast, it is not even 4 o'clock. So I would like to go around one more time. But we are going to do it really efficiently.

So, 3 minutes instead of 5. A quick question and a little less historical depth, which is incredibly valuable, but some quick answers.

I will go first. Is there a difference in the depth of belief held by members of official churches, either on the Protestant or the Catholic side, versus the members of the unofficial churches in China? Joseph.

Mr. KUNG. Yes, there is. As far as the Catholic church is concerned, for instance, there is an underground church that not only is loyal to the Holy Father, not only do they love the Holy Father, but they also recognize the Holy Father, the Pope, is the head of the Universal church. This means they recognize the administrative, judicial, and legislative authority of the Pope.

The Patriotic Association, even though they also say they are loyal to the Pope, they also say they have love for the Pope, they also say prayers for the Pope, but nevertheless, they do not recognize the universal administrative, legislative, and judicial authority of the Pope. That is the main difference between the underground church and the Patriotic Association.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I would just say, for one thing, we do not know a great deal about the internal beliefs and attitudes of members of either sector of the Catholic Church in China. There are very few good research studies made of attitudes.

A second factor, is that the second Vatican Council occurred long after the Communist takeover, so none, or very little, of the church's changes and developments since the time of the second Vatican Council in the early 1960's have really impacted the Catholic Church in China. They have, to some extent. There is a degree of communication and contact, but it is not the way it would be under normal circumstances.

So, we know little. The differences between them, I think we know still less. Joseph Kung is quite correct, in terms of the attitude taken toward ties with the Holy See.

But I think the beliefs in the Sacraments, for example, and the basic teachings of the church, they would understand them from pre-Vatican II days, and probably do not differ very greatly.

Mr. WOLF. David.

Mr. AIKMAN. As far as the Protestants go, we actually do know quite a lot, both about the profession of faith of the unregistered house church Christians and the official doctrines approved by the

Three Self Patriotic movement authorized by the Religious Affairs Bureau.

In terms of official belief, there is no question that the Protestant house church movement is far more evangelical, explicitly and overtly so. Nevertheless, you do find some Three Self Patriotic movement pastors and large numbers of lay people who are very zealous in their faith, who are very evangelical, and who in fact often have contact, unofficially, of course, with the unregistered house church leaders.

Mr. WOLF. Thanks.

John.

Mr. FOARDE. No questions.

Mr. WOLF. Sharon.

Ms. PAYT. I am going to be very brief, I promise you.

What is the impetus, if any, among the different religious convictions, the Buddhists, the Christians, the Catholics, Protestants, Falun Gong, and other religious movements to come together to counter religious persecution?

Mr. MARSHALL. As far as I know, say, between Buddhists, Muslims, Christians, and so on, I am not sure about much contact of that kind. Organizationally, it would just be very difficult to do, and I am not sure if there is any impetus to do that.

The documents you are referring to seem very scared by the fact that different Protestant groups and Protestant and Catholic groups seem to be teaming up.

Mr. AIKMAN. I am not aware of any interreligious cooperation, for example, as Paul suggested between, say, Buddhists, Muslims, and Christians. There is not that degree of security, I think, in one's own belief vis-a-vis an all-powerful State for that thing to arise.

I am sure, once you have got a measure of religious freedom as we understand it, that sort of thing would happen.

Mr. QUIGLEY. My sense is that the degree of Catholic/Protestant ecumenism among the open church is very limited, indeed. It may exist. I think you are quite correct, that there is a degree of reaching out because of similarities of situation among the underground churches.

What is also happening though in recent years, is there is a less tense relationship between the underground and the overground church within the Catholic Church, partly because the underground churches recognize that many people within the open church have been able to stand up to some degree to the government's edicts.

In the ordination of half a dozen, or five, bishops on Epiphany 2 years ago, the government had tried to have 12 bishops to match exactly the number that the Pope was ordaining that day, and many bishops and priests simply refused.

Seminarians that were trucked out the day before to practice for the singing at the Mass refused to come. So, there is a degree of getting their back up a little bit in terms of being under the control of the CCPA.

Mr. MARSHALL. Remember, also, that people in registered churches suffer major disabilities. As a religious believer, you cannot be in the Communist Party, which means you are barred from access to government jobs and other things of this kind. So, people

who are members of registered groups usually have a real commitment and belief, otherwise, why set yourself up for a loss?

Mr. WOLF. Bob Shepard.

Mr. SHEPARD. Yes. The history of religious persecution is often about hatred at sort of the grassroots level, people trying to practice and people in the community seeing the religious groups or the worshipers as alien to their community.

In China, it seems as if the case is that, from what has been described and what I have read previously, the persecution seems mostly the monopoly of the state. Is there a grassroots hostility? Is that a difficult problem? Are religious groups, religious people, treated with hostility or as aliens within their own communities?

Mr. AIKMAN. There have been examples of hostility by local communities to the arrival of Christian groups, usually from people threatened because of access to worship is regarded as unacceptable, at least by most Protestant evangelical groups.

But one of the interesting reason that I have heard from a number of sources for the rapid rise of evangelical Protestants in China, unregistered house churches in the 1980's and 1990's, was the fact that Communist Party wives had gone to Beijing to have illnesses fixed up medically, and the hospitals in Beijing were unable to cope with their illnesses. They would come back to their locality. This was particularly true in Hunan Province.

Some dear old Bible lady would come and pray for them, and whatever you think about prayer and healing is neither here nor there, but very often these people would actually recover. Because they were so astounded, often you had house church groups meeting in the homes of Communist Party cadres.

Sometimes the husband would then be refreshingly—I remember back in the 1980's, in Beijing, there was a newspaper article in the Beijing Daily complaining that too many Communist Party wives were being healed and, therefore, were sort of becoming advocates of Christianity at the grassroots.

Mr. WOLF. Karin Finkler.

Ms. FINKLER. Anything you would like to express that you have not been able to express?

Mr. QUIGLEY. May I just say one thing on the last question? I have no evidence for this, but I put it out as a hypothesis. In terms of popular hostility toward religious groups, just on the part of people at the base, the Chinese have gone through the cultural revolution, they know what that created. With that as a memory, they may well, indeed, be more tolerant of differences and so on than they were a couple of decades ago.

Mr. KUNG. Some of you here may know Mr. Marc Thiessen, who was the righthand person of Senator Helms before. Recently, he wrote a splendid article in a magazine called Crisis Magazine. I have two copies right here.

The title of the article he wrote is, "A Tale of Two Bishops." He describes the difference between the underground church and the Patriotic Association. So, it is a very in-depth analysis or insight. If anybody is interested in reading it, I will leave it right here.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you.

Geoff Gleason.

Mr. GLEASON. When you look into the future, what do you see in the next 5 or 10 years? I have been working here on Capitol Hill since 1978 and have heard the argument thousands of times, that with greater economic prosperity we would see more personal freedoms. It has been going on and on.

The current administration, the previous administration, the President's father's administration. Yet, I look in the Washington Post today and we again see Beijing's record of political and religious oppression has only grown worse, and they were just given PNTR. Now you mentioned the next generation. Maybe after the hardliners are appeased, what occurs? How much longer is it going to take to see some progress in this area?

Mr. QUIGLEY. This is a view that the two bishops in Hong Kong have expressed quite publicly, and I suspect many others in other ways, that there is a generational shift coming about in the Party.

If that bodes well, if the change is indeed a positive one, that over a period of 3 or more years—it certainly is not going to be immediate—once the new leadership feels confident that they can, in fact, effect change, we may see that. I cannot imagine anything happening in the next 12 months, other than the election of new people.

Mr. MARSHALL. Again, I do not want to attempt to predict the future. But the classic way of combining relatively open markets with authority on governments is fascism. You hold society together by using a very extreme form of nationalism as the glue. If you can whip that up, people will coordinate their activities voluntarily. You can be very popular. China already has some of those characteristics.

What one might fear, is that those would become full-blown. So, one aspect of that, particularly in the subjects we are talking about now, is that xenophobia would become much worse.

So, I am not saying that that is going to happen. That is a particular danger I see, and we need to be aware of that. Communism is still used, but functionally it does not explain much about it.

I do not want to use the term too loosely, but I would worry about fascist directions in China. I mean, free markets coordinated in a national goal, held together by ideological nationalism.

Mr. WOLF. We are going to keep going.

My next question is on the issue of Bibles. The numbers that you read in the press of Bibles printed and available in China are enormous. I understand that the purchase of Bibles must be through organized churches. They are not for sale in public bookstores.

Is there much leakage, so to speak? Are Bibles there available to underground church adherents? Can they get Bibles? And what are the other issues relating to availability of Bibles?

David, why don't you start, then Mr. Kung.

Mr. AIKMAN. Bibles are available in some parts of China through official churches and can be obtained quite easily. The difficulty, is distribution. Many counties of China do not have state-authorized churches, and therefore do not have a legal outlet.

So, if there is a large Christian community there, where are they going to get their Bibles from? If they send a delegation to the nearest large town, chances are that their request for 20,000 Bibles

might be met, if not with incredulity, certainly with a request for their names and addresses.

So, the problem is in largeness of numbers. Bibles can be, and indeed are, legally printed in China. You can actually order 50,000 Bibles from the Amity Press, as long as you pay in dollars.

The question is, if you rent a truck to carry that stuff, it is the people who rent the truck out who may report you to the Public Security Bureau for doing something that is technically quite legal.

Mr. KUNG. One more thing I want to say about it. Plenty of Bibles are available in China, but the problem is this. The Patriotic Association printed millions and millions of copies of Bibles. They alter the Bible where there are references about the authority of the Pope. They scrape it out. They alter it. They just scratch it out or scrape it out, with a space between, leaving a blank.

In my house, I have two copies of the Bible. One is a genuine Chinese Bible, another one is a Bible from the Patriotic Association. Even somebody who does not speak Chinese, who speaks English, could see the difference because there are blank spaces there.

Mr. QUIGLEY. This is true in the case of the Catechism of the Catholic Church that was issued a few years ago, and the Chinese have allowed that to be printed so that you can now buy the Catechism of the Catholic Church in China. But there were several sections which were omitted, including those having to do with Communism.

But, just as Joseph indicates, they did not bother to move the pages or the paragraphs together, so you see these blank spots. Therefore, everybody wants to know what was there, and they will find ways of finding out what was there.

Mr. WOLF. Karin, did you have something?

Ms. FINKLER. Yes. My question is in follow-up to your statement, Mr. Quigley, that in 1 to 3 years there could be a change.

What do you, and anybody else on the panel, see as positive things that the U.S. Government could do to encourage those who would make changes in the next few years?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Well, I think engagement is exactly the right thing. I do not think that by trying to isolate and not work with China is going to be of any value, with China, or with other countries with which we have great differences.

So China's accession to the World Trade Organization, I think, basically is a positive thing, that they will have to live by the rules of the WTO, and that is going to be tested every step of the way.

The question that was raised earlier about whether it is useful to have the U.S. Government really press on religious freedom issues is—on religious freedom issues, yes. The question came up specifically about the matter of the Vatican's relationship, and that is more delicate, where the U.S. Government should weigh in on that.

But on human rights issues and religious freedom, I think we have all indicated that it is a role that organized states can play both indirectly by its policies toward human rights, and quite directly. The Ambassador in Beijing did raise the issue of Bishop Su. I think that can be done over, and over, and over again.

Just on that point, in terms of engagement with China, I always tend to say, everybody believes in engagement with China because the alternative is to try to pretend it does not exist, or going to war, or something. It is a question of what form is the engagement.

One of the things I would stress, is continually making this an irritant. Other things being equal, you do not like to irritate people. You like to get on well. But in this case, knowing this is an ongoing concern, I think it was important to the Chinese that they realized that it was very important to President Bush. It is important to America, but also to this particular guy who you are going to have to deal with for at least another 2½ years, or whatever.

So the fact that this is always a problem, I think that this would strengthen those in China who, themselves, see the attempt to repress religion as being worse than useless.

Ms. PAYT. David, you are writing a definitive book on religion in China. Or should I not ask you about it? I was going to ask you, are there any patterns or trends that you are noticing from the research you are doing right now on that?

Mr. AIKMAN. Well, I think the most interesting pattern, in a very broad sort of cultural context, is the possibility that certain aspects of Chinese culture may be significantly and permanently changed by the large number of Christians, both Catholic and Protestant.

Just to illustrate this, the city of Wenzhou, which is a provincial capital of Zhejiang, is believed to have the largest percentage of Protestant believers in China, maybe as high as 30 percent. I mean, you go there, you see churches everywhere, and most of them are unofficial. Wenzhou citizens are extremely diligent business people.

So you have communities of Wenzhou Chinese Christians with churches in places like Moscow, Paris, Bucharest, Budapest, Barcelona, and Florence. You even have pastors to illegal Chinese immigrants in New York from Wenzhou.

I think that, whatever you believe about Christianity or any other religion, you can put aside for the time being. I think one of the most fascinating historical questions is, is China going to make a leap from what I call the historical determinism of Marxism and Leninism and the sort of ethical determinism and the hierarchical determinism of the Confucian tradition, to be an open society with a concept of time as linear rather than circular—you know, the dynastic cycle, etc.—and if so, what would be the impact upon a China with a significantly changed culture if it became the major super power at the end of the 21st century? It is a very interesting historical question that is worth posing, even though we obviously do not have any definitive answers right now.

Ms. PAYT. Thank you.

Mr. WOLF. All right.

Please make any concluding statements.

Mr. QUIGLEY. No. I think you have actually exceeded your goal of ending by before 4:30, and I think you ought to rest on your laurels. I have no concluding comment to make. Thank you.

Mr. MARSHALL. Just to reiterate a point I made a few times in terms of divisions within the Chinese leadership on the campaign against unregistered religions.

As we said, the campaign is uneven across the country, so you have got conflicts between local, provincial, and central officials. Within the central government, many of these conflicts seem to be of the kind not so much that—there are people who say, this is inhumane, we should not be doing this. But probably more common, is saying that this is useless.

Why are we doing this? We have got all of these businesses that are going to go bankrupt, we have got unemployment, we have got movement to the city, and we have got police forces and security officials going around chasing people for singing hymns in their living room.

That sort of frustration, and that is a very pragmatic attitude, is something we should try and sort of encourage and appeal to in our dealing with China.

Mr. AIKMAN. Nothing further.

Mr. KUNG. Three years ago, I think, the Holy Father made a speech, broadcasted directly to China. In that speech, there was one sentence that reminded the Chinese Government, all of these Catholics, even though they are underground, they love China. They are very patriotic.

I think that is a very important point right now. I am afraid that the Chinese leadership has a mistaken idea that those Christians do not love China, and they are not patriotic. That is why the persecution is going on.

Mr. WOLF. Well, thank you. We want to thank all four of you very much. This is a critically important issue, and you have all added a lot to our understanding.

We will have a full transcript of this. We will have it posted on our Web site in about 5 weeks. Anything supplementary you want to put into the record is welcome. We will both publish it and post it on our Web site. It will be used as important input for the report that the Commission will make to the President and to the Congress in October. This will all go into that.

So, all I can say is, thank you very, very much for a superb 2 hours.

[Whereupon, at 4:21 p.m. the roundtable was concluded.]

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THOMAS E. QUIGLEY

MARCH 25, 2002

Thank you for this opportunity to offer some brief comments on the issue of religious freedom today, especially with reference to the Catholic Church in the People's Republic of China. I'll confine my remarks to several recent developments in China that directly touch on the role of the Catholic Church there.

CATHOLICS IN CHINA

First, some numbers. Out of well over a billion people, Chinese Catholics number roughly 12 million, with some four million of these in the open or registered Church, roughly eight million in the underground or unregistered Church. The government, of course, doesn't recognize the latter, so official figures have it that there are about 100 million "believers" in the country—less than 1 percent, surely a gross undercount—of which 4 million, according to the government, are Catholic.

The number of Catholics is small, and growing only at a very slow pace, but 12 million is still far larger than the roughly 3 million Catholics before the Communist take over. And as Dick Madsen, one of the best China church-watchers, likes to note, that's a lot more Catholics than there are in Ireland.

SINO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Let me frame these remarks by several fairly recent events. Last year, 2001, was significant in a couple of ways for the Church in China. Just over a year ago, in April, there was the Hainan Island collision and the downing of the US spy plane, which, coming on the heels of the Belgrade Embassy, plunged Sino-American relations very low indeed. But then the plane business was resolved. Secretary Powell went to Beijing in July, and President Bush planned his State visit to China for October, coinciding with the APEC meeting in Shanghai.

Then came 9/11, which caused the State visit to be postponed, but the President still went ahead with a quick Asia trip in October, enabling him to meet briefly with Jiang in Shanghai, and then finally to have the postponed State visit just a month ago, in late February. These US-China visits have a bearing on the matter of religious freedom because in both his October and his February meetings with Jiang, Mr. Bush raised quite dramatically the issue of religion, including his own faith commitment, and pressed Jiang to grant religious liberty, to free Catholic clergy, especially bishops, who are under detention, and to pursue dialog with the Vatican, as well as with the Dalai Lama.

DIALOG WITH THE HOLY SEE

The question of encouraging China's dialog with the Holy See is something that both the Vatican and our bishops' conference have been urging on our government for some time. The essential goal of the dialog is the restoration of normal relations between the Holy See and the People's Republic, relations which the Chinese broke off when they expelled the Apostolic internuncio, Antonio Riberi, and arrested, imprisoned, and finally deported all the foreign clergy and religious in 1951.

But the more immediate, practical goal of such talks, aimed at allowing a Vatican representative to reside in Beijing, whether or not full diplomatic relations are restored, is the opportunity for the Vatican to explain and interpret the sometimes complex reality of the Church to the Chinese authorities. Thus, when Bishop X is accused of breaking the law, simply because he declines to have his ministry governed and controlled by the CCPA—the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association—the Papal representative could at least make the case that the bishop's arrest serves no valid purpose, that it can more likely lead to popular discontent than to dampen it, that it is in fact counter-productive to China's desire to be fully accepted into the world community which places high value on the free expression of religious belief, and so on. And thus by persistent, diplomatic pressure, changes in this behavior might eventually come about.

The other effect of 9/11 was, of course, China's signing on in the war on terrorism, resulting in greatly improved US-PRC relations, evidenced clearly in the Bush State visit last month. The President there referred to the relationship as "constructive and cooperative."

THE RICCI SYMPOSIA

Now, a second set of events, these specifically of the Church, were the two Ricci meetings last October, one in Beijing (October 14–17) and one in Rome (October 23–25). They were to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the arrival in Beijing in 1601 of the great Jesuit scholar and missionary, Matteo Ricci. There was at the time a flurry of press speculation that these symposia would herald a major breakthrough in China's relations with the Church, even rumors that China was about to let the Holy See set up an apostolic delegation in Beijing. The speculation was totally groundless, of course, but the Ricci events produced one of the most dramatic developments in the centuries-long relationship between the Catholic Church and China.

On the 24th of October, Pope John Paul II issued a statement to the Sinologists then meeting at Rome's Gregorian University on the theme of Encounters and Dialogue. In the course of his fairly long discourse, tracing the story of Ricci's contribution, the Holy Father turned to the present:

The Chinese people, especially in more recent times, have set themselves important objectives in the field of social progress. The Catholic Church for her part regards with respect this impressive thrust and far-sighted planning, and with discretion offers her own contribution in the promotion and defense of the human person, and of the person's values, spirituality and transcendent vocation. The Church has very much at heart the values and objectives that are of primary importance also to modern China: solidarity, peace, social justice, the wise management of the phenomenon of globalization, and the civil progress of all peoples.

PAPAL APOLOGY

Then, after expressing the Church's affection for the Chinese people and her desire to be of service for the good of all the people, and noting the "long line of generous missionaries" and the many works of human development they accomplished down the centuries, especially in the fields of health care and education, he said the following:

History, however, reminds us of the unfortunate fact that the work of members of the Church in China was not always without error, the bitter fruit of their personal limitations and of the limits of their action. Moreover their action was often conditioned by the difficult situations connected with complex historical events and conflicting political interests. . . . In certain periods of modern history, a kind of "protection" on the part of European political powers not infrequently resulted in limitations on the Church's very freedom of action and had negative repercussions for the Church in China. . . . I feel deep sadness for these errors and limits of the past, and I regret that in many people these failings may have given the impression of a lack of respect and esteem for the Chinese people on the part of the Catholic Church. . . . For all this I ask the forgiveness and understanding of those who may have felt hurt in some way by such actions on the part of Christians.

He concluded by expressing "the hope that concrete forms of communication and cooperation between the Holy See and the People's Republic of China may soon be established."

THE PRC RESPONSE

What was the Chinese government's reaction? Virtual silence, one might almost say a kind of embarrassed silence, with a spokesman for the foreign ministry [Sun Yuxi] trucked out to repeat the standard mantra of the past: "The Holy see must break relations with Taiwan" and "The Vatican must not use religion to interfere in China's internal affairs."

Interfering in China's internal affairs is the code term for China's ignoring its own constitutional guarantee of religious freedom. It is China's denial of the Church's right to exercise its normal and customary role of appointing bishops as heads of dioceses all over the world, and thus a government's interference in the internal affairs of the Church.

Why were the authorities unable to react more positively to this quite extraordinary papal apology? For the same reason that they grossly over-reacted to the October 1, 2000 canonization of the Chinese martyrs, as a smokescreen to cover over the existing divisions within the Party. The overriding factor right now is the upcoming Party Congress this Fall, which is expected to usher in a new, somewhat younger, leadership. Bishop Joseph Zen, Coadjutor of Hong Kong, holds out the hope

that this new leadership, and the rising of a political class of even younger people, many of whom will have studied abroad, will gradually bring about genuine change. Gradually perhaps over a period of 3 years, he thinks. And change, openness, is the only way to avoid the bloody outcome that some foresee; "there are many unhappy people in China," the bishop notes [ZENIT interview, 2/20/02].

RELIGIOUS REPRESSION TODAY

In the meantime, religious expression continues to be either repressed, sometimes brutally, or controlled, although the controls over the registered Catholic Church are showing signs of wear and ineffectiveness. The vast majority of all the registered bishops have been reconciled with Rome, which the government obviously knows. The power of the Patriotic Association is greatly diminished and given to sometimes desperate gestures, such as the staged ordination of bishops on Epiphany 2000, timed to coincide with the Pope's ordaining 12 bishops that same day.

What's the status of religious persecution of Catholics right now? Over the past months, we've been treated to a kind of good cop-bad cop reporting on the State of religion in China. The Wall Street Journal in February claimed that "China is re-thinking its heavy-handed policies and taking a more tolerant line on mainstream groups." But at the same time, we know of the secret documents smuggled out by officials of the State Security Ministry and other government agencies that envision a still tighter crackdown on unauthorized religious groups. And at the beginning of Lent this year, mid-February, the news agency of the Vatican's missionary congregation issued a list of some 33 Catholic bishops and priests known to have been arrested or disappeared or under house arrest. The best known of these and the one for whom American ambassador Clark Randt has intervened is Bishop James SU Zhimin of Baoding, a well-respected figure who has been repeatedly arrested, released, and re-arrested. His whereabouts is presently unknown.

CONCLUSION

Is the end game in sight- We'll have to wait to see what the new leadership is like and, if more open to change, how long it will take for them to consolidate their positions. It seems clear that Jiang's modest moves for change in 1999 lost out to the hard-liners. The PRC has now decided that two can play at issuing human rights reports and has now put out its own report on the dismal human rights record of the United States, detailing the many perceived violations of human rights in this country, including, as one chapter has it, "Wantonly Infringing upon the Human Rights of Other Countries."

Those of us who advocate for international human rights and religious freedom have our work cut out. I cite the instance of a recent and very detailed policy brief of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Re-balancing United States-China Relations." Amidst a wide-ranging list of issues discussed, there is not a word about human rights, still less about religious freedom.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAUL MARSHALL

MARCH 25, 2002

Thank you for the opportunity to join this round table on the issue of religious freedom in China. Freedom House commends the Commission for monitoring this issue.

Freedom House's Center for Religious Freedom is alarmed by mounting repression against the major religious and spiritual groups in China—Protestant Christians, Roman Catholics, Tibetan Buddhists, Falun Gong, and Uighur Muslims. Beijing controls the five "authorized" religions (Protestantism, Catholicism, Buddhism, Islam and Taoism) by the Religious Affairs Bureau (RAB), controlled by the United Front Work Department, itself controlled by the Central Committee of the Communist Party. In turn, Party officials, by law must be atheists. The RAB registers and controls Protestant Christians all religious groups through the Three-Self Patriotic movement and the China Christian Council, Catholics through the Catholic Patriotic Association and Bishops Conference, and similar patriotic associations for Buddhists, Muslims and Taoists. Falun Gong is banned completely.

China's new tactic of labeling religious groups as so-called "cults" and then cracking down on them intensifies the repression of non-approved religion. After China stopped treating religious offenses as counter-revolutionary, religious offenses were treated as a type of civil offense, punishable by fines, or by minimal incarceration. This would be comparable to a "misdemeanor" in America (though punishable by possibly 3 years in a labor camp). With the introduction of the laws regulating "he-

retical cults" in October 30, 1999, religious offenses can now be classified as threatening national security, comparable to a "felony" in America, and punishable by life sentences or even death. This tactic has been increasingly employed in the last 2 years, and government spokespersons maintain that believers are not being repressed by restrictive religion laws, but are criminals disrupting public and social order laws.

The result of these developments has been a marked deterioration in religious freedom in China over the last year and in particular since Congress approved PNTR. China has not ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Chinese government has not provided information or permitted unhindered access to religious leaders who are in prison, in detention, under house arrest, or under surveillance.

The heightened crackdown may stem from frustration and political insecurity as authorities observe the astonishing revival of religion throughout China particularly through unsanctioned groups. Since the end of the Cultural Revolution, China's Christian churches, registered and underground, Catholic and Protestant, have been experiencing explosive growth. Thirteen million Protestants are registered with the government. Unregistered Protestants may number over 50 million, in house-churches, so named because services are held in houses.

While this roundtable is focused on Catholics and Protestants, it is important to raise the situation of Falun Gong, which this month is facing perhaps its worst repression ever. Falun Gong officials in the U.S., say:

Police have been ordered to "shoot on sight" anyone posting or handing out written materials for Falun Gong. After practitioners showed cable TV programs with facts about Falun Gong on March 5 in the city of Changchun, Jiang Zemin issued a "Kill Without Mercy" order. On March 15, Amnesty International issued an Urgent Action request for "Falun Gong practitioners in Changchun City," saying, "Amnesty International believes they are at serious risk of torture or ill-treatment . . . police 'stop and search' checkpoints have reportedly been established across the city. . . ." Consequently, 5000 or more practitioners in the Changchun area have since been arrested, several practitioners have reportedly 'jumped' or 'fallen' from tall buildings when pursued by police, and police have secretly cremated the bodies of numerous practitioners tortured to death by police. Latest reports indicate that more than 100 have died in Changchun in this spasm of violence by authorities in the past 3 weeks.

We are concerned that some 33 Catholic bishops and priests are in prison, under house arrest, or under strict police surveillance, including Bishop Su Zhimin of Baoding in Hebei Province, who disappeared into custody in 1996. The Vatican's Fides News Service list 13 bishops who have been arrested, as well as 20 priests, and says that this list is incomplete.

Among Protestants, one of the most striking recent cases is Pastor Gong Shengliang, who was sentenced to death on December 5 on charges of operating an "evil cult" and on apparently trumped-up charges of rape and assault. The month-long period for deciding his appeal was extended on January 5 by a Hubei court following sharp international protest. In a letter, dated December 31, 2001, members of an underground church in China describe the torture and abuse that was applied to them by police to pressure them to testify against Gong:

These few days, all of those arrested have been badly beaten by the police. Ma and her boy Longfeng were both beaten almost to death. Li Enhui fell unconscious and was awakened with cold water and beaten again. They did this to her non-stop for 7 days and 7 nights. Xiao Yajun was also questioned 7 days and 7 nights. On July 20, we heard the news that Yu, who was arrested in Ma's house, had been tortured to death.

In efforts to find and apprehend Pastor Gong and suppress the South China Church, police arrested 63 congregants, severely beating at least 25 Christians and torturing some with electric prods. The person whom the authors write was tortured to death is Yu Zhongju, a young mother, who had been arrested last May in a private house connected with Pastor Gong's congregation. She died in police custody in late July, after having being beaten.

I will focus the rest of my remarks concerning China on what has been revealed in secret Chinese government documents, released in February, detailing an official crackdown against large, unregistered churches and other religious groups nationwide. Copies of the documents, along with translations, were provided to Freedom House's Center for Religious Freedom by Mr. Shixiong Li and Mr. Xiqu (Bob) Fu of the New York-based Committee for Investigation on Persecution of Religion in China. Freedom House's Center had the official documents authenticated by expert and exiled former Chinese government journalist, Su Xiaokang.

The seven documents, issued between April 1999 and October 2001, detail the goals and actions of China's national, provincial and local security officials in repressing religion. (The Freedom House analysis is available online at: www.freedomhouse.org/religion). They show that China's government, at the highest levels, aims to repress religious expression outside its control, and is using more determined, systematic and harsher criminal penalties in this effort. Hu Jin-tao, designated as the successor of President Jiang Zemin is quoted in the document as endorsing the drive against the Real God church. The Minister of Public Security is quoted giving the order to "smash the cult quietly." (Document 4).

Ye Xiaowen, the head of China's Religious Affairs Bureau, wrote in January 2002 that repression is not working and suggested that a more nuanced approach is needed. In fact, the documents reveal that a brutal, but more clandestine, approach is being employed to crush unregistered churches and religious groups.

As a result, normal religious activity is criminalized, and, as the December death sentences brought against South China Church Pastor Gong Shengliang and several of his co-workers attest, the directives outlined in these documents are being carried out with ruthless determination.

Several documents focus particularly on measures to "smash" the Christian South China church and the Real God Church, which, Chinese authorities state, rivals Falun Gong in its reach and dangerous effects. Other documents list several Christian churches, Falun Gong, the Unification Church, and other banned religious groups. In all, 14 religious groups are identified in Document 1 as "evil cults."

The documents indicate that Beijing may feel it is losing its battle to control religious expression. They note with palpable alarm that the Real God Church is growing rapidly throughout 22 Chinese provinces. Document 4 says that "inner circles" of the Communist Party and government officials have secretly joined the banned Real God Church, and instructs officials to find out who among them are members of the group.

China is an officially atheist State that arrogates to itself the authority to define orthodoxy, determine dogma and designate religious leaders. The documents are notable for their crudeness in understanding the religions the government purports to control. Revealing a fundamental misunderstanding or deliberate misinterpretation of the New Testament, Document 1 uses a basic Christian doctrine that Christ is in every believer to accuse churches of "deifying" their leaders, a practice defined as "cult-like."

Document 2 betrays deep paranoia on the part of Chinese officials. It raises particular concerns about public unrest over China's entry into the WTO which it ties to Western support of democracy movements ("Democratic Party of China"), and religious groupings, especially Falun Gong; it accuses the Vatican of "still waiting for any opportunity to . . . draw the patriotic religious believers up to them and incite them to rebel."

In Document 4, "Praying for world peace," ecumenical relations between churches, printing religious publications, and developing a diocesan, parish and prayer group-like organizational structure, are all seen as dangerous activities. Document 4 also views with alarm ecumenical relations between the Protestant house-church Real God and the underground Catholic Church. Real God is also said to have ties with Tiananmen Square student protest leaders, as well as in the Communist Party and the government.

Measures to be taken against banned religious groups include surveillance, the deployment of special undercover agents, the gathering of "criminal evidence," "complete demolition" of a group's organizational system, interrogation, and arrest, as well as the confiscation of church property, and homes in which meetings are held. Document 2 repeatedly refers to the use of "secret agents" to infiltrate "cults," underground Catholics, businesses, joint ventures, people with "complicated political backgrounds," prestigious colleges and universities, and other organizations.

As the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended, U.S. policy should press the Chinese government to take effective steps in the following four areas:

1. End its current crackdown on religious and spiritual groups.
2. Reform its repressive legal framework and establish an effective mechanism to hold officials accountable for religious-freedom and related human rights violations.
3. Affirm the universality of religious freedom and China's international obligations and ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
4. Foster a culture of respect for human rights.

The U.S. government's China policy should support and, as appropriate, fund human rights advocates within China, as well as those, wherever found, who are promoting the rule of law, legal reform, and democracy there. The U.S. Government

should make sure that Tibetan and other ethnic minorities, as well as representatives of religious communities and other nongovernmental organizations, are included in exchange programs with China.

Through public diplomacy, the United States should directly explain to the Chinese people this message and the reasons for our concern. Such efforts should include the expansion of Radio Free Asia and Voice of America broadcasts throughout China. Since the U.S. permits Chinese media, including the official Chinese Central Television Company, access to American markets, we should ensure that U.S. media, including broadcasting companies, are allowed a similar presence in Chinese markets. Also, the U.S. Government should ensure that U.S. companies doing business in China do not engage in practices that would facilitate violations of religious freedom and other human rights, such as disclosing employees' religious or spiritual activities or affiliations to Chinese officials.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOSEPH M.C. KUNG

MARCH 25, 2002

Ladies and gentlemen:

When I entered this country 47 years ago in 1955, China was a young communist country. At that time, the communists were throwing the bishops, priests and their faithful into jail and labor camp.

Forty-seven years later, China is still a communist country. China is still throwing the religious believers into jail and labor camp by thousands. Although China has changed by opening its door to the outside world, the persecution of religious believers has never stopped. This persecution has recently become so bad at a time when China is making significant economic progress, at a time when China has joined World Trade Organization, and at a time when China professes fighting terror, while it continues to create its own terror among its own religious believers.

Since late 1999, the government of China has destroyed 1,200 churches in one eastern province alone. An 82 year old priest, Father YE Gong-Feng was savagely tortured to unconsciousness and Father LIN Rengui was beaten so savagely that he vomited blood. Underground Catholic seminarian Wang Qing was tortured for 3 days, being suspended by his wrists, beaten, and forced fed with contaminated liquids that caused severe injury and illness. Catholic priest Hu Duo suffered broken legs in police beatings. Even a 12 year old girl could not escape the brutality. She told the interrogators that she had become a liturgy lector. As a result, she was beaten so savagely that she had to be hospitalized.

There is a tiny village called Dong Lu in Hebei. In that village, there is a shrine for the Blessed Mother. Each year, tens of thousands of pilgrims visited this shrine from all over China. However, in May 1996, 5,000 Chinese soldiers, supported by dozens of armed cars and helicopters, destroyed and leveled that shrine. The government confiscated the statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary and arrested many bishops and priests. Bishop Su Chimin, the underground bishop of this shrine, was arrested at least 5 times in the past and had already spent approximately 26 years in prison. He disappeared after he was last arrested in October, 1997. We do not even know if he is dead or alive. The auxiliary bishop of this shrine, Bishop An Shuxin, was last arrested in May, 1996. He has been in prison for the last 6 years. We do not even know where he is. The pastor of this shrine, Father Cui Xingang, was also arrested 6 years ago in May, 1996.

There are approximately 50 bishops in the underground Roman Catholic Church. Almost every one of them is either arrested, or under house arrest, or under strict surveillance, or in hiding, or on the run. For instance, Bishop Jia Zhiguo, Bishop of Zhengding in Hebei, was just arrested 5 days ago. We do not know where he is.

Obviously, there is severe on-going persecution of underground Roman Catholic in China at this time.

The communists took over China in 1949. After 7 years of severe persecution, the communists failed to stamp out the Catholic Church. So, in 1957, the Chinese communist government created its own church called the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association—in order to replace the Roman Catholic Church in China and to have complete control of the church.

Although this Patriotic Association's Church calls itself "Catholic", it does not take its mandate from the Pope. It takes orders only from the Chinese Government. It is under the sanction of the Chinese government. Therefore, it is not persecuted. To this day, the Patriotic Association continues to openly advocate independence from the Pope. Our Pope has refused to recognize this Patriotic Association, or the "Official Church".

In contrast, underground Roman Catholics have no public churches in China because they are illegal there. A Holy Mass, a prayer service, and even praying over the dying by Roman Catholics are all considered illegal and subversive activities by the Chinese government. Religious services for the Roman Catholic Church can only be secretly conducted in private homes or deserted fields. The Chinese government deems these private gatherings of Roman Catholics as illegal, unauthorized, subversive and punishable by exorbitant fines, detention, house arrests, jails, labor camps, or even death.

Approximately 5 months ago, Chinese government authorities arrested underground Bishop Lucas Li of Feng Xiang and 18 underground priests, and closed an underground monastery and two underground convents. The reason? The Patriotic Association was coming to town.

The government is now forcing underground Roman Catholics to register with the Patriotic Association. Refusing to do so is now liable to sentencing to 3 years' labor camp.

Being ordained as an underground Roman Catholic priest and conducting evangelization without permission from the Chinese government are now also considered a crime punishable by 3 years in the labor camps. This punishment is illustrated in a court paper dated April 13, 2001 and is attached at the back of my speech.

Let me say few words about Cardinal Kung. In fact, no description of the persecution of religious believers is complete without mentioning him, because he is a symbol of persecution in China.

Cardinal Kung was the Bishop of Shanghai for 51 years until he died 2 years ago on March 12. He was imprisoned for 32½ years, mostly under solitary confinement, because he refused to renounce the Pope. Pope John Paul II secretly created Bishop Kung a Cardinal in 1979 while he was still in jail and proclaimed him publicly a Cardinal 12 years later in 1991 after he arrived in the United States. Cardinal Kung lived in the United States for 12 years. When Cardinal Kung received his red hat in the Vatican, he received an unprecedented 7-minutes standing ovation from 7,500 people. When he died, the Pope called him "this noble son of China and of the Church."

In an interview with the Chinese Press in New York on February 12, 1998, Mr. Ye Xiaowen, the director of the Religious Bureau of China, stated: "Kung Pin Mei committed a serious crime by dividing the country and causing harm to its people." One month later in March 1998, the Chinese government confiscated the passport of this then 97 year old Cardinal Kung, officially exiling him and making him stateless.

Why is the Chinese communist government so fearful of this 97-year-old Cardinal that it had to confiscate his passport to prevent his return to China? Even after his death, Cardinal Kung was still persecuted and insulted by the Chinese government. After the Cardinal's death, the Chinese government issued a statement that "Kung Pin Mei was a criminal of China found guilty by the Chinese court. Kung committed a serious crime of dividing the country and dividing the church. History will judge him for his crime." I believe that history will indeed judge. However, history will judge that Cardinal Kung is not a criminal. History will also judge that those religious believers who have been persecuted by the Chinese government are also not criminals. The criminals will be those who sent Cardinal Kung to life imprisonment. The criminals will be those who have been persecuting millions of Chinese religious believers who only want to practice their religion according to their conscience, not according to the choice of the government. The criminal will obviously be the Beijing government. Thank you.

