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The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 1 p.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Christopher H. Smith (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. SMITH. The subcommittee will come to order. I want to thank you all of you for joining us for this hearing to examine the status of Chinese human rights defender Chen Guangcheng, and that of his family and others who have been targeted by Chinese officials in connection with this case.

This hearing will also focus on Chen’s cause. Chen Guangcheng is among the bravest defenders of women’s rights in the world. Chen defended thousands of women from the ongoing, most egregious systematic state-sponsored exploitation and abuse of women in human history—pervasive forced abortion, and involuntary sterilization as part of China’s one-child-per-couple policy—and suffered, as a result of his defense, cruel torture, degrading treatment, unjust incarceration, and multiple beatings.

The sheer magnitude of this exploitation of women has been largely overlooked and trivialized by many, and even enabled. United Nations Population Fund has, for over 30 years, supported, defended and whitewashed the crimes against women and children Chen struggled to expose. That is why President Reagan, and more recently President Bush, defunded the U.N. Population Fund. In an indefensible reversal, the Obama administration has provided approximately $165 million to the UNFPA.

Mr. Chen, as we know, who was blinded by a severe fever as an infant, is a self-taught lawyer. He garnered international attention in 2005 when he organized a class-action lawsuit against local officials who were forcing women to undergo abortions and sterilizations to comply with China’s one-child-per-couple policy. There were as many as 130,000 involuntary abortions and sterilizations performed in Linyi County in a single year. In response to his heroic efforts to defend women and men from forced sterilization and women from forced abortion, Mr. Chen was sentenced to 51 months in prison on trumped-up charges and then subjected to extralegal house arrest where the beatings continued.
In response to his incredible escape on April 22nd and the events that followed, I chaired an emergency hearing about Mr. Chen, with the Congressional-Executive Commission on China in this same room on May 3rd. During that hearing, which took place just days after—after Mr. Chen left the U.S. Embassy in Beijing, Mr. Chen spoke to us from his hospital bed in Beijing over Mr. Bob Fu’s cell phone. Mr. Chen indicated that he wanted to come to the United States for some time of rest, as he put it, noting that he had not had rest for the past 10 years. He asked for a face-to-face meeting with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who was in Beijing at the time. Regrettably, that didn’t happen. He also expressed fear for the life of his family members, and said that he was most concerned about their safety, especially that of his mother and his brother. He was extremely concerned about their welfare, as well as their whereabouts.

In that context Mr. Chen noted that security officers had installed seven video cameras and even an electric fence around his house in Shandong Province, saying that they “want to see what else Chen Guangcheng can do.” As soon as the authorities learned of his escape, they refused to allow his daughter to attend school. For these reasons, he was justifiably worried about the villagers and others who were helping him and what they were being subjected to, including severe, life-threatening retribution.

Reports that we have received since are corroborating Mr. Chen’s fears. Following his escape from house arrest, Chinese officials started breaking into the homes of his family in the same village and rounding up those who had assisted him for interrogations. When local officials and thugs broke into the home of Mr. Chen’s brother, Mr. Chen’s nephew, Chen Kegui, reportedly tried to defend himself with a kitchen knife. He is now in a police detention center. I am extremely concerned, as is Chen Guangcheng, for his welfare, as well as that of other family members.

The day after the emergency hearing on May 4, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs posted on their Web site the statement that “[a]s a Chinese citizen, [Mr. Chen] may apply like other Chinese citizens according to the laws and normal procedures of the relevant departments.” The U.S. Department of State also issued a press release announcing that “[t]he Chinese Government stated today that Mr. Chen Guangcheng has the same right to travel abroad as any other citizen of China. Mr. Chen has been offered a fellowship from an American university, where he can be accompanied by his wife and two children. The Chinese Government has indicated that it will accept Mr. Chen’s applications for appropriate travel documents. The United States Government expects that the Chinese Government will expeditiously process his applications for these documents. . . .”

Now, 11 days later, Mr. Chen is still in the same hospital room with his wife and two children under de facto house arrest. Although Mr. Chen is under the impression that his application for a passport was made last Sunday when he was visited by a Chinese official, and under Chinese law blind persons are supposed to be able to apply orally for travel documents, he has not been notified of any further action on the application. With the exception of the half-hour each morning and afternoon that the children are es-
corted outside by one of the nurses, he and his family are not al-

lowed to leave the hospital, and no one is allowed to see them.

Anyone who attempts to see Mr. Chen risks severe retaliation. For example, on May 2nd, human rights lawyer Jiang Tianyong at-
tempts to visit Mr. Chen in the hospital. He was forcibly taken away by police officers. It was later reported that Mr. Jiang was beaten so severely that he lost his hearing in at least one ear, and has been forced to move from Beijing to Hebei Province until after the 18th Party Congress.

Mr. Jiang was here in the United States in October 2009 and tes-
tified twice before the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, an amazingly heroic man. Mr. Wolf chaired one of those hearings, and I chaired the other. One of his recommendations was that Presi-
dent Obama should speak with President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao about freeing a number of political prisoners, including Chen Guangcheng, who was imprisoned at that time. Now Mr. Jiang himself must be included in the list of those on whose behalf the United States advocates for.

Chinese nationals are not the only ones being prohibited from trying to meet Mr. Chen. The Foreign Correspondents Club of China reported in early May that officials threatened to revoke the visas of foreign journalists who entered the hospital without per-
mission. I would note here that many journalists have demon-
strated amazing courage and laudable perseverance in public-
cizing Mr. Chen’s plight. It is largely due to their promotion of Mr. Chen’s case that has reached this stage of a possible travel to the United States. I would earnestly ask them not to forget Mr. Chen and his family, and extended family, and others, like He Peirong, who are risking their security and their lives on his behalf.

The story, unfortunately, is far from over.

Before I turn to our panel of distinguished witnesses to discuss the current events, I would like comments by my fellow colleagues, some of whom are en route, to be made a part of the record, without objection.

I would like to now ask our witnesses if they would come to the witness table, and I will introduce them to the subcommittee.

Beginning first with Pastor Bob Fu, who was a leader in the 1989 student democracy movement in Tiananmen Square and later became a house church pastor and founder along with his wife. In 1996, authorities arrested and imprisoned them for their work. After their release they escaped to the United States in 2002 and founded the ChinaAid Association. ChinaAid monitors and reports on religious freedom in China, and provides a forum for discussion among experts on religion, law and human rights in China. Pastor Fu is frequently interviewed by media outlets around the world and has testified at U.S. congressional hearings, including the one on Chen Guangcheng, held by the China Commission. It was Bob Fu, whose cell phone and translation made that very important connection with Chen Guangcheng on May 3rd.

We will then hear from Mr. Wei Jingsheng, who served two jail sentences totaling more than 18 years in China for his pro-democ-

racy Coalition, an umbrella organization for many Chinese democracy groups. He is also president of the Wei Jingsheng Foundation and the Asian Democracy Alliance. He has written numerous articles and regularly speaks about human rights and democracy in China, including broadcasts via Radio Free Asia.

I would note parenthetically that I first met Wei Jingsheng when he was released very briefly in 1993. He was such a highly prized human rights advocate that China thought if they released one dissident, they would procure the 2000 Olympics. When that didn’t happen, he was rearrested and brutally beaten and tortured until his eventual release because he was close to death. So this is a truly remarkable man.

And when I met him in China, he said that when Americans and Westerners coddle and treat in a kowtowish way the Chinese Government, they beat us more in the Chinese laogai and prison gulags. When you are tough and transparent and say what you mean and mean what you say, they beat us less. And I will never forget that lesson. He said that in a hotel in January 1994 when we had dinner together. So a great man, and that was before his re-arrest.

We will then hear from Ms. Reggie Littlejohn, who is founder and president of Women’s Rights Without Frontiers, an international coalition that opposes forced abortion, gendercide, and sexual slavery in China. She has legally represented Chinese refugees in numerous political asylum cases and testified before the European and British Parliaments, the White House, and Congress. Ms. Littlejohn serves as the expert on China’s one-child policy for the ChinaAid Association and has issued several groundbreaking reports from inside of China about the incalculable suffering caused by the coercive enforcement of the one-child-per-couple policy.

We will then hear from Ms. Chai Ling, the founder of All Girls Allowed, an organization dedicated to restoring life and dying with dignity to girls and mothers, and to revealing the gross injustice of China’s one-child policy. Chai Ling also established the Jenzabar Foundation and serves as one of its board members. The foundation supports the most inspirational and influential humanitarian efforts of students through grant opportunities. A key student herself during the 1989 Tiananmen Square movement, one of the most wanted by the Chinese Government, and a very heroic character, Chai Ling was subsequently named Glamour Woman of the Year and nominated twice for a Nobel Peace Prize. She is the author of the book, “A Heart for Freedom,” and has already saved a number of little girls who would have been subjected to sex-selection abortions in China, who are now living today because of her intervention and that of her organization.

We will then hear from Ms. Mei Shunping, who was born in 1958. Because of the Cultural Revolution, she was unable to finish school. She and her husband were married in 1981, just after the one-child-per-couple policy was implemented. As a factory worker in a textile facility, she was forced by the Family Planning Commission to undergo five forced abortions. She came to the U.S. in 1999 and lives with her husband in New England. Ms. Mei has one son, who also lives in the United States. Her dream is to return to school and to finish her education.
And I now yield to Mr. Carnahan.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for really putting together this very important hearing and for your continued work in championing human rights everywhere.

I join you in concern for the outstanding issues in the case of Chen Guangcheng, as well as ongoing human rights issues in China. The case of Mr. Chen not only highlights these abuses, but also the need to evaluate the current status of U.S.-China relations. Although still unfolding, Mr. Chen's affair appears to mark a watershed moment for U.S.-China relations.

Despite the many serious remaining concerns, I believe it is important to stress the significance of the U.S. reaching two deals on a sensitive crisis with the Chinese, as well as engaging in the annual Strategic and Economic Dialogue as planned. These talks underscore the vast array of national and economic security issues in which the U.S. and China must collaborate. We must continue to work toward greater understanding with regard to North Korea, Iran, the South China Sea, intellectual property rights protections, and currency manipulation, just to name a few.

I believe efforts to improve cooperation officially and through enhanced public diplomacy will allow us to better address areas of mutual interest and those of disagreement, including the myriad of security challenges and the serious cases of human rights abuses like the ones that Mr. Chen has endured and those revealed in the course of his brave work.

Beyond bilateral engagement to address these issues, the U.S. must also continue to pursue engagement through multilateral fora, including the U.N., to affect positive change in China. It is important to note, in fact, that the U.N. Population Fund in China was among the first organizations to raise Mr. Chen's rights and abusive practices in Linyi with Chinese Government officials. I look forward to hearing more about the status of Mr. Chen, and ways the U.S. and international community can ensure the safety of his family and his supporters.

With China facing a generational leadership change later this year, coupled with major societal, economic, and humanitarian issues as a result of its one-child policy, I also hope we consider what the deal on Mr. Chen reflects about the internal political situation in China and appropriate U.S. actions.

In closing, I once again want to thank the chairman for calling this important hearing and the witnesses for being here today to share their stories.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. Russ, thank you very much.

I would like to now ask Pastor Bob Fu if you would proceed.

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

Pastor Fu. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your leadership. Thank you for your continuous support on behalf of a Chinese family.

While we are still waiting for a real progress report about Chen and his close family members, any plan, or about the issuance of a passport from the Chinese Government, today I want to focus on
the plight of his extended family members and his supporters. And especially I am deeply concerned about the Chen's nephew, Chen Kegui, and I want to really give you an updated report after talking with at least two of his lawyers and another legal representative in the past few days.

Here is a chronology for what had happened to Mr. Chen Kegui. Of course, he has been under criminal detention since April 30, and then on May 9, he was formally arrested with the trumped-up charge called “intentional homicide.”

This is how the so-called homicide happened: After Chen Guangcheng's escape last month, the local official who has been directing the persecution of Chen, the town mayor Zhang Jian, led a group of people in a raid on the home of Chen's brother, Chen Guangfu, that began at about 11:30 p.m. on April 26th and continued to dawn. Without showing any IDs, they broke down the door, and jumped over the walls of Chen Guangfu's home, and then seriously beat Chen Guangfu and then his wife, Ren Zongju. And their son, Chen Kegui, thought some bandits had come to rob them. So, after he walked out of his bedroom, he was violently attacked for at least 3 hours, and according to the eyewitnesses and his own report, he was bleeding from his face, from his head, and out of those circumstances, it was purely out of self-defense and witnessing how his parents were violently beaten up, he injured several of the attackers with a kitchen knife.

And then early morning of April 27, he himself, in a conversation recorded by a reporter for 50 minutes, he was talking about how he was violently attacked. He said he was waiting. He called the Chinese police, telephoned the equivalent of 9–1–1. He wants to surrender himself, but after waiting for a few hours, he was afraid for his life, so he walked away to another neighboring county, actually in the nearby Province of Jiangsu—the county's name is called the Xinyi county—and there he was trying to surrender to the neighboring province. And at least from my conversation with one of his lawyers, the attorney Liu Weiguo from Jinan, the capital city of Shandong Province, on April 29, that in a conversation he had with attorney Liu Weiguo, he said, you know, I am waiting, and I was waiting to go to that detention center to surrender myself. And then on April 30, obviously, he was under criminal detention, and later on he was charged with intentional homicide.

And almost all of the lawyers who were waiting to handle Chen Kegui’s's case, have lost their freedom of movement, or had their lawyer's license confiscated or are being held by the authorities. And some of them had been simply kidnapped. And I talked with Dr. Teng Biao, a professor of law at the Chinese University for Political Science and the Law, last night, and he said he just tried to go to Beijing where—that is his home—on May 12, and only found he was kicked out on May 13. That is the latest.

And attorney Liu Weiguo, is losing his freedom of movement, so he is not allowed to travel to either Beijing or Shandong at all. And another attorney from Guangzhou, attorney Wu Chen—let us see, Wu Chen, only after he—the same day when he announced he will be the attorney for Chen Kegui, his license was being held by the Chinese Government, so he is not allowed to represent Mr. Chen Kegui’s case. Based on the experience of Mr. Chen Guangcheng’s
trial or pretrial in 2005, we cannot have confidence that Mr. Chen Kegui will receive any fair trial.

And let me just talk a little bit about a few other cases about those supporters of Mr. Chen, who have experienced tremendous persecution in the past week or so just simply for being associated with Mr. Chen, or for raising awareness. One of them, his name is Lu Haitao, netizen from Beijing, just because he tried to visit Mr. Chen, he and his wife, who was 2 months pregnant, and kept being harassed and invited and forced to have tea with the public security officers since May 10, and then because of that harassment and the threat, on May 13, Mr. Lu Haitao’s wife, Yang Lanlian, had a miscarriage. Their 2-month-old baby is gone.

And, of course, the other individuals like Mr. Jiang Tianyong, who has testified before you, Mr. Chairman, was beaten, and was also removed from Beijing as well.

And there is another individual whose name is Song Ze. He is a member of Beijing’s NGO, Gongmeng, who has been just raising awareness for Mr. Chen. But he, on May 6, this month, he had been put under criminal detention. Right now he is being held at the Fengtai District detention center.

And another activist, Liu Guohui, who has been an advocate, and also a constant visitor, or trying to visit Mr. Chen in the past couple of years, and her passport recently was even declared invalid. So she has no way to even travel to overseas. And other lawyers, most of them who are not able to have any freedom of movement.

So I am very, very concerned that the Chinese Government, especially the local authorities, will make trumped-up charges; based on this trumped-up charge, they will make a fake trial, expeditiously hand him a very severe sentence, and possibly if he is convicted, he could be sentenced to death.

Where is the way out for Chen Guangcheng? Despite the fact that the United States and China have reached an apparent agreement and are committed to Chen Guangcheng’s freedom and security, and Chen Guangcheng remains under de facto house arrest in the Chaoyang Hospital. And I talked with him pretty much twice a day, until last night and this morning we lost contact.

And all the visitors are barred, including the U.S. diplomatic representatives are not allowed to visit him, and some of the Chinese supporters and friends who just tried to visit him were barred, or tailed and beaten.

So all of this shows that the implementation of the agreement and the realization of the commitments are far more important than the agreement and the commitments themselves. I hope that Congress will do more in monitoring and urging the administration to ensure the civil rights of Chen Guangcheng and his family members are protected by the law, and Chen Guangcheng was allowed to enter the U.S. Embassy. Members of the Obama administration, including the Assistant Secretaries Kurt Campbell and Michael Posner, the State Department legal advisor Harold Koh, and Ambassador Gary Locke all made a great active efforts, and, of course, sacrificed sleep during the negotiation time.

And although some aspects of the events that followed certainly were not handled properly by the administration, we are nonetheless pleased to see that high-level American and Chinese officials
have promised to help Chen Guangcheng and his family come to the United States so they can rest and have further studies at a U.S. institution. And this shows that our country recognized that it is responsible, you know, for the outcome of the fate of Chen Guangcheng.

We hope that Members of Congress can provide all of the tools that the administration needs to back their commitment and to follow through, and we are certainly looking forward that day when Chen and his wife and two children to touch the soil in the United States of America very soon, hopefully.

Mr. SMITH. Pastor Fu, thank you so very much for your testimony and for your insights.

[The prepared statement of Pastor Fu follows:]
Why the ruthless treatment of a blind man?

--Prospects not bright for a way out for Chen Guangcheng

Testimony of Bob Fu, founder & president, China Aid Association
to
U. S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs (COFA)
Hearing of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health & Human Rights
“Chen Guangcheng: His Case, Cause, Family, and Those Who are Helping Him”

1 p.m., Tuesday, May 15, 2012
Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building

It has now been more than three weeks since Chen Guangcheng’s miraculous escape on April 22 from his family home in Dongshigu village (Yinan county, Linyi district) in Shandong province where he had been imprisoned for 19 months. After his escape, Chen Guangcheng managed to make his way to Beijing with the help of some netizens (or Internet-based supporters), then took refuge in the U.S. Embassy for six days, after which he was sent to Beijing Chaoyang Hospital where he was put under house arrest. On May 3, through a call on my cellphone, Chen was able to speak live to a hearing of the Congressional-Executive Committee on China and to tell Chairman Chris Smith directly that he and his family wished to come to the United States. The following day, the Chinese and U.S. governments expressed their willingness to work together toward this outcome. The entire Chen Guangcheng incident has been full of dramatic ups and downs and has captured the attention of the world. Along with the rest of the world, I continue to believe that a satisfactory result is possible. But in the almost two weeks since that phone call, there has been no substantive progress by the Chinese government toward allowing Chen to come to the United States. The Chinese government has yet to issue him a passport, which means Chen Guangcheng has not been able to leave China.

1. Chen Guangcheng’s cause

Chen Guangcheng, 41, is a blind self-taught human rights lawyer who began in the early 1990s to use legal means to protect his own fundamental rights as well as that of his fellow villagers, including the villagers’ land use rights, and the right of disabled persons to enjoy tax exemptions
and fare exemptions on public transport. He had some success in winning cases of this kind.
In 2001, he graduated from Nanjing University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, and in 2002, he tried but failed to set up an association for the rights of the disabled in Beijing. In 2003, the local government named him one of its Ten Outstanding Young Persons, and in July and August of that year, he and his wife visited the United States.

In 2005, Chen Guangcheng led a team of human rights lawyers in an investigation that exposed 130,000 cases of forced abortions and forced sterilizations (tubal ligations) in the Linyi district of Shandong province—for which he became the target of government attacks and oppression. That same year, he was named “Person of the Year” by the Hong Kong-based magazine Asia Week, and in 2006, Time Magazine named him one of its 100 most Influential figures in the world. But in August 2006, because of his activism, the Chinese government sentenced Chen Guangcheng to four years and three months imprisonment. In August 2007, while he was serving his prison term, Chen was given the Philippines’ Magsaysay Award. Following his release from prison on September 9, 2010, Chen and his wife, Yuan Weijing, were put under house arrest where they were beaten and abused and forbidden to seek medical treatment.

In the face of such harsh persecution, Chen Guangcheng has never given in: he has kept up his battle against the forces of evil, even to today.

2. Chen Guangcheng’s family
Chen Guangcheng’s wife, Yuan Weijing, is a former high school English teacher. The couple has a son and a daughter. Yuan Weijing has made great sacrifices for Chen Guangcheng and his cause. She once said: “I am Guangcheng’s eyes.” When Chen was in prison for more than four years time, all the family’s burdens fell on her, and she was allowed only three prison visits. After Chen’s release from prison, their children became the victims of guilt by association and have been unable to lead normal lives. Chen’s elderly mother was the only person allowed to go to the family’s home during Chen’s house arrest, and she has been the sole source of the basic supplies necessary to keep the family alive. Chen’s eldest brother, Chen Guangfu, has been the victim of local government persecution since the beginning of 2006 because of his relationship
to Chen Guangcheng. He, Chen’s wife, and Chen’s elderly mother have all been brutally beaten because of Chen’s noble actions.

After Chen Guancheng’s escape last month, the local official who has been directing the persecution of Chen, town mayor Zhang Jian, led a group of people in a raid on the home of Chen’s brother, Chen Guangfu, that began at about 11:30 p.m. on April 26 and continued to dawn. Without showing any IDs, they broke down the door and jumped over the walls of Chen Guangfu’s home, then savagely beat Chen Guangfu and his wife, Ren Zongju. Their son, Chen Kegui, thought bandits had come to rob them. When he was violently attacked, he injured several of his attackers with a kitchen knife. The Yinan county police have already formally arrested him on the charge of “intentional homicide.” Almost all of the lawyers who were willing to handle Chen Kegui’s knifing case have lost their freedom of movement, or had their lawyer’s license revoked, or simply been kidnapped. According to Chen Kegui’s current lawyer, Liu Weiguo, Chen Kegui’s actions were entirely in line with legitimate self-defense.

Nevertheless, Chen Guangcheng has made clear that he is worried that the local government will seek to retaliate against him through Chen Kegui. Furthermore, Chen’s brother, Chen Guangfu and his wife have been criminally detained for the crime of “harboring and sheltering” [a criminal or fugitive]. They have been released on bail but could be sentenced at any time.

Chen Guangcheng’s family and relatives stand firmly with him. Even though they have suffered intense persecution, they have never abandoned him nor given up their support of his noble cause. This is truly a family of heroes.
3. Chen Guangcheng's supporters

Chen Guangcheng has a band of loyal supporters who have united around him because of their shared sense of responsibility for advancing human rights and the rule of law in China. They too have suffered for supporting Chen. Among them, there are some well-known persons like lawyers Teng Biao and Jiang Tianyong and dissident Hu Jia and his wife, as well as some ordinary heroes like the key figures in the rescue operation Miss He Peirong, Guo Yushan and others. In addition, American movie star Christian Bale, of Batman fame, as well as a steady stream of hundreds of ordinary Chinese went to visit Chen Guangcheng in 2011. They were illegally blocked, beaten, arrested, robbed, and verbally abused. Recently, when lawyers Jiang Tianyong and Teng Biao tried to visit Chen Guangcheng in hospital, they were both beaten and Jiang lost the hearing in one ear.

Here in the United States, I and many people from different countries and different backgrounds have all been supporting Chen Guangcheng and his cause. They include Congressmen Chris Smith and Frank Wolf, Committee chairperson Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, many mainstream reporters, and many people living in Midland, Texas, where ChinaAid is based. Zhang Min, a news show host on Radio Free Asia's Mandarin service, was the first and has been the most comprehensive in reporting on Chen Guangcheng's great deeds, and she is a true friend of Chen Guangcheng and his wife.

But let me remind everyone here, there is one long-term supporter of Chen Guangcheng who has paid a heavy price for following his conscience whom we should not forgot, and that is the constitutional law expert and pioneer of the Christian rights defense movement Dr. Fan Yafeng.

Beginning in 2005, Fan Yafeng and a number of other lawyers and dissidents (many of whom are Christians), including Gao Zhisheng, Hu Jia, Li Fangping, Xu Zhiyong, Li Jinsong, helped and supported Chen Guangcheng’s cause: to expose the atrocities of forced abortion and forced sterilizations (tubal ligations). On September 20, 2010, Fan Yafeng hosted a Beijing lawyers forum that was attended by Li Subin, Zhang Kai and other Beijing human rights lawyers to discuss how to help win the freedom of Chen Guangcheng, who had served his time and been
released from prison only to find himself imprisoned at home. Three days later, he and two other Christian human rights activist went to the Shandong provincial government’s representative office in Beijing and held up banners protesting the persecution of Chen Guangcheng. Less than three months later (Dec. 9 to 18), Dr. Fan Yafeng was taken into custody and tortured. After he was released, he was held in “Chen Guangcheng-style house arrest”—with communication with the outside world completely cut off, even to today.

If the persecution of Chen Guangcheng is considered “the actions of the local government,” then I can’t help but ask, how do you explain Fan Yafeng’s 15 months of house arrest in Beijing, or the beatings of Chen Guangcheng’s two Beijing lawyers who tried to visit him in Chaoyang Hospital in Beijing? What I want to make clear to the American government and the American people is this: Do not be easily misled and deceived.

4. Where is the way out for Chen Guancheng?
The power struggle among China’s senior leaders in advance of the 18th Communist Party Congress has been intensified by the Wang Lijun - Bo Xilai case, and it has already clearly revealed that the central government has split into two. Against the backdrop of these unique circumstances, the fact that Chen Guangcheng was still able to take and make calls on his phone after he was handed over by the U.S. Embassy to Beijing Chaoyang Hospital without doubt upset the plans of many players in this incident. And it also increased the dramatic variables at play.

Despite the fact that the United States and China have reached an apparent agreement on and are committed to Chen Guangcheng’s freedom and security, Chen Guangcheng remains under house arrest in hospital and visitors are barred, taunted and beaten. All of this shows that the implementation of the agreement and the realization of the commitments are far more important than the agreement and commitments themselves.

I hope that Congress will do more in monitoring and urging the Obama administration to ensure that the civil rights of Chen Guangcheng and his family members are protected by law. Chen Guangcheng was allowed to enter the U.S. Embassy, and members of Obama’s administration,
including Assistant Secretaries of State Kurt Campbell and Mike Posner, State Department legal
avisor Harold Koh and Ambassador Gary Locke, all made great efforts and sacrifices during the
egotiation period. Although some aspects of the events that followed certainly were not
handled appropriately by the Administration, we are nonetheless pleased to see that high-level
American and Chinese officials have promised to help Chen Guangcheng and his family come to
the United States so he can rest and further his studies. This shows that our country recognizes
that it is responsible for the outcome of the fate of Chen Guangcheng. We hope that Congress
can continue to offer maximum support to the Administration in quickly implementing the
agreement reached by the Chinese and U.S. leadership, and can help Chen Guangcheng and his
family transition smoothly to life in the United States.

Conclusion
Chen Guangcheng has paid an extremely heavy price to defend the rights of the disadvantaged
groups who were the victims of coercive population control measures (mainly women). His
conscience, courage and spirit has been like a light shining in the long dark night of defending
human rights in China, and has also inspired people around the world who are struggling for
human rights and justice.

He is blind, yet he sees and speaks the truth. And he is willing to pay the price for doing so.

The time is now—for the free world to provide a way out for this great blind man.

Thank you.

Pastor Xi Aqu “Bob” Fu, founder and president, China Aid Association
Tuesday May 15, 2012
Mr. Smith. And I now yield to Wei Jingsheng, again, a political prisoner for 18 years, the father of the Democracy Wall movement.

STATEMENT OF MR. WEI JINGSHENG, FOUNDER AND CHAIRMAN, OVERSEAS CHINESE DEMOCRACY COALITION

[The following testimony was delivered through an interpreter.]

Mr. Wei. In January 1994, I met with Representative Chris Smith in Beijing for 3 hours, and then he was obviously concerned with the situation of the American policies about the Chinese human rights. So, he advised then-Secretary of State Warren Christopher to meet with me in Beijing in that spring.

Since then, there was a very important negotiation going on, and that negotiation had not only affected the human rights situation in China, but also affected the U.S.-China relationship. At this point there aren’t too many people that have the full knowledge of this history. And I think it is very important to reflect the full accounts of that negotiation, and because it will make a good reference for what is going on at the present now. So therefore, I give you a reflection of the history then, and because it is kind of long, so I will have my assistant read out my statement to you. Thank you.

In September 1993, I was released half a year ahead of schedule with conditions restricting my personal freedoms. Such a release is called as a controlled release by Chinese law. The supervision would not end until March 29, 1994, until the end of my 15-year sentence.

After being released from prison, I had done the following work: (1) helped to collect donations for individuals and organizations subjected to political prosecutions; (2) purchase bank stock shares as preparation for facilitating money transfers; (3) planned to establish independent workers union for workers; (4) planned to set up a nongovernment organization for artists to relieve them from exploitations of the government; (5) assisted in offering 1 billion Chinese yuan worth of stock in state-owned enterprises, and in proving with the facts after making huge profits that the government had been manipulating the stock market to exploiting mass investors.

I met with Representative Chris Smith in January 1994, and we had talked for 3 hours in a restaurant in Beijing. And I give him the advice and we exchanged ideas as regarding how to push for human rights and democracy progress in China.

On February 27, 1994, following the meeting with Chris Smith, I met with the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck privately in a restaurant. He asked me if I was willing to meet Warren Christopher, the U.S. Secretary of State, to discuss human rights issues in China when Christopher was to visit China in the following month. Shattuck mentioned about the debates in the U.S. Congress on decoupling human rights from trade issues and the potential risks of this meeting.

I thought if my opinions would have some effect in preventing the U.S. from moving backwards on human rights issues in China, I would be willing to take such risks and meet with the Secretary of State. Shattuck mentioned that my opinions has been passed on to President Clinton by Senator Kerry, and already had a positive
effect on the setup of Radio Free Asia. He hoped that my views would help the Secretary of State Christopher. We discussed and agreed on some details of the meeting with the Secretary of State Christopher during his visit.

In the morning, about 2 or 3 days later, police who had been in charge for my surveillance come to my home and said their superior would like to talk to me. Later they brought me to a resort hotel near the Ming Tombs Reservoir, saying that I should relax here and wait for their superior. I asked whom I would meet and what to discuss, but got no answers.

On the next day, an official came, who claimed to be a senior official representing the highest authority in the Chinese Government. By observing the way he casually dismissed the police officer to have a private talk with me, I could tell that his status should be true. Based on the fact that he had to leave for 1/2 hour after our talk, then come back with responses, I would assume there were officials with higher rankings nearby who monitored our conversation and then made the decisions.

At the very beginning of the talk, this official said that it was a negotiation because they needed my help. He said that he knew that I had an appointment to meet the U.S. Secretary of State and also knew my opinions. “We could not change your opinions and will not want to do so, but we wish you would not meet the U.S. Secretary of State.”

I said that that is not possible. Because I had agreed to meet, I could not break the promise. He said that they could offer things in exchange. “We know what you want to do,” he said. “If only you will not meet the U.S. Secretary of State, we will agree to what you want.”

I said I did not believe things could be so simple. Why was it so important for me to meet or not with the U.S. Secretary of State? Why would you agree to let me do the things that you had been prohibiting us from doing, just because of this?

He said, “You might not know how important that the Sino-U.S. trade is to us; taking away those false figures, 70 percent of our real profit was from the foreign trade, and the 70 percent of that come from the Sino-U.S. trade because of the U.S. market’s profit was higher. You might think we, the Communist Government, would collapse without American profit, which is true. I would want to do the same, if I were you, but the Chinese people would suffer, and many Chinese companies would go bankrupt. Since you love the people so much, we had guessed that you would agree to our offers.”

I said, “Not really. I believe that the collapse of the Communist Government and the establishment of a democratic system would be more beneficial to the Chinese people. It will be the lesser of two evils. And the interests of Chinese would be better compensated in the future.”

He said, “You have described the issue too simple. You were once in our internal circle and should know our politics. Do you really think it would lead to trade sanctions?”

I said, “Why not?”

He said that the interests of both China and the United States have dictated that the trade sanctions, if any, would be short-lived.
The businesses of countries would not allow them to continue to the degree that I would need; that is, resulting in the collapse of the Communist Government.

I said, in that case, you had no need to negotiate with me. You also know that I would rather stay in prison than give up the principles.

He said, “We knew that. We understand you better than your comrades, but we also hoped that you could think about that carefully. Someone would have to hold the responsibility for even short-term sanctions, and the highest authority would be forced to step down because of that. That is why someone wanted to make a fuss on you and why we had to protect you from getting into trouble.”

He also said, “You might laugh at me for such a low-level lie, but I have to tell you that it was the truth. You are now standing at the focal point of the Sino-U.S. relationship. If you were in trouble, whether real or false, the highest authority would bathe in shit. Only after he steps down could someone take this position. Therefore, some people are eager to get you in trouble to achieve their own objectives. When they reach their goals, they would cooperate with the U.S. Government to resolve the trade issues, but you would lose your chance to reach your own goals. You should know better than the stakes in this deal.”

I said, “I still do not believe in your promises. I will need an assurance. The stepping down of Jiang Zeming, might not be a bad thing, and the person replacing him might want to compromise with us as well.”

He said, “We would agree with the several things that you want to do. Would you think about it again? I have something to do and will come back in ½ hour.”

He gave me a piece of paper with the offers listed on it. The first thing was to release political prisoners, including a list with 35 names. The next three were also what I really wanted to do; that is, establish workers’ unions, establish artists’ own businesses, and purchasing bank shares and help with receiving and transfer of humanitarian donations.

After more than an hour, the official, whose last name was Guo, came back and asked how I thought about that. I said, “What you agree to means nothing. The establishment of a workers’ union requires approval from the Ministry of Civil Affairs. An artist’s company requires approval from the Ministry of Culture, and the purchase of bank shares requires approval from the People’s Bank. Those were not under the authority of the judiciary branch. Therefore, all of what you have said sounds like lies.”

He said, “I repeat again that I am representing the highest authority to negotiate with you. All these items are within our scope of power. When the time comes, I will help you to complete all the procedures.”

I still say that I could hardly believe what he just said.

He said, “How about this: We will offer you one more offer that you would be able to see. In addition to releasing the political prisoners, providing that you do not betray your promise, we will not arrest any of your people,” by which he means all pro-democracy activists.
I said, “But you just detained a number of pro-democracy activists recently who were not on your list. What about them?”

He said those who got detained recently had not get into the legal procedures yet. “If you give me 1 day, I will get all of them released. We could decide tomorrow whether you would accept our offer. Tomorrow you could make phone calls to verify if we had the ability to keep our promise.”

The next day I called several friends and verified that all of those detained were indeed released without either conditions nor explanations, but I was still inclined not to accept their offers.

This official seems very anxious and almost lost his posture and told me that “you must know that we are already bearing a great deal of risk. We have also explained it within the Communist Party. If you still disagreed, then we will have to arrest you, which would just be playing into the hands of the other side, and all of the offers to you would be blown away.”

Then he added, “The Americans are not as reliable as you might think, and could ultimately reach a compromise with a new leader. Then political prisoners would be round up as usual, and then you would not be able to complete anything that you want to do. You should think about what is at stake. Let me give you a worst-case scenario. Even if we recanted in the future, you at least got the benefit of having the political prisoners released. The other side might not even give you this benefit.”

After that time, I felt the credibility of his words were pretty high, so I accepted their offers, and I made a detailed plan for me to leave Beijing to seek medical treatment, and I politely declined to meet Secretary of State Christopher. I felt that I definitely would not get those offers through the meeting with the Secretary of State. And if the U.S. were to insist on checking on the human rights issues in China, it would not have canceled the annual review of the Most Favored Nation status.

The offers included the provision that immediately after Secretary of State Christopher had left Beijing, I could go back to the city and continue to do what I wished to accomplish, and they would fulfill their remaining offers.

On March 29, 1994, while I was Jinan, they notified me two things: First, I had completed my prison sentence and would no longer be under their control, and all my civil rights were restored. Second, although Secretary of State Christopher had already left China, the situation had changed somehow, and they hoped I would spend some time relaxing in the South and return to Beijing after 1 or 2 months. I rejected the second request, and insisted on going back to Beijing according to our original conditions. I thought that by doing so, I could verify if they had the ability to fulfill their promise.

Two days later I entered the highway from Tianjin to Beijing, but the entire highway was closed with just the car carrying my friend and me and four police cars surrounding us. When arrived at the exit of Tong County we were blocked by more than 100 police officers, including agents from several different departments of the Public Safety Bureau, and officials from the State Security Bureau, and the prosecutor’s office.
A police officer, who I was familiar with, and who has been in charge of my surveillance for many days, told me that the current situation was too complicated, and they did not know what was going on either. He asked me not to make a big scene, and then they were doing backroom negotiations. Later a policeman who I did not recognize came and showed me the subpoena. They took me and the businessman who was going to transfer stock shares of 1 billion Chinese yuans' worth to a counterfeit antique-making company in Tong County.

I slept until the afternoon and then heard the policeman I knew arguing with someone. I heard a strange voice saying that we got orders that no one was allowed to meet this man alone. The policeman I knew said, "We got the instructions from our superior that we must meet with him alone. You have no authority to listen to our conversation, and your superior has agreed to this."

Then they made phone calls. After that, the police officer I knew took me to a private room outside the restaurant and told me that after departure of the Secretary of State Christopher, the debate within the Communist Party got more heated. The other side did not believe the Americans, and also did not believe that I did not influence the Americans. They insisted on handling me by the dictatorship theory of the Communist Party, and they did not think that they should abide by terms of agreement with me; otherwise, it would be a loss of the spirit and principle of the Communist Party. Their boss was dealing with this conflict, and they asked me to be more patient. I said I did not know that internal affairs, but my patience has a time limit.

On the third day, I formally informed the police who were guarding me that according to the Law of Criminal Procedures, a subpoena for interrogation could not last longer than 3 consecutive days. Unless they got an arrest warrant, I would leave by my own this evening. They said, "You just wait. We will go immediately to the prosecutor's office to get an arrest warrant."

At the evening, I asked if they got the arrest warrant. They said they have not yet. The prosecutor's office will not issue an arrest warrant. But they already had a residential surveillance certificate issued by the Public Safety Bureau, which did not need approval from the prosecutor office.

I said, "Residence under surveillance means that I would stay in my own house, and that there would be no restrictions for my personal freedom. I just cannot leave your surveillance. What are you going to do? It is illegal detention."

They laughed at me and said I should not try to use their legal loopholes. Their laws would be interpreted by them, not by my own understanding. Although there was none, they could create a procedure, create a precedent for me in regarding this residence under surveillance. And because it did not get into the legal procedure, they did not even need to notify my family members. I would not have any rights provided by the law.

They started an illegal detention against me that lasted for 18 months, without newspapers and TV, without any contacts with the outside world.

From what I learned later, at least by the summer of 1995, the promise of releasing political prisoners and no arrest of my people
had indeed been kept for about 1 year. I think it was because the trade sanction would not be lifted as smoothly, and that the American people still cared about human rights situation in China. Otherwise Jiang Zemin would not be able to get a compromise between the trade and the theory of dictatorship under the Communist Party.

From this procedure we can learn several features concerning negotiation with the Chinese Communist regime. One, they are only restrained by their interests, but are not bound by their promises. This is because fundamentally they do not recognize the common knowledge and reason, but only their great ideals. This is the same as all evil cults. Therefore, by insisting on staying in China, Mr. Chen Guangcheng made a wrong judgment due to a lack of common knowledge, and the U.S. Government did not let him learn such a common knowledge and thus brought to him the trouble that will come up.

Two, the Chinese Government is not a whole, but consists of various interest groups. The struggles within those factions lack rules, and national interests often become bargaining chips between their own negotiations. Promises made by one faction often become targets to be attacked by other factions. Noncompliance of agreement is a common happening in China. The U.S. Government, by believing in promises made by one particular faction without any assurance, has made the mistake of political judgment.

Three, taking a hostage first and then making negotiations is a traditional way of negotiation by the Chinese Communists. In their ideology, obtaining maximum benefit regardless of the means is a legitimate method against those who are deemed as not fit to their ideals. They would use any means to advance their interests, which is their official theory. By returning Mr. Chen Guangcheng to the hands of Chinese police, the U.S. administration has made yet another mistake of political judgment, and the world will pay an extra price for it.

I am sorry I used the extra time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wei follows:]
Congressional Testimony at the hearing of
Chen Guangcheng: His Case, Cause, Family, and Those Who are Helping Him

WEI, Jingsheng
Chair, Overseas Chinese Democracy Coalition
May 15, 2012
House Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights

In September 1993, I was released half a year ahead of schedule, with conditions restricting my personal freedoms. Such a release is called as a controlled release by China law. The supervision would not end until May 29, 1994, at the end of my 15-year sentence.

After being released from the prison, I had done the following work:

1) Helped to collect donations for individuals and organizations subject to political persecutions.
2) Purchased bank stock shares as a preparation for facilitating money transfers.
3) Planned to establish independent workers' unions for workers;
4) Planned to set up non-governmental organizations for artists to relieve them from exploitations of the government;
5) Assisted in offering 1 billion yuan's worth of stock in state-owned enterprises, and in proving with facts after making huge profits that the government had been manipulating the stock market to exploit mass investors.

On February 27, 1994, I met with US Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck privately in a restaurant. He asked me if I was willing to meet Warren Christopher, the US Secretary of State, to discuss human rights issues in China when Christopher would visit China in the following month. Shattuck mentioned about debates in the US Congress on decoupling human rights from trade issues, and potential risks of this meeting.

I thought if my opinions would have some effect in preventing the US from moving backward on human rights issues in China, I'd be willing to take such risks and meet the Secretary of State. Shattuck mentioned that my opinions had been passed on to President Clinton by Senator Kerry and already had a positive effect on the setup of Radio Free Asia. He hoped my views could help
the Secretary of State Christopher. We discussed and agreed on some details of the meeting with Secretary of State Christopher during his visit.

In a morning about two or three days later, a police who had been in charge of my surveillance came to my home, and said their superior would like to talk to me. Later, they brought me to a resort hotel near the Ming Tombs Reservoir, saying that I should relax here and wait for their superior. I asked whom I would meet and what to discuss, but got no answers.

On the next day, an official came, who claimed to be a senior official representing the highest authority. By observing the way he casually dismissed the police officers to have a private talk with me, I could tell that his status should be true. Based on the fact that he had to leave for half a hour after our talk then came back with responses, I would assume there were officials with higher rankings nearby who monitored our conversations and made decisions.

At the very beginning of the talk, this official said that it was a negotiation, because they needed my help. He said that he knew I had an appointment to meet the US Secretary of State, and also knew my opinions. "We could not change your opinions and will not want to do so. But we wish you would not meet the US Secretary of State."

I said that's not possible. Since I had agreed to meet, I couldn't break the promise.

He said that they could offer things in exchange. "We know what you want to do," he said. "If only you will not meet the US Secretary of State, we will agree to what you want."

I said I did not believe things could be so simple. Why was it so important for me to meet or not with The US Secretary of State? Why would you agree to let me do the things that you had been prohibiting us from doing just because of this?

He said, "You might not know how important the Sino-US trade is to us. Taking away those false figures, 70% of our real profit was from the foreign trade, and 70% of that came from the Sino-US trade because the US market's profit was higher. You might think we the Communist government would collapse without the American profit, which is true. I would want to do the same if I were you. But the Chinese people would suffer and many Chinese companies would go bankrupt. Since you love the people very much, we had guessed that you would agree to our offers."

I said: "Not really. I believe that the collapse of the Communist government and the establishment of a democracy system would be more beneficial to the Chinese people. It would be the lesser of two evils. And the interests of the Chinese people would be better compensated in the future."

He said that "You have described the issue too simply. You were once in our internal circle, and should know politics. Do you really think it would lead to trade sanctions?"
I said why not?

He said that the interests of both China and the US had dictated that trade sanctions, if any, would be short lived. The businesses of countries would not allow them to continue to the degree that I would need, i.e., resulting in the collapse of the Communist government.

I said in that case, you had no need to negotiate with me. You also know that I'd rather stay in prison than give up the principles.

He said, "We knew that. We understand you better than your comrades. But we also hoped that you could think about it carefully. Someone would have to hold the responsibility for even short-term sanctions, and the highest authority would be forced to step down because of it. That's why someone wanted to make a fuss on you, and why we had to protect you from getting into trouble."

He also said that "You might laugh at me for such a low-level lie, but I have to tell you that it was the truth. You are now standing at the focal point of the Sino-US relationship. If you were in trouble, whether real or false, the highest authority would bathe in shit. Only after he steps down, could others take his position. Therefore, some people are eager to get you in trouble to achieve their own objectives. When they reach their goals, they would cooperate with the US government to resolve the trade issues. But you would lose your chance to reach your own goals. You should know better about the stakes in this deal."

I said "I still do not believe in your promises. I would need an assurance. The stepping down of Jiang Zemin might not be a bad thing, and the person replacing him might want to compromise with us as well."

He said "We would agree with the several things that you want to do. Would you think about it again? I have something to do, and will be back in half an hour."

He gave me a piece of paper with the offers listed on it. The first one was to release political prisoners, including a list of 35 names. The next three were also what I really wanted to do, i.e., establishing workers' unions, establishing artists' own businesses, and purchasing bank shares and helping with the receiving and transfer of humanitarian donations.

After more than an hour, the official - who's last name was Guo - came back and asked how I thought about it.

I said "What you agreed to means nothing: the establishment of a workers' union requires approval from the Ministry of Civil Affairs; an artists' company requires approval from the Ministry of Culture; and purchase of bank shares requires approval from the People's Bank. Those were not under the authority of the Judiciary branch. Therefore, all of what you have said sounds like lies."
He said: “I repeat again that I am representing the highest authority to negotiate with you. All these items are within our scope of power. When the time comes, I will help you to complete all the procedures.”

I still said that I could hardly believe what he just said.

He said “How about this: we will add one more offer that you would be able to see. In addition to releasing the political prisoners, provided that you don’t betray your promise, we will not arrest any of your people.” by which he meant all pro-democracy activists.

I said “But you just detained a number of pro-democracy activists recently who were not on your list. What about those people?”

He said those who got detained recently had not get in the legal procedures yet. “If you give me one day, I will get them all released. We could decide tomorrow whether you would accept our offers. Tomorrow you could make phone calls to verify if we had the ability to keep our promise.”

The next day I called several friends and verified that those detained were released without either conditions or explanations. But I was still inclined not to accept their offers.

This official seemed very anxious and almost lost his posture, and told me that “You must know that we are already bearing a great deal of risk. We have also explained it within the Communist Party. If you still disagreed, then we would have to arrest you, which would just be playing into the hands of the other side, and all the offers to you would be blown away.”

Then he added: “The Americans are not as reliable as you might think, and could ultimately reach a compromise with the new leader. Then political prisoners would be rounded up as usual, and you would not be able to complete anything that you wanted to do. You should think about what is at stake. Let me give you a worse case scenario. Even if we recanted in the future, you at least got the benefit of having the political prisoners released. The other side might not even give you that benefit.”

At this time, I felt that the credibility of his words was pretty high, so I accepted their offers and made a detailed plan for me to leave Beijing to seek medical treatments, and I politely declined to meet Secretary of State Christopher. I felt that I definitely would not get these offers through the meeting with the Secretary of State. And if the US were to insist on scrutinizing the human rights issues in China, it would not have canceled the annual review of the Most Favored Nation status.

The offers included the proviso that immediately after Secretary of State Christopher had left Beijing, I could go back to the city and continue to do what I wished to accomplish, and they would fulfill their remaining offers.
On March 29, 1994, while I was in Jinan, they notified me two things: first, I had completed my prison sentence and would no longer be under their control, and all my civil rights were restored. Second, although Secretary of State Christopher had already left China, the situation had changed somewhat, and they hoped I could spend some time relaxing in the South and return to Beijing after one or two months. I rejected the second request and insisted on going back to Beijing according to the original conditions. I thought by doing so, I could verify if they had the ability to fulfill their promise.

Two days later, I entered the highway from Tianjin to Beijing. But the entire highway was closed with just the car carrying my friend and me and four police cars surrounding us. When we arrived at the exit of Tong County, we were blocked by more than one hundred police officers, including agents from several different departments of the Public Safety Bureau, and officials from the State Security Bureau and the Procuratorate.

A police officer, whom I was familiar with and who has been in charge of my surveillance for many days, told me that the current situation was too complicated and they did not know what was going on either. He asked me not to make a still scene, and they were doing backroom negotiations. Later, a policeman whom I did not recognize came and showed me a subpoena. They took me and the businessman, who was going to transfer stock shares of one billion yuan’s worth, to a counterfeit antique making company in Tong County.

I slept until the afternoon, and then heard the policeman I knew arguing with someone. I heard a strange voice saying: we got orders that no one was allowed to meet him alone. The policeman I knew said: we got instructions from our superior that we must meet with him alone. You had no authorization to listen to our conversation, and your superior had agreed to this.

Then they made phone calls. After that, the police officer I knew took me to a private room in an outside restaurant, and told me that after the departure of Secretary of State Christopher, the debate within the Communist Party got more heated. The other side did not believe the Americans, and also did not believe that I did not influence the Americans. They insisted on handling me by the dictatorship theory of the Communist Party, and did not think that they should abide by the terms of the agreement, otherwise it would be a loss of the spirit and principle of the Communist Party. Their superior was dealing with this conflict and they asked me to be more patient. I said I did not know their internal affairs, but my patience had a time limit.

On the third day, I formally informed the police who were guarding me that according to the Law of Criminal Procedures, a subpoena for interrogation could not last longer than three consecutive days. Unless they could get an arrest warrant, I would leave by my own this evening. They said “You just wait, we will go immediately to the Procuratorate to get the arrest warrant.”

At evening, I asked if they got the arrest warrant. They said not yet. The Procuratorate would not issue an arrest warrant. But they had got a residential surveillance certificate issued by the Public
Safety Bureau, which did not need approval from the Procuratorate. I said that "Residence under Surveillance meant that I would stay in my own home and there would be no restriction of my personal freedom, I just could not leave your surveillance. What you are doing now is an illegal detention."

They laughed at me and said that I should not try to use their legal loopholes. Their laws would be interpreted by them, not by my own understanding. Although there was none, they could create a precedent for me in regarding this "Residence under Surveillance". And because it did not get into the legal procedure, they did not even need to notify my family members. I would not have any rights provided by the law. Thus they started an illegal detention against me that lasted 18 months, without newspapers and TV, without any contact with the outside world.

From what I learned later, at least by the summer of 1995, the promises of releasing political prisoners and no arrest of my people had been kept for about a year. I think it was because the trade sanctions could not be lifted smoothly, and the American people still cared about human rights situations in China. Otherwise, Jiang Zemin would not be able to get a compromise between the trade and the theory of dictatorship under the Chinese Communist Party.

From this process, we can learn several features concerning negotiations with the Chinese Communist regime.

1) They are only restrained by their interests, not bound by their promises. That is because, fundamentally, they do not recognize common knowledge and reason, but only their great ideals. This is the same as all evil cults. Therefore, by insisting on staying in China, Mr. Chen Guangcheng made a wrong judgment due to a lack of common knowledge. And the US government did not let him learn such a common knowledge, and thus brought to himself the trouble that will come up.

2) The Chinese government is not a whole, but consists of various interest groups. The struggles within those factions lack rules, and national interests often become bargaining chips between their negotiations. Promises made by one faction often become targets to be attacked by other factions. Non-compliance of agreements is a common happening in China. The US government, by believing in promises made by one particular faction without any assurance, has made a mistake of political judgments.

3) Taking a hostage first and then making negotiations is a traditional way of negotiation by the Chinese Communists. In their ideology, obtaining maximum benefit regardless of means is a legitimate method against those who are deemed as not fit to their ideals. They would use any means to advance their interests, which is their official theory. By returning Mr. Chen Guangcheng to the hands of Chinese police, the US government has made yet another mistake of political judgment, and will pay an extra price for it.
Mr. SMITH. Thank you for that very, very comprehensive look. And I think part of what your testimony helps to do is to ask the question, the very pertinent question, “How highly do we value political prisoners, human rights, democracy?” and that the Chinese Government and the leadership weighs the resolve and the commitment of the U.S. side in its bilateral relationship? And if we are not committed, all in, if you will, on human rights, they take the measure of our resolve or the lack thereof and respond accordingly.

And I think you talked about, you know, the leadership and especially that it is not monolithic. There are people inside the government who might even want to do the right thing, but if we are now folding or not extending our very serious resolve to all players, Chen, his wife, his two children and the others, we, unwittingly perhaps, but we nevertheless give up what we might otherwise obtain.

So I would like to now ask Ms. Reggie Littlejohn if she would present her testimony.

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

Ms. LITTLEJOHN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Honorable members of the subcommittee, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for this opportunity to address the subcommittee here during this very sensitive time of negotiations on behalf of Chen Guangcheng, his family, and his supporters. I have been asked to testify concerning two of his key supporters. One is He Peirong, also known as Pearl, and the other one is Jiang Tianyong, one of his key leaders of his legal team.

Pearl, as many of you know, has played a key role in organizing the support for Chen Guangcheng for years. And last time I testified, which was on May 3rd, she had been detained for almost a week, and I voiced a concern that she might be tortured, that the Chinese Communist Party might be pressuring her to disclose the other members of her network. But we raised the issue of her case very strongly in that hearing. Congressman Smith raised it very strongly, and the very next day she was released.

So I have Skyped with her twice now, the day after she was released and then also on Saturday, and she has asked me to read a statement to the committee thanking everyone for the way that her case has been raised in visibility, which she believed is what has resulted in the fact that she was not tortured during that detention.

And as Congressman Smith just said, echoing what Wei Jingsheng has said, that this kind of accommodation of kowtowing to the Chinese Communist Party and trying to basically exercise quiet diplomacy is very ineffective, but it is rather when you have transparent, powerful advocacy that people are protected.

So Pearl said,

“I would like to thank everyone who fights for our freedom, activists, Congressman and Congresswomen, as well as the U.S. Government, the State Department, Secretary Clinton and the United States. I hope I will visit this great country one day, but now I just want to stay with my friends in China. What I want is for all my friends to be safe.”
Now, that is very courageous on her part, because even though Pearl was not tortured during this most recent detention, she has suffered significant violence. Specifically, on January 10, 2011, she drove to Chen’s village where plain-clothes guards smashed her car outside of his home. Then on May 30, 2011, she went to Yinan County for Chen’s case, and plain-clothes guards kidnapped, robbed, and beat her. And, in fact, they struck her face 30 to 40 times. She was subjected to a painful position for 4 hours while she was being driven in a car, and then she was dumped on the road.

Then on June 6, 2011, she went to Yinan County again for Chen’s case, and the local officials again kidnapped her and robbed her. Plain-clothes guards drove her for over 4 hours and kicked her out of the car into a field, where they tried to stuff her socks into her mouth. Then they tied her up and touched her breasts.

Despite the violence that she has suffered, Pearl wants to remain in China for the protection of her friends, and I just think that her courage and commitment is to be commended and admired.

Jiang Tianyong has taken up several sensitive legal matters and has long been a member of Chen’s legal team, and for this he has suffered violence on a number of occasions. Most recently, according to media reports, Jiang Tianyong, simply tried to visit Chen Guangcheng and was beaten so severely that it appears that he has lost hearing in one of his ears. Then after he was severely beaten, and it became clear that Chen’s nephew, Chen Kegui, was being charged with intentional homicide, which carries a death sentence, Jiang Tianyong stood up for Chen Kegui and said that the charge of homicide with intent has been trumped up, and that it really should be wounding with intent.

So this is, again, he had just been beaten, and he is immediately standing up publicly for Chen’s nephew. I just can’t even fathom the kind of courage that these people have.

So he has now reached an agreement with officials that he will not try to visit Chen again; that he will not meet with foreign media; and as you know, he has left Beijing and is now in Hebei.

This is not the first time that Chen Guangcheng has suffered violence. On November 10, 2009, Jiang Tianyong and I both sat on a panel at a hearing before the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, as it was called by Congressman Smith, and we both testified on the one-child policy. Jiang Tianyong testified concerning the cases that he was assisting Chen on, the ones for which Chen was detained. And Women’s Rights Without Frontiers released the Chen Guangcheng report on Chen’s birthday on November 10, 2011, and then at this hearing in English on December 6, 2011.

But Jiang Tianyong was telling about these cases where a woman had been forcibly aborted up to the 9th month of pregnancy, where people were sleeping in the fields to avoid family planning police, where forced sterilizations were taking place. It was just suicide. There was all sorts of horrible things that he was reporting on. His testimony and my testimony were similar in the sense of the gravity of the cases that we were exposing, but that is where the similarity ended. I was able to go home safely to my family.

At the end of that hearing, Congressman Smith kindly invited the various people who were testifying up to his office. And at the
end of that meeting, Jiang Tianyong said, “Look, I am really worried. If anything happens to me, will you please watch out for my wife and my child?” And that statement just struck my heart, of the courage that these people have, people who live in China, to come to the United States and testify. They are risking not only their own safety but that of their families, to expose the truth of what is going on there, not simply so that we will know what is happening but so that we will take effective action to try to help free the people of China from these horrific human rights abuses.

Several days later, when Jiang Tianyong did return to China, his fears materialized. He was beaten, dragged away by four cadres right in front of his daughter, who was screaming, and his wife was beaten. And so then I got a call from Congressman Smith and immediately flew back to Washington to speak at a press conference for him to be released.

Despite this violence, Jiang Tianyong has persisted in his bravery. In February 2011, Chen Guangcheng and his wife, Yuan Weijing, released through the China Aid Association a video showing the horrific conditions of their house arrest, and for that they were severely beaten and left without medical attention. And then soon after that, a group of Chen’s lawyers got together to try to talk about how they might help him. And you have to understand also that the Arab Spring and the Jasmine Revolution are a backdrop to this conversation, as well. But many of those lawyers were detained, including Jiang Tianyong and Teng Biao.

Jiang Tianyong was detained for 60 days, and he endured beatings, shouts, shackles, blindfolds, and no sunlight during those 60 days. And, according to a media report, he was banged in the head so severely that it caused significant memory loss. And apparently what they did was they would use water bottles to beat him in the head. And he had so much memory loss he could not even remember his Skype password or how the furniture was arranged in his bedroom when he got out.

I believe that the systematic persecution, detention, and torture of Chinese human rights lawyers appears to be a deliberate decimation of the Chinese human rights bar. And as an attorney myself, I am very, very concerned about China and the rule of law. How can China say that they care about the rule of law or that there even is a rule of law when people who are trying to uphold the rule of law are themselves detained and tortured and have their licenses revoked?

Although Pearl and Jiang Tianyong appear safe for the moment, who knows whether the Chinese Communist Party will retaliate against them if and when Chen is able to come to the United States. Women’s Rights Without Frontiers calls upon the United States Congress and the Department of State to raise the issue of the safety of Chen’s supporters, who are heroes in their own right.

Thank you.

Mr. Smith. Ms. Littlejohn, thank you very much for that testimony.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Littlejohn follows:]
Honorable members of the Sub-Committee, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify here today, during a sensitive time in engaging the People’s Republic of China (PRC) to free Chen Guangcheng and his family.

I have been asked to brief the Sub-Committee on the treatment of two prominent activists who are supporters of Chen: He Peirong, also known as Pearl, who was instrumental in Chen’s escape, and Jiang Tianyong, a key member of Chen’s legal team.

He Peirong (Pearl)

He Peirong, also known as Pearl, has played a key role in organizing support for Chen within China. When I testified about her on May 3, she had been detained for almost a week and I was very concerned that she might be tortured to learn the names of others in her network. The very day after the hearing, at which her case was strongly raised by Rep. Chris Smith, Pearl was released and was interviewed by the BBC.

Some say that quiet, back door diplomacy is the way to deal with the detention of Chinese human rights defenders. But we have found that high profile visibility is far more effective. Pearl herself seems to have endorsed this approach in her BBC interview. According to this interview, she was confined to a hotel room. The police were “polite,” but persistent in their
effort to obtain information, which Pearl did not divulge. About her own safety, she said, “I was very concerned, but once the thing went public, I was no longer worried.”

I stayed with Pearl the day after her release, and again on this past Saturday. Pearl is grateful that she was treated so well in detention in Nanjing. This has not always been the case. I understand from a reliable source that she has encountered violence three times in Shandong:

- On Jan 10th, 2011, She drove to Chen’s village, where plain clothes guards smashed her car outside of Chen’s house.
- On May 30 2011, she went to Yinan county for Chen’s case and plain clothes guards kidnapped, robbed and beat her. They struck her face 30 to 40 times. She was subjected to a painful position for four hours while being driven in a car, and she was dumped on a road by thugs.
- On June 6 2011, she went to Yinan county for Chen’s case again. In the local official’s office she was kidnapped and robbed again. The plain clothes guards drove her for over four hours and dumped her in the middle of wheat field in Jiangsu. Two men kicked her into a field. They tried to stuff her socks into her mouth, tied her up in the field and touched her breast twice. A video at a highway toll station showed that the police in Yinan County were involved.

Despite the violence she has suffered, Pearl wants to remain in China for the protection of her friends. Pearl has asked me to make this statement for her at this hearing:

“I would like to thank everyone who fights for our freedom: activists, Congressmen and Congresswomen, as well as the U.S. Government, the State Department, Secretary Clinton, and the United States. I hope I will visit this great country one day, but now I just want to stay with my friends in China. What I want is for all my friends to be safe.”

Jiang Tianyong

Jiang Tianyong has taken up several sensitive legal matters and has long been a member of Chen’s legal team. For this, he has suffered violence on several occasions.

Most recently, according to media reports, Jiang Tianyong tried to visit Chen Guangcheng in the hospital, and for this he was beaten so severely in the head that he may have lost hearing in one ear. He and his family have also been monitored. Even after this beating, he bravely spoke out for Chen Kegui, Chen Guangcheng’s nephew, who has been accused of intent to murder – even though he was acting in self defense and no one died. Jiang stated, “the charge of ‘homicide with intent’ had been trumped up and that it should actually be ‘wounding with intent’.”

2 Lawyers for Chen Kegui Face Threats, Taipei Times, 5/12/12
http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/world/archives/2012/05/12/2003326451
I understand that Jiang has reached an agreement with officials that he will not try to visit Chen again, he will not meet with foreign media, and he will leave Beijing. He has now received medical treatment and is no longer being monitored.

This is not the first time that Jiang has suffered violence for his legal bravery. On November 10, 2009, Jiang Tianyong and I were fellow presenters, sitting at the same table, testifying before Congress on China’s brutal One Child Policy. Though our testimony was similar, the difference between us was profound. As an American, I could go home to my family and enjoy safety and peace. When Jiang left the hearing, he said to his fellow presenters, “I’m worried.” If anything happens to me, please look after my wife and child.” I stood in awe of his courage – risking not only his own safety, but also the safety of those he loves most, to reveal the truth about the suffering of women and girls in China. 

A few days after returning to China, as Jiang was leaving his apartment to take his young daughter to school, his fears materialized. According to reports, four cadres grabbed him and dragged him off to detention. Then they beat his wife. All this happened right in front of their seven-year-old daughter, as she screamed helplessly.

Despite this violence, Jiang has persisted in his bravery. In February 2011, Chen Guangcheng and his wife, Yuan Weijing, secretly recorded a video describing the harsh conditions of their house arrest. Following the video’s release, they were beaten senseless and were denied medical treatment. Chen’s legal team tried to gather to discuss ways to assist him, but several were placed under house arrest, preventing them from attending this meeting. Lawyers who did attend the meeting, including Jiang Tianyong and Teng Biao, were later beaten and disappeared for two months or more. According to a media report, Jiang endured beatings, shouts, shackles, blindfolds, no sunlight. He said he was banged on the head so severely — typically with plastic bottles filled with water — that his memory began to slip. He couldn’t remember his Skype password or how the furniture was arranged in his bedroom back home.

Although Pearl and Jiang appear safe for the moment, who knows whether the Chinese Communist Party will retaliate against them once Chen comes to the United States. Women’s Rights Without Frontiers calls upon the United States Congress and the Department of State to raise the issue of the safety of Chen’s supporters, who are heroes in their own right.

---

1 In the Chen Case, Collateral Damage. International Herald Tribune Rendezvous. New York Times Blog. 5/7/12.
http://rendezvous.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/07/in-the-chen-case-collateral-damage/
Mr. SMITH. I would like to now ask Chai Ling if she would present her testimony to the subcommittee.

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

Ms. CHAI. Thank you, Chairman Smith. Thank you for your persistent 30-plus years of fight to defend the victims in China and uphold the human rights conditions in China. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to share today about the cause that Chen Guangcheng has fought to uphold.

By now, you have heard much about Chen Guangcheng’s miraculous escape. As the media firestorm surrounded him last week, and you probably read details about his journey to Beijing, you learned about the twists and turns in the diplomatic saga that followed. Incredibly, U.S. officials fretted about the timing of Chen’s arrival at the Embassy. After he left, they downplayed his concerns for his family’s safety. Several days ago, an American official casually told The New York Times, “The days of blowing up the relationship with China over a single guy are over.” Maybe they prefer the days of, you know, Mr. Wei Jingsheng.

But anyway, seeking genuine protections for Chen and his family should hardly have blown up the relationship. But more to the point, it grieves me to hear Chen dismissively referred to as a single guy. He is one man, it is true, but he is a symbol, a hero, in the eyes of women, children, and the poor in China. Why? Because he defended them when it was costly and when no one else in China would. He has lived out the words of the prophet Isaiah, who said, learn to do right, seek justice, defend the oppressed, take up the cause of the fatherless, and plead the case of the widow.

Often missing from last week’s news stories was the cause that defined Chen Guangcheng’s work and led to his imprisonment. It explains why he is a hero to so many in China today. I want to highlight this cause. It is the one that we share with Chen through our work at All Girls Allowed. The one-child policy formally sanctions violence against women. Chen knew this. Chinese authorities jailed him in 2006 after he filed a class action lawsuit on behalf of the women who had undergone forced abortions and sterilizations because of the policy.

I would like to share some of the stories and images that will show you what is happening in China right now even as I speak. I should warn you that these stories are disturbing. They will give you a personal glimpse at the gendercide, or systematic elimination of girls, taking place in China, where men outnumber women by 40 million. They show the brutality of forced abortions. They show why Chinese women face a climate so oppressive that a woman takes her life every 3 seconds in China.

The first story illustrates how severely the one-child policy can affect a single family. This is Deng Lourong, the picture you can see on the PowerPoint presentation on the screen, who lives in Anhui Province. She is the second daughter of two parents who violated the one-child policy because they desperately wanted a boy after Lourong’s birth. So in her family they had three girls.

But after Lourong’s birth, officials demolished the family home and confiscated their belongings. Two years later, Lourong’s mother...
again gave birth to a girl and disappeared 3 days later. Her father fled from the family planning officials and left the three girls in the care of their grandmother. Undeterred, officials detained the girl's grandmother in 2002 and left them without a guardian. During the night, a man broke into their room and raped the 12-year-old Lourong. Her sisters managed to obtain the release of their grandmother after this, but the elderly woman died a month after she returned home. The rapist, meanwhile, was sentenced to a mere 5 days in administrative detention. Within 3 years, Lourong was sold as a child bride to a man twice her age. Her sisters were also sold by traffickers and have not been found as of today. When a German reporter and Chinese volunteers found Lourong's father last November, he told them that Lourong's husband had turned her into a prostitute to earn income for him. He beats her frequently and sold her body to bachelors in that area. Deng was in a poor mental state. She would roam the mountains for over a week sometimes before returning to the house. Remember, all of this was set into motion by the enforcement of the one-child policy upon this family and the lack of value assigned to girls and women in China. A second story is Ma Jihong. Last October, officials dragged Ma into a van. That is Ma Jihong's picture. When she was heavily pregnant with her third child, she died during a forced abortion procedure. That is the picture. It is kind of gruesome. And her family did not know hours afterwards. Her husband and two surviving daughters have no real resources to take. The third picture is—I believe that is her picture. Yeah, that is her family. And they make under $2 a day as a cotton farmer. A final story came out less than 2 months ago on Weibo, a Chinese version of Twitter. It is just an image, but a chilling one. A 9-month-old baby is dropped into a bucket of water following a full-term forced abortion. According to the source, the infant's parents did not have a permit for their second child. You can see in that image in the water bucket, that is the baby's body. So I wish I could tell you these stories were rare, but they are not. They are a mere glimpse into the dark environment that the one-child policy created for women. This is a darkness into which Chen Guangcheng tried to shine a light. I want to challenge you, honorable Members of Congress, to view your callings as servants of the people in light of these words from Isaiah. “If you do away with the yoke of oppression, with the pointing finger and malicious talk, and if you spend yourselves on behalf of the hungry and satisfy the needs of the oppressed, then your light will rise in the darkness and your night will become like the noonday.” This challenge also applies to President Obama and Secretary Clinton. It is my fervent prayer that your light will rise in the present darkness that consumes many at this very moment in China. Please continue to press for Chen Guangcheng’s freedom and the assurance of safety for his family and his supporters. Their freedom is not secure yet, and you are in a position to act. I urge you to compel China to honor its word and its own laws. If you are concerned that such a cause is not realistic or pragmatic enough—I know you are present here because you are not
thinking that way, but we know there are leaders thinking that way who are not present here—I humbly ask you to do what is right. It was not economically pragmatic for William Wilberforce to seek an end to the British slave trade. It was not expedient for Martin Luther King to speak out against injustice and then land in a Birmingham jail. Ronald Reagan was not acting with calculated diplomacy when he said, “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.” I can think of many instances in history where men and women sacrificed pragmatism for the sake of higher principle. Somehow, they always end up on the right side of history. I hope America would stand on the right side of history in confronting this largest injustice in our time, and God will honor your courage.

Finally, though we are sitting here in the halls of power, we can take heart in the fact that our power is weakness when compared to the strength of our God. We can face injustice without fear because we serve a God who is just, hears our prayers, and can overcome any power. Jesus said, “You may ask me for anything in my name, and I will do it.”

We have long prayed for these injustices in China to cease. We know that God is faithful. The only reason why these injustices still happen is that he chose to raise a man and woman among us to end them, and he is patient with us. God can and will end this injustice of forced abortion and the one-child policy. We know that. It may be our generation of privilege to carry out his task.

Here is a final story that gives hope. It shows that God does answer prayers. Last year, Nie Lina was arrested for being 4 months pregnant with a permit. Our team met and prayed for her release, knowing that a forced abortion was imminent. But family planning officials, you know, decided not to go through the procedure at the last minute, and she was released. Nie Lina gave birth to a baby girl 5 months later. So that is her baby girl.

But on the night of December 5, 2011, we learned Nie Lina was arrested again, this time for petitioning the government about her property, which officials had confiscated. She, her 70-year-old mother, and her 3-month-old baby was in the illegal “black jail.” The guards were hardly feeding her, and her baby was crying from hunger because she could not produce enough milk. The guards told her that she would be there for another 6 months at the least. You all probably remember that there was a hearing the next day on December 6 on behalf of Liu Xiaobo. You allowed us to all pray for Nie Lina and Chen Guangcheng and Liu Xiaobo. Many of you all joined us in this prayer. Thank you, Brother Bob Fu, Sister Reggie Littlejohn, for all of your prayers.

This is what happened 20 hours later at midnight on the next day in China, because they were watching us at 4 o'clock a.m. their time. Nie Lina was blindfolded, together with her mom was blindfolded, and was drove off and dropped off outside of Beijing 2 hours away and released alongside together with her baby and her mother. It was a dramatic answer to our prayers. And Chen Guangcheng—despite the fact that Chen Guangcheng has not obtained the full freedom, but his ability to escape from a massive prison was no less a miracle either.

Your words are so important. Media attention is also so important, and prayers are very important as we speak publicly. As Ms.
Reggie Littlejohn also reminded us, the Chinese Government watches us, the world watches us, and acts in response to our conviction. So, with your permission, I would like to end this testimony with a prayer.

Heavenly Father, you, Lord, hear the desires of the afflicted and you encourage them and you listen to their cry. You hear the cries of people in China calling for your justice and mercy. You hear our cries as we, too, plead for your justice to roll down like a mighty river. Today, we lift Chen Guangcheng and his family and his supporters up into your care, for we know you will finish what you have started and you will surely one day bring them to complete freedom.

We lift up to you these leaders here, these servants of the people. I pray to you for raising them up and bringing them here today. I ask you to move their hearts and inspire them to assist the families and friends of our brave friends in China.

Lord, please protect us all from being indifferent when we are suffering. You say that if a single sparrow falls, you notice. How much more do you notice the plight of your daughters, Ma Jihong, Deng Lourong, and the millions of other women and the babies oppressed by the one-child policy?

Please inspire the men and women here today to use their authority in a way that serves the least of these in the world you have created. And unto Him, who is able to do immeasurably more than all we can ask or imagine, according to His power there is at work within us, to Him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus throughout all generations forever and ever. Amen.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Chai, thank you very much for your extraordinary testimony and the importance of prayer, because they certainly need it, and we all do. So thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Chai follows:]
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Mr. CHAIRMAN and Ranking Members of Congress, thank you for giving me the chance to share today about the cause that Chen Guangcheng has fought to uphold.

By now, you have heard much about Chen Guangcheng’s miraculous escape. As the media firestorm surrounded him last week, you probably read details about his journey to Beijing, you learned about twists and turns in the diplomatic saga that followed.

Incredibly, U.S. officials fretted about the timing of Chen’s arrival at the embassy. After he left, they downplayed his concerns for his family’s safety. Several days ago, an American official casually told the New York Times: “The days of blowing up the relationship [with China] over a single guy are over.”

Seeking genuine protections for Chen and his family should hardly have “blown up the relationship.” But more to the point, it grieves me to hear Chen dismissively referred to as “a single guy.” He is one man, it is true. But he is a symbol—a hero—in the eyes of women, children, and the poor in China.

Why? Because he defended them when it was costly, and when no one else would. He has lived out the words of the prophet Isaiah, who said:

Learn to do right; seek justice.
Defend the oppressed.
Take up the cause of the fatherless;
plead the case of the widow.²

Often missing from last week’s news stories was the cause that defined Chen Guangcheng’s work, and led to his imprisonment. It explains why he is a hero to so many in China. Today, I want to highlight this cause. It is one that I share with Chen through my work at All Girls Allowed.

The One-Child Policy formally sanctions violence against women. Chen knew this. Chinese authorities jailed him in 2006 after he filed a class action lawsuit on behalf of women who had undergone forced abortions and sterilizations because of the Policy.

---

² Isaiah 1:17, Today’s New International Version.
I would like to share some stories and images that will show you what is happening in China right now, even as I speak. I should warn you; these stories are disturbing. They will give you a personal glimpse at the “gendercide,” or systematic elimination of girls, taking place in China, where men outnumber women by 40 million. They show the brutality of forced abortion. They show why Chinese women face a climate so oppressive that a woman takes her life every three seconds.

The first story illustrates how severely the One-Child Policy can affect a single family. This is Deng Lourong, who lives in Anhui Province. She is a second daughter of two parents who violated the One-Child Policy because they desperately wanted a boy. After Lourong’s birth, officials demolished the family home and confiscated their belongings. Two years later, Lourong’s mother again gave birth to a girl—and disappeared three days later. Her father fled from Family Planning officials and left the three girls in the care of their grandmother.

Undeterred, officials detained the girls’ grandmother in 2002 and left them without a guardian. During the night, a man broke into their room and raped 12-year-old Lourong. Her sisters managed to obtain the release of their grandmother after this, but the elderly woman died a month after returning home. The rapist, meanwhile, was sentenced to a mere 3 days in administrative detention.

Within three years, Lourong was sold as a child bride to a man more than twice her age. Her sisters were also sold by traffickers and have not been found. When a German reporter and Chinese volunteers found Lourong’s father last November, he told them that Lourong’s husband had turned her into a prostitute to earn income for him. He sold her body to bachelors in their area. She was in a poor mental state and would roam the mountains for over a week sometimes before returning to the house.

Remember, all of this was set into motion by the enforcement of the One-Child Policy upon this family—and the lack of value assigned to girls and women.

A second story is Ma Jihong’s. Last October, officials dragged Ma into a van when she was heavily pregnant with her third child. She died during the forced abortion procedure, and her family did not know for hours afterward. Her husband and daughters have no real recourse to take.

A final story came out less than two months ago on Weibo, a Chinese version of Twitter. It is just an image, but a chilling one: A 9-month-old baby is dropped into a bucket of water following a forced abortion. According to the source, the infant’s parents did not have a permit for their second child.

I wish I could tell you that these stories were rare, but they are not. They are mere glimpses into the dark environment that the One-Child Policy creates for women. This is the darkness into which Chen Guangzhong tried to shine a light.

I want to challenge you, Honorable Members of Congress, to view your calling as servants of the people in light of these words from Isaiah:

If you do away with the yoke of oppression,
with the pointing finger and malicious talk,
and if you spend yourselves in behalf of the hungry
and satisfy the needs of the oppressed,
then your light will rise in the darkness,
and your night will become like the noonday.\(^1\)

It is my fervent prayer that your light will rise in the present darkness that consumes many, at this very moment, in China. Please continue to press for Chen Guangcheng’s freedom and the assurance of safety for his family and supporters. Their freedom is not secure yet, and you are in a position to act. I urge you to compel China to honor its word and its own laws.

If you are concerned that such a course is not realistic or pragmatic enough, I humbly ask you to do what is right. It was not economically pragmatic for William Wilberforce to seek an end to the British slave trade. It was not expedient for Martin Luther King to speak out against injustice and then land in a Birmingham jail. I can think of many instances in history where men and women sacrificed pragmatism for the sake of higher principle. Somehow they invariably ended up on the right side of history.

I hope that you will stand on the right side of history in confronting the injustices of our time.

Finally, though we are sitting here in the halls of power, we can take heart in the fact that our power is weakness when compared to the strength of our God. We can face injustice without fear because we serve a God who is just, hears our prayers, and can overcome any power. Jesus said: "You may ask me for anything in my name, and I will do it."\(^2\)

He can, and will, end the injustice of gendercide and the One-Child Policy. May it be our generation’s privilege to carry out the task.

Allow me to close in prayer for you:

Heavenly Father,

You, Lord, hear the desire of the afflicted; you encourage them, and you listen to their cry.\(^3\)

You hear the cries of people in China, calling for your justice and mercy. You hear our cries as we, too, plead for your justice to roll down like a mighty river.

I lift up to you these leaders here—these servants of the people. I praise you for raising them up and bringing them here today. I ask that you move their hearts and inspire them to assist the family and friends of our brave brother Chen Guangcheng.

Lord, please protect us all from being indifferent when we see suffering. You say that if a single sparrow falls, you notice. How much more do you notice the plight of your daughters Ma Jiakong and Deng Lina, and the millions of other women oppressed by the One-Child Policy?

Please inspire the men and women here today to use their authority in a way that serves the 'least of these' in the world you created.

Now to him who is able to do immeasurably more than all we ask or imagine, according to his power that is at work within us, to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus throughout all generations.

---

1 Isaiah 58:9-10, TNIV.

2 John 14:14, TNIV.

3 Psalm 10:17, TNIV.
Thank you.

---

* Ephesians 3:20-21, TNIV
Mr. Smith. I would like to ask Ms. Mei if you would proceed.

STATEMENT OF MS. MEI SHUNPING, VICTIM OF FORCED ABORTION

[The following testimony was delivered through an interpreter.]

Ms. Mei. Mr. Chairman and honorable Members of Congress, I am very grateful for the opportunity to testify today before Congress to expose America and the world to how the one-child policy in China destroys lives and the rights of women.

My name is Mei Shunping. I had an assumed name, a name called Liuping. I was born in 1958 in Tianjin, China, and arrived in the United States in 1999. Before coming to America, I worked in a state-owned textile factory in Tianjin. The majority of the workers in the factory were young women, so the family planning policy was implemented strictly. I am only one of these many women whose lives were destroyed by the policy—the women that Chen Guangcheng tried to help so courageously.

I got married in 1981 and gave birth to a son 2 years later. According to the policy at that time, women who gave birth were required to have an IUD implanted or one of the spouses was required to be sterilized. At that time, I had swelling in my right kidney for undiagnosed reasons so doctors refused to implant an IUD in me. Without the IUD, I became the prime target for surveillance by the factory’s family planning commission.

Without the IUD, I became pregnant. From 1983 to 1990, because of the one-child policy, I had to have five forced abortions on the following dates: September 28, 1984; December 17, 1985; March 20, 1986; May 5, 1989; and December 14, 1990. All the operations were recorded in my medical history. I suffered greatly because of the inhumane one-child policy.

There were many severe methods of surveillance and punishment to prevent unplanned pregnancies and above-quota births. My factory’s family planning commission used three levels of control: At the factory level, in the factory clinic, and on the factory floor. If one worker violated the rules, all women would be punished. Workers monitored one another. Women of reproductive age accounted for 60 percent of my factory floor. Colleagues were suspicious and hostile to each other because of the one-child policy. Two of my pregnancies were reported by my colleagues to the family planning commission. When discovered, pregnant women would be dragged and undergo forced abortions. There was no other choice. We had no dignity as potential child bearers.

By order of the factory’s family planning commission, every month during their menstrual period women had to undress in front of the birth planning doctors for examination. If anyone skipped the examination, she would be forced to take a pregnancy test at the hospital. We were allowed to collect a salary only after it was confirmed that we were not pregnant.

The day of my fifth and last abortion—December 14, 1990—was the saddest of my life because I was unable to prove that I wasn’t pregnant within a 10- to 15-day period. The birth planning doctor in the factory clinic found out about my pregnancy that day. Officials from the factory family planning commission drove to City Police Hospital and forced me to have an abortion in the birth plan-
ning department. It was my first operation in that hospital. All my previous abortions happened in the Central City Hospital.

After the abortion, the doctors, without my knowledge, implanted a metal IUD in my uterus. When I learned of the procedure, I protested that I had a kidney disease and could not keep the IUD, but they completely ignored me. The doctors just gave the bill to my husband and told him to pay.

While my husband argued with the doctors, I was recovering in the hospital bed. When I left the operating room, still weak, I could not find my husband. I was told that he had been arrested. I collapsed, crying, from the physical toll of the two operations and the emotional shock. A kind nurse tried to comfort me, but she was pushed away by a man who also threatened to have me arrested by the police. I felt alone, sick, and weak.

Afterwards, I learned that my husband had been sentenced to criminal detention without a trial for violating and obstructing the one-child policy, disturbing the normal operations of a hospital, and disturbing social peace. My husband was released 15 days later.

I was in great pain from the metallic IUD and the weakness of the abortion and almost did not want to live. The arrest of my husband deprived me of care of my family. My young son did not know what was happening and kept crying for his father. I did not know what to do and could only hold my son and cry with him. Even now when I think of all of this, my heart shudders and the pain throbs.

Those painful 15 days of separation became the catalyst of my eventual failed marriage. My body suffered great damage from all the forced abortions. I gradually grew afraid of a family life with my husband. I tried to find excuses to refuse any intimate demands from my husband. I grew to hate him after the IUD was inserted because I blamed my suffering on his unwillingness to be surgically sterilized.

After the fifth abortion and the IUD insertion, my factory also gave me a serious administrative warning and fined me 6-months’ wages. Afterwards, I had to go to the factory clinic every month for exams to make certain that I had not privately taken out the IUD or become pregnant. I carried this IUD in my body for over a decade before I came to America.

My husband’s detention accelerated the demise of our marriage. He was suspended from his job and censored and then lost his job in 1991. Our family immediately sunk into financial difficulty. We argued frequently. I was laid off at the end of 1995.

I was still considered of reproductive age. The family planning commission of my neighborhood commission took up the job of monitoring me. In early 1997, I spent 40 days taking care of my terminally ill mother and missed a monthly pregnancy check. Agents from the family planning commission waited at my home to drag me to the exam. When they pushed me to the ground, I fell and hurt my neck vertebrae. My spirit completely collapsed after this. I attempted suicide but was stopped by family from jumping out of the building.

With the help of old friends, in 1999 I escaped the China that humiliated and destroyed me and came to the free soil of America. My husband came to the U.S. a year later. We were unable to mend our past grievances and divorced in 2001.
I became extremely depressed after the divorce. But at the suggestion of my friends, I started attending church, where I felt the warmth of Christ's family. And then Lord Jesus led me to give up the bitterness in my heart bit by bit. I reunited with my husband in 2009, and we joined together again after I was baptized last year—I think 2 years ago.

Now we live in the great family of Christ in the free land of America. I feel happiness but know that back in China there are millions of women who are suffering like I did. Every day, thousands of young lives are being destroyed. I beg everyone to save them and wish everyone to join me in prayer for them.

Let the love of our Heavenly Father, the grace of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit fill their hearts and release them from the hellish suffering. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you so much, Ms. Mei. Thank you for your courage in bringing every woman's story in China to the attention of this subcommittee.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Mei follows:]
Testimony of Mei Shunping  
*Victim of Forced Abortion in China*

May 15, 2012

Mr. Chairman and honorable Members of Congress, I am very grateful for the opportunity to testify today before Congress to expose to America and the world how the One-Child Policy in China destroys lives and the rights of women.

My name is Mei Shunping. I was born in 1958 in Tianjin, China, and arrived in the United States in 1999. Before coming to America, I worked in a state-owned textile factory in Tianjin. The majority of the workers in the factory were young women, so the Family Planning Policy was implemented strictly. I am only one of these many women whose lives were destroyed by the policy—the women that Chen Guangcheng tried to help so courageously.

I got married in 1981, and gave birth to a son two years later. According to the policy at that time, women who gave birth were required to have intrauterine devices (IUD’s) implanted, or one of the spouses was required to be sterilized. At that time I had swelling in my right kidney for undiagnosed reasons, so doctors refused to implant the IUD in me. Without the IUD, I became the prime target for surveillance by the factory’s Family Planning Commission. From 1983 to 1990, because of the One-Child Policy, I had to have five abortions on the following dates: September 28, 1984; December 17, 1985; March 20, 1986; May 5, 1989; and December 14, 1990. All the operations were recorded in my medical history. I suffered greatly because of the inhumane One-Child Policy.

There were many severe methods of surveillance and punishment to prevent unplanned pregnancies and above-quota births. My factory’s Family Planning Commission used three levels of control: at the factory level, in the factory clinic and on the factory floor. If one worker violated the rules, all would be punished. Workers monitored each other. Women of reproductive age accounted for 60% of my factory floor. Colleagues were suspicious and hostile to each other because of the One-Child Policy. Two of my pregnancies were reported by my colleagues to the Family Planning Commission.

When discovered, pregnant women would be dragged to undergo forced abortions—there was no other choice. We had no dignity as potential child-bearers. By order of the factory’s Family Planning Commission, every month during their menstrual period, women had to undress in front of the birth planning doctor for examination. If anyone skipped the examination, she would be forced to take a pregnancy test at the hospital. We were allowed to collect a salary only after it was confirmed that we were not pregnant.
The day of my fifth and last abortion, December 14, 1990, was the saddest of my life. Because I was unable to prove that I wasn’t pregnant within the 10-15 day time period, the birth planning doctor in the factory clinic found out about my pregnancy. That day, officials from the factory Family Planning Commission drove to the City Police Hospital and forced me to have an abortion in the Birth Planning Department. It was my first operation in that hospital. All my previous abortions happened in the Central City Hospital. After the abortion, the doctors—without my knowledge—implanted a metal IUD in my uterus. When I learned of the procedure, I protested that I had a kidney disease and could not keep the IUD, but they completely ignored me. The doctors just gave the bill to my husband and told him to pay. While my husband argued with the doctors, I was recovering in a hospital bed. When I left the operating room, still weak, I couldn’t find my husband. I was told that he had been arrested.

I collapsed crying from the physical toll of the two operations and the emotional shock. A kind nurse tried to comfort me, but she was pushed away by a man who also threatened to have me arrested by the police. I felt alone, sick and weak. Afterwards, I learned that my husband had been sentenced to criminal detention without a trial for violating and obstructing the One-Child Policy, disturbing the normal operations of a hospital, and disturbing social peace. My husband was released 15 days later. I was in great pain from the metallic IUD and the weakness of the abortion and almost didn’t want to live. The arrest of my husband deprived me of the care of my family. My young son didn’t know what was happening and kept crying for his father. I didn’t know what to do and could only hold my son and cry with him. Even now, when I think of all this, my heart shudders and the pain throbs.

Those painful 15 days of separation became the catalyst of my eventually failed marriage. My body suffered great damage from all the forced abortions. I gradually grew afraid of family life with my husband. I tried to find excuses to refuse any intimacy demands from my husband. I grew to hate him after the IUD was inserted because I blamed my suffering on his unwillingness to be surgically sterilized. After the fifth abortion and the IUD insertion, my factory also gave me a "serious administrative warning" and fined me six months’ wages. Afterwards, I had to go to the factory clinic every month for exams to make certain that I had not privately taken out the IUD or become pregnant. I carried this IUD in my body for over a decade before I came to America.

My husband’s detention accelerated the demise of our marriage. He was suspended from his job and censored, then lost his job in 1991. Our family immediately sank into financial difficulties. We argued frequently. I was laid off at the end of 1995. As I was still considered of reproductive age, the Family Planning Commission of my neighborhood committee took up the job of monitoring me. In early 1997, I spent 40 days taking care of my terminally ill mother and missed the monthly pregnancy check. Agents from the Family Planning Commission waited at my home to drag me to the exam. When they pushed me to the ground, I fell and hurt my neck vertebrae. My spirit completely collapsed after this. I attempted suicide but was stopped by my family from jumping. With the help of old friends, in 1999, I escaped the country that humiliated and destroyed me, and came to the free soil of America.

My husband came to the U.S. a year later. We were unable to mend our past grievances, and divorced in 2001. I became extremely depressed after the divorce, but at the suggestion of my friends I started
attending church, where I felt the warmth of Christ’s family. The Lord Jesus led me to give up the bitterness in my heart, bit by bit.

I reunited with my husband in 2009, and we joined together again after I was baptized last year. Now we live in the great family of Christ, in the free land of America. I feel happiness but know that back in China, there are millions of women who are suffering like I did. Every day, thousands of young lives are being destroyed.

I beg everyone to save them and wish everyone to join me in a prayer for them. Let the love of our Heavenly Father, the grace of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit fill their hearts and release them from the hellish suffering. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, Amen.
Mr. Smith. And by extension—and I am very grateful that C-SPAN is here—that men and women in their homes will hear what every woman goes through in China and has been going through since 1979 when the one-child-per-couple policy was first instituted.

I think it is very important to point out that, in China, brothers and sisters are illegal, and women are treated as criminals if they have a child without explicit government permission. I know Chai Ling herself has suffered the gross exploitation of being forcibly aborted. And so many women, by the millions, by the tens of millions, have suffered this degrading and this horrific abuse of women. And, again, that is what Chen Guangcheng's mission was, and that is what his cause was. And for that, he has been so brutally mistreated. And so I do, again, want to thank you for that.

I would like to now turn to my distinguished colleague, Ann Marie Buerkle, who is a registered nurse. She is also a lawyer, a former assistant attorney general for the State of New York. And she also chairs the Subcommittee on Health for the Veterans Affairs Committee.

But I understand Bob Fu is going to join us in a moment. We do have Chen Guangcheng on the phone. And then we will go to Ann Marie Buerkle. Again, he joined us on May 3 and provided very useful insights, to say the least. And so we will yield to him momentarily so he can speak from his hospital bed again in China.

Ann Marie, if you wanted to say a few words before we begin.

Ms. Buerkle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank all of you for being here today, for your pursuit of justice and human rights in China. Future generations—you talked about some of the past, with Martin Luther King and Ronald Reagan—future generations are going to look at you for your devotion to creating a free China. So thank you all very much for your courage, for your willingness to be here and testify before us. We so appreciate all that you do, and we just want to work with you to shed a light on this terrible injustice that exists in China.

Mr. Smith. We will go to questions momentarily, but you know, Ms. Mei mentioned how her husband was detained. Again, I think for the purposes of understanding the depravity of the one-child-per-couple policy, I invited, with the help of Harry Wu, a woman who ran a program in Fujian Province. She went under the pseudonym of Mrs. Gao.

When she came here, she said, you don’t understand, America and the West and really the rest of the world, what a priority it is to the government to impose this one-child-per-couple policy and to use and employ forced abortion and forced sterilization. She self-described before this committee in this room just several years ago at a hearing that I chaired, she said, “By day I was a monster, by night I was a wife and mother of one child.” And she said that they used detention against family members, the way Ms. Mei talked a moment ago, to hold family members, to put them in prison, as they looked to find a woman who was trying to escape the family planning cadres. That is the reality that goes on every day in
China that is so grossly under-appreciated by so many of us in policymaking positions.

And, again, when you talk about that kind of abuse of women that is unprecedented in world history, where an entire couple of generations now of Chinese women have been made to suffer that cruelty, with barely a peep of dissent from the Obama administration, from many of our friends in the European Union and elsewhere, and then when you get groups like the UNFPA, the U.N. Population Fund, who say repeatedly that the program in China is totally voluntary, when it is totally involuntary, it is a whitewash that has no comparison either.

So thank you for sharing that detail that is so extremely important, that it is not just, if that wasn’t enough, the mother herself, the woman herself who is so hunted and degraded by the Chinese dictatorship, they also look at the rest of the family in a way that parallels what is going on with Chen Guangcheng. It is not just him and his family, it is the rest of his family, the extended family.

And, without objection, I will put in the record a list of nine members of his family, and a list of six friends, who we are deeply concerned about—and that is not the extent of it; some other friends might be in trouble, as well—that we know the government has either arrested, detained, beaten.

[The information referred to follows:]
Status of Chen Guangcheng’s Relatives

- **Yuan Weijing** [Yuan Wei-jing]—Chen Guangcheng’s wife. Currently with Chen Guangcheng at Chaoyang Hospital in Beijing. Yuan reportedly faces restrictions on freedom of movement and has had to “pass security checks before being allowed out to buy food for the family” (RFA, 8 May 12).
- **Chen Kerui** [Chen Ker-wei] and **Chen Kerui** [Chen Ker-ui]—Chen Guangcheng’s seven-year-old son and six-year-old daughter. Currently with Chen Guangcheng and Yuan Weijing at Chaoyang Hospital in Beijing (RFA, 8 May 12).
- **Wang Jixiang** [Wang Jia-xiang]—Chen Guangcheng’s 78-year-old mother—Chen reported to Voice of America on May 15 that she remained in their village in Shandong province, but was not permitted to leave their home without guard escort. (VOA Chinese, 15 May 12)
- **Chen Guangfu** [Chen Guang-fu]—Chen Guangcheng’s older brother. Authorities detained Chen Guangfu on April 16 following a clash with police in his home (CHRD, 1 May 12). Authorities released him on May 7 (VOA, translated by China Aid Association, 7 May 12). Chen Guangfu reportedly remains under close police surveillance and is forbidden to leave his village or make any phone calls (RFA, 8 May 12).
- **Chen Kegui** [Chen Kie-gui]—Chen Guangcheng’s nephew, Chen Guangfu’s son. Chen Kegui was criminally detained on April 30 and formally arrested on May 9, on charges of “intentional homicide” (Criminal Procedure Law, Art. 61) for attacking/revenge against officials who invaded his home in 2011. Chen Guangcheng reported to the Wall Street Journal on May 15 that local officials have yet to permit Chen Kegui to see his lawyers. Chen Kegui is being held at the Yan’an County Detention Center in Shandong province. (WSJ, 15 May 12)
- **Ren Zongxia** [Ren Zhong-xia]—Cheng Guangcheng’s sister-in-law, Chen Guangfu’s wife, and Chen Kegui’s mother. Ren was reportedly detained and then released pending trial on charges of “harboring a criminal,” Chen Kegui (RFA, 8 May 12).
- **Liu Fang** (Lee-oh Fang) — Chen Guangcheng's niece-in-law, Chen Kegui's wife — Liu Fang’s lawyer, Si Wujing, reported to the Wall Street Journal that Liu is in a safe location, but that local officials from her county are demanding to see her. Si plans to bring another lawyer to meet with the officials, but says, “I refuse to bring Chen [Kegui]’s wife over to see them.” (WSJ, 15 May 12)

- **Chen Guangjun** (Chen Guang-tsan) — Chen Guangcheng’s cousin. Officials reportedly took Chen Guangjun and his son into custody on April 28, 2012. Information on his current whereabouts appears to be unavailable (Chinese Human Rights Defenders, 1 May 12).

- **Chen Hua** (Chen Hoo) — Chen Guangcheng’s cousin. Chen Guangjun’s son. Officials reportedly took Chen Hua and his father into custody on April 28, 2012. Information on his current whereabouts appears to be unavailable (CHRCD, 1 May 12).
Status of Chen Guangcheng's Supporters

- **He Peirong** [Hai Pay-rong]—Nanjing-based human rights advocate. Played a key role in transporting Chen Guangcheng from Shandong province to Beijing following his escape. State security personnel reportedly took He from her home in Nanjing "to assist with investigations" (Reuters, 7 May 12). She was interrogated at a hotel for seven days and has now returned home, where she is "allowed to move about freely" (NYT, 8 May 12). On May 10, He posted on her Twitter account that she is not accepting interviews with the media (Twitter, 10 May 12).

- **Guo Yushan** [Gwo Yu-shan]—Beijing-based scholar and human rights advocate. Authorities initially detained him for 50 hours following Chen's escape and released him on April 30 (LA Times, 1 May 12). A French journalist posted on Twitter on May 1 that he had spoken with Guo, who stated he was not allowed to grant interviews to foreign journalists (Twitter, 1 May 12). Guo reportedly has remained in contact with Chen following his release (WP, 3 May 12).

- **Jiang Tianyong** [Jee-yang Tiao-an Yohng]—Beijing-based lawyer, human rights advocate, and supporter of Chen Guangcheng. Authorities reportedly ordered Jiang to leave Beijing on May 8 and instructed him to notify the police prior to his return. Jiang had previously reported that security personnel beat him after he attempted to visit Chen at the hospital, damaging his hearing. Authorities permitted him to seek medical treatment on May 7 for the injuries he sustained during the beating. The doctor that examined Jiang, however, reportedly refused to record the injury. Chinese Human Rights Defenders reported in their May 13 update that officials had warned Jiang not to return to Beijing until after the leadership transition occurs, expected late this year. (NYT, 8 May 12; CHRD, 13 May 12)

- **Hu Jia** [Hu Jee-yah]—Beijing-based human rights advocate. Authorities detained Hu Jia on April 27 and held him for 24 hours for questioning regarding Chen Guangcheng's escape (LA Times, 1 May 12). Hu Jia has not posted on his Twitter account since April 30. Hu Jia stated on that date that he would be cutting himself off from all technology from May 2–22. (Twitter, 30 April 12).

- **Zeng Jianyin** [Zang Giin-yen]—Beijing-based human rights advocate, wife of Hu Jia. Zeng stated in a May 2 post on her Twitter account that state security guards were following her when taking her daughter to school and that she was being placed under house arrest (Twitter, 2 May 12). Zeng has subsequently posted that security personnel continue to prevent her from leaving her home, and that authorities continue to deny her requests to pursue a master's degree at a Hong Kong university (Twitter, 4 May 12; 2 May 12, 8 May 12; Daily Beast 8 May 12). Zeng Jianyin's most recent Twitter post
indicated that she would be cutting herself off from all technology for ten days (Twitter, 8 May 12).

- **Liu Yaping (Lee-chi Yan Ping)** Associate of Beijing-based artist and human rights advocate Ai Weiwei. Authorities reportedly detained Liu when she attempted to bring a birthday cake to Chen Guangcheng's son at Chaoyang hospital on May 4. Liu reported on her Twitter account that authorities released her after 9 hours (Twitter, 4 May 12).
Mr. SMITH. And then including friends like He Peirong, which Reggie Littlejohn spoke so passionately about, and Jiang, who has suffered so much, including the loss of his hearing. And that was just a few weeks ago, just a few weeks ago.

We do now have Chen Guangcheng on the line, and I would like to—Ann Marie, would you join us?

Mr. Chen, you are on. Welcome back again.

Mr. CHEN. [Mr. Chen’s testimony and answers to member questions were delivered via teleconference and through an interpreter.]

I just want to talk about what had happened to my other family members after I escaped from my own home.

On April 26, around midnight, a group of Chinese Government—the local government hired thugs, led by the local township leader Mr. Zhang Jian, raided my elder brother Chen Guangfu’s home at midnight. Around midnight, this group of thugs by the Chinese, the local authorities, just broke into my elder brother’s home and started beating him violently. And my elder brother was taken away by these thugs without any reasoning.

And then they came back and started beating up my nephew, Chen Kegui. They used sticks and violently beat him up. And then for 3 hours he is bleeding on his head and his face, was not stopped. And so this was so violent that Chen Kegui, according to my knowledge, had to defend himself. This charge against my nephew, Chen Kegui, for so-called intentional homicide, is a totally trumped-up charge. And for himself at his own home to be accused of committing this crime of intentional homicide against the intruders is totally absurd and irrational, unreasonable.

So this guy, this township leader, Mr. Zhang Jian, had led from 40 to sometimes 80 officials, guards and thugs, raided my home in the past year and beat me and my family seriously. And so this is a pattern already. It is not the first time he had—against my family.

After my nephew was beaten up and he actually was waiting to surrender himself, the police came back again and violently beat up my sister-in-law. So my brother, of course, was taken away without any reasoning by the authorities. And then the attorney, Si Wei汁tang, who has already got the commission paper signed by my nephew’s wife, went to Yinan County, and even though he had the signature by Chen Kegui’s wife, the detention center and the public security officers in Yinan county refused for him to meet with Chen Kegui by calling that document as a fake document, although they know it is true. And also they just want to have my nephew’s wife to come and to surrender herself.

And what has been done by these Yinan public security officers is a total violation against the Chinese Constitution and the Chinese criminal law. And, of course, those charges against my nephew for self-defense is in contradiction of Chinese law, as well. The same tactic of the Yinan County that was used against me in 2006 when they tried every way to prevent my attorneys from defending me at my trial, is now being used again against my nephew, Chen Kegui. And I do think those charges are trumped-up charges. And those people in Yinan County have already been on the wrong side, on opposite side of the rule of law in China.
And this is so far what I have learned about my extended family members in Yinan County. So right now I am not able to communicate with them anymore because all their communication tools were confiscated already.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chen, very briefly, I have invited to the dais the people who are testifying today on your behalf: First, Bob Fu; the great Wei Jingsheng; Reggie Littlejohn; Chai Ling; and Ms. Mei. And we are also joined by Congresswoman Bass and Congresswoman Buerkle from New York.

Briefly, the focus of the hearing has been about your safety and your wife and children, with a particular emphasis on your cause, fighting as you did so bravely to defend women from forced abortion, and to rally congressional support and hopefully executive branch support and hopefully worldwide support for your extended family as well as your friends like He Peirong.

If I could ask you very briefly, has the United States Government, our Embassy, been able to in any way make contact with your extended family and your friends who are at grave risk and are suffering beatings?

Mr. CHEN. For that question, I am not very clear on the specifics, but I do know, however, the U.S. Embassy has been communicating with me every day.

Mr. SMITH. If I could, your wife and your children, how well are they doing under this enormous burden?

Mr. CHEN. They are doing fine, especially my two children. They kept telling my wife and I that this is such a wonderful place, we can play outside. You can tell, from what they told my wife and I, how terrible they have been back to our hometown. They were only allowed to have a 1-hour outing every day.

Because my wife and of course children had been under such a long time of difficulties with malnutrition and with low blood pressure when I saw them under these circumstances, I felt very saddened.

TRANSLATOR. One suggestion from the panel of the witnesses is to suggest to Mr. Chen to hire his own lawyers, not to accept the government-appointed lawyers for his family members.

Ms. LITTLEJOHN. This is Reggie.

I am wondering whether there is any lawyer that has been accepted to be the lawyer for Chen Kegui. I mean, we have heard that there are 13 who offered some—at least 1 has been beaten and at least 1 has had his license revoked. And I am wondering specifically about Teng Biao. I understand that he has offered, and I am wondering how he is doing. We haven’t had much news of him.

Mr. CHEN. I do know that many lawyers are waiting and wanting to go, and I feel they will be able to go. They are planning to go.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chen, Ann Marie Buerkle just asked, do you know that all of America is listening to your voice right now? There are large numbers of people from the media here, and C–SPAN is broadcasting this throughout America. What would you like to tell the American public?

Mr. CHEN. I want to extend my gratitude and thankfulness to all those who cared and loved my family and myself and our situation,
especially to American people who have shown that you care about the equality and justice. These are universal values. And I am very, very grateful to all of you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chen, Chai Ling would like to say something.

TRANSLATOR. I think the question from Ms. Chai was, we are very proud of you as a hero of America and Chinese, and the many millions of Chinese women are very encouraged by your courageous act.

And what Mr. Chen just answered, he said, “I am not a hero, I just do what my conscience asks me to do. I cannot be silent and cannot be quiet when facing these evils against women and children. And so this is what I should do.”

And Ms. Chai Ling said, “Many, many Christians all over the world have been fasting and praying for you.”

And Mr. Chen said, “What I have done is just out of my conscience and conviction. I cannot be silent when we see and face these kind of evils.”

And Ms. Chai said, “You are the first man to stand up for this 30 years of Chinese one-child policy, on behalf of the 400 million Chinese babies who are forcibly aborted and killed. So we praise you and we thank you and appreciate you.”

Ms. CHAI. We will stand with you until the very end, and you will be set free.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chen, thank you so very much. We will continue—this is the third hearing. The first one was last November when we thought you had disappeared. This is the third hearing. And I can assure you, as chairman of both the Congressional-Executive Commission on China and as chairman of the Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, we will never cease in our advocacy for you, your family, your extended family, your friends, and the very important human rights cause that you espouse, defending women from the crime of forced abortion and forced sterilization. So thank you so very much.

Mr. CHEN. Thank you.

I want to let you know I have been praying for you. And your courage has inspired all of our women, and we have been praying for you every day and one day that this evil one-child policy will be abolished soon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chen, thank you.

Mr. CHEN. I have a final word that I want to emphasize. What had happened to my family and to my extended family members are just a total violation of the Chinese own law, including Chinese relevant law about the family planning system. And so what they have done is just totally in violation of the Chinese own law. So they should be held accountable by the Chinese own laws.

So that is what I want to emphasize. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you so much, Mr. Chen.

I think we are close to concluding this hearing. And I want to thank our very distinguished witnesses and ask them if perhaps they might have some final comments they would like to make.

I do—and I say this with all due respect to the President of the United States. I am concerned when the United States Government, when President Obama was asked about Chen Guangcheng
specifically and human rights, he said, “No comment on Chen,” and that, human rights, “it comes up.” My hope is that we are in the process of a game-changing reappraisal of our deprioritization of human rights in China, and perhaps elsewhere in the world but absolutely in China, where, wittingly or unwittingly, we have enabled this terrible crime of forced abortion and forced sterilization to occur while we have looked askance and acted as if it wasn’t happening.

Chen Guangcheng reminds us in a very powerful way, in the suffering that he has endured, that he stays in solidarity with the women of China, as do I, as does Ann Marie Buerkle, as do so many Members of Congress, as does this panel.

So if you would like to make any concluding statements, because I think we have heard it all with Chen’s own voice just a moment ago. So would anybody want to make any final statement before we conclude the hearing?

Ms. CHAI. Yeah, I would just like to say, Chairman Smith, you are such a hero and inspiration to all of us too. There is no one else in this country that has fought and stood together with the victims like Mei Shunping and Chen Guangcheng for the past 30 years. Thank you for your persistence. May God bless you and all the work you are doing.

And we do believe this year China’s one-child policy and genocide will come to an end. So we encourage the American leaders, including President Obama, Secretary Clinton, and other congressional leaders to join us, join the people, and to bring about an end to this horrific, the largest crimes against humanity on earth in this year.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. I want to thank our distinguished witnesses.

We will continue pursuing, obviously, Chen’s case until it is resolved successfully. And the focus that he has brought on the hideous one-child-per-couple policy will increase in terms of focus, scrutiny. And, God willing, it will end.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:05 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]
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