AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 116–230

RULE BY FEAR: 30 YEARS AFTER TIANANMEN SQUARE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 5, 2019

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

Available via the World Wide Web:
http://www.govinfo.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
40–872 PDF WASHINGTON : 2020

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho, *Chairman*

MARCO RUBIO, Florida
RON JOHNSON, Wisconsin
CORY GARDNER, Colorado
MITT ROMNEY, Utah
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
RAND PAUL, Kentucky
TODD, YOUNG, Indiana
TED CRUZ, Texas

ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware
TOM UDALL, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, Connecticut
TIM KAINE, Virginia
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
JEFF MERKLEY, Oregon
CORY A. BOOKER, New Jersey

CHRISTOPHER M. SOCHA, *Staff Director*
JESSICA LEWIS, *Democratic Staff Director*
JOHN DUTTON, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Risch, Hon. James E., U.S. Senator From Idaho	1
Menendez, Hon. Robert, U.S. Senator From New Jersey	2
Qiang, Xiao, Founder and Editor-in-Chief, China Digital Times, Berkeley, CA	4
Prepared Statement	7
Richardson, Ph.D., Sophie, China Director, Human Rights Watch, New York, NY	13
Prepared Statement	15
Walker, Christopher, Vice President for Studies and Analysis, National Endowment for Democracy, Washington, DC	18
Prepared Statement	20

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FOR THE RECORD

Responses of Mr. Xiao Qiang to Questions Submitted by Senator Robert Menendez	48
Responses of Mr. Christopher Walker to Questions Submitted by Senator Robert Menendez	51
Suggested Reading for the 30th Anniversary of the Tiananmen Crackdown Submitted by Senator Robert Menendez	48
Material Submitted for the Record by Senator Markey: Letter to Secretary Pompeo	53

RULE BY FEAR: 30 YEARS AFTER TIANANMEN SQUARE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2019

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:17 a.m. in room SD–419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. James E. Risch, chairman of the committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Risch [presiding], Gardner, Romney, Barrasso, Young, Cruz, Menendez, Cardin, Shaheen, Coons, Kaine, and Markey.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES E. RISCH, U.S. SENATOR FROM IDAHO

The CHAIRMAN. Our committee will come to order.

This morning we are going to, on the 30th anniversary, or the day after the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre, honor all those brave citizens of China who believed in a freer future for their China. Please join me in a brief moment of silence for them, including those who lost their lives.

[A moment of silence.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

In June 1989, the photo of a lone Chinese citizen standing down a column of People's Liberation Army tanks in Tiananmen Square was the snapshot seen around the world of the Chinese people's suffering.

The Chinese Government's modes of repression today are perhaps more difficult to capture in a single image but are, nevertheless, omnipresent, pernicious, and increasingly brazen. Every day is Tiananmen Square, but you do not see the pictures and you do not see the way that they are treated because it is done surreptitiously. Though perpetrated by the Chinese Communist Party for decades, human rights abuses have intensified under President Xi Jinping.

As we sit here today, there are between 1 million and 2 million Muslims locked up by Chinese authorities in internment camps, where they face political indoctrination, isolation, abuse, and death. For every person in the camps, dozens more wonder what has happened to their loved ones.

In general, freedom of religion is extinct in China. The Chinese Communist Party is bent on interfering in the selection of the next Dalai Lama. It has shut down churches and detained Christian pastors. And the Chinese Government is working on crafting so-

called correct interpretations of the Bible. All of this is part of explicit government policies aimed at stripping religious organizations of their independence and forcing them to align with the Chinese Communist Party.

Those who bear the greatest brunt of the Communist Party's disrespect for the rule of law are those who stand up to defend it. In the 4 years after the Chinese Communist Party's July 2015 crackdown, numerous human rights lawyers and other advocates have received multiyear sentences. Those not in prison face restrictions on their freedom of movement and other forms of harassment and intimidation.

Alongside these seismic abuses of power, we should not forget the injustices faced by all Chinese citizens each day. It is every censored Internet search or text message. It is the inability to buy a plane ticket because of a low, quote, social credit score, unquote. It is every facial scan.

These examples demonstrate technology's role as an accelerant in the Communist Party's repression today. The Chinese Government and Chinese companies are pioneering an intrusive mass surveillance system. This is a serious challenge that we will pay particular attention to in this hearing and in the committee's work on command.

Another challenge is the spread of Chinese human rights policies outside of the mainland. Chinese companies are exporting technology to regimes with poor human rights records and training authoritarian governments in information management and new media. China is seeking to redefine human rights norms at the United Nations, and it is exploiting the openness of advanced democracies to chill freedom of expression, particularly discussion about China itself.

This is rule by fear. This is a regime that believes it bestows rights to its people and can take them away just as quickly as it bestows them. A regime that has appointed itself the judge of Chinese culture and identity, even though the birth of China predates the Chinese Communist Party rule by more than 5,000 years. And a regime that inserts the state into the facets of life that best promote human flourishing: faith, family, and civic engagement.

The United States should make the defense of intrinsic values like fundamental freedoms and human rights a more central part of our approach to China. That we stand for freedom and human rights as well as prosperity is an advantage that we should not shy away from.

I want to thank everyone for their interest in this topic and how we can stand up for the Chinese people, as well as protect our own societies.

With that, I will turn it over to Ranking Member Senator Menendez for his opening remarks.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for calling this important hearing. And let me thank in advance our three extraordinary witnesses.

The 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre provides an important opportunity to discuss human rights in China and the importance of a values-driven American foreign policy. Indeed, the events of 30 years ago continue to resonate because of our collective commitment to building a more just and decent world.

Unfortunately, China has continued down the path it began that fateful day. With Xi Jinping declaring himself president for life, cracking down on civil society and human rights, introducing an Orwellian system of mass surveillance, advancing militarily in the South China Sea, and with predatory economic practices in Africa and the western hemisphere, China's trajectory is clear.

Under the guise of the so-called reeducation campaigns, the CCP has brutally forced nearly a million Uyghurs in Xinjiang into heavily surveilled, forced labor camps, a model Xi may intend to expand throughout the country.

Tibetans, facing wide-scale repression and harsh controls on religious, educational, cultural, and linguistic freedom, were in many respects the test subjects for the sort of ethnic surveillance we see in Xinjiang.

CCP authorities likewise repress Christians and Falun Gong members who face forced labor and torture for their beliefs.

Lawyers, journalists, students, labor activists, and human rights defenders are all at risk. And behind its Great Firewall, China has created a social credit system that rewards the, quote/unquote, good and punishes the, quote/unquote, bad.

Sadly, China's authoritarian model is appealing in all too many places around the globe where dictators and despots are happy to accept China's assistance in repressing their own people. From Cambodia to Venezuela to Angola, we find the Communist Party of China sharing the technologies and techniques they have refined to crush democracy in their own country.

Developing an effective policy that keeps our values at the center of our China policy is uniquely challenging and increasingly urgent. Just being more confrontational with China does not make us more competitive with China. Nor does simple confrontation help us resolve core human rights concerns.

As we reflect on those lost and the events of Tiananmen, we must also look inward. We must ensure our values, grounded in international human rights, guide our efforts to strategically and coherently respond to China's rising power and growing authoritarianism.

Unfortunately, the administration has simply failed to use our cherished time-tested principles and tools to universally and strategically support and promote human rights. And this is simply unacceptable. To confusion and dismay, last week Secretary Pompeo announced the establishment of a new commission to make sure that we have, quote, a solid definition of human rights. Well, the solid definition already exists. We do not need to redefine human rights. We need to defend and protect them.

We must leverage all of our tools in our toolkit. We must cultivate robust diplomatic and security partnerships. We must bolster our own presence. We must address our own economic challenges and pursue more adroit economic statecraft abroad. And core American values must be the centerpiece of our foreign policy.

We can start by investing in institutions that support democratic governance globally and stand with those who seek freedom.

We must remember what made America a leader of nations. It was not just the strength of our military or the dynamism of our economy. It was the enduring power of our ideals.

This committee must step up to advocate for more than a transactional approach to human rights because democracy will not defend itself.

In the memory of those who died for their belief in democracy in China 30 years ago, we must remind ourselves of the sheer power of an informed democratic society living in freedom. We must lead with the values that made us great to be a beacon for those around the world. In doing so, we offer a better model, one which the people of China demonstrated 30 years ago has universal appeal, not limited to a civilization or a particular nation. We must equally advocate, for example, for peaceful protesters in Sudan attacked by their government over the weekend.

And it is these values that inspire others to partner with us and to rally with us in facing down the greatest challenges of our time.

We owe those who stood in Tiananmen Square 30 years ago and the Chinese people nothing less today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

We now have three outstanding witnesses that are going to testify. We will hear from them, and then we will have a round of questions.

First, I want to introduce Mr. Xiao Qiang. He is a research scientist at the University of California-Berkeley School of Information and the founder and editor-in-chief of China Digital Times, a bilingual China news website launched in 2003. Though a theoretical physicist by training, he became a full-time human rights advocate after the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989. His current research focuses on state censorship, propaganda, and disinformation, as well as emerging big data and artificial intelligence-empowered state surveillance in China.

Mr. Xiao, we would love to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF XIAO QIANG, FOUNDER AND EDITOR–IN–CHIEF, CHINA DIGITAL TIMES, BERKELEY, CA

Mr. XIAO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and respectable members of the committee.

June 5th, this very day, exactly 30 years ago, I was studying a Ph.D. program in the University of Notre Dame. After seeing on TV the PLA soldiers open fire on peaceful demonstrators in my home city, Beijing, I abandoned my astrophysics program and caught the first flight home to China. For 2 months in a time of terror, I tried to find out what had happened, contacting people in hiding, dodging police, and handing over donations raised abroad to the victims and their families.

And I came back from that trip with one full realization. I realized that the name of the People's Republic of China itself is a lie. This government has never been the people's, nor is it a republic. China's National People's Congress is not elected by Chinese people. And China's People's Liberation Army only opened fire on peo-

ple on the street of Lhasa, Beijing, and these days in the towns and villages in Xinjiang. When challenged, this lie could only be maintained through brutal violence and through the fear created through such violence.

After 30 years, the Chinese communist regime has not only survived but also increased its power. Many Western politicians have been convinced that the wealth of the middle class and that the rise of the Internet will transform China from authoritarianism to democracy. But the reality is that Chinese rulers have taken advantage of their inclusion in the globalized trading process, significantly growing its economy under the CCP-controlled state capitalism and are refusing to allow any political liberalization.

And President Xi Jinping today, after he scrapped the presidential term limits written in the Chinese constitution—he became the most powerful dictator in the world.

And there is another threatening trend, threatening the hope of freedom of China. The digitalization of Chinese society is turning China into a surveillance state. Facial recognition, voice recognition, DNA collection, 200 million civilian cameras everywhere, social credit system, a new generation of digital technology, including artificial intelligence and big data analysis, is empowering the state to control, to monitor, to manipulate China's vast population in scalable fashion, at ease and with capacity to micro-target individuals. It can also help the state to identify and quash opposition in advance. China is exporting these technologies to other autocratic regimes around the world, normalizing and enabling a global authoritarianism.

Ladies and gentlemen, the United States must develop an effective policy to stop this Chinese surveillance tech industry, disrupting its supply chains, and through working with allies, prevent China from using its government-controlled companies to advance its digital totalitarian interests in other parts of the world.

We must have no illusions. It is the existence of the Chinese Communist Party dictatorship that abuses and threatens the liberty and the safety of Chinese people and people's lives anywhere in this increasingly interconnected globe. But this is not a clash of civilizations. It is a clash between two different political systems, between democracy and a one-party dictatorship. We just need to look to Taiwan where Chinese civilization works well with democratic governance. We can also look to Japan, South Korea, and India.

As a son of China and a proud citizen of the United States of America, I am asking each of you, when making the best possible China policy that defends the value and the interests of American people, please also make it align with and support Chinese people's struggle for human rights and freedom because we share a common humanity.

Thirty years after Tiananmen, the Chinese Communist Party continues to rule China, rule Chinese people through fear. But those who rule by fear also live in fear. Last week, I was visiting Berlin and had some time to take a walk in the streets. Where the Berlin Wall once stood now there is a dark line on the ground through the city, some parts are hiking trails. But I also saw something else: names of victims of the Nazis engraved in shining brass

plaques, 70,000 of them spread throughout Berlin city. I started to envision that one day in Beijing, the names of those who died during the Tiananmen massacre will be engraved into the city's roads, building walls, and parks and on Tiananmen Square, the gate of heavenly peace. I asked myself, where is Hitler's Nazi Germany now? Where is the former Soviet Union? Where is Suharto's Indonesia or Pinochet's Chile? They are all gone because the ultimate spirit of human dignity is more enduring than tanks and machine guns or even they are empowered by artificial intelligence and spaceships. Freedom will prevail in West or East, in Berlin or in Beijing.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, please allow me to ask you close your eyes for 1 minute. Just close your eyes. Can you see millions of Chinese faces on Tiananmen Square? Millions, peaceful, fearless, young, full of longing for freedom. Can you see the goddess of democracy standing tall in Tiananmen? Can you see the brave young man, his white shirt with two plastic shopping bags in his hands standing still in front of a column of moving tanks?

Chinese people want, deserve, and demand human rights and freedom just like American people, just like people anywhere in the world. The only reason these voices cannot be fully heard is because they are being suppressed by the Chinese Government. Yes, it is the most powerful authoritarian state in the world. The regime is not just domestically oppressive, but it is becoming externally aggressive like an empire.

I would like to end my testimony with a quote from Mahatma Gandhi, a great man from another great civilization.

"When I despair, I remember that all through history the way of truth and love has always won. There have been tyrants and murderers, and for a time, they can seem invincible, but in the end, they always fall. Think of it always."

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Xiao follows:]

Prepared Statement of Xiao Qiang

Honorable Chairman Risch and respectable members of the Committee,

It is a real honor to speak in front of each of you.

My name is XIAO Qiang. I am the Founder and Editor-in-Chief of China Digital Times, an independent bilingual news website about China. I am also a research scientist at the School of Information of University of California at Berkeley, and the director of Berkeley Counter-Power Lab, an interdisciplinary faculty-student research group focusing on digital rights and Internet freedom.

Thirty years ago, the world watched as millions of Chinese citizens took to the streets in Beijing and around the country, standing up for freedom. The Chinese Communist Party's paramount leader Deng Xiaoping responded by sending in infantry troops, who opened fire on peaceful protesters and drove tanks into the crowds, crushing many on Chang'an Ave (Avenue of Eternal Peace) in the nation's capital, my home city, Beijing. Hundreds, maybe thousands of Chinese citizens died in this massacre.

June 5th, this very day, exactly thirty years ago, after seeing those scenes on TV in the United States where I was studying for a Ph.D., I abandoned my astrophysics program and caught the first flight home to China. For two months, in a time of terror, I tried to find out what had happened, contacting people in hiding, dodging police, and handing over donations raised abroad to the victims and their families.

I came back from this trip with one full realization and one simple belief. I realized that the name of the People's Republic of China itself is a lie. This government has never been the "people's," nor it is a "republic." China's National

People's Congress is not elected by the Chinese people, and China's People's Liberation Army opens fire on people on the streets of Lhasa, Beijing and now, in the towns and villages of Xinjiang. When challenged, this lie can only be maintained through brutal violence and the fear created through such violence.

The simple belief I gained is that the tanks and machine guns can massacre human bodies, but cannot ultimately kill Chinese people's desire for freedom.

That is why I left my science path and became a full-time human rights activist, devoting my life for the past thirty years to the campaign to establish universal human rights and democracy in China.

Mr. Chairman, respectable members of the Committee,

After 30 years, the Chinese Communist regime has not only survived but also increased its power. The choice to suppress the 1989 protests, and any hint of protest since, has allowed the CCP to so far avoid the fate of the Soviet Union. Many Western experts and politicians have been convinced that the wealth of the middle class will make China democratize. I admit, as an activist living in exile, I too, had strong hope that the rise of the internet would help to transform China from authoritarianism to a democracy. But the reality is that Chinese rulers have taken advantage of their inclusion in the globalized trading process, significantly growing its economy under the CCP controlled state capitalism, but refusing to allow any political liberalization. The Chinese government also build and maintains the world's most sophisticated internet censorship apparatus, known informally as the Great Firewall, which includes both computational algorithms and human censors tasked with monitoring, filtering and blocking any online contents considered "subversive" to the one-party dictatorship.

Since President Xi Jinping came to power in 2012, his government has massively increased control over the entire society, including in cyberspace. Criticism has disappeared; journalists, lawyers, bloggers, and university professors have been censored, threatened, and detained. Nobel Peace Prize laureate Liu Xiaobo, who helped advise the students of 1989 and continued to fight for a free China in the years since, died in prison in 2017 after authorities failed to give him proper and

timely medical treatment. Amid all this, one year ago, President Xi Jinping scrapped the presidential term limits written into the Chinese constitution and became the most powerful dictator in the world.

Mr. Chairman, respectable members of the Committee, the Tiananmen Massacre and the increasing repression since have shown us: Chinese people want, deserve and demand human rights. But their voices have never been fully heard because they have been suppressed by their government.

Tiananmen remains a taboo both in the media and in China's vast cyberspace. One example happens on Weibo, the main Chinese equivalent of Twitter. This Chinese social media platform has an estimated over 600 million users but it is heavily censored by the government. My China Digital Times team has documented over 264 Tiananmen-related search phrases blocked on Weibo since 2011. Here are only few examples:

Blocked search keywords includes "64", "89", "8x8", "square of 8" (八平方), "98" "65-1" and "May 35" （五月三十五号）which translates to June 4.

It also includes "anniversary" (周年), "pay respect"（致敬）, "mourn" (悼念) , "candle" (蜡⊠) and "public square" (广⊠)".

It even includes general phrases or words when Chinese censors found out they have been used to discuss Tiananmen: "fire" (火), "move" (⊠), "that day" (那天), "special day" (特殊的日子), "that year" (那年) and "today" (今天) .

These are just a few examples, not an exhaustive list as my team only relies on trial-and-error and crowdsourcing to detect blocked search terms. But they show Chinese authorities' Orwellian attempt to erase Tiananmen from public discourse. For thirty years, the Chinese Communist Party has whitewashed the history of 1989 with their propaganda machine and censorship apparatus backed by violent repression. The truth about Tiananmen has been replaced with deception,

indifference and cynicism, as the history of the brutality of June 4th becomes more deeply suppressed.

But over the past thirty years, Chinese people have never stopped pursuing greater freedom and a more humane, just and open society. Intellectuals, students, journalists, bloggers, factory workers, miners, petitioners, and even farmers in small villages have begun to conceive and pursue their interests as "rights." Despite all the government's efforts to repress these voices, the trend has grown beyond anything China's rulers can reverse.

However, the world has also recently witnessed, another trend threatens the hope of freedom in China: the digitalization of Chinese society is amplifying the state's capacity to monitor and control the country's 1.4 billion people. The new arsenal of the Chinese surveillance state includes mass video-surveillance projects incorporating facial-recognition technology; voice-recognition software that can identify speakers on phone calls; and a sweeping and intrusive program of DNA collection. There are more than 200 million surveillance cameras peppered around entire country, recording what's going on. Chinese government's facial recognition database includes almost every one of its 1.4 billion people. In addition, officials are at work on a nationwide Social Credit System (SCS) intended to assess the conduct of every Chinese. A new generation of digital technology, including AI and Big Data Analysis, will empower the state to monitor, control and manipulate China's vast population in scalable fashion, at ease and with the capacity to micro-target individuals. It can also help the state to identify and quash opposition in advance. China is now on its way to building the world's first "digital totalitarian state." It is also exporting these surveillance and control technologies to to autocratic regimes around the world, normalizing and enabling a global authoritarianism. This is why the U.S. must widen its focus to the entire Chinese surveillance tech industry, disrupting its supply chains, and through working with allies, prevent China from using its government-controlled companies to advance its digital totalitarian interests in other parts of the world.

For the Tiananmen Massacre, U.S must continue to call for a full public accounting for those killed, detained and missing thirty years ago, including the identity and whereabouts of Tank Man - the brave young man who stood in front of a column

of tanks on Chang'an Ave on June 5, 1989 in an image recognized around the world--though often not in China, where there has been a complete blackout of its display for the past 30 years. The Chinese government must acknowledge the demands of the Tiananmen Mothers, an informal group of parents whose children were killed by tanks and guns in 1989, but who have been repeatedly silenced in their efforts to call for accountability and a full accounting for the deaths. They are not allowed to publicly mourn their children. Without a basic grounding in the truth about Tiananmen, if a government cannot come to terms with its own history and make peace with its own people, how can the world trust the myth of its "peaceful rise"?

Mr. Chairman, respectable members of the Committee,

The rise of China under a one-party dictatorship threatens not just American interests but also the rules-based international order. US-China relations are not, and should not, just be about economic competition, or even global power rivalry. It should also be firmly rooted in the universal value of human rights. The Unites States of America must continue to uphold this liberal framework.

We must have no illusions: it is the existence of the Chinese Communist Party dictatorship that abuses and threatens the liberty and dignity of Chinese people, and people's lives anywhere in this increasingly interconnected globe. But this is not a "clash of civilizations." It is a "clash" between two different political systems, between democracy and a one-party dictatorship. We just need to look to Taiwan, where "Chinese civilization" works well with democratic governance. We can also look to Japan, South Korea, and India. The "clash of civilizations" frame does not single out China among friends and allies of the United States, but it can isolate the United States from the rest of the world, and at the very worst, it can become a dangerous, self-fulfilling prophecy. As a son of China, and a proud citizen of the United States of America, I am asking each of you: when making the best possible China policy that defends the value and interests of American people, please also make it align with, and support, Chinese people's struggle for universal human rights and freedom.

Thirty years after Tiananmen, the CCP continues to rule Chinese people through fear. But those who rule by fear also live in fear. As a great Chinese human rights campaigner, astrophysicist Fang Lizhi once said 30 years ago: "We (Chinese people) may only fear today, but we absolutely do not fear tomorrow. In contrast, those murderers not only fear today, they fear tomorrow even more." Remembering Tiananmen Massacre is speaking truth to power and an act of resistance against Chinese Communist Party dictatorship regime.

Last week I was visiting Berlin and had some time to take a walk in the streets of the once divided city. Where the Berlin Wall once stood now there is only a dark red line through the city; some parts are even now a hiking trail. But I also saw something else - names of victims of the Nazis engraved in shining brass plaques, 70,000 of them spread throughout Berlin. I started to envision that one day in Beijing, the names of those who died during the Tiananmen Massacre will be engraved into the city's roads, building walls and parks, and on Tiananmen Square - The Gate of Heavenly Peace. I asked myself: Where is Hitler's Nazi Germany now? Where is the former Soviet Union? Where is Suharto's Indonesia or Pinochet's Chile? They're all gone! Because the ultimate spirit of human dignity is more enduring than tanks and machine guns, even when those weapons are aided by big data analysis, artificial intelligence or missiles, satellites and spaceships. Freedom will prevail, in West or East. In Berlin, or in Beijing.

I would like to end my testimony with a quote from Mahatma Gandhi, a great man from another great civilization:

"When I despair, I remember that all through history the way of truth and love have always won. There have been tyrants and murderers, and for a time, they can seem invincible, but in the end, they always fall. Think of it--always."

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate that testimony.

We will now hear from Sophie Richardson. She is the China Director at Human Rights Watch. Dr. Richardson is the author of numerous articles on domestic Chinese political reform, democratization, and human rights in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Vietnam. Under her leadership, Human Rights Watch has documented a myriad of human rights abuses by the Chinese Government, including most recently the use of mass surveillance and the emerging technologies issue.

Dr. Richardson.

STATEMENT OF SOPHIE RICHARDSON, Ph.D., CHINA DIRECTOR, HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH, NEW YORK, NY

Dr. RICHARDSON. Chairman Risch, Ranking Member Menendez, members of the committee, thank you for inviting us to join you on this very somber anniversary.

Among the most disturbing aspects of President Xi's rule is Chinese authority's development and deployment of surveillance technology that aspires to engineer a dissent-free society. Authorities deny people any meaningful privacy rights from the government's prying eyes, and coupled with a deeply politicized judicial system, the lack of a free press and the denial of political rights, people across the country have no ability to challenge these developments or even truly understand how society is being transformed until it impacts them or their families directly.

What are some examples of this technology? One of the Ministry of Public Security's most ambitious and privacy-violating big data projects is the police cloud system, which appears to be national. The system scoops up information from people's medical records to their supermarket memberships to delivery records, much of which is linked to people's unique national identification numbers. The police cloud system aims to track where the individuals have been, who they are with, and what they have been doing, as well as make predictions about their future activities. In effect, the system watches everyone, and the police can arbitrarily designate anyone a threat who requires greater surveillance, especially if they are deemed to be undermining stability.

The Chinese Government is also developing a national social credit system that rewards good behavior and punishes the bad. At present, it is a blacklisting system in which behaviors the authorities disapprove of, from abnormal petitioning to eating on the subway, can affect one's ability to obtain services such as getting mortgages or traveling on high-speed trains, or even enrolling children in public schools.

To what extent the social credit system will evolve and how it will interact with the police systems of mass surveillance remains an open question.

In December 2017, we reported on Xinjiang authorities' compulsory collection of DNA samples, fingerprints, iris scans, and blood types of all citizens in the region between the ages of 12 and 65, in part under the guise of a free public health care program. That campaign significantly expanded the authorities' collection of biodata beyond previous government efforts in the region. It did not appear that the government disclosed to the public or to participants the full range of how the collected medical information would be used and disseminated or for how long it would be storied, and it appears that people were given little information about the program or the ability to opt out of it.

We discovered that a U.S.-based company, Thermo Fisher Scientific, had sold DNA sequencers to the Xinjiang Public Security Bureau during this period. After inquiries from Human Rights Watch, Members of Congress, and the New York Times, the company agreed to stop selling that particular technology in that particular region. However, it remains unclear whether it has adopted

due diligence policies that might prevent such problems in the future.

Most recently, Human Rights Watch reverse-engineered an app used by the police and government officials in Xinjiang that is connected to a police mass surveillance system called the Integrated Joint Operations Platform, or IJOP, which aggregates information about all residents of Xinjiang under the guise of providing public security. Our research into the app revealed that the authorities consider many ordinary and legal behaviors, such as, quote, not socializing with neighbors, quote, often avoiding using the front door, using WhatsApp or simply being related to someone who had obtained a new phone number, as suspicious. The app then flags such people for interrogation, some of whom are then sent to Xinjiang's political education camps where they are arbitrarily and indefinitely detained.

The consequences of these technologies across China are enormous. The state is now not only able to peer into virtually every aspect of a person's public and private life, but is also clearly using information gained that way to reward and punish people outside any discernible legal scheme.

Major Chinese tech companies now operate around the world. In 2014, we documented ZTE's sale of telecom surveillance technology to the Ethiopian Government, which used that equipment to monitor its political opponents. IFlytek, one of China's major voice recognition companies, which is helping the Ministry of Public Security in building a national voice pattern database, is also working MIT. China Electronics Technology Group Corporation, a state-owned defense conglomerate behind Xinjiang's IJOP system, has numerous subsidiaries, including Hikvision, a major surveillance camera manufacturer whose products are used around the world, including in the U.S.

What can be done about any of this?

To combat the Chinese Government's expanding use of surveillance technology in the commission of human rights violations, we urge the United States to impose appropriate export control mechanisms, including by adding companies to existing export control lists and imposing targeted sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Act.

We also encourage consideration of end-user bans.

U.S. companies and universities working in this sector should be encouraged to adopt due diligence policies to ensure that they are not engaged in or enabling serious human rights violations.

We urge the swift adoption of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act, which we were very glad to see was voted out of this committee.

While there is much work for the U.S. to do to limit Chinese Government and Chinese Communist Party encroachments on human rights abuses in the United States, particularly with respect to realms such as academic freedom, those strategies must place at their core welcoming and protecting the rights of people from China who come here in order to be able to freely exercise those rights.

Finally, the U.S. and ideally members of this body today should recommit their support to independent civil society across China.

That community is under sustained assault and it needs sustained attention from the U.S., including both Congress and the executive branch. People from that community paid a terrible price at Tiananmen. They have paid it over the past 3 decades. Yet, they have not abandoned the Tiananmen spirit and nor should the U.S.

Thank you. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Richardson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SOPHIE RICHARDSON, PH.D.

Chairman Risch, Ranking Member Menendez, members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to testify on this somber anniversary.

Human Rights Watch began reporting on human rights violations committed by the Chinese government in the mid-1980s, and while many of us had hoped that the government's greater interactions with the international community and institutions over the subsequent years would eventually lead to greater respect for human rights, the reality is the reverse: under President Xi Jinping, not only is the state carrying out gross human rights violations, including heightened repression of peaceful activists and the arbitrary detention of one million Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, it is also aggressively attempting to undermine international institutions critical to protecting the human rights of people around the world.

We now know that the 1989 Tiananmen Square Massacre was not an aberration, but an expression of deep-seated authoritarianism embraced by successive administrations in Beijing. The U.S. response to Tiananmen was strong and principled, not just in rhetoric, but in actions. Over time, however, the fate of the sanctions imposed by the U.S. in response to Tiananmen represented a wavering commitment to pressing for reform in China: those sanctions have been slowly eroded on paper, superseded by business interests, and are hardly reflective of Chinese authorities' technological prowess. The sanctions, which were designed to limit the export of "equipment or instruments related to crime control and detection," meant that the U.S. could not sell gear, such as handcuffs. But they do not limit the export of the kinds of technology Chinese police now deploy to maintain "public order"—equipment like DNA sequencers, the sale of which remains permissible under U.S. law.

Our research is only a snapshot of an evolving system of mass surveillance: these systems are generating massive datasets—unprecedented in human history—of personal information, people's behavior, relationships, and movements. The Chinese police are researching ways to use such information to understand in a more fine-grained way how people lead their lives. The goal is apparently to identify patterns of, and predict, the everyday life and resistance of its population, and, ultimately, to engineer and control reality.

HUMAN RIGHTS UNDER PRESIDENT XI JINPING

Since President Xi assumed leadership as the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) general secretary in late 2012, his government has actively sought to roll back all of the modest human rights gains made over the previous decades.

Inside China, Xi's government unleashed a ferocious crackdown on independent civil society, arbitrarily detaining and prosecuting, on harsh and baseless charges, human rights lawyers, writers, journalists, and feminist activists. Repression of ethnic minorities and religious communities has grown exponentially, leading to the current crisis in Xinjiang. The government has adopted a slew of blatantly abusive laws, many of them in tension with China's international obligations and its own Constitution. It has killed off legal reform, strengthened the Party and Xi's control over state institutions; in March 2018, the CCP removed term limits on his presidency. Space for any independent activism or peaceful criticism is virtually gone, perhaps best embodied by the July 2017 death under guard of 2010 Nobel Peace Prize laureate Liu Xiaobo, or the dramatically shrinking space for human rights in Hong Kong.

Outside China, Xi's government has aggressively engaged in undermining key international human rights institutions, particularly at the United Nations. Beijing's trillion-dollar Belt and Road Initiative has no human rights safeguards; its development banks, including the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, are notoriously weak in this regard. Human Rights Watch has detailed Chinese government and Communist Party efforts to limit academic freedom and undercut labor standards outside China. As important, Beijing tries to control and intimidate diaspora communities, ranging from pressuring governments to forcibly return people seeking

asylum to censoring WeChat communications between democratically elected representatives and their constituents.

MASS SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY INSIDE AND OUTSIDE CHINA

Among the most disturbing aspects of Xi's rule and the current situation: Chinese authorities' development and deployment of surveillance technology that aspires to engineer a dissent-free society. Chinese authorities deny people any meaningful privacy rights from the government's prying eyes, and, coupled with a deeply politicized judicial system, the lack of a free press, and the denial of political rights, people across the country have no ability to challenge these developments or even truly understand how society is being transformed until it impacts them—or their families—directly.

What are some examples of this technology? One of the Ministry of Public Security's most ambitious and privacy-violating big data projects is the "Police Cloud" system, which appears to be national. The system scoops up information, from people's medical history, to their supermarket membership, to delivery records, much of which is linked to people's unique national identification numbers. The Police Cloud system aims to track where the individuals have been, who they are with, and what they have been doing, as well as make predictions about their future activities. It is designed to uncover relationships between events and people "hidden" to the police by analyzing, for example, who has been staying in a hotel or travelling together. In effect, the system watches everyone, and the police can arbitrarily designate anyone a threat who requires greater surveillance, especially if they are seen to be "undermining stability"—an alarmingly ambiguous construct. It's critical to understand that there is no transparency in such a designation, and no way to challenge it—this is not the same as predictive policing in the U.S.

The Chinese government is also developing a national "social credit system" that rewards "good" behavior and punishes the "bad." At present, it is a blacklisting system in which behaviors the authorities disapprove—from "abnormal petitioning" to eating on the subway—can affect one's ability to obtain services, such as getting mortgages and travelling on high-speed trains. The system already has rights implications. We documented a case in which Li Xiaolin, a human rights lawyer, was put on a blacklist for failing to apologize "sincerely" to a plaintiff in a defamation case. In that case, the penalty was exacted in an arbitrary and unaccountable manner: authorities failed to notify him that he had been blacklisted, leaving him no chance to contest his treatment.

To what extent the social credit system will evolve, and how it will interact with the police systems of mass surveillance, remains an open question. It is important to note that the social credit system and the mass surveillance systems were envisioned as part of the Chinese government's bigger vision for "better" "social management"—meaning, social control.

In December 2017, Human Rights Watch documented Xinjiang authorities' compulsory collection of DNA samples, fingerprints, iris scans, and blood types of all residents in the region between the ages of 12 and 65, in part under the guise of a free public healthcare program. That campaign significantly expanded authorities' collection of biodata beyond previous government efforts in the region, which only required all passport applicants in Xinjiang to supply biometrics. It did not appear that the government has disclosed to the public or to participants, the full range of how collected medical information will be used and disseminated or how long it will be stored, and it appears that people were given little information about the program or the ability to opt out of it. We discovered that a U.S.-based company, Thermo Fisher Scientific, headquartered in Waltham, Massachusetts, had sold DNA sequencers to the Xinjiang Public Security Bureau during this period. After inquiries from Human Rights Watch, members of Congress, and the *New York Times*, the company agreed to stop selling that particular technology in that particular region. However, it remains unclear whether it has adopted due diligence policies that might prevent such problems in the future.

Most recently, Human Rights Watch reverse-engineered an app used by police and government officials in Xinjiang that is connected to a police mass surveillance system, called the Integrated Joint Operations Platform (IJOP), which aggregates information about all residents of Xinjiang under the guise of providing public security. Our research into the app revealed that the authorities consider many ordinary and legal behavior, such as "not socializing with neighbors," "often avoiding using the front door," using WhatsApp, or simply being related to someone who has obtained a new phone number, as suspicious. The app then flags such people for interrogation; some of whom are then sent to Xinjiang's "political education" camps

where they are arbitrarily and indefinitely detained until authorities deemed them to have become sufficiently loyal to the Chinese Communist Party.

The consequences of these technologies across China are enormous: the state is now not only able to peer into virtually every aspect of a person's public and private life, but is also clearly using information gained that way to reward and punish people outside any discernible legal scheme. It's not just the case that it's now "suspicious" if you go out your back door instead of your front door in Xinjiang, it's that the authorities can know that and investigate and punish you for it, even though it's legal. You are not only suspicious if you question state policies, your level of suspiciousness is also dependent on who you are related to, who you spend time with.

Like other human rights violations committed by Chinese authorities, tech-related abuses no longer stay inside China. In recent years major Chinese firms have sold surveillance technology and provided training to other abusive governments; in 2014 we documented ZTE's sale of telecom surveillance technology to the Ethiopian government, which used that equipment to monitor its political opponents.[1] iFlytek, one of China's major voice recognition companies, which works with the Ministry of Public Security in building a national voice pattern database, is working with universities in the U.S.;[2] it is unclear whether that cooperation is subjected to due diligence strategies to ensure that that collaboration is not inadvertently contributing to human rights violations. China Electronics Technology Group Corporation (CETC), a state-owned defense conglomerate behind Xinjiang's IJOP system, has numerous subsidiaries.[3] These subsidiaries in turn have joint ventures and research and development partnerships abroad. One of CETC's subsidiaries is Hikvision, a major surveillance camera manufacturer whose products are used around the world, including in the U.S.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We now find ourselves confronted with a powerful Chinese government willing to deploy extraordinary resources to deny people inside and outside China their human rights.

Human Rights Watch appreciates that many congressional interventions on China and human rights have long been bipartisan and bicameral, and that in recent years members of Congress have stood on principle to protest human rights violations even when administrations would not.

To combat the Chinese government's expanding use of surveillance technology in the commission of human rights violations, we urge the United States to impose appropriate export control mechanisms to deny the Chinese government—and Chinese companies enabling government abuses—access to technologies used to violate basic rights, including by adding companies to existing export control lists, and imposing targeted sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Act against individuals linked to serious violations of human rights. U.S, private companies and public universities working in this sector should be encouraged to adopt due diligence policies to ensure they are not engaged in or enabling serious human rights violations.

It is imperative that Congress keep up the pressure on the administration to promote universal human rights; certainly, your multiple inquiries as to the administration's approach to Xinjiang have helped. This is particularly important when it comes to international institutions that have a role in protecting human rights, including the United Nations Human Rights Council, which I know can sometimes be difficult for members of Congress to do. It is important for you to recognize that the U.S. withdrawal from that body, in particular, has made it much more difficult to develop international pressure to end to the crisis in Xinjiang, and the Chinese government has moved swiftly to occupy this space.

We urge the swift adoption of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act, which I was glad to see recently passed out of this committee, and vigorous implementation of the Tibet Policy Act, the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act, and the Hong Kong Policy Act—all three regions are under enormous pressure from Beijing and face serious encroachments on human rights.

While there is much work for the U.S. to do to limit Chinese government and Chinese Communist Party encroachments on human rights in the United States, particularly with respect to realms such as academic freedom, those strategies should place at their core protecting the rights of people from China who seek an opportunity to exercise those rights—not make assumptions about or limit them as a result of their nationality or ethnicity. This is a mistake the U.S. has made in the past, and it should not be repeated.

Finally, the U.S.—and ideally members of this body, today—should recommit their support to independent civil society across China. That community is under sustained assault, and it needs sustained attention from the U.S. government—in-

cluding both Congress and the executive branch. People from that community paid a terrible price at Tiananmen; they have paid it over the past three decades. Yet they have not abandoned the Tiananmen spirit, and neither should the U.S.

Notes

[1] ZTE did not respond to Human Rights Watch's letter of inquiry.
[2] iFlytek did not respond to Human Rights Watch's letter of inquiry.
[3] CETC did not respond to Human Rights Watch's letter of inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

We are going to hear now from Christopher Walker, who is Vice President for Studies and Analysis at the National Endowment for Democracy. Prior to joining NED, Mr. Walker was Vice President for Strategy and Analysis at the Freedom House. Mr. Walker has also served as an adjunct assistant professor of international affairs at New York University's Center for Global Affairs. He has been at the forefront of the discussion on authoritarian influence on democratic systems, including to what he has termed "sharp power."

Mr. Walker.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER WALKER, VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDIES AND ANALYSIS, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. WALKER. I would like to thank Chairman Risch, Ranking Member Menendez, and other esteemed members of the committee for the opportunity of presenting testimony on the impact of China's international engagement on democracy.

For many years now, the paramount authorities in Beijing have tightened their grip on Chinese society. At home, the Chinese Communist Party has taken steps to intensify its control of media and free expression and sharpened repression more generally. The authorities have enhanced their ability to do so through the application of modern technologies.

China in the post-Tiananmen era has been viewed by external observers largely through an economic development lens. The democracies' headlong rush into unconditional, rather than measured and principled, engagement with China has resulted in evident problems. The central assumption was that by deeply engaging the People's Republic of China and welcoming its integration into the global economic system, its government would be encouraged to move in the direction of meaningful political reform. But this approach has not turned out the way we anticipated.

Although today China intersects in many ways with the global system, it has not become more transparent and accountable under the CCP's rule. Rather, it has developed policies and practices that can corrode and undermine democratic standards. Thus, we are at the same time facing systems integration and systems competition.

For too long, observers in free societies have viewed these trends with China as divorced from developments from beyond the PRC, but this narrow view is misguided and has led to a dangerous sense of complacency. Beijing has internationalized its authoritarianism in ways that affect us all. On this important anniversary of the brutal crackdown on Tiananmen Square, we are obliged to reflect on the China that has emerged over the past 3

decades and on how the country's leadership is pursuing its ambitions beyond its country's borders.

A critical aspect of China's development is the massive resources the authorities have invested in modern technologies. Such investments over the years have been central to the repression in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, which is functioning now as a technology-animated police state. As China scholar Samantha Hoffman notes, investment by the Chinese authorities in other parts of China, including in Tibet, over an extensive period of time has enabled the building of the formidable arsenal of surveillance that today is evident in the Uyghur region.

Indeed, today the Uyghur region itself serves as an incubator for the testing and development of cutting-edge technological tools of oppression that are invariably feeding back into other parts of the PRC but also having impact beyond China's borders, including in places such as Latin America and Africa.

Apart from the sphere of technology, Beijing has refined and scaled up its instruments of influence and, with them, its ability to manipulate the political landscape in other countries. As the leadership in Beijing has become more repressive domestically, China has grown more ambitious internationally in ways that are anathema to democratic values and the rule of law. Such behavior is at direct odds with the notion of China as a responsible stakeholder.

Under the direction of the CCP, China has established platforms abroad for educational, cultural, and other forms of influence within open societies. It has been noted during the course of the discussion so far that China is sharing technologies and know-how with other authoritarian regimes, which is true, Cambodia, Angola, Venezuela, and the like. But I would stress that the wrinkle today that should really concern all of us is that China is sharing these technologies in more open societies. We can talk more about that, but this is really critical to the understanding of China's evolution and its ambitions.

So I will just say a brief word about some of this in the media sphere where China has learned to manage political ideas within its own borders quite effectively, as my colleagues have noted. They are now bending globalization in a way that manipulates discourse abroad both in wide open democratic societies but also in authoritarian settings.

In Africa, for example, China has intensified its engagement especially in the region's media sphere, expanding its presence in state-owned media outlets in the region, hosting exchange programs, and training for journalists, and acting as a supplier for Africa's telecommunications infrastructure. I would note, however, that the Chinese Government's training of journalists is not what we imagine it to be. It is not real journalism education. Instead, the focus is on talking up Chinese achievements, big infrastructure projects and the like, and on learning how to report from the Chinese Government's perspective. Such patterns are also evident in Latin America.

I would note that in the United States in 2015, it was reported that China Radio International, which is Beijing's state-run radio

network, was operating as a hidden hand behind a global web of stations on which China's government controls much of the content.

This is in line with the patterns we are seeing in terms of China's engagement around the world. And this is defined by opacity and secrecy. So in Panama, just to give a couple of other examples, and El Salvador, when these governments switched their diplomatic recognition from Taiwan to the PRC, key government, private sector, and civil society actors in those countries were kept in the dark until after official announcements were made.

In Argentina, a deal reached, when Cristina Kirchner was in power, saw the People's Liberation Army given a 50-year lease to build and operate a space observation station with dual-use capabilities in Patagonia. After recent reporting revealed the agreement provided the Argentine Government with no mechanisms for oversight or access to the station, Argentina's national congress launched an investigation and is seeking to revisit the agreement. The key issue here is that in none of these cases was there a public discussion of these very important issues before the deals were cut, and this plays out across examples we see where China is engaged.

So what do we do about the challenge? I would say the following.

First, I think it is important to emphasize that we have entered into what is a global struggle over whose values will predominate. On the one hand, we have those of the CCP that privileges state control, censorship, and rule by law. On the other hand, we have democratic systems that privilege openness, free expression, and the rule of law. How this contest plays out will define the character of the world we live in.

I think as principal steps to get at this, first, we need to address the large knowledge and capacity gap on China that exists in so many settings. We need to support journalists, civil society, policy elites so they can handle the burden that they are facing now in their own countries in Africa, Latin America, the Balkans, and elsewhere.

Second, we need to move beyond transparency. Enhancing transparency is a way of safeguarding democratic societies against undesirable Chinese party state influences, a necessary but insufficient step.

Third, we need to prioritize democratic solidarity.

And finally, we need to accelerate learning through cooperation with democratic partners.

Thank you for your attention.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Walker follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. CHRISTOPHER WALKER

I would like to thank Chairman Risch, Ranking Member Menendez, and the other esteemed members of the Committee for the opportunity and privilege of presenting testimony on the critical subject of the impact of China's international engagement on democratic institutions, principles, and ideas.

For many years now, the paramount authorities in Beijing have tightened their grip on Chinese society. At home, the Chinese Communist Party has taken steps to intensify its control of media and free expression, and has sharpened repression more generally. The authorities have enhanced their ability to do so through the application of modern technologies.

China in the post-Tiananmen era has been viewed by external observers through an economic development lens. The democracies' headlong rush into unconditional—rather than measured and principled—engagement with China has resulted in evident problems. The central assumption was that by deeply engaging the People's

Republic of China (PRC) and other such regimes and welcoming their integration into the global economic system and key international political institutions, the autocracies would be encouraged to move in the direction of meaningful political reform. But this approach has not turned out as we had anticipated.

Rather than reforming, China has deepened its authoritarianism, and in an era of globalization is now turning it outward. Thus, we are at the same time facing systems integration and systems competition. Although China today intersects in many ways with the global system, it has not become more transparent and accountable under the CCP's rule; rather, it has developed policies and practices that can corrode and undermine democratic standards.[1]

For too long, observers in free societies have viewed trends within China as divorced from developments beyond the PRC. But this narrow view is misguided and until now has contributed to a dangerous sense of complacency. In an era of globalization, Beijing has internationalized its authoritarianism in ways that affect all of us. On this important anniversary of the brutal crackdown on Tiananmen Square, we are obliged to reflect on the China that has emerged over the past three decades and on how the country's leadership is pursuing its ambitions beyond its borders.

A critical aspect of China's development is the massive resources the authorities have invested in modern technology. Such investments over the years have been central to the repression in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, which is functioning now as a technology-animated police state.[2] As China scholar Samantha Hoffman notes, investment by the Chinese authorities in other parts of China, including in Tibet, over an extensive period of time has enabled the building of the formidable arsenal of surveillance that today is evident in the Uyghur Region.[3]

In an environment without meaningful checks on state power, the Chinese authorities have wide latitude for testing ever more elaborate methods of censorship and social management. As powerful technologies exert greater influence, the U.S. and other democracies are engaged in complex and difficult debates involving civil society, government, and academia over issues of privacy, surveillance, and security. Such debates, for all practical purposes, do not occur in China, opening up an enormous space for systematic abuse of the kind that has taken shape in Uyghur Region. As machine learning and other technological advances accelerate, the precision with which the Chinese government will be able to modernize censorship is bound to grow. Indeed, today the Uyghur Region itself serves as an incubator for the testing and development of cutting- edge technological tools of repression that invariably are feeding back into other parts of the PRC, but also having an impact beyond China's borders, including in Latin America and Africa.[4]

Apart from the sphere of technology, Beijing has refined and scaled up its instruments of influence and, with them, its ability to manipulate the political landscape in other countries. As the leadership in Beijing has become more repressive domestically, China has grown more ambitious internationally in ways that are anathema to democratic values and the rule of law. Such behavior is at direct odds with the notion of China as a "responsible stakeholder."

A NEW ERA OF CONTESTATION

In this new era of contestation, China has claimed a larger role on the global stage and has sought to promote its own preferred ideas, norms, and approaches to governance. Beijing's unexpected ability to carry out digital censorship, to use economic leverage to mute voices in the democracies, and more generally to influence democratic systems abroad has created a need for fresh ways of thinking about and dealing with this new situation.

As China's leadership has placed greater importance on shaping the political operating environment overseas, it has spent many of billions of dollars over the past decade to shape public opinion and perceptions around the world.

Although information is increasingly globalized and internet access is spreading, China and other authoritarian states have managed to reassert control over the realm of ideas.[5] In China, the state keeps a firm grip on the media environment, and the authorities in Beijing use digital technologies to press their advantage at home and, increasingly, abroad.

Under the direction of the Chinese Communist Party, China has established platforms abroad for educational, cultural, and other forms of influence within open societies. Over time, it has become clearer that such initiatives tend to be "accompanied by an authoritarian determination to monopolize ideas, suppress alternative narratives, and exploit partner institutions," what is now understood as "sharp power,"[6] an approach to international affairs that typically involves efforts at cen-

sorship and the use of manipulation to degrade the integrity of independent institutions.[7]

The authorities in Beijing have cultivated economic leverage as a tool for getting others to play by their rules. Beijing's approach seeks to reduce, neutralize, and preempt any challenges to the CCP regime's presentation of itself. Its state-funded research centers, media outlets, people-to-people exchange programs, and network of Confucius Institutes often mimic civil society initiatives that in democracies function independently of government. Meanwhile, local partners and others in democracies are often unaware of the logic that underpins China's foreign policy and how tightly the Chinese authorities control social groups, media, and political discourse at home.

Today, the corrosive effects of China's influence beyond its borders are increasingly apparent in a number of crucial domains, including publishing, culture, academia, and media—sectors that are essential for determining how citizens of democracies understand the world around them. China's influence activities aim to discourage challenges to its preferred self-presentation, as well as to its standing or its policies. Limiting or muting public discussion of issues deemed unwelcome by the Chinese party-state is a critical characteristic of sharp power.[8]

MEDIA

Having learned to manage political ideas within their own countries, authoritarian regimes are now bending globalization to their own ends by manipulating discourse abroad, especially in the wide-open information space afforded to them by the democracies. Massive investments in overseas media infrastructure play a central role. China has scaled up a multifaceted effort to shape the realm of ideas.

State dominance over political expression and communication is integral to authoritarian governance. Such control enables the promotion of favored narratives across media platforms, as well as through the words of state officials and surrogates. In an era of global information saturation and fragmentation, the authorities in Beijing understand the "discourse power" that can be exercised through focused and amply funded information initiatives. As the PRC's media platforms expand and its largest internet firms go global, Beijing's ability to curate information in a systematic and selective manner will only grow stronger, especially in places where local media organizations are vulnerable.

One such place is Africa.[9] There, China has made major investments in media infrastructure, and Chinese censorship tactics are being deployed in matters that Beijing deems sensitive. Throughout sub-Saharan Africa, Chinese state-media outlets have bureaus with two sets of editors: There are African editors on the local payroll, but a group of Chinese editors in Beijing vets their decisions, at least regarding stories that the PRC feels strongly about. The Chinese government gives African journalists "training" and brings them to visit China. Real journalism education, however, is not the goal. Instead, the focus is on taking in Chinese achievements (cultural sites, big infrastructure projects) and on learning how to report from the Chinese government's perspective.[10]

This is part of a global pattern that is also visible in Latin America. China's president Xi Jinping has said that he wants to bring ten thousand Latin American politicians, academics, journalists, officials, and former diplomats to China by 2020.[11]

One example relevant to the United States was reported in November 2015, when it came to light that China Radio International (CRI), Beijing's state-run radio network, was operating as a hidden hand behind a global web of stations on which the Chinese government controls much of the content. According to a Reuters investigation, 33 stations in 14 countries "primarily broadcast content created or supplied by CRI or by media companies it controls in the United States, Australia, and Europe." As part of this elaborate Chinese-government effort to exploit the open media space, more than a dozen stations across the United States operate as part of the CCP's "borrowed boat" approach, in which existing media outlets in foreign countries are used to project China's messages.[12]

Through its formidable global media apparatus more generally, China is spreading messages abroad, using a variety of tools, about alternatives to democracy as models of governance, how the media can be controlled, and value-neutral internationalist positions in debates on issues such as internet governance.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTES

Chinese authorities portray the Confucius Institutes as being similar to the British Council or the Goethe-Institut, both of which receive government funding to give language and culture classes. Yet unlike those freestanding organizations, the Confucius Institutes are embedded within educational institutions, most of which are

committed to the type of free intellectual inquiry that is impossible at Confucius Institutes themselves.

Many casual observers of the Confucius Institutes might not realize that the Confucius Institutes' constitution, found on the website of Hanban (the Chinese arm of the government that directs them), implies that Chinese law applies within the premises of the Institutes.[13] Moreover, the Confucius Institutes employ staffers who at times have sought to block host universities from holding discussions on sensitive topics such as Taiwan or Tibet.[14]

Little about these institutes is transparent; it is hard to say, for instance, what amount of Chinese government money goes to individual host universities. It is also unclear what level of control universities have over curricula within the Institutes because the agreements between these parties often remain confidential.[15]

INCUBATING AND SHARING TECHNOLOGY TOWARD REPRESSIVE ENDS

Beijing's considerable influence is increasingly evident in the digital space. China and other autocratic regimes have applied the online tools and techniques that they have refined for domestic use internationally as well. As noted at the outset of this statement, many of the techniques that are applied abroad are first incubated at the domestic level by the Chinese authorities. Through the online censorship system known as the Great Firewall, Chinese authorities have long been able to manage and restrict what China's people—the world's largest number of internet users inside a single set of national borders—can access when they go online. Now the government is increasingly applying machine learning to combine censorship and surveillance into comprehensive social management, a development that will increasingly impact global freedom of expression.[16]

Beijing's paramount aim, it seems, is to exert control over key information spheres and the tools for manipulating thoughts, images, and ideas. Its management model is centralized and unitary.[17] As the authorities in Beijing deepen their artificial intelligence (AI) capacities, including through massive data collection, they are likely to apply these technologies to devise ever more precise methods of social management, including predicting individual behavior and potential collective action.

A recent case in Ecuador suggests some of the potential risks. Ecuador's negotiation under President Rafael Correa of a Chinese-financed loan to acquire surveillance equipment and technology to power its ECU–911 monitoring system took place in the absence of meaningful public debate, and civil society is only now in a position where it can begin to grapple with the potential ramifications of such an extensive system that has already been put into place. There is evidence to suggest that the ECU–911 system is being used to monitor civil society activists and critics of the government, much as these systems are used in China.[18]

In China, the companies responsible for developing these technologies are not only partnering with the state security apparatus, but are intertwining themselves within key institutions in democratic societies, giving them an increasing stake in the platforms and algorithms that determine speech on a worldwide basis. China's ambition to become a global powerhouse in big data, AI, and other emerging technologies has significant ramifications for democratic governance globally, yet much of civil society involved in the governance of emerging technologies has yet to engage on this issue in a meaningful way.[19] Democracies have yet to develop a comprehensive response to China's plan to build digital infrastructure across key parts of the globe, creating a "Digital Silk Road," and allowing China immense power over the future of the digital world.

THE CORROSIVE EFFECTS OF AUTHORITARIAN CAPITAL

Many emerging and vulnerable democracies face challenges in governing foreign direct investment, including weak accountability in public spending, opaque corporate governance, poor procurement oversight, and lax anti-corruption enforcement. These challenges are easily exploited by authoritarian regimes intent on using state-connected financial resources for reasons other than development or mutual economic benefit, leading to potentially disastrous outcomes for open and democratic governance. When investment and foreign assistance is part of a meaningful public discussion involving civil society in developing economies, the effect can be to strengthen such essential features of democratic governance as citizen voice and participation, and transparency and accountability. If the authoritarian-linked firms and institutions driving the capital flows ignore or even undermine liberal-democratic values and concerns, however, the durability of democratic governance can suffer, corruption can flourish, and authoritarianism can find fertile ground.

In regions such as the Western Balkans where the interests of local political elites, who retain power by catering to key patronage networks, overlap with Chi-

na's high tolerance for corruption, Beijing's way of doing business exacerbates existing problems surrounding transparency and accountability.[20] The situation in Central Europe and the Balkans, where young, aspiring or vulnerable democracies predominate, is also relevant. In countries throughout those regions there are indications that China has sought to utilize various forms of capital inflows, including equity, debt, and aid, to achieve geostrategic aims and divert the region from a trajectory of integration into the community of democratic states. Regional initiatives, such as China's "16+1" initiative (now "17+1" since the recent addition of Greece to this grouping) to strengthen bilateral ties with primarily former Eastern Bloc countries, offer Beijing an easy alternative to dealing with the EU as a whole.[21]

In countries where projects under BRI auspices have turned sour, its combining of infrastructure financing with geopolitical aims has raised doubt and opposition. In December 2017, for instance, the government of Sri Lanka admitted its inability to repay the US$8 billion that it had borrowed from Chinese firms to build a deep-water port at Hambantota, handing the project to Beijing on a 99-year lease in an instance of what critics have called "debt-trap diplomacy." In other cases, Chinese financing for infrastructure projects under the BRI have seen countries take on unsustainable debt levels for projects of questionable economic viability. For example, in Montenegro a project financed by China's Export-Import Bank to link the coastal port of Bar by road to Serbia has been dubbed "the highway to nowhere" after the government could not afford to take out further loans to complete the overruns of the project.[22]

OPACITY AND SECRECY AS NORMS

Such deals with China tend to be characterized by an essential lack of transparency. This opacity allows China to work with partners who have few other options because of their poor credit ratings and reputation for corruption, and also, by agreeing to inflate project cost, Beijing is able to funnel a portion of its investment to influential elites in partner governments.[23] Patterns across regions and sectors have taken shape that illustrate the extent of the problem. Several other recent cases have come to light, for instance, which demonstrate how Beijing's preference for working directly and exclusively with executive branch elites in its engagement with foreign governments and how this can have had a corrosive effect on the integrity of institutions and governance more broadly.

When Panama and El Salvador switched diplomatic recognition from Taiwan to the People's Republic of China, key government, private sector, and civil society actors were kept in the dark until after official announcements were made. In the case of El Salvador, its congress has launched an effort to review and halt the advancement of an accompanying agreement to establish a special economic zone that would comprise 14 percent of the country's territory in strategic areas along the coast and give preferential benefits to Chinese firms.[24] Only a few weeks ago, more than a dozen other agreements that the El Salvadorian president had reached with China were made public for the first time, spanning from promoting the Belt and Road Initiative, to scientific and technological cooperation, and educational exchange, among others. In all of these cases, civil society and policymakers have been forced to play catch up in order to understand the implications of how such agreements may impact their countries and to retrofit monitoring and accountability mechanisms.

In Argentina, a deal reached with the Cristina Kirchner administration saw the People's Liberation Army given a fifty-year lease to build and operate a space observation station with dual-use capabilities in Patagonia. After recent reporting revealed the agreement provided the Argentine government with no mechanisms for oversight or access to the station,[25] Argentina's national congress launched an investigation and is seeking to revisit the agreement.[26] In Africa, agreements on major deals also fit the pattern.[27]

The pattern of China's engagement that has taken shape globally has not eluded the U.S. In recent years, reports of influence that were once episodic have become more frequent as journalists and other observers have begun to look more closely; the patterns of opacity and manipulation that have characterized China's engagements in other parts of the world have come to light here. China's Influence and American Interests, a report produced by the Hoover Institution and the Asia Society and released in November 2018 found that "in certain key ways China is exploiting America's openness in order to advance its aims on a competitive playing field that is hardly level. For at the same time that China's authoritarian system takes advantage of the openness of American society to seek influence, it impedes legitimate efforts by American counterpart institutions to engage Chinese society on a reciprocal basis."

This report further observed that "China's influence activities have moved beyond their traditional United Front focus on diaspora communities to target a far broader range of sectors in Western societies, ranging from think tanks, universities, and media to state, local, and national government institutions. China seeks to promote views sympathetic to the Chinese government, policies, society, and culture; suppress alternative views; and co-opt key American players to support China's foreign policy goals and economic interests."[28]

ACKNOWLEDGING, AND COMPETING IN, THE EMERGING CONTEST OVER VALUES

Given China's rapid emergence on the world stage and its more visible authoritarian internationalism, it seems we are approaching an inflection point. If anything, the challenge presented by China and other ambitious, internationalist autocratic regimes has grown in the most recent period. At the same time, the democracies are only slowly waking up to the fact that they have entered into an era of serious and strategic contestation based on governance models.

The conflict over values that has taken shape globally is one between autocratic regimes, on the one hand, whose animating governance principles favor state control, management of political expression, and privileging "rule by law" over rule of law, versus democratic systems, on the other, whose principles are based on open societies, free and independent expression, and rule of law. In an era of globalization, the struggle over these fundamental values is being waged in every region and across diverse polities. How this battle plays out will define the character of the world we live in.

To date, much of the response to the China challenge from the democracies has focused on the trade and military dimensions, both of which properly deserve attention. But we must deal with the fact that much of Beijing's activity in recent years may be related to but is distinct from these domains. In order to compete, the U.S. and other democracies will need to address this gap in the sphere of values. And at a fundamental level, any response to this global challenge also needs to consider the essential importance of democratic development in China itself.

DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE RESPONSE TO THE CHINA CHALLENGE

Given its corrosive impact on critical democratic institutions, China's authoritarian internationalism poses both a rule-of-law and a national security challenge. The following are key steps, drawn from the International Forum for Democratic Studies' sharp power report, which can be taken to address the Beijing's influence efforts:

Address the large knowledge and capacity gap on China. Information concerning the Chinese political system and its foreign policy strategies is limited in many of the societies where China is deeply engaged. This asymmetry places societies at a distinct strategic disadvantage. There often are few journalists, editors, and policy professionals who possess a deep understanding of China—the Chinese Communist Party, especially—and can share their knowledge with the rest of their societies in a systematic way. Given China's growing footprint in these settings, there is a pressing need to build capacity to disseminate independent information about China and its regime. Civil society organizations should develop strategies for communicating expert knowledge about China to broader audiences.

Deepen understanding of authoritarian influence. China's sharp power relies in part on disguising state-directed projects as commercial media or grassroots associations, or using local actors as conduits for foreign propaganda or tools of foreign manipulation. To respond to these efforts at misdirection, observers need the capacity to put them under the spotlight and analyze them in an independent and comprehensive manner.

Move beyond transparency. Enhancing transparency as a way of safeguarding democratic societies against undesirable Chinese party-state influence is a necessary but insufficient step. Once the nature and techniques of authoritarian influence efforts are exposed, countries should build up internal defenses. Authoritarian initiatives are directed at cultivating relationships with the political elites, thought leaders, and other information gatekeepers of open societies. Such efforts are part of Beijing's larger aim to get inside such systems in order to incentivize cooperation and neutralize criticism of the authoritarian regime. Support for strong, independent civil society is essential to ensuring that the citizens of democracies are adequately informed to evaluate critically the benefits and risks of closer engagement with Beijing and its surrogates.

Prioritize democratic solidarity. Beijing and its surrogates are exerting pressure on independent institutions within free societies to an extent that would not be imaginable during the Cold War. The leadership of institutions essential to the func-

tioning of the public sphere within democratic societies—publishers, university administrators, media and technology executives, and others—in the past did not need to take into account to such a degree the prospect of manipulation or censorship by external authoritarian powers. Today, however, the exertion of sharp power makes it necessary for them to renew and deepen their commitment to democratic standards and free political expression. To address this challenge, common standards must be developed, with the aim of reducing these institutions' exposure to divide and conquer dynamics in order to safeguard their integrity over the long term.

Accelerate learning through cooperation with democratic partners. A number of countries, Australia especially, have already had extensive engagement with China and can serve as an important point of reference for countries whose institutions are at an earlier stage of their interaction with Beijing.[29] Given the complex and multifaceted character of Beijing's influence activities, such learning between and among democracies is critical for developing responses that are not only effective but consistent with democratic standards.

Notes

[1] Christopher Walker, "Authoritarian Regimes are Changing How the World Defines Democracy," Washington Post, June, 13 2014.

[2] Chris Buckley and Paul Mozur, "How China Uses High-Tech Surveillance to Subdue Minorities," New York Times, May 22, 2019."How Mass Surveillance Works in Xinjiang, China," Human Rights Watch, May 2, 2019. Gerry Shih, "'Police Cloud': Chinese Database Tracks Apps, Car Location and Even Electricity Usage in Muslim Region," *Washington Post*, May 2, 2019. Josh Chin and Clément Bubrge, "Twelve Days in Xinjiang: How China's Surveillance State Overwhelms Daily Life," *Wall Street Journal*, December 19, 2017.

[3] Samantha Hoffman, "China's Tech-Enhanced Authoritarianism," Testimony before House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Hearing on "China's Digital Authoritarianism: Surveillance, Influence, and Political Control," May 19, 2019.

[4] Authur Gwagwa and Lisa Garbe, "Exporting Repression? China's Artificial Intelligence Push into Africa," Net Politics Blog, Council on Foreign Relations, December 17, 2018. Simon Allison, "How China Spied on the African Union's Computers," Mail and Guardian, January 29, 2019. Evan Ellis, "Chinese Surveillance Complex Advancing in Latin America," Newsmax, April 12, 2019. Angus Berwick, "How ZTE Helps Venezuela Create China-style Social Control," Reuters, November 14, 2018.

[5] Xiao Qiang, "The Road to Digital Unfreedom: President Xi's Surveillance State," Journal of Democracy, no. 1 (2019): 53–67.

[6] Christopher Walker and Jessica Ludwig. "The Meaning of Sharp Power: How Authoritarian States Project Influence." Foreign Affairs, November 16, 2017.

[7] International Forum for Democratic Studies, "Sharp Power: Rising Authoritarian Influence" (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for Democracy, 2017).

[8] Christopher Walker, Shanthi Kalathil, and Jessica Ludwig, "Forget Hearts and Minds." Foreign Policy, September 14, 2018.

[9] See, for example: Andrea Vega Yudico, "China's Multi-Billion Dollar Telecommunications Investment in Africa Poses Threat to Independent Media," Center for International Media Assistance, October 24, 2017. Nick Bailey, "East African States Adopt China's Playbook on Internet Censorship," Freedom House, October 24, 2017.

[10] Emeka Umejei, "Will China's Media Influence African Democracies?" Power 3.0, 2 April 2018.

[11] Juan Pablo Cardenal, "China's Elitist Collaborators," Project Syndicate, 17 April 2018.

[12] Koh Gui Qing and John Shiffman, "Beijing's Covert Radio Network Airs China-Friendly News Across Washington, and the World," Reuters, November 2, 2015.

[13] Rachelle Peterson, "Outsourced to China: Confucius Institutes and Soft Power in American Higher Education," National Association of Scholars, June 2017.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Bethany Allen-Ebrahimian, "House Proposal Targets Confucius Institutes as Foreign Agents," Foreign Policy, March 14, 2018.

[16] Paul Mozur, "China Presses Its Internet Censorship Efforts Across the Globe," New York Times, March 2 2018.

[17] Qiang, "The Road to Digital Unfreedom: President Xi's Surveillance State."

[18] Paul Mozur, Jonah Kessel, and Melissa Chan, "Made in China, Exported to the World: The Surveillance State," New York Times, April 24, 2019.

[19] Lindsay Gorman and Matt Schrader, "U.S. Firms are Helping Build China's Orwellian State," Foreign Policy, March 19, 2019.

[20] Kurt Bassuener, "Pushing on an Open Door: Foreign Authoritarian Influence in the Western Balkans," National Endowment for Democracy, May 2019.

[21] Martin Hala, "The 16+1 Initiative: China's Divisive Equation for Central and Eastern Europe," Power 3.0, June 5, 2018.

[22] Noah Barkin and Aleksandr Vasovic, "Chinese 'highway to nowhere' haunts Montengro," Reuters, July 16, 2018.

[23] Jonathan Hillman, "Corruption Flows Along China's Belt and Road," Center for Strategic and International Studies, January 18, 2019.

[24] Benjamin Russell, "What a Controversial Deal in El Salvador Says About China's Bigger Plans," Americas Quarterly, April 23, 2019.

[25] Cassandra Garrison, "China's Military-Run Space Station in Argentina is a 'Black Box,'" Reuters, January 31, 2019.
[26] Cassandra Garrison, "Argentine Lawmakers Seek Greater Oversight of Chinese Space Facility in Patagonia," Reuters, March 29, 2019.
[27] "Report: Kenya Risks Losing Port of Mombasa to China," The Maritime Executive, December 20, 2018.
[28] China's Influence and American Interests: Promoting Constructive Vigilance, ed. Larry Diamond and Orville Schell, the Hoover Institution, November 29, 2018.
[29] See, for example, John Fitzgerald, "China in Xi's "New Era": Overstepping Down Under," Journal of Democracy, no. 2 (2018) and John Garnaut, "How China Interferes in Australia," Foreign Affairs, 9 March 2018.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you so much. All three of you have provided a perspective for us and corroborates what a lot of us have read from time to time. It is a chilling picture that starts to emerge of what is happening in China as far as people's privacy, as far as the surveillance, and their real inability to do anything that the government is not looking over their shoulder on.

Mr. Walker, you raised an interesting point. I would like you to expand on that a little bit, if you would, and that is the proliferation of technology to open countries as far as their use of these technologies to surveil their own people. Could you talk about that for a couple minutes?

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Senator.

This transcends the technology issue but it is a critically important part of the discussion.

So the focus on what we might call the authoritarian fraternity where repressive states deal with repressive states is one part of the discussion. But if we think about how the relationship between China and countries such as Ecuador today or Argentina or countries in the Balkans is evolving, in Serbia where there is far deeper engagement with China today than there was, say, 5 or 6 years ago, these are essentially open settings. They have struggles to achieve democratic reform, but all of these societies are looking to do so. In each of these cases, the privileging of secrecy, the transferring of technologies, as we have learned in the Ecuadorian case that, in fact, can have applications that are used for purposes that are not consistent with privacy and the rule of law. This is something that needs far greater scrutiny.

And my fear is that because the expertise we have available today either knows China, on the one hand, or some of the countries we are talking about, on the other hand—there is what I would call a strategic gap in meaningfully addressing some of the issues that countries in Latin America, sub-Saharan Africa are facing.

Sophie mentioned Ethiopia and ZTE. Ethiopia right now has the promise of democratic reform but itself, as I understand, has ZTE, Huawei, and StarTimes as its principal tech and content providers. So it is solely China that has both the ability to create choke points for content in that setting and also to manipulate the tech environment.

The CHAIRMAN. You made reference to rule of law. Very few countries, if any, other than the United States, have the kind of laws that provide for privacy of their own citizens. So how does that play into that? I mean, if they go to a country that does not have those kind of laws, really there is nothing to stop the government from converting themselves into an overseer of the population.

Mr. WALKER. So I think it is true that in authoritarian settings, the safeguards that one would hope for do not exist on rule of law, privacy, and other such issues. In some of the countries we have been discussing that are weak democracies or vulnerable democracies, they may well have laws on the books that provide such safeguards, but I would suggest that they are in greater jeopardy through this deep engagement with China and that this provides a vulnerability that was not really in view as recently as 5 or 6 years ago and it is something we are only coming to terms with now.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Menendez.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all for your testimony.

I agree that China's so-called long arm and influence abroad is having implications in human rights issues around the world. For example, we recently saw that Amnesty International was denied a lease in New York after a Chinese state-owned enterprise was involved. Just a few days ago, more than 1,000 Twitter accounts associated with Chinese human rights activists and defenders were mysteriously shut down. We have seen the Chinese Government pressure Southeast Asian countries to detain and deport activists or ethnic minorities, such as Uyghurs.

So the question is, are we equipped to confront these global human rights challenges that China presents? Are there things that we can better do with our partners, allies, and activists on the ground to tackle this issue across the world? I would like to hear, Ms. Richardson, if you have some perspectives on that.

Dr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Senator. It is a broad question. Maybe I can give you an example that speaks to your question, also what the chairman was just asking about.

Earlier this year, we were looking into censorship of WeChat, which is a social media platform that is used by Chinese speakers all over the world, particularly Chinese speaking diaspora communities, including in the U.S. And we came upon an example in which a Canadian member of parliament who is herself of ethnic Chinese descent had been communicating with her own constituents through her WeChat account, and she had posted both on her WeChat account and on her Facebook page some remarks that were sympathetic towards the pro-democracy movement in Hong Kong. And it was not until we contacted her office to point out that the messages that had been posted on WeChat, which is of course owned by a large Chinese company, had been censored. We were not able to ascertain who exactly had done that. She and her staff had not been aware of it.

But I think it is a very powerful example partly of the phenomenon that Chris is talking about, about spaces in democratic countries that are being exploited partly because they are not being watched very carefully. It is not the habit of elected members of bodies in democratic countries to worry about their communications with their own constituents being censored especially by entities in some other country. So I think there is much to be done in the realm of simply being vigilant to these threats.

We did some work earlier this year about threats to academic freedom outside of China but as a result of Chinese Government

pressure. Every single school that we spoke to certainly has honor codes and codes of conduct that speak to issues like cheating and plagiarism. We could not find a single one that had on its books any particular rules or instructions or guidelines to even look for examples of embassies threatening students or demanding that they share information with the nearest consulate.

So the problem now is not even so much about changing or updating the laws but being vigilant to these kinds of threats and taking steps to guard against them.

Senator MENENDEZ. Let me ask you, Mr. Walker, in this regard, the NED's report on sharp power, a document to how the Chinese Government is using the space provided by open societies to infiltrate and spread their propaganda. And the lack of reciprocity in U.S.-China relations is evident not only on trade issues but also when it comes to freedom of information, movement, and academic freedom.

Do you think that the Congress should explore further ways to enforce reciprocity in U.S.-China relations beyond trade? Does the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act and its implementation provide a model for other areas?

Mr. WALKER. So I think the Tibet issue is emblematic of the larger challenge. And I would commend everyone here to a report produced by the Hoover Institution and the Asia Society which focused on this very issue. And it observed that the Chinese authorities systematically deny American institutions access to Chinese society, whether we talk about educational exchange, cultural exchange, media engagement. We know this from both the harassment that our independent media faces, as well as our public broadcasters that are seeking to reach Chinese audiences. And at the same time, American counterpart institutions are not afforded the same opportunities.

I think this is not, in my view, a binary choice between simply denying China access here as a way of responding. I think we need to be creative, and we need to think about ways to publicly shine a light on the fact that China is so stingy with access to our institutions. I do not think we have done that enough. That is a first step. That does not cost too much to make a point that this is the way their system is operating. This is the way they treat their own people, denying them access to perfectly legitimate conversations about a range of issues, corruption, human rights, press freedom. They do not permit such freedoms there, and they do not permit it for their own people. They do not permit it for democratic institutions. I think the first step is to have a much more robust discussion to engage on this, and I think that would go a long way towards setting some wheels in motion.

Senator MENENDEZ. Finally, what should we do about U.S. companies that are involved in providing equipment and other forms of elements of the surveillance that China is using at home and promoting abroad? What should be our policy in that regard?

Dr. RICHARDSON. I think at least until such time as we can determine, or an independent credible entity can determine, that the political education camps in Xinjiang have been closed, I think an end-user ban on selling just about anything to any part of the Xinjiang government is appropriate.

Longer term, the UN has set out guidelines for business and human rights that require that each company have a due diligence strategy in place to assure that the company does not have policies or practices or is conducting business in ways that contribute to or enable human rights.

We have had a lot of conversations in the last couple of years with many different kinds of companies, and while most of them have some form of a corporate social responsibility policy, when you ask for an actual due diligence strategy, what steps is that company taking to see who it is selling to, what it is selling, most of them do not have it.

And it is worth pointing out that Thermo Fisher had all the right export licenses to sell what it did. We were never contesting that. But the problem with a lot of current export controls is that they have not kept up with what technology is in demand by Chinese authorities for abusive purposes. So while it is still illegal, as a result of the Tiananmen sanctions, to sell, for example, handcuffs to the Public Security Bureau, it is perfectly legal to sell DNA sequencers. So there are big gaps I think in the export controls that can and should be closed.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Gardner.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for holding this incredibly important hearing.

And thank you to the witnesses for your testimony today.

I was proud to work with you, Mr. Chairman, the ranking member, and many members of the committee on Senate Resolution 221 to remember the tragic events at Tiananmen Square 30 years ago, and I hope this resolution is something that we can pass out of the Senate as quickly as possible in recognition of that. And I urge all my colleagues to support it. We have to, as a Senate, as a country, continue to demand that the Communist Party of China account for this activity and respect the basic human rights of the Chinese people. We should empower people around the globe to know the truth of Tiananmen. Tiananmen was not a fake. It was not a fake moon landing. It was not a figment. It was real. People were killed by an authoritarian state. We must continue to share the truth and not to allow crime against humanity to be censored away.

Just a couple days ago, hundreds of Chinese dissident voices had their accounts suspended on Twitter. You can see the firewalls that have been put in place, the banishing of chat groups and discussion groups and websites that just seem to undergo routine maintenance right around the time of the 30th anniversary of Tiananmen Square.

As evident from the abuses in Xinjiang and Tibet, China's human rights record has only worsened in the last 30 years.

This is why the administration and Congress must now act to send a strong message to Beijing that the United States will not abide by such abuses. The Gardner-Markey Asia Reassurance Initiative, signed into law on December 31st, authorizes the administration to impose sanctions against any individual or entity that, quote, violates human rights or religious freedoms or engages in

censorship activities. We should take up this language immediately.

Section 409(a)(2) of ARIA also authorizes funds specifically to promote democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in the People's Republic of China.

I want to follow up on what Senator Menendez had talked about. The Wall Street Journal just reported not too long ago that many U.S. companies continue to do business in Xinjiang and perhaps are either wittingly or unwittingly complicit in the violations that are taking place, the violations of human rights that are taking place there.

But we have even more challenges because as Beijing encourages investment in Xinjiang to draw jobs there, there are subcontractors who are very much a part of the supply chain that are going to Western companies headquartered here that are participating in human rights violations.

We know that China is going to try to interfere in Taiwan's election coming up over the next several months.

We know that several pension funds in the United States are involved and make investments in one of the largest surveillance companies in China that is actively being used to violate human rights of Uyghurs and beyond.

We have authorized a lot of legislation, a lot of funding to help address this and meet this challenge.

I would love to hear from you. How do we make sure that we best tailor the funds that we have authorized to address these human rights violations and what we can do to support human rights defenders in China? I would just open that up to any of you.

Mr. XIAO. Senator, thank you for starting to say we should continue to tell the world about the truths of Tiananmen. We know that in China that truth has been repressed. And through my own work, I watch—my China Digital Times team—watch the Chinese Internet very closely. Over the past 8 years, every year, that by the time near June 4th and the last 3 weeks, there is always intensified suppression of the online content about Tiananmen. Chinese do speak out, but they are being suppressed.

I give you the examples, just examples. Over 264 words are blocked by the Sina Weibo search engine. By the way, Sina Weibo is like China's equal on Twitter, 600 million users. And also on the Wall Street index, it is the company here. Look at what kind of words are being blocked. Yes, of course, "64," "89," "8x8," "65–1," or "98," not only "June 4th" but "May 35th" to translate to June 4th. The Chinese are using those words to create conversations, but they are being stopped by the censor and deleted. There are more, "anniversary," "pay respect," "mourn," "candle," "public square." And how about this? Near the date to June 4th, there will be a ban of the word "today" or "that day." Why? Because once you search that "today," most of the discussion is about June 4th. The censors are not quick enough to delete them. So they just ban the search words. And "move" and "fire" and there is a Chinese character that looks like a tank that means point. So anybody say "point, point, point," that means "tank, tank, tank." That is the code word that has been banned.

So it is not that Chinese people are just born to be creative to speaking those things. It is because they have a motivation to speak, but the technology and the censorship and the repression is much harder to suppress those voices.

Now, a government like that cannot face the truth and accountability to Tiananmen, how can the world trust its myth of a peaceful rise. No. You treat the Chinese people this way when you are getting powerful. That oppression is not going to stop by the Chinese border. And this is what we are facing.

And you are asking how do we appropriate funds effectively. I will start from freedom of expression, free flow of information on the Internet. Yes, the Chinese state is powerful. I keep on saying that, but it is also fragile and insecure. Simply when you meet a Chinese leader, if they are so powerful, why do they not just take off, stop the Great Firewall just for 6 months? Try it. Let the information flow. Let the Chinese people access all the other content on the Internet for just 6 months. Why do you not take down the Great Firewall? The regime cannot afford it. It is that fragile, and that is why that is so brutal.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you for sharing that Tiananmen truth.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much.

Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you to each of our witnesses for being here today.

Last February, a number of us journeyed to the Munich Security Conference. One of the meetings that we had was with the prime minister of Greece. And one question that we had for him was about Greece's acceptance of support from China for the Port of Piraeus. And one of his responses was very memorable to that. He said I asked for help from the European Bank, and I was denied. I asked for help from the United States, and I was denied. The Chinese were willing to help me.

So can any of you speak to the ways in which China uses its economic leverage to spread its political system and whether we are doing enough in the United States to respond to that? Mr. Walker, do you want to begin?

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Senator.

I think that example is illustrative of a much larger challenge. You spoke in a strategic port context, but I think one of the things we have not touched on yet, which is so critical, is that China is investing enormous resources into people-to-people exchanges, into media, into educational initiatives. And there was a time when observers of these things, going back not that long ago, were quite dismissive of these issues. But now it is impossible to travel to Africa, to Latin America, to Central Europe and not to meet someone who has got this sort of opportunity. And what they say is, look, we are getting these opportunities. They are paying our way, and we are not getting these opportunities from our democratic partners, including the U.S.

And I think if we are serious about competing and meeting the values challenge, we have to be more deeply engaged across all of these areas. It is something we have to come to terms with.

Dr. RICHARDSON. Thanks, Senator, for the question.

I will just have one other example which is that it used to be in our universe a fairly easy thing to do to ask the European Union to speak with one voice about human rights issues in China. That has become exponentially more difficult in recent years largely as a result of Chinese financial developments in Southern Europe and the rise of institutions like the 16 plus 1. It is clearly there to try to split EU solidarity. I think we see that across not just blocs like the EU but even within individual governments that have historically been reasonably strong on these issues where people within those governments are clearly feeling the pressure between possibly losing out on a trade deal and taking a principled position. Often what we try to point out is that they can do both. Typically they can get away with doing both. But increasingly people within governments are convinced that they cannot and they have stopped trying. And that is a serious challenge for human rights advocacy.

Senator SHAHEEN. And so are we doing enough in the United States to counter that economic commitment that China is making to many of these countries?

Mr. WALKER. So I think fundamentally no. But it goes beyond, in my view, the economic question. I think there has been a misapprehension over the last generation that China was pursuing its interests solely on the basis of economics, and China's engagement in all the settings we look at comes without other features, including politics and values. This was another misapprehension. The values that come with China's engagement aims to get partners to set aside certain subjects, sideline civil society participation, and otherwise, in one way or another, to censor discussion on certain issues of importance to the CCP. And this is critically important because this censorship starts to grow roots, it becomes a larger problem.

Sophie alluded to this idea of divide and conquer that has emerged within the context of the 16 plus 1 in Central Europe which is now the 17 plus 1 because Greece has joined that set of countries. China uses this essentially as a bilateral initiative to operate with the 17 countries. This is happening both at the state level as well as within states where our universities and cultural institutions and media enterprises are finding is that they too can be picked off when they are engaging with China.

And so we need to cultivate the capacity that was not necessary even a decade ago, which is ways to create common standards and greater solidarity among our democratic institutions because if they are faced with the China party state on their own, they are going to have a really hard time.

Senator SHAHEEN. My next question I think is—and I only have a little bit of time left, but for you Mr. Xiao. Certainly we read reports in the United States about efforts on the part of Chinese who are trying to speak out against the repression that is going on in China. One of the things that we have seen reports on in the last decade or so has been an effort in China to respond to schools that are collapsing because of shoddy construction and children being killed, to the environmental concerns that the Chinese people have, to health issues that are there. Is the surveillance state also squashing those movements as well?

Mr. XIAO. If they are independent movements from the civil society and pressing the government and giving real pressure, then yes.

At the same time, the technology development in China also does services, also make the economy growing, also make people's lives smoother. And the government provides better services really as long as they do not challenge the one-party dictatorship. That is the part that they will put a foot on.

So on the issue of whether Chinese people see whether there is privacy that should be protected or whether the technologies should be implemented in a society, the problem is there is no public discussion. It would not allow it.

For example, the social credit system everybody is talking about. We know how Orwellian this can be. But right now, they have not quite gotten there. They have not connected to the central database facial recognition and all of these together yet, but it is on its way. But the idea has been started from even 2004, as early as that. As soon as they see they want to introduce it in the western America, for example, the credit system from financial transactions, immediately the government see they can expand that to the social area, and that becomes an entirely different issue. And then as China does many things, they have a general policy goal, but then they let the local governments do the experiment, pilots, to experiment how those things will play out, and they will pick what works or not and then expand.

So there is one county in 2004 in Jiangsu Province. That party secretary went ahead to have the social credit system within his county, put credits on everybody, on the ordinary people. If they have a petition to the government, that is a negative credit. If they do something, disobey the government regulation, that is a social credit. And that experiment was reported in China by the Chinese media, and it generated a huge controversy. And there was a lot of criticism and discussion at the time because the Chinese media at that time had a little room. And the public discussion is no different than what we see now. Hey, this is violating people's rights, and this is too much power for the government. Because at the time, it was a local government doing the experiment, the people would just take advantage and say, hey, it is just the local government that went too far.

But that discussion was being censored later on. For a couple years, it was there in official media, but then now it has disappeared. Nobody says negative things about the social credit system anymore. And that local government has continued experimenting on social credit. They may modify it. They may revise. But the experiment continues.

Now there are over 40 pilot projects and expanding, but the public discussions on those issues, zero. And that is what is happening in China.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Shaheen.

Senator Barrasso.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. John, just a second. Before you start, for those of you who see us coming and going, I want to explain that for a minute. The leadership recently scheduled four votes over the top

of this meeting. But because of the importance of this particular issue, we decided not to put the meeting off. We are going to continue on. So we are going to have to step out and vote from time to time, but various members will preside.

So, Senator Barrasso, I am going to go vote and Senator Romney you can chair, if you would.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This weeks marks the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. People around the world continue to remember. On June 4th, 1989, the Government of China sent tanks into Tiananmen Square to violently suppress and forcibly disperse peaceful demonstrators. The Chinese Government's infantry troops opened fire on students and on activists who were standing up for their fundamental freedoms. The horrible events resulted in the death and injury of hundreds of courageous Chinese citizens who were killed, tortured, and imprisoned due to their participation in a peaceful democracy movement in Tiananmen Square.

The Chinese authorities to this day continue to block and censor public discussions and events marking the anniversary of Tiananmen Square.

But despite those efforts, the world has not forgotten. You go to the front page of the Wall Street Journal today and here it is. Hong Kong remembers Tiananmen Square victims 30 years on. You go to the front page of the New York Times today with a picture of the crowds in the streets. A perilous anniversary. Thousands gather Tuesday in Hong Kong on the 30th anniversary of the crackdown of Tiananmen Square in Beijing. You go to the Financial Times, front page picture of the candles lit and held. Hong Kong pays tribute to Tiananmen Square.

So the world has not, nor will it ever forget. We will always remember. We have not forgotten the courage, the pain, the brutality of the Government of China that it imposed. In fact, those who suffered and died, I think, inspired future generations to proudly demand freedom and democracy across the globe, which is why I am happy that the three of you are here today speaking out.

The United States has a long record of championing liberty and freedom around the globe. We must continue to support individuals who are demanding freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion. And the harassment, detention, and imprisonment of Chinese citizens exercising their rights continues today, and we will continue to speak out.

So the question to the three of you is what is the most effective approach in your minds for us to engage the Government of China on human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Dr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Senator, both for the lovely remembrance and the question.

This is not a time in history when the Chinese Government is eager to have an honest conversation about human rights because it knows it does not have a good story to tell. And we are certainly aware that many governments, including the U.S., continue to try to have that conversation, but frankly, I think those discussions veer on the perverse if not the counterproductive because often the Chinese Government will take what is said to it by another government about human rights issues and twist it or misreport it. And

I think that can be very discouraging for people across the country to see if, in fact, they are able to know about it at all.

I think there is much to be said at this point in time for governments pursuing, for example, things like shadow human rights dialogues with independent activists. There are many people standing in Washington right now who would be incredible to have debates with about the trajectory for the rule of law in China, how to deal with certain kinds of social issues, how to deal with press freedom. And I think for governments to engage those people at a level and with a degree of recognition that might normally be reserved only for another government, I think, does a couple of different things. First, it empowers that community and gives it the recognition it deserves. And I think arguably most important, it sends a message to Beijing that those are not the only actors to have these conversations with.

Senator BARRASSO. Anyone else want to add?

Mr. XIAO. Yes. To answer the question of how to best empower the Chinese people who are fighting against the communist regime, let us learn from our enemy. President Xi Jinping this February had an important meeting to his cadre. It is about preventing potential risks, severe risks. And in that speech, some of it made public, he highlighted two things that he worried about as risks: one, Internet; two, youth. He is afraid that a new generation of Chinese youth are having different value systems that he would not like these people to have. He has his fears, but his fears should be our advantages.

His dream of a China dream, that empire dream, repressing the Chinese people and putting surveillance cameras everywhere that the Chinese Communist Party can last for another 100 years is a nightmare for the Chinese citizens. It is a nightmare for the entire world. Everybody values freedom. So to go against that is the right way.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ROMNEY [presiding]. Thank you.

Senator Markey.

Senator MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much.

Thank you all for your work. Mr. Xiao, we salute your personal commitment to stand up for human rights after the Tiananmen Square massacre. This anniversary really gets focused on in America maybe not as often as it should on these human rights abuses.

Ms. Richardson, we appreciate the reporting by Human Rights Watch on China's high tech surveillance efforts against the Uyghur and other communities. Last month, the New York Times described how Beijing is exporting its mass surveillance model to other governments. And a Rohingya human rights activist told the East Asia Subcommittee in April that it was worried that China could export this surveillance technology to Burma to further repress the Rohingya.

I wrote a letter to Secretary Pompeo asking him to clarify the administration's actions in terms of countering China's actions. As we wait for a response, I would like to ask you, what do you think the administration should do as China exports surveillance technology and surveillance training to other countries?

[The information referred to is located at the end of hearing.]

Dr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Senator, for the question.

I think at the absolute top of the to-do list is making sure that U.S. companies are not in any way engaged in or supporting any kind of censorship itself.

It may be of interest to you that I think about 2 weeks ago, it was reported that the City of Mandalay was actually contemplating partnering with a Chinese company to build a smart cities network in that particular area. That is a term that is used to describe a very comprehensive surveillance architecture in particular areas. Often it is presented as being in service of public safety, but it allows for enormous surveillance.

Senator MARKEY. Mr. Xiao, what would you want the United States to be doing?

Mr. XIAO. First of all, now we are starting to really need to have a very clear eye on what China's—those trade practices are, both domestically and internationally. It is just a political project. It is not just about free trade. Even they are under the disguise of private companies, but the state has what they call a strategic goal for national willingness or national will. And that strategic goal, grand strategic goal, will translate into subsidizing some of those strategically important private companies to go to the One Belt and One Road, to the other countries developing certain technologies, build up certain trade relations, and taking advantage of open society that the rule of law or the diversity of society and the free trade and all of that.

Senator MARKEY. We are kind of time limited. Thank you and thank you for the insight. We very strongly received your message here.

The New York Times suggested U.S. officials have been shelving sanctions against Chinese officials responsible for abuses against the Uyghurs out of concern that punitive measures will undermine trade talks. If true, what message does our inaction send not only to the estimated 3 million detainees around the world but also to the Chinese Government and international community about the commitment that we have to protecting human rights in China?

Dr. RICHARDSON. Senator Markey, I do not know how many more times we can say to the administration we are waiting to see Global Magnitsky sanctions in response to the gross human rights violations taking place in Xinjiang. I literally do not know what else the administration is waiting for.

Senator MARKEY. Mr. Walker.

Mr. WALKER. I do not know if I have anything to add to that.

Senator MARKEY. Mr. Xiao, what is the impact in China of the administration's policy?

Mr. XIAO. On what? I am sorry.

Senator MARKEY. What is the impact of this policy of the United States to kind of turn a blind eye.

Mr. XIAO. The trade war?

Senator MARKEY. Yes.

Mr. XIAO. It is, of course, a huge issue, and the authorities are also using it to fan the nationalism. And with the repression and the censorship on the Internet and the Chinese media, you can only hear one side of voices. My team has been really working hard to go through the deleted contents, the censored materials to listen

to the other voices that Chinese people looking at trade war. There are. There are liberal voices. There are more clear eyes. They are the ones who believe that letting the Chinese Government to follow those rules, to letting the foreign companies in to compete maybe is bad for the government, for the state enterprises, but it is good for people. It is good for consumers as a matter of fact.

Senator MARKEY. So thank you.

There is a Dickensian quality to all of these technologies. We invented them. Facial recognition, Internet, all of it. It can degrade. It can debase. It can enable. We as the inventor of these technologies cannot turn a blind eye to the degrading, to the debasing of cultures using our technologies. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator GARDNER [presiding]. Thank you, Senator Markey.

Senator Coons.

Senator COONS. Thank you. I would like to thank both Chairman Risch and Ranking Member Menendez for holding this important hearing today on the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre.

Mr. Xiao and Dr. Richardson, Mr. Walker, thank you for taking time to speak with us today about human rights and in particular about China's human rights record.

Senator Tillis and I as the co-chairs of the Senate Human Rights Caucus yesterday issued a statement honoring and remembering the Chinese students who raised their voices to call for freedom 30 years ago. Like most of us, I remember the horror I felt watching that brutal government crackdown, as well as the inspiration I felt of the lone, anonymous man standing courageously in the path of a column of tanks. His brave act is an important reminder to all of us that all humans struggle for a basic measure of dignity and freedom.

So it is deeply disappointing the Chinese Government refuses to acknowledge what happened 30 years ago. The fact the government is working diligently in China to erase all mention of what happened in Tiananmen Square makes it all the more important for those of us blessed with freedom and the right to speak freely to do so.

It is also a reminder that there are many in China who believe in the universal values of liberty and freedom. We have a disagreement not with the Chinese people but with the authoritarianism and the Chinese Communist Party. Tiananmen is an important reminder. Many Chinese still want and hope to work for a transparent and accountable government, and not all Chinese believe the propaganda they hear frequently. And we in the United States should find ways to lift up these brave voices.

I found particularly compelling Senator Menendez's opening in which he reminded us that it is the power of our example as a nation rather than the example of our power that has built a global network of values-based alliances. And whether it is in Sudan where protesters who were peaceful were mowed down by their army just in the last few days or whether it is 30 years ago on the square at Tiananmen, we need to stand up for human rights.

Dr. Richardson, if I might. You have had a number of my colleagues question you about the administration and their sort of in-

consistency. Your testimony underscored the importance of having Congress keep up the pressure on our administration to promote universal human rights and to not be selective. I applaud Secretary Pompeo for issuing a strong statement about Tiananmen Square, but remain concerned the administration's highly selective failing to speak out on human rights abuses in North Korea or in Saudi Arabia, for example.

How much of our credibility, Dr. Richardson, depends on being consistent as a nation when we speak on human rights, and what happens to our credibility when we are selective, when we only condemn human rights abuses in a few countries and, obviously and frequently, overlook them or ignore them in other countries?

Dr. RICHARDSON. Thanks, Senator, for the question.

I mean, clearly being consistent on human rights is essential. If you are selective about it, then you are leaving yourself vulnerable to criticisms that you only care about these issues in one place for political reasons rather than for principled ones. And it undermines the idea that human rights are indeed universal.

I think given the scope of my particular work where the U.S.'s absence recently has been most acutely felt has been at the United Nations Human Rights Council where the U.S.'s withdrawal has made it exponentially more difficult to advance any steps towards fact finding or accountability or a longer-term strategy——

Senator COONS. I will just say one of the more inspiring aspects of my opportunity to serve alongside Senator John McCain was hearing him articulate the way in which human rights is not just one of many interests, it is sort of the principal interest that the United States has to continue to consistently advance around the world. It is what defines us, our willingness to advocate for human rights even when it is not in our narrow or short-term economic or strategic interest.

Mr. Walker, I found your comments about the ways in which the technology of control and authoritarianism is now being exported by China globally to reinforce things I have seen particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. One of my concerns is that the ways in which the repression of the Uyghurs in Xinjiang is playing out, as you testified in detail, is now going to be replicated in other countries around the world fairly quickly.

One of my concerns is that we have dedicated ourselves to deploying the mechanics of elections to middle income and to lower income countries and that there is a concerning, now, possibility of real overlap between the biometric data capture in order to validate elections and the machinery of repression that you described.

How can we come up with standards of conduct for governments for this century in order to help their citizens have confidence that, by participating in what seems to be a public health screening or by participating in voting, they are not in fact handing over their own personally identifying information in a way that makes it easier to track and repress them?

Mr. WALKER. So it is a terrific question, Senator, and it is not an easy one to answer.

I would say it speaks to the need for democratic solidarity at a very basic level. I believe that all the democracies are in this together, and to the extent you have democracies in sub-Saharan Af-

rica or Latin America, which are now adopting the technologies from China but also the norms that come around them, it is terribly important that we understand this. It is not just the hardware. But when China comes in, they come with know-how and a certain set of standards and norms that in my view are anathema to democratic and human rights norms.

This is going to take a lot of work because in countries that have deep institutional roots and therefore, at least to some degree, more of an ability to respond to precisely the sort of issue you touched on, they will be better positioned, but not entirely positioned, as we learned in our own country with the vulnerabilities of our election system, which is true in all democracies now. I think this is going to speak to the need for new models of cooperation that would go across disciplines, and this is something that is terribly important. It cannot just be regional specialists. You need technologists. You need data scientists. You need people who understand privacy law and rules. And this is an area of work we are going to have to get better at in the coming period.

Senator COONS. I will say this. In visits to the Baltic States and to Eastern European states that have faced persistent and broad-scale interference in their media and communication systems and their electoral systems from Russia, there is a sharing among democracies of the means of resisting undue influence. I think we need to rapidly develop and deploy something comparable.

Your comment on Chinese training of journalists in Africa was a reminder that we are far into what is now a competition, not a clash of civilizations, Mr. Xiao, as you correctly pointed out, but a clash of competing visions of the role of the individual with regard to the state and society.

I am well over my time, and we have another vote called. Mr. Xiao, I will simply say I found your comments inspiring. I would love to give you a minute, if I might, to simply share with us—given that I am confident that young Chinese in mainland PRC continue to yearn for the same things as those a generation ago did in Tiananmen Square, what can we do here in the United States to help them?

Mr. XIAO. Before I answer that question, I want to respond—not respond—commenting on your——

Senator GARDNER. If you could be brief with your responses. I know we have got limited time and a vote coming on. Thank you.

Mr. XIAO. Sure, okay.

The United States should put many, many pro-democracy human rights programs, including the educational area, that have an agenda to engage the Chinese youth to a more open world. Today many young Chinese, even they come to the United States, they live in their Chinese social media world. They are still not so open to the life here and the political system and values here. So there is much more a program can do even to the Chinese students and overseas Chinese around the world studying in this country.

Senator GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Xiao.

Senator Kaine.

Senator KAINE. Thank you and thank you to the witnesses.

I know you have testified and there have been questions asked about the Uyghur situation, but I just want to return to it. The re-

porting that we have had for the last couple of years about this sort of mass suppression of Uyghurs in northwest China has just been chilling. The involvement of some American companies in helping provide China with technology has been very, very disturbing. And it strikes me that if Uyghurs were Christians and the Chinese Government was placing officials in the homes of Christians to monitor whether they engaged in religious observances or not, in the United States we would be absolutely taking to the streets about this. I think the fact that they are Muslims and the fact that the information that we get is a little bit harder to access for some has maybe suppressed the degree of outrage among the American public.

But I have worked on legislation with colleagues to get more reporting from the State Department, letters to the administration to ask them to do more.

What might we do that would better raise in the American public's conscience the just shocking violations of these people's basic human rights? I mean, a million-plus in concentration/reeducation camps. But again, the placing of officials in people's homes to monitor their religious observances is just unheard of. What can we do to spread the word more and generate global outrage about what is happening?

Mr. WALKER. So maybe just a brief observation. I think the reporting that has been done in papers like the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, which has really been phenomenal bringing to light in graphic detail the way in which this, as I called it, technology-animated police state has emerged in Xinjiang, is critically important.

I think the next step is for all of us to understand that what is happening there cannot be seen in a vacuum. What is happening there has been happening in other parts of China already and has informed development in the Uyghur region, and it is informing developments beyond China now in all the ways we have been discussing. And that is central to this, that this is now I think relevant for all of us who value privacy, who value human rights, that the surveillance mechanisms under which the Uyghurs are suffering is in the view of the leadership in Beijing are something that can be applied elsewhere. And that should really chill all of us.

Senator KAINE. I am going to ask a second question, and I am going to finish on time because I have to vote on this vote.

And the second question is this. So give us some advice. Here is something that we hear often from the administration if we raise human rights issues with respect to Saudi Arabia, for example. They will say, well, look, if we insist on tough human rights standards, they will just go to China or Russia because China and Russia will do all kinds of business with them without any human rights standards. That argument always makes me furious. I want to be true to our values. I do not care. I hate dictators of the right, left, or whatever, or the cults of personality, and I think we ought to stand for something different.

But how do you respond to that argument when somebody makes the argument that, hey, there are a lot of countries around the world that are perfectly willing to do all kinds of business with you

with no human rights expectations? Why should the U.S. still insist on high human rights standards?

Dr. RICHARDSON. Well, Senator Kaine, thanks for the question.

I have been at Human Rights Watch since 2006, and I have heard that argument from just about every government and every administration we have worked with since then in the U.S. and beyond. Nobody wants to be in the lead irking the Chinese. It sort of depends on who is in the hot seat that particular day.

I think governments are at a point now, though, where there is a much greater recognition of the threat the Chinese Government presents not just inside but outside China. And the question now is how to channel, I think, an agreement that there is not going to be convergence on established international norms to translate that into forceful policies that prioritize, among other things, human rights.

I would tweak your point of comparison a little bit. We found ourselves saying a lot if any other government in the world was locking up a million Muslims simply on the basis of their identity, let us imagine what the global response would look like and aspire to that.

Senator KAINE. You got a good point.

Dr. RICHARDSON. Very quickly, two things I can think of off the top of my head that this committee and others can do.

First of all, I think the Uyghur diaspora community across the U.S. is in desperate need of recognition, attention, support, and that ranges everywhere from trauma counseling to databases of missing family members, simply a recognition of their problems.

The other is really to reach out to your counterparts in other governments to find commonality. We cannot find many governments that disagree that the situation in Xinjiang is incredibly serious and problematic. It is very hard to get anybody to step up and make the first move in pushing for any sort of joint response that presumably would put greater pressure on China.

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Thank you. I appreciate those important questions. I am going to do a follow-up on that when I get a chance. But now, Senator Romney, you are up.

Senator ROMNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate the committee and the chairman for hosting this hearing. It is such an important topic. And I apologize just as a Member of the Senate for the fact that we keep on emptying the room up here, but there are votes going on. So we keep on having to run back and forth to vote. And the good news is that your responses are kept in the record and will be available to us and to people throughout the world that have interest in this topic, as I think many, many do.

I, for one, was inspired by the extraordinary bravery that was demonstrated 30 years ago at Tiananmen Square and was impressed with the courage of the individuals who stood and expressed their desire for freedom and recognized a sense of vitality and energy among the people in China to consider alternative paths. Clearly, the whole country was not looking to become a democracy in our form, but they were looking at alternatives.

My perception today is that that may no longer be the case, and I wanted to get your thought about what the mood and the percep-

tion is among the people in China. I say that because with the Uyghurs being incarcerated, with the effort to create civic scores for individuals, there is a sense that perhaps the spirit of Tiananmen has been crushed and that it is forgotten among the people of China.

I have a very close colleague who is a professor at a business school. He has several Chinese students that are in his business school class. Their classmates ask questions about freedom of expression, about the freedoms that they hope to have. And almost to a person, he says they defend the government. They suggest that it is totally appropriate to prevent the Internet to foment anger among the Chinese people, that they should be united. So he said it is extraordinary to see that there is very little discussion of alternatives among the Chinese people.

And so I turn to you who watch closely what is happening in the country and would ask for your perception as to whether or not there a dissent movement within the country. Is there an openness to change? Is there a desire for change, or has it been crushed by the government? Please.

Mr. XIAO. When social media just got into China around 2003–2004, and there were a few hundred, a few thousand Chinese blogs, I asked my student researchers to say, look, there is political discussion on Chinese blogs. He came back to say no. They only talk about money and business. Really?

After 10 years, by the time of 2009, 2010 and 2011 when social media became, like hundreds of millions of users, even the censors were working so hard, the online main voice opinion leaders are public intellectuals holding liberal political values. They have the maxim of the follower. But that leads to President Xi Jinping to have a full-scale crackdown on the Chinese Internet. So if the control is not strong enough, those voices not only coming out, not only dissent, but popular and massive.

Second, yes. We heard all of this about Tiananmen in the past. We forgot about Tiananmen. Some people say I changed my mind, and some people say I do not know anything about Tiananmen. But really? Do you really believe that? Why does the Chinese Government try so hard to suppress every single word about Tiananmen on the Internet? Do not say that the Chinese Government is making a mistake, wrong judgment on this. They know as soon as they can let that repression a little bit off, the memory do comes back. People do remember. People that are now remembering are not telling you they are remembering because of fear. And they rule by fear.

Senator ROMNEY. Any other comments? Yes.

Dr. RICHARDSON. Just a quick observation, Senator, that I think one piece of the current puzzle really is about people who leave China for more open environments precisely because they want to know about or become exposed to different political systems or have the opportunity to study in places that ensure academic freedom. And I think it is imperative for the United States and other democracies to think of those people in terms of solidarity. I think it is a complicated discussion now with concerns about national security or whether people are acting as agents on behalf of the Chinese Government.

But I really feel very strongly, especially given that this is a mistake the United States has made in the past to arbitrarily target people based on their citizenship or their ethnicity, to not repeat that mistake at this particular moment. There are people who come here precisely because they want the rights and the freedoms, and I think there are people who are feeling uncomfortably targeted. And it is imperative, in keeping the Tiananmen spirit alive—part of that lies here too in keeping this environment open for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Cruz.

Senator CRUZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to each of the witnesses for being here today.

This week marks a dark occasion in world history. 30 years ago, thousands of Chinese protesters gathered in Tiananmen Square demanding freedom and demanding democracy. The Chinese Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army slaughtered them. To this day, we still do not know exactly how many perished on that bloody dawn, as Nobel Peace Laureate Liu Xiaobo described it.

Today the CCP continues its war against the people of China and treats the rest of the world with similar disdain.

In my view, China poses the greatest long-term geopolitical threat to the United States. They have to be dealt with and dealt with with clear eyes. We cannot break off relations with Beijing, but we must begin to rethink the assumptions that have guided U.S. policies toward China since Tiananmen Square.

Let us start by addressing an uncomfortable reality here at home: the role of U.S. technology in China's oppression of its people.

Dr. Richardson, Human Rights Watch recently released a report where your colleagues reverse engineered a Chinese censorship app for smart phones. This app, called the Integrated Joint Operations Platform, is a primary tool of mass surveillance in Xinjiang. In this report, you referenced U.S.-based companies that contribute to the censorship apparatus in Xinjiang. This week, I plan to introduce legislation, the Tiananmen Act of 2019, to restrict China's access to such technology.

In your judgment, how widespread is U.S. technology in modern day Chinese surveillance and censorship?

Dr. RICHARDSON. Senator, thanks for that question. I wish I had a perfect answer to it. When we are done reverse engineering things, that is the next on our list of research projects.

But I think the fact that we do not have clarity about that and that it is not easy to get clarity about that is a problem in and of itself. And we have discussed this morning the need for due diligence strategies from all manner of companies, whether they are tech companies, whether they are infrastructure extractives, about what exactly the nature of their business is and how they can be sure they are not enabling or contributing to human rights violations.

Senator CRUZ. If you google "Tiananmen Square" in China, do you learn anything about the massacre, about the slaughter?

Mr. XIAO. You see all the tourists and the tourist pictures.

But remember this. The Chinese Government does not only suppress those discussions, they are also guiding and inciting and sort of channeling the public opinion to the ideological foundation that is supporting the regime. Only under the fear and under such technological support is that strategy is effective.

But now we have a game changer, which is the new layer of the artificial intelligence, big data technology. Yes, the U.S. is still ahead of China in artificial intelligence, in many areas, but not in our implementations of facial recognition, not in voice recognition, not in some of the other metrics of collecting because China has a large set of data. They are training their algorithms to make the application much more precise and comprehensive and fast. And this is the danger.

Senator CRUZ. Well, and many of us are concerned that U.S. companies are actively aiding and abetting China's suppression of its people and censorship of free speech. Indeed, days before the Tiananmen Square anniversary this year, reports began to circulate that Twitter had suspended the accounts of dozens of Chinese political dissidents. Twitter reportedly had run a sweep for bots.

How would you describe the Communist Party's efforts to coerce American companies into assisting the party censorship activities?

Mr. XIAO. On Twitter, I can say this. I do not know what has recently happened inside the Twitter company. I think they should tell the public by giving a report on that.

But I do know that the Chinese espionage and intelligence communities have developed the tools, the technologies to infiltrate Twitter, Facebook, gmails, to create fake accounts, create fake tweets, and to penetrate anybody's Twitter account or Gmail account or Facebook account—they have that technology.

Senator CRUZ. Mr. Chairman, if I may ask one more.

The CHAIRMAN. Please. Go ahead.

Senator CRUZ. Mr. Walker, you have warned about China's sharp power, and you have described the Chinese infiltration of American higher education institutions. This is an issue that concerns me greatly. Just this week, I introduced the Stop Higher Education Espionage and Theft Act, which gives the FBI and DHS new authorities to address the issues.

My question for you is what steps should universities take to insulate themselves from Chinese espionage, and what steps should the U.S. Government take to protect higher education from these threats?

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Senator. I think the question you have asked is related to the previous one as well, that this is a pattern of either inducing or cajoling or coercing open institutions, independent institutions in open societies to behave in ways they would not otherwise behave. And so you have alluded to some of these issues that are relevant to the stealing of technology and related things. But there is a full spectrum of challenges that have emerged that transcend those issues which can induce educators, students in our open societies to sidestep certain issues or to not talk about certain things that are not welcome by the Chinese authorities.

I think this is something that we need, as I have alluded to in previous writings and earlier today, to find ways to develop more durable democratic solidarity so that no single institution is exposed to the entreaties and the influence of the Chinese party state. That is the most effective way over time to have these institutions feel as though they can say no and essentially uphold liberal democratic standards.

Senator CRUZ. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Cruz.

In closing up, let me just talk about a couple things.

Number one, are all three of you aware of the Micron Technology case, the case that emanates from Idaho? Micron Technology is the second largest maker of DRAM memory chips in the world, and the Chinese have stolen their trade secrets and their technology and gone home and patented them in China and now are suing them in China over the use of their own technology. Are the three of you aware of that?

This is a poster child for what they are trying to accomplish with China 2025. You ought to get familiar with that. It is on the radar of the administration at the highest level and obviously here in Congress. We have taken it up with the Chinese ambassador here who is—he was born to be an ambassador. He is defending the undefendable.

Let me just close up with a point that I want to raise that we just barely touched on, and that is the fact that all of us on this committee and me maybe more so than others get touched by virtually every country in the world. We get the head of state, the number two, the commerce person, defense person, foreign secretary person. And when you talk about what China is doing in their country, first of all, you find that China is doing something in every country. I mean, they are ubiquitous around the world. But when you talk to them about what they are doing and you bring up the Sri Lanka case where the Sri Lankans lost the port—they took the money mistakenly and now have lost that port. They come back and say, well, the United States is not doing enough. China shows up with a bushel basket of money and the United States does not.

You sit and you listen to that. And these are people that desperately need money in some places like Sri Lanka. What is your response to that? What do you say to somebody like that? Ms. Richardson, I think you started. Why do you not touch on that for a minute, please?

Dr. RICHARDSON. I find myself saying often in interviews that we are all familiar with the phrase that nature abhors a vacuum. Nature has got nothing on the Chinese Communist Party, which will move into any space it is granted. And I think any government that is serious about defending human rights needs to get out and become very aware very quickly of all of the spaces that the Chinese Government and Communist Party have moved into and defend them vigorously now while they still can. Many of the key institutions that the United States relies on, that people in China who want democracy rely on, that people in Sri Lanka who want human rights rely on are under threat specifically as a result of the

Chinese Government pressure, and that should be a priority for the U.S.

The CHAIRMAN. Good answer. One of the problems is there is only so much money, and the Chinese seem to be able to pick out places where they can put money. They do not do it like we do. I mean, it has got nothing to do with human rights. It has got nothing to do with democracy. It has got nothing to do with the rectitude of the government that is in power. All they are looking for is the wedge to put the money into. And it puts us at a real disadvantage as we go out and do that. And that is particularly true in American—I hear this from American companies all the time. They go out and bid on a job or what have you. They do not have a Corrupt Foreign Influences Act (Foreign Corrupt Practices Act) in China, as you probably know. So our companies are at a disadvantage there when they try to compete.

Mr. XIAO. Not only about money. These countries, including their government, need to understand or recognize the danger of being so in debt or controlled, potentially being controlled and manipulated by the Chinese authoritarian regime. That is not a rules-based game. They have oppositional parties—many of them. They have a civil society. They have a relatively open media. Their people need to know this is not just about who provides more money. And Chinese—a lot of those investments are also eroding the democratic systems in those countries.

So if there is some kind of public education throughout those different countries China goes to, that public campaign to recognize what the Chinese Government is capable of doing to control the countries—in those countries for China's interest, then there is certain resistance that can help.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is appropriate.

I do not want to risk an international incident, so I am not going to mention countries. But there are some countries that are much more susceptible to this than other countries, and I think that is a good point.

Mr. Walker, do you want to close it up?

Mr. WALKER. So I think one way to think about this, Senator, is that it is about the money in certain respects but it is not only about the money. And for so many of the countries that we are talking about and as my colleagues have alluded to, they are now deeply engaged with China on a wide range of levels in many spheres, and it is not just about the infrastructure investment. It slowly becomes about the way their media and technology spheres develop. It is about the degree to which perhaps weak political opposition can continue to sustain itself. It is about the way in which civil society can operate, for example, in countries in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America.

And I would put it this way. I do not think the United States and its partners have the luxury of not doing anything because China is projecting and exerting its values in a vigorous and purposeful way. To the extent we are not vigorously pursuing our own values and helping our partners defend them in solidarity, it will be a losing proposition, and we are going to find ourselves 5 years from now, say, if we do about what we are doing now, in a very unpleasant position.

The CHAIRMAN. Well said.

Thank you all for being here today.

For the record, I will state that I am going to keep the record open until close of business on Friday. Members may have questions to submit. If you would be so kind as to respond to those at your earliest convenience, we would greatly appreciate it.

This has been a very good hearing. I think that it is going to be watched around the world probably, and I think it has underscored the challenges that we are facing.

Thank you again so much for being here.

The committee will be adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF MR. XIAO QIANG TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR TIANANMEN

To this day the Chinese government refuses to let the survivors of the Tiananmen massacre and their families commemorate and honor their dead and continues to deny them justice in a concerted effort to wipe June 4 from memory.

On May 20th, police ordered 82-year old Ding Zilin whose son Jiang Jielian was killed in the June 4 massacre to leave her home in Beijing and travel more than 1,100km to her hometown, a common tactic used against activists to silence them during politically sensitive periods.

Ding Zilin is a founding member of Tiananmen Mothers, a group of families of victims who are seeking an investigation into the June 4th bloodshed. I ask Unanimous Consent to submit for the Record a letter from the Tiananmen Mothers to China's leaders calling for accountability and justice. Their own government may seek to silence them, but we can help them to have a voice.

SUGGESTED READING FOR THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TIANANMEN CRACKDOWN SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

"Mourning Our Families and Compatriots Killed in the June Fourth Massacre: A Letter to China's Leaders" By the Tiananmen Mothers

https://hrichina.org/en/press-work/press-release/mourning-our-families-and-compatriots-killed-june-fourth-massacre-letter

Charter 8 December 17, 2017

https://www.cecc.gov/resources/legal-provisions/charter-08-chinese-and-english-text

"I Have No Enemies: My Final Statement" By Liu Xiaobo

https://china.usc.edu/liu-xiaobo-i-have-no-enemies-my-final-statement-december-23-2009

Question. How can we help ensure accountability and justice for the Tiananmen Mothers and others who lost family and friends thirty years ago?

Answer. Maybe honoring Professor Ding Zilin in some more prominent level from the U.S. Congress.

Question. What additional measures can we take to assure June 4 will not be erased from history?

Answer. Publicly raise this issue with China at least every anniversary.

DIGITAL SURVEILLANCE

Thirty years ago, the world was shocked when the Chinese Communist Party used tanks and the full force of the military to quash the pro-democracy movement. Today, they don't need to send in tanks. In Xinjiang they've amassed a massive surveillance state that looks like it came out of a George Orwell novel. Where people

live in fear and under constant surveillance. Where technology allows the Chinese government to collect data and aggregate people if they are so-called "threats" to the Party, permitting the government to arbitrarily detain more than a million Uyghurs in concentration camps.

Question. What do we know about the Chinese government's use of surveillance technology to suppress human rights in Xinjiang and elsewhere in China?

Answer. Pervasive surveillance in Xinjian both complements and fuels the ongoing mass detentions in the region.

This issue is widely reported by the media by now, such as:

https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/04/04/world/asia/xinjiang-china-surveillance-prison.html

https://logicmag.io/07-ghost-world/

https://www.hrw.org/video-photos/interactive/2019/05/02/china-how-mass-surveillance-works-xinjiang

Question. What role have U.S. companies played in providing China with such technology?

Answer. New Jersey-based Infinova has directly provided surveillance systems to Chinese authorities in Xinjiang and elsewhere; others may have done the same. In other cases, U.S. companies support Chinese surveillance firms by importing their products for sale.

U.S. companies including Intel, Nvidia, Seagate, and Western Digital supply essential components to Chinese tech firms such as Hikvision and Dahua.

https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/03/19/962492-orwell-china-socialcredit-surveillance/

Research into underlying AI technologies is highly internationalized. Oxford University's Jeffrey Ding, for example, recently wrote that "the seeds of China's AI development are rooted in Microsoft Research Asia (MSRA) in Beijing [. . . .] At the same time, MSRA has been essential for Microsoft." (The linked piece, describing five key points Ding gleaned from his first year of compiling his ChinAI email newsletter, is highly recommended.) Some news reports have criticized companies and institutions over research partnerships involving military-linked institutions in China, but the actual risk arising from these has been disputed by some experts, including Ding. The issue is further complicated by widespread potential for dual use of AI technologies.

Any U.S. company operating in China could be forced to help surveil its users there under recent security legislation. Notable recent examples include Apple's transfer of local user data to servers operated in partnership with a government-owned Chinese partner, and Google's planned design for its apparently aborted "Project Dragonfly" Chinese search service, which would have logged search queries and tied them to users' verified identities. Twitter has also been the center of recent anxieties following a wave of account suspensions affecting Chinese users shortly before the recent Tiananmen anniversary on June 4. (The company has said that these were accidental.)

Numerous recent reports have also highlighted American investments in Chinese surveillance firms.

https://www.ft.com/content/36b4cb42-50f3-11e9-b401-8d9ef1626294

https://www.economist.com/business/2019/04/06/google-and-the-ethics-of-business-in-china

https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/ryanmac/us-money-funding-facial-recognition-sensetime-megvii

U.S. banks like Morgan Stanley and Goldman Sachs are also supporting Chinese tech companies more generally with large loans. Although the firms in question like Bytedance are not directly involved in abuses in Xinjiang, they, like any Chinese company in their position, would be required to cooperate with censorship and surveillance of users.

Question. What role does Congress have in prohibiting these U.S. companies from doing business with Chinese security services?

Answer. The financial and technological stakes are high enough to make restraint or self-regulation by industry unreliable at best. Any controls imposed by the executive branch might be traded away to serve other ends, given the current administration's evident lack of concern for underlying rights issues. Congress therefore seems the most likely source of robust, durable restrictions.

Question. Should we require the State Department to publish a list of problematic Chinese companies who are aiding in the government's crackdown on human rights?

Answer. "Aiding in the government's crackdown of human rights" might be too broad: any Chinese tech company could be forced to censor content or provide details of users' activity on their platforms, for example. Narrower criteria such as direct provision of surveillance hardware or software to authorities in Xinjiang might both be more practical and provide a basis for more focused, effective policy. As with the dual-use AI research problem noted above, the situation is complicated by the entanglement of political repression with legitimate law enforcement and urban management, which could make broader conditions for inclusion such as provision of surveillance systems to authorities across China impractical.

In addition, the corporate landscape is fluid and opaque. With regard to Xinjiang, for example, facial recognition firm Megvii was reportedly not involved in the surveillance app examined by Human Rights Watch, despite the presence of its own code among that obtained by HRW. Sensetime sold off its share in a Xinjiang-based joint venture in April, but the move has been described as "only symbolic" and "a fig leaf." It would be a considerable challenge to compile a list without false positives that would damage its credibility and loopholes that would undermine its effectiveness.

Question. What additional steps can the U.S. government take to ensure that technology does not fall into the wrong hands or shape how China uses such forms of digital authoritarianism?

Answer. One important step would be to lead by example. American surveillance technologies are widely used in dubious ways at home, and widely sold to dubious regimes abroad. Particularly in the current climate, this undermines the credibility of concerns about or measures against Chinese surveillance, both at home and abroad. In addition, the sale of U.S. surveillance technology to third countries increases its exposure to possible Chinese acquisition and reverse-engineering.

Another crucial step will be provide FBI and other intelligence agencies more resources and high priority to gather intelligence on such harmful technology transfer, and more responsive to human rights organizations' credit reports on those issues.

CIVIL SOCIETY

It comes as no surprise that the Chinese government harasses activists and dissidents who wish to commemorate the June 4 anniversary. The Chinese government also uses vague national security legislation to ensure that civil society doesn't work on sensitive topics such as human rights and democracy, closing the space for any work to be done inside the country.

Question. How can we help promote and partner with civil society inside of China?

Answer. The Chinese government has stepped up severely on cracking down civili society in China in the past 6 years. One thing the U.S. government can do is put some funding to support programs aiming at hundreds of thousands of Chinese students who are studying outside of China, especially in America.

FALUN GONG

While we have rightfully been focused on the plight of the Uyghurs in recent months, the Falun Gong continue to experience systematic persecution at the hands of the Chinese government.

Question. In your view, how should this administration be addressing the human rights violations perpetrated against the Falun Gong?

Answer. The persecution on Falun Gong should be always included in the list of human rights violations, particularly on religious persecutions and being raised to Chinese government by US government in all appropriate occasions.

Question. Should we be encouraging the administration to consider using Global Magnitsky sanctions against those individuals who are credibly alleged to be responsible for the persecution of the Falun Gong?

Answer. Yes, definitely.

GREAT FIREWALL

For China to change for the better it is clear that it will be up to the Chinese people to better understand and challenge their government's human rights practices. For example, the Tibetan people have resisted peacefully to the Chinese gov-

ernment oppression for decades. Yet all information about China's repression of the Tibetans is censored by the Communist Party.

Question. Do you think the Chinese people appreciate the increasing discrimination suffered by Tibetans?

Answer. In general, not much. Chinese people are by large unaware of the increasing discrimination suffered by Tibetans. Not only lack of related information (they are all suppressed by Chinese censors) , but also on going propaganda about how Tibetans are "enjoying" their "good life" Brough by Han Chinese also enhanced this ignorance and prejudice about Tibetans among Chinese people. Fundamentally, this is due to the information censorship and lack of public debate on those issues. Chinese people are not aware.

Question. How does the "Great Firewall" function to suppress the free-flow of information in China? What can be done to alter that situation?

Answer. "Great Firewall" is a computational algorithms and infrastructure which monitoring, filtering and blocking unwanted websites outside of China from Chinese internet users. It can be circumvented by anti-blocking technology—commonly knows as Proxy or VPN-like technology - and there are large number of Chinese users (potentially tens of millions) are willing to use such technology to circumvent the Great Firewall. Therefore, if US government increase amount of funding in annual Internet freedom bill, and year-marked some amount on China, it will guarantee effective institutional efforts to develop anti-blocking technology to keep up in this arms-race. The current funding and China portion is simply not adequate. This not to completely undermine the Great Firewall, of which Chinese government invested in billions of dollars to keep it up hand, but still can effectively mitigate its impact and serve millions, potentially tens of millions of Chinese users freer flow of information.

RESPONSES OF MR. CHRISTOPHER WALKER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR TIANANMEN SQUARE

Question. How can we help ensure accountability and justice for the Tiananmen Mothers and others who lost family and friends thirty years ago? What additional measures can we take to assure June 4 will not be erased from history?

Answer. A crucial aspect of ensuring accountability and justice for the Tiananmen Mothers and others who lost family and friends 30 years ago is to make certain, first and foremost, that the Chinese authorities are not successful in their efforts to erase the massacre from collective memory. In this regard, the stakes are growing as Beijing improves its capabilities in modernizing censorship. As scholar Glenn Tiffert's work has shown, the CCP is actively working to censor the digitized archives of Chinese periodicals, books, documentary collections, and other historical sources. American universities, as well as universities in other free societies, have a vital role to play in cataloging and resisting this censorship to preserve the historical record of this period for Chinese and foreign scholars. More fundamentally, given the concerted effort of the Chinse authorities to suppress independent information it is important to promote the consistent flow of information about the Tiananmen massacre within, as well as outside of, China.

DIGITAL SURVEILLANCE

Thirty years ago, the world was shocked when the Chinese Communist Party used tanks and the full force of the military to quash the pro-democracy movement. Today, they don't need to send in tanks. In Xinjiang they've amassed a massive surveillance state that looks like it came out of a George Orwell novel. Where people live in fear and under constant surveillance. Where technology allows the Chinese government to collect data and aggregate people if they are so-called "threats" to the Party, permitting the government to arbitrarily detain more than a million Uyghurs in concentration camps.

Question. What do we know about the Chinese government's use of surveillance technology to suppress human rights in Xinjiang and elsewhere in China?

Answer. The CCP has created a massive, centralized surveillance system within the Uyghur region, using biometric data, a network of cameras, and facial recognition AI to monitor, intimidate, and suppress the Uyghur and other minority populations. Authorities in the region have access to detailed information about the peo-

ple they oversee, from their blood type to their cell phone and electricity usage, information that police today can access in real time, or close to it. This information is then used to harass and often detain people for legal activities that the government may deem suspicious. Apart from enabling the imprisonment of millions of members of ethnic minorities in reeducation camps, this pervasive surveillance also creates an atmosphere of fear, where people assume that the authorities are constantly watching, in both private and public spaces, both online and offline. There is reason to believe that the tech-animated surveillance that the CCP has put into place in the Uyghur region is part of a wider, iterative process of high-tech surveillance development that has nationwide implications.

Question. What role have U.S. companies played in providing China with such technology?

Answer. [No response received]

Question. What role does Congress have in prohibiting these U.S. companies from doing business with Chinese security services?

Answer. [No response received]

Question. Should we require the State Department to publish a list of problematic Chinese companies who are aiding in the government's crackdown of human rights?

Answer. [No response received]

Question. What additional steps can the U.S. government take to ensure that technology does not fall into the wrong hands or shape how China uses such forms of digital authoritarianism?

Answer. [No response received]

CIVIL SOCIETY

It comes as no surprise that the Chinese government harasses activists and dissidents who wish to commemorate the June 4 anniversary. The Chinese government also uses vague national security legislation to ensure that civil society doesn't work on sensitive topics such as human rights and democracy, closing the space for any work to be done inside the country.

Question. How can we help promote and partner with civil society inside of China?

Answer. As I noted in my written statement, at a fundamental level, any response to this global challenge to democracy presented by China's rise also needs to consider the essential importance of democratic development in China itself. In this regard, it is essential that the democracies continue to support people and organizations that can help enhance transparency, accountability, and human rights within China.

FALUN GONG

While we have rightfully been focused on the plight of the Uyghurs in recent months, the Falun Gong continue to experience systematic persecution at the hands of the Chinese government.

Question. In your view, how should this administration be addressing the human rights violations perpetrated against the Falun Gong?

Answer. [No response received]

Question. Should we be encouraging the administration to consider using Global Magnitsky sanctions against those individuals who are credibly alleged to be responsible for the persecution of the Falun Gong?

Answer. [No response received]

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY SENATOR MARKEY:
TTER TO SECRETARY POMPEO

EDWARD J. MARKEY
MASSACHUSETTS

COMMITTEES:
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
FOREIGN RELATIONS
RANKING MEMBER:
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY
COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION
RANKING MEMBER:
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY
SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP
CHAIRMAN:
U.S. SENATE CLIMATE CHANGE TASK FORCE

United States Senate

SUITE SD-255
DIRKSEN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2107
202-224-2742

975 JFK FEDERAL BUILDING
15 NEW SUDBURY STREET
BOSTON, MA 02203
617-565-8519

222 MILLIKEN BOULEVARD, SUITE 312
FALL RIVER, MA 02721
508-677-0523

1550 MAIN STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SPRINGFIELD, MA 01103
413-785-4610

June 5, 2019

The Honorable Michael R. Pompeo
Secretary of State
United States Department of State
2201 C Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Pompeo,

We write to request that the State Department explain its strategy for countering China's export of surveillance technologies and associated practices to foreign governments whose leaders look not with revulsion but with envy at China's authoritarian control at home.

On April 24, 2019, the *New York Times* highlighted Ecuador to illustrate how other governments are now applying and abusing "technology built for China's political system."[1] Ecuador is one of eighteen countries that the independent watchdog Freedom House has identified as using Chinese-made intelligent monitoring systems and facial recognition technology.[2] Ecuador's system consists of 4,300 high-powered cameras that send footage to 16 monitoring centers employing more than 3,000 police officers, who manually review collected footage. The footage is also sent to a domestic intelligence agency that has long intimidated and attacked political opponents.[3] China has provided not only the technology but also the training necessary for Ecuadorean officials to use the system in a manner at odds with democratic values and internationally guaranteed rights to privacy and freedom of movement.[4]

Additionally, a May 1, 2019 report by Human Rights Watch illustrated that the most intrusive of China's exports may be yet to come. Human Rights Watch reverse engineered a mobile application used by Chinese authorities involved in the repression of Uighur and Central Asian minorities in Xinjiang. This enabled Humans Rights Watch to identify the type of information that feeds into one of China's main mass surveillance systems, called the Integrated Joint

[1] Paul Mozur, Jonah M. Kessel, and Melissa Chan, *Made in China, Exported to the World: The Surveillance State*, N.Y. Times (April 24, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/24/technology/ecuador-surveillance-cameras-police-government.html.
[2] Adrian Shahbaz, *Freedom on the Net 2018: The Rise of Digital Authoritarianism* (Oct. 2018), https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/FOTN_2018_Final.pdf.
[3] Paul Mozur, Jonah M. Kessel, and Melissa Chan, *Made in China, Exported to the World: The Surveillance State*, N.Y. Times (April 24, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/24/technology/ecuador-surveillance-cameras-police-government.html.
[4] *Id.*

Operations Platform (IJOP).[5] The system monitors and flags individuals engaged in supposedly suspicious activities such as not socializing with neighbors, avoiding use of the front door, and employing encrypted communication tools (i.e., WhatsApp and Viber). Among other functions, the system scores government officials on their performance in carrying out repressive orders from higher-ranking officials, serving as a tool to control government employees. Human Rights Watch assesses that the Chinese government believes that its "dystopian projects are bearing fruit, as these mass surveillance systems have woven an ever-tightening net around people across the country."[6]

The spread of sophisticated and authoritarian mass surveillance within China in itself is problematic, but its export to other governments poses a worldwide threat of repression. On May 19, 2019, multiple Sri Lankan news sources reported that China will provide high-tech surveillance equipment along with trainers to help Sri Lanka trace individuals who are "promoting terrorism" and "spreading false information."[7] At an April 9, 2019 hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, Tun Khin of the Burmese Rohingya Organization UK noted to Senator Markey his fear that China could export to Burma the same advanced technologies that China currently uses to oppress the Uighur community.[8]

It is clear that China is enabling authoritarianism even where foreign leaders are uninspired by the ideology of the Chinese Communist Party. Beijing is actively exporting methods of control that any authoritarian can implement, eroding freedom in every recipient country and undermining an international order built on open societies. While the United States is rightfully examining China's potential exploitation of telecommunications infrastructure through the activities of Huawei and other Chinese firms, such a focus overlooks the challenges posed by China's exports of capabilities and techniques explicitly aimed at video, internet, and financial surveillance.

To better understand the State Department's strategy for countering China's exports of authoritarian surveillance technologies and practices, we respectfully request a written response to the following questions no later than June 26, 2019:

1) What tools is the State Department using to push back against the spread of China's surveillance practices?

---

[5] Maya Wang, *China's Algorithm of Repression*, Human Rights Watch (May 1, 2019), https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/05/01/chinas-algorithms-repression/reverse-engineering-xinjiang-police-mass-surveillance.

[6] *Id.*

[7] *Sri Lanka caught in the big power conflicts*, The Sunday Times (May 19, 2019), http://www.sundaytimes.lk/190519/columns/sri-lanka-caught-in-the-big-power-conflicts-349932.html. See also Santhush Fernando, *China-style Mass Online Surveillance*, The Morning (May 19, 2019), http://www.themorning.lk/china-styled-mass-online-surveillance/.

[8] ARIA in Action, Part 1: Human Rights, Democracy, and the Rule of Law: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy of the S. Comm. On Foreign Relations, 116th Cong. (2019) (statement of Mr. Tun Khin).

(a) Do you regularly raise this topic at high levels when meeting with foreign counterparts? If so, please provide documentation to support. If not, why not?

(b) Is the topic regularly on the agenda for bilateral discussions? If so, please provide documentation to support. If not, why not?

2) What metrics does the State Department use to evaluate the effectiveness of its efforts to counter the spread of Chinese surveillance tactics?

3) To what degree is the Bureau of Democracy, Rights, and Labor (DRL) focused on the spread of Chinese surveillance tactics? Is DRL helping civil society to understand the implications of mass surveillance and to push back against such technology where it is abused?

4) Given China's efforts to propagandize mass surveillance as a benign tool for maintaining order, how does the Global Engagement Center (GEC) prioritize this issue? What metrics does GEC use to evaluate the effectiveness of any efforts?

5) The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (ARIA) highlights China's "invasive and omnipresent surveillance." How is the State Department following through on Section 404 of that legislation, which calls for appropriate personnel and resources to advance United States democracy, human rights, labor, anti-corruption, and good governance policy interests in the Indo-Pacific region (notwithstanding the fact that this is a global issue)?

6) How do the administration's proposed cuts in the FY 2020 budget request help the United States address this challenge? Please address, in particular, funding cuts for civil society organizations that promote human rights and the rule of law as well as cuts to public diplomacy and exchange programs that advance democracy and good governance.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue. Should you have any questions about this request, please contact Omar Bashir of my staff at 202-224-2742.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Markey

Edward J. Markey
United States Senator

○