

and involvement of everyone in the family, and Grange members have an equal voice and an equal vote at meetings regardless of their age, sex or position within the organization.

Whereas the Grange's activities with regard to legislative action sets it apart from all other fraternities, service and family organizations, and since its earliest years, the Grange has included legislative involvement—from a strictly non-partisan position—as one of its distinctive characteristics such that all policies which the Grange fights for on the local, state and national levels are decided upon by the grass-roots membership.

Whereas the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry, the National Grange, was founded in 1867, through the vision of Oliver Hudson Kelley, who recognized that farmers, because of their independent and scattered nature, needed representation and a voice at all levels of government as well as a means of coordinating social interaction, which is especially important to rural residents.

Whereas the Grange has been responsible for promoting cooperatives which had the potential of helping farmers economically; undertaken efforts to ensure that the voice of the farming community is heard by lawmakers at the local, state and national level which led to the Extension Service, Rural Free Delivery, and the Farm Credit System, among other nationally significant benefits; and has served rural America in many other ways such as championing the education of rural residents, which led to dramatic improvements in rural schools.

Be it therefore resolved the Grange should receive special recognition and thanks for its many activities, programs and functions benefitting its members, rural America and the nation as a whole;

Be it further resolved that on this day, June 23, 1997, this resolution will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the public record recognizing the civic achievements of the Grange and its membership and extending the gratitude and thanks of the nation.

## VALUABLE INSIGHT ON THE MFN ISSUE

**HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 23, 1997*

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit the following into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first is an excellent response from the Reverend Daniel Su on extending most-favored-nation trade status to China. Rev. Daniel Su, a Chinese Christian, has lived in China and has valuable insight on the MFN issue. As Reverend Su states in his letter, "To sacrifice ourselves for the sake of principles is heroic, but to sacrifice other people for our principles is insensitive." With this letter, Reverend Su is responding to an open letter on China's persecution of Christians written by Gary Bauer, president of Family Research Council. I am submitting a letter from Mr. Bauer also. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A RESPONSE TO THE "OPEN LETTER" BY G. BAUER AND OTHERS

(By Daniel B. Su)

I. AN OVERALL RESPONSE:

This Open Letter as well as other anti-MFN efforts are valuable in that they remind us of the important principles such as freedom and human dignity. They enhance the public awareness of China's human rights situation thus creating more pressure on Beijing and making the message of the MFN debate even stronger. It also gives the US government greater bargaining power with Beijing. NGOs should continue to speak out; the louder, the better.

However the Letter miscalculates the overall impact if the MFN should be revoked. Revocation would create more problems than what it may solve. It defies all logics that Beijing government would turn around and improve its human rights situation if it were humiliated with its loss of MFN.

The Letter scores high in preaching moral principals, but we need to make one important distinction: To sacrifice ourselves for the sake of principles is heroic, but to sacrifice other people for our principles is insensitive—to say the least.

We all deplore the gross human rights violation in China. But the Letter does not want to address the most important question in this serious debate: Will revoking China's MFN improve or worsen its human rights situation and religious freedom? By avoiding this serious question and relying more on emotional appeal, the Letter becomes less serious and relevant.

While the views of those who signed the Letter should be respected, we also notice that many other well respected Christian leaders' names are not on it. And that in itself is a reflection of the healthy diversity among Christian leaders' opinions over the MFN issue.

## II. SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO THE LETTERS' ARGUMENTS (PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBERS IN BRACKETS):

[p. 1, par.2]: We may agree that many Christian leaders may not think it appropriate to voice their pro-MFN views in public, but let's not underestimate the integrity of those who do speak out. Missions leaders understand China better; that is why they tend to favor renewing China's MFN.

[p. 1, par.3]: We agree that the US should and could have engaged China in a more effective way to improve its human rights; relying on trade and other current policies is not enough. On the other hand, our ideals need to be tempered with a sense of realism. The US leverage is limited; contrary to our wishes, the US government is not able to solve all the problems of the world. After all, we live in a fallen world where all countries have fallen short of the higher standards.

[p. 1, par.4]: We should continue to be the voice for the voiceless in China despite Beijing's threats, for the persecuted find strength and consolation in knowing that we care and are speaking up for them. However, on the abortion issue, unless the US government first outlaws abortion on its own land, it has no moral authority to teach other nations how to do abortion. (The NGOs are better qualified to do the job.) The US and China differ only in how abortion is achieved, but in both cases does it not end up depriving the baby's inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Let's pray for the day when the US regains its moral ground to address such issues.

[p. 1, par.5]: A serious warning should be given to those who try to exploit the plight

of Chinese Christians and make them look like the archenemy of the Beijing government. What's at stake here is the cause of Christ and

[p. 1, par.5]: A serious warning should be given to those who try to exploit the plight of Chinese Christians and make them look like the archenemy of the Beijing government. What's at stake here is the cause of Christ and the lives of many Chinese Christians! China's Christians are simple religious people who do not have a political agenda, and they despise those who try to put a political label on them. There is indeed a serious danger that the arguments made by the Letter may be sized upon by those China bashers and new hawks whose only interest is to make an enemy out of China—now that the Soviet enemy is no more—and to demand sacrifices from American people.

[p.2, par.1] With the fall of communism, it may well be the panic reaction of some elite intellectuals to suggest "strangling the baby [the church] while it is still in the manger," yet we still need to be truthful enough to acknowledge that the current Beijing government policy is only to control and contain the growing church, thus allowing for some limited freedom.

[p.2, par.2] NGOs should be commended for speaking up for the Chinese persecuted.

[p.2, par.3] Of course, things can be much worse in China—anyone who understands China knows that. Christian gatherings of worship could have been forced to close totally; those political dissidents in jail today could have been executed; dissidents could have been sentenced to 15 years instead of 5; families of the prisoners could have faced much more harassment and discrimination.

[p.2, par.4] While we protest against the inhumane treatment of Pastor Wong, we can agree that this is an exceptional case rather than the rule. We all know that technology cuts both ways. While the Chinese police become better equipped, Chinese Christians and political dissidents also benefit from having access to computers, copying and fax machines, Internet, and so on, making it difficult for police to control people.

[p.2, par.5] It sent a wrong message to Beijing and Chinese people when President Clinton declared to delink human rights concerns from the MFN. However, revoking China's MFN can only backfire.

[p.3, par.1] Let's quit making the US the model to all nations and instead take an honest look at reality. The US is part of the fallen world where we see rampant abortions, racial tension and violent crimes, partisan spirit and demagoguery in politics, divisions and scandals within the church, consumerism and hedonism in society, and alarming moral decay in culture. Christian leaders should know better than to display the US as a model. Let's make a distinction between the United States and Christian faith. The early America did share biblical aspirations for justice, equality, and human dignity, but such aspirations are Christian, not American. Though America's sins, past and present, in no way justify Beijing's abuse of power, they do help keep us humble, don't they?

## III. CONCLUSION

China today is in a critical stage. It can either evolve into a more open and democratic nation or an enemy to the US. If the Soviet Union could evolve into a democracy, why can't China? Let's not be like the pessimists who say things won't change; instead, let's work to turn possibilities into realities. What's crucially needed today is for American leaders to unite in formulating a con-

sistent, comprehensive China policy that helps China get on the right track without turning it into an enemy. That is a moral obligation the leaders owe to America and America's children.

[Rev. Daniel B. Su is from China and now works in the US as the assistant to the president, China Outreach Ministries, Inc., Fairfax, Virginia]

#### OPEN LETTER ON CHINA'S PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Recently, letters have circulated on Capitol Hill from some groups and leaders involved in missions in China. These letters urge Members not to vote to revoke China's Most-Favored Nation (MFN) trade status. They cite potential dangers to the missions if the U.S. responds to Beijing's terrible record on human rights, national security and workers' rights.

There are points of agreement between us and those missions organizations. We can agree, for example, to put no individual at risk of retaliation. We should take great care in dealing with a regime that has demonstrated its willingness to settle disagreements with tanks and with bullets in the back of the head. We can also agree that those Christians directly involved in work in China are not necessarily the ones to lead the fight against MFN. They may be too close to the situation for prudence or safety to permit open opposition to the regime.

But the letters make other arguments. They suggest that a forceful response by the United States government to what everyone acknowledges is an appalling Chinese government record would be counter-productive. We cannot accept those arguments. As deeply as we respect Christian missionaries in China and throughout the world, we must disagree with a policy which allows China's rulers to manipulate the United States of America simply by threatening reprisals against these innocent, godly people. It is a form of hostage-taking.

For the U.S. to surrender to such threats would be to assure that Beijing will use threats whenever Americans cry out against the cruelty and injustice of the communist Chinese regime. Should we all keep silent about China's massive campaign of forced abortions and compulsory sterilizations? Should we avoid criticizing China's use of slave labor in the Laogai? Should we turn aside from China's latest violations of chemical weapons agreements, including shipments to Iran of poison gas? Is the United States truly the leader of the Free World? Or are we merely the "moneybag democracy" the Chinese rulers contemptuously call us?

There is a real danger that the arguments made by some U.S.-based missions may be seized upon by those whose only interest in China is profits. Some multi-national corporations have allowed the brutal Chinese birth control policies to be run in their factories. Some have also accommodated Chinese repression by banning religion in the workplace. And some have exploited prison laborers.

We wholeheartedly support missions throughout the world, and especially in China. We think it's necessary, however, to take a clear-eyed view of the conduct of the Chinese government. While missionaries seek no conflict with the government, the reality is that China's rulers do not view Christians so benignly.

Paul Marshall, in his well-received book "There Blood Cries Out," describes the attitude of China's elites. "In 1992, the Chinese state-run press noted that 'the church played an important role in the change' in Eastern Europe and warned, 'if China does not want such a scene to be repeated in its land, it

must strangle the baby while it is still in the manger."

We are proud to note the consistent and principled stance of the U.S. Catholic Conference in opposing MFN for China. Catholics are brutally repressed in China, as are Evangelicals, Muslims and Buddhists. But the USCC has never allowed Beijing's threats to deter it from its duty to speak up for the oppressed. Nor should we.

We know that we are not on "the front line" in confronting Chinese repression. Because we have a freedom to speak out that is not granted to those on the Mainland, we must use our God-given freedom to speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves. When it is argued that the situation will be worsened if America takes action, we must ask candidly, how can it be worse for the Chinese dissidents? Our own State Department reports that all dissidents have been either expelled, jailed or killed.

We rejoice in the fact that American missionaries hold U.S. passports. We pray that a strong United States will help to safeguard our fellow Americans' lives while they do the Lord's work in China. But Chinese Christians are not so protected. For Pastor Wong, leader of 40 Evangelical churches, MFN has brought no benefits. He has been arrested four times for spreading the Gospel. The last time he was jailed, his fingers were broken with pliers. While Vice President Gore was preparing to visit Beijing in March, Chinese secret police invaded the apartment of Roman Catholic Bishop Fan Zhongliang in Shanghai, seizing Bibles and other religious articles. The move against the nation's highest Catholic prelate was clearly intended to intimidate millions of faithful Chinese Catholics. MFN has only made the Chinese police more efficient in denying basic human rights to Bishop Fan and his flock.

President Clinton's 1994 "delinking" of trade and human rights concerns has actually increased repression in China. Now, even if missionaries plant churches, the Chinese secret police can disrupt them. This view is affirmed by New York editor A.M. Rosenthal. He has written:

Knowing Washington would not endanger trade with China, even though it is mountaintop in China's favor, Beijing increased political oppression in China and Tibet—and its sales of missiles, nuclear material and chemical weaponry.

Rosenthal refers to the president as Beijing's "prisoner." Let us assure, by our steadfastness, that the rest of us do not wear such claims.

From the beginning of this debate, we have recognized that the argument over MFN is not just about what kind of country China is, it is also a dispute about what kind of country America is. We believe Americans have a moral obligation to stand up for human rights, for the rule of law and for the rights of workers. We know, from long and tragic experience in this blood-stained century, that a regime which brutalizes its own people is virtually certain to threaten its neighbors.

Sincerely yours,

Gary L. Bauer, President, Family Research Council; Ralph E. Reed, Executive Director, Christian Coalition; Rev. Richard John Neuhaus, President, Institute for Religious and Public Life; Keith A. Fournier, Esq., President, Catholic Alliance; D. James Kennedy, President, Coral Ridge Ministries; Joseph M.C. Kung, President, Cardinal Kung Foundation; James C. Dobson, Ph.D., President, Focus on the Family; Phyllis Schlafly, President, Eagle Forum; Chuck Colson, President, Prison Fellowship Ministries; Gov. Robert P. Casey, Chairman, Campaign for the

American Family; Steve Suits, South Carolina Family Policy Council; William Donohue, President, Catholic League for Civil and Religious Rights. Richard D. Land, President, Christian Life Commission; Steven W. Mosher, President, Population Research Institute; Gerard Bradley, Professor, Notre Dame Law School; John DiIulio, Professor, Princeton University; Robert P. George, Professor, Princeton University; John Davies, President, Free the Fathers; Kent Ostrander, Director, The Family Foundation (KY); Matt Daniels, Executive Director, Massachusetts Family Institute.

Rev. Donald E. Wildmon, President, American Family Association; Deal W. Hudson, Publisher & Editor, Crisis Magazine; Bernard Dobranski, Dean, Columbus Law School; Rev. Steven Snyder, President, International Christian Concern; Ann Buwalda, Director, Jubilee Campaign; P. George Tryfiates, Executive Director, The Family Foundation (VA); Randy Hicks, Executive Director, Georgia Family Council; Marvin L. Munyon, President, Family Research Institute (WI).

William T. Devlin, Executive Director, Philadelphia Family Policy Council; William Held, Executive Director, Oklahoma Family Council; William A. Smith, President, Indiana Family Institute; Thomas McMillen, Executive Director, Rocky Mountain Family Council; Michael Heath, Executive Director, Christian Civic League of Maine; David M. Payne, Executive Director, Kansas Family Research Institute; Gary Palmer, President, Alabama Family Alliance.

Jerry Cox, President, Arkansas Family Council; Dennis Mansfield, Executive Director, Idaho Family Forum; Michael Howden, Executive Director, Oregon Center for Family Policy; William Horn, President, Iowa Family Policy Center; Joseph E. Clark, Executive Director, Illinois Family Institute; John H. Paulton, Executive Director, South Dakota Family Policy Council; Mike Harris, President, Michigan Family Forum.

#### CENSUS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED IN PROPER PERSPECTIVE

#### HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the Washington Times puts the issue of how the 2000 census should be conducted in proper perspective. Considering how many administration departments have been politicized, we cannot risk having possibly millions of Americans disenfranchised because of census sampling. I submit the editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, June 12, 1997]  
POLITICS AND CENSUS NUMBERS

After the fiasco involving the Clinton administration's utter politicization of the Immigration and Naturalization Service's last-minute, pre-election blitz last year to enfranchise felons and other likely Democratic-voting immigrants, is there really any wonder why Republicans fear approving this crowd's use of sampling for the 2000 census?