



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 98th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, May 9, 1984

House of Representatives

The following is an amendment offered by Rep. Chris Smith (NJ-04) to H.R. 5119 on May 09, 1984 to prohibit use of population and health funds of the development assistance funds to carry our population planning programs in the People's Republic of China or to contribute to any international organization which carries out such programs in China unless the President certifies to Congress that such programs do not include forced or coerced abortion. Attached is the debate that ensued.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Page 27, line 16, strike "Not" and insert in lieu thereof "Subject to the limitation in subsection (f)(4)(A)(ii) of this section, not".

Page 27, after line 24, insert the following: "(c) Section 104(f) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (b) of this section for the fiscal year 1985, and any unobligated balances of funds appropriated to carry out that subsection for any prior fiscal year, may not be used—

**"(i) to carry out population planning programs in the People's Republic of China, or
"(ii) for contributions to any international organization or any private or voluntary organization which carries out population planning programs in the Peoples' Republic of China,**

unless the President has certified to the Congress that he is satisfied that the government of that country does not carry out any population planning programs which include forced or coerced abortion."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment in an attempt to end our complicity in and unwitting approval of the barbaric and utterly savage population policy in China that includes forced and coerced abortion.

Specifically, my amendment would bar the use of American taxpayers' funds to finance population planning programs in the People's Republic of China unless the President first certifies to Congress that he is satisfied that the Government of that country does not carry out any population planning programs that include forced or coerced abortion. This amendment is in the finest tradition of our human rights policy.

The amendment applies to both direct funding to China, a policy that could well come into being within the coming year and to international organizations like the U.N. Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and voluntary organizations which carry out population planning programs in China.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that there will be those today who will say that the occurrence of forced and coerced abortion in China cannot be proven, which is what the Communist officials say. To them I say the evidence is overwhelming and even if you have doubts, my amendment includes a certification requirement. Mr. Chairman, likewise, I suspect that there will be those who argue that U.S. funds are not used to pay for abortions directly. To them, I would suggest that pouring millions of dollars into organizations that are an integral part of China's repressive population program makes us partners in the repression of women and children in China for clearly, our dollars further the goals and objectives of that policy and the methods employed. It seems clear to me that the proposed \$50 million grant to China by the U.N. Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) of which the United States donates approximately 25 percent, significantly improves China's ability to expand and implement its aggressive population program.

Mr. Chairman, there is an abundance of evidence that the People's Republic of China has embarked on one of the most brutal and repressive population control policies the world has ever known. In order to enforce the Government's 1979 "one child per family" norm, coerced and forced

abortion has become commonplace. Not rare, but commonplace.

Well documented stories of women being hauled into clinics often in late stages of pregnancy to undergo forced abortions have been reported by reputable journalists and responsible news media including "60 Minutes," the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal. In its February 1984 "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1983," the U.S. Department of State states on page 746:

Each province sets guidelines for the desired number of children to be born during the year. These guidelines often become translated into rigid quotas at lower level units such as factories and communes. In such units, women must apply for permission to have a child. Those becoming pregnant outside the "plan" are subject to peer pressure, harassment, and sometimes economic penalties and in many cases are forced to have abortions, even in late stages of pregnancy.

I recently contacted Elliot Abrams, Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs to ask his view on whether or not forced or coerced abortions were part of China's population policy. According to Mr. Abram's office, it is an "indisputable fact."

On April 9, the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial: "Paying for Abortions" in which they called for termination of U.S. funds to China's program.

By now, the evidence about coercive birth control in China is overwhelming . . . China Scholar Steven Mosher, in his book "Broken Earth", described what he saw in one rural village:

"(The Pregnant Women) sat listlessly on short plank benches in a semicircle . . . where He Kasifeng (A top cadre and Communist Party member) explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms. 'You are here because you have yet to "think clear" about birth control, and you will remain here until you do . . . None of you has any choice in this matter . . . Then, visually calculating how far along the women in the room were, he went on to add, "the two of you who are eight or nine months pregnant will have a Caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort." What is less well known, however, is that the U.S. government supports this 'family planning' . . . We realize that China's huge population presents a unique birth-control problem, but "poison shots" and "struggle sessions" aren't the solution . . . China may believe that only coercion will work, but American taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize it.

In the May 16, 1982, edition of the New York Times, veteran reporter Christopher Wren quoted Mr. Li Hanbo, the deputy director of Guangdong Province family planning program who said: "There is no question of forcing pregnant women to have an abortion."

The New York Times article goes on to say:

Elsewhere in this coastal province two women were locked up for 15 days as "sorceresses" for inciting pregnant women at

their farm commune to flee from family-planning workers. All but 9 of the 325 women with unauthorized pregnancies were later given abortions . . . Those incidents, reported by the Canton radio, are but two skirmishes in a desperate battle that the provincial authorities have been waging over birth control. Harsher reports reaching Hong Kong last summer charged that thousands of pregnant women in Eastern Guangdong were rounded up and forced to have an abortion.

Broadcast newsman Morley Safer narrated a segment on "60 Minutes" aired on February 12, 1984, that provided further insight and documentation of coerced and forced abortion in China.

Entitled "No Brothers, No Sisters," Morley Safer begins by saying:

Imagine the world this way, by law, one child per family, which would eventually mean a world without brothers and sisters . . . but how does a government, even a totalitarian government, impose such a policy? How do you dictate one child per family? That's what the BBS and "Nova" . . . went to China to find out.

"60 Minutes" continued:

Chong Zuo is considered to be a model town in the attempt to achieve a nation of one-child families . . . Madam Chen is the official in charge of Chongzuo's one-child policy. She tells the representative of each factory the quota of births they've been allocated for 1983. So far, they've kept to their quota.

Madam CHEN. There was a pregnant woman in Wazan factory. We persuaded her to have an abortion. We took her to the hospital. That night she changed her mind and escaped. The doctor didn't notice, and she escaped. She ran off to Shanghai. The Shanghai people helped us find her, and we brought her back to the hospital for the abortion. We were all very busy finding her. Such things happen.

SAFER. Workers must have their factory's permission to get married. To get that, they must receive instruction in family planning and pass a written test. They must be over 24 years old. When they get their permission, they are told by Dr. Chen, the Family Planning Officer, when they can try for a child.

SAFER. In each team of 16 women there's an informer, a tattletale. She's constantly alert for anyone who might be pregnant without permission, any whispers of someone acting suspiciously maternal.

Madam Chen goes on to say:

CHEN. "Controlling the population is our aim. Less birth is our aim. Punishment is not our aim. The fines are to enable us to control the population. If they prefer the fine and have a child, we have not succeeded in our aim. Our job is to finish the baby in the stomach. So when you have got rid of one there will be one less person."

Later in the broadcast, Morley Safer introduced us to another population control leader. And we get a good look at the methodology of coercive abortion.

SAFER. Mr. Ming is the leader of a work brigade of 500 families in a commune just outside of Chongzuo. . . There are no two-children families in the commune, but Mr. Ming's record is being threatened by this couple, Jeng Hu and Man Zue, who wanted

to have a second child. It took weeks of persuasion to change their minds, and now, six months pregnant, Man Zue has agreed to have an abortion. . . . It was this woman, Mrs. Feng, a family planning officer, who commanded the persuasion. Mrs. Feng decides which women can have a child. . . . Mrs. Feng called and said, I have to tell you why you mustn't have this child. Man Zue said, come back and tell me after the baby is born. Mrs. Feng brought along the leaders of the brigade, who spent several evenings telling her that one child is good for the country, that it's also good for you. . . . Next night, more senior officers of the commune came to the house. They went through it all again and again, very slowly. The next night an even more senior official came, and he said the same things. . . . And so it went on, night after night. Man Zue said, I think they found me very difficult. In the end, she got worn down, she said, after awhile I knew they would just keep on and on and on. . . . Finally, she did agree to have the abortion, at six months pregnant. She'll be given an injection into the womb that will kill the baby, the dead baby will then be delivered within 24 hours. Man Zue did sign the one-child certificate.

A Wall Street Journal correspondent, Michele Vink, reported in the November 30, 1981, edition of the Journal:

In Dongguan County in eastern Guangdong, for example, a reporter for Hong Kong's leftwing newspaper Zheng Ming Ribao saw pregnant women herded into vehicles and taken to hospitals for abortions. "The vehicles were filled with wailing noises, and the scenes were really bitterly distressing." He reported. One woman already nine months pregnant arrived at the hospital, he wrote, and immediately received an injection. "Three hours later the baby was born—but then it stopped breathing," the reporter said. Some pregnant women reportedly were handcuffed, tied with ropes or placed in pig's baskets. . . . Though doctors aren't supposed to perform abortions past the eighth month of pregnancy, they do, a Chinese source reports. "Every day hundreds of fetuses arrived at the morgue," he says. A woman with an unauthorized pregnancy is likely to receive an injection from hospital doctors before labor, resulting in a stillborn child or a baby so ill that it dies in a few days, the source adds.

Fox Butterfield, a highly respected reporter and former New York Times Peking Bureau chief writes in his book China, "Alive in the Bitter Sea":

In recent years the street committee has gained a further and more extraordinary power—the right to decide which couples in the neighborhood may have children. This prerogative is part of the government's tough new campaign to reduce China's rate of population increase. Each province and city has been awarded a quota for the number of babies to be born per year, and the street committees then determine which families may use the quotas. "We give first preference to couples without children," said Mrs. Tsem, a street committee member I got to know. "If a couple already has two children or more, we tell them not to have any more.

. . . Mrs. Tsem (a "street committee" member) was frank about how her street committee administered the program. "We assign a person to keep track of each woman's menstrual cycle. If someone misses

her period and isn't scheduled to have a baby, we tell her to have an abortion. There isn't room for liberalism on such an issue."

Nick Eberstadt, a visiting fellow at Harvard University's Center for Population Studies wrote in the New York Times, April 22, 1984:

So, increasingly, the population program turned to coercion . . . in some areas, women with "unauthorized" pregnancies were rounded up and ordered to submit to injections of abortifacients. Official edicts warned that those "who attempt to defeat the fertility plan" would be considered "enemies of the people"—a threat that any adult who lived through the Cultural Revolution understood only too well. Families that defied the "one child norm" were faced with monthly fines that often meant semi-starvation. (. . .) Almost a quarter of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities' \$50 million bequest to Chinese population programs is American money. Failure to act against these grave and obvious human rights abuses would expose America to some very serious charges—and those charges would be right.

In their book "One Billion: A China Chronicle (1983)," Jay and Linda Matthews wrote:

The new birth control campaign had just begun and commune officials wanted to make an example of her . . . Finally, under intense pressure, the couple agreed to let the doctors induce early birth at seven months and let the baby die if it was a girl. But when a commune official standing by in the delivery room saw it was a boy, he reneged and insisted it not be saved. The husband and mother-in-law were on their knees at the delivery room door, pleading for reconsideration, but their child died because the nurses were not allowed to put it in an incubator. Some days later the mother-in-law saw the four-year-old son of one of the officials playing by a lake. In a rage, she threw the child into the water, then jumped in herself, and both drowned. . . . Compulsory sterilizations and abortions have become common.

Mr. Chairman, the repressive population policies have also led to an alarming increase in infanticide. In his article "Why are Baby Girls Being Killed in China?" Steven Mosher points out:

The wave of infanticide sweeping China is a direct consequence of a population-control policy of unprecedented severity. It restricts families to one child, ignores the realities of old-age economics in the countryside and systematically denigrates the value of human life. Parents are permitted to have only one child, and then only after a "birth quota" has been issued by the authorities. While the birth of a son has always been a more important event than the arrival of a daughter, Peking's policy of one child per family has raised the stakes. For the peasantry birth has become a kind of Russian roulette: The arrival of a son heralds a relaxed and secure old age: The coming of a daughter portends poverty and slow starvation during one's declining years. It is not "feudal nonsense" but brutal economic reality that moves the parents to hope for a man-child. If the child isn't male, then the choice is a stark one: Either kill or abandon the newborn female infant, reserving your one-child quota for the birth of a boy, or face a harrowing old age. It is no surprise that many peasants decide in favor of their

own security, and trade the infant's life for their own.

It is also an act in which the Chinese state is a silent accomplice. The English-language China Daily printed in Peking may publish editorials lamenting the resurgence of infanticide, but the implementation of the birth control policy at the grass roots encourages cadres to overlook the willful murder of female infants.

County, commune and production brigade cadres are told how many births their unit is to be allowed each year and are promoted and otherwise rewarded on the basis of whether they succeed in meeting the quota. It isn't in their interest to prevent female infanticide. Each girl who dies at birth or disappears soon after is one less head that they will be held to account for in the annual birth control report. Not only are forced abortions being performed up to the time of birth, there are even cases of officially sanctioned infanticide. In one incident shortly after I left Guangdong province, a young woman pregnant for the first time gave birth to twin boys. What should have been an occasion for rejoicing quickly turned tragic as the cadres present asked her which one she wanted. Both of them, she replied, but to no avail. One of the babies—she could not and would not choose which—was taken from her and put to death.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, many of China's own newspapers have admitted the rise in infanticide.

On March 3, 1983, the People's Daily wrote "the butchering, drowning and leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women who have given birth to girls has become a grave social problem."

An article in the April 11, 1983, New York Times written by Li Jianguo and Zhang Xiaoying—pseudonyms for two Chinese students attending school in the United States states:

According to news reports in China's dailies, during the last two years large numbers of female infants have been butchered, drowned or left to die, and numbers of women have suffered gross maltreatment as a result of nationwide implementation of the Government's population control policy.

We learn, from the People's Daily, the Liberation Daily, the Worker's Daily, Canton Evening News and The Chinese Youth that these illegal incidents happen not only in villages but in cities as well. In the areas most seriously affected, female infants and women who have given birth to female infants have been forced to die. As a result, nationwide, male infants have begun to far outnumber female infants. Both of us, citizens of the People's Republic of China, are deeply ashamed of, and mortified by, this utter barbarism and disregard of humanity. We are filled with boundless indignation that during this last quarter of the 20th Century such atrocities take place in our country. They reflect, on the one hand, the persistence of feudal thought and traditional indifference to the welfare of women and female children, and, on the other, the backward, benighted conditions of poverty and ignorance under which most parts of China still lives. But if China has curtailed population growth and lengthened the life of an average individual at the tragic expense of the lives of newborn girls, would it not be the greatest irony possible

for Mr. Qian to receive this award at this time?

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, it is common, accepted practice for our Government to withhold Federal dollars to programs, projects, and institutions that are found to be practicing racial or sexual discrimination, a prudent policy, I might add, that I strongly support.

There are numerous examples of laws and regulations that stipulate the loss of Federal funds if certain conditions are not met. Examples are to be found in laws pertaining to the handicapped, to HUD grants, to the loss of highway funds and sewage treatment moneys if, for example, provisions of the Clean Air Act are not adhered to.

Even Presidential candidates recognize that denial of U.S. funds for programs provides real leverage. According to the Chicago Sun Times, Senators GARY HART and ALAN CRANSTON—the latter while still a candidate—promised to deny Federal projects to States whose legislatures fail to ratify the equal rights amendment.

I believe we would be utterly remiss and irresponsible if, when fully informed of the use of forced abortion in China, we were to look the other way and pretend it did not exist or that it was completely out of our hands. We do have some clout in this grisly matter. We can make a difference. We do have some tools at our disposal—namely our funds and our outrage—to press for reform.

Mr. Chairman, UNFPA has three options if my amendment passes and eventually becomes part of the law. First, they can exert their considerable influence and clout to exact reforms in Chinese population policies. Or, second, they can disengage and get out—an unambiguous message to the Peking Government that the world community will not tolerate—or walk hand in hand with a policy of—forced or coerced abortions. Or third, UNFPA might decide to continue on in China, without our aid, and thus itself look the other way and pretend forced abortions are not really occurring. Of course, this would make a mockery of the United Nations often stated commitment to human rights.

I would suggest to my colleagues that we in this body have an obligation, a duty, not to be partners in this cruel repression of Chinese women and children. I would suggest that if we fail to take action, the cancer of the Chinese experiment will worsen and intensify and thereby claim more victims. I would remind my colleagues that such a policy would never be tolerated here. The outrage, I hope, would be deafening. Civil libertarians would assail such a policy, and they would be right. Human rights activists would assail such a policy, and they would be right. Religious and moral leaders would assail such a policy, and

they would be right. Government leaders and editorial writers would assail such a policy and they would be right. Liberals, moderates, and conservatives would assail such a policy, and they would be right.

Forced and coerced abortion would never be tolerated in our own backyard. It is no less offensive, I hasten to point out, in someone else's, even if they live on the other side of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. Our traditions, our laws, the generous impulse of our people call for us all to do nothing less.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following article for Members' further study:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 9, 1984]

PAYING FOR ABORTIONS

By now, the evidence about coercive birth control in China is overwhelming. Fox Butterfield, in his book "China: Alive in the Bitter Sea," described how neighborhood cadres monitor women's menstrual cycles. CBS's "60 Minutes" recently reported on involuntary abortions. And China scholar Steven Mosher, in his book "Broken Earth," described what he saw in one rural village:

"[The pregnant women] sat listlessly on short plank benches in a semicircle . . . where He Kaifeng [a top cadre and Communist Party member] explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms. 'You are here because you have yet to think clear' about birth control, and you will remain here until you do. . . . None of you has any choice in this matter. . . . Then, visually calculating how far along the women in the room were, he went on to add. 'The two of you who are eight or nine months pregnant will have a Caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort.'"

What is less well known, however, is that the U.S. government supports this "family planning." It does so by contributing to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (\$38 million this fiscal year), which in turn is giving \$50 million over four years to China's birth-control program. The contribution is probably breaking U.S. law, which prohibits U.S. aid for forced sterilization or abortions.

The UNFPA naturally resists this conclusion. "This organization has never funded an abortion of any kind," says Rafael M. Salas, the agency's executive director. He says the UNFPA's agreement with China prohibits coercion. And while abuses may occur, Mr. Salas says, the UNFPA has no evidence that this has happened in China.

We respect Mr. Salas's protests, but we also find it hard to believe that some of that money isn't going to pay for forced abortions. And even if the money goes only to Peking's birth-control bureaucracy, it still supports a policy that requires the chilling coercion that Mr. Mosher describes. In totalitarian China, policy flows from the state down, and political control is rigid enough to make sure it's enforced. Nor can the Chinese toss out the government if they don't like its policy, as the Indians did a few years back when they opposed Indira Gandhi's forced sterilizations.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is concerned enough to have begun investigating UNFPA's funding in China.

Jay F. Morris, deputy administrator of AID, says "there's no denying what the Chinese are doing" with birth control. But he says that so far, AID hasn't any evidence that its money is subsidizing coercion. As for concern about indirectly subsidizing a policy, Mr. Morris says: "That's a much larger issue that we really don't deal with."

We realize that China's huge population presents a unique birth-control problem, but "poison shots" and "struggle sessions" aren't the solution. Countries with far higher population densities—such as Taiwan and South Korea—have prospered without such measures. They've recognized that the best birth-control policy is an economic policy that produces rapid growth. China may believe that only coercion will work, but American taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize it.

TESTIMONY OF JACQUELINE R. KASUN, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY, ARCATA, CALIF.

It is not widely known that the People's Republic of China is operating the world's most coercive program of population control, including forced abortion, sterilization, and infanticide.

What may not be so widely known is that United States foreign aid dollars are supporting the Chinese program. According to the Population Reference Bureau, a population activist group supported by the United States government, the Chinese population control program receives about \$50 million a year from the United Nations,¹ whose largest supporting donor is the United States. The Chinese program also receives support from the International Planned Parenthood Federation which in turn gets a large part of its money from the United States government.²

The Chinese program of population control has been operating with varying degrees of intensity since the 1950's. It has been intensely studied and widely reported in the house publications of American population organizations—the Population Council, the Population Reference Bureau, Worldwatch, and related groups. Cultural exchanges between China and the United States have taken Americans to China and brought Chinese to this country to study and explain the system. American television and Steven Mosher's recent book *Broken Earth: The Rural Chinese* (Free Press, 1983) have brought it to public attention.

By the early 1970's the system of birth quotas was in effect in China. The quota system meant that couples who had pregnancies out of turn were denying that privilege to others and were therefore subjected to intense peer group pressure for abortion and/or sterilization. Punishments—such as loss of pay and employment and dismissal from school—and rewards—such as payments for sterilization and vacations for abortion—were in effect.³ The program was greatly admired by enthusiasts such as the U.S. State Department's Ambassador Marshall Green for its use of the so-called "village system" of population control, because this system uses group rewards and peer pressure as means of enforcement.⁴ When the group reward (such as additional seed for fertilizer for crops) depends on meeting the village birth reduction quota, group pressure on recalcitrant couples is very effective. The U.S. Agency for International Development admired the village system so

¹ Footnotes at end of article.

much that, under the direction of Dr. R. T. Ravenholt, the agency introduced it into AID's program for Indonesia.⁵

From the two-child family of the 1970's it was only a step for China to the one-child family norm proclaimed in 1979. Increasing reports of repression and resistance began to reach the outside world at the same time as the evaluations by the United States-based population organizations became ever more admiring and funding from the United States increased.⁶ By 1982 Christopher Wren was reporting in the *New York Times* on thousands of Chinese women being "rounded up and forced to have abortions." He described women "locked in detention cells or hauled before mass rallies and harangued into consenting to abortions." He told of "vigilantes [who] abducted women on the streets and hauled them off, sometimes handcuffed or trussed, to abortion clinics" and of "aborted babies which were . . . crying when they were born."⁷ Michele Vink reported in the *Wall Street Journal* on women who were "handcuffed, tied with ropes or placed in pig's baskets" for their forced trips to the abortion clinics.⁸ As Steven Mosher points out, the People's Republic press itself now openly speaks of the "butchering, drowning, and leaving to die of female infants and the mistreatment of women who have given birth to girls"⁹ in this society where only the son can care for his parents in their old age.

As the horror of the system has mounted, so have the accolades in the population lobby press. The Population Reference Bureau lists it among "well-designed family planning programs."¹⁰ *Worldwatch*, which is supported by the United Nations and therefore indirectly by the United States, cites it among its "Population Policies for a New Era."¹¹ Planned Parenthood of Korea, which receives support from International Planned Parenthood, which in turn receives support from the United States, has launched its own one-child family drive.¹² Topping it all, Rafael Salas, director of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities which was created at the urging of the U.S. Agency for International Development and which receives financial support from the United States,¹³ has presented the Chinese government with an award for excellence. I am proud to say that a distinguished member of my profession, Dr. Theodore Schultz, a Nobel Laureate enlisted as an advisor to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, told the agency to remove his name from the award.¹⁴

The honey-voiced narrator of a Nova film being shown on public television in the United States assures us that this brutal program is necessary in order for China to "modernize" and to avert what she calls the "catastrophe" of excess population. The fact is, the Chinese system is catastrophe. It robs human beings of their dignity, treating them as if they were livestock being bred for the convenience of the state. The Chinese system of population control is not the result of overpopulation in China but rather the result of the catastrophic misdirection of policy and abuse of power by the Chinese government.

After more than three decades of economic mismanagement by their central planners, the Chinese people have realized one of the slowest rates of development and lowest standards of living on earth. Though they have vast industrial and agricultural resources and are an industrious and intelligent people, their output in 1981 amounted to only \$300 per person, barely enough for

survival. Most of their economic resources are unused. For example, less than a third of their agricultural land is in crops.¹⁵ Far more densely populated nations around them in Asia have forged ahead of them in economic development. Taiwan, with a population density more than five times as great as China's, produces eight times as much per capita and has a larger volume of trade.¹⁶ The Republic of Korea, with a population density four times as great as China's has a per capita output almost six times as great as China's.¹⁷

From the Great Leap Forward through the Proletarian Cultural Revolution and up to the current one-child family drive, recent Chinese history has consisted of one mad experiment after another, with devastating consequences for the Chinese economy and the Chinese people. What China needs is not population control but political rationality and economic efficiency. According to Christopher Wren, the Chinese estimate that it now costs more than \$865 to prevent one birth in Guangdong.¹⁸ This is almost three times the per capita gross national product and fifteen times the annual cost of supporting a child in China. What this means is that with a tiny fraction of the effort now being lavished on stamping out births, the Chinese could support the children in question and still have enough left over to mount a sizeable investment program for the improvement of their economy. A sustained and efficient development program of this magnitude would bring China to comfortable prosperity rather than the ruin which it is now producing.

The United States cannot change the government of China. We cannot stop their mad experiments upon their own people. We can and we should, however, separate ourselves from this savagery. We should, like Professor Schultz, let the world know that we do not countenance or support such things. For the sake of our national honor and our name in history, we should—we must—immediately terminate all support for the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, for the International Planned Parenthood Federation, and all organizations which support population control in the People's Republic of China.

HOW BAD IS THE SO-CALLED POPULATION PROBLEM IN CHINA?

(Many countries are more crowded than China, but few produce as little per person, as the following table shows)

Country or State	Persons per square mile 1982	GNP per capita dollars 1981
Taiwan	1,482	\$2,280
Republic of Korea	1,080	1,700
Japan	825	10,080
West Germany	643	13,450
United Kingdom	595	9,110
India	570	260
Switzerland	398	17,430
China	285	300
France	256	12,190
United States	64	12,820
Pennsylvania	264	NA
Maryland	429	NA
New York	371	NA

¹ Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
 Source: Population densities from "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1982-83; GNP figures from World Bank, "World Development Report 1983."

FOOTNOTES

¹ Population Reference Bureau, *Intercom*, May/June 1983.
² International Planned Parenthood Federation, *Report to Donors*, 1980, p. 40.
³ Pi-chao Chen, "Lessons from the Chinese Experience: China's Planned Birth Program and Its

Transferability," *The Population Council, Studies in Family Planning*, Vol. 6, No. 10, October 1975, pp. 354-366.

⁴ Ambassador Marshall Green, "U.S. Perspectives on World Population Issues," The Conference Board, Dallas, Texas, March 30, 1977.

⁵ AID, Memorandum for Assistance Administrators, Mission Directors, AID Representatives and Principal AID Officers, 11 June 1980; Hearings of Select Committee on Population, 95th Congress, 2nd Session, Vol. II, April 25, 26, 27, 1978.

⁶ U.N. Fund for Population Activities, 1980 Report, and 1981 Report.

⁷ Christopher Wren, "Chinese Region Showing Resistance to National Goals for Birth Control," *New York Times*, May 16, 1982.

⁸ Michele Vink, "Abortion and Birth Control in Canton, China," *Wall Street Journal*, November 30, 1981.

⁹ Steven W. Mosher, "Why Are Baby Girls Being Killed in China?" *Wall Street Journal*, July 25, 1983.

¹⁰ Population Reference Bureau, *Intercom*, March/April 1983, p. 7.

¹¹ *Worldwatch* Paper #53.

¹² International Planned Parenthood Federation, *People*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1983, p. 28.

¹³ NSSM 200, "Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests," December 10, 1974, declassified on December 31, 1980, pp. 121-122.

¹⁴ *New York Times*, June 24, 1983.

¹⁵ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *FAO Production Yearbook 1980*.

¹⁶ World Bank, *World Development Report*, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1983.

¹⁸ Wren, *op. cit.*

[From the Richmond News Leader, June 28, 1983]

CHINA'S BIRTH CONTROL

Communist China's population control programs emphasize abortion and sterilization. Chinese officials often "encourage"—i.e., force—expectant mothers to abort their babies; they also require the sterilization of couples with two or more children. Both practices contravene explicit provisions in the international aid programs subsidizing Communist China's birth control drives.

Communist China receives extravagant grants from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). In turn, the fund receives extravagant grants from the U.S. Agency for International Development. Not only does the UN proscribe the use of its money for forced sterilization, U.S. law prohibits the use of AID cash for abortion and sterilization. The standard disclaimer attached to AID applications states:

This project is consistent with AID policies, and with sections 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act and 525 of the Appropriations Act, 1982, which provide that funds will not be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions or to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilizations as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations or to pay for any biomedical research which relates, in whole or in part, to methods of or the performance of abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning; or to lobby for abortion.

The intent is clear. And clearly, Communist China's forced abortion and sterilization programs transduce U.S. law and UN regulations. The issue transcends birth control. It involves the sanctity of the law.

Either laws mean what they say, or there is no reason to write them. No nation should be above the law. If law prohibits the use of U.S. or UN money for, say, building soccer fields, then countries using such cash to construct stadiums should forfeit their

grants. A similar standard should apply to birth control programs.

Although UN officials concede that Communist China may be violating UNFPA guidelines, they seem less than vigorous in enforcing the law. U.S. officials appear similarly lackadaisical. Yet Communist China's flouting of the law carries profound implications for relations between it and the U.S.

Many in the U.S. want to increase trade between Washington and Peking dramatically. Trade agreements between the U.S. and potential enemies usually include assurances that American products or technology will not be used for military purposes. If Communist China openly breaks laws regarding population control, then can the U.S. expect it to obey agreements regarding manufactured goods?

The United Nations and the United States often speak of their desire to enforce international law in a world rent with lawlessness. Communist China's abuse of its population control grants gives the UN and the U.S. an opportunity to practice what they preach.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1983]

WHY ARE BABY GIRLS BEING KILLED IN CHINA?

(By Steven W. Mosher)

In 1980, when I was living with the 8,000 members of Sandhead Brigade in China's Guangdong Province, I asked village friends whether female infanticide ever occurred locally. The answer, which came with rather more heat than I had expected, was an emphatic no. "Ours is a land of fish and rice," one wrinkled old midwife told me in explanation. "All the people here have always been able to raise their daughters." She and others insisted that even under the old imperial regime girl babies had never been put to death.

Yet less than two years later Chinese friends in Hong Kong who had recently been back to the village began to tell of girl infants dying soon after birth in suspicious circumstances. One young woman was even more candid, admitting to me that when her mainland sister-in-law had recently given birth to a girl, the baby had been murdered immediately. A bucket of water had been prepared beside the bed. When the newborn turned out to be a girl, she was drowned.

Female infanticide isn't just an anomaly of the village I lived in. Premier Zhao Ziyang thought the problem widespread enough to condemn it in his report to the National People's Congress in December 1982. "We must protect in particular infant girls and their mothers," he said. "The whole society must resolutely condemn the criminal activities of female infanticide and maltreatment of mothers. The judicial apparatus should resolutely punish the offenders according to law."

In recent months provincial newspapers throughout China have reported grisly tales of the murder of female infants. On March 3, the People's Daily admitted that "the butchering, drowning and leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women who have given birth to girls has become a grave social problem."

Peking claims that these crimes are committed by "backward" villagers in the name of "feudal" attitudes that "boys are precious, girls are worthless." Male villagers, said to desire sons to "carry on the ancestral line and extend the generations," have been especially singled out for censure. "In their keen desire to have sons," the English-lan-

guage Peking Review said last January, "some men still torment their wives who bear daughters and worse still, they kill the baby girls through neglect or outright murder." If Peking is to be believed, many peasant men are ignorant and misguided monsters who willingly sacrifice their infant daughters on the altar of some feudal belief.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Infanticide does have a long and tragic history in many parts of China. But by the middle decades of this century, it looked as though this barbarism was on its way to extinction. In Chinese villages today, where ancestral land has long since been expropriated by the state and ancestor worship in on the decline, traditional notions of clan and family continuity no longer exert much influence. These attenuated ideas could not possibly account for the sudden reoccurrence of female infanticide.

The wave of infanticide sweeping China is a direct consequence of a population-control policy of unprecedented severity. It restricts families to one child, ignores the realities of old-age economics in the countryside and systematically denigrates the value of human life.

Parents are permitted to have only one child and then only after a "birth quota" has been issued by the authorities. Each population unit, such as a rural collective, is limited to a certain number of births per year, which it allots to couples who have.

Women pregnant with "over-quota" babies are forced to attend round-the-clock "studies courses" until they submit to an abortion. Families who actually have a second child must pay heavy fines of up to \$2,000—several years wages in mainland China—and run the risk of demotion or assignment to less desirable work as well.

This draconian policy makes no provision for the long-term economic concerns of peasant parents, especially their anxieties about financial security in old age. Sons are the only social-security system known to villagers, for there are no pension programs in the Chinese countryside. Neither can daughters give long-term assistance, for rural custom decrees that they take up residence with their husband's family upon marriage and sever all economic ties with their natal family. Even if they were to keep a daughter at home, peasants say, it would be impossible to find her a husband in a population of only sons.

Those who are without sons must toil in the fields throughout their twilight years. As their strength declines to the point where they cannot keep up, they are assigned lighter work that pays scarcely enough for their rice ration. Old age is a long downward spiral of flagging vigor, worsening diet and weakening health.

While the birth of a son has always been a more important event than that arrival of a daughter, Peking's policy of one child per family has raised the stakes. For the peasantry birth has become a kind of Russian roulette: The arrival of a son heralds a relaxed and secure old age; the coming of a daughter portends poverty and slow starvation during one's declining years. It is not "feudal nonsense" but brutal economic reality that makes the parents to hope for a man-child.

If the child isn't male, then the choice is a stark one: Either kill or abandon the newborn female infant, reserving your one-child quota for the birth of a boy, or face a harrowing old age. It is no surprise that many peasants decide in favor of their own security, and trade the infant's life for their own.

It is also an act in which the Chinese state is a silent accomplice. The English-language China Daily printed in Peking may publish editorials lamenting the resurgence of infanticide, but the implementation of the birth control policy at the grass roots encourages cadres to overlook the willful murder of female infants.

County, commune and production brigade cadres are told how many births their unit is to be allowed each year and are promoted and otherwise rewarded on the basis of whether they succeed in meeting the quota. It isn't in their interest to prevent female infanticide. Each girl who dies at birth or disappears soon after is one less head that they will be held to account for in the annual birth control report.

Front-line cadres take their cues from their superiors, and these have made clear that population growth is to be held down at all costs, even that of the lives of millions of infants.

Not only are forced abortions being performed up to the time of birth, there are even cases of officially sanctioned infanticide. In one incident shortly after I left Guangdong Province, a young woman pregnant for the first time gave birth to twin boys. What should have been an occasion for rejoicing quickly turned tragic as the cadres present asked her which one she wanted. Both of them, she replied, but to no avail. One of the babies—she could not and would not choose which—was taken from her and put to death.

(Mr. Mosher, one of the first American social scientists since 1949 permitted to live in a Chinese village, is author of "Broken Earth: The Rural Chinese," to be published later this summer by The Free Press.)

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1983]

INFANTICIDE IN CHINA

(By Li Jianguo and Zhang Xiaoying)

According to news reports in China's dailies, during the last two years large numbers of female infants have been butchered, drowned or left to die, and numbers of women have suffered gross maltreatment as a result of nationwide implementation of the Government's population-control policy. This shocking situation, which the Government must take immediate steps to stop, deserves to be brought to the attention of the United Nations.

We learn, from The People's Daily, The Liberation Daily, The Worker's Daily, Canton Evening News and The Chinese Youth that these illegal incidents happen not only in villages but in cities as well. In the areas most seriously affected, female infants and women who have given birth to female infants have been forced to die. As a result, nationwide, male infants have begun to far outnumber female infants.

The Government's birth-control policy has reduced population growth rate to 1.2 percent—it is 2 percent in other developing countries—but the rate reportedly was creeping toward 1.3 or 1.4 percent, and this means the Government may not meet the 1.2 billion target set for the year 2000. A census last July put the population at 1,008,175,288—five million more than was expected. The customary preference for a male child, pressure to limit new families to just one child, bonuses for cooperating parents and a warning that families who have more than one will be financially penalized inevitably have led to infanticide.

On March 3, The People's Daily said: "At present, the phenomena of butchering,

drowning and leaving to die female infants and mistreating women who have given birth to female infants have been very serious. It has become a grave social problem." The People's Daily said, on Jan. 31, that because of investigations and statistics from Shenyang, Anshan, Benxi and six other cities, in the last year 196 women went to local offices of the Chinese Women's Association to report mistreatment." Apparently, the most seriously affected provinces are Anhui, Liaoning, Shandong, Hebei, Guangdong and Sichuan.

Both of us, citizens of the People's Republic of China, are deeply ashamed of, and mortified by, this utter barbarism and disregard of humanity. We are filled with boundless indignation that during this last quarter of the 20th century such atrocities take place in our country. They reflect, on the one hand, the persistence of feudal thought and traditional indifference to the welfare of women and female children, and, on the other, the backward, benighted conditions of poverty and ignorance under which most parts of China still lives.

But traditional prejudice and economic backwardness notwithstanding, we strongly feel that all elements of our Government concerned with implementation of the new population policy should be held directly accountable for the prevalence of such tragic incidents. Infanticide need not be an inevitable outcome of the policy. Apparently, the affected units and organizations have not adopted a policy of "gentle persuasion and education" to achieve the desired goal of birth control and population control but have callously exerted political pressures and adopted extreme political measures for implementation of the policy.

It is true that the population-control policy has effectively reduced China's population growth. Nevertheless, these other, unintended results of such a policy contradict fundamental values of humanism, ethics and civilization. The Government, by permitting the news reports of the atrocities, obviously indicates that it opposes them. But, deplorably, it has not exercised its power to stop them, as far as we know.

Ironically, Qian Xinzhong, chairman of the Chinese National Committee on Birth Control and Population Planning, in June is to come to the United Nations to receive an award as the representative of the country that has been most effective in implementing birth control and population planning. But if China has curtailed population growth and lengthened the life of an average individual at the tragic expense of the lives of newborn girls, would it not be the greatest irony possible for Mr. Qian to receive this award at this time?

Because of this situation, we hope that the Secretary General, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, will take appropriate action to inform the concerned United Nations agencies—with the full cooperation of the Chinese Government—so that they may start a detailed investigation of this matter and, using all the resources at their command, end these horrors as soon as possible. To protect its dignity, we suggest that the United Nations should postpone giving Mr. Qian the award pending an investigation by responsible United Nations bodies and a report from Peking that this deplorable situation has ceased.