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 out 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.
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 polices in China that includes forced and coerced abortion.

Specifically, my amendment would bar the use of American taxpayers' funds for 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 employ 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 suggest that pouring millions of dollars into organizations that are an integral part of China's repressive population programs make 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 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 not be going home until you have this matter in focus... 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 who are four months pregnant 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. Incidents reported by the Canton radio, are but two skirmishes in a desperate battle that the province's authorities are 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 newsmen 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 in a totalitarian government, impose such a policy? How do you dictate one child per family? That's what "60 Minutes"... 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. We had the doctors look for her, 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 on the watch. Nobody who is pregnant without permission, any whispers of some- one acting suspiciously maternal.

Madam Chen goes on to say:... "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 child, there will be one less...

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-child families in the commune, but Mr. Ming's record is being threatened by this couple, Jeng Hu and Man Yue, who wanted
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to have a second child. It took weeks of per- suation to change their minds, and now, six months pregnant, Man Zue has agreed to have the baby. It was this woman, Miss Feng, a family planning officer, who com- manded the persuasion. Mrs. Feng decides which women can have a child. "Mrs. Feng asked me 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 and 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 officials 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 agreed to have the abortion. Six months pregnant, she'll be given an injec- tion into the womb that will kill the baby, the baby will be delivered within 24 hours. Man Zue did sign the one child certificate.

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

In Dongguan County in eastern Guang- dong, for example, a reporter for Hong Kong's leftist newspaper Zheung Yat Ribaio saw pregnant women herded into ve- hicles 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 re- ceived an injection. "Three hours later the baby was born—but then it stopped breath- ing," 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 preg- nancy, they do. a Chinese source reports. "Between dozen of fetuses arrived before table, resembling a stillborn child or a baby so ill that it dies in a few days, the source adds.


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 increased. Each province and city has been awarded a quota for the number of babies born per year, and the three street committees then determine which families may use the quotas. "We give first preference to couples without children," said one 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. Tien (a 'street committee' member) was frank about how her street committee handled the program. She assigns 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."

Mr. Chairman, the repressive popu- lation policies have also led to an alarming increase in infanticide. In his article "Being a Baby Girl 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 devalues 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 peo- pany birth has become the Russian roulette: The arrival of a son heralds a re- laxed 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 re- ality that moves the parents to hope for a man-child. But when the choice is stark one: Either kill or abandon the newborn female infant, reserving your love for one-child—she could be a boy, or the other-She faces 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 complicit. The anti-foreigner Chinese Daily printed in Peking may publish editorials lamenting the resurgence of In- fanticide, but the implementation of the birth control policy at the grass roots en- courages cadres to overlook the willful murder of female infants.

"Country, 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 succeeded 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 offi- cially sanctioned infanticide. In one incident shortly after I left Guangdong province, a young woman pregnant for the first time gave birth to twins. 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 one—was taken from her and put to death.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, many of China's own newspapers have admit- ted 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 dai- lies, during the last two years large numbers of female infants have been 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 in- fants 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 In- dignation 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. In many parts of China still lives. But if China has curtailed population growth and lengthened the average life span, it has paid a 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 Alan Cranston and Gary Hart, then the latter while still a candidate—promised to deny Federal projects to States whose legislatures fail to ratify the equal rights amendment. If the U.S. Senate were to 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 grizzly 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—unambiguously and firmly. Or third, they 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 had 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 of the outrage, I hope, and intensify and thereby claim more... The Chinese experiment will worsen if we fall to take action, the cancer of... and pretending it did not exist or that it... 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—$106 million this fiscal year, which in turn is giving $50 million over four years to China's birth-control program. The contribution is prohibited under U.S. law, which in turn 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 is chilling 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 the banned Indira Gandhi's forced sterilizations.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is committed to a policy that has begun investigating UNFPA's funding in China.
much that, under the direction of Dr. R. T. Ravenhoit, the agency introduced it into Africa itself.

From the two-child family of the 1970's it was only a step for China to the one-child family program 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 organizations became ever more admiring and funding from the United States increased. 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 harrassed into consenting to abortions." He told of "vigilants [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." "Michele Vink reported in the Wall Street Journal on women who were "handcuffed, tied with ropes and gagged in pig's baskets" for their forced trips to the abortion clinics. As Steven Mosher points out, the People's Republic itself now classifies all of the "women who are drowned, leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women who have given birth to girls in the belief that 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." 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." People's Daily 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. "Topping it all, Rafael Balas, 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,\(^{12}\) has presented the Chinese government with an award for excellence. I am proud to say that I am a member of my profession, Dr. Theodore Schultz, a Nobel Laureate enlisted as an ad viser to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, told the agency to remove his name from the award.\(^{13}\)

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 reached one of the slowest rates of development and lowest standards of living on earth. Though they are the largest industrial and agricul tural resources and 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 annual harvest is in crops.\(^{14}\) Far more densely populated nations around them in Asia have forged ahead of them in economic development.\(^{15}\) With a population density more than five times as great as China's, produces eight times as much per capita of its produce and fifteen times the annual cost of its food.\(^{16}\) 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 $885 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 present evil way and expect them to do it on their own. We can and 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, in the following table shown]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country or State</th>
<th>Persons per GNP per person</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>12,040</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>13,420</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{2}\) Worldwatch Paper, 1983.

\(^{3}\) International Planned Parenthood Federation, People, No. 10, No. 2, 1983, p. 28.


\(^{5}\) New York Times, June 24, 1983.


\(^{8}\) Ibid., 1983.

\(^{9}\) Wren, op. cit., 1983.

[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 extragrafts from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). In turn, the fund receives extragrafts 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 any extragrafts for sterilization 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, 1983, 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 the performance of abortions or involuntarily 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 traduce 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 laws mean nothing, either 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 UNFPA guidelines concede that Communist China may be violating UNFPA guidelines, they seem less than vigorous in enforcing the law. U.S. officials assert similarly that Communist China’s flouting of the law carries profound implications for relations between it and the U.S.

To increase the pressure between Washington and Peking dramatically, Trade agreements between the U.S. and potential trading partners usually include assurances that American products or technology will not be used for military purposes. If Communist China’s abuse of its population control grants gives the UN and the U.S. an opportunity to practice what they preach.

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?

(Steven W. Mosher)

In 1980, when I was living in the 8,000 member 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 woman replied, “not a feudal country.”

Female infanticide is not an anomaly of the village I lived in. Premier Zhao Ziyang thought the problem widespread in rural China. Neither can it be considered an issue 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 those ties with their natal family, the Chinese countryside is a land of old-age economics in the countryside and systematically denigrates the value of human life.

Infanticide is not an anomaly of the village I lived in. Premier Zhao Ziyang thought the problem widespread in rural China. Neither can it be considered an issue 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 those ties with their natal family, the Chinese countryside is a land of old-age economics in the countryside and systematically denigrates the value of human life.

Parents are permitted to have only one child and this limit may be corrected with the quota. Women pregnant with “over-quota” babies are forced to attend round-the-clock “study courses” until they submit to an abortion. Women who actually have a second child and those who’ve exceeded the limit of three births per year, which it allot to couples who have.

Women pregnant with “over-quota” babies are forced to attend round-the-clock “study courses” until they submit to an abortion. Women who actually have a second child and those who’ve exceeded the limit of three births per year, which it allot to couples who have.

Infanticide does have a long and tragic history in many parts of China. But by the middle of this century, it looked as though this barbarism was on its way to extinction.
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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 this limit may be corrected with the quota. Women pregnant with “over-quota” babies are forced to attend round-the-clock “study courses” until they submit to an abortion. Women who actually have a second child and those who’ve exceeded the limit of three births per year, which it allot to couples who have.
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Infanticide in China

(Li Jianguo and Zhang Xiaoying)

According to news reports in China’s daily, 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 policies.

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 1,088,179,289—five million more than was expected. The customary preference for a male child, pressure to limit new families to only one child, bonus awards for those who submit to sterilization and a warning that families who have more than one will be financially penalized and excluded from scholarships.

On March 3, The People’s Daily stated: “At present, the phenomenon of butchering,
drowning and leaving to die female infants and maltreating 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 maltreatment.** Apparemly, 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 Xinxhong, chairman of the Chinese National Committee on Birth Control and Population Planning, 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 Perez de Cuellar, 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.
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