

**HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY UNDER THE
NEW ADMINISTRATION**

**HEARING
AND
MARKUP
OF
H. Res. 188 and H. Con. Res. 106
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
AND THE
COMMISSION ON
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS**

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 10, 1993

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1993

74-426 CC

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
HARRY JOHNSTON, Florida
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
ROBERT A. BORSKI, Pennsylvania
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, Georgia
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida
ERIC FINGERHUT, Ohio
PETER DEUTSCH, Florida
ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN, Maryland
DON EDWARDS, California
FRANK McCLOSKEY, Indiana
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
(Vacancy)

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa
TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JAN MEYERS, Kansas
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
CASS BAILENGER, North Carolina
DANA ROHRBACHER, California
DAVID A. LEVY, New York
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, Florida
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California

MICHAEL H. VAN DUSEN, *Chief of Staff*
JO WEBER, *Staff Associate*

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

TOM LANTOS, California, *Chairman*

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
FRANK McCLOSKEY, Indiana
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio

DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana

ROBERT KING, *Staff Director*
MICHAEL ENNIS, *Republican Professional Staff Member*
KENNETH R. TIMMERMAN, *Professional Staff Member*
BETH L. POISSON, *Professional Staff Member*
MARYANNE MURRAY, *Professional Staff Member*

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

DENNIS DeCONCINI, Arizona, *Chairman*
STENY HOYER, Maryland, *Co-Chairman*

EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts	FRANK LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico	HARRY REID, Nevada
FRANK McCLOSKEY, Indiana	BOB GRAHAM, Florida
BEN CARDIN, Maryland	BARBARA MIKULSKI, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey	ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, Illinois	ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia	CHARLES GRASSLEY, Iowa
HAMILTON FISH, New York	CONNIE MACK, Florida

Executive Branch

VACANCY, *Department of State*
VACANCY, *Department of Defense*
VACANCY, *Department of Commerce*

SAMUEL G. WISE, *Staff Director*
MARY SUE HAFNER, *Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel*
JANE S. FISHER, *Deputy Staff Director*

DAVID M. EVANS, *Senior Advisor for Post-Soviet and East European Affairs*
R. SPENCER OLIVER, *Consultant*

MIKE AMITAY, Staff Member	RONALD McNAMARA, Staff Member
PATRICIA CARLEY, Staff Member	JEANNE McNAUGHTON, Staff Member
BRENDA COLLIER, Receptionist	TOM MURPHY, Technical Editor
OREST DEYCHAKIWSKY, Staff Member	MICHAEL OCHS, Staff Member
JOHN FINERTY, Staff Member	JAMES S. RIDGE, Press Secretary
ROBERT HAND, Staff Member	ERIKA B. SCHLAGER, Staff Member
HEATHER HURLBURT, Staff Member	VINCA SHOWALTER, Staff Member
JESSE JACOBS, Staff Member	CORINNE ZACCAGNINI, Office Administrator

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESS	
The Honorable Timothy E. Wirth, Counselor, U.S. Department of State	6
PREPARED STATEMENTS	
Hon. Dennis DeConcini	39
Hon. Tom Lantos	40
Hon. Steny H. Hoyer	44
Hon. Gary L. Ackerman	47
Hon. Timothy E. Wirth	48
APPENDIX	
1. Text of H. Res. 188, to express the sense of the Congress that the Olympic Games in the 2000 should not be held in Beijing or elsewhere in the People's Republic of China	55
2. Text of H. Con. Res. 106, Urging the President to raise, at the highest levels of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the issue of Chinese population transfer into Tibet in an effort to bring about an immediate end of that government's policy on this issue	59
3. World Conference on Human Rights: Fact Sheet	62
4. U.S. Draft Human Rights Action Plan	66
5. U.N. General Assembly, World Conference on Human Rights, adoption of the Report of the Preparatory Committee	69
6. Fact sheet from Puebla Institute on the Rising Tide of Religious Intolerance and Religious Repression in China	91

U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY UNDER THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, INTER-
NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS, AND
THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN
EUROPE,

Washington, DC.

The subcommittee and commission met, pursuant to notice, at 10:25 a.m., in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Tom Lantos (chairman of the subcommittee), and Hon. Dennis DeConcini (cochairman of the commission) presiding.

Senator DECONCINI. The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe will come to order.

It is a great pleasure to welcome my former colleague, Counselor Wirth. During his years in the Senate, I have come to know him as an outstanding advocate of human rights. He served on the Helsinki Commission for many years and made valuable contributions to our work in promoting the CSCE principles. I cannot think of a better person to represent our country in furthering the cause of human rights than former Senator Wirth.

Unfortunately, there is much work to be done. The euphoria over the demise of the Soviet Union has been replaced by a troubling lack of confidence and political will on the part of the West over how to promote the commitments agreed to in the Charter of Paris.

This Helsinki document, which celebrates the end of the cold war and was to have been the framework by which CSCE states would be guided, is in danger, in my view, of becoming nothing more than a shallow agreement of meaningless words and empty promises, given the West's appalling inaction in the former Yugoslavia.

And it would seem, in light of a recent proposal by France to bypass the CSCE and establish a smaller pan-European "confederation" which would permit border changes in the name of stability and exclude the Muslim countries of Central Asia, that some Western European countries are not willing to pay the political price needed to move Europe beyond the legacy of its past. At a time when we should be seeking to bring peoples of difference cultures together, it is an ominous signal in my view that any leading country in Europe at the end of the 20th century would seek to turn the clock back and divide Europe along ethnic and religious lines.

Further, the United Nation's refusal to stop Serbia's territorial aggression or even to use force when necessary to deliver humanitarian aid in Bosnia-Herzegovina calls into question the integrity of its commitment to undertake credible action against genocidal slaughter and egregious violations of the principle of sovereignty.

Around the world we see democratic countries, including, I am sad to say, the United States, continuing to apply human rights policies selectively. We send substantial aid, for example, to our close ally Morocco, but do not put enough pressure on that country to cease its repressive policies. Countries like China, Uzbekistan, Indonesia, and more than 40 others are rejecting the principle of the universality of human rights, a principle the United Nations must vigorously promote.

The post-cold war era offers the democratic world a truly historic opportunity to raise the threshold of international standards of behavior. It is essential now that the United States have a strong leadership role in the United Nations and work aggressively, as only a real leader can, to insist that all governments be held accountable for the manner in which they treat their citizens. We must now allow the lowest common denominator to prevail or the world will become further divided as more and more would be dictators observe the successes of tyrants like Milosevic and Karadzic.

I look forward to hearing from Counselor Wirth about ways in which we can strengthen the U.N.'s ability to promote and protect human rights, as well as how we can make greater use of regional bodies such as the CSCE in the areas of human rights and conflict resolution. I believe that the U.S. objectives for the Conference in Vienna are right on target, and we are fortunate to have someone with the experience and commitment of Counselor Wirth with his considerable skills and dedication to carry this out.

I will yield to Mr. Smith, the ranking Republican.

[The prepared statement of Senator DeConcini appears on p. 39.]

STATEMENT OF MR. SMITH

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to join you in welcoming the former Senator and now Counselor Tim Wirth to our committee. I also serve on the committee chaired by Tom Lantos, our distinguished chairman from California. We are pleased that you are here.

The upcoming conference, I think, offers a unique opportunity to restate a number of our vital concerns about human rights, and to do so in a very forcible way. To ensure that those countries that continue to lag in the enforcement, they say all of the right things and they make all of the paper promises, but when it comes to enforcement of human rights and ensuring that their citizenry is protected, their record does not match the words.

And I think that it is important that this conference and the high-level presence of the United States and other countries in forcibly bringing up these issues could not come at a more opportune time.

I would hope, as we have had in the last few weeks, that issues, particularly as they pertain to countries like China, where ongoing repression against religious believers, bishops, Protestant clergy, high church members, be very much highlighted at this conference,

as well as other egregious human rights abuses, including what I have often thought of as the orphan human rights abuse in this world, and that is coercion in population control.

And I know that Counselor Wirth shares my concern and our concern. And Mr. Lantos has been very forcible in his statements concerning the outrageousness of this crime against humanity where women, and most of the victims are women, are forcibly aborted, forcibly dealt with in a way with regard to involuntary sterilization, and involuntary insertions of IUD's and the like against their will.

And I think that China needs to be aware of the outrage that is shared by men and women of good will around the world that this practice cannot continue. Population control and family planning has done a gross disservice when this kind of egregious behavior is practiced.

We also, of course, share your concerns, and the administration's concerns, and the bipartisan concerns about what is going on in Bosnia. Having been there in Croatia when it was under siege and saw first-hand the abominations committed against innocent civilians, the forced rape, I and others, and I know you share it, feel that we need to speak out again with one accord that this will not be tolerated, and that everything humanly possible needs to be done to stop these heinous practices.

So welcome to the committee, and it is good to see you again.

STATEMENT OF MR. LANTOS

Senator DECONCINI. Thank you, Congressman.

I now will yield to the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights. And that is Congressman Lantos, who has a long legacy, even before I was involved with the CSCE, of fighting for human rights when it was not nearly as popular as it might be today. So we welcome him and his committee being here, and thank him for his strong leadership. Congressman Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And let me say at the outset that no one in the Congress has done more for human rights than Senator DeConcini. And the subcommittee that I have the honor of chairing is delighted to hold this hearing jointly with you.

I would just like to take a couple of minutes to offer an opening statement, and do a minute's worth of subcommittee business, and the move on.

Today, the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations, and Human Rights will examine the Clinton administration's human rights policy, and discuss U.S. goals for the upcoming U.N. World Human Rights Conference.

The two topics are closely related. As the conference, the first of its time in a quarter century, and the first global human rights meetings to be held in the post-cold war era, gives the new administration the opportunity to put forth its blueprint for human rights in a dramatically changed world.

One would imagine that the conference, taking place as it does after the collapse of the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe and

the Soviet Union, would be a much more harmonious occasion and its participants would bask in the glow of new-found camaraderie.

However, the brutal warfare in the former Yugoslavia and Somalia, the government's violent repression of its own citizenry in China and Haiti, the bitter sectarian violence in Kashmir and Northern Ireland, and the recrudescence of right wing extremism in Germany, and the ongoing scourge of left wing terror in Peru, all demonstrate that the post-cold war world is anything but a calm, peaceful, or reasonable place.

Thus, it is sadly no surprise, Mr. Chairman, that the conference appears to be riven by strife and dissension even before it opens. Indeed, a few days ago, the June 6 *New York Times* warns that holding the conference may be a mistake. Because many Third World countries are preparing to launch an attack against the idea that there are universal and enduring principles of human rights, applicable to all peoples, in all conditions, in all times.

That idea is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the seminal document on human rights which has paved the way for the hard won advances of the last 45 years. Hence, many Western diplomats and nongovernmental organizations are maintaining that no result at all would be better than a bad one, and are on guard lest the West sign off on a watered down final statement that undermines the principle of universality.

We will discuss the administration's strategy to deal with this grave threat to the international human rights community as to how it will respond to the contention of many developing countries that they have an absolute right to assistance with their economic development, regardless of their human records.

On the positive side, we will look at the administration's goals for the conference, including its commendable aims of integrating better women's and children's rights into the U.N.'s human rights network and reforming and enhancing the U.N.'s human rights protection mechanisms.

As regards U.S. human rights policy, I am very eager to learn how this new administration sees human rights as they fit into the overall foreign policy of the United States. I am also keen to examine the connection between democracy and human rights, which while close is not always a one to one correspondence, as evidenced by the serious and persistent human rights violations in political democracies such as India, Mexico, Turkey, to name but a few.

I am sure that the administration, which has reorganized the Bureau for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs into the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor has some strong feelings on the subject.

Finally, I would very much like to hear how the administration intends to address what I and many of my colleagues consider a serious inadequacy of U.S. human rights policy in recent years. That is the severance of the link between its human rights reporting, that is the State Department Country Human Rights Reports, and U.S. assistance and general foreign policy toward offender nations.

Thus, it was highly disturbing, not to say unconscionable, to see the well documented abuses of Saddam Hussein's Iraq consistently ignored by the administration before August 1991, or to see the ad-

ministration pursue business as usual with China after Tiananmen Square.

Addressing all of these topics is a tall order, which most people would find daunting. But today we have with us one of the most wide-ranging and seminal thinkers of the administration, no doubt because he was molded in the legislative branch before.

I refer to my dear friend and distinguished former colleague, Tim Wirth, the new counselor of our Department of State, and former distinguished Senator and Representative from the State of Colorado.

Tim, we are very pleased that you could join us today. As approach the millennium, all of us are eager to hear your words of wisdom on how we can usher in the peaceable kingdom.¹

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lantos appears on p. 40.]

STATEMENT OF MR. HOYER

Senator DECONCINI. I thank the Congressman. And I thank Chairman Lantos.

I yield to co-Chairman Hoyer of the Helsinki Committee back on our purpose of being here, and we will proceed.

Mr. HOYER. Senator and counselor, I have an incredibly good statement to make, and I know that you want to sit there and hear more of our statements.

Mr. WIRTH. I came up here for that.

Mr. HOYER. It is 11 pages. It is very good, and I feel very strongly about it. In deference to your time, let me simply say first of all, I think the President has made a very wise selection.

As a former member of this Commission, and a former Member of the House, and the U.S. Senate, Senator Wirth has been a real leader in this country on behalf of human rights. We could not have a more articulate, forceful, and better spokesperson, in my opinion, going to this conference, to articulate how very strongly, the United States and the international community believe that human rights is a critical element in governing the relationships between our nations.

We see human rights being undermined throughout the world. We have more emerging democracies. That is good news. But we have in this process some very difficult things happening. Yugoslavia being, I think, probably as horrendous an example, but there are many others on the African continent and on every continent in the world, save I would perhaps say our own, but we certainly need to pay attention here at home as well.

But the fact is, I think, that you are going to be a forceful voice overseas to continue what has been the hallmark of America. And that is what we have been, if not the principal, unequalled and unsurpassed at least, in terms of our commitment to human rights as a goal for the international community, and a consideration for how we relate to other nations.

¹At this point in the hearing, the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights began the consideration of H. Res. 188. The markup was interrupted with House votes and it was resumed later during the hearing when additional subcommittee Members were present. In order to place together at the same point in the record all of the discussion concerning the consideration of this resolution, the text is inserted at a later point.

Thank you, very much. And I would ask for my statement to be included in the record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hoyer appears on p. 44.]

Senator DECONCINI. It will be included in the record.

Congressman Martinez, do you have any statement regarding the hearings this morning?

Mr. MARTINEZ. No, Senator.

Senator DECONCINI. Very good.

Senator Wirth, we welcome you, and you may proceed.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I am delighted to be here.

Senator DECONCINI. Let me interrupt you just a minute. The Senate is going to have a vote in about 5 minutes. So I am going to be leaving in 15 minutes. But I am going to come back. You may proceed while I am gone.

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
COUNSELOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you very much. I am delighted to be here with so many distinguished chairmen, as well as to be back working with you all. And we have all spent a great deal of time together. I do not know if you have realized, Mr. Chairman, and Congressman Martinez is also the chairman of a small and extraordinarily powerful caucus, that is called the Walsonberg Caucus.

There is a town in southern Colorado where my grandfather, and Secretary Cisneros' family, and Congressman Martinez' family all worked for the same coal company, the Victor American Fuel Company. Congressman Martinez was born in Walsonberg and is Chairman of the Walsonberg Caucus. So we have five very distinguished chairmen here today. And I just wanted to add that for the record. It might have missed you along the way, but we will come back and remind you of the virtues of Walsonberg.

Mr. MARTINEZ. It is prominently displayed in his biography, however.

Mr. WIRTH. It is, it is. We have talked about it on a number of occasions.

I am delighted to be here and have a chance to talk to you about the administration's human rights policy. I, too, have a statement, which I will see the gratitude on your faces, when I ask unanimous consent that my full statement be included in the record.

Mr. LANTOS. It will be included.

Mr. WIRTH. Promoting respect for human rights worldwide is one of the pillars of this administration's foreign policy. By fostering pluralism and democracy around the world, we also lay the foundation for stability and economic progress that benefits us as well as others. By working to ensure that other governments respect the rights of their citizens, we create a safeguard against threats to international peace and security, themes that are well understood by this subcommittee and by the CSCE committee, and that wonderful process.

We are fortunate to live in a country expressly founded on human rights principles. Our ideals have inspired people around the world. In recent years, we have witnessed the flourishing of democracy as well. Elections in recent weeks in Burundi, Cambodia,

Paraguay, and Yemen, and the referendum on democracy and economic reform in Russia are just the most recent examples of a worldwide trend away from authoritarianism and toward representative government.

The desire to enjoy the full range of human rights is universal. We respect the national ethnic, religious, and cultural differences that make countries unique. However, where you live should not determine whether you will be imprisoned, tortured, or killed merely for expressing your beliefs.

While a growing number of countries do respect these rights, they continue to be under severe challenge in many other countries, including Bosnia, Burma, China, Cuba, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, and Sudan.

The U.N. World Conference on Human Rights, which as you noted, Mr. Chairman, will take place over the next 2 weeks, June 14 to 25, represents an important opportunity for the Clinton administration and for the U.S. Government to show U.S. support for the popular movements for freedom and democracy that are emerging all over the world in this post-cold war era.

The conference represents an opportunity to reaffirm the universality of those rights, which are enshrined in the United Nations charter and in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We cannot afford to take a business as usual approach to human rights. The administration has made human rights a key component of its foreign policy. And we intend to follow up that policy with activism to advance the cause of human rights. And one of the most important ways that we can do this is to strengthen the U.N. systems for dealing with human rights.

We have worked closely with nongovernmental human rights organizations to develop an action plan to improve the United Nations' effectiveness in addressing and resolving human rights problems. And that draft action plan has been made available to members of the committee.

This plan figures prominently in our strategy for the conference next week in Vienna. And I would like to summarize briefly for you some of the components of that plan.

First, we want to ensure greater effectiveness of the U.N. Human Rights Center, and its advisory services and reporting activities.

Second, we hope to better target U.N. assistance toward helping nations establish the rule of law, eliminate torture, and resolve ethnic, religious, and racial conflict.

Third, we believe that we must integrate more fully the rights of women and children system-wide throughout the United Nations, and support the appointment of a Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women.

Fourth, we believe that the capacity of the United Nations to promote democracy will be increased by assisting in the conduct of elections and improving the administration of justice.

Fifth, we believe that human rights considerations should be integrated in the U.N. activities, such as peacekeeping, refugee protection, conflict resolution, and development of humanitarian programs.

And finally, we believe that an office of a U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights should be created as a means of improving the effectiveness of the United Nations in implementing human rights standards.

These are the highlights of the action plan which we have developed, Mr. Chairman, in cooperation with a very broad and inclusive group of nongovernmental organizations with the help of the staff of the CSCE Commission and with broad consultations, which will be the basis of the position which we take in Vienna.

Throughout much of our history, the United States has provided moral leadership in our foreign policy. We must now be in the forefront of those members of the international community who are supporting international human rights standards.

As Members of Congress, you have already done a great deal and can do more to help achieve that goal. For example, we believe that it is necessary as soon as possible to pass the implementing legislation necessary to complete ratification of the U.N. convention against torture.

In addition, the administration is considering ratification of the four international human rights treaties that are pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The convention to eliminate racial discrimination. The convention to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women. The American convention on human rights. And the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

We must, of course, look beyond the world conference to the longer term. The ambitious American agenda will not be completed in Vienna, nor should we expect it to be. However, we can work with other nations to reaffirm our commitment to those fundamental principles; to implement them around the world; and to isolate, Mr. Chairman, those renegade countries who are backsliding and who are using this conference and using other discussions of national sovereignty as a way of covering up and hiding their own egregious human rights abuses.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I thank you very much for the opportunity to be with you today. As I pointed out, our full statement, I hope, will be included in the record, along with the draft U.S. Action Plan, which lays out in great detail the position taken by this administration broadly embraced, I believe, by NGO's of all stripes across the country.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement and biographical sketch of Mr. Wirth appear on pp. 48-54.]

Mr. HOYER. I do not know which Mr. Chairman he is referring to.

Mr. WIRTH. All four.

Mr. HOYER. Senator or counselor—Tim?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes. "Hey you," works really well, you know.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

Mr. HOYER. At the end of your statement, I think that you touched on the gravamen of the problem with which you are going to be confronted. And that is that we are going to have the same

rubric apparently from a number of countries coming in to try to focus on economic rights, which of course the Soviets and Eastern bloc did for so many years in saying those are the real rights that count.

They have ultimately concluded that if you did not have individual personal liberties, and freedoms and protections, that economic well-being was a casualty.

The position that I have just stated, I presume that will be the continuing posture of the United States and of the West.

Could you perhaps discuss our strategy as we again hear this tired old rhetoric from countries that pretend that they are giving economic rights?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, the United States adheres to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And it is very clear in article 22, 23, 25, and 26 of the Universal Declaration that this also includes basic fundamental economic rights as well.

So for countries somehow to argue that their commitment to basic human rights is separate from their earlier commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights it seems to me is absolutely a mutually exclusive kind of an argument, and makes no sense whatsoever. It is not consistent in any way, shape, or form.

However, as you know, there will be and continue to be a number of countries that hide behind the commitments to economics, saying that economics and development have to come first. And I suppose that that then begs the question that if those come first, that gives them the right to torture, or to murder, or to whatever it may be, which I think they would not admit to. They are saying that those come first before a commitment to individual human rights.

We believe absolutely that each of the elements of the triangle of human rights, democracy, and economic development go hand in hand. And that having an open society, and having open markets, and having an open political system will contribute more rapidly to the mainstreaming of these countries in the economics of the globe, which is rapidly shrinking, as we all know. Everybody is becoming intertwined, as we all know. This is the wave of the future, and we are in it.

Now to understand this exactly is, of course, difficult. We in the United States have changed. We have committed ourselves, as you know, to the social and economic covenant, which is something which we had not done before. We think that is very important.

The United States has said that economic development is extremely important, and we recognize that. But now we have dropped the other shoe in saying that it is enormously important to pair economic development and human rights together. They do go hand in hand.

History teaches that. As you pointed out, the history of the last 50 years if nothing else teaches us that. And we will continue to make that case over, and over, and over again.

ENFORCEMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. HOYER. Excellent. Now with respect to enforcement mechanisms. I give a lot of talks, in which I, and I think everybody probably here does, including yourself, talk about a new world order.

President Bush articulated a new world order which related really to international cooperation, most particularly in the Persian Gulf, where egregious violations of borders and of human rights occurred, and the international community joined forces to redress those rights. Just as starkly, we have failed to do that in Yugoslavia, and Bosnia in particular.

What discussions or what posture will be taken, or what thoughts do you have with respect to enforcement mechanisms? So that we can go the step from what was the cold war articulation of human rights; the conferencing on human rights, the weekly, monthly, and annual meetings on human rights, which ultimately had an effect, a substantial effect. I think that one could argue that it had a very significant part in bringing down the Berlin Wall and creating democracies, and in enhancing human rights.

We are now at the stage where rhetoric is obviously not having an effect. The end of the cold war has unleashed nationalism, ethnic hatreds, uncontrolled power-seeking by individuals.

Tim, with respect to the commitment to human rights, what discussions do you think there will be with respect to further enforcement mechanisms, holding accountable those who egregiously violate international principles?

Mr. WIRTH. Let me, if I might, put that into a category as to what we can do unilaterally, and then what we believe we can do on a multilateral basis.

As the assumption of your question suggests and as you suggested yourself, we are moving very rapidly from the former bipolar superpower world which was based on kind of a hub and spoke set of relationships into a multilateral fabric. But we have a foot in both camps at this point. So therefore, I think that it is important to answer the question from the perspective of what we think we can and should be doing, and what transitions we make in our foreign policy, and then what we can do with multilateral institutions.

On the first part at home, one of the clearest and loudest commitments of President Clinton in this administration is to democracy, strengthening our capacity to help democracies around the world, to understand that there are different kinds of democracies, to strengthen the processes of civil institutions, court systems, the relationships of the military to constitutional government, all of those elements which define a civil society.

One of the key elements in that—and one of the most difficult—is for us to gather and understand better information on ethnic conflicts that are out there that you were pointing out in your question. These are popping up in many places all over the world.

We have in the United States an obligation, we believe, to do a better job of collecting information about those. More importantly, to develop, as was done through the CSCE process for example in the military, to develop a whole set of mechanisms on transparency, confidence-building measures, and having communities come to know each other, as you and I did for example years ago in getting the Soviet and U.S. militaries to talk to each other.

Do you remember that? That was a crazy idea when we were talking about that a decade ago. But it created the beginnings of understanding between people seeing each other, measuring each other, coming to know one another. Those same principles of trans-

parency and confidence-building, we believe, can be applied to confidence-building and the development of understanding of ethnic groups one with another. And that is part of what we are trying to do with this new democracy unit in the State Department.

So that, in part, goes to what our obligations are as to really changing our reporting mechanism and the way in which we help get groups together before you get into a Bosnia situation. Preventive medicine is one way of putting it.

On the international side, we believe very strongly that we must continue to contribute to and help to strengthen the United Nations and other international organizations, the OAS, for example, in our own hemisphere.

We have to work with those multinational institutions. It is more difficult to do. We hope that we are going to be able to have the budgetary freedom, for example, to pay our arrears, so that we will at the United Nations have the kind of clout that it is asking us to have, and be able to play the leadership role that countries around the world are asking us to play in that institution.

We want to increase the rapporteurial capability of the United Nations, to look at egregious problems. For example, there is the issue of women, that Congressman Smith and others brought up this morning. We think that a very special effort ought to be paid by the United Nations to the issues of women and children. Congresswoman Snowe has introduced a very interesting resolution related to strengthening our own capability, which I hope we can do in the State Department, to do precisely that.

We also want, in addition to the rapporteurial capability to bring to the attention of the world, we also want to work to strengthen the technical assistance capability of the United Nations, to go in and to help with work on elections, to help with work on the development of a free press, to help with work on military-civilian relationships, a whole set of technical issues that we are learning how to do through the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute, for example, as arms of our own Government's efforts.

This is a new world, Congressman Hoyer, as you well know. And we are struggling in the State Department with these new kinds of institutions to adapt our own foreign policy and our goals.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I will have to be leaving, because we are in the middle of the Foreign Ops markup, Mr. Obey's bill, up one flight. And we have a number of issues in there, as it relates to human rights and Yugoslavia in particular.

Mr. WIRTH. I know in that markup that you are also thinking very generously toward the Department of State.

Mr. HOYER. Of the votes that you want to count in the room, you want me in the room.

Mr. WIRTH. Take that generous trail up there at high speed, if you would, Congressman Hoyer.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you.

Mr. WIRTH. And if we can help in any way, do let us know.

THE CSCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. LANTOS. Before Chairman Hoyer leaves, let me just express to him my personal admiration for the work that he has done in the field of human rights as our leader here in the House of Representatives. He has done this with a degree of commitment and intelligence, and perseverance, and success that all of us across the political spectrum are deeply grateful for.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, if I might add just a note to that as a member of the Helsinki Commission for many years myself under the Congressman's very able leadership. I watched precisely that same attention to detail, and continuing energy and commitment with enormous admiration. And we really appreciate that, and look forward to strengthening this continuing relationship with an administration that shares these goals absolutely.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I might say on that that I have not met, but I know that Senator DeConcini and I both want to meet with you, Secretary Christopher and others to discuss the CSCE process. We are very advantaged by having a former Member inside the structure.

Mr. WIRTH. I was hoping that we might have a chance to talk about it. We have a very specific item, a very specific agenda item, which we wanted to raise with you, and discuss with you, related to perhaps getting the CSCE to take the lead on looking at freedom of the press, and looking at what is happening to means of free expression in Central and Eastern Europe, which is of concern to us.

I think that CSCE might be a very, very good vehicle for this. Congressman Lantos, I know, is very interested in this. It is an area that we believe ought to be explored. And this might be an area of very specific cooperation between all of you and CSCE.

Mr. HOYER. I look forward to doing that, and we will do that. I might say with respect to Congressman Lantos that he and I have worked very closely together. And although he is not on the Commission, as you know, he has worked very, very closely with the Commission. As Chairman of this subcommittee and as co-chairman of the Human Rights Caucus of the Congress, he has done extraordinary work himself. So we will work closely on that. It is a good effort.

Mr. WIRTH. We can do that maybe soon after the 4th of July. We will be back from Vienna. And then that other item, we might be able to get together on.

Mr. HOYER. We will do it. All of you can say that you were involved in a scheduling conference.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, sir.

CHINESE HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AND RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Chairman Hoyer.

I have a large number of very specific questions ranging from Bosnia to Tibet. But in deference to my colleague, who does need to leave in a few minutes, I yield to Congressman Smith.

Mr. SMITH. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Congressman, Senator, Counselor, Tim, there are a couple of questions that I would like to ask. You know, it is interesting that in human rights work, you usually see the same cast of characters who are motivated and highly dedicated. Steny Hoyer comes to mind very quickly. We have traveled together. Tom Lantos and yourself are always out in front on human rights.

For me personally, my motivation has always been twofold. One, the biblical admonition that what you do to the least or the most vulnerable of my brethren, you do likewise to me. And also, the idea of personalizing and emphasizing. If I were in that situation, what would I want someone to do to aid my cause.

As I have worked on issues whether they be oral rehydration therapy, or immunizations, or human rights, it has always been those two factors that have motivated me.

As I alluded to earlier in my remarks, when I look at the one child per couple policy in China, my wife and I have four children. If we lived in China, we would have one child, and Chris, Elise, and Michael would be dead. It is the simple fact of the matter. It is possible that the second order birth, Christopher, might be living. But our final two children, who have been borne to my wife, would be deceased at government decree.

That is what motivates me when I look at the situation in China. When I read, as I am sure you have read, and as Secretary Christopher very eloquently said in the hearing recently, when he read the April 25 *New York Times* report, which outline these horrible abuses against women and against the family. The Chinese Government is literally stealing those children. That is what it is, it is theft of children, and then killing them by way of forced abortion or infanticide.

It starts off with that very compelling story of Li Qinliang, who lost her child when the government said she must get rid of that child because it would not accommodate another birth.

When I read that, again I put myself in her shoes, and her husband's shoes, and her family's shoes, and said except for the grace of God, there goes my family.

I was hoping, and perhaps you could comment on this issue that is of great concern to all of us as well another form of exploitation of women that does not get a human rights focus the way that it ought to, and that is the trafficking of women with regard to prostitution.

Again, the *Times* had a very incisive story in this week about how so many women are being lured from the East Bloc countries to Russia and the former Soviet Union countries that make up that bloc, and are being physically abused and then coerced by way of drugs or some other ways into prostitution.

When the administration talks about women's and children's rights, will it raise in Vienna, first, this coercion issue, which I think is such an outrage; and secondly, this other issue of the trafficking of women? Whether it be Asia, or Europe, or anywhere else in the world, this is an abomination and an exploitation of women of the worst kind.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you very much, Congressman Smith, for that very eloquent statement. You and I have discussed this issue on a number of occasions in the past. And I always look forward to mak-

ing sure that we do everything we can to understand each other. And we find areas of common interest, which are much greater than our differences. And I appreciate the way that you have always approached this.

First, on the issue of coercion, we find that the administration's position is the position that you have, and that I have, and that any civilized human being has. This position is that that kind of physical coercion is absolutely abhorrent to the administration.

I asked Warren Zimmerman, who as you know is in charge of population, refugee, and migration affairs in the State Department, to go to New York personally and to deliver that statement. It was a very strong statement. I thought that was an extremely important thing for us to do in order to make very clear, so there is no doubt where this administration was coming from, what the President believed, and what Secretary Christopher and the State Department believed ought to be done.

There is always confusion about these things, if you let it go. And we wanted to define, if we might, Congressman Smith, clearly what we thought the parameters of unacceptable behavior were. And I think that Ambassador Zimmerman's statement did that very clearly and very well.

On the issue of women, we are concerned about that as we are concerned about the increased evidence and reality of trafficking in children as well. This is an appalling situation reflecting a fabric of greed, crime, and inhumanity that runs against the grain of everything that we believe in the United States of America, no matter what one's perspective.

And, it certainly runs against the grain of all of the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which all nations in the United Nations have added their signature.

We will continue to pursue this in every way. As I said in my opening statement, one of our primary concerns is for a new initiative focused on a broad group of women and children. And we will continue to do that.

It is also a hallmark of what the administration is trying to do in terms of our foreign policy, and how that runs through our concerns on the environment. For example, if we look at Russia, some of the groups that have been most concerned about democracy are environmental groups and women's groups. They are the same groups supporting the same goals.

It is true if we look at human rights situations. And we should elevate the attention to and understanding of the rights of women and the concerns whether they relate to trafficking, or relate to prostitution, or relate to reproductive health. They are all the kinds of issues that we ought to be and want to be putting higher on the agenda than, perhaps, they have been in the past.

Mr. SMITH. With the obvious exception of reproductive health as it relates to abortion, I could not be more in sync with what you are saying.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

One final question, and I will be very brief. One of the things that I noticed when I was the congressional delegate to the U.N. and I saw it up front, and worked with it with Ambassador Valadares at the U.N. Convention on Human Rights meeting in Geneva, and as I begin to look more and more at the reports being issued by the rapporteur on religious intolerance, I became very concerned that it was a paper tiger. That the lack of access to countries where these abuses were occurring was greatly inhibiting the ability of human rights, first to be exposed where there are abuses, and to recommend reforms.

How might the administration consider reforming the rapporteur system or network? Because again, very often, it just means a high level dialogue where allegations are made by the rapporteur. In the case of the PRC and other governments, or Cuba, they forward back a list of responses that simply deny or somehow denigrate the evidence that has been presented.

Mr. WIRTH. Well, as you know, Congressman Smith, this United Nations conference coming up in Vienna is not a conference based upon enforcement or taking country-specific problems. What we do want to do is to try to strengthen the rapporteur's system.

Take our own experience. Our own experience with the human rights report, which you know is put out every year as mandated by the Congress, is a document that is very broadly respected. It raises issues, and countries look at it very closely. It becomes the basis for a lot of our actions around the world, and part of our foreign policy in each country.

We would hope that one, the United Nations, would be able to help in that process of illustration, and have the rapporteurial process be more than just a dialogue. I should be a very clear enunciation of fact and with special reference now to the women's issues.

And second, we hope that we are going to be able to strengthen the United Nations human rights system to add greater technical assistance capability. Once you find a problem, then what do you do about it. We can identify and talk about it, and make sure that people know about it. But then how do we take the next step in working with that country, not only to expose the kinds of problems, but also to try to provide the mechanism for solving those problems.

Whether that mechanism is technical assistance to that government, or is the inclusion of activities with nongovernmental organizations, we believe very strongly that broadening the base of government efforts to include more and more nongovernmental organizations is a very, very useful and positive thing to do. And it must be a good thing to do, because those are some of the things that are most resisted by the Cubas and the Chinas of this world, the access of nongovernmental organizations.

So those are some of the things that we are trying to do. All of those again are outlined in the draft action plan.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Mr. SMITH. Finally, I would hope that some consideration would be given to another issue because there is a wide array of opinions on this. As articulated in the Declaration on the Rights of the Child and then restated in the preamble in the Convention on the Rights of the Child, children before birth, as is said in the preamble, are worthy of protection, special protections by countries. In addition to prenatal care, I would argue that this should include legal protections concerning their personhood.

I know that we have a disagreement on this, but my feeling is that birth is an event that happens to each and every one of us. Birth is not the beginning of life. If one merely back tracks logically from the moment of birth, there is a child in utero that is very special and worth of protection. I would just hope that this would be considered. I thank you.

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman Smith, as you know, this administration believes very strongly that the whole issue of birth control ought to be more broadly defined. That it ought to include issues of child mortality. That it ought to include issues of the health of women. There is a broader context that must be considered. And we made that point very, very clear in our positions on population as stated 3 weeks ago in New York.

Mr. SMITH. Again, abortion as a method of birth control. The taking of those unborn baby girls or boys. I would argue, and polls in the United States at least would indicate that the American people do not share that view.

Hard cases are one thing. But using abortion as a method of birth control is resoundingly rejected by Americans. I happen to believe that the most fundamental of all human rights is the right to life of everyone. Again, life is a continuum. It does not begin at birth. Thank you.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN BOSNIA-HERCEGOVINA

Senator DECONCINI. Thank you, Congressman Smith.

Counselor, I have another vote. So the chairman here has agreed that I can go next and pose a couple of questions to you. Thank you again for coming. I am sorry I missed some of your statement.

You have called for the energizing of the human rights program in the United Nations.

How does the administration then intend to actually do that—if that was in your statement and I missed it, I apologize, and you need not answer again—to protect human rights in cases such as Bosnia-Herzegovina, where there is a palpable lack of will among nations to take steps necessary to stop this massive human rights violation?

Mr. WIRTH. Obviously, the Bosnian situation is enormously complicated and a huge sink into which so many efforts and so many good intentions have gone.

Related to this specific human rights area, we believe very strongly that—we were talking earlier about the rapporteurial situation of the United Nations has to be better. We talked earlier about conflict resolution, anticipating down the line how do we bet-

ter understand before the kinds of conflicts that we are seeing in Bosnia occur.

We have, as you know, been instrumental in supporting the war crimes tribunal for Bosnia. And the United Nations is in the process of implementing that right now. That is going to be a long time in coming, to make sure that that is a reality, as we all know. But that is a step in the right direction.

The United States continues to be the major donor in terms of humanitarian support and humanitarian relief. We have just designated Ambassador Zimmerman as the special envoy of the United States to the EC for humanitarian matters to make sure that we are doing everything we can to ensure that our allies and others concerned about the problems in Bosnia are supplying their fair share. We are taking as many steps as we think are feasible at this point.

Senator DECONCINI. I read, I believe, in this morning's paper that Secretary Christopher has committed the use of U.S. troops as part of a U.N. effort for protecting enclaves and delivering humanitarian aid. And then the story I read, which I do not have in front of me, led me to believe that would authorize the use of force for the protecting of those different entities.

Is that the policy now, or can you comment?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, the Secretary is certainly consulting with NATO, with the EC, and with the Secretary General about the offer of U.S. troops. That offer has been made. That offer, as I understand it, is also part of these discussions. These would be blue-helmeted troops.

Beyond that, I think to get into any discussion of what might be rules of engagement or whatever would not be appropriate for this forum.

Senator DECONCINI. Senator Wirth, the administration, and I realize that this is very speculative, but is it safe to say that the administration does not, and from your standpoint would not support a plan that gave up permanent territory to an aggressive nation, i.e. Serbia, as it relates to Bosnia-Herzegovina?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, the United States continues to pursue the policy, Mr. Chairman, of trying to resolve the differences between these various ethnic groups in every peaceful way that we possibly can.

Senator DECONCINI. Does that include not negotiating for territorial exchanges, or does that include negotiating for territorial exchanges?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, the United States has supported the safe haven proposal, as you know. That is being debated right now in New York at the United Nations, as to whether it is feasible and enforceable. We are trying to figure out a way in which territorial integrity can ensure the safety of individuals.

Senator DECONCINI. My concern is this. That we have been the leaders, and properly so, along with some other countries of the Helsinki final act at the Paris Conference and other CSCE meetings. The documents agreed to at these meetings clearly state that territorial seizure by another country through force is against international law. And what I am trying to do quite frankly is pin you down, as to whether or not that is the policy of the United

States. That we will adhere to that, and that we will not sanction a plan, which does not mean that it might not come about, but we will not sanction a plan that would permit the territorial gains by Serbia in Bosnia.

Mr. WIRTH. That begs the question also, Mr. Chairman. The next step is when you cross that line, then what does one do about it. And that is what we have all been working on in such a torturous fashion since the 20th of January, inheriting this very, very complicated situation that was out of control and continues to be.

We are deeply concerned, as you know, about its spread further south in particular. And that alarms us a great deal and I think just about to every nation.

Senator DECONCINI. I hope what I hear you saying, Senator Wirth, is that our policy at least today is to be in full compliance with the human rights treaty of the United Nations, and the Helsinki final act, and the Charter of Paris recently signed, as it relates to territorial integrity. It is not our position as of right now, and hopefully will never be that we would sanction or participate in the dividing of another country based on aggressive action.

Mr. WIRTH. Of course not.

Senator DECONCINI. Whether it was Serbia, Bosnia-Hercegovina, or Hungary, or anywhere else.

Mr. WIRTH. Absolutely.

Senator DECONCINI. Thank you, Senator. I am going to leave for a vote. I appreciate you taking the time to be here with us. And again, I compliment the administration for your appointment. I look forward to your strong voice in Vienna and other human rights forums where you will have an opportunity to express the strong feeling of the people of the United States. Not just the government, but the people of the United States.

COUNTERNARCOTICS STRATEGY

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Might I add that I also very much look forward to sitting down and talking to you about an issue that we have talked about over the past months. And that relates to our counternarcotics strategy, how that relates to democracy, and now that in turn relates to human rights. Again, these issues are intertwined, as you have pointed out so many times.

And we are trying to surface a much clearer understanding of those parts of the counternarcotics programs that we know have worked in the Andean countries and in Central America. Issues that you have been concerned about: how do we strengthen the fabric of these countries, and how do we support those very brave people who are fighting against the great pressures of vast amounts of narcotics money that is moving in.

We have a big responsibility there, recognized loud and clear by this administration. When I am in Vienna, for example, the Colombian foreign minister and I will be going together to meet with the United Nations drug enforcement group, which we thought was a very important statement to make, to have the United States and Colombia going together for that. We look forward to working with you on this matter.

Senator DECONCINI. Thank you, Senator. As you know, there are great things happening through the Southern Command in Panama with General Joulwan in concurrence with the Colombian Government for the first time ever. And even to a lesser extent Peru and Bolivia.

I would urge you, and I know that you do not have time, I just did it for a one night stand, I would urge you to go down there and take a few hours to be briefed by General Joulwan and the other agencies that are there on the efforts coordinated with Colombia. And that it does work for a small amount of defense dollars and other dollars that are invested in it. Thank you.

Mr. WIRTH. It is extremely important. I met with General Joulwan, and look forward to doing that. We have had some major successes. And what has not been done, Mr. Chairman, is telling the story very well. We have not been good at this unfortunately. And we have got to be much more precise, and we have got to work very closely together. Because it is so extremely important to our foreign policy, and this is right in our own back yard. And it would clearly be, I think, a real disaster for us to have some of these emerging democracies become in effect narco-democracies, something we cannot, should not, and must not condone in any way, shape, or form.

Senator DECONCINI. Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA AND THE OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Senator DeConcini. We are delighted to have had you join us with the Helsinki Commission.

Senator Wirth, I would like to begin my questioning with the subject of China. The President proposes a new approach to the question of most favored nation treatment. As you well know, in the House, we have indicated over the years an opposition to granting China most favored nation treatment with overwhelming votes and in some instances with unanimous votes.

The President's new proposal asks for a 1-year period during which the administration will do its utmost to work on improving the human rights situation in China. And as you know, there is a division in the Congress on whether to go along with this approach, which is a distinct improvement over the previous approaches, or whether to insist upon ending most favored nation treatment given the appalling human rights violations currently underway in China, both within China and with respect to the suppression of the people of Tibet.

I am inclined, and I have made no decision yet, but I am inclined to give the administration the opportunity to proceed as outlined by the President the other day. But before I make a decision, and a large number of my colleagues have indicated to me that they are taking a similar wait and see attitude, we wish to know what the administration's policy is with respect to the holding of the Olympics in Beijing in the year 2000.

Now I am sure that within a few days that we will be getting the administration's written response to H. Res. 188, my resolution, which calls for not holding the Olympics in China in the year

2000, and urging the U.S. delegate to the International Olympic Committee to vote that way.

But I would like to explore this issue with you now here in open session. It seems to me that the President's position on most favored nation treatment, if it is to be taken at face value, which I do, says that a year from now that there will be another look at China's human rights policy. If in fact various things which are now U.S. law are complied with, and if in fact there is significant progress along many other lines, MFN would be extended, I presume, for another year.

So the President is putting China on a short leash with respect to most favored nation treatment. The current leash runs, according to the President's proposal, 12 months. Now clearly, with the vote on settling on the location of the Olympics in the year 2000 being scheduled for September, just 3 months away, the decision needs to be made now as to whether this administration will favor granting China now the opportunity of holding the Olympics in the year 2000 given the current status of human rights in that country and not knowing at all what will happen during the next 12 months, 24 months, or 36 months.

Once the decision is taken to hold the Olympics in Beijing, it would be almost impossible to reverse that decision. There would have to be another Tiananmen Square outrage for that to be considered.

So I would like to ask you to indicate your view on this legislation. I know that you may need to consult with some of your colleagues on this, but I also know your longstanding involvement in human rights issues and your very clear understanding of what is at stake, namely the granting to a dictatorial regime something that was granted to Hitler's Germany in 1936 and exploited to the fullest by that despicable regime in Berlin. Is the administration inclined to take the position that my resolution takes, that we would love to see the Olympics in China in the year 2004 or 2008, the sooner the better, as soon as human rights conditions both in China and in Tibet warrant the holding of this great international event in Beijing?

Voting to hold the Olympics in China is an enormous vote of confidence in the Beijing regime, and this decision must be taken within the next 3 months. Does the administration favor this resolution which states that, given current conditions, this action is really not warranted?

So I would first like to ask you to deal with this issue.

Mr. WIRTH. The administration's response to your resolution is currently under review, as you know. And that review is not completed. Mr. Samaranché, who is the head of the International Olympic Committee, has spoken publicly of the IOC's approach to consideration of human rights practices in determining whether a candidate country would make a suitable site for the Olympic games. He is very aware of our concerns about human rights. He has explicitly stated that as part of their discussions that human rights will be part of the decisionmaking process that they make.

The situation is, as you know, somewhat complicated by the fact that this is a private body making this decision, which does not, of course, excuse us from not making any statement on this. But

it should be noted that this is not a governmental body, nor is the U.S. representative to the Olympics a U.S. Government employee, or appointee, or whatever. Again, this is a private decision.

Having noted the fact that we are currently reviewing this, and we will get back to you on it shortly, we should, I think, with significant pride point to the decisions made by the administration in terms of the coalition put together on MFN. And I would hope very much that we will have your hardy support for the approach taken by the administration.

For the first time on China policy, we have together almost all of the major players in support of the executive position taken by the administration. The day after that very good vote in the House of Representatives on the budget, which you will remember, happened on a Thursday.

The next morning, the announcement of our policy on China was made. At that announcement, we had for the first time in a long time the leadership on the resolutions on MFN. Senator Mitchell and Congresswoman Pelosi were there. We had leaders from the NGO communities most concerned about Tibet, and the treatment of the Dalai Lama and the Tibetans.

Senator Moynihan, who has made it very clear that he did not want to support, as I understand it, any granting of MFN until the Tibet situation was taken care of, was there that day. And a great part of the business community.

It was a very broad coalition in support of what we believe was the right strategy for us to be pursuing at this point.

You used the word short leash. I suppose that that is a good metaphor to use. It is their country, but our relationships with them are now on a short leash. And that has been made very clear. And you know how difficult this negotiation was.

We continue to work with the Chinese Government. My own office will be deeply concerned with this. Assistant Secretary Shattuck, who is the new Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, will be going to the People's Republic. We hope that that will result in a series of discussions related to specific abuses, specific problems, and broad overall policy.

We are heartened by the response that we have received to the administration's new approach on Tibet. As you know, for the first time the Dalai Lama met with the Secretary in the Department of State.

I know that you are very attuned to the subtleties of the symbolism of all of this, but the Dalai Lama was there.

Mr. LANTOS. I vividly remember, Senator Wirth, when the Dalai Lama was the guest of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus at the invitation of my good friend Congressman Porter, the Republican co-chairman, and myself. And the Dalai Lama could not go near the State Department or the White House.

So we appreciate these improvements. But I think that it is important for you and the President to understand that the MFN extension for 1 year with a review at the end of the year is in the view of many of us an intelligent policy. And having confidence in the President's commitment to human rights, and the Secretary's commitment, and your commitment, many of us are inclined to give

you the benefit of the doubt, which I think you are fully entitled to for this year.

But I do not think that there is an analogous situation with respect to the site for holding of the Olympic games. Nothing will be interrupted, no American business relationship will be interrupted, no American contact with China will be interrupted.

The question basically boils down to a very simple point, namely do we believe today, given human rights conditions in China and in Tibet today, which the State Department's human rights report describes in the most ominous terms, is this the time to give China the right to hold the Olympics. And this decision has to be made within 3 months.

So while the decision will be private, the administration's position will have to be public because we have requested a statement on the administration's policy on my resolution. We hope that this statement will be forthcoming, because we expect to move this legislation quickly. We hope to have it up for a vote within a few days. And it is my strong hope that the administration's position will be in our hands before that vote is taken.

Let me just lay out for my colleagues the schedule I intend to follow. We have a vote that we will have to be leaving for in just a couple of minutes. And the committee will be in recess during that vote.

MARKUP OF H. RES. 188

Mr. Chairman, if I may, and this will not take more than a minute, I need to conduct a couple of business items of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Security and Human rights.

We are marking up two resolutions. The first one is my own resolution, H. Res. 188,² to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Olympics in the year 2000 should not be held in Beijing or anywhere else in the People's Republic of China. Will the clerk report the resolution.

The CLERK. House Resolution 188 to express the sense of the Congress that the Olympic games in the year 2000 should not be held in Beijing or elsewhere in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. LANTOS. Without objection, further reading of the resolution is dispensed with, printed in the record in full and open for amendment at any point.³

The legislation that we are considering today expresses the sense of the Congress that the Olympics in the year 2000 should not be held in Beijing or in any other location in the People's Republic of China.

I introduced this resolution with a number of our distinguished colleagues from across the political spectrum with Chairman Hoyer of the Helsinki Commission, and several members of this subcommittee, including my good friend, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, and Mr. Sawyer of Ohio.

²The initial discussion of H. Res. 188 took place at an earlier point in the hearing. The markup was interrupted with House votes, and it was resumed at this point. In order to place together at the same place in the record all of the discussion concerning the consideration of this resolution, the initial part of the discussion is included here.

³The text of H. Res. 188 appears in appendix 1.

This resolution notes the importance of the venue of the Olympic games. Since Adolph Hitler used the 1936 Olympic games as a showcase for his vicious racist and supernationalist regime, the world has rightly been repulsed by the use of the Olympic games to enhance the image of a totalitarian and dictatorial regime.

The efforts to which the Chinese Government has gone to win the honor of holding the Olympic games is a reflection of how politically important those games are to the Chinese leadership in Beijing.

When the members of the International Olympic Committee went to Beijing, Chinese Government officials cleared the street of street vendors which might be offensive to the committee. They turned off the polluting coal fire heating plants that normally provide necessary heat for the city. Because they did not want the city's vista to be clouded by the usual coal smoke.

And they gave expensive, enormously expensive, gifts to the International Olympic Committee and to members of the Olympic delegation.

Perhaps the most disgusting were statements made by Chinese Government officials in connection with their desire to win the Olympics assuring Olympic officials that there would be no untimely political or other demonstrations or expressions of dissent to disturb the tranquillity of the games.

Mr. Chen Xitong, currently chairman of the Beijing 2000 Olympic bid committee, assured the International Olympic Committee in China's formal application, and I am quoting, "Neither now nor in the future will there emerge in Beijing organizations opposing Beijing's bid" to host the Olympics.

Mr. Chen is certainly an expert in assuring that there will be no dissent. In the spring of 1989, Mr. Chen was the major of Beijing at the time of Tiananmen Square. It was the same Mr. Chen who called for a crack-down on pro-democracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square. And on May 20, 1989, the same Mr. Chen signed a martial law decree authorizing the entry of troops into the city.

My legislation states that it is the sense of the Congress that the Olympic games in the year 2000 must not be held in the city of Beijing or anywhere else in the People's Republic of China.

My legislation urges the International Olympic Committee to find another, more suitable venue for the games. It also urges the U.S. representatives on the International Olympic Committee to vote against holding the games in China and directs the Clerk of the House to transmit a copy of our resolution to the chairman of the International Olympic Committee and the U.S. representative to the International Olympic Committee.

I recognize Mr. Smith of New Jersey for any remarks that he would like to make on this subject, or Chairman Hoyer, who are cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to Mr. Smith. I obviously support the resolution strongly and congratulate the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I join you in supporting this very important resolution. I think that it would send a distinctly wrong message to hold the Olympic games in a

country where the hard liners continue to rule with impunity, where the rule of law and human rights are not protected, and where the individual citizen has no due process rights. I think that it would be a mistake to somehow convey a false sense that things are on the up and up in Beijing.

It is interesting to note that the mayor of Beijing, who is also organizing the Olympic bid, is the same mayor who with a great amount of glee, was part of the investigation of the Tiananmen Square massacre, and certainly did nothing to mitigate that disaster. As a matter of fact, he seems to have been part of it.

We boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympics, and rightly so, because of the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan. And it seems inconceivable to me that we will turn around and now apply a different standard to a nation that is one of the worst abusers of human rights in the world.

I do have an amendment, and I have conferred briefly with my friend and colleague, Mr. Lantos, to see if he would find this acceptable. The amendment simply states, "Whereas the Government of China has engaged in ongoing pervasive human rights abuses of women and children, including the use of forced abortion and involuntary sterilizations as part of China's one child per couple policy," I ask that that be considered, or ask unanimous consent that it be included in the text.

Mr. LANTOS. Is there objection? Without objection the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Smith, is agreed to.

Mr. HOYER. I would love to vote on your resolution, quite frankly.

Mr. LANTOS. We would love to have you vote on the resolution, Congressman Hoyer.

Mr. HOYER. Without objection.

Are we on to something different?

Mr. LANTOS. We are still on the Olympic issue.

Mr. HOYER. As I said, I very much support, Mr. Chairman, your resolution. I think, as Mr. Smith has pointed out, it is an appropriate statement for us to make. President Carter took a lot of heat for what he did in Moscow. I was not in the Congress then, but I know he took a lot of heat. He was right. He was right to stand on principle. And I think frankly his administration will go down as having been probably the strongest administration in history on human rights.

I want to say that Secretary Schultz, I thought, was probably one of the strongest secretaries on human rights. So in a bipartisan way, I think that the message has been sent, and we need to continue to send that message. And I think that this resolution does it.

Mr. LANTOS. Would my good friend from California like to make a comment now or later?

Mr. MARTINEZ. I might as well make it now. I seem to be the odd man out. I have very seldom disagreed with the chairman, Mr. Lantos, but I do disagree with this.

And the only way that I can really relate to it is that in the past that we have isolated governments who we disagreed with. And we have supported governments that claim to be democracies and waved the flag of democracy very high, and yet practiced more

human rights violations than any of the Communist countries that we have isolated.

And to me, I do not know how we can influence a country unless we are talking to it and dealing with it. It only relates back to an experience that happened to me early on when I came to Congress where there was a young man from Beijing that wanted to serve a summer internship in one of the offices here in Washington, and no one would take him because he was from Communist China. And we took him.

And at the end of his stay here, he had written a thesis for his masters, and left me a copy of it. Immediately upon leaving my office and going back to Berkeley where he came from to finish up his studies there, I was approached by one of our government agencies interested in that document. And I turned it over to them, and they returned it to me a few weeks later. And I asked what they discovered in the document, because I had not had a chance to read it before they picked it up. And they told me that it was quite complimentary to the United States.

Well, this young man took back to Beijing the ideas that he learned here about freedom in the United States. Tiananmen Square happened because there were a lot of young people who had been educated in this country, who saw the freedoms that we enjoy, and understood that you have to challenge governments when they are oppressive and wrong.

So they were not successful. But they will continue that effort. And that effort grows and grows. And communism itself as a government is failing in every way to serve its people. Their economy is bad, because of their restricted rights or nonexistent rights. I am not sure that we do the right thing by isolating countries.

I really believe that with the Olympic games held there, and people coming from all over the world, people from other forms of government who show in those forms of government with the rights of freedom and the rights of expression, how much better China could be for it.

A long time ago, I asked two young people who had asked the then Presidential candidate as President how he would promote peace. And the response was by continuing dialogue with those countries that we disagree with.

I do not know how you can continue a dialogue if you continue to harp on those things that we disagree with without exchanging any other opportunities for them to experience better ways.

I go back to the idea that we have not been successful in fighting communism. Communism defeated itself. We actually have fed communism in supporting oppressive governments, and I go back to Samosa. And I got back to Battista. And the idea that we militarily occupied all of those countries for all of those years, and we did not leave democracies when we should have been promoting democracies, but we left dictatorships.

Why? Because they were right wing dictatorships, not left wing dictatorships. And we felt that a right wing dictatorship was better than a left wing dictatorship. I do not know how. They are both oppressive. One just gives you a trial and then shoots, and the other one does not give you a trial and shoots you. So what is the difference really? I do not know how we can support one or the other.

If we are really true to our goal of supporting democracy, then we ought to be supporting democracy. And we ought to try to influence those countries. And the best way to influence them is with exchanges.

One of the best programs that I have never seen in high schools and in rotary clubs around this country is group study exchanges, where they send young people from here, either young people of high school age, or college age, or young professionals, to other countries, and exchange people back.

You ought to see the untold reward that that brings to both countries. And I believe for that reason that if Beijing, and really it is very early, Beijing has made an application. They have not been granted the right to hold the Olympic games. I think that we ought to wait.

In 7 years from now, there might be a lot of changes. Nobody ever expected that communism in Russia would fall without a shot being fired. I can remember Khrushchev here telling Nixon that they would bury us without firing a shot. I think that the opposite happened.

Mr. LANTOS. If my colleague would yield for a second.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Just let me finish one last statement, and then I will yield. I remember that many of us, Democrats and Republican alike, gave great applause to President Nixon for opening dialogue and trying to normalize relations with Red China. And there are many instances now where Communist China is coming into this country and entering into business deals with people in this country, making investments here and taking technology from here and using it in their country. And there are a lot of our countries who are investing there.

That is not consistent to me. To do that, and then to say all of a sudden something, something that could bring a whole wave of people and new ideas to China, to try to deny that.

I will yield.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend for yielding. And let me say that there is a great deal of wisdom in what my good friend and colleague from California says. There is one point of fact, which I would like to bring to his attention, respectfully.

The decision concerning the holding of the Olympics in the year 2000 will be made in the immediate future—in September of this year. So we really do not have a chance to wait 7 years until the year 2000. That decision will be made now.

Nothing would please me more than to enthusiastically support Beijing being the location of the Olympics in the year 2004 or 2008, by which time the outrageous human rights abuses which are currently being perpetrated hopefully will have ended.

The decision concerning Olympics 2000 is imminent. And the Olympic Committee will now decide whether to hold the Olympics in one of the many palpably democratic countries such as Australia, for instance, which is also applying, or whether to award this extraordinary privilege, the spirit of the Olympic games, to this Chinese regime.

But in deference to our colleagues from the Senate and the Helsinki Commission, Mr. Chairman, we will suspend this discussion

and debate, and our votes, until after Counselor Wirth has had a chance.

Senator DECONCINI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. If the chairman would allow me, since I did yield. And if I have any time, let me reclaim that time.

Mr. LANTOS. Surely.

Mr. MARTINEZ. And say in deference to the 7 years, I was not suggesting that we wait to make the decision for 7 years. I was saying that in 7 years that a lot of things will change.

Mr. LANTOS. I hope so.

I will take this opportunity for a vote on the resolution concerning not holding the Olympics in Beijing in the year 2000, and the resolution of the distinguished chairman of the Asia Subcommittee concerning Tibet.

We have discussed House Resolution 188. Are there further amendments or discussion? If not, the question now occurs on agreeing to the resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Olympics should not be held in Beijing or elsewhere in the People's Republic of China in the year 2000.

All of those in favor signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. LANTOS. All those opposed, no.

[No response.]

Mr. LANTOS. In the opinion of the Chair the ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to.

MARKUP OF H. CON. RES. 106

Mr. LANTOS. The subcommittee will now consider House Concurrent Resolution 106, which was introduced by my good friend and colleague Congressman Gary Ackerman, Chairman of the Asia Subcommittee. Will the clerk report the resolution.

The CLERK. House Concurrent Resolution 106. A concurrent resolution urging the President to raise, at the highest levels of the government of the People's Republic of China, the issue of Chinese population transfer into Tibet in an effort to bring about an immediate end to that government's policy on this issue.

Mr. LANTOS. Without objection, further reading of the resolution is dispensed with, printed in the record in full and open for amendment at any point. I am pleased to call on Congressman Ackerman with respect to his resolution.

I am very pleased to call on my good friend and colleague Congressman Ackerman, Chairman of the Asia Subcommittee, with respect to his resolution.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I thank the distinguished chairman very, very much. And I welcome our colleague back here with us today.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that a lot has been said to this point on this particular resolution. Let me say, of course, that I offer it on behalf of not only myself, but you as well, and Mr. Gilman, and Mr. Porter.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I am one of those who supported the President's approach on MFN to China. And I played some strong role in the discussions that went on during that process. Nonetheless, I think that it is important and imperative that we make this very, very

important statement with respect to what is going on in Tibet today.

I think that we must make a very, very strong and affirmative statement as to what is going on in Tibet. I do not consider myself a China basher in any sense of the word. And I would like to encourage the kinds of things that we would like to see.

But what is going on in Tibet is an absolute outrage. We must take a position and make a very, very strong moral statement. If it is not ethnic cleansing that is going on in Tibet, it is certainly ethnic dilution. And the net result of each are the same.

I appreciate the deep feelings that some of our colleagues have on this issue. But nonetheless, it is time, Mr. Chairman, that somebody in this Government make a very strong affirmative statement. And I believe that the time is at hand.

Thank you very much.⁴

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Are there any other comments on the Tibet resolution?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LANTOS. Congressman McCloskey.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I might say very briefly that it is really great to see Mr. Wirth here. And I commend his appointment. And I would like to commend you and Mr. Ackerman on this resolution. I have had a strong interest in this area for years. First, engendered by the fact that in my hometown of Bloomington, Indiana, that Dr. Norbud, the brother of the Dalai Lama has counseled and advised me on these concerns for years.

I will say that the position of the last administration and State Department was abominable. When we brought it up, we were told repeatedly that this was an internal Chinese matter. And indeed, everything that can be done should be done.

Also, incidentally, in the area I think of linguistic and cultural promotion within our State Department, there were no Tibetan speakers, Tim, assigned to the State Department in the last administration. I know that there are moves on to rectify that. I hope that they are followed through on.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank my friend for his comments.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LANTOS. Congressman Porter.

Mr. PORTER. Just briefly. I am not a member of the subcommittee, and obviously cannot vote on the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. We are delighted to have you comment.

Mr. PORTER. But as a member of CSCE and the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, and a principal cosponsor of Mr. Ackerman's resolution, I think that this is of extreme importance. Perhaps with the exception of Bosnia, there is no greater example in the world today of cultural genocide than what is happening in Tibet.

It is a country obviously with which we have little direct contact or any trade, but it is a country that the Chinese should understand that we care greatly about. And the leadership that the Dalai Lama has brought to bear on what is happening in this country

⁴The prepared statement of Mr. Ackerman appears on p. 47.

has captured the imagination of the American people and their sense of equity and justice.

And Mr. Chairman, I would very, very strongly urge the adoption of this resolution, and commend Mr. Ackerman for his great leadership in this area.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much. And I certainly concur. We are deeply grateful to Chairman Ackerman for bringing this issue before this body.

Is there any further discussion or amendment? If not, the question is now on agreeing to the resolution. Those in favor of the Tibet resolution will say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. LANTOS. Those opposed.

[No response.]

Mr. LANTOS. The ayes have it and the resolution is adopted.

And the subcommittee is in recess for 10 minutes while we cast our votes.

[Recess.]

Mr. McCLOSKEY. If we can resume the hearing. Mr. Lantos will be here soon, I am advised.

[Pause.]

Mr. LANTOS. Senator Wirth, I would like for you to describe for the subcommittee how the administration envisages the operations of the newly created war crimes tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

Would we support an active effort to arrest and prosecute war criminals? Would we support the establishment of a permanent war crimes tribunal that would try war crimes and crimes against humanity wherever and whenever they occur?

You should note that I am completing the draft of such legislation. And I would be very much interested in hearing your views. It seems to me that the likelihood is very strong, unfortunately, that Yugoslavia is not the only place where war crimes will be committed. In the coming years, there will be other places. And I think that it would be extremely important to move in an organized, systematic, and sustained fashion rather than on an ad hoc basis.

So if you could comment both on the newly created war crimes tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and on the issue of how the administration would view the establishment of a permanent war crimes tribunal?

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have been joined by Ambassador James Bishop, whom you know.

Mr. LANTOS. We are very happy to have Ambassador Bishop.

Mr. WIRTH. The Security Council is right now setting up the procedures for the war crimes tribunal. That is going on as we sit now. So it is difficult to flesh that out any further than where we are now. We are hopeful that that will be a very effective organization, and that is strongly supported by this administration.

A permanent war crimes tribunal, as you also know, raises a series of jurisdictional issues in terms of sovereignty of nations and some legal concerns. And we have not to date supported a permanent war crimes tribunal. This administration has not come down one way or the other. It just has not focused on that. But as a general matter of policy within the State Department, the State De-

partment has not supported a permanent war crimes tribunal for the reasons of sovereignty with which you are familiar.

Mr. LANTOS. Let me ask a general question about the extent to which the Department of State attempts to develop a united front with other highly developed wealthy nations in the field of human rights.

One of the most frustrating aspects of working in the human rights field, for 13 years as a member of this body has been the standard statement of administration witnesses, that while our calls for sanctions of one type or another are eminently reasonable, and praiseworthy, and have great merit, it would really not help the situation at all because other countries like Japan and various European countries—which seem to have a far lesser degree of interest in human rights, and certainly do not tie human rights policy to economic policy, or trade policy, or aid policy—would continue business as usual.

The easy excuse for years has been that if we act unilaterally, it is not helpful anyway, and therefore we really should not act.

Now you have just been on the job a short time. And I realize that you have not yet had a chance to do so, I presume.

But do you have plans, does the administration have plans, for instance with respect to Japan, to involve that government as a major player in human rights policy which clearly has not been the case historically?

It seems to me that many of the failures of the West have been the result of a lack of unity, a lack of cohesion, and a lack of concerted effort. And on the part of some administrations in the past, this lack of unity was used as an excuse for not acting. Acting alone does not help, so let us not act alone. Let us put effort into getting Japan, Germany, and other countries into a united front with us in dealing with this issue.

I would be grateful to get your views on this matter.

Mr. WIRTH. It is an extraordinarily good and an extraordinarily difficult question, as you know, when we again are dealing with sovereignty.

Let me just make three points. One, we have consulted increasingly and extensively with the EC and with Japan on human rights issues. The Japanese are increasingly forthcoming on these and related kinds of issues. Counter-narcotic issues, population issues, the environment issues.

The Japanese Government has become much more open about this sort of thing, and much more involved in this sort of thing. And it is extremely heartening. As you know, the President and Prime Minister Miyazawa are going to have bilaterals at the time of the G-7 in Japan. A number of these issues will be up for discussion. We think that that is very promising, and so do they.

We believe that we and the Japanese have a lot of work to do together, and so do they. We want to strengthen this relationship at a time when a lot of people are talking about just the opposite, threats to the U.S.-Japan relationship. We think that there are many currents going just the opposite direction, and that is very good.

The European situation. Let me just cite a specific example on that front. It is the question of Iran. We are under, as you can

imagine, a lot of pressure from commercial enterprises in the United States to allow them to do various sales to Iran on the argument that if we do not do it, the Europeans are going to come in and do it. At which point, what do we stand for anyway.

You know, this is the number one, or among the top two or three renegade countries in the world. And who are we to believe that we are going to, for the purposes of X, Y, or Z, change their practices or policies by denying our firm a commercial benefit, so we might as well go ahead and trade with them. Because if we do not, then the other people are going to.

Well, we can make that statement loud and clear. But as you know, it is sometimes very difficult to get our European allies to go along with a position like that. Because these are very, very large markets. Happily, it looks like we are in the situation now where the Iranian letters of credit and the Iranian ability to pay would appear to be diminishing, and that is great. But it is very frustrating. It is enormously frustrating.

Mr. LANTOS. It is not a united policy.

Mr. WIRTH. It is not a united policy. And we would like to try to make it one. Pan Am 103 is another example. We are, as you know, very, very concerned about continuing on following up with our partners on keeping pressure on the Libyan Government, and broadening sanctions, regarding Pan Am 103.

We are continuing to do that. And we hope that we can get our allies to go along. That is enormously important to us. Not only because of the families of the Americans who were slaughtered on Pan Am 103, which is by itself reason, but also because we have got to present, we believe, a united front on the issue of terrorism.

We have human rights and terrorism, and they go hand in hand. And if we are in the position where, for some kind of commercial benefit or whatever, it may be that we appear to be condoning terrorism, then it seems to me that we are just asking that the door be opened for more problems on that front. We should be going in just the other direction.

These are two of the particular issues that I have been working on and are familiar to me right now. And I just wanted to share those two. You are more familiar with those than I am. Those are good examples of how difficult it is to create and develop a united front.

Mr. LANTOS. Is the Secretary aware of the importance of developing a united front on these issues?

Mr. WIRTH. This Secretary, I will tell you, is absolutely terrific on this front. He brings it up on every position. It is his last point of briefing. The last briefing that he had before going on this trip to NATO, the EC, Turkey, and Vienna, the last briefing was on the subject of human rights.

His speech on Monday will be a very strong speech. He raised the question of human rights on his last Middle Eastern trip, at the top of the agenda in every one of the visits. He is, as you know, from his history in the State Department before and his history now, a clear and outspoken advocate. This is one of the items that makes Warren Christopher tick. And it is a wonderful kind of leadership for us to have. We are very lucky to have that.

Mr. LANTOS. Senator Wirth, as you probably know, a couple of days ago, the Foreign Affairs Committee had its first vote on the question of Yugoslavia in that long protracted debate on this subject. We have had not a single vote on what is going on there either in the Senate or in the House in all of these many months until 2 days ago when the Foreign Affairs Committee after a very lively debate voted to lift the embargo on weapon sales to Bosnia. This will come to the full House, and there will be a vote on it we expect next week.

There is really no point talking about human rights unless a human rights policy is backed up where appropriate with a credible threat of force. The great difference between the Persian Gulf War which was successful, and the Bosnian nightmare which is a disaster, is that in the one instance the United States organized collective security, and in the other instance we did not organize collective security.

I believe that the bulk of the blame—obviously beyond the perpetrators—belongs to Europe, because this was a European problem. But when the Europeans palpably did not act, the previous administration should have persuaded its NATO allies to issue a credible threat of force against Milosevic. A credible threat of force deterred the Kremlin, a much greater power than Milosevic, for 45 years from using physical force in Europe. The previous administration did not do that.

Is there a clear recognition that unless we are prepared to use force that our human rights policy will be empty, and it will be laughed at, and it will have no credibility? Clearly, with respect to this Yugoslav drama, all of it could have been avoided had NATO issued a credible threat of force against Milosevic. It did not.

So we have over 150,000 dead. And 1,400,000 displaced people, most of whom will never return to their homes, never return to their homes. It will take decades physically to rebuild. And it will take generations to rebuild the fabric of what had been a very beautiful functioning multilingual and multiethnic, multireligious, and multicultural society.

There are questions being raised in some circles that there is a reluctance to recognize that the credible threat of force is an indispensable component of a human rights policy.

I would be grateful if you would comment. Which I think will have to be the last question, because you need to leave, and my colleague and I have a vote.

Mr. WIRTH. Nobody disagrees that foreign policy has got to have behind it the ability to enforce that foreign policy. But that foreign policy also has to have behind it in this multilateral world, as we were just talking, the ability to engage our allies constructively in this effort.

That was not done early on when it could have been done. And what we have got to do, I believe, is not only try to figure out how to sort our way out of the quagmire in which we find ourselves, but maybe more importantly to figure out what did we learn from this about earlier intervention, what did we learn about our ability to be peacemakers early on, not just peacekeepers but peacemakers early on. What do we learn about how do we support multinational institutions, U.N. peacemaking forces, in a way in which the per-

ception of one country coming in and doing that unilaterally is not there?

I think that there are some enormously important lessons out of all of this. And we have to be mindful of those as we try to sort our way through the Bosnian situation and keep it from escalating elsewhere.

I think, just as a final point, that the U.S. offer to the United Nations of 300 U.S. troops in Macedonia to be part of the United Nations force is a recognition of the fact that we want to do what we can to contain this, and that this has to be done under international auspices.

Mr. LANTOS. Well, I am pleased to note two things. Number one, at a meeting at the White House, it was my colleague, Congressman Bereuter, and I, who recommended to the President the placing of U.S. military forces in Macedonia. I am not sure that the 300 figure is the right figure. While this serves as a trip wire, it could be more credible if it were more substantial and had appropriate weaponry.

This is purely symbolism, and it may not be sufficient. I think that to stabilize the area, it must be made clear to potential aggressors that this will trigger an immediate devastating response. Only 300 troops are more a hostage than a force. I realize that they are part of an international force, and it may work. But there are no hostilities in Macedonia now, but a larger force, in my judgment, would have been more desirable.

Let the record show, and I agree with you, that by January 20, which is the date this administration took office, there were no good solutions in Yugoslavia. The time for good solutions was the year before and the year before that. So this administration was confronted with a hopeless series of alternatives, and we are groping now for the last undesirable alternative.

Before thanking you for your first and I am sure not your last excellent presentation to the subcommittee, I know my colleague has a quick question.

Mr. SMITH. I know that there was no recorded vote, but I would ask that the record show me to have been in favor of H. Con. Res. 188 as a cosponsor.

Mr. LANTOS. It will be so recorded.

Mr. SMITH. Second, I would ask that a very important fact sheet by the Puebla Institute on the Rising Tide of Religious Intolerance and Religious Repression in China be made part of the record.

Mr. LANTOS. Without objection.

[The information appears in the appendix.]

Mr. SMITH. The report points out that torture and ill treatment of religious believers is on the rise. We hope that this issue would also be raised, as I am sure that it will be, by Mr. Wirth.

Finally, two questions perhaps you might want to answer for the record, because I know your time is short. Two days ago, we passed a resolution which I offered in committee, to call on the administration to call on Boutros Ghali and the U.N. Secretariat to basically raise the issue of Shen Tun, and the fact that his free speech rights, I believe were violated when he was disallowed to followup on the invitation by the U.N. Correspondents Club to speak at their office, which is in the U.N. Building.

I would like to ask you to raise anew, as I have asked Secretary Christopher, and he said that it was not raised during his Middle Eastern trip, the issue of the rising tide of religious intolerance in the Islamic countries.

Unfortunately, to be a Jew, to be a Christian, to be anything other than a member of Islam, especially if one converts, subjects a person to unbelievably horrible repercussions including imprisonment, beatings, and perhaps even death in some cases. We need to begin, I think, raising the issue of human rights in these Islamic countries in the Middle East.

Mr. LANTOS. Senator Wirth, if you would submit those for the record.

Mr. WIRTH. I will do so.
[The response follows.]

RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE ON ISLAMIC COUNTRIES

We engage in discussions with secular and religious activists as well as governments, encouraging them to practice the respect for human rights, pluralism and tolerance of others inherent in the Islamic, Jewish and Christian traditions. These are values rooted in traditions we hold in common, values we are convinced will well serve the peoples of this region.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AT THE U.N.

Ambassador Madeleine Albright, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York, asked U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali to reverse his decision to disallow Chinese dissident Shen Tong to accept an invitation to speak at the U.N. Correspondents Club on May 25. The Secretary General declined to do so. Although that decision was the Secretary General's to make, our official position remains that Shen Tong should have been allowed to speak at the Correspondents Club.

Mr. LANTOS. And since you have 3 more minutes, and my colleague has returned, I personally want to thank you for your excellent statement and answers. And I will turn the chair over to Congressman McCloskey.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, Congressman Lantos. And it is always a pleasure to be with you in this subcommittee. We look forward to working with you. Thank you very much.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wirth, I understand that you have 3 minutes, is that right?

Mr. WIRTH. About two and a quarter. I am sorry.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. OK. Very briefly. We could go on and on about Yugoslavia and the Balkans. Obviously, there are major human rights problems to say the least, and to my idea genocide.

In recent days, Vuk Draskovic, the democratic resistance political leader, has not only been beaten close to an inch of his life, but pulled out of the hospital and imprisoned. At what point does the administration realize that Milosevic et al. are going to deal only with force or the threat of force rather than tailoring their concerns for peace and justice, if you will, to whatever immediate pressures they are feeling militarily.

Also, does the State Department have a definition or decision yet as to whether the actions by the Serbs and the Bosnian Serbs constitute genocide, and at what point realistically speaking does the West or international justice if you will lay hands on people like Milosevic, Seselj, Arkan, all the way down the line.

I mean, has that been thought out as to at what point do we really nab them, or in essence are we just talking about it?

Mr. WIRTH. You are talking about enforcement all the way down the line. Enforcement of international law. The enforcement of sanctions. And ultimately, how prepared are the NATO forces, the Europeans and the United States to go with military action.

And to date, as you well know, there has been little if any consensus on that. And the most recent proposal for safe havens, as we discussed earlier, I think, before you were here, is now under discussion in New York at the United Nations, that is whether or not that is a viable proposition.

So if we had very clear and good answers to that, I think that we would all be doing them with the great support of the American public. But I think that we have neither the answers nor an American public that believes that the United States ought to become deeply involved militarily on the ground in the former Yugoslavia.

And without that kind of political support, as we all know, it is impossible to move ahead. And it would be I think enormously inadvisable for us to do so without a clear understanding of support and a clear statement of what the alliance can do to get it.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. I could react for about twenty minutes to what you are saying without in any way personally reflecting on you, Mr. Wirth, because it is not your policy that has been implemented here.

But specifically, what does the State Department say about genocide. Are they ready to state that this is genocide rather than tantamount to genocide or akin to genocide?

Mr. WIRTH. We have done so. We have done so.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. In what document, record, or communication?

Mr. WIRTH. In supporting the Tribunal on Genocide. We have done so.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Could I get a copy of a definitive statement that genocide has occurred? Because quite frankly, I have been asking Mr. Christopher for that since April 1st. Again, not be pejorative on that, but I just have not gotten a reply. That would be very helpful if I could get that in the next day.

Mr. WIRTH. We have, as you know, supported the war crimes tribunal. And we have made statements and made clear that genocidal acts have taken place.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. I do not want to go on about it. But to two such distinguished State Department representatives here, if I say by tomorrow afternoon if I could have a statement as to whether the State Department believes it is genocide or not, it would be helpful.

Mr. WIRTH. We will get that right back to you. Those statements have been made, and we will get it right back to you.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Great.

[The response follows:]

ETHNIC CLEANSING IN BOSNIA

As the Secretary indicated in his testimony of May 18 before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Department of State does believe that certain acts committed as part of the systematic Bosnian Serb campaign of "ethnic cleansing" in Bosnia constitute acts of genocide.

I would like to emphasize that no conclusion can or should be drawn at this stage as to the culpability of particular individuals. This is a question that should be re-

served for the War Crimes Tribunal or other court, where the question of culpability will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

We have played a leading role in U.N. efforts to bring war criminals to justice, including the establishment of the War Crimes Tribunal (the first since World War II) and assistance to the U.N. Commission investigating war crimes. We worked specifically to ensure that crimes of genocide would be within the Tribunal's jurisdiction, and were successful in this effort.

We are working to ensure that the War Crimes Tribunal becomes fully operational.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. How about Macedonia. We express this concern for Macedonia. We are talking about troops in Macedonia. As you know, Macedonia, which has not at all been complicit in anything but attempts at peace in the Balkans, has suffered immensely. I guess for the time being that the naming controversy has been resolved with the U.N. and the Greeks.

When are we going to get around to the U.S. recognizing Macedonia?

Mr. WIRTH. I would have to get back to you on that. I know that we have made the offer of troops to Macedonia with the concurrence of the appropriate authorities in doing so. And beyond that, on the issue of recognition, I would have to get back to you on that.

[The response follows.]

RECOGNITION OF MACEDONIA

U.S. interests, and the interests of the countries in the region, are best served by a resolution of the dispute between Greece and Macedonia that is acceptable to both. Such an outcome would provide the basis for recognition of Macedonia by Greece and the United States, lead to the establishment of normal relations, and thus promote regional stability.

The controversy has gone on far too long in view of the volatility of the region, and we call on both parties to negotiate responsibly and resolve their differences quickly and reasonably. We also support the U.N. mediation effort in this regard.

On June 18, the Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 845 urging Greece and Macedonia to continue their efforts to resolve their differences under the auspices of the U.N. The Secretary General is to report on these efforts to the Security Council by September 20, the beginning of the 48th session of the General Assembly.

Another area where there is an anomaly. As I understand it, we do not have diplomatic relations as such, or in essence we do not recognize the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, that is, Serbia and Montenegro. Yet we have a functioning embassy there. I guess that there are arguments pro and con on how much good that does.

But is there any thought to pulling the embassy out?

Mr. WIRTH. Again, Congressman McCloskey, this all falls in the political division of the State Department, and I am not into the nuances of recognition, and the embassy, and so on. But I will tell you that I will become much more knowledgeable about this within the next 24 hours than I am today.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I would just pass along the idea, Tim, which is not hardly original with me, what a carnage and what a mess of tragedy and outrage it is. As you know, Senator Levin is back recently saying the sanctions are in essence nonexistent. Again a person with whom I am relatively well acquainted and admire very much. We talk about Milosevic's concerns for peace and justice. But he has just had Vuk Draskovic beaten within an inch of his life and imprisoned.

As a former colleague and to someone that I respect so much, knowing your abilities and the way that you are going to dig into these things, I just humbly request that you take those concerns back and ask them to focus a little better than they have over on the State side.

Mr. WIRTH. We share your outrage, and we share your concern. And we are as appalled as you are, and as I believe Americans are, about what is happening. Having stated that outrage, the question then becomes, therefore, what are the next kinds of steps for which we can develop a coherent policy, as we were suggesting earlier. And that gets us back into that circle.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I know your time concerns. And I am not being argumentative. Perhaps I might fax over to you an AP report yesterday from Secretary Christopher, and perhaps we will have a chance to take this up with Secretary Christopher.

In essence, Secretary Christopher saying that even if, assuming all of the policies that the administration says it wants, in essence a lifting of the arms embargo and the air strike, were implemented, it would be ineffective. There is a certain anomaly or incongruity in arguing for policies that you say you want, and at the same time saying in public that the policies that you are zealously recommending or at least significantly recommending would be ineffective.

I know again that is not your area, and I am going even above your pay grade a little bit. But I would just say that those concerns are there. If you will, if nothing else, to the logical integrity, a concern for logical integrity, by the administration at the highest levels. And I admire the administration tremendously, as you know.

Mr. WIRTH. I have not seen that press report. I can only tell you that I see Secretary Christopher almost every morning. And I can only tell you of the toll that all of this has taken on him personally and how deeply he feels this, and how he has put all of his energy and soul into trying to sort this one out. And we all have enormous respect for him and what he believes. And the idealism that he brings into this job, which I think is shared by you and me and those of us who have had a similar kind of bath in the reality of public policy.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I really appreciate it.

Mr. WIRTH. I enjoyed being here.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:52 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

PREPARED STATEMENTS

OPENING STATEMENT
DENNIS DeCONCINI, CHAIRMAN
HEARING: U.S. POLICY ON HUMAN RIGHTS
JUNE 10, 1993

It is a great pleasure to welcome my former colleague, Counsellor Wirth. During years in the Senate I came to know him as an outstanding advocate of human rights. I served on the Helsinki Commission for many years and made valuable contributions to our work in promoting the CSCE principles. I can't think of a better person to represent our country in furthering the cause of human rights.

Unfortunately, there is much work to be done. The euphoria over the demise of the Soviet Union has been replaced by a troubling lack of confidence and political will on the part of the West over how to promote the commitments agreed to in the Charter of Paris. This Helsinki document which celebrates the end of the Cold War and was to have been the framework by which CSCE states would be guided is in danger, in my view, of becoming nothing more than a shallow agreement of meaningless words and empty promises given the West's appalling inaction in the former Yugoslavia. And, it would seem, in light of a recent proposal by France to bypass the CSCE and establish a smaller pan-European "confederation" which would permit border changes in the name of stability and exclude the Muslim countries of Central Asia, that some Western European countries are not willing to pay the political price needed to move Europe beyond the legacy of its past. At a time when we should be seeking to bring peoples of different cultures together, it is an ominous signal, in my view, that any leading country in Europe at the end of the twentieth century would seek to turn the clock back and divide Europe along ethnic and religious lines.

Further, the United Nation's refusal to stop Serbia's territorial aggression or even to use force, when necessary, to deliver humanitarian aid in Bosnia-Herzegovina calls into question the integrity of its commitment to undertake credible action against genocidal slaughter and egregious violations of the principle of sovereignty.

Around the world we see democratic countries, including, I am sad to say, the United States continuing to apply human rights policies selectively. We send substantial aid, for example, to our close ally Morocco but do not put enough pressure on that country to cease its repressive policies. Countries like China, Uzbekistan, Indonesia and more than forty others are rejecting the principle of the universality of human rights -- a principle the United Nations must vigorously promote.

The post Cold War era offers the democratic world a truly historic opportunity to raise the threshold of international standards of behavior. It is essential now that the United States exert a strong leadership role in the United Nations and work aggressively, as only a real leader can, to insist that all governments be held accountable for the manner in which they treat their citizens. We must not allow the lowest common denominator to prevail or the world will become further divided as more and more would be dictators observe the successes of tyrants like Milosevic and Karadzic.

I look forward to hearing from Counsellor Wirth about ways in which we can strengthen the UN's ability to promote and protect human rights, as well as how we can make greater use of regional bodies such as the CSCE in the areas of human rights and conflict resolution. I believe the U.S. objectives for the Conference in Vienna are right on target and we are fortunate to have someone with Counsellor Wirth's considerable skills and dedication to help carry out those goals.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. TOM LANTOS
U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY
Thursday, June 10, 1993

Today the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations, and Human Rights will examine the Clinton administration's U.S. human rights policy and also discuss U.S. goals for the upcoming U.N. World Human Rights Conference. The two topics are closely related as the conference, the first of its kind in twenty-five years and the first global human rights meeting to be held in the post-Cold war era, gives the Administration the opportunity to put forth its blue print for human rights in a great changed world.

One would imagine that the Conference, taking place as it does after the collapse of the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, would be a much more harmonious occasion and that its participants would bask in the glow of new-found camaraderie. However, the brutal warfare in the former Yugoslavia or Somalia, the government's violent repression of its own citizenry in China and Haiti, the bitter sectarian violence in

Kashmir and Northern Ireland, and the recrudescence of right-wing extremism in Germany or the on-going scourge of left-wing terror in Peru, all demonstrate that the post-Cold war world is anything but a calm, peaceful, or reasonable place.

Thus, it sadly is no surprise that the Conference appears to be riven by strife and dissension even before it opens. Indeed, the June 6th New York Times warns that holding the Conference may be a mistake because many third world countries are preparing to launch an attack against the idea that there are universal and enduring principles of human rights, applicable to all peoples, in all conditions, in all times. That idea is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the seminal document on human rights which has paved the way for the hard-won advances of the last forty-five years. Hence, many Western diplomats and NGO'S are maintaining that no result at all would be better than a bad one, and are on guard lest the West sign off on a watered-down final statement that undermines the principle of universality.

We will discuss the administration's strategy to deal with this grave threat to the international human rights community as well how it will respond to the contention of many developing countries that they have an absolute right to assistance with their economic development, regardless of their human rights records. On the positive side, we will look at the Administration's goals for the conference, including its commendable aims of integrating better women's and children's rights into the UN's human rights network and reforming and enhancing the UN's human rights protection mechanisms.

As regards U.S. human rights policy, I am eager to learn how the Administration sees human rights concerns fitting into its overall foreign policy. I am also keen to examine the connection between democracy and human rights, which while close is not always a one-to-one correspondence, as evidenced by the serious and persistent human rights violations in democracies such as India, Mexico, or Turkey, to name but a few. I am sure the Administration, which has reorganized the Bureau for Human

Rights and Humanitarian Affairs into the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, has some strong feelings on this subject.

Finally, I would very much like to hear how the Administration intends to address what I and many others consider a serious inadequacy of U.S. human rights policy during the Reagan-Bush years; namely, the severance of the link between its human rights reporting, that is, the State Department Country Human Rights Reports, and U.S. assistance and general foreign policy toward offender nations. Thus, it was highly disturbing, if not to say unconscionable, to see the well-documented abuses of Saddam Hussein's Iraq consistently ignored by the administration before August 1991 or to see the administration pursue business as usual with China after Tiananmen Square.

Addressing all of these topics is a tall order, which most people would find daunting. But today we have with us one of the most wide-ranging and interesting thinkers of the Administration -- no doubt because he was molded in the Legislative branch beforehand. I refer to my friend and former colleague Tim Wirth, the State Department Counselor, and former Senator and Representative from Colorado. Tim, we are pleased that you could join us today, and, as we approach the millennium, all of us are eager to hear your words of wisdom on how we can usher in the peaceable kingdom.

**COMMISSION ON
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

237 FORD HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

(202) 225-1901

REPRESENTATIVE STENY H. HOYER
**Co-Chairman, U.S. Commission on Security
and Cooperation in Europe**

"The U.N. Human Rights Meeting"
A Joint Hearing with the
House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee
on International Security, International Organizations
and Human Rights
June 9, 1993

THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE IS VERY PLEASED TO JOIN CHAIRMAN LANTOS OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS FOR A HEARING ON THE UPCOMING UNITED NATIONS WORLD CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN GENERAL.

THE COMMISSION IS VERY ENCOURAGED BY THE APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR TIM WIRTH AS STATE DEPARTMENT COUNSELOR, AND BY HIS ROLE AS HEAD OF THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THIS CRITICAL MEETING ON HUMAN RIGHTS. HAVING SERVED AS A HELSINKI COMMISSIONER FOR MORE THAN A DECADE, TIM WIRTH HAS LONG BEEN A VOCAL AND DEDICATED PROPONENT OF STRENGTHENING U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY. WE ARE HONORED THAT HE COULD BE WITH US TODAY, AND LOOK FORWARD TO HIS TESTIMONY.

AT THE TIME OF THE FIRST WORLD CONFERENCE, A QUARTER OF A CENTURY AGO, THE HEAD OF THE US DELEGATION REMARKED, "IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD, WE HAVE PROCLAIMED MORE HUMAN RIGHTS THAN WE HAVE IMPLEMENTED. THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION IS PROPERLY NAMED. ITS IDEALS ARE UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED, BUT IT REMAINS A DECLARATION AND NOT A FACT."

AND THOUGH, IN OUR WORLD TODAY, MORE PEOPLE THAN EVER ARE LIVING IN FREE OR PARTLY FREE COUNTRIES, MUCH SUFFERING ENDURES. COMMUNIST REGIMES STILL STRANGLE HUMAN FREEDOMS IN CHINA.

NORTH KOREA, VIETNAM, TIBET, CUBA AND LAOS. MILLIONS OF INNOCENT PEOPLE HAVE BEEN STARVED TO DEATH BY BRUTAL THUGS IN AFRICAN STATES SUCH AS SOMALIA, ETHIOPIA AND SUDAN. THE EFFORTS OF INDIVIDUALS TO ENJOY THEIR BASIC RIGHTS REMAIN PRECARIOUS IN COUNTRIES ACROSS THE GLOBE, FROM KENYA TO CAMBODIA TO GUATEMALA.

WHEN THE CAPTIVE NATIONS OF EUROPE SAID GOODBYE TO DECADES OF COMMUNISM, MANY WERE HOPEFUL THAT A NEW WORLD ORDER WAS AT HAND. YET, UNLEASHED WITH THE PROCESS OF DEMOCRATIZATION CAME NEW THREATS TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND DIGNITY, AS BRUTAL AS THE OLD - AMONG THEM, EXTREME NATIONALISM AND THE RESULTING VIOLENT ETHNIC CLASHES.

IN SOME REGIONS OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION AND IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE CIVIL AND ETHNIC CONFLICT HAS BROUGHT AND CONTINUES TO BRING A LEVEL OF VIOLENCE AND DESTRUCTION UNPRECEDENTED SINCE WORLD WAR II. DEMAGOGUES, POSING AS PATRIOTS, USE EXTREME NATIONALISM TO SWEEP REASON ASIDE. UNRESOLVED HISTORICAL INJUSTICES ARE RESUSCITATED, ATROCITIES INVITE REVENGE, AND NEW HATREDS ARE BEING PASSED ON TO NEXT GENERATIONS.

CONSEQUENTLY, MANY WHO SO EAGERLY PLACED THEIR HOPES IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS NOW CONFRONT NOT ONLY ITS FRAGILITY BUT ALSO AN IMPORTANT REALITY: DEMOCRACY DOES NOT ENSURE HUMAN RIGHTS. FREE ELECTIONS AND MAJORITY RULE DO NOT NECESSARILY GUARANTEE JUSTICE. DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES USED BY A MAJORITY TO PURSUE ENDS THAT CAST ASIDE THE CONCERNS AND VOICES OF ITS MINORITIES WILL IN TURN BE USED BY THOSE MINORITIES TO JUSTIFY EITHER SEVERANCE FROM OR THE OVERTHROW OF THE MAJORITY REGIME.

WE HAVE SEEN THE CIVIL WAR IN TAJIKISTAN CLAIM TENS OF THOUSANDS OF LIVES AND CREATE UP TO HALF A MILLION REFUGEES. ARMENIA'S WAR WITH AZERBAIJAN OVER NAGORNO-KARABAKH IS NOW IN ITS SIXTH BLOODY YEAR WITH LITTLE HOPE OF END IN SIGHT. ABKHAZIA, IN THE NORTH-WEST CORNER OF GEORGIA, HAS NOT ESCAPED ITS SHARE OF ETHNIC VIOLENCE.

AND IN THE HEART OF EUROPE, THE UGLY SPECTER OF INTOLERANCE AND RACISM HAS SHAKEN THE FOUNDATIONS OF EVEN ESTABLISHED DEMOCRACIES. HATEFUL DISPLAYS OF ANTI-SEMITISM, ABUSE OF REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS, VIOLENCE AGAINST THOSE SEEN AS DIFFERENT OR FOREIGN - THESE HORRIFYING REALITIES MUST SERVE AS A WARNING KNELL TO US ALL THAT NONE OF OUR SOCIETIES

HAS ACHIEVED PERFECTION OR PERMANENCE IN THE SAFEGUARDING OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS.

NOWHERE IS THIS MORE EVIDENT THAN IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA. AS WE ALL KNOW TOO WELL, THE WAR HAS CREATED MILLIONS OF HOMELESS CIVILIANS. BETWEEN ONE AND TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND INNOCENT PEOPLE ARE DEAD. HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS ARE INJURED AND MISSING. SOME ARE STARVING EVEN AS WE SPEAK. ETHNIC CLEANSING IS THE GENOCIDE OF THE MUSLIM POPULATION OF BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA.

I BELIEVE THAT THIS UNITED NATIONS MEETING IS TAKING PLACE AT A CRITICAL TIME. PROMOTING RESPECT FOR UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS SHOULD BE SQUARELY AT THE CENTER OF THE WORLD STAGE - AND NEVER JUST AN AFTERTHOUGHT OR SIDE SHOW. THE TRADITIONAL GUIDING LIGHT OF EACH STATE'S FOREIGN POLICY - THAT OF NATIONAL SECURITY - CAN NOT BE VIEWED AS DISTINCT FROM THAT OF HUMAN RIGHTS. INDEED, IF RECENT HISTORY HAS TAUGHT US ANYTHING, IT IS THAT NATIONAL SECURITY - AND BY EXTENSION, REGIONAL STABILITY AND PEACE - WILL NEVER BE ATTAINED AS LONG AS BASIC HUMAN RIGHTS REMAIN AT RISK.

REMARKS OF REP. GARY L. ACKERMAN
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY,
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS
ON H. CON. RES. 106

THANK YOU CHAIRMAN LANTOS AND CONGRESSMAN BEREUTER. I APPRECIATE YOUR BRINGING MY RESOLUTION BEFORE YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE SO EXPEDITIOUSLY.

AS WE ALL KNOW, THE PRESIDENT HAS GRANTED MOST FAVORED NATION STATUS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, WITH EXECUTIVE CONDITIONS. I SUPPORTED THE PRESIDENT IN HIS APPROACH, AND I BELIEVE I HELPED SHAPE THE DEBATE ON THAT ISSUE, TO SOME EXTENT.

NEVERTHELESS, THE PLIGHT OF TIBET BEARS A HEAVY BURDEN ON MY HEART. LAST MONTH, THIS COMMITTEE HAD THE HONOR OF MEETING WITH HIS HOLINESS THE DALAI LAMA. THAT GREAT MAN OF PEACE, THE SPIRITUAL LEADER OF THE TIBETAN PEOPLE, SPOKE IN GREAT DEPTH ABOUT WHAT I CALL THE "ETHNIC DILUTION" OF THE TIBETAN PEOPLE.

THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, IN AN EFFORT TO DESTROY THE TIBETAN IDENTITY IS ATTEMPTING TO TRANSFER ETHNIC CHINESE INTO TIBET, WITH THE APPARENT GOAL OF DESTROYING THE TIBETAN NATIONAL IDENTITY. IN MY VIEW, MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS AN OUTRAGE.

THAT IS WHY I AUTHORED THIS RESOLUTION, WHICH URGES THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO RAISE THIS ISSUE AT THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE DIPLOMATIC LEVELS.

THE TIBETAN PEOPLE ARE A KIND, GENTLE, PEACE-LOVING PEOPLE. THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT INDUCES ETHNIC CHINESE TO RELOCATE IN TIBET BY OFFERING WAGE AND PENSION INCENTIVES, TAX BENEFITS, AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE. THIS SIMPLY CANNOT CONTINUE.

LET ME COMMEND YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR YOUR COMMITMENT TO THE PLIGHT OF THE TIBETANS, AS WELL AS FOR YOUR TREMENDOUS CONTRIBUTIONS AND ENDEAVORS ON BEHALF OF ALL HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS OF ALL PEOPLES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.