year-old boy made a speech. He told how a bone marrow transplant paid for by Yad Byad had cured his leukemia. ''He got up in front of the 350 guests,'' Siegel recalls, ''and we were all crying. And he said. * * *'' Siegel stops and looks away in an attempt to compose herself, but her eyes fill with tears anyway. ''And he said to us, 'You saved my life'''

CLINTON POLICIES ON HUMAN RIGHTS MARRED BY INCONSISTENCY, FLIP-FLOPS, WEAKNESS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting that the first hearing of the new Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which was held last February 2, was for the purpose of receiving and beginning to analyze the 1994 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

The subcommittee, which I chair, is an amalgamation of two Foreign Affairs subcommittees from the previous Congress. In addition to our substantial legislative responsibilities, including the crafting of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, last week's proceeding marked the beginning of an extensive series of hearings, briefings, and reports by the Subcommittee on Human Rights and humanitarian concerns around the globe.

I am delighted to have my good friend TOM LANTOS serving as ranking members of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. Previously, TOM had chaired the Subcommittee on National Security, International Organizations, and Human Rights and was eminently fair, consistent, and effective. During my 15 years in Congress, I have had the privilege to fight alongside TOM in numerous human rights battles from Romania to the former U.S.S.R. to the People's Republic of China.

It is my intention and sincere hope to leave no stone unturned in the attempt to expose, scrutinize, and seek remedies for man's inhumanity to man, wherever and however it occurs. In like manner, our subcommittee will endeavor to recognize and encourage improvements in human rights practices. Above all, I will insist that objectivity, fairness, and the pursuit of trust be at the core of our work.

In the weeks and months ahead, the subcommittee will explore policy options designed to mitigate the seemingly endless suffering and abuse endured by so many.

In my view, the Country Reports are among the most important work the Department of State does. They allow the United States Government an opportunity to bear witness, to reassert fundamental principles, and also to examine its own conscience about whether its foreign policy comports with these principles.

Mr. Speaker, let me make some general observations about human rights.

First, the very idea of human rights presupposes that certain rights are fundamental, universal, and inalienable: they are too important to be taken away or circumscribed by governments.

Second, the United States has a commitment to human rights that is unique in the history of the world. It is no accident that the signers of our Declaration of Independence rested their resistance to tyranny not on tradition, self-interest, or the balance of power, but on the conviction that all human beings are ''endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.'' More recently, President Ronald Reagan reminded us that it is the destiny of the United States to be a ''shining city on a hill,'' a living monument to the idea of freedom.

Human rights are indivisible, mutually reinforcing, and all-inclusive. Human rights cannot be abridged on account of race, color, creed, gender, age, or condition of dependency. Inclusiveness means everyone, and perhaps especially the inconvenient: the unborn child, or the dissent, or the believer in another religious tradition.

The right to life, religion, speech, assembly, and due process are the pillars of a free, sane, and compassionate society. The moral character and depth of soul of any society is measured not by its military might, technological prowess, athletic excellence or GDP, but on how well or poorly it treats its weakest and most vulnerable members.

It is particularly ironic that the subordination of human rights to other concerns, such as trade, immigration control, or congenial relations with other governments, is often justified on the ground that these are U.S. interests. This formulation misses the point: the most important U.S. interest is the promotion of freedom and of decency. We are strong enough and prosperous enough that we have no need to accept blood money, or to send refugees back to persecution, or to seek our alliances among regimes that murder and torture their own people.

Immediately prior to Thursday's hearing I received portions of the reports and had the opportunity to read the findings concerning about 10 countries. I have some reservations concerning certain portions of the reports, which I would like to state briefly.

First, I hope that in the State Department's effort to keep pace with what it calls ''the changing nature of human rights problems,'' you do not lose sight of the fact that some rights are fundamental. Every year the reports seem to tell us more about the extent to which various societies have developed such institutions as collective bargaining and one-person-one-vote democracy. I do not mean to suggest that these things are not important. They are. They tell us much about a society. However, we must not allow their presence or absence to deflect attention from extrajudicial killing, torture, and imprisonment on account of religious or political beliefs.

Second, and even more troubling, on some issues in some countries the 1994 reports seem to acknowledge, yet minimize, human rights abuses. In a few cases the reports seem almost to suggest excuses or justifications for such abuses. At least three instances of this forgiving approach involve cases in which the foreign policy of the present administration has also given too little attention to egregious and well-documented human rights abuses. I refer to the harsh measures taken by the Chinese Government against those, especially women, who resist its coercive population control program, and by both China and Cuba against people who try to escape from these countries.

Finally, the reports raise deep concerns about the half-hearted and inconsistent human rights policy of the present administration. On ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and the brutal killings in Chechnya, the reports fully state the extent of the human rights abuses. Unfortunately, the administration has not given sufficient weight to these abuses in formulating its policy toward the nations in question. Human rights appears not to have been the primary concern.

CHINA: FORCED ABORTION AND STERILIZATION

The 1994 report acknowledges that forced abortions have been reported in China. Indeed, it acknowledges that ''most people still depend on their government-linked work unit for permission to have a child,'' and that the ''highly intrusive one child family planning policy * * * relies on * * * propaganda, and economic incentives, as well as more coercive measures including psychological pressure and economic penalties * * * [including] fines, withholding of social services, demotion, and other administrative punishments such as loss of employment * * *. The report also clearly states that ''penalties for excess births can be levied against local officials and the mothers' work units * * * providing multiple sources of pressure * * *.''

The report, however, then seems to accept blindly and uncritically the Chinese Government's oft-stated lie that ''physical compulsion to submit to abortion or sterilization is not authorized'' by the government. This is the same story the Chinese Government has been telling for years. The 1994 report also continues—as in past years—to suggest that the one-child policy is not even enforced in rural areas of the country. This ignores the 1991 country-wide tightening of enforcement of the coercive population control program. The pervasive use of forced abortion and sterilization, particularly since 1991, has been well documented by demographers, dissidents, journalists, and human rights activists. Most recently, a series of articles in the New York Times in April 1993 showed clearly that forced abortion in China is not rare, not limited to economic coercion or social pressure, not confined only to urban areas or to certain parts of the country, and definitely not unauthorized by those in power.

The report, as in past years, also seems to excuse the excesses of the brutal People's Republic of China policy by pointing with alarm to the size of China's population and with evident approval to the general thrust of the regime's effort to minimize population growth.

Forced abortion was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg war trials. Today it is employed with chilling effectiveness and unbearable pain upon women in the People's Republic of China. Women in China are required to obtain a birth coupon before conceiving a child. Chinese women are hounded by the population control police, and even their menstrual cycles are publicly monitored as one means of ensuring compliance.

The 1993 New York Times articles pointed out that the People's Republic of China authorities, when they discover an unauthorized pregnancy—that is, an illegal child—normally apply a daily dose of threats and browbeating. They wear the woman down and eventually, if she does not succumb, she is physically forced to have the abortion.

The 1994 report also barely mentions the brutal eugenics policy under which the People's Republic of China regime has undertaken to reduce the number of defective persons. In December 1993 the Chinese Government issued a draft law on eugenics that would nationalize discrimination against the handicapped. That law is now going into effect. This policy of forced abortions against handicapped children, and forced sterilization against parents who simply do not measure up in the eyes of the state, is eerily reminiscent of Nazi Germany.

CHINA: REPRISALS AGAINST FORCED REPATRIATES

The report on China also states that escapees who are forcibly repatriated ''are often detained for a short time to determine identity and any past criminal record or involvement with smuggling activities.'' The report adds that ''[a]s a deterrent and to recover local costs incurred during the repatriation, the authorities in some areas levy a fine of $1,000 or more on returnees.''

This appears to be a deliberate attempt to put government reprisals against escapees in the most favorable possible light—perhaps because these reprisals have frequently been conducted against people who were forcibly repatriated by the United States Government. The report fails to mention that a $1,000 fine amounts to several times the per capita income in rural areas of China. A fine of this amount is a clear indication that the People's Republic of China regime regards these people as its enemies, not as routine offenders. Nor does the report say what happens to people who are unable to pay these oppressive fines. Newspaper reports during 1993 state that hundreds of people repatriated by the United States have been imprisoned for more than a brief period and have been forced to serve on prison work gangs. The report does not say whether any of these people remained incarcerated during 1994.

CUBA: MASSACRES OF PEOPLE ATTEMPTING TO ESCAPE

Similarly, the report on Cuba describes two well-documented instances in which the Cuban Border Guard deliberately killed people who were trying to flee the country. These are the sinking of the *Olympia* and of the *13th of March.* The report goes on to state, however, that there have been no reports of such killings since the September 9 Clinton-Castro immigration agreement. The reports do not state how we would know whether such killings have taken place since the agreement, or what steps—if any—we have taken to make sure they do not. Rather, it leaves the clear impression—without any supporting evidence—that the Castro regime quickly changed its ways upon signing the agreement.

OTHER COUNTRIES: DISCONNECT BETWEEN HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

I have already stated my concern about the incongruity between the well-documented human rights abuses in Bosnia and Chechnya and our policies toward those countries. The 1994 reports confirm the atrocities in these countries: in Bosnia, concentration camps, routine torture, and rape as an instrument of government policy; in Chechnya, the killing of thousands of civilians and the destruction of hospitals and an orphanage. The director of the Washington office of Amnesty International has commented that the administration's policy toward Chechnya amounted to giving Russia a green light to commit the brutality that is so well documented by the report. I raised this same concern last month to an administration official who testified before the Helsinki Commission, which I chair. He dismissed it out of hand. This is part of an unfortunate pattern: After an initial period of encouraging rhetoric, the Clinton administration's human rights record has been marked by broken promises, weakness, retreat, inconsistency, and missed opportunities.

There is a similar incongruity between the administration's new friendship with the Government of North Korea and the 1994 report about the situation on the ground in that country. This is a rogue government that not only detains an estimated 150,000 political prisoners in concentration camps, but, also kidnaps citizens of other nations and causes them to disappear. The reports also state that ''Political prisoners, opponents of the regime, repatriated defectors, and others * * * have been summarily executed.'' This is the regime to which the administration, amid much self-congratulation, recently arranged a $4 billion multilateral aid package.

Other abuses, well documented in the 1994 reports, to which our Government's response has been inadequate or nonexistent include the ''extrajudicial executions, torture, and reprisal killings'' by Indian security forces fighting separatist insurgents in Kashmir, and the brutal persecution of Christian missionaries and others by the Government of Sudan.

CONCLUSION

Future country condition reports will be far more useful to congress, to the executive, and to the American people if they take care never to understate the extent of human rights abuses—especially when a thorough and honest account of such abuses might compel the reconsideration of United States Government policy toward the perpetrators. We must also work together to ensure that these reports are not just published and then forgotten. Rather, they must be regarded by those who conduct our foreign relations as an indispensable guidebook for a foreign policy worthy of the United States.

HISTORY STANDARDS ARE BUNK

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit an article from the February 6, 1995, U.S. News & World Report entitled ''History Standards Are Bunk,'' to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HISTORY STANDARDS ARE BUNK

A funny thing happened to the National History Standards on their way to a famous forum: They were denounced by the United States Senate by a vote of 99 to 1.

This is a major turning point in the debate. The standards are, as Washington Sen. Slade Gorton said, a ''perverse'' document, loaded up with crude anti-Western and anti-Americans propaganda, but until now, the authors of this mess have been able to pose as bewildered moderates, set upon by a pack of crazed right-wingers.

A new spin will be needed now that the pack of irrational right-wingers includes Ted Kennedy, Carol Moseley-Braun and the entire Senate.

During a debate on other legislation, Gorton introduced an amendment to pull the plug on funds for the history standards. That probably would have passed fairly easily in a closer vote. But several senators were queasy about pre-empting other concerned groups, including the nation's governors, who have led the effort to set voluntary standards. So a ''sense of the Senate'' condemnation was voted on instead and passed without dissent. Even the one ''No'' vote, by Louisiana Democrat Bennett Johnston, was a ''Yes'' in disguise. He wanted stronger action than simple condemnation.

How do you get all 100 senators to repudiate your standards? Easy. Just do it the way the major perpetrators, historians Gary Nash and Charlotte Crabtree, did it at UCLA's National Center for History in the Schools. Start the standards with the ''convergence'' gambit: America is not a Western-based nation but the result of three cultures (Indian, black and European) ''converging.'' This subliminally puts the Founding Fathers, and whites in general, in their place as mere founders of a third of a nation.

TRASHING EUROPEAN CULTURE

Though two of these three founding cultures were preliterate, depict all three as equal in value and importance, except for the fact that European culture was worse and dedicated largely to oppression, injustice, gender bias and rape of the natural world.

Carry this theme through, trampling moderate opinion to the point where Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers says: ''No other nation in the world teaches a national history that leaves its children feeling negative about their own country—this would be the first.''

Connecticut Sen. Joseph Lieberman took up this theme in the Senate debate, calling the standards ''a terrific disappointment.'' We don't need ''sanitized history,'' he said, but we certainly don't need to give our children ''a warped and negative view'' of America and the West, either.

How did these standards get to be so bad? After all, historians and teachers of all political persuasions (and none) took part in the discussions. But most of the power, and control of the drafting process, stayed in the hands of academics with a heavy ideological agenda.

Earl Bell, head of the Organization of History Teachers, and one of four K-through-12 teachers on the panel, felt run over by the ideological academics. He hates the view of the cold war in the standards as a clash that wasn't really about anything, just a quarrel between what he called ''equally imperialistic nations.'' The companion World History Standards, he says are even worse, ''unrelentingly anti-Western.''

The fiasco over the American and Western history standards is a reflection of what has happened to the world of academic history. The profession and the American Historical Association are now dominated by younger historians with a familiar agenda: Take the West down a peg, romanticize ''the Other'' (non-whites), treat all cultures as equal, refrain from criticizing non-white cultures.

The romanticizing of ''the Other'' is most clearly seen in the current attempt to portray American Indian cultures as unremittingly noble, mystical, gender-fair, peace-loving and living in great harmony with nature. All the evidence that doesn't fit is more or less ignored. The premise of the exercise makes it profoundly dishonest and propagandistic.

In the World History Standards, as Senator Lieberman noted in the Senate, slavery is only mentioned twice, and both times as practices of white cultures: in ancient Greece and in the Atlantic slave trade. The