# HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN BURMA

HEARING

BEFORE THE

TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 23, 2009

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.tlhrc.house.gov

TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

JAMES P. McGOVERN, Massachusetts, *Cochairman*

JAN SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois
DONNA EDWARDS, Maryland
KEITH ELLISON, Minnesota
TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin

FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia, *Cochairman*

CHRIS SMITH, New Jersey
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona

HANS J. HOGREFE, *Democratic Staff Director*
ELIZABETH HOFFMAN, *Republican Staff Director*

# C O N T E N T S

WITNESSES

Dr. Sean Turnell, Associate Professor of Economics, MacQuarie University in Australia ……..5

Chris Beyrer, Professor of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins University…… 10

Myra Dahgaypaw, Karen refugee, Eastern Burma……14

Jennifer Quigley, Advocacy Director, U.S. Campaign for Burma……....17

APPENDIX

Hearing Notice……...…28

# HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN BURMA

**THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2009**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C.*

The Commission met, pursuant to call, at 2:00 p.m., in Room 210, Cannon House Office Building, Mr. Hans Hogrefe [Democratic staff director of the Commission] presiding.

Mr. HOGREFE. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Hans Hogrefe. I am the Democratic staff director of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, and I would like to welcome all of you to today's hearing on the human rights situation in Burma.

My colleague Elizabeth and I will start off today's hearing, introducing our witnesses, so when the members come back from the votes, they can go straight to the testimony and the questions and answers, so we can dispense with all of the formalities.

I would like to say, though, how glad I am that Elizabeth put together today's hearing because it is a very, very timely issue for us, as the administration is reviewing the U.S. foreign policy vis-a-vis Burma.

As you know, Congress has taken a significant interest in Burma and has passed several bills, including the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act and the JADE Act that were passed under the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Tom Lantos, who had long taken a deep interest in Burma.

Can you hear okay? Is that good enough? You totally missed my very important opening statement?

Okay, let me quickly say again: Welcome to all of you. Today's hearing is very timely, and this is why it is so great that Elizabeth put this together for the Commission. Because, as you know, Secretary Clinton had, during a recent trip through Asia, announced that there will be a general review of the policy vis-a-vis Burma, and that, of course, I think, generally speaking, we would welcome.

Now, there is a significant body of legislative work that Congress has done to

be considered, including the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act as well as the JADE Act. Both pieces of legislation were passed under the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the late Tom Lantos, who had worked significantly and to a large extent on the human rights situation in Burma, as had the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, the predecessor to this very entity that is holding today's hearing.

Human rights concerns obviously significant, range from religious freedom, civil and political rights, as well as ethnic minorities and indigenous rights, and impact the refugee situation. You know, it is a wide range of different human rights issues that are of significant concern with regard to Burma and the military regime.

Most recently, you obviously know about the attempt of the military dictatorship in Burma to find a quasi-legitimized way of dealing with the political question by developing a road map, a draft constitution, and now intending on holding elections to legitimize the control of the military junta and the strong hold of power. While at the same time, of course, the legitimate leaders, including Aung San Suu Kyi, are still under house arrest. And the NLD, the National League of Democracy, is totally excluded from all meaningful participation. And, therefore, we think that this whole road map and this tactic by the military regime is nothing but a sham, in essence.

Having said that, I would like to turn the floor over to my colleague Elizabeth for the introductions and any remarks that you would like to make. And then we will go into the testimony as soon as the members are here.

Thank you very much.

Ms. HOFFMAN. I apologize that we had to start late. Unfortunately, votes were called. So we are just going to go ahead and do introductions. I am the Republican staff for the Commission.

First, I would like to welcome and introduce Dr. Sean Turnell, associate professor at Macquarie University in Australia. Much of Dr. Turnell's work has been concerned with economic reform in post-democratic Burma. With Alison Vicary and Wylie Bradford in 2001, he established Burma Economic Watch, an online resource of information and commentary on Burma's economy. Dr. Turnell recently published a book examining the history of Burma's monetary and fiscal system, "Fiery Dragons: Banks, Money Lenders, and Microfinance in Burma." In addition, he currently serves on the editorial boards of the History and Economics Review, Burma Economic Watch, and the Macquarie Economics Research Society of Australia and the Asian Studies Association of Australia.

Next I would like to welcome and introduce Dr. Chris Beyrer, professor at Johns Hopkins University. He serves as director of the Johns Hopkins Fogarty AIDS International Training and Research Program and as director of the Center for Public

Health and Human Rights. He has extensive experience in conducting international collaborative research and training programs in HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases. He served as field director of the Thai PAVE and HIVNET studies from 1992 to 1996, based in northern Thailand, and has done extensive research on HIV in Thailand, Burma, China, India, and across southeast Asia.

Myra Dahgaypaw is a Karen woman from eastern Burma Karen State. She was born in a conflict area. Many of Myra's immediate family members, including her parents, brother, sister-in-law, and niece, were murdered by the military regime in Burma. Myra lived as an IDP for over 10 years until she fled to the Thai-Burma border area in Thailand in 1987.

Myra became a legally recognized refugee in Thailand in 1988 owing to the fact that she cannot return to her home village due to fear of violent persecution for her Karen ethnicity. Myra was unable to enter a refugee camp in Thailand until early 1985, when official camps were established for Burmese inside Thailand. Myra eventually left the refugee camp to further her education and went on to work with the Burma Project Education Office in Thailand for 6 years before coming to the United States.

Myra has been an activist since she was in high school in the refugee camp. She is a member of the Karen Women's Organization and a board member of the Karen American Communities Foundation. She has continued her activism on behalf of the Karen people in the United States, working to help newly resettled Karen refugees and to raise awareness about the Burmese military regime's atrocities against the Karen peoples.

Jennifer Quigley is advocacy coordinator for the U.S. Campaign for Burma. Jennifer has worked on women's rights and the movement for freedom and justice in Burma in different capacities for 7 years. From 2004 to 2006, she worked for the Women's League of Burma and its member organizations on international advocacy and capacity building, both while living in Thailand and the U.S.

Her work included advocating for and with women from Burma at the United Nations to both ensure the U.N. Security Council and other U.N. bodies pressure the military regime to end violence against women and bring peace and democracy to Burman and guarantee women from Burma are full participants in all stages and decision-making levels of the peace-building process. As the advocacy coordinator for U.S. Campaign for Burma, Jennifer works to further Burma legislation in the U.S. Congress.

Thank you all for being with us, and thank you very much for coming. And we look forward to hearing from you. It looks like we still have a few more votes, but we are going to go ahead and get started and let the members come in. We can fill them in, and you can certainly address their questions.

So we will first start with Dr. Turnell.

**STATEMENT OF SEAN TURNELL, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY IN AUSTRALIA**

Mr. TURNELL. Thank you very much. I would just like to begin by expressing the honor that I have in addressing this particular commission. The work by Senator Lantos, of course, is very well-known amongst the people of Burma and his tireless efforts on their behalf, and also in my home country of Australia, the work by Mr. Lantos on human rights is very well-known as well.

What I am here to do today in my presentation is to talk about Burma's economy, which is in a dire state. I am very often telling people that Burma's economy is in a dire state. And I am usually thinking that it has hit bottom, only to be surprised a few months later to find that, no, there is further bottom still to come.

And so, things are extremely bad at the moment. And amongst many people in Burma who I know who experienced things like the Second World War, which was a particularly bad time in Burma, suggest that, in fact, things are worst than that. So I think that gives some measure of the state of the economy at the moment.

The world's attention, of course, was driven to both Burma and its economy last year when the country was hit by Cyclone Nargis. And the hearts of many people went out, as, I think, did the horror and the disgust at the regime's response to that cyclone.

The interesting thing, I think, about that cyclone in terms of the economy is that, whilst it focused great attention on Burma, to some extent it clouded the real issue, because it almost suggested that Burma's economy perhaps was just a victim of natural disasters and so on. In fact, Burma's economy is the victim of a disaster, but it is not a natural one, and it flows directly from the nature of the political leadership.

If we look at Burma's economy, it is a situation that has been essentially disassembled since the military first took over the country in 1962. And since that time, the chronic economic mismanagement of that regime has turned a country that was once fairly prosperous -- it was the country that, in the 1950s, was seen as the one country in southeast Asia most likely and most quickly to catch up with the developed world. And, of course, we know that history has turned out rather different on that front.

But if we look at all the issues, all the attributes that we want to see for economic development, from property rights, from rational and reasonable macroeconomic policy-making, we find that none of those things, essentially, exist in Burma. So if we are going to place blame for economic conditions in Burma, there is no doubt as to where that is located.

It is important, I think, to highlight, too, that this is an act of will; this is not an act of a country that doesn't have resources. One of the great changes in Burma's

economy over the last decade is the discovery of very large reserves of natural gas in the Bay of Bengal and off the Gulf of Martaban. This is bringing in substantial foreign reserves to Burma, and it is a very different situation from just a few years back, such that the country is now taking in about $2 billion a year, every year, for those exports of natural gas.

Now, that money, in a genuine reforming government, a government that was genuinely interested in the conditions of its people, could be used to do extraordinary things. And part of my work has been identifying what could be done. But they chose not to do that. In fact, they choose to hide those reserves. A glance at the public accounts in Burma indicate, for instance, that those gas reserves are brought on to the accounts at the official exchange rate, which has the act of undervaluing the earnings that Burma gets from its gas exports by 200 times.

It is no surprise, then, on the back of that that, if we look at the situation post-Nargis, there has been almost no contribution financially from Burma's regime to that reconstruction. They are very much content to let reconstruction take place from international NGOs and so on. And, in fact, the amount they have spent is only about $50 million, less than one-seventh of that spent by international NGOs. They are currently asking for a lot more money, and yet there is no equivalent promise whatsoever from the regime to spend in kind.

That lack of spending also matches a lack of concern in other spending areas. Burma spends 0.3 percent of its GDP on health, for instance. Health and education combined, 1.4 percent of GDP. That is less than half of the next poorest country in ASEAN. It is less than half of the spending on defense. And it is the only country in the Asian region that spends less on health and education than it does on the military.

So all of that gives us some indication of their priorities and some indication of what is to blame for the fact that GDP per head Burma today is $280 U.S. That is way less than obviously a dollar a day, which is taken as the benchmark of absolutely poverty.

I would like to move on to talk about the whole question of economic sanctions because that is a very timely issue at the moment, of course, because coming up very shortly, I believe on May 15, is the Clinton investment act ban coming up for a vote. That needs to be renewed by the administration.

And I just wanted to address some of the misconceptions about economic sanctions, because there has been concerted efforts in recent times to have the United States relax some of its economic sanctions. And I wanted to just point out why it is my belief that now is not the time, most certainly not the time, for the U.S. to act unilaterally in that way.

The first thing I wanted to take with that issue, then, is, I guess, to pull down what I have mentioned already, which locates the blame for Burma's current

economic circumstances, and just to make the point that Burma's economy is in a dire state but it is not in a dire state because of economic sanctions.

It is really important to realize, I think, that when we think about the question of sanctions, far and away the biggest sanctioner of Burma is the regime that rules it. People don't invest in Burma for the most part not anything to do with economic sanctions imposed by other countries, but simply because why would you ever put your funds at risk in such a country?

If we look at the investment patterns of nonsanctioning countries, firstly we find that there is very little in the way of investment. What there is tends to be concentrated in extractive industries of various kinds, such as the aforementioned gas and so on. Such investment has little multipliers in terms of skill transfer, employment, and so on. So it is not even a particularly attractive investment.

What keeps real productive and genuine employment-creating investment in Burma away from the country, in fact, are: The policy environment that I mentioned earlier is arbitrary. It is an environment where, in other words, risk is very great that you will have your assets seized and you just won't be able to function in any reasonable way. So that is the first point I wanted to make on that point.

The other issue is just simply to say that there is nothing to stop Burma's current military regime from pursuing economic reform because of sanctions. All of that is in their own power to do so. That is the preeminent problem, and it is within their will to do so, and that they don't says and speaks volumes, I think.

The other thing I wanted to raise with the sanctions is sometimes you get the argument that, look, economic sanctions, by promoting trade and commerce, creates another force in the economy, if you like, a countervailing group of people who have financial means to oppose the regime and so on. Now, it is an interesting idea, that one, and it is fine in the abstract, but, in the particular circumstances of Burma, it doesn't really apply.

If we look at Burma's regime, what we find is a situation where it is the state that not only controls the commanding heights of the economy, but it commands those aspects of the economy that are most engaged in international trade and commerce. So a relaxation of sanctions doesn't empower some countervailing force. A relaxation of sanctions in this current environment would, in fact, empower the regime itself.

It is important, I think, to stress in that same context that the Government of Burma is not like the Government of Vietnam and China or any other authoritarian regimes that have made substantial economic strides. Those governments usually recognize the interest of business, and sometimes they are corrupt, in fact invariably they are, and they take some cut, et cetera, of business activity. Burma's is not like that, and the metaphor that I like to employ in that context is that Burma's regime is

more like a looter than a parasite on the body of the economy. They come in and they destroy what they can't create, nor indeed what they even can understand.

I would like to address, I guess, the specific issue of financial sanctions, which I think are especially valuable, and make a number of points on that front.

The first point I wanted to make with financial sanctions is that they are incredibly well-targeted. The average Burmese person doesn't live within cooey of a bank, let alone have a bank account and let alone have access to the international financial system. So when there are financial sanctions that ban people from Burma from having international bank accounts and so on, rest assured that this is targeting the very group who needs to be sent a message and in a particularly effective way.

This tends to join, too, the ban that is sometimes placed on particular individuals who are usually very desirous of doing things like sending their kids to college here in the United States and so on. The financial sanction ban has a nice linking with that particular ban, as well, and I think to make an extraordinarily effective instrument.

There are another few virtues, I think, for financial sanctions. A phenomenon that we are used to from many developing countries is that the resources from those countries are often taken abroad and kept abroad in international bank accounts and so on and away from the country. Financial sanctions and, in particular, the focus upon the U.S. dollar in that regard allows us to track some of those movements and allows us, in fact, to limit that wholesale looting of Burma's economy.

A final thing that I wanted to say about the financial sanctions is we should impose them for our own reasons irrespective, in fact, of what is going on in Burma itself. It is the case that Burma's economy is very heavily affected by the narcotics trade, and, in fact, that has increased again over the last couple of years. And there is no reason why we should be opening our financial system to such tainted money.

One of the bills that has been passed by the U.S. Congress, of course, is the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act. I think that is a critical one, and it is critical in a number of ways. It is critical because it focuses on an area of the Burmese economy that is very much under the control of the regime. It is also a very interesting sanction in that it dovetails very, very well with the financial sanctions. In fact, you need something like the JADE Act if you are going to have effective financial sanctions, because, of course, precious stones are, in a sense, alternative monetary instruments. And so, if you didn't have such an act, you would find that the financial sanctions themselves would be greatly undermined.

The final thing that I wanted to say today and, in fact, the final thing on the sanctions story is just to make another point. And this really relates to whatever we think about the way that sanctions are imposed or the fact that they are imposed at all, and that is to think of them as, in a sense, money in the bank. Those sanctions sitting

there are a resource that we can drawn down once genuine political and economic reform emerge in Burma.

Again, whatever we may agree or disagree about their imposition, they are there, they are incredibly useful, and they are going to be much more useful when, perhaps, some new government arrives in Burma with a genuine reform mandate. I think it is critical, then, in that regard that we wait and see what is going to come out of Burma and that we don't deleverage our influence and, in particular, the influence of the United States over Burma by a unilateral reduction in sanctions.

Thanks very much. That will end my presentation. And thank you again for the opportunity to talk to this particularly panel.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Turnell is not available]

Ms. HOFFMAN. Thank you, Dr. Turnell.

I am going to turn it over to Dr. Beyrer now.

**STATEMENT OF CHRIS BEYRER, PROFESSOR OF EPIDEMIOLOGY, JOHN HOPKINS**

Dr. BEYRER. Well, thanks very much, and let me second what an honor it is to be here in front of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

What I wanted to talk to you about today is some work that we have done collaboratively with our partners: the Burma Medical Association; the Mae Tao Clinic; the Global Health Access Program, which is an NGO based out of Los Angeles; the Karen Department of Health and Welfare. And this is work on trying to understand the relationship between access to essential maternal/child health services and maternal health interventions and human rights violations in eastern Burma.

The human rights violations have been documented in eastern Burma for decades, and these violations affect the health and the wellbeing of multiple communities. But some of the most affected ethnic nationalities have been the Karen, the Karenni, the Mon, and the Shan. And these are the groups that we partnered with.

Now, women and children are particularly vulnerable, and maternal/child health itself is increasingly understood to be especially affected by human rights violations. And this has been recognized internationally. And the inseparability of health and rights for women and for children is explicit in the only two international human rights conventions to which Burma is signatory. That is the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the CEDAW, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. And both of those recognize the inseparability of health and rights.

In 2006 and 2007, we conducted a series of population-based surveys to assess essential maternal/child health services in eastern Burma in the Karen, Karenni, Mon, and Shan areas and did quantitative analyses of health and rights interactions. The results of that work have been published in the international medical literature, and I have added a manuscript of the paper publication of that to my comments.

Now, health indicators are poor and rights violations are widespread in eastern Burma, as you heard from Professor Turnell. This is a regime that has grossly underinvested in health and education. It has, of course, very low levels of spending, but what spending there is almost barely reaches these populations. And so they have been particularly affected.

What we did, essentially, was to work with our partners in these ethnic minority areas to select communities. And we have to be frank here that these communities were among the more stable, so that they have somewhat lower prevalences of rights violations than we think is happening in some of the least stable areas in the country. We surveyed reproductive, maternal, and family planning services access. And then we did an exposure estimate of household level of human

rights violations within the previous 12 months.

For those of you who are interested in the methods, very briefly, this was two-staged cluster random sampling surveys of ever-married women of reproductive age -- that is 15 to 45 years -- documenting essential antenatal care interventions, skilled attendants at birth, post-natal care, family planning services.

And then we added three biological measures. And this is critical, because we are attempting to link outcomes of health with human rights violations, and we really want to have biological measures among these women. Those include MUAC, middle upper arm circumference, which measures malnutrition; hemoglobin with a color-scale technique; and plasmodium falciparum, malaria parasitemia, for which we use a rapid diagnostic dipstick which is heat-stable. Of course there is no electricity and no refrigeration in these areas.

And then, as I said, exposure to human rights violations was measured over the previous 12 months. Between September 2006 and January 2007, we surveyed 2,900 households. And let me just share a few of the highlights of those findings.

So on the question, for example, of was there any skilled attendant at birth for the last birth of a woman, 5 percent of women had anybody at their last birth with skills. That is one of the lowest levels in the world.

Overall, very low levels of antenatal care. For example, only one in five households had a bed net. Only 11 percent of women had any iron supplementation. And at the time of the survey, 60 percent of the women we surveyed had anemia and 7 percent had active falciparum malaria. That is the most dangerous form of malaria.

What about human rights violations? Well, what we found was that, across these areas, the rights violations differed strikingly. And they differ, in some degree, because of the political difference in these areas. So, for example, in the Karenni area, we found no evidence of forced relocation, because this is a stable ceasefire zone. But 32 percent of households surveyed had had an adult taken for forced labor in the previous 12 months. So forced labor -- and here we really mean slave labor -- is a function of being in a ceasefire area. In contrast, we found much less forced labor in the Karen area, but 10 percent of households had been forcibly relocated in the previous 12 months.

I am sorry to say that the worst outcomes overall were in the Shan areas that we had surveyed. And in the Shan areas, we found, for example, fields having been destroyed, burned, or mined; livestock stolen; food stores stolen; food taxation and theft by soldiers; forced labor; forced relocation; direct physical attacks by soldiers and authorities; and an extraordinarily high land mine injury prevalence. 4.5 percent of households, close to one in 20 households, had an adult or child with a land mine injury in the previous year. That is among the highest land mine rates you will ever see.

Now, we attempted, then, to take these human rights violations, the answers about maternal access to health care, and these biological measures and pull this together in an epidemiologic analysis to say, what are the health impacts on women and children of these human rights violations? I have to say that, because of the sample size and the fact that the largest populations and the largest sample were Karen, that what I am going to talk about now, these linkages, are really specific to the Karen population.

But what we found, for example, was that the odds of a woman having anemia were about 50 percent higher among women who had been forcibly displaced; that there was a dramatic increase in, for example, malnutrition and forced displacement. Women who had been forcibly displaced were seven times as likely to be malnourished. And, perhaps most strikingly, when we looked at the issue of not having had any prenatal care -- so these are women who have not had a single prenatal care visit throughout their pregnancy -- five times more likely among women who had been forcibly displaced than among those who had not.

And that, I think, is such an important measure of what we mean when we talk about human rights violations in these areas. They are having very direct impacts on some of the simplest and cheapest interventions there are. I think there is nothing more cost-effective than prenatal care, and it is absolutely perceived to be the basis of a minimum public health response.

So, in conclusion, I think we can say conclusively that basic coverage of maternal interventions is woefully inadequate in these populations. It is well below the standard even for Burma, which is among the worst in the region. And it is going to take financial and human resources to improve this, but also tremendous political engagement.

I have to, before I go into recommendations, just conclude also by thanking donors, which I didn't at the beginning. This work was supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Population Institute, for which we are greatly indebted.

I have a number of recommendations. And just very briefly, I want to highlight that these data -- remember, now, we are talking 2,900 household surveys across these conflict zones -- were collected by community-based ethnic health organizations. And they really demonstrate the capacity of these groups to conduct population-based assessments of health and rights. And this kind of work needs to be continued and expanded.

The health crisis in Burma is manmade, and it is the result of violations, abuses, and the stark underfunding of basic health services by the junta. While humanitarian assistance to ethnic areas should, of course, be markedly increased, doing so through the SPDC in these areas is unlikely to benefit the affected communities. And the U.S. should really consider expanding support for health

services based in communities and for cross-border interventions.

We would call on the SPDC to cease and desist rights abuses in these ethnic areas. And I would support Dr. Turnell's comment that targeted sanctions to keep pressure on the junta until forced labor, forced relocation, and other human rights abuses in these areas cease and desist.

And finally, I would just again like to thank the committee for the opportunity to share these unfortunate but I think important findings.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Beyrer is not available]

Mr. McGOVERN. [Presiding.] Well, thank you very much.

And before we go on to the next witness, let me apologize to the panel and to the audience for the late start and for me not being here. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the fact that they said votes would be more like 4 o'clock, with this place you never know, and seven votes came. So I very much apologize. And I very much appreciate all you being here, and I will talk more after everyone has testified.

Myra Dahgaypaw is here, and we would like to hear from you now. And thank you very much for being before this committee.

**STATEMENT OF MYRA DAHGAYPAW, KAREN REFUGEE, EASTERN BURMA**

Ms. DAHGAYPAW. Thank you very much. It is an honor for me to speak to you today. And, of course, first of all, I would like to thank you so much for holding the hearing today to highlight human rights abuses in Burma. Congress has been taking extraordinary efforts to shed light on the atrocities that the Burmese military regime has waged against the people of Burma. And today, I am going to address the plight of one of Burma's ethnic minorities, my own ethnic nationality, which is Karen, from eastern Burma.

Eastern Burma has been home for the Karen, Karenni, and Shan minority ethnic groups for decades. And these ethnic groups have their own governmental structures, but yet the Burmese military regime has been waging an intense campaign to take control of these regions and then to clear out all of the inhabitants. And since 1996, the military regime has ravaged more than 3,000 villages in eastern Burma, including my birth village. And this scorched-earth campaign has created one of the worst cases of internally displaced people, which are called IDPs, in the world, with more than half a million struggling to survive as IDPs today.

The Burmese army also uproots the entire village in just a few minutes and sends the villagers running with little more than the clothes on their backs. Then the Burmese troops place land mines around the area to ensure villagers remain on the run and cannot return to their homes. So, today, eastern Burma is one of the world's most heavily mined areas.

After villagers are forced from their villages, they live minute by minute like nomads. They eat what they find in the jungle and often go to bed hungry. And they are always on the move; children are in tow. And they live in constant fear of the military.

I am a Karen from the Karen state in eastern Burma. And I was an internally displaced person for 11 years, then a refugee for 17 years, until I came to the States in 2003. My parents and grandparents were also IDPs, and I do believe that my great-grandparents were IDPs. And my point that I wanted to make here is that we, the Karen people, we are not recently displaced; we have been displaced for generations.

According to my personal experience, my family and I had nothing. We didn't have enough food to eat, places to sleep, or enough clothes to wear, especially when the situation made it more difficult when it is cold or raining. And we were constantly running from the military regime troops, and we would hide in caves, bushes, and the jungle. And the places we called homes were burnt down many times a year. And one thing that I will never forget is sleeping with half of my body in the rain and another half under a plastic tarp.

And there were many times that we have no food to eat. Sometimes we had, like, a can of rice to feed seven family members. So the older family members in the family wouldn't take the rice; instead, they would keep it for my sister and I, because we were the youngest. So we survived by eating bamboo shoots from the jungle, and sometimes we had to go to bed without food in our stomachs.

And we lived in constant terror under the threat of torture, rape, killing, and starvation. Both of my parents and older brother were shot by the military soldiers when I was a child. And then my youngest aunt was raped by the Burmese soldiers while she was working on her farm with her husband. She was raped and bled until she was unconscious. And her husband, my uncle, was forced to watch, and then he was brutally murdered. The Burmese troops cut his skin, marinated with salt, and then left him to bleed to death. The only reason my aunt lived was because the soldiers thought she was dead.

Humanitarian organizations also could not get past the military regime to us, so there was not enough food or medicine. Villagers were prohibited from accessing western medicines in order to prevent guerrilla groups from getting access to these medicines. I suffered from malaria so many times, flu and other diseases many times in a year. And many of my cousins died very young from malaria, hepatitis, and other diseases.

According to the Thai-Burma Border Consortium report, 2008 report on IDP, Nyaunglebin, which is my home district, had 20,800 people in relocation sites, akin to prison camps under close control of the military regime, and 21,000 people in hiding sites, struggling to survive and avoid being killed or captured by the Burmese army troops.

In addition to forcibly displacing entire villages, the government also employed kidnapping, forced labor, torture, and executions to terrorize villagers and consolidate their control.

Forced labor takes different forms in Burma. Most of the minority people have been conscripted into forced labor to work on labor-intensive programs like agriculture production, road projects for the military units, or as porters carrying weapons and ammunition for the soldiers on the front line. And, also, forced labor includes work on the pipelines and dams, which are foreign-funded projects, or by providing sexual services for the soldiers.

Others are forced to work on large-scale development projects that the Burmese military regime has with Thailand, like Salween dams. One of the five proposed dams along the Salween River has already displaced over 35,000 people in the past year. And those 35,000 joined the growing IDP population in eastern Burma, and the remaining villagers from the area have been forced into road construction.

What I have been talking about is just my personal experience and the Karen

ethnic groups. But there are other several other ethnic groups beside the Karen, and each of them faces oppression and displacement at the hands of the military regime that will force them to live as IDPs or flee to the borders or other countries.

Outsiders who don't know much about Burma would ask, why? How can the Burmese people be internally displaced in their own country? Well, although you know the answer, please let me repeat it again. The problem is the State Peace and Development Council, which we call the SPDC, the military regime that oppresses, tortures, and murders its own people.

Finally, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to everyone who supports the cause of Burma. And I would like to urge you to continue your support. The international community must continue to pressure the Burmese military regime into ceasing all human rights abuses and violence against civilians. The regime must be held accountable for the crimes against humanity and system of impunity.

If we were going to have a free, stable Burma, the regime must be held accountable for all the crimes they have committed. Then all of Burma's key parties, including the military, the pro-democracy movement led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, and the ethnic nationalities must meet under a collective leadership to discuss about the future of Burma in a peaceful and respectful manner. Until then, the country once known as "the rice bowl of Asia" will continue to suffer at the hands of the most brutal and corrupted regime of our time.

This is one of my favorite quotes that I like ending with, taken from Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel Peace Prize winner who has been under house arrest for more than 13 years. She said, "Please use your freedom to promote ours."

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Dahgaypaw is not available]

Mr. McGOVERN. Thank you very much.

Ms. Quigley?

**STATEMENT OF JENNIFER QUIGLEY, ADVOCACY DIRECTOR, U.S. CAMPAIGN FOR BURMA**

Ms. QUIGLEY. Thank you, Congressman McGovern. I would like to thank the members and staff of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission for the opportunity to speak today about the current state of human rights in Burma.

As many of you are aware, there has been much buzz and confusion over the past few months about the U.S. Government's review of its Burma policy. We welcome this review. As advocates, we are always looking for new avenues and strategies to pursue in our quest to help the people of Burma live in a free, democratic, and just country. We hope the new administration, along with Congress, will engage Burma's democrats and ethnic nationality leadership to incorporate their insights and vision into the policy review.

Much of the attention Burma has received over the years has centered around the nearly two-decades-long pursuit of democratization and national reconciliation. I want to briefly touch upon this subject before discussing some of the other pressing issues facing Burma today.

First, in an attempt to legitimize their rule, Burma's military regime last year unilaterally drafted a new constitution. In addition to completely marginalizing both the democratic opposition, the National League for Democracy, led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, and ethnic nationality leadership from the constitution drafting process, the military regime also made campaigning against the constitution in its national referendum last May a criminal offense.

The regime's new constitution contains numerous provisions designed to enshrine military rule. Daw Aung San Suu Kyi is precluded from taking part in the political process. Eighty percent of the vote in parliament is required to amend the constitution, yet 25 percent of the parliament is required to be from the military, under direct command of the military leadership, effectively prohibiting anyone from amending the constitution without the military's consent.

The constitution also requires military experience for all high-level and ministerial positions in the government, which not only excludes the democratic opposition from playing a leading role in government, but also enshrines gender discrimination since women in Burma are prohibited from joining the military.

While there are many other undemocratic and objectionable articles in the constitution, of particular concern is the amnesty provision. The constitution contains a clause by which all members of the military have amnesty for all the crimes they have committed and denies access to justice for the regime's victims.

As my colleagues have mentioned and Myra has experienced firsthand, the military regime has committed innumerable war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The international community must denounce the regime's constitution and its elections scheduled next year as undemocratic and illegitimate.

To ensure their scheduled elections for 2010 are not disturbed in any way, the military regime has undertaken rigorous efforts to clean house before next year. The regime has imprisoned anyone that could potentially be perceived as opposition, including monks, politicians, lawyers, student activists, labor activists, journalists, and humanitarian aid workers, and sentenced them to lengthy prison terms in remote jungle prisons. Burma's political prisoner population now totals nearly 2,200 people and grows every month, as the regime hunts down more democracy supporters.

At the same time, the military regime has begun to mount a vigorous campaign to force the 17 ethnic nationality ceasefire groups to disarm and support the regime's elections. Some of these groups, including the new Mon State Party, have publicly announced that they will not disarm and participate in the elections until the regime meets the conditions of the ceasefire and allows them the ability to amend the constitution.

Tensions will continue to mount as the regime continues to pressure the ethnic nationality groups to disarm without guaranteeing them a legitimate voice in a national reconciliation process. If the ceasefires dissolve, the stability of the region and the safety and security of the already-vulnerable ethnic nationality populations would exponentially be jeopardized.

Already, the Burmese military regime has intensified its attacks against the Karen National Union and other pro-democracy ethnic nationality groups with whom there are no ceasefire agreements, creating a precarious situation for ethnic nationality civilians in these areas.

For those who have followed Burma for years, the regime's tactics are not surprising but are nonetheless worrisome. Recently, the plight of Rohingya refugees is of great concern. Equally alarming is the fate of the Rohingya that are still in Burma. The Rohingya are an ethnic Muslim minority that reside in Northern Arakan State in Burma near the border with Bangladesh. The military regime discriminates against them regarding citizenship, freedom of movement, education, and access to jobs, as well as subjecting them to numerous human rights abuses. Recent reports indicate that the military regime is beginning to increase its persecution of the Rohingya, something the international community should not take lightly.

Burma's military regime has recruited tens of thousands of child soldiers, destroyed or displaced more than 3,300 ethnic minority villages, displaced more than a million people, including more than half a million that are struggling to survive as internally displaced persons, employed rampant forced labor, and used rape as a weapon of war against ethnic minority women. All of these abuses continue today.

But, as my colleagues and I detail the litany of war crimes and crimes again

humanity Burma's military regime has committed and the dire economic and humanitarian situation the regime has created, the question on all of our minds is, what can we do about it? For me, part of the answer lies in examining and understanding how the regime works and how they respond to the international community.

One useful example is the case of forced labor. In 1998, the International Labor Organization conducted a commission of inquiry into reports of Burma's military regime's use of forced labor. This commission was strongly supported by the AFL-CIO and other labor unions in the United States. The ILO's commission of inquiry reported that there is abundant evidence of pervasive use of forced labor on the civilian population, and the obligation to suppress such practice is flouted in a, quote, "widespread and systematic manner." The commission further stated that the authorities of Burma may be grossly guilty of universally recognized atrocities.

In the decade since the ILO's commission, despite their efforts to reach out to the regime, they have distinguished Burma as, quote, "one extremely serious case of flagrant violation of the convention." The military regime continues to undermine efforts by the ILO to combat forced labor. On January 29 and February 1 of 2009, three forced laborers were killed in forced labor camps run by the military regime in Burma's Pegu Division. The following month, labor activists were arrested, and villagers who had reported forced labor abuse to the ILO officer in Burma were also arrested. The military regime continues to violate international law with impunity.

On the political front, the United Nations, for more than a decade, has tried to facilitate a dialogue towards national reconciliation between the military regime, Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy, and ethnic nationality representatives. There have been more than 30 visits by successive U.N. special envoys or rapporteurs to Burma to engage with the regime and persuade them to support national reconciliation, with little to no effect.

As recently as December 2008, U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, in response to requests by 112 former heads of state from around the world and 241 members of parliament from Asia that he go to Burma to convince the regime to release Aung San Suu Kyi and all other political prisoners, said he would not go until he could be sure of a successful trip and did not see that as possible. It is alarming that the U.N. Secretary-General does not think he can secure the release of Aung San Suu Kyi, even with overwhelming support of the international community, including the U.N. Security Council, which has continually expressed its support for his good offices mandate, as outlined in their presidential statement of October 2007.

Given the situation in Burma, we would like to suggest three new steps as the cornerstone of U.S. policy toward Burma.

One, Burma's military regime has shown no signs of ceasing its human rights abuses against Burma's civilian population, particularly against ethnic minority

civilians. The international community has documented the regime's war crimes and crimes again humanity and system of impunity and has engaged the regime through dialogue to persuade them to abide by international humanitarian law with no positive results.

First, and most importantly, it is time the U.S. and U.N. Security Council take the next step and establish a commission of inquiry, an official international investigation, into the regime's perpetration of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and system of impunity. The longer the world waits, the more people in Burma will die. The world took similar steps on Rwanda, Bosnia, and Darfur, and the situation in Burma is no less important.

Second, the United States should engage in vigorous diplomacy with the U.N. Security Council's Burma's neighbors and even the military regime itself. This diplomacy should seek to build support for a transition to democracy in Burma. As Desmond Tutu wrote in The Washington Post a few days ago, this process should ensure there is a "dignified way forward" for all those in Burma who are willing to compromise.

Third, the United States should maintain existing sanctions and move to increase targeted sanctions on the military regime. This means the Treasury Department should more aggressively move to identify and freeze the assets of the military regime. It also means the United States should press the European Union to implement tougher financial sanctions. The E.U. has already done a lot, but this is an area in which the E.U. can do more.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Quigley is not available]

Mr. McGOVERN. Thank you very much.

And thank you all for coming.

As was mentioned, the Obama administration is currently reviewing U.S. policy towards Burma, which I think everyone agrees is an appropriate thing to do. Am I correct on that?

So we are all in agreement on that.

Given what is going on, I think a thoughtful review is needed in order to gauge whether our current policy has been effective in promoting and protecting human rights in Burma and what else we can do that might be more effective. Clearly, the horror and the tragic situation in Burma continues. When you read about these terrible atrocities in the newspaper and hear about it on television news, it is heartbreaking. We have to figure out a way to bring the world together to come up with a more effective response.

Before I go any further, I want to thank Elizabeth Hoffman and Hans Hogrefe, who subbed for me, and for all of their work in putting this together.

Ms. Quigley mentioned the Washington Post op-ed article by Bishop Desmond Tutu, entitled, "What Burma Needs From the White House." I would like to enter into that the record of this hearing.

Mr. McGOVERN. I read that article, and I couldn't agree with him more when he notes that, during this policy review, he hopes that the President and the Secretary of State will remember that "the voices of those with the most at stake cannot easily be heard." He is referring, of course, to not only Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, who has historically led the Burmese democracy movement and who remains under House arrest and cannot speak to the world, but he is also referring to the millions of Burmese who suffer under the repressive rule of the current government in Burma.

They have never had a voice, and, in recent months, those who have dared to speak out and act on their behalf -- the hundreds of activists, the Buddhist monks, the nuns, the journalists, labor leaders, and bloggers who work to bring freedom of speech, association of worship, the right to choose to live in a democratic country -- they have been sentenced to years and even decades in isolated jungle prisons, cut off from all contact by their families, friends, and the world. And they have paid a price for asking us in the international community to maintain pressure on the government.

So here we have a review going on. We all think that the review is a good thing. Am I correct that everybody here agrees that we should not ease the sanctions? Is that something that everybody is in agreement, the sanctions should not be eased?

I guess the question is, Ms. Quigley, you made reference going to the U.N.

Security Council, more diplomacy with Burma's neighbors, and keeping and strengthening the existing sanctions. Bishop Tutu, in his article, talks about, yes, we should engage the Burmese Government. How do you engage them, at this point?

Does anyone here favor a U.S. ambassador in Rangoon? Should we have somebody there?

If you can tell me specifically how you engage this regime in a constructive way, I am all ears.

Dr. BEYRER. I think one of the issues, Representative, is the special envoy. This is an idea that people have put forward. We understand there have been discussions. President Bush actually came quite close.

Mr. McGOVERN. The JADE Act provides for that.

Dr. BEYRER. Exactly. We think that would send an important signal of high-level engagement from the administration.

Mr. McGOVERN. So a special envoy versus an ambassador?

Ms. QUIGLEY. Correct. We want to send a signal that we want to engage, but not necessarily that we have reached a level of acceptance of the legitimacy of the regime. So, a special coordinator.

Mr. McGOVERN. In the aftermath of the announcement by the Obama administration to review our policy, what has been the reaction from key leaders of the opposition in Burma? Have we heard anything on that?

Ms. QUIGLEY. Two things, sort of informally. I am happy that there is a review taking place to sort of expand opportunities that haven't been necessarily explored yet, but also nervous that some comments have included the idea that maybe sanctions are not a good idea.

As far as, sort of, any formal comments, they have not officially met yet. Word has been reached that potentially by the end of the month we should have a formal response from the opposition as to what they would like to say for this policy review. But I stress that is the democratic opposition. I am not sure if there has been much outreach to the ethnic nationality leadership. And, for me, that is of particular concern, because the regime likes to make sure that the National League doesn't have access to those leaders.

So the more that the U.N. and the U.S. can engage not only with the regime itself, but reaching out to the ethnic nationality leadership, I think that would be beneficial for the policy review, in addition to what they need and want to secure those territories. Like I said, I am very concerned about the dissolution of ceasefires.

Mr. McGOVERN. China: It seems like in so many of these human rights hearings we do, it all comes back to China. China has provided massive amounts of military and economic support to the Burmese regime.

I guess the question is, how appropriate would it be for the Obama administration to seek China's assistance in developing contacts with the Burmese regime?

Dr. BEYRER. I think, first, it would be very appropriate. I suspect, indeed, that China itself is probably putting a lot of pressure on the Burmese regime to engage in genuine economic reform in particular.

Mr. TURNELL. I thought I might mention, just in that context, actually, sometimes one of the arguments against sanctions, for instance, is that somehow the U.S. has deserted the field, which then allows countries like China, with their own human rights problems and so on, to enter the market. And it is an interesting idea, that, which, again, like some of the other ideas about the sanctions, are fine in theory until you start digging into the facts.

And it is interesting, I did some exploration into the data of trade relations between China and Burma, and it is interesting that, while that has increased by 300 percent over the last decade, if we look at China's trade growth with some other countries, including this one, including Australia and including Africa, we find significantly higher increases in trade with those countries. So, to some extent, that increase in trade between China and Burma, for instance, is driven by Chinese demand for resources and energy more than anything else.

But having said that, of course Burma is a problem for China, just as it is a great problem for ASEAN. And I think we would all urge countries like China and ASEAN and so on to put their own pressure on Burma.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yeah. I mean, in Bishop Tutu's op-ed today, he says, "Unlike some authoritarian regimes, this one seems to care not a bit for the economic wellbeing of its country." And then he goes on to say, "would probably interpret an easing of sanctions as an acknowledgement that it has won the struggle with its people and proved its right to rule."

And I agree with you that we should be easing up the sanctions, but I am trying to figure out how we can make them work better. You sense that China might be willing to press the Burmese Government to do a little bit more; perhaps they are the appropriate party to be engaged with. But it just seems -- how do we strengthen these sanctions? What else can we do to strengthen these sanctions so that we can get the authoritarian government to actually care what is going on here? Any suggestions on that?

Mr. TURNELL. Yeah, I think there are a couple of things that can be done.

Firstly, some of the loopholes can be closed off, in particular from some of the regional countries. For instance, for all of the reasons that I mentioned earlier, I think financial sanctions are particularly valuable at hemming in and sending exactly the right message to the right people. But because there are some neighboring countries that don't impose sanctions, then I think quite a good deal of pressure could be levied against them. And most of those countries are actually good friends of the United States, and most of them are highly desirous of having a good financial system.

Mr. McGOVERN. Do you want to name a few of them for the record?

Mr. TURNELL. Well, I will certainly name Singapore for the record, which is the name that most often comes up.

The alternative to Singapore over recent years has been the country of Dubai. But, after some of the events -- in fact, after the financial crisis, I think a lot of the money has come back to Singapore and so on. So those are two countries.

And I think, beyond that, you know, to go back to the point that I made at the end of my testimony, there is a positive story with the sanctions. And that is that they are a restriction that is on now, but of course they are a promise in the future. They are a check that can be cashed for genuine economic reform. I think they actually provide an incentive for good political and economic outcomes down the track. And I think it is really important at the moment that they not be cashed because there has been nothing in return.

Ms. QUIGLEY. And I think, as I said, you know, they have had these conversations where the regime would like to have its money in dollars. And we have effectively managed to take away their currency of choice, you could say. And so the other strong currency that they desire is the euro. And if we approach our other allies to strengthen their own sanctions, that would effectively cut off the two strongest occurrences in the world from the regime. The regime is not interested in having kyat. They are interested in having dollars, and second best would be the euro.

Dr. BEYRER. I would just like to make a comment, if I might, as well, about the relationship between the sanctions debate and the humanitarian assistance debate, because I --

Mr. McGOVERN. My following question was going to be about the humanitarian stuff. You beat me to the punch, so go right to it.

Dr. BEYRER. Well, I think it is very important to be mindful of the fact that the junta has been willing to allow international donors to spend more money on humanitarian assistance and on health programs, to some degree. And there has been considerable pressure from our allies but also from partners in the states wanting to

increase that.

And what I think is important to, sort of, stay mindful about is really two things. One is that the junta continues to so grotesquely underfund health and education sectors and to put so little of its own resources into this that it effectively makes aid very limited in its impact. And a very good example in my own field, in HIV/AIDS, the junta has received from the 3D Fund close to over $96 million overall, promised overall, from the Three Diseases Fund. But their own contribution for last year is still a little under 200,000 U.S. dollars for the entire national AIDS program for this country, which is -- and speaking of, sort of, crimes against humanity, certainly counts as one.

And it is very striking that even some of the NGOs that have been there for many years and working in HIV/AIDS, including the most prominent one that has been supporting the largest number of people on anti-viral therapy, has come out and said, you know, an NGO cannot do this, this eventually has to become a government program. And there is still no investment, no further investment from the junta.

So the argument that sanctions are the cause of the humanitarian and health suffering of the people of Burma I think is a very unjust one. It puts the onus essentially on the sanctioners and not the junta for completely divesting from this sector. And what you would want to see is some commensurate funding in response. I think --

Mr. McGOVERN. Should that be contingent on a humanitarian aid package that gets sent there? I mean, how do you force them to do that?

Dr. BEYRER. Well, I think heretofore we have not done well, but I think it is very important for that pressure to be applied.

I think what we have seen with some other donors is that they have done humanitarian assistance in the past -- certainly Japan has been an example of this -- with no, sort of, pressure for the junta to pony up, and, as I said, the outcomes are very, very limited. So, with the national AIDS program, again, as an example, the great majority of people in this country who need ARVs are simply not getting it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Just on a related subject, I also co-chair the House Hunger Caucus. In the aftermath of the cyclone that hit, I mean, can you give me a little status report on the food security situation?

Dr. BEYRER. Well, the World Food Programme has been, of course, a major donor in the country. It is very hard to get a handle, actually, on the extent to which the food security situation has been resolved. The measures have been quite problematic. For example, what you often hear is that an increasingly higher and higher proportion of people in the delta have received some relief, and the definition of "some relief" can be very marginal; so, some rice, some protein. But the question about whether or

not you have actually achieved food coverage and security for the population broadly I think is not answered.

And we recently put out a report looking at not the humanitarian response overall but the human rights situation in the delta and identified a number of ongoing rights violations right up until November of 2008, so well after the acute phase of the response.

Mr. McGOVERN. Ms. Dahgaypaw, can you comment a little bit on the refugee crisis in Thailand?

Ms. DAHGAYPAW. In terms of numbers of refugees in Thailand, I believe the number is adding up all the time, because the internally displaced people cannot live at the places where they hide. I mean, they can hide for only a certain amount of time, and then after that they don't have places to hide anymore, so they have to move into the refugee camp. But then the camp is already overflowed, so that is why it has ended up with the U.S. and many other countries having to take the refugees to come over here to the U.S. or to other countries so that the IDPs can move into the refugee camps. So the adding number is never-ending.

Mr. McGOVERN. Well, let me again thank all of you for being here today. And, again, I apologize for my lateness.

But part of the mission of this commission is to try to raise awareness on human rights issues all around the world, but also to take this information, provide it to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and to pass it on to the administration, which we will do.

This is a very serious crisis. And we have a lot of serious crises around the world, unfortunately. That is kind of the challenge, is everyone is trying to balance everything here. But I assure you, this commission, working with Congressman Wolf and working with others, we are going to raise these issues even louder. And the testimony and the advice that you have given today you can be assured will be passed on to the relevant people in the committees here in the House and, as well, the administration.

I very much appreciate you all being here today. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 3:19 p.m., the Commission was adjourned.]

# A P P E N D I X

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

**Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission (TLHRC)**
**Hearing Notice**

**Human Rights Abuses in Burma**

**Thursday, April 23**
**1:30 – 3:00 p.m.**
**210 Cannon HOB**

Please join the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission for a hearing with experts to discuss the egregious and ongoing deterioration of human rights in Burma and how the international community is responding to the dire situation. The ruling State Peace and Development Council (SPDC) held a referendum to approve its draft constitution in May 2008 and continues its' plans for elections in 2010 under these new constitutional election law provisions which are deemed undemocratic by international election standards. The new constitution will take full effect when a new parliament is convened following those elections, leaving the SPDC and military in control of all organs of government.

According to the State Department, Burma's extremely poor human rights record continued to deteriorate in the past year, with the military regime continuing to perpetuate serious abuses against political opponents. Democracy leaders and ethnic minorities throughout the country face widespread and systematic human rights violations by the Burmese Army, including religious persecution, sexual violence against women, human trafficking, forced labor and forced relocation. Recent reports have exposed evidence of a wide array of abuses perpetrated by the ruling SPDC in their response to Cyclone Nargis. The United States has announced it is reviewing its Burma policy and at the end of April, the European Union will consider whether to renew its sanctions regime as well.

**To discuss these issues we welcome the following witnesses:**

- **Chris Beyrer**, Professor of Epidemiology, *International Health and Health, Behavior and Society at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health in Baltimore, Maryland*

- **Dr. Sean Turnell**, Associate Professor of Economics, *MacQuarie University in Australia*

- **Myra Dahgaypaw**, Karen refugee, Eastern Burma

- **Jennifer Quigley**, Advocacy Director, *U.S. Campaign for Burma*

If you have any questions, please contact Hans Hogrefe (Rep. McGovern) or Elizabeth Hoffman (Rep. Wolf) at 202-225-3599.

/s/James P. McGovern, M.C.
Co-Chair, TLHRC

/s/Frank R. Wolf, M.C.
Co-Chair, TLHRC