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Nina Shea:

Hello, I'm Nina Shea. I'm a senior scholar at the Hudson Institute and direct its Center for Religious Freedom. The Winter Olympic Games in Beijing are beginning. They've been branded "The Genocide Olympics" by human rights advocates, and they are the being boycotted in a diplomatic boycott by the United States, the UK, and Australia. This chain of events was put in motion with a determination by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, last January, 2021, that there was an ongoing genocide against the Uyghur Muslims and others in Xinjiang, China's far-western province. This determination by Secretary Pompeo received bipartisan endorsement when Secretary Blinken later in 2021 also recognized the Uyghur genocide.

Hosting the Olympics is a competition among states, in itself. The International Olympic Committee selected Beijing for this honor and in doing so bestowed upon it a golden propaganda opportunity that the CCP will take full and shameless advantage of while the world's attention is fixated on the games over the next two weeks. Expect it to present a cheerful and confident facade and suppress any hint that Uyghurs or others are suffering egregious atrocities and repressions at its hands. Expect CCP apologists to vehemently deny that genocide is happening and say that they don't care if there's a Uyghur genocide, anyhow.

Hudson Institute's Center for Religious Freedom is committed to ensuring that genocide, this genocide, is not forgotten. We are holding an Olympics Boycott series. This will consist of four deep dive discussions with top China experts on genocide and religious repression across China. I'm delighted to kick off this series with our first expert, Dr. Miles Yu. Dr. Yu served as principal policy advisor in the China policy division of Secretary Pompeo's staff at the State Department. He was engaged in this capacity on China-related issues and participated in key U.S. government inter-agency deliberations on major policy and government actions with regard to China, including on this genocide question.

I'm also honored to say that he is a colleague of mine at the Hudson Institute as a senior scholar. Thank you, Dr. Yu.

Dr. Miles Yu:

Thank you, Nina, for this very, very worthy project. I think, you know, China obviously, is a country of consequence and both in terms of the enormity of its economy, its population and also its crimes and its impact on the rest of the world.

When I say China here, I have to make a distinction. The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people, and China the nation are very different. Completely different. That's a point that Secretary Pompeo pointed out very, very clearly throughout his entire tenure at the State Department.

I think the Uyghur issue is particularly pointed because it distinguished this administration from the previous administration in the U.S. recent history of almost seven decades of dealings with China. In other words, we try to hold the Chinese government accountable for its actions. This is one of the very good examples of that government policy and major policy switch. I'm very glad that we started with this discussion.
Nina Shea:

Well, I couldn't think of any better person to start it with, Miles, because you have been writing about this a long time, even before the decision was made. You had a piece about the “Final Solution” in Xinjiang. I'd like you to start by really telling us what the designation, what the determination of the Secretary of State exactly was. I called it a landmark decision, and I think there are several reasons for it. Number one, it's ongoing, it's probably one of the two or three genocides that the United States has been willing to recognize while the situation was still going.

Dr. Miles Yu:

Yeah.

Nina Shea:

But can you tell us exactly what the determination was?

Dr. Miles Yu:

Okay. So the determination is very significant, number one. Let me just a few words of why this matters. Normally the designation of genocide is done by an international criminal tribunal, I believe. In recent memory, that court has designated, for example, genocide in Rwanda. Of course you can always say the Nazis. Goes further, there's a Nazi genocide against the Jewish people. And Cambodian genocide committed by Khmer Rouge. But you can designate the genocide in a way that could be interpreted legally. And also you can designate by other means too. But in compliance with the legal definition of genocide, there was actually a very specific definition of genocide by the United Nations. I have here this Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. This is a UN document. Article two specifically mentioned this. I'll read this very short paragraph. Designation of genocide. What it is. Then I'll go back to what the U.S. government action really was all about.

Article two of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such: A) Killing members of the group. B) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group. C) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part. D) Imposing measures intended to prevent birth within the group. And E) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. That's the UN definition of genocide.

Nina Shea:

And the Uyghurs checked all the boxes. The Uyghur genocide.

Dr. Miles Yu:

So here's the thing. I was a policy advisor for Secretary Pompeo, and there were several other colleagues that were spread out in the State Department in charge of particular affairs. There is a Global Criminal Justice Bureau. Our job is to provide the secretary all facts. What's going on in the world, in particular areas or particular topics. Then we suggest solutions, right? Policy solutions.
With all the facts we gathered about Xinjiang and about what was going on in Xinjiang and gave to the secretary, it was 100% sure for the secretary that this was a genocide, because all the facts we presented to the secretary fit into every single requirement of the genocide definition. Then what's left is this. Now this is nothing new. The Chinese Communist Party’s criminal acts against its own people has been going on for decades. It classified the whole nation into basically several arbitrary categories, most prominently by classes. This is typical, authentic Marxist Leninism.

The whole population normally is grouped into two general categories, right? Progressives and reactionaries. In between, there are some kind of classes. This is how the government of China determine which classes should be eliminated. That's what class struggle is all about. In between, and in recent decades, that kind of arbitrary definition and the classification of the population shifted from classes, not completely, but more or less into ethnic groups.

Among China's ethnic groups, most primarily Tibetans, Uyghurs, Mongolians, the Chinese government use the arbitrary methods of classifying its people to designate the entire ethnic group as a target of the power of the regime, and the Uyghurs fit into that. There's no question, based upon all our intelligence, our fact finding, and information from the human rights organizations globally. And we all put it together for the secretary and he read all the things and he basically ... what’s next was two things. One, consult the lawyers and bureaucrats, and two, to gather enough courage to make the right designation. Right? So-

Nina Shea:

He was really in the lead. I mean,

Dr. Miles Yu:

He was.

Nina Shea:

He didn't have the bureaucracy behind it, but we can get into that in a minute, but the press makes it sound that there was this vast network of concentration camps in Xinjiang where the local population was being put, was being detained, by the CCP and that was the reason for genocide. Because it resonates to have concentration camps, it brings up images of the Holocaust. But that is not what you're saying. That really is not part of the genocide definition.

Dr. Miles Yu:

Well-

Nina Shea:

And that there were actually precise facts that were then identified to establish that legally, this was, under the international definition, the most heinous crime known to mankind. That this is genocide that we, as American people, swore we would never forget.
**Dr. Miles Yu:**

You're right. The widespread massive concentration camp system in Xinjiang for the specific purpose of confining the Uyghurs is indisputable. There's been a lot of media reports on that. In popular perception, however, that seems to be the only imagery people have, that is, genocide is supported by this mass concentration camp system. That's true. But that's just one tip of the iceberg because beyond that, to designate Xinjiang atrocity as a genocide, a national leader would have considered the following.

Number one, is there any other aspect of this crimes in Xinjiang that fit into, 100%, the UN definition of genocide? Number two, and I think this is actually a most critical one, is to prove the intent of the perpetrator. So, that's actually a classical weapon used by those deniers of gigantic atrocities because it's very hard to prove the intent with... Even up to this day, you still have some kind of a revisionist Holocaust denier to challenge the world to find a piece of instruction written by Adolf Hitler to exterminate the Jews.

Even though the entire policy, the entire Nazi's Third Reich's existence, is built to reach that particular intent. We have also empirical evidence to prove that genocide did take place, right? So, this is very technical. What I'm trying to say here is in a Xinjiang designation to prove the intent of the communist party actually is not really that difficult. Because we also have leaked documents, ream after ream of documents, which were later published by places like New York Times, to actually prove there is a systemic policy from top down to discriminate against Uyghurs, to designate the Uyghurs, as an entire ethnic group, as a target of the state.

**Nina Shea:**

I think part of what President Xi said in those documents, in these private directives that he was giving to the communist party -- these were not public documents, they were, as you said, leaked -- was “show no mercy” to the Uyghurs.

**Dr. Miles Yu:**

That's right - “Show no mercy.” The only reason the Uyghurs were a problem to the CCP is because the Uyghurs have tried for hundreds of years, particularly in the last 70 some years, under extreme communist dictatorship, to have successfully maintained its ethnic, culture, and religious identity. It has not given up its own traditional characteristics. So, is incumbent upon Xi Jinping to basically wipe out that aspect of that. Now, I must say, there's also another debate within the State Department to talk about what is so repulsive? Obviously, to put people into the camp, yes. But if we focus just on torture of the Uyghurs, themselves, physically is not enough because there is also another aspect that we have to really consider, that is: the purpose of the Chinese Communist Party in putting these people into camps is not necessary to physically exterminate them.

**Nina Shea:**

Well, they said it was for vocational training
**Dr. Miles Yu:**

That's right. But it's to basically remold their mind, to force them go through an ideological indoctrination process, so they will emerge from those camps as something totally different in the Chinese Communist Party and will become a socialist new person. That is, they would emerge from that having gotten rid of their own belief in Islam, their own ethnic tradition, and their own belief in the uniqueness of their culture. So, that's basically the purpose of the Chinese Communist Party.

**Nina Shea:**

Brainwashing.

**Dr. Miles Yu:**

Brainwashing. So, in addition to the physical torture, physical confinement, part of that, there's also a higher purpose for the Chinese Communist Party. That is to change their mind, to change their belief system. That's why it is a very, very disheartening for me to see that many Muslim majority countries did not have the guts, courage to speak up, to defend their own religion. Because the purpose of the Chinese Communist Party is not only to physically torture those Uyghurs, but ultimately, to destroy their faith. And this is a religious war. This is a classical Marxist-Leninist war against all organized religions, Muslims, in particular. So, this is a case that we have to consider beyond that.

**Nina Shea:**

Just on that point, how did the CCP deceive the Muslim world? They brought some of them in, I think, to see the camps or they gave them a Potemkin tour. Or, they just weren't willing to see it?

**Dr. Miles Yu:**

One of my favorite novels is a novel by the great African American writer, Ralph Ellison, who published the novel in 1950s. It's called *The Invisible Man*, in which the Black protagonist had the famous line. He said, "It is not that I don't exist. It is that you refuse to see me." So, in a similar vein, the crimes or the atrocities that were taking place in Xinjiang were not entirely invisible to the world, is that the world refused to see it, to recognize this is the case. So, to answer your question, I think a lot of Muslim majority country, particularly the leaders, who for their short-term economic gain with the Chinese Communist Party, refused to recognize what is very obvious to everybody.

**Nina Shea:**

I think that's another reason why this is a landmark decision because not only was it an ongoing genocide that was recognized, unlike say, the situation with the Armenians, that was finally recognized this past year by the United States. But it was also against a great power. It was against China, which is a major power in the world today, unlike Sudan, with Darfur, or Rwanda, or even Cambodia. This was also a very courageous piece of this determination.
Dr. Miles Yu:

We have to give Secretary Pompeo the greatest credit because the atrocities against its own people by the communist party, particularly ethnic minorities, is nothing new. In every administration, the senior officials all knew about this. It would take courage and foresight. And I always say this, there’s a very interesting part of this. It is not just to make a right decision because when dealing with the Chinese Communist Party, for decades, the United States government and its people have had this kind of profound, moral dilemma. That is, we are not sure this is 100% right. We know it’s practically useful to engage with the CCP. But morally speaking, there is some kind of repugnant part that we cannot really reconcile. That is, we know the Chinese Communist Party is repressing its people. We know they’re putting a lot of people into camps. We know they’re jailing, killing its human rights defenders in China. But, for practical reasons, we do not want to say that. That actually bothered the moral conscience of the American people, particularly American senior officials for decades. And I think this act taken by Secretary Pompeo, by the Trump administration, to designate the CCP as genocidal in this policy in Xinjiang, reconciled that kind of moral dilemma, so that in our policy toward China, we could live with our good conscience. And because not only is it morally right, but most importantly, because it’s the truth. We cannot really conduct business with China, guided by this gigantic lie, as if nothing is happening in China in the realm of human rights.

And I think from now on, we should really conduct business with China, and all other governments in the world, with clear conscience, the American conscience, because that’s the American way. Otherwise, we would lose not only our leadership in the world, in terms of sheer sharp power, military, economic, technology, but we also, we will lose our moral leadership. American leadership in the world is really all about its morality. It’s all about what is right about America.

Nina Shea:

That's what distinguishes us from the China brand, which wants to present itself as a more efficient and successful model to the world -- through authoritarianism.

Dr. Miles Yu:

That's right. That's right. To me, the most efficient regime in modern history probably is Nazi Germany or Imperial Japan.

Nina Shea:

Yes.

Dr. Miles Yu:

But they are morally bankrupt.

Nina Shea:

They are morally bankrupt, and they are shameless in their pursuit of deception, and trying to cover up, to lie, to say that these are vocational training camps, that they’re placing Muslims in jobs, when actually it's enforced labor on a grand scale, they even did something that was so atrocious on Twitter, out of the
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Embassy here in Washington, boasting that women were being empowered by what they were doing to them, and that is the forced abortions and forced sterilizations and population prevention programs. Can you speak to that? Because I think that that was a really interesting piece of your evidence, looking at how, as Secretary Pompeo said in The Wall Street Journal, genocides aren't always by firing squads or in gas chambers, and that this was a method of population prevention that was skewed against the Uyghurs, that was deliberately done by the Chinese Communist Party, and it was really ... although it's mentioned in the definition that you read of the genocide convention, suppression of birth or prevention of birth ... it was kind of controversial. Could you speak to that?

Dr. Miles Yu:

Yes. I think the Chinese have committed enormous crimes against its people, particularly the women of China, in the last 30-some years in the name of population control and family planning. Particularly for someone like myself who grew up in China, I witnessed the absolutely grotesque brutality of forced abortions and family planning, committed by the entire machine of the State. Against the Uyghur women it is particularly repulsive, because if you look at the population decline rate the last several years, when Xi Jinping intensified the repression against the Uyghurs, it was shocking. It was several dozen times higher than the national average population decline, so clearly there was an intended policy to diminish the size of the Uyghur population and force these Uyghur women to marry non-Uyghur men, so that somehow, through these forcible methods, quite disgusting, that would homogenize the Uyghur population.

Those policies were outrageous, outrightly outrageous, but for the Chinese people, for the regime itself, it really doesn't matter much to them, because in China, there has been a persistent ... what Ms. Arendt called the banality of evil. There are so many things that's going on, but it's become a common occurrence, so people don't take it very seriously. We have to really reawaken people's sense of outrage against what was going on in China. A lot of things going on.

Olympics, the same thing. Olympics is for normal nations to have a location to celebrate the triumph of individual athletes. It should never be used to legitimize a genocidal regime. It should never be used as a tool through which a genocidal regime propagandizes its own global image and polishes its own crime. That's the whole moral issue behind offering and granting Beijing the host privilege of the Olympic Games.

Nina Shea:

Well, so you had the satellite imagery showing that there were these concentration camps, a vast array of them. They were military, I believe, satellite photos from the United States, not from China. You had the leaked documents with the president's intent to show no mercy on the Uyghurs, to target the Uyghurs and the other ethnic Muslims, and to what he called “balance” their populations with the Han majority Chinese, by which he meant, as you just explained, diminishing the growth rate. I think it was something like a drop, a plummeting, of 24% from 2018 to 2019, compared with a 4% drop in population for China overall.

You had that stark statistical information, but then there was the testimony of Uyghur women. The ones who had escaped abroad were able to say what had happened to them, and they were talking about forced abortions and forced sterilizations against their will. What you all did during the determination
process was to make a deduction that this population growth suppression or plummeting was related to what the women had been saying for years, and no one really added it up or thought that it amounted to anything or believed that.

Dr. Miles Yu:

Yes. This is not a real aberration, right? This is like the norm, because the Communist Party is targeting some particular group, either by social class or by ethnicity, and their determination is unmatched because they control all human and natural resources. It's ruthless. It cannot be [inaudible 00:27:55]. Evidence itself is not lacking. We have enough evidence. You talk about satellite imagery. You talk about newspaper reports. I mean, I remember BuzzFeed did an incredible job identifying a lot of camps, for which they actually won a Pulitzer Prize. You also have brave Chinese citizens who sneak into Xinjiang and are driving around documenting all this, the elaborate camps designed for the Uyghurs.

Now, those camps, they're not a vocational training center, because there's barbed wire, there are soldiers, guards with guns, and there was restricted access to it. Obviously those were nothing but concentration camps. You have all this evidence over there. The question is what do we do about that, what the international community could do. I think the Trump administration took the step forward and made this bold designation.

Now, you talk about the resistance. I know there are very good bureaucrats within the administration who are accustomed to the idea of maintaining a smooth relationship with China, because China is a country of consequence. We have enormous economic engagement with China and China’s people. Those are all true, but we cannot ignore what's really happening. If we don't take any action to hold the Chinese government accountable, things like this are going to happen again and again and again. For that, I think we did the right thing, and I’m very grateful to be part of that. I think there are a lot of people within the government who actually contributed to this work. It’s not one individual, but ultimately it would take the secretary of state to make a decision.

I have also said this. One unique aspect of Secretary Pompeo’s leadership is that once he realized the first principle, the most important thing, it provided the guidance, and he is uncompromising when he demanded of his subordinates to reach this compromise. I remember during the process of designation, we had a lot of lawyers, we had a lot of bureaucrats argue, "Hey, listen we could do a crime against humanity, that's a designation.” Secretary Pompeo said, "Does that conform 100% with what's going on?" They said, "Well, there are some technical difficulties, procedures, public relations, reactions about this, so we are very safe if we do this, sort of 90% of what you wanted." Secretary Pompeo said, "No, I want that 10%." He has to be 100%.

That's why we came up with this genocide designation, because there's a UN definition, and every single factual reporting that went to him could confirm some aspect of that. Basically, there’s no legal stand or factual stand against the designation. In the end, what really, really matters, I think, is really the courage and leadership.

Nina Shea:

Yes. I noted that Secretary Pompeo did write a Wall Street Journal piece explaining his rationale a little bit. He says what was key to him was this population control or population suppression, and gradual
eradication. Some of the Uyghurs' testimony says, "They're trying to eliminate us, eradicate us, slowly by this method," but there isn't a big justification, a big tome that really explains the process, the facts, the evidence that you all gathered, and that has been a criticism of the work. I heard ... and maybe you can confirm today whether this is true ... that that evidence, that pile, great record of evidence of genocide against the Uyghurs, was classified by the State Department and is not public for 25 years.

**Dr. Miles Yu:**

Well, I cannot really comment on a specific process over there, who was involved in it, but I would say this. The process of government deliberation is very serious and thorough, and goes back and forth, back and forth. There’s always different alternative interpretations of certain facts. So, for a legal definition, I would say ultimately, I think, government officials sometimes actually thrive on linguistic, semantic ambiguity and to confuse the ultimate, larger picture. And I think, in this particular case, the facts are indisputable. The UN legal definition is there, but I think there are many people within the government who tend to sort of forget what their obligation really is, that it is to provide legal, as well as technical advice to the decision makers, not policy advice.

Policy advice is specifically, exclusively within the domain of the leaders. So I think a lot of colleagues within the bureaus tend to give policy advice, as opposed to professional technical, legal advice. They often, for example, will say, "All right, you can get away with designating a genocide, but this will have a severe consequence on the bilateral relationship between the US and China." On that ground, many people feel uncomfortable providing the genocide designation, but that actually is the problem you see ... the problem is, you are not supposed to say what impact this might have on the bi-lateral relationship, even though it's true, even though it's legally justifiable. So, that's why the leader would like to make the decision. And I think, the US-China bilateral relationship has to be based upon truth and candor. Without those two elements, we're going to go astray as we have been going, for almost 50 years.

**Nina Shea:**

We can’t be part of the cover up. They're working hard to cover up these atrocities and we can't be part of it. We have to call it for what it is, let the chips fall. And because the genocide convention does have a definition in black and white, because it was adopted, it was the first human rights treaty to be adopted unanimously by the UN General Assembly, back in '48. It really holds a lot of weight and it has permeated the American consciousness that this is something that we stand against. We stand against genocide and precisely, it was so important, that 10% that you described because -for the very reason, I guess, that the lawyers at state didn't like it - we need to take action. There has to be some consequence for genocide.

**Dr. Miles Yu:**

Not all lawyers

**Nina Shea:**

Not all lawyers, its okay.
Dr. Miles Yu:

Just a few.

Nina Shea:

Not all lawyers, I'm a lawyer, so I don't stand against it. But you have “crimes against humanity” and they say, "Well, that's the same thing and it's just as bad, but the intent is missing." Well under our notion of law, intent is very important for crimes and it doesn't hit with the same force as the label of genocide. And it's important that we do take a stand. We have taken a stand. Can you tell us about some of the things that happened during your tenure at State with sanctions and whether we should be doing more at this point?

Dr. Miles Yu:

Well, I think I was fortunate enough to be able to join a great team led by Secretary Pompeo in the Trump administration. I think one of the greatest satisfactions I have had is to be able to contribute to the revolutionary change of direction in our bilateral relationship with China. We changed the entire conceptual framework of dealing with Communist China. We no longer ignored the fundamental political and ideological differences between these two systems represented by China and the United States. We no longer tolerated China's rampant infringement upon intellectual property rights upon our national security, among our subnational governments, for example. So, we basically realized the fundamental threat posed by the Chinese Communist Party, to not only the United States, but also to the free world in general. Now, many people object to the use of phrase, free world.

I don't know why they will object. Look at what's going on in China. China has its technologies. China has all this manpower and the financial resources to literally impose totalitarian standards of its own upon the rest of the world, through its technology, through its global economic and financial outreach. So, this is nothing new. That's why Secretary Pompeo keeps saying that the threat posed by the Chinese Communist Party is a central threat of our times. He's not an alarmist, he's a realist. So, this is why I was able to be part of that. I was fortunate enough to be able to work with so many wonderful individuals within the Trump administration to make that fundamental change. I hope that whatever we did will be the beginning of a new station in a different direction of this American sort of a locomotive, leading the country to a new destiny.

And I think it also, let me just put it this way. We started out with talking about this designation. It's not whether we did it right or not, at the time. Those decisions and the changes we made during the Trump administration actually have stood the test of time, even though it's only a year. But within the year, we have this drastic change of American administration. With the two administration that had totally different governance philosophies in many fundamental ways. But on China policy, what we did was almost endorsed entirely by the new administration, because we have the rare moment in our nation's history where a consensus has emerged. Both parties, Democrats, Republicans realize the China threat. As a matter of fact, some portion of the Democratic establishment didn't think we have done enough, which is kind of really interesting.

So, I will say on the issue of genocide, for example, since the designation a year ago, which itself is a landmark, at the time, it was shocking to many people, for its boldness, for its straightforwardness. But
up to this moment, as we speak, there has been no significant, and meaningful rebuttal to that designation. Nobody has been able to prove us wrong on that. The only party entity that's vigorously opposed to it is the Chinese Communist Party, the very perpetrator of this genocide, we have decided. So, that doesn't say anything. And in the meantime, China continues to vigorously blockade any meaningful international investigation of what's going on in Xinjiang. So, the repression continues, it's going on. So, that's why I think, even though it's a landmark decision and I think we did the right thing, the world has really followed American leadership.

Nina Shea:

Yeah. There has been real leadership and we're now seeing it play out even with these games and you're right, it's much more than a landmark decision on the Uyghurs as important and necessary as that is, it's also a landmark policy shift. And I guess my last question is, do you think, getting back to the Olympics, is it a mistake for the Olympics to be held in Beijing?

Dr. Miles Yu:

I think it's a mistake for even granting this to Beijing. Again remember, Beijing was granted the right to host summer Olympics in 2008. At the time the thinking predominantly was that we give Beijing the right to host in the hope that Beijing will use this opportunity to become more open, to become more liberal, to become more democratic. The issue of, for example, press control. The Chinese government promised, even though it's kind of pathetic, that we're going to keep the free press during the game, but that part was not even fulfilled. So, I always say, the Chinese government cannot be trusted 100%.

They only use events like this to basically hijack international goodwill and for its own influence, for its own propaganda. And in the end, as Secretary Pompeo keeps saying that, when dealing with China, we should even go beyond more than what we did with the Soviets. President Reagan always said, “Trust, but verify.” When dealing with China CCP, we should always do something, “distrust and verify,” because their pattern of mendacity has been so well established. Everything we do when we deal with the CCP, we should start at that point of distrust and then ask them to prove to us otherwise by its deeds and by its words.

Nina Shea:

Well, I'm hoping that Hudson Institute can use this period of the Olympic Games while world attention is on China, to open up American eyes, even further to what we're contending with, with this very threatening and evil regime. And I should say that talking to you, Miles, today, has gone a long way in helping in that effort. Thank you so much for joining us.

Dr. Miles Yu:

Thank you.