Chinese Special Education Teachers Explore U.S. Programs

Special education received little attention in China until the late 1980s when, as part of its educational reform, the Chinese government began to establish more schools for children with special needs, experiment with mainstream inclusion programs, and enroll students with disabilities into mainstream post-secondary institutions. Yet the field of disabilities education is still relatively new and limited in scope. For example, only 3% of Chinese special education teachers have received specific training for their positions, and there is no legislation to support students with disabilities, such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the United States. Chinese education leaders are eager to find means to train special educators, raise social awareness of the importance of education for children with disabilities, and attract additional financial resources.

It is in this context that the National Committee on United States-China Relations welcomed a ten-member delegation of Chinese special education officials, scholars and school principals/teachers to the United States on a two-week study program from October 16 to 30, 2002. The project falls under the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the U.S. Department of Education and the PRC Ministry of Education (MOE); the National Committee has been the implementing agency for that MOU since its signing in 1979.

The group consisted of MOE’s top special education official, the head of education in Anhui, heads of special education in Hubei and Inner Mongolia, vice president of the National Rehabilitation Research Center for the Deaf (who raised a deaf son and changed careers from engineering to deaf education), two principals of schools for the deaf, and one special education teacher. It was a group of wonderful, devoted, and interested professionals.

Delegation members examined the following topics relevant to special education in America at the K-12 levels: historical background; federal, state and local policies; administration and governance; curriculum development; teaching methodology; and use of technology. During stops in the Boston; Washington, D.C.; Minneapolis; and San Francisco metropolitan areas, the delegation met with representatives of government and non-government agencies, public and private schools, educational associations, and teacher training colleges.

Through discussions at the Department of Education, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), and other national organizations, the group put special education in a larger, policy-oriented framework. During these meetings, the delegation members recognized the importance of legal protection and structure to facilitate education of students with disabilities.

One highlight early in the visit came at Newton North High School in Newton, MA, where the delegation visited...
LONG-TERM LABOR LAW PROJECT FOR THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

The National Committee is part of a consortium that was awarded a grant from the United States Department of Labor for a new multiple-year project about labor law in China.

The China Labor Rule of Law Program is a major project that will take place over the next four years. It is designed to address institution building and system building on the national, regional, and local levels. There are four main foci: to enhance China’s capacity to develop laws and regulations to implement internationally recognized workers’ rights and enable those charged with implementation and enforcement of those laws and regulations to operate more effectively; to promote greater awareness of labor law among Chinese workers and employers; to improve industrial relations and develop a national system for, and train officials on, various aspects of worker rights, collective bargaining, and labor dispute prevention and resolution; and to enhance legal aid services to workers and migrant laborers.

The program will be administered by a consortium of three organizations: the National Committee, Worldwide Strategies, Inc. and the Asia Foundation. The National Committee will focus on the first of the four foci.

BUSY YEAR UNDERWAY AT THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

The National Committee is as busy as we have been for a long time. Since the last issue of Notes in June, we have hosted five delegations in the United States (one of them a mix of participants from the PRC, Hong Kong SAR, and Taiwan); sent two to the People’s Republic and Hong Kong; and organized the itineraries of two self-funded PRC groups. Participants in our Teachers Exchange Program (TEP) and our AOL Time Warner Internships began their sojourns in the United States; a wrap up session for last year’s TEP teachers took place; and we ran eight public programs (three in Washington, D.C. and the rest in New York) and three smaller events at the National Committee offices. Reports on these programs may be found elsewhere in these Notes.

As Notes goes to press, we are preparing to send a delegation to China for a conference at Tsinghua University on the media’s role in market economies, and to work again with the Stanford-Harvard Preventive Defense Project to send a delegation to Taipei, Shanghai and Beijing. The latter, led by former Secretary of Defense William Perry, and including Generals Brent Scowcroft and John Shalikashvili, and former Ambassadors Joseph Prueher and Michael Armacost, will be an important and timely delegation, coming as it does immediately after the 16th National Party Congress. At the end of November, a delegation will visit China for discussions on municipal finance, a heretofore circumscribed area of activity in China that is now receiving greater attention. (Chinese municipalities are not authorized to issue bonds, resulting in higher costs for water treatment plants, roads and other infrastructure.)

In addition, we have begun planning work on the new Department of Labor grant, a fascinating and challenging project. We are very fortunate that our consortium partners – Worldwide Strategies, Inc. and the Asia Foundation – bring enormous experience, professionalism and camaraderie to the table. We have also begun to prepare for the next meeting of the Young Leaders Forum, scheduled for April in Hangzhou.

The Department of Education will keep us busy next summer, when we will take a delegation of presidents of minority-serving universities to China and send a Fulbright-Hays delegation of American teachers to China.

And we will continue to develop public programs that examine aspects of China or U.S.-China relations that are not sufficiently illuminated by the media. The next such program is the December 3 event at the China Institute that showcases the three AOL Time Warner interns from Fudan University who live in New York. This is a group of extremely bright and articulate young people; I am certain that those of you who can attend will learn quite a lot, as I have at past sessions.

You may ask how we are able to juggle so many balls at the same time. The answer is that we have dedicated, talented people on the staff who are supplemented on occasion by independent contractors. For example, former staffer Marilyn Beach, now working in Beijing, will have conducted two exchange programs for us this calendar year. Our October 18 World War II symposium could not have been done without the assistance of our friend Madelyn Ross, who is based in Washington, D. C. In addition, nearly everything we do involves collaboration, if not full-fledged partnership, as was the case with our two programs on Capitol Hill this fall. Finally, we rely on the tremendous network of friends and supporters who are part of the extended National Committee family. For that support we are always very grateful.

John L. Holden
November 2002
China’s rapid economic development and industrialization have brought modernization and an improved quality of life for a great number of citizens in China. The advantages of economic development have not occurred in a vacuum, however. Chinese leaders, as those in all other industrializing and industrialized countries, are forced to contend with a variety of difficult environmental management issues. One of the most important of these issues concerns the manufacture, transport, and consumption of a variety of chemical compounds that are often dangerous to the natural environment and human health if not handled and disposed of properly.

From June 22 to July 5, a delegation from the People’s Republic of China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong SAR visited the United States for a program that addressed these issues. The delegation of eight hazardous waste specialists traveled to Washington, D.C.; Baltimore; Houston; New Orleans; Baton Rouge; and San Francisco. The program showed how federal, state and local policies and regulations are designed and implemented, and how government offices and private industries interact with community and voluntary organizations to prevent and mitigate hazards and educate the public. In the process, Chinese and American specialists shared information about managing hazardous waste and achieving a healthy ecological balance between economic development goals and environmental protection.

The program explored waste management in the context of the social issues that often complicate such matters. For example, the delegation went to “Cancer Alley,” an area between New Orleans and Baton Rouge, Louisiana where public health concerns have been raised as a result of serious petrochemical contamination in communities surrounding oil fields and processing plants. This visit underscored sensitive social issues associated with hazardous waste sites, such as the preponderance of poor, minority and traditionally under-represented communities located within the hazardous region.

Meetings with a wide range of key players, including professional colleagues, academics, NGO leaders, businessmen, government officials, and the media, helped participants gain new perspectives and form new ideas and impressions that they took back home. The eight participants also learned from one another: despite the wide range of professional experiences, regional differences, and ages (from 23 to 50 years old), the members of the group created solid relationships and got along very well.

In a Hong Kong Economic Journal article, the group’s interpreter, Sonia Ng, noted the contrast between the plantations, their grandeur and beauty, and the harsh realities of nearby areas like Cancer Alley and the Superfund site in Baton Rouge, where hazardous chemicals had been illegally disposed of, leaving a cesspool of toxic substances. In fact, the Superfund site was one highlight of the tour because the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality is experimenting with new ways to use natural biological processes to clean toxic sites. Viewing this experiment firsthand left a deep impression on the participants.

Other institutions visited included the USEPA, the American Chemistry Council, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Earth Justice, Natural Resources Defense Council, Waste Management, the City of Houston, the Tulane Environmental Law Clinic, brownfield redevelopment sites, and hazardous waste transfer centers.

The participants were not always the recipients of information; they were also presenters. At a public program at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C., three delegation members gave keynote speeches, all of which inspired excellent questions from the audience of more than 40 from government, academia, NGO, and industry sectors from the greater Washington, D.C. area. After the major speeches, each delegation participant had the opportunity to make presentations and all were interviewed for a report to be published in the Wilson Center’s China Environment Series. Several reporters representing media in Taiwan, the Mainland, and Hong Kong attended, and an article in The China Post emphasized how remarkable it was to attend a gathering of professionals from throughout Greater China.
the EDCO Program for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. EDCO stands for Educational Collaborative, an umbrella organization in Massachusetts designed to pool resources across localities to serve specific populations of students. The delegation members were impressed with the students as well as with the EDCO “school-within-a-school” model. While successfully integrating deaf students into the mainstream environment, it retains a strong support system, giving them a wider range of options. In this and subsequent site visits, delegation members compared different models of inclusion and discussed possible variations that would suit their communities.

An intense daylong program at Gallaudet University in Washington, D.C. was arranged by Dr. Richard Lytle, the head of Gallaudet’s education department. Dr. Lytle has collaborated closely with Chinese colleagues in recent years and even postponed a trip there in order to host this group. He arranged a wonderful day of interaction with students and faculty (most of whom were deaf) that focused on deaf education in America, visits to Gallaudet’s affiliated elementary and secondary schools, examples of how to use technology in teaching, discussions on teaching methodology and curriculum development, a luncheon hosted by the university’s president and a Chinese student panel.

The panelists spoke passionately about issues relating to their different experiences in China and America. While discrimination against those with disabilities still exists to a large degree in China, there is a growing number of people who feel compassion toward this often marginalized group. Yet even with the increasing level of compassion, there are still many barriers to disabled educational and professional development. This is due, in large part, to the low expectations placed on people with disabilities in China. A common viewpoint is that those with disabilities should be cared for, not educated or given professional opportunities. The students also mentioned issues of educational choice and method: the Chinese education system is very rigid and there is less attention paid to the individual needs of students. They emphasized that one of the things they have learned in the United States is that as a deaf person, the key is not to give up on oneself and not to feel that society has given up on you.

In the San Francisco Bay area, the group focused on what awaits special needs children after they leave school. They visited two NGOs – the Community Gatepath which provides employment training and opportunities for young adults with disabilities, and the Living Skills Center for the Visually Impaired, which works with young adults on their independent living skills. The delegation was impressed by the confidence expressed by teachers and officials in disabled children and recognized the positive effects of these attitudes on the students they saw. They noted the extensive legal protections for the disabled in this country and the relative abundance of expertly trained teachers that provide a solid learning environment for physically and mentally impaired students. When the group heard that one building at a state-owned school had just undergone a $4-million renovation, the delegation leader gasped, “That is the entire annual budget of special education in China.”

This is the first time that special education in China has been looked at under the Department of Education/National Committee auspices: this issue was long overdue for exploration, and the interactions that resulted have provided the core for much-needed future cooperation between and among Chinese and American experts in the field.
Major events have shaped Sino-American relations in the two years between the 10th U.S.-China Dialogue of January 2000 and the 11th in June 2002: the election of President George W. Bush; the collision of an American reconnaissance plane and a Chinese fighter jet off the coast of China; the decision by the United States to offer a “robust” package of arms to Taiwan; President Bush’s statement that the United States will do “whatever it takes to help Taiwan defend herself;” the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States; Chinese support for America’s war on terrorism; two visits to China by President Bush; and the visit to the United States of then Vice President Hu Jintao.

There was thus a lot to discuss during the Dialogue, held again this year at the Pocantico Conference Center of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund in Tarrytown, New York. Led by Ambassador Mei Zhaorong, president of the Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs (CPIFA), a delegation of 12 Chinese met with 13 Americans for two-and-a-half days of intense talks focused on various aspects of the U.S.-China relationship. On some issues, discussants established common ground; on others, they could reach no consensus. Since the first Dialogue in 1984, conversations have gained depth, partially due to the increasingly diverse range of representatives on both sides. This year’s group included former and current government officials, academics, business people, educators and NGO representatives.

In the days surrounding the talks, the Chinese delegation traveled to New York City; Washington, D.C.; Philadelphia; and other Pennsylvania sites. The National Committee arranged a schedule that included noteworthy meetings with Dr. Henry Kissinger, Mr. David Rockefeller, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, several congressmen and senators on Capitol Hill, the National Security Council, the U.S. Institute of Peace, various Asian American organizations, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, the Foreign Policy Research Institute, CIGNA, and Patton Boggs LLP.

The National Committee is grateful to the Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs for its co-sponsorship of this event over the past two decades, to the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund for their financial support of the program, and to the many Committee members and friends who helped make this such a successful program.
In June 2002, the U.S.-China Teachers Exchange Program moved from the American Council of Learned Societies to the National Committee. Over the first six years of the program, 69 American teachers taught in Chinese secondary schools and 119 Chinese teachers taught in American elementary, middle, and high schools. This year there are 22 Chinese secondary school teachers of English teaching in K-12 schools in Oregon, Colorado, Wisconsin, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine. Margot Landman, the program’s founder, continues to direct the program, which is now accepting applications for the 2003-2004 school year. (Contact her at mmlandman@ncuscr.org for information and an application.)

The following are excerpts from The Exchange, a periodical written for the program and published three times per year. The two articles below were written by teachers from the 2001-2002 cohort and are published in Vol. 6, Issues 2 and 3 of The Exchange, respectively. The publications are available upon request from Charles Donohoe at cdonohoe@ncuscr.org.

**Volunteering at the Red Cross**

By Ning Guili, Beacon School, New York, NY

Have you ever heard of “Red Cross”? Surely, the answer to this question from most people would be positive. As common sense, we know that the International Red Cross, born of a desire to bring assistance to the wounded in the battlefield, prevents and alleviates human suffering wherever it may be found. It helps peoples all over the world to promote understanding, cooperation, friendship, communication and peace. Have you ever volunteered with Red Cross? I have. Exactly speaking, I am volunteering with the American Red Cross for the Disaster Relief Operation #787—helping those who are affected by the 9/11 attacks.

On September 11th 2001, suicide terrorists hijacked four jetliners, two of which crashed into the World Trade Center in New York, causing them to collapse. At that very moment, I was teaching D Band class (at Beacon). One of the kids came late to class. He brought us the news as soon as he entered the classroom. I didn’t believe him at all, neither did his classmates, which I could tell from their facial expression. We didn’t believe him, not because we didn’t trust him, but because what happened was just incredible. However, it was no less a fact, whether we doubted or not.

**To the Moon**

By Brad Badgley, Nanjing Teachers University Affiliated High School

In the British newspaper The Guardian, an article appeared on May 20th reporting that the Chinese have plans to put a man into earth’s orbit by 2005 and land one on the moon by 2010. After that, they have plans to set up a permanent lunar base.

I asked my students if they knew of this plan. They said that they did. I then wondered aloud why China wanted to go to the moon? The students said that it would show that China was part of the modern world and would gain respect from other countries. Several said simply, “because America did it so we must also.” Then, I boldly wondered if it wouldn’t be better to help the poor. This received muted mumbles of approval. Then one student rose and said, “Well, why doesn’t America stop spending money on missile defense and help the poor in Africa?” I must have hit a nerve. He stood there and watched for my reaction. The room was thick with nervous anticipation.

I grinned at the kid. “Good point! Actually, forget about Africa! Africa? There are poor and struggling people in America. And their numbers are growing!” The students laughed. They were trying to decide whether to believe me. They were starting to think. I began again, “So, China wants to go to the moon so that they can gain respect and national pride. Well, people have already been to the moon. It has been done. Why not do something humans have not done before?” There weren’t any comments but their eyes were lit up with the challenge.

Then a student rose and said, “If we can go to the moon there are minerals there that we can use to build houses for the poor people.” This presented an interesting conundrum; is it better to spend billions because we think we will find a solution to earth’s problems out there? Or, should we use our vast financial resources to fix the problems here first? One student said,
On September 25, 2002, the National Committee jointly sponsored “China in Transition,” the first meeting in a two-part policy series on Capitol Hill. Co-sponsors were the Freeman Chair in China Studies at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), the China Program of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP), and the Asia/Pacific Research Center of Stanford University. The program was hosted by Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman Senator Joseph Biden, the National Committee and CSIS. Eighteen specialists discussed four aspects of China’s transitioning society: the Chinese Communist Party, social and welfare issues, rural China, and the economy. By holding the event on Capitol Hill, the conference enabled many important policy- and opinion-makers to hear the views of China experts.

The second meeting, “Taiwan and U.S. Policy: Toward Crisis or Stability?”, took place on October 9 and was organized primarily by the China Program at CEIP and the Asia/Pacific Research Center of Stanford University. Seventeen specialists discussed the economic, diplomatic, and political-military implications of U.S. policy regarding Taiwan and the PRC. Conference reports of each meeting are available on the web at www.ncuscr.org or at any of the co-sponsors’ websites.

Dr. Roderick MacFarquhar, Leroy B. Williams Professor of History and Political Science at Harvard University, addressed the issue of succession and its historical significance during his keynote address at the September 25 forum. Below is an excerpt from that speech, which provides insight into the transition of the CCP leadership.

I have been asked to address the subject of political transitions in China and I shall focus on politics of succession. As everyone here today knows, and indeed that’s presumably why everyone is here, China is at this very moment in the run-up to a most important political transition: succession at the very top of the Communist Party. How that succession process evolves will tell us a lot about the degree of institutionalization that has taken place in the Chinese political system since the Cultural Revolution. It may also provide some insight into whether the new generation of leaders will be able to cooperate or whether they will continue to consider politics as a zero-sum game.

Succession in China is, and should be, a perennial topic because in a leader-friendly Leninist system like China, the identity of the leader has enormous implications for the whole polity. But the main importance of this topic is that the moment of succession is the midnight of the state, the time of its maximum weakness, the moment at which power passes from the veteran to the novice. The succession process is therefore a key element in determining whether or not a nation gets through this particular pass without mishap.

In traditional societies, when monarchs ruled as well as reigned, the moment of national weakness was guarded against by having in place an heir apparent, normally the eldest son of the king, who became king immediately on the death of his father. “The king is dead, long live the king!” This formula was designed to combine speed with certainty, essential characteristics of a pre-modern succession system when transitions were more likely to be disputed than in 21st century America!

Modern democratic states have sacrificed speed in favor of greater certainty. The transitional election period paralyzes British decision making for three weeks, and the American political system for six months or even longer. But at the end of the day, the result is fair and seen to be fair and so the possibility of it being upset is minimal. Floridas aren’t supposed to happen, and normally they don’t. Where democracy is new, and politicians have qualms about its stability, the old world is brought in to shore up the potential deficiencies of the new. Throughout South Asia for instance, dynastic succession has been seen as a key element of stability, resulting in the rule of a whole series of widows and daughters. Nor are dynastic politics limited to new democracies, as the names Bush and Kennedy suggest.

And of course, dictatorships, too, can breed dynasties, like North Korea’s Kims, the Great Leader and the Dear Leader; the Ceaucescu family village in Romania; Papa Doc and Baby Doc in Haiti; and the recent passage of power from father to son in Syria. In China in the 1970s, Mme. Mao dreamed of succeeding her husband in emulation of the fabled Tang dynasty Empress Wu.

Dynastic successions have one great advantage for the departing dynast. He or she can normally assume that their policies or, more importantly, their “legacies,” whatever they may be, will be sustained. Their reputations should be in safe, because loyal, hands. In no country has the legacy issue been more important than communist China; nowhere else does it seem as important that the future justify the past. But despite this concern, nowhere has the succession process been so singularly mishandled.

The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) had two succession systems to look to: the imperial one with its immense historical overhang for somebody so conscious of China’s past as Mao, who was already 18 when the last emperor abdicated; and the Soviet one, for Mao and his colleagues also aspired to modernity. Their slogan in the early 1950s was that “the Soviet today, is China’s tomorrow.”

The imperial system under the Qing was modeled on that of the Ming. In their native land before the conquest of China, the Manchus were accustomed to having the great khan chosen by his peers, but during an early crisis, the Kang Xi emperor adopted the Ming system because he wanted to ensure that the Chinese, bureaucrats and people, would be on his side. The Ming system was a variation on the dynastic model common in pre-modern
England: the successor was the son of the emperor, but unlike in England, the emperor had the right to choose which of the many male offspring from his various wives should be the lucky, or perhaps unlucky, one. The objective was political stability and the legitimacy of the succession. It also enabled the mandarins to ensure that the heir apparent was properly educated. But there was a problem which stemmed from what Evelyn Rawski has described as the perils of combining the Han Chinese system of succession — naming the heir at an early age — and the non-Han conquest tradition of employing imperial kinsmen in governance.¹

What this meant was that as Kang Xi got disenchanted with his heir apparent, his other sons began vying for the succession. In other words, there was legitimacy without stability. The result was the adoption of a system of secret succession. After disinheriting his first heir apparent, the Kang Xi emperor refused to name the next one until he was on his deathbed. Since this resulted in rumors of fraud, later emperors wrote down the names of their successors in edicts that were sealed in a casket to be opened as the incumbent was on his deathbed. From the mid-1800s till the end of the dynasty, it was the Empress Dowager who did the choosing.

What I want to stress about the Ming-Qing succession system is not just the search for stability common to all succession systems, but the method of choice. The incumbent, whether the legitimate emperor or the illegitimate Empress Dowager, did the choosing. There might be a presumption that it would be the eldest son of the chief wife, but that wasn’t guaranteed, and the choice could be invalidated if the incumbent saw fit.

The Soviet model gave similar powers to the incumbent. Lenin of course didn’t designate any heir, and the result was the power struggle that resulted in the triumph of Stalin and the execution of all his rivals. Stalin, however, did indicate whom his successor should be, choosing Malenkov to give the political report at the last party congress he attended. But living in Stalin’s shadow, Malenkov did not have the time to establish an independent status and his absolute primacy, and after Stalin’s death he was pushed aside and then purged by Khrushchev. When Khrushchev was purged in his turn in 1964, it was the acolyte whom he seemed to be grooming for the succession — Brezhnev — who took over.

Brezhnev’s short-lived successors, Andropov and Chernenko, were of his generation and emerged as the choices of the older members of the Praesidium, as the Soviet Politburo was called. It is the coming of Gorbachev that is more interesting because at that time, in 1985, it was clear that (1) it was time for a new generation to take over and (2) there were a number of aspirants. According to good Soviet sources, it was a party elder, Andrei Gromyko, who rose first in the Politburo and proposed Gorbachev, after which all debate was stilled. In effect, one party elder of enormous authority and experience had preempted the issue and decided who should be successor — rather like the Empress Dowager in fact.

In the case of the CCP, the Comintern, or in the last analysis Stalin, played the role of elder statesman. From 1921 till 1935, the Comintern picked and purged. Mao was the first Chinese communist leader to be picked by his peers and he had to struggle with rivals before his final triumph. In those struggles, the support of the generals was crucial.

Once Mao had established himself in power in the early 1940s, the order at the very top of the party, the equivalent to the modern Politburo Standing Committee (or PSC) stayed almost exactly the same for 21 years, from the Seventh Congress in 1945 till the start of the Cultural Revolution in 1966. Looking at that line-up, it seemed that the No. 2, Liu Shaoqi, was the designated heir. We learned later that, underpinning this unvarying line-up was a succession system devised by Mao, the two-front or two-line model. According to official sources, Mao had noted the post-Stalin turbulence in the Soviet leadership and had felt that this was because Stalin’s successors had never been allowed to develop independent personae. Mao’s two-front solution to this danger was that whenever he was out of Beijing or simply disinclined to exert himself, he would retire notionally to the second front, leaving his PSC colleagues, notably Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, to run things on a day-to-day basis. But with the benefit of current knowledge, we know that Mao remained central to the decision-making process, always consulted by Liu, Deng and Zhou Enlai, even when he was out of town.

Mao became obsessed with the succession process during China’s polemics against the Soviet Union. He argued that the rearing of true revolutionary successors was the key to whether or not China followed the Soviet Union and restored capitalism. And as the Cultural Revolution proved two years later, Mao meant what the polemics said. He decided that Liu was not revolutionary enough to succeed him and he elevated Marshal Lin Biao to be heir apparent, abandoning the two-front succession model for the best pupil model. Being loyal and a good study, Lin would presumably ensure that Mao Zedong Thought ruled even after its progenitor died. Clearly Mao was concerned with his legacy.

In effect, Mao was pursuing the traditional succession objectives of certainty and stability, and he even flirted with the idea of naming a successor to Lin Biao, presumably trying to ensure the safeguarding of his legacy for the next two generations of leaders. But Mao had more problems

with successors than the Kang Xi Emperor.

The defection and death of Lin Biao in the early autumn of 1971 was a devastating blow to Mao. The evidence suggests that Mao had earlier decided against leaving Lin behind as his heir. Mao had always relied on the support of the generals, but he had always insisted on their subordination to the civilian party. By the beginning of the 1970s, it had become clear, however, that if Lin became party chairman, the generals would almost certainly dominate the party.

Mao now resorted to what can only be called the heir-apparent-as-symbol model. Wang Hongwen was young and had genuinely risen to the top out of the maelstrom of early Cultural Revolution politics. He could claim to be a worker and a soldier and he was of peasant stock. Thus he was a sort of pledge to the millions of rusticated student Red Guards that perhaps their day would still come. Unfortunately for Mao, it soon became clear that Wang Hongwen was not up to the job of running China and that he was unacceptable to the generals.

At this point, Mao resorted to another tack. He brought back Deng Xiaoping as an old comrade whom the generals could trust, only to dump him again when he should have succeeded Zhou Enlai as premier. He knew that Deng would not safeguard the legacy of the Cultural Revolution. Obsessed with this problem, Mao’s last desperate fling in 1976 was to choose Hua Guofeng, who was like Wang Hongwen in being indebted to the Cultural Revolution and would therefore safeguard that element of Mao’s legacy. With Hua in charge, Mao pretended to be at ease.

Unfortunately for Hua Guofeng, he was in a worse position than Malenkov when he succeeded Stalin. Like Malenkov, he had always been in the shadow of his patron. But unlike Malenkov, who was at least among peers when he succeeded Stalin, Hua’s rivals were his longtime superiors in the party, and so in the end, unlike his Soviet counterpart, Hua was unable to cling on to any of his offices for very long after Deng became the paramount leader in December 1978.

Deng Xiaoping, like Mao before him, felt he should choose his successors, and he also felt he should choose two, Hu Yaobang as No. 1 and Zhao Ziyang as No. 2. Deng also revived the two-front system in effect, refusing to take the top leadership posts in either the party or the government, thus hoping to give Hu and Zhao the chance to stand on their own feet. Of course, it didn’t work out that way, because everyone knew Deng was the ultimate boss. And of course, like Mao, the incumbent party elder had the right to dispose of heirs apparent when they disappointed him. Deng had seemingly achieved certainty for the succession but it turned out to be illusory and unstable.

As a result of the 1986 and 1989 student democracy movements, Deng found himself forced to dump first Hu and then Zhao, and like Mao he had desperately to cast around for somebody who would preserve his legacy of economic reform. How this resulted in the choice of Jiang Zemin is interestingly revealed in the recent book, *The Tiananmen Papers*. If those documents are to be believed, the eight gerontocrats met twice as the 1989 events were building to a crisis to discuss whom to put in place of Zhao Ziyang. As with the Manchus of old, the elders met to choose the next great khan. When Deng agreed to Jiang Zemin, everyone fell into line as when Gromyko picked Gorbachev.

When Jiang Zemin seemed hesitant about supporting Deng’s efforts to boost the speed of economic development in 1992, Deng reportedly thought of getting rid of him too, but was persuaded not to in the interests of stability. So Deng tried to guarantee his legacy by choosing who should be Jiang’s eventual successor, Hu Jintao.

“Before the next turnover of the leadership, the CCP needs to devise a system of selection whose legitimacy no contender for the top spot would question...”

Beijing gossip has it that Jiang is very upset with not being able to choose his own successor like Mao and Deng did.

Deng also put in place a succession norm: nobody should stay in office after 70, but he died before being able to enforce that at the 15th Party Congress five years ago. Again a party elder intervened, and Jiang, who was over 70, was saved from retiring.

However the current succession process ends up, it is quite clear that the succession issue is of enduring importance in Chinese politics, but that currently there is no certainty and therefore no stability about the process. Suppose that everything works out as Deng would have wanted it and the three elders, Jiang Zemin, Li Peng, and Zhu Rongji retire from all their posts. That would mean that two of Deng’s institutional changes were finally taking hold: retirement at 70 and only two terms in any office. But it would leave unsettled the key issue of how the successor is chosen.

Are the incoming leaders prepared to go the Mexican PRI route, devised in the first half of the 20th century: i.e., to institutionalize the choice of the successor by the incumbent? In other words, to return to the *de facto* system pioneered in the PRC by Mao? I doubt it. That system has proved too unstable. Of the eight successors chosen by Mao and Deng, only one proved viable, Jiang Zemin, and he probably only because he had the support of Deng for seven years after he became general secretary and so was able to establish himself.

Before the next turnover of the leadership, the CCP needs to devise a system of selection whose legitimacy no contender for the top spot would question: at a minimum, choice by the Politburo; better still, election by the Central Committee which, according to the party constitution, supposedly already has that right. This would not only bolster the legitimacy and authority of the leader, and promote stability in the system; it would also introduce a welcome element of democracy into the party. This in turn could have profound effects in the long run on the way the party runs China.
THE WTO AND ITS EFFECT ON AGRICULTURE:
A U.S. EXPERT REFLECTS ON CHINA PROGRAM

From October 18 to 27, a delegation of American experts in agriculture and trade traveled to China to provide workshops on the WTO's impact on agriculture. The following article was written by delegation member Fred Crook, president of The China Group, an agricultural consulting firm.

A six-person delegation put together by the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations went to China (Beijing, Harbin, Nanjing, Yangzhou, and Shanghai) in October to run a series of workshops on China's agriculture in the post-WTO environment. The China Development Research Foundation (CDRF), an organization associated with the State Council's Development Research Council (DRC), served as the host, taking care of the logistics of the workshops; arranging meetings with government officials, among them Minister Wang Meng-kui of the DRC, Vice Governor Zhang Taolin of Jiangsu province, Mayor Ji Jianye of Yangzhou, and many government and Party cadres from prefectures, counties, and townships; and planning site visits to agriculture-related economic development zones, a soybean protein processing facility, a hydroponics greenhouse project, and one of China's largest agricultural expo fairs. The delegation also met briefly with American Embassy and Consular agricultural representatives in Beijing and in Shanghai.

This program was designed to provide an environment in which U.S. agricultural and trade experts could meet officials in China to discuss practical ways for national, provincial, and local governments and enterprises to minimize disruptions in their respective economies and to maximize possible gains because of China’s entry into the WTO.

Many Americans believe that China has a monolithic government and since the central leadership has pushed for and obtained entrance into the WTO, all trade and investment problems throughout the country have been resolved. The NCUSCR team found, however, that there is a vital need to continue to address trade and investment issues because China’s economy, society, and political system are incredibly complex and the issues are just beginning to be addressed. Farmers and local governments were not consulted in the run up to WTO accession, but now they are the ones who must implement rules that both injure local interests as well as provide great opportunities.

Participants attending the three workshops differed from place to place.

At the Beijing workshop a large portion of the 100 attendees were researchers from universities and policy institutes. In Harbin (100 attendees) and Yangzhou (over 500 attendees), a large percentage were cadres from provincial, prefectural, county and township governments, especially from the rural departments and agricultural bureaus. All of them listened attentively to the presentations.

Robert B. Anderson, president of Sustainable Strategies, Inc. spoke about China’s agriculture and market access issues in the U.S. organic food marketplace. Gary Chu, managing director of General Mills China, and Wendy Tai, director of Public Policy at General Mills headquarters in Minneapolis, addressed the topic

“Harry Dai, Mechel Paggi, Wendy Tai, Isi Siddiqui, Fred Crook, and Bob Anderson in front of the Russian Orthodox Church of St. Sofia in Harbin.

Continued on page 11
of China’s agriculture in the post-WTO environment from the perspective of a global food company. I talked about improving China’s capacity to move food products from farm gates to consumers. Mechel S. Paggi, director of the Center for Agricultural Business at California State University-Fresno, discussed trade between China and California, and Isi A. Siddiqui, vice president of Biotechnology and Trade for CropLife America, addressed the role of regulatory harmonization in facilitating agricultural trade between China and the United States.

Meeting formats included large workshops, brief interviews, site visits and discussions over meals. In each meeting, officials expressed a number of concerns:

- The growing gap between urban and rural living standards;
- Slow growth in rural incomes;
- Problems with producing quality agricultural products that are internationally competitive;
- The need to reform rural structures to meet domestic and foreign competition;
- Market access issues for Chinese agricultural exports (to the United States, Japan, Korea, and the European Union);
- A shortage of trained personnel in administering quality standards, conducting foreign trade, and dealing with WTO administration;
- The need to develop proper organizational forms for rural areas;
- Rural unemployment, rural labor transfers to urban areas, and development issues in small urban areas;
- The need to train young people and retrain displaced workers;
- Methods for finding capital to invest in agriculture and rural enterprises; and
- Problems in dealing with GMO food materials.

TV crews filmed workshop presentations and newspaper reporters attended some of the sessions; articles on the group and their comments appeared in local newspapers, including a front-page article in the China Daily. Film crews also conducted short interviews with team members, and Robert Anderson was featured in a half hour TV program called “Dialogue.” Synopses of the individual papers from team members (which were translated and distributed to those who participated in the workshops) are to be published by the DRC for distribution to relevant government agencies.

Continued from page 6 Red Cross

languages were spoken, and 40 percent were foreign born. The whole Trade Center financial area was affected. Over 100,000 people lost jobs.

I experienced the loss, the sorrow, the pain and even the fear together with New Yorkers. Thus I was willing to help, even though I could do little. Some other teachers in my program and I registered at the Disaster Relief Headquarters in December. On January 5th, we began working with Service Center 1 at Canal Street. I worked as interpreter at first. An old man complained that after the incident, his asthma became worse because of the polluted air. He asked Red Cross for a vacuum and an air purifier. He speaks Mandarin and Cantonese. I did the translation between him and the Red Cross officer. In the afternoon, we did some paper-work, helping with the filing. If I hadn’t worked on the files, I would never have had an idea about how many people were affected. I had a great time working there because sometimes helping is more a pleasure than being helped. I hope I will do more help before I go back home.

Continued from page 6 To the Moon

“We must go out there first. We can use what we learn to help the poor people here.” Another student rose and said, “What about the poor people now? Which poor are we helping? Those100 years from now or the ones that are in trouble now?”

A third student rose and said, “The solution isn’t to give money. The poor have to be able to help themselves.” A girl rose, and with great trepidation said, “We must go to the moon because America must not be allowed to steal it from the people of the world.” Then nobody spoke. They gazed at their hands, and their desks, at the floor, at their shoes. That was it. That was the answer. There was nothing else to say. They had been floating without the answer net and had had a spell of vertigo. This girl brought their feet and minds firmly back to the ground and to the task at hand. After class, one of the boys who sits in the back caught up to me as I was leaving. “Badgley, here is what I think.” He handed me a piece of paper. He had written, “China must do both. If we only use our economy, technology, and resources to help the poor then we will always be poor. If we can work on both then we can benefit from our discoveries and help the poor even more.” Sharp kid.

Officially, the moon belongs to all. China and the U.S. are two of many nations that have ratified the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which declares that exploration and use of the moon shall be carried out “for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all.” In Article IV, the treaty states that the moon is to be used “exclusively for peaceful purposes.” Then in 1979 the United Nations drafted a decree saying that the moon and its resources belong to all nations and humans and should be apportioned as such. Russia, Japan, China, and the United States have not signed it. The race is on!
Five years ago Notes from the National Committee carried an article about the first three interns from Fudan University who had come to the United States on an exciting new program sponsored by Time Warner: “Time Warner hopes to create an annual program that will provide opportunities for practical, hands-on training for undergraduate journalism students from Fudan University.”

Indeed, five years later, such a program not only flourishes but has grown in number, strength, and intensity. Now sponsored by AOL Time Warner the program supports six interns working for TIME Magazine, HBO, CNN, Fortune Magazine, AOL Government Relations, and Warner Brothers Studios. In addition to a unique working experience, each intern has a different living experience — from a private apartment in Los Angeles, to dormitory-style living in New York, to host families in Washington, D.C. and Atlanta. They share two weeks together getting a hands-on introduction to American culture and history, including meetings with journalists, home stays, tours of national landmarks, and many culinary adventures.

This year’s group, like the others before it, is articulate and thoughtful, addressing many challenging issues with a fresh, young perspective. We thought National Committee members might enjoy hearing the views of these representatives of China’s younger generation. What follow are excerpts from the interns’ commentary on the most surprising or impressive aspects of America since they’ve been here.

***************

“Americans cherish their history. I was surprised to discover so much cultural heritage during our Orientation Program and now in NY I can also find many museums featuring different periods of the history. Before I came here, I never imagined that, because the country is so young, yet in fact every detail is preserved so well!”

– Zhou Li, TIME Magazine, New York

“Before I came here I had the impression that Americans don’t care too much about their families and the family members are not very close to each other. And I also thought that their attitudes toward marriage are not serious enough. But after staying with some people and talking to their family members, I got to know more about them. Many examples show that they are not like what I imagined. They try to spend much time with the family. And what I admire most is that they work very hard at work time (almost everyone is a perfectionist at work), and in their spare time they would enjoy life as much as they can with family and friends. Both parts are very important to them.”

– Bai Xue, Warner Brothers Studio, Los Angeles

“One of the most impressive things I have seen in America is the large amount of well-built cultural institutions like museums, libraries and galleries. For me the most gorgeous is the Library of Congress… Besides, there are many more wonderful places like the Holocaust Museum, the Smithsonian Museums, Metropolitan Museum and MoMA. But the influence of one or two top-level places is after all limited. I appreciate more the wide accessibility of the New York Public Libraries. Of course, in Shanghai we have Shanghai Museum and Shanghai Library. But if you can count all these facilities in such a densely populated city as Shanghai by using just 10 fingers, they are much too scarce.”

– Xuan Jie, HBO, New York

“Everything is ‘user-friendly.’ I still remember that in elevators we girls always push the wrong ‘button,’ which has Braille letters on it for the blind. And this is not the only ‘friendly’ thing I find here. For example, anyone can cook a big dinner with salad, entree, and dessert in just half an hour with all those ready-to-cook stuff. Also, no one will ever get lost in museums with those signs of directions. Everything is considerately designed or made to be user-friendly, which is the thing I like best about the U.S. and its people.”

– Annice Xiao, AOL Government Relations, Washington, D.C.

“I attended a seminar in Columbia University. There are people who once suffered by Tiananmen event and now pursuing the Ph.D. in U.S. universities. They are people who are not on good
terms with the Chinese government because of their articles and books. There are people who once studied in America and now go back to China to be professors in university or resources for Chinese government. There are those who are doing business in New York and L.A. No matter what kind of backgrounds they have, their concern about China’s future gathers them together. On this seminar, for the first time, I heard so many complaints about the economic and political problems in China from the Chinese people rather than from the foreign scholars. And for the first time I see some serious challenges facing China now which I, a girl who grew up in Shanghai, the most international, modern and prosperous city would never have expected. I should admit, some people’s complaints have really challenged a lot of views and opinions I held before but pushed me to seriously reconsider what kind of career I should pursue. Complaining is easy. Anyone can complain. The more important and difficult thing is to change it for the better!” – Shen Si, Fortune Magazine, New York

“The three most surprising things are: 1. Freedom of speech in American media. They can say whatever they want, really, even making fun of the presidents. 2. Ordinary Americans’ concern for politics. Iraq is a good example. People really say what they think and try to do as well to either support or to stop the war. They really think their single or individual response counts and they should make their voices loud and heard. 3. I see what an ordinary American’s life is like. Simple and common, in pursuit of their either great or humble dreams.

Yes, these really let me see a bigger picture of America and begin to understand more that ‘dissent is not disaster.”’ – Wu Dandan, CNN, Atlanta

Do we have your email address?

From time to time, we send important information to members via email: email broadcasts, news of upcoming events, and more. It’s the best way to stay informed, but we don’t have contact info for all of you.

Please send your email address to info@ncuscr.org and we’ll add you to the list!
REMEMBERING SINO-AMERICAN COOPERATION: FLYING TIGERS, THE HUMP, AND DOOLITTLE’S RAIDERS

By Madelyn Ross

A series of events took place recently in Washington D.C. and Texas to commemorate and honor the Chinese and Americans who fought together in common cause during the Second World War. As part of this commemoration, the National Committee on United States-China Relations and the China Foundation for International and Strategic Studies co-hosted a symposium entitled Sino-American Cooperation in World War II: Recalling and Commemorating Friendship.

The symposium, held at the Reagan Building Amphitheater on the morning of October 18, 2002, brought together many participants from the China theater of the war – members of the famed Flying Tigers, pilots and crew from Doolittle’s Raiders and the 14th Air Force, Merrill’s Marauders, as well as members of China’s guerrilla forces and Chinese citizens who helped rescue American forces in China from the Japanese. National Committee President John Holden introduced the morning speakers, who included Minister Zhao Qizheng of the State Council Information Office, Chinese Ambassador to the United States Yang Jiechi, General Song Chengzhi, formerly a commander of the Fourth Front Army, and former congressman and World Bank President Barber B. Conable, Jr., who served in the Pacific during the war and retired last year as chairman of the National Committee.

Following these presentations, the audience was treated to a series of lively personal stories told by American veterans of the war in China. These included General John Alison and Peter Wright, both famed aviators who served in China with the Flying Tigers – the American volunteers who took on Japan’s air force in China before Pearl Harbor and later became part of the American 14th Air Force. They also heard from Fletcher Hanks and Jay Vinyard, who flew planes over the treacherous Himalayan “Hump Route,” which served for several years as war-torn China’s only supply link with the outside world. Fletcher’s wife Emma Hanks remembered her years in China as a student and later a nurse working with the Flying Tigers. A member of the famed Doolittle’s Raiders, Thomas Griffin, who navigated one of the 16 planes that carried out a surprise bombing mission over Japan in 1942, told of his crash landing and escape through China. Anna C. Chennault reminisced about her husband, General Claire Chennault, who formed and led the Flying Tigers in China. These stories of bravery and sacrifice were a highlight of the morning and held the audience in their seats well past noon, when the symposium was supposed to conclude.

The symposium took place more than sixty years after the first Americans arrived in China to fight the Japanese and served as a rare opportunity to hear from the remaining survivors of this daring chapter of history. It was followed by an afternoon ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery to remember the many who died during the war. Following brief remarks from retired General Li Laizhu and retired Captain Charles Mott of the Flying Tigers, two Chinese and two American veterans laid a wreath at the base of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in honor of their missing comrades. Following the ceremony, the provinces of Yunnan and Zhejiang each held a reception and reunion for American veterans who had served in those areas of China as well as some of their Chinese rescuers and their descendants, who came from China for the events.

An exhibition of photos and war memorabilia prepared by the State Council Information Office of China with the cooperation of the Chinese Embassy and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was on display at the Woodrow Wilson Center from October 17 to November 5; it opened with a reception at the Wilson Center on the evening of October 17. Speakers included Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska (himself a veteran of the China theater) and former Congressman and Wilson Center Director Lee Hamilton, Vice Chair of the National Committee. The exhibition will be displayed again at the Air Force Museum in Dayton, Ohio early next year. Finally, on October 22, the Chinese Consulate General in Houston organized the dedication of a memorial to American pilot James R. Fox, Jr., a Texan who was killed in China during the war. The bronze bust of Fox was unveiled at the George Bush Presidential Library and Museum.
Program Calendar

Corporate and Public Programs:
All events occurred in New York.

Breakfast Briefing with Antony Leung
June 4, 2002
Antony Leung, Financial Secretary, Hong Kong SAR, spoke at a breakfast briefing cosponsored by the Asia Society and Hong Kong Economic & Trade Office in collaboration with the China Institute, Committee of 100, Hong Kong Association of New York, Hong Kong Trade Development Council and the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations.

Luncheon speech by Ambassador Randt
June 12, 2002
U.S. Ambassador to China Clark T. Randt, Jr. spoke with National Committee corporate members about the current status of U.S.-China political and economic relations during a luncheon in New York City. Ambassador Randt pointed to several positive indicators for Sino-American relations, including China's cooperation in the war on terrorism, President Bush's two trips to China and the recent visit of Vice President Hu Jintao to the United States.

"Three Parties, Three Views:
Cross-Strait Policy in Taiwan"
October 8, 2002
Representatives of Taiwan's three major parties discussed the similarities and differences of their respective parties' views at a National Committee public program in New York City, beginning with brief presentations and a question and answer session with the 40-member audience. The presenters were part of a larger group visiting New York for a meeting hosted by the National Committee on American Foreign Policy.

Exchanges:

Fulbright-Hays Summer Seminar to China and Hong Kong
June 24-July 28, 2002
As part of the Fulbright Program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, seventeen secondary school and college/university educators, administrators, and curriculum specialists went to Beijing, Xi'an, Chengdu, and Shanghai, with an optional extension in Hong Kong sponsored by a private donor.

Chinese Teachers Orientation Program
June 30-July 10, 2002
At the conclusion of their year of teaching with the Teachers Exchange Program, seventeen Chinese teachers gained a sense of American culture and history by traveling to Williamsburg, VA; Washington, D.C.; and New York. The program was co-sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies.

K-12 English Teachers
July 27-August 10, 2002
A group of ten K-12 English teachers from the People’s Republic of China visited the United States July 27 – August 10, 2002, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Committee. The delegation members explored language teaching programs, as well as different aspects of American society – its history, culture, political and educational systems – and the role of Native Americans historically and today.

Elections in the United States and Greater China
October 30-November 9, 2002
The National Committee and The Carter Center were pleased to host a delegation of election specialists from the People’s Republic of China, Taiwan and Hong Kong SAR in the United States for a ten day visit to Washington, D.C., Pennsylvania, Atlanta and New York City.

The program, which included meetings, seminars, site visits, public fora, and direct observation in Pennsylvania of a variety of activities connected with the mid-term elections, was designed to help the participants better understand the American electoral process. In addition, participants had the opportunity to discuss with each other local elections in their own communities, a subject that was addressed in both public and closed-door seminars during the visit.

Email Broadcasts:

Jiang Visits Crawford
October 28, 2002
Just after Jiang Zemin’s visit to President Bush’s ranch in Crawford, Texas, National Committee President John Holden provided members with an assessment of the meeting and its implications on global and regional issues, focusing on the leaders’ discussions of Iraq, North Korea, Taiwan and terrorism.

In addition to these programs, the National Committee planned visits this fall for the China Education Association for International Exchange (CEAIE) and the Shanghai Institute for International Studies on the East and West Coasts. The National Committee also hosted roundtable discussions with prominent guests such as Prof. Ni Shixiong of Fudan University and Prof. David Zweig of The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. For information on the seven official National Committee programs not listed here, please see the articles within this newsletter.
PORTrait of Carla Hills to Hang in Yale Law School

On November 12, at a reception at the Century Association in New York, a portrait of Ambassador Carla Hills, National Committee chair, was presented to the Yale Law School. The portrait will hang at the Yale Law School in New Haven, where Mrs. Hills was one of only fourteen female graduates in the Class of 1958.

George L. Priest, John M. Olin Professor of Law and Economics at Yale Law School, praised her for her achievements: “Carla Hills has distinguished herself as an attorney in private practice and at the highest levels of government. Her portrait uniquely captures her elegance, her toughness and her resolve. It will hang in a room with portraits of the most accomplished graduates of Yale Law School, including President Ford, in whose cabinet she served, President Clinton and Supreme Court Justices Byron White and Potter Stewart. The portrait of Carla Hills will serve as an inspiration for all Yale Law students as an example of excellence and achievement in the law.”

Mrs. Hills has been active in law, government, and business, creating a list of achievements too long to enumerate. In government, she served as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) under Gerald Ford (the third woman to hold a cabinet position); former President Bush’s principal advisor on international trade policy; and U.S. Trade Representative from 1989 to 1993. Currently, she heads the consulting firm Hills & Company International Consultants.

The portrait, by renowned artist Aaron Shikler, is the second he has painted of Mrs. Hills; the first was completed 25 years ago while Mrs. Hills was Secretary of HUD. Speakers at the ceremony included Dean Anthony T. Kronman, Yale Law School; the Honorable Guido Calabresi, Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and former Dean, Yale Law School; and Maurice R. “Hank” Greenberg, Chairman and CEO, American International Group. Her husband, children and grandchildren also attended.
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