SURVEY OF PROGRAMS ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS AND SECURITY ISSUES

REPORT PREPARED FOR THE FORD FOUNDATION
BY THE
NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

CHINA POLICY SERIES
NUMBER XXIII
MARCH 2007

SURVEY OF PROGRAMS ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS AND SECURITY ISSUES

Table of Contents

Preface

Since the signing of the Shanghai Communiqué 35 years ago, American think tanks, NGOs and academic institutions have played pivotal roles in providing a stimulus for policy dialogues and for exchanging views among American and Chinese (as well as other Asians) on international relations and issues of Northeast Asian security.

To ascertain the extent of that role, the National Committee on United States-China Relations conducted a survey in 2003 of programs addressing Sino-American relations and security issues. The report was commissioned by the Ford Foundation and the results provided solely to the Foundation. In 2005 and 2006, we updated that report, again at the behest of the Ford Foundation; the result is the document you are reading. We identified about 34 relevant institutions for the update. All but a few responded; we gleaned information from the websites of those that did not. (We initially contacted several other institutions but ascertained that their programs did not fit into the survey's parameters: a focus on U.S. - China relations and northeast Asia security issues in a bilateral or multilateral context. See the Introduction for a full explanation of the survey parameters.) We want to thank everyone who spent time filling out the questionnaires and answering follow up queries, both written and by phone. We trust that we have characterized their programs and their comments accurately.

Many people worked very hard to bring the report to fruition: Mr. Peter Mackenzie, a consultant to the National Committee, designed and compiled the first report and did yeoman's service on this one; Professor Stephen Noerper of New York University's Center for Global Affairs provided substantive analysis of much of the material and a group of graduate professionals in his Asia Today class did an independent review and synthesis of the surveyed organizations' activities; National Committee intern Mr. Matthew Magliocco and staff members Ms. Jung Hwa Song, Ms. Jenna Crouch and Ms. Katherine Forshay provided critical assistance. We are deeply grateful to them all.

Jan Berris
Vice President
March 2007

I. Introduction and General Conclusions

At the behest of Ford Foundation, the National Committee on United States-China Relations (NCUSCR) conducted a survey of American institutions with programs that address Sino-American relations and security issues in a bilateral or multilateral format. We relied on our extensive contacts and personal connections with other organizations to compile information about each of these programs and about the field as a whole. This survey follows up on a similar, unpublished survey done in 2003, also for the Ford Foundation.

Parameters

We developed the following parameters for programs included in the survey:

- All are conducted by American organizations, though many have PRC or other foreign co-partners;
- Since 2003, all have carried out activities related (either completely or partially) to U. S.–China political and/or military/strategic issues;
- Some deal exclusively with the Sino-American bilateral relationship, while others place this relationship in a broader regional context that includes other countries or regions (usually India, Japan, Korea and/or Russia); and,
- Some organizations conduct U.S.-Taiwan projects, but these fall outside the parameters of this report unless they occur within the context of discussions on the U.S-Mainland China-Taiwan relationship.

Content of Survey

We sought to answer the following questions:

- What is the nature of these programs?
- What are their primary sources and types of funding?
- What is the extent of cooperation between American organizations and their Chinese counterparts?
- What problems and challenges do these programs face?
- What kind of overlap is there in content and participants from one program to another?
- What subjects have received the most (and least) attention?

This is a descriptive and not an evaluative survey. At some points in this report, reference is made to particular weaknesses or difficulties of specific programs. However, the survey is not meant to evaluate the quality or effectiveness of each program, but rather to provide a comprehensive description of the range of programs and activities currently taking place. We have relied on written materials provided by the organizations themselves as well as telephone interviews with program directors and some Internet research.

Defining Terms

The organizations surveyed conduct a number of different activities; we have divided these into seven categories: bilateral dialogues, multilateral dialogues, bilateral conferences, multilateral conferences, delegation study visits, visiting fellowships, and academic exchanges. Not all projects fit precisely into the categories as we have defined them, but for the most part these classifications are useful in understanding the diverse techniques employed by American and Chinese institutions in pursuing their objectives. For information on some of the specific initiatives being implemented by each of the surveyed entities, please see *Appendix B: Program Descriptions.*

Bilateral dialogues and conferences include participation by American and Chinese specialists and concentrate on issues in the relationship between the two countries. **Multilateral dialogues and conferences** broaden the discussion by including participants from other countries in addition to the United States and China, and by concentrating on issues affecting regional or global security. Many of these initiatives address strategic triangles of which the United States and China form two points (the third is most often Japan, Korea, India or the European Union); others imbed the Sino-American relationship within a regional focus on Northeast Asia or the larger Pacific Rim.

We make a fine distinction here between dialogues and conferences, based on several factors. Both types of activity include participation by American and Chinese experts; contain discussion of key aspects of U.S.-China relations; have a duration of at least one full business day; aim to facilitate positive policy outcomes; and, in most cases, produce specific deliverables, including reports, papers and briefings (though in some instances, these deliverables may not be released externally).

In addition, dialogues must have all of the following characteristics;

- They are co-organized by both American and Chinese organizations;
- They are part of (or planned to be part of) an ongoing series of discussions;
- Attendance is closed, i.e. limited to invited participants; and,
- Recordings or transcripts of the proceedings are not released.

Any event that satisfies all of the first set of characteristics, but lacks one or more of the characteristics in the second list, we have classified as a conference as opposed to a dialogue.

Delegation study visits are trips to China by American policy experts, or to the United States by their Chinese counterparts. These customarily include a schedule of meetings and briefings with government officials, academic specialists, diplomats, business leaders and other individuals who may influence foreign affairs and security policy. Some dialogue and conference programs also include delegation-type elements, in that experts traveling abroad to participate in such programs often take the opportunity to hold meetings outside the conference hall. In this report, delegations are differentiated by the following characteristic: the chief purpose of a delegation study visit is the trip itself and the high-level meetings it includes; if the chief purpose of a trip is to participate in a conference or dialogue, we have not placed it in the "delegation" category.

Activities in the above five categories can be described as “Track II diplomacy,” which, for the purposes of this report we define as informal diplomacy in which private citizens engage in dialogue with the aim of better understanding, conflict resolution or confidence-building. In this case, the “private citizens” in question are think tank scholars, academics, former government and military officials and social activists on both the American and Chinese sides. Some of those surveyed also conduct Track I ½ programs. These are similar in structure to Track II activities but include participation by a mix of non- governmental people and governmental representatives in their individual capacities. Throughout this report, when referring to both kinds of activities, rather than repeating the more awkward Track II/Track I½ appellation, we use Track II to cover both formats. When discussing a particular program that falls into the above Track I½ definition, we will call it that.

Many of the surveyed institutions also organize conferences and seminars on specific aspects of the U.S.-China political/strategic/military relationship that are only for American participants. As this survey is concerned with programs involving participation by both American and Chinese specialists, we have not included these activities.

The other two categories in the survey are **visiting fellowships** and **academic exchanges**. Again, we have made a fine distinction between them. Fellowships and academic exchange programs both bring Chinese foreign policy experts, government officials and/or students of foreign policy to the United States (or vice versa); expose key individuals to the policy environment in the other country; imbed individuals within a specific institution, giving them access to the institution's resources; take place over a set period of time; and, in most cases, produce specific deliverables, such as reports and briefings.

In addition to the above, if the program includes any of the following aspects we have classified it as an "academic exchange" and not a "visiting fellowship:"

- The visiting individual is expected to complete a specific slate of courses in addition to his or her independent research;
- The individual provides instruction or counseling to students within the host institution; or,
- The exchange takes place while the individual is completing a degree course at an academic institution.

Academic exchanges are a difficult area to survey, given the large number of American universities and institutions with East Asia or China Studies programs that exchange faculty and staff who focus on security and international relations. It was beyond the resources of this project to include all of these programs; thus, this section of the survey should be seen as a good indication of what is being done by the relevant think tanks, but it is only a small sampling rather than a comprehensive listing of what is going on in this area in academia.

General Conclusions

Key conclusions gleaned from survey data include the following:

- A broad range of American organizations are conducting relevant programming with counterparts in China;
- The most common types of activity include bilateral and multilateral dialogues, bilateral and multilateral conferences, delegation study visits, visiting fellowships and academic exchanges;
- Since the previous survey in 2003, there has been a significant increase in the number of programs that imbed China in multilateral discussions of regional security;
- American organizations are moving away from "one-off" conferences or short-term projects and toward sustained dialogues and other long-term initiatives;
- Some key visiting fellowship programs have been scaled down significantly, and other institutions are seeking ways to make this type of programming worth the considerable expense;
- While U.S. organizations have partnered with a wide range of Chinese counterparts, in fact, it is only a small, very active group of Chinese institutions that seem to be involved in the majority of Track II activities;
- In contrast to a wide geographic range on the part of the American organizations, the vast majority of Chinese partner organizations are located in Beijing, along with a handful in Shanghai;
- The quality of the Chinese participants in exchanges, and the candor and productivity of discussions between the two sides, has improved considerably in recent years, in part due to the emergence of a younger, more worldly generation of Chinese interlocutors;
- The ability of Chinese organizations to manage the logistics for large events and to bring influential people to the table has improved notably in recent years, though some American institutions are becoming frustrated over cost-sharing issues with Chinese partners;

- Whereas the previous survey indicated that Track II programs had been suspended as a result of crises in the U.S.-China relationship, no significant events since the 2001 EP-3 reconnaissance plane incident have occurred to cause any interruption to Track II activities. This has provided a climate that benefited many such programs;
- The election of Chen Shui-bian and the subsequent perception on the part of the Mainland that Taiwan is making stronger moves toward independence resulted in a more restrictive attitude on the part of the Chinese government toward U.S.-Mainland China-Taiwan exchanges, causing most such programs to be suspended;
- Direct interaction between American institutions and the Chinese military, while not as robust as some would like, has been improving since the low point of the EP3 incident and particularly after several visits to China by senior American DOD officials in the latter part of 2006;
- Many program directors are concerned that foundation priorities are shifting away from Track II programming involving China;
- Funding for these activities remains dependent on a small number of sources but organizations are seeking to augment shrinking foundation grants with funds from their own endowments, from private individual and corporate donors, and from some non U.S. funders, while at the same time pursuing strategies to reduce the cost of Track II programs; and,
- Many respondents believe that Track II exchanges focus on too narrow a range of topics and involve too limited a pool of participants; they suggest possible areas of expansion.

Appendices

The following appendices accompany the narrative report:

- A list of the organizations surveyed in the course of this project (Appendix A);
- Descriptions of relevant programs they are implementing (Appendix B);
- A spreadsheet indicating which types of activity each organization has recently conducted (Appendix C);
- A spreadsheet indicating each organization's Chinese partner organizations (Appendix D);
- A spreadsheet indicating each organization's funding source(s) (Appendix E).

II. General Observations

Recent Trends in Programmatic Focus

Activities organized by American institutions have increased significantly since the National Committee completed the previous survey in 2003, though the number of entities involved has increased only slightly. That year we surveyed 39 programs on U.S.-China relations and security issues. However, 11 of those ran projects that only included American specialists so would not have met the narrower specifications we used in the 2006 survey. This year, we have identified 34 institutions with activities that include both Chinese and Americans. Among these there has been a dramatic shift in the types of activities in which they choose to engage.

Table 1: Comparison of Types of Activities in 2003 and 2006

Type of Program	Number of Organizations 2003	Number of Organizations 2006	Trend
Bilateral Dialogues	6	17	+183%
Multilateral Dialogues	3	13	+333%
Bilateral/Multilateral Conferences	18	17	-6%
Delegation Study Visits	8	8	0%
Visiting Fellowships	11	13	+18%
Academic Exchanges	6	9	+50%

While many organizations continue to sponsor single-event conferences and delegations, interest in these areas has, respectively, slightly decreased or remained steady, while interest in sustained dialogue has increased dramatically. Many American organizations have determined that their resources are best spent building long-term relationships with Chinese counterparts through ongoing dialogues and other results-oriented programs. Several program directors said that they are tired of "talking for the sake of talking" and that single-event conferences and delegations often serve only as shows of goodwill while seldom leading to tangible achievements. They hope that as dialogues with reliable partners mature, the level of trust between the two sides will be intensified and will make it easier to discuss vital but sensitive issues. Unfortunately, program directors have concerns that funding for Track II activities is becoming scarcer as funders, especially the large foundations, are becoming more concerned with concrete deliverables.

Comparing 2003 and 2006 also reveals a broadening of the scope of the Track II-type activities, mirroring the increasing complexity of the relationship. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, most programs were single-mindedly concerned with bilateral relations between the United States and China; discussion topics were mostly limited to such concerns as the Taiwan question, human rights, political reform, military cooperation and arms control. Participants were almost always current or former diplomatic and military officials, as well as regional specialists from leading universities and foreign policy think tanks.

In recent years, though, Track II activities have undergone an expansion in the range of topics discussed, the number of countries represented and the diversity of professional backgrounds among the participants. This is, in part, a result of the changing nature of the U.S. engagement with China. During the 1980s and 1990s, one of the greatest utilities of such events was to address short-term crises and disagreements over divisive issues. Shifting diplomacy to the level of exchanges among a variety of professionals and private citizens promoted frank discussion of issues that could not always be raised constructively at the diplomatic level due to intense political pressures on both sides. It also broadened the kinds of topics that could productively be addressed, with trans-national issues such as energy security and public health coming to the fore.

The political environment for these activities has changed dramatically since 2001. First, no diplomatic "earthquakes" between the two countries have occurred since that year's EP-3 reconnaissance plane crisis. Second, domestic politics in both countries have shifted: during earlier decades, conservative politicians in the United States made effective political use of Americans' suspicions toward China, pointing to evidence such as the Cox Commission Report and Chinese involvement in the 1996 presidential election. At the same time, Chinese hardliners strengthened their positions by whipping up public sentiment against "U.S. hegemony," most effectively after the Belgrade embassy and spy plane incidents. However, since 2001, citizens of both countries perceive

greater foreign threats than each other: America is focused on the war in Iraq and the broader international campaign against terrorist organizations and state sponsors of terrorism, while Chinese public sentiment in recent years has been most inflamed against Japan rather than the United States. This has created a more conducive environment for U.S.-China diplomacy and has allowed Track II dialogues to focus on longer-term (and often non-traditional) security issues rather than on putting out temporary fires.

Dialogues among the United States, Mainland China and Taiwan seem to be a decreasing area of focus for Track II exchanges. There is a perception among many institutions that the positions on all sides of this relationship have calcified and that it is difficult to achieve significant progress through Track II dialogue at present. Several people surveyed believe that the risk that cross-Strait tensions will escalate into open conflict in the near future has decreased and that cross-Strait issues will only be resolved over a very long term. Additionally, restrictions on the part of the Chinese government have made it nearly impossible to bring people from Mainland China and Taiwan to the same table with Americans; for this reason, some former U.S.-Mainland China-Taiwan dialogues have been reformatted into two separate dialogues (one between the United States and Mainland China and the other between the United States and Taiwan). A small number of American organizations continue to organize events attended by all three sides, but these programs are kept very low key and completely off the record.

Many issues covered by current Track II dialogues are too big for the straitjacket of U.S.-China bilateral ties, and so Track II programs now place China within a larger regional and sometimes global context. This survey finds the most dynamic area of Track II cooperation to be multilateral rather than bilateral. A reasonable stability has been achieved on most of the traditional bilateral issues so there is little likelihood of major shifts in direction, regardless of the results of Track II discussions. On the other hand, there is much more volatility and uncertainty on the multilateral front, especially as regards pressing issues such as the containment of North Korea, the restoration of deteriorating China-Japan relations, China's global quest for energy security, and Western strategy for adjusting to a rising China with greater economic, military and cultural power than ever before. After many decades of internalization, this power now radiates outward to the rest of East Asia and is beginning to be felt in further-flung areas of the world such as Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. Indeed, as China's quest for energy security has fueled its growing economic presence in these regions, there has been increased interest among American think tanks and scholars in focusing on those relationships.

As a result, not only is the content of Track II discussions expanding to cover issues with a longer time horizon, but the process and format of these discussions is also expanding and bringing to the table representatives of other countries that are deeply affected by these concerns. In addition, because multilateral issues often touch on highly technical areas such as energy utilization and nuclear weapons technology, Track II programs are now more likely to enlist participation by scientists, officials and policy specialists whose expertise is functional rather than regional.

Most multilateral Track II programs are concerned with strategic triangles. The one most frequently addressed is the U.S.-China-Japan trilateral relationship. At least five institutions surveyed are engaged in trilateral discussions with these two countries; two add South Korea to the equation. One reason for this focus is that all of these countries have much at stake in dealing with an increasingly isolated and assertive North Korea as it develops its nuclear capacity. Achieving regional consensus on a strategy to confront this threat is arguably each country's utmost security priority in Asia. In the past ten years, China has proven itself to be an indispensable player in discussions of peninsular security. One program director, whose organization recently invited Chinese specialists to participate

in a formerly U.S.-Korea bilateral dialogue, insists that "no one talking about the United States and North Korea can afford to leave China out of the discussion."

U.S.-China-Japan dialogues have also risen in importance as relations between the two Asian powers have taken a sharp downward turn in the past several years. Many of the surveyed organizations see counteracting the deepening distrust among Asia's two greatest historical rivals as a key U.S. interest. The recent ascendance of a new Japanese prime minister who favors a more powerful military adds new impetus to these discussions

Several surveyed organizations see great value in a transatlantic discussion between U.S. and European China experts aimed at developing common strategies. However, some program directors expressed a belief that the time is not ripe to "trilateralize" these discussions. One argued that "We are not yet at a stage in the trans-Atlantic relationship where the United States and the European Union agree on policy toward China. The debate over the arms embargo shows that European policymakers don't see China as a serious threat except in the economic realm, while Americans have a much more skeptical view toward the security challenges that may arise from China's growing power. The United States and the European Union need to develop a more unified China policy before China can be brought into the dialogue." Nevertheless, by the beginning of 2007, at least one organization, the Atlantic Council, had organized U.S.-E.U.-China trilateral discussions and another, the Elliott School's China Policy Program, planned to begin doing so.

The survey found slightly more institutions sponsoring visiting fellowships by Chinese specialists than in 2003, but many program directors were ambivalent about this area. Visiting fellowships provide key Chinese officials and other "policy influentials" with a closer view of the American foreign policy-making process and, it is hoped, a better understanding of U.S. global interests. However, maintaining fellowship programs requires steady funding streams at a time when many funders prefer to provide support on an event-by-event basis.

Some program directors also expressed skepticism that fellowships produce benefits commensurate with their costs. They emphasized that these programs are only worth the considerable investment (one estimated that a single year-long fellowship can cost as much as $100,000) if the fellows are of a very high caliber, and if they make full use of the resources and opportunities made available to them. Fellows should be given a rigorous schedule and should be expected to produce high-quality research products; it does no one any good to bring mediocre scholars who almost never leave the host institution, which is sometimes the case. There was also general agreement that short-term fellowships (i.e., less than six months) are too superficial to achieve much, and that longer-term encounters are always more beneficial.

The greatest value of visiting fellowships to the fellows themselves is the opportunity to make contacts and form relationships with counterparts in U.S. policy circles. One program director suggested that bringing fellows from more advanced countries such as Japan and China, that already have a myriad of opportunities to interact with American experts, may not be the best use of resources, believing that there would be more benefit to fellowships for specialists from more isolated countries such as Vietnam or Mongolia. However, there is less donor interest in these countries.

Since the 2003 survey, several thank tanks have scaled back Chinese participation in their visiting fellowship programs, though none have done away with it. For instance, the Stimson Center, which hosted six Chinese visiting fellows in 2000, now only hosts one or two each year. Although many institutes used to fully fund visiting fellows through foundation grants, most now only provide office space and access to the institute's facilities, resources and staff; fellows are expected to come with their own grants.

III. The Experience of Track II Programming in China: Crossing the River by Feeling the Stones

To conduct Track II activities with real policy relevance, U.S. institutions face a number of challenges. First, they must find the right Chinese collaborators, partners that will bring to the table capable experts with strong connections and reputations, thereby ensuring that Track II discussions will be reported to the highest levels of the Chinese leadership. These partner organizations must also be highly skilled in organizing logistics for joint activities. American institutions must also adapt to sudden changes in the political climate between the two countries. Those examining issues related to military affairs must navigate daunting obstacles to deal with the most closed sector of the Chinese policy apparatus. Most importantly, they must locate dependable sources of funding that will sustain their programs over the long term. Given changing priorities on the part of donor organizations, this is becoming harder and harder.

The following draws on completed questionnaires and interviews with program directors to examine how each of these challenges has affected those surveyed and the strategies they have employed to overcome them.

Chinese Partners

In the past decade, Chinese foreign policy think tanks have become increasingly influential players in China's foreign policy process, and the blossoming ties between these organizations and their U.S. counterparts have offered American China-watchers a useful window into Chinese thinking. The number and diversity of these organizations have also increased, giving American institutions the luxury of choosing their ideal partners rather than having to work with the Chinese government's hand-picked intermediaries.

The U.S. organizations surveyed have formed working relationships with six Chinese universities and academies and nine think tanks, as well as the Ministry of Health, the National People's Congress, the International Department of the Chinese Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army (see Appendix D: Program Co-Hosting between U.S. and Chinese Institutes Since 2003[*]). These Chinese partners have co-hosted conferences and delegations, provided visiting fellows, and sent staff members and contacts to participate in meetings, among other cooperative activities.

The geographical distribution of Chinese partners remains limited: 16 out of 19 are located in Beijing (the remaining three are in Shanghai). This is in large part a result of the institutions' historical ties to particular government ministries or agencies. Some respondents remarked that this geographic myopia can limit the candor of discussions, and that Chinese scholars at institutions further from Beijing are sometimes more forthcoming with information and less reluctant to express dissenting views.

[*] Please note that this table includes only cooperation on Track II dialogues, conferences and delegations. Some of the surveyed institutions do not show a Chinese partner in this table; this is due to one of two reasons. First, some only host activities outside China and invite Chinese participants on an individual basis without the assistance of a Chinese organizational partner. Second, some institutions host only visiting fellows programs or academic exchanges, which are covered by this survey but not this table.

However, the concentration of partners in the capital makes it easier for American institutes to conserve scarce resources by holding meetings or conferences with multiple Chinese partners in a single trip.

Cooperative activity seems to be particularly concentrated around seven entities, each of which works with three or more U.S. partners: the **China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR)**, which is affiliated with the State Council's Foreign Affairs Office and the Ministry of State Security (MSS); the **Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS)**; the **China Foundation for International and Strategic Studies (CFISS)**, which has ties with the Second Department (Intelligence) of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) General Staff; the **China Institute for International Studies (CIIS)**, affiliated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA); the **China Reform Forum (CRF)**, affiliated with the Central Party School (CPS); **Fudan University's Center for American Studies**; and the **Shanghai Institute for International Studies (SIIS)**, affiliated with the Shanghai municipal government.

The concentration of activity around these institutions reflects their broad mandates to engage foreign counterparts and the U.S. organizations' recognition that certain think tanks/academics are well positioned to influence Chinese foreign policy. The *guanxi* (personal connections) enjoyed by these organizations, and in particular their executives, ensures that influential people attend Track II events, and that the discussions held at these events are reported to top policymakers.

Most respondents agreed that the overall quality of cooperation with Chinese institutions has dramatically improved since they first began forming partnerships in the 1980s. Some that have had long-standing partnerships recalled that in the early years, discussions were not very fruitful. Chinese scholars served as "barbarian handlers," or intermediaries tasked with gathering as much intelligence as possible from foreigners while making sure not to let out any revealing insights into Chinese foreign policy. Too much of the Chinese contribution to Track II discussion consisted of empty harangues, and when it came time for in-depth discussions, many Chinese participants would "sit there like Buddhas."

However, in the past few years discussions have become much more substantive, constructive and mutually beneficial. The Chinese government, which now understands the value of Track II exchanges, allows Mainland institutes more latitude and encourages them to form deeper relationships with Americans and American institutions; one respondent noted that in 2002 and 2003 there was a sudden rush or "full court press" of Chinese organizations seeking American collaborators for Track II dialogues. The respondent surmised that around that time there must have been a clearly conveyed change in Chinese government policy. This is also evident from the much more open atmosphere at the events themselves.

Partially this is because an increasing number of Chinese participants in Track II activities come from a younger generation of specialists, many of whom have been educated abroad or otherwise exposed to the West. One program director noted that "many of the people in these organizations now think and act like Americans."

Though the Confucian institutional culture is not always nurturing to these emerging talents, young scholars are slowly gaining acceptance. A lot hold similar principles to their older counterparts, but employ more subtle and diplomatic strategies to promote them. As a result, even though many experts adhere to the Party line, ideology is much less of an issue than before, and discussions are more open and frank. Chinese participants are much more likely to disagree among themselves whereas before they would present a united front at all costs. However, even given the increasing openness,

respondents noted that as always has been the case, the most valuable discussions at meetings often take place outside the conference hall, in one-on-one chats where Chinese feel more comfortable airing their views.

Respondents to the survey were most inclined to evaluate the quality of Chinese partner institutions based on their ability to bring high-powered people to Track II events. Some program directors expressed disappointment that, for some events, they had worked hard to include top American specialists only to find the other side of the table populated by Chinese academics with scant influence on policy. One respondent indicated that his organization is considering a switch to inviting Chinese participants to Track II events on an individual basis rather than relying on a Chinese partner organization, out of concern that Chinese partners too often identify participants based on seniority and organizational politics rather than on their ability to contribute to discussions. Other desirable qualities mentioned in Chinese partner organizations included their ability to mobilize logistical support and the effectiveness of their foreign affairs offices.

The limited number of world-class foreign policy scholars also leads to what several respondents referred to as a "usual suspects" phenomenon, whereby the same small group of individuals appears at most Track II activities, many of whom are not very deeply involved in the issue being discussed.

Some respondents expressed frustration with the increasing tendency of Chinese institutes to shift costs to their American partners. In the past, when most Chinese institutions were solely (or heavily) subsidized by their government parent bodies, it was usual for the Chinese side to pay all in-country costs for participants in Track II programs taking place in the PRC, while the American partner would pay international travel costs; reciprocal arrangements were made when Chinese delegations visited the United States. However, several phenomena in recent years have made this "gentleman's agreement" less of a given. First, many Chinese institutions now have to obtain private funding for some or all of their activities and projects. In addition, expansion of Track II activity in recent years has led to a certain level of competition among American institutions to maintain partnerships with Chinese counterparts. This gives the Chinese organizations an opening to seek a "better deal" by asking potential American partners to bear some or all of their own expenses when they visit China. Some well-funded American organizations are receptive to this, preferring to pay part of their in-country costs to avoid ceding control over such things as where their delegates stay, how they travel in China and, sometimes, the Chinese participants in the program. Others, however, are alarmed at the rising cost of holding events in the PRC. One program director complained that "Chinese institutions now have a lot of money but they are still free-riders. The Chinese need to be pushed to use their own budgets to support these activities."

One respondent asserted that in recent years some Chinese organizations have begun to prioritize their relationships with foreign institutions based upon how much financial support these institutions provide, and that "bilateral exchanges are becoming a commercial enterprise." In some cases, the respondent said, even journalists calling to interview Chinese scholars are re-routed to the institution's division for international exchanges, which charges a fee for the interview. None of the other respondents expressed as strong a point of view, although some mentioned that Chinese organizations assisting American partners with meetings or co-hosting events now routinely ask for service fees that go beyond what would seem a normal amount to cover necessary staff time and other indirect costs. It has also become common for Chinese organizations to request that American institutions provide honoraria to all conference participants, even those who do not give formal presentations. (Apparently, giving honoraria even to observers has become customary in China.)

Some participants pointed to the language barrier as a significant obstacle to Track II exchanges. There are a limited number of Chinese foreign policy experts with a good grasp of English, and even fewer American foreign policy specialists with the kind of Chinese language skills necessary to communicate confidently about sensitive subjects without benefit of interpretation. The case is true for written materials as well. While most Chinese foreign policy specialists can handle English language materials and quite a few American China specialists have sufficient language ability to access open Chinese language sources, including those being produced by participants in Track II dialogues, often senior officials attending such meetings have to rely on an eclectic collection of translated materials that do not necessarily accurately reflect foreign policy developments in the other country.

Yet, despite the programmatic, economic and other frustrations, respondents noted that Track II dialogues and maintaining valuable partnerships are worth it in the long run. In the past ten years, access to Chinese security specialists has increased immensely, as has the range of topics open to discussion, the level of trust between the two sides and the quality of the discussions.

Many of the surveyed institutions are trying to add value to ongoing dialogues by developing methods of maintaining continuous communication between meetings. Advances in communication technology, the dropping price of international telephone calls and the greater freedom Chinese scholars now enjoy in holding discussions with foreign contacts have all made this much easier. Rather than just exchanging information and opinions once or twice a year at major meetings, American and Chinese counterparts are now in frequent contact, exchanging papers via email, discussing key issues over instant messaging and Skype calls and holding informal meetings during visits to China or the United States. Some institutions have sought to establish virtual forums and email list-serves to exchange ideas, but there has been little success with this so far, and many individuals on both sides prefer to keep in touch via more *ad hoc* and flexible modes of communication.

Many respondents agreed that the most productive dialogues are those that are kept small, with ten or fewer people on each side ("the larger the group, the more harangues we get"); limited to high-level specialists who are deeply familiar with the issue at hand and able to influence policy; and are highly confidential, thus allowing for a frank expression of views.

Political Obstacles

In the 2003 survey, many American program directors told us that the primary obstacle to the success of their Track II programming had been the interference of political frictions. From the 1980s until the early part of this decade, numerous U.S. organizations saw planned activities in China postponed or canceled as a result of events such as Tiananmen Square (1989), Lee Teng-hui's visit to Cornell (1995), the Taiwanese presidential election and the subsequent naval standoff (1996), the NATO bombing of China's Belgrade embassy (1999), the Cox Commission Report (1999) and the EP-3 reconnaissance plane incident (2001).

However, this problem seems to have all but dissipated since 2001. While disagreements have emerged between the two governments, they have never reached the crisis level brought about by the events listed above. The SARS outbreak of 2003 led to the rescheduling of some planned events on the Mainland, but none of the surveyed institutions reported canceling or postponing activities as a result of bilateral political crises since the previous survey.

One previously mentioned exception is that after the election of DPP candidate Chen Shui-bian as Taiwan's president in 2000, the PRC became much stricter about allowing interaction between government officials, military officers and scholars from the Mainland and Taiwan, particularly when the subject under discussion is related to security. Organizations that in the past sought to bring together experts from both sides of the Strait now report that the Chinese government has decided to strictly limit such interaction until Taiwan affirms the "One China" principle.

In the 2003 survey, some respondents noted that tighter American visa restrictions post-9/11 had been a headache, but those surveyed this time have now adjusted to this and are building in enough lead time to meet the new requirements. However, the fact that many senior and retired Chinese officials find the fingerprinting requirement and the long waits at the U.S. Embassy demeaning, means that fewer people of that rank come to meetings held in the United States.

Military Exchanges

One of the few areas of Track II programming that has become more difficult in recent years, according to respondents, is that of exchanges involving the Chinese military. During the 1990s, officers of the PLA were frequent participants in Track II dialogues, training programs such as the Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies' (APCSS) Executive Courses and visiting fellowship programs such as the Atlantic Council's. However, contact with the PLA has dropped off sharply during this decade, such that very few American institutes now have significant interaction with Chinese military leaders.

No single phenomenon accounts for this trend, but several have contributed to it. For one, the post-Tiananmen level of military-to-military contacts has never returned to the pre-Tiananmen level. For another, after George W. Bush's inauguration in 2001, a new group of civilian military leaders came into office that was deeply suspicious of Chinese military ambitions. These suspicions were exacerbated by the EP-3 plane standoff in 2001. Enthusiasm for friendly exchanges with the PLA dropped, and the Pentagon introduced a new policy of approving these exchanges only on a case-by-case basis. This caused major headaches for Defense-affiliated organizations attempting to conduct cooperative programming with Chinese counterparts, and minor ones for organizations trying to facilitate the visit of Chinese delegations to the Pentagon, U.S. military bases or even the military academies.

However, some respondents see positive signs of a renewed interest on the part of U.S. policy-makers in contact with the PLA. One indicated that the perception of China among top security officials has been shifting from that of a "bogeyman" threatening U.S. security interests to an increasingly measured assessment of China's role and responsibilities in regional affairs. Two signs of this were Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's October 2005 visit to China and the speech delivered at the National Committee gala in September of that year by Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick, in which he encouraged China to act as a "responsible stakeholder" in global security and to work with the United States and others to sustain a peaceful international system. Several respondents reported that the "case-by-case" policy is not currently being implemented as strictly as it was in the first few years, and military exchanges are now nearly as easy to arrange as they were pre-2001; however, damage was done and this level of contact has been set back significantly.

It should be noted that the difficulties are not solely on the U.S. side. Since the election of Taiwan president Chen Shui-bian in 2000, the Chinese government has become more restrictive about allowing PLA officers to participate in activities where their Taiwan counterparts are present or even recognized on an equal basis. This has necessitated some U.S. institutions to rethink the structure of trilateral or regional exchanges while trying not to alienate either partner. At least two organizations,

APCSS and the National Committee on American Foreign Policy (NCAFP), have attempted to address this problem by allowing participation by Taiwan and Mainland China partners on a rotating bilateral basis: APCSS has so far been unable to re-engage the Chinese but the NCAFP routinely hosts U.S-Mainland and U.S-Taiwan events.

It is most difficult to interact with Chinese military counterparts on programs involving strategic nuclear doctrine, which is the province of the PLA's Second Artillery Division. The "holy grail" for dialogues on this topic has been the participation of high-ranking officers from this division. It is difficult for these officers to gain permission from the government to speak freely or even to participate in bilateral programs at all, and it is believed that everything said must be vetted in advance. So far only a few institutions have had Second Artillery Division participation in their dialogues. For the most part, the best American institutes can do is to conduct dialogues with Chinese institutions such as CFISS and CIISS that have close ties with the PLA, in hopes that the message will filter through. The PLA remains the most closed and conservative branch of the Chinese foreign affairs constellation, and this topic is particularly sensitive. However, respondents report signs that what PLA participation in such dialogues there has been is having positive effects, and the importance of these interactions has been impressed upon key military leaders.

Funding

Thirty-nine separate sources of funding were reported for the programs surveyed (see Appendix E: Funding Since 2003). Most of the surveyed institutions are supported to some extent by foundation grants. However, it appears that only a few large foundations are deeply committed to this area of programming. The Ford Foundation is the most ubiquitous funder, supporting nine of the surveyed programs, followed by the Luce Foundation (six); the MacArthur Foundation, the Korea Foundation and the Starr Foundation (four); and The Asia Foundation and the Freeman Foundation (three).

As in 2003, there is a general sense among program directors that it is becoming harder to locate funding for such activities, particularly from the foundations that have traditionally supported them. Some pointed out that foundations are still feeling the pinch of money lost when the post-2000 economic downturn caused a sharp decrease in the value of their endowments. However, most respondents indicated that the tightening of funds was due in greater part to donors' shifting priorities, expectations and strategies.

One change in donor strategy that several respondents discussed is the shift from providing grants to American organizations conducting dialogues with Chinese partners to funding the Chinese institutions directly. Concerns were voiced by respondents that American foundations lacked effective mechanisms for ensuring the accountable use of funds by Chinese institutions, many of which are already well-supported by the government agencies with which they are affiliated. One respondent pointed out that some of the Chinese institutions are now investing heavily in real estate, as can be seen during visits to their elaborate buildings and campuses. (In fairness, it should be noted that most American organizations have enjoyed well-equipped, climate-controlled buildings for many years while their Chinese counterparts made do with much less comfortable or modern facilities.)

Another common concern voiced by respondents is the tendency of some of the large foundations to engage in frequent and dramatic changes in focus in the name of "reinvention." One respondent lamented that "one year the donors will be very interested in funding U.S.-China security projects, then the next year they're only interested in projects involving health care." Another respondent expressed frustration at the "idiosyncrasy" of foundation priorities, arguing that "much of what is funded reflects the personal inclinations of foundations' directors," which are constantly changing. Many program directors perceive a decrease in overall interest among foundations in U.S.-China

relations and regional security cooperation, even those that have traditionally been Asia-focused. Other countries and regions, such as India and the Middle East, have been "hot" in the past several years, and Northeast Asia is getting less attention, despite its continuing strategic importance.

Several respondents noted that the particularities of Track II exchanges are not really a good fit with the objectives of most foundations, which are primarily interested in capacity building and research products, neither of which are central to most Track II programs. One commented that "It's always a struggle to do the kind of work you think is important while at the same time making the funders feel as if they are getting their money's worth." Some respondents feel that many foundations have an "academic bias" and are insistent that Track II activities result in books and other major deliverables. However, these deliverables can often take months or even a year to produce, and are often too long, theoretical and out-of-date to be of much use to policy-makers. Shorter, more quickly compiled reports that can be distributed among participants are often more useful in sustaining Track II dialogues, but these are discounted by donors. More important, as many Track II events are off the record, there can be no tangible deliverables.

Additionally, many foundations are now only willing to fund one-off events and short-term projects. This makes it difficult for organizations to sustain programs over multiple years, a basic need for Track II dialogues. One respondent suggested that, "foundations need to have more of a venture capital-type outlook, nurturing and sustaining programs even if they don't succeed right away." Several respondents reported that shrinking grant sizes have forced staff to spend significant time fundraising, leaving less time to develop good programs.

It seems a contradiction that the level of Track II activities, visiting fellowship and academic exchanges has increased dramatically since 2003, even while many organizations report serious difficulties in obtaining foundation grants, yet both trends do indeed exist. Those surveyed are trying to sustain the recent momentum in such activities while overcoming funding shortages through two strategies: reducing programming costs and seeking alternative sources of funds.

Measures taken by the surveyed institutions to reduce costs include the following:

- Moving away from one-off conferences, which incur considerable costs but produce few tangible benefits;
- Decreasing the number of participants in Track II dialogues while striving to increase their caliber;
- Pooling resources to co-host events with other American institutions;
- Organizing more conferences in China, where costs are lower, rather than bringing Chinese participants to conferences in the United States;
- Organizing multiple events with different partners in the course of single trips to China;
- Relying more on phone, email and Internet communication, and on individual visits and "mini-meetings," rather than on full-fledged conferences, to sustain Track II dialogues;
- Negotiating cost-sharing arrangements with Chinese partner organizations, especially with regard to international travel expenses; and,
- Curtailing visiting fellowship programs or requiring that visiting fellows come with their own grants;

Table 2: Comparisons of Funding Sources for American Institutions, 2003 and 2006

Funding Sources	% of 2003 Institutes	% of 2006 Institutes[†]	Trend
Foundations	69	64	- 5
Corporate/Individual Donors	15	31	+16
Internal Endowments	15	31	+16
U.S. Government	31	31	+0

A comparison of the funding information provided by surveyed institutions in 2003 and 2006 shows that many are trying to broaden the funding base of their programs. While a smaller percentage of organizations reported receiving foundation grants, the percentage supporting these activities with unrestricted funds not linked to particular programs from their own internal endowments has more than doubled since 2003, as has the percentage of those tapping into donations from private individuals or corporations. These funds allow organizations the flexibility to choose the issues and activities they think best serve their objectives, without having to meet donor requirements for clear outcomes, deliverables and reporting.

The percentage of institutions receiving government funds, from such sources as the Departments of Energy, State and Defense, has remained steady. One respondent noted that many government agencies have a long-term interest in developments in China, and often have a better understanding of the importance of these developments than most foundations. As a result, "there is an enormous amount of government funding available for work on China." However, another respondent argued that government funding can be hard to secure, can have more onerous reporting requirements, and affords less flexibility in determining the program content: "The government only funds projects that address issues it sees as strategic at the moment. Government agencies also have a narrow field of vision, whereas we need to concentrate on the really big issues that will pan out over the next 20-30 years."

IV. Scope of Activities

In the survey questionnaire and in subsequent interviews, respondents were asked whether they feel that current programs cover sufficient ground, or if important areas in Sino-American relations are not being addressed. Many respondents believe that while there has been an over-abundance of Track II programming in areas such as bilateral relations, regional security and nonproliferation, other issues remain under-examined, including the following:

- **The impact of China's domestic challenges on U.S.-China relations and security issues**. The likelihood that China's leaders will be consumed with domestic challenges in the coming years makes it less probable that China will engage in foreign adventurism, which could have positive impacts on U.S.-China relations. Furthermore, one program director pointed out that "while the security and diplomatic issues on which most Track II programs focus will remain intractable in the next few years, enormous work can be done on China's domestic agenda. This will also be extremely helpful in furthering the objective of political reform."

[†] Note: This chart only includes the 26 out of 39 institutions surveyed in 2003: 28 of the 2003 organizations would not have qualified for the 2006 survey (the others programs involved American specialists only), and of these two did not provide specific funding information.

- **Non-traditional threats to security.** The most common suggestions included environmental degradation, terrorism, the spread of infectious diseases and energy security.
- **U.S.-China cooperation on security interests in other regions of the world.** Regions mentioned include South Asia, the Middle East, Europe and the former Soviet Union, as well as failed states around the world.
- **U.S.-China cooperation within international organizations.** China's perceived obstinacy toward U.S.-backed initiatives toward Iran and Sudan at the United Nations is just one example of the need for this kind of discussion.

Some respondents also indicated that participation in Track II activities has been limited to a very small community of scholars and policy-makers. Most dialogue programs are focused on getting American China experts to talk to Chinese Americanists, but few among these groups have real influence on foreign policy. At the same time, many leading specialists in Washington and Beijing who work on security issues but are not regional specialists, have little or no communication with their foreign counterparts. Track II exchanges should shift away from their tight focus on bilateral issues and bring a more diverse group of functional specialists into dialogue with each other.

Respondents also supported more direct exchanges with the PLA and the Chinese Communist Party, despite the closed and secretive nature of these institutions. It was also suggested that American organizations conducting programs on non-traditional security threats or domestic issues in China should work directly with Chinese government agencies rather than going through intermediary organizations. This is difficult to do with traditional security issues, as the relevant Chinese government ministries and institutions have long-standing ties to particular organizations (for example, the PLA's relationships with CFISS and CIISS) and prefer to "outsource" the exchange of ideas with foreign organizations to them. It may be less difficult for American organizations to conduct programs with Chinese ministries focusing on domestic issues, as they may be more directly accessible (in part because there are fewer "non-governmental" organizations in China with strong ties to these ministries).

V. Conclusion

This survey focuses on a field of programming that is rapidly expanding. Interaction between American organizations and their Chinese counterparts on security and international relations issues is involving more entities, engaging more participants, and dealing with a broader range of issues than ever before. Through activities such as policy dialogues, conferences, visiting fellowships, delegation study visits and academic exchanges, American and Chinese institutions have established a means of trading information and viewpoints that has proved remarkably resistant to downturns in the bilateral relationship.

This significant expansion could not have happened without recent improvements in the status, influence and autonomy of Chinese policy institutions. A new, more worldly and independent-thinking generation of analysts is taking charge of these organizations, bringing about an improvement both in the quality of information available to Chinese America experts and in the quality of advice that these people and their institutes provide to Chinese leaders. Furthermore, many U.S. experts report that the organizational abilities of these institutions have improved significantly in recent years, as has the analytical depth of the work they produce, though some claim that it still falls short of international standards. However, an open and substantive discussion with key institutions such as the PLA and the Chinese Communist Party remains elusive.

American organizations are concerned about the future funding environment for these activities. Economic factors and shifting priorities are causing the purse strings to tighten at many foundations, and many organizations surveyed are now dedicating significant resources to exploring and developing alternate sources of funds, such as corporate donors. Nevertheless, most organizations have found innovative ways to reduce the cost of these activities and have not yet seen their programming substantially curtailed by the more constricted funding environment.

When asked to speculate on the future, many of the organizations surveyed expressed a belief that Track II activities must go beyond their current narrow focus on high-profile issues in the bilateral relationship and to investigate lower-profile issues, bilateral or otherwise, that can become sources of friction. There was strong agreement that greater efforts need to be made on both sides to include perspectives and participants outside the small community of scholars currently specializing in U.S.-China relations. To that end, further exploration of grass roots efforts by individuals, non-traditional groups and universities is in order. Two interesting new trends relate to that and may or may not affect the way Sino-American relations are addressed. The first is the recent movement of several former think tank analysts to jobs at universities – where the pay tends to be higher and the perks more plentiful. The second is the growing number of foreign institutions that want to have a presence in China. At the moment, these programs are integrating themselves into pre-existing entities: in November 2006, The Brookings Institution announced the opening of its first-ever overseas center, the Brookings-Tsinghua Center at Tsinghua University. Some are looking further in the future: the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has a long term goal of establishing a policy research center based in China, having already set up a joint program on globalization and international relations with the China Reform Forum.

The creative use of new technologies needs to be further explored and more needs to be done to address important issues: growing regionalism and China's role in it, trends of nationalism across Asia and particularly in China, energy security; and geographic areas that have not had much attention, such as Africa, Latin America and the Mid East. Indeed, during the period between the taking of the survey and finalizing this publication, interest in these latter areas, particularly China's relations with Africa, has been on the rise.

Wang Jisi, Dean of Peking University's School of International Studies and one of China's pre-eminent Americanists, "The Chinese-U.S. relationship remains beset by more profound differences than any other bilateral relationship between major powers in the world today. It is an extremely complex and highly paradoxical unity of opposites. It is not a relationship of confrontation and rivalry for primacy…In its pattern of interactions; it is a relationship between equals."[‡] Despite historical differences in Chinese and American political ideologies and policies, the two countries increasingly engage each other in myriad ways. It is thus critical to continuously develop and maintain relevant dialogues between their policy leaders and shapers in order to provide impetus for creative solution-building.

[‡] Wang, Jisi, *China's Search for Stability With America,* Foreign Affairs, vol. 84, number 5, September/October 2005, p. 46.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SURVEYED INSTITUTES

The Asia Foundation
Asia Society
Asia Pacific Center for Strategic Studies
Atlantic Council of the United States, Asia Program
Bonnie Glaser (Independent Consultant)
Brookings Institution, Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, China Program
Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)
    International Security Program
    Freeman Chair in China Studies
The CNA Corporation
East-West Center
Foreign Policy Research Institute
The George Washington University, Elliott School of International Affairs, China Policy Program
Georgetown University, Asian Studies Program
Harvard University
    John King Fairbank Center for East Asian Research
    John F. Kennedy School of Government
Kettering Foundation
The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation
Monterey Institute of International Studies
National Academy of Sciences, Committee on International Security and Arms Control
National Bureau of Asian Research
National Committee on American Foreign Policy
National Committee on United States-China Relations
National Defense University
Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability
Pacific Forum CSIS
RAND Corporation
Stanford University, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Project on Peace and Cooperation
Stanley Foundation
Henry L. Stimson Center
Union of Concerned Scientists
United States-China Policy Foundation
University of California at San Diego, Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Denver, Center for China-U.S. Cooperation
University of Georgia, Center for International Trade and Security

APPENDIX B: PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

The profiles below are a sample of some of the relevant programs run by the organizations surveyed and are not meant to be an exhaustive listing of the organizations' activities.

I. Bilateral Dialogues

In 2003 and 2004, the **Atlantic Council** facilitated a U.S.-China dialogue as part of its **Project on the Strategic Structure and System of International and Regional Security after the Iraq War**. Two meetings were held, one in Washington and the other in Shanghai. The Project, a joint initiative with Tsinghua University's Institute of International Studies, brought America China specialists together with scholars from Chinese universities and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, as well as officials of the Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Council is seeking to build on this dialogue with U.S.-China bilateral discussions on topics such as the challenges of failing states and transnational threats, including proliferation, terrorism, crime, disease, regional conflict, environmental degradation, and crisis management.

Since 2004, the **Atlantic Council** has hosted a series of dialogues on cross-strait security issues, entitled **Building Cross-Strait Strategic Understanding**. These have allowed the Atlantic Council to address critical cross-Strait issues and to provide insights to the American foreign policy community. Participants in this program have included current and former policy makers, scholars and business people from Mainland China, Taiwan and the United States.

The **Carnegie Endowment for International Peace** organizes the **Carnegie Endowment-China Reform Forum Cooperative Project on the Challenges of Globalization**. Since 2005, this project has included three bilateral dialogue meetings between American and Chinese security experts and scholars. The meetings, all hosted in Beijing by the China Reform Forum, focused on topics such as preventing and resolving conflict across the Taiwan Strait, recent changes in U.S. policy toward China, and the implications for China and the U.S. of India as a rising power.

The International Security Program (ISP) of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has co-hosted the **U.S.-China Strategic Dialogue** with the China Reform Forum (CRF) since 2003. This project seeks to promote understanding and cooperation between China and the United States by convening a series of Track II meetings on challenges to international security. There have been three meetings of this Dialogue, focusing on topics such as globalization and the emergence of China, the implications of China's growing role in the Asia-Pacific region and China's peaceful development and the future of Sino-American relations. For each meeting, the program has brought a five to eight-member Chinese delegation of think tank scholars and former officials to meet with American foreign policy experts, business, government and media leaders. CSIS plans to expand the program and develop it as a senior-level U.S.-China Track II exchange. The most recent meeting, in Seattle in April 2006, included a meeting between China's President Hu Jintao and a small group of eminent former U.S. officials including Henry Kissinger, Brent Scowcroft and William Perry. President Hu gave his "stamp of approval" for a higher level dialogue between CRF and CSIS based on contact between influential foreign policy scholars on both sides.

In 2005, **CSIS** began the **U.S.-China Dialogue on Internal Developments in North Korea**. This project seeks to facilitate a dialogue between American and Chinese experts on developments on the Korean peninsula. In July 2005, CSIS and the United States Institute of Peace co-hosted a delegation of Chinese experts on Northeast Asia and convened a day-long conference to discuss North Korea's economic and political situation and external policies. Participants included U.S. scholars and

government officials. In the spring of 2006, a CSIS delegation visited Beijing and Northeast China to conduct interviews with Chinese experts on North Korea. Delegation members included leading U.S. experts on policy toward China and North Korea. CSIS' Chinese partner for this project is the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations. A follow-on daylong conference was held in Washington, DC, in December 2006 that included a simulation of a nuclear accident in North Korea. CSIS will conduct an additional two rounds of this project, the first of which is currently being planned.

Finally, CSIS conducts a program on **U.S.-China Strategic Nuclear Dynamics**, in cooperation with the RAND Corporation and the Institute for Defense Analyses. This project analyzes the U.S.-China strategic nuclear dynamic and complements the official bilateral strategic dialogue. It includes an annual Track I ½ dialogue between government and non-government nuclear security specialists from the two countries. The project was launched in 2004 in partnership with CSIS' Freeman Chair in China Studies and the China Foundation for International Strategic Studies. In June 2006, CSIS' ISP Asia Program sent a specialist delegation to meet with Chinese officials and analysts. The group held a meeting in Beijing, focusing on U.S. and Chinese nuclear doctrine and strategy. The dialogue is a useful forum at which Americans and Chinese can seek to clarify misunderstandings and encourage transparency. This dialogue deals with issues such as missile defense and transparency on nuclear doctrine. CSIS follows meetings of this dialogue with a series of extensive briefings for U.S. defense officials, including the Pentagon, PACOM and STRATCOM.

Pacific Forum CSIS co-hosts the **U.S.-China Strategic Dialogue** with the Center for Contemporary Conflict at the Naval Postgraduate School of Monterey and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency. (Note: this is a separate project from the one of the same name organized by CSIS/ISP.) This Track I ½ Dialogue brings together a select group of national security officials, military personnel and experts from the United States and China to discuss key security issues, including non-proliferation, arms control, nuclear weapons, and military modernization. This program has had two meetings so far, in August 2005 and November 2006.

Pacific Forum has also co-hosted an annual **bilateral workshop series on U.S.-China relations** with Fudan University since 1999. This program brings together a small group of experts from both countries to focus on contemporary issues in the bilateral relationship, as well as long-term visions of regional and global security. Cooperation between the two institutes began around the time of the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. The program was one of the few forums for American and Chinese security experts to communicate in the aftermath of that destabilizing event. This dialogue has recently focused on issues such as the continued stalemate on the Korean Peninsula, the passage of China's Anti-Secession Law, concerns about the war on terrorism and Chinese efforts to promote "Asia for Asians" multilateralism that excludes the United States.

The **CNA Corporation** conducts an extensive set of dialogues with numerous Chinese "sister institutes." These dialogues include annual roundtables in the United States or China (alternating each year), as well as continuous discussions sustained by frequent exchanges of staff visits. Each roundtable focuses on a specific topic in the U.S.-China relationship; recent roundtables have focused on regional security issues, Chinese domestic reform, U.S. political trends and media affairs. Participation is limited to staff members from CNA and the Chinese counterpart, though outsiders are sometimes invited to sit in, including former officials, scholars and business specialists. CNA's partner institutions include the Chinese Institute for International Strategic Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, China Foundation for International Strategic Studies, Shanghai Institute for International Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Fudan University's Center for American Studies and the PLA National Defense University.

Since 2003, the **China Policy Program (CPP) at The George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs** has conducted a bilateral dialogue on **U.S.-China Relations in the Global Context** with the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS). This is the only dialogue currently being run by an American organization that examines U.S. and Chinese policy toward non-Asian security issues. As China has become an active player in global affairs, there is need for more discussion between the two countries on their policies toward different regions of the world, including Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. There are currently areas of overlap and areas of contradiction between the two countries' approaches, and the potential for cooperation must be explored. This program seeks to expose specialists on non-Asian issues in the United States and China to their counterparts and enable them to forge relationships. Participants in this dialogue include American specialists on a variety of regions and issues, CIIS staff and other Chinese and American foreign policy experts. Two meetings of this dialogue have been held so far and a third is planned in March 2007.

The China Policy Program also has an ongoing relationship with the International Department of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP/ID) and is seeking to institutionalize a collaborative seminar series that examines various issues related to political reform. The first meeting of this series was held in Beijing in May 2004. This meeting, entitled **"Analyzing the Collapse of the Soviet Union: Chinese and American Perspectives,"** provided an opportunity for leading U.S. and Chinese Sovietologists to compare viewpoints on the reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union. The American specialists tended to emphasize the role of Mikhail Gorbachev in promoting reforms that led to the downfall of Soviet communism, while their Chinese counterparts pointed to systemic weaknesses in the Soviet system originating decades before the eventual collapse. The CPP is now liaising with the CCP/ID to plan another conference in Washington, D.C.

The China Public Policy Program of **Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government** holds occasional **Strategic Policy Dialogues**, gatherings of high level officials, policy-makers, and leaders of industry and the non-profit sector to discuss topics pertinent to global trends and China's domestic reform agenda. The most recent events were conferences in 2001 and 2003 focusing on financial sector reform in China and Asia, generally.

The **Kettering Foundation**, a research organization concerned with the role of citizens in government and international relations, co-hosts an annual dialogue with scholars from a number of organizations including Beijing University, the Shanghai Institute of American Studies and the Institute of American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences at which research and ideas are exchanged regarding each country's citizens' perceptions of the bilateral relationship.

The **Committee on International Security and Arms Control (CISAC)** of the **National Academy of Sciences** initiated its **Security Policy Dialogue with China** following a successful 1988 meeting of a delegation of American scientists and arms control experts who met with their counterparts in Beijing. Since the initial meeting in 1991, CISAC has held nine full meetings. In the course of the dialogue, CISAC's Chinese counterparts proposed that in addition to the regular meetings held every 12-15 months, there be smaller, more frequent meetings focused on specific topics. All of CISAC's meetings have been off the record, and have brought together specialists from the military, nuclear and biological establishments. The formal sponsor for the dialogue is the Scientists' Group for Arms Control (CSGAC) of the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, and meetings have been hosted by the Institute for Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics of the Chinese Academy of Engineering Physics. In 2006, CISAC and CSGAC launched a joint project to publish an

unclassified glossary of nuclear security terms. The glossary will contain approximately 1,000 terms and is expected to appear in the second half of 2007.

In 1994, the **National Committee on United States-China Relations** began sending groups of retired four-star generals and admirals to China, led by former secretaries of defense. The impetus was to try to fill the void in military-to-military contacts in the wake of their suspension after Tiananmen. The first two of these programs were very successful; the third in the series, a delegation to China in February 1998 led by then just-retired Secretary William Perry, initiated an ongoing relationship between the National Committee and the **Preventive Defense Project** of Stanford and Harvard Universities that still continues; the eighth meeting was held in September, 2006**.** The two organizations collaborate on yearly Track I ½ meetings in alternating venues that focus on Northeast Asian security issues, with a special emphasis on cross-Strait relations. The China Foundation for International and Strategic Studies is the PRC counterpart organization and, until his death in January 2005, Wang Daohan, former Shanghai mayor and advisor to Jiang Zemin on cross-Strait issues, was the leader on the Chinese side. In Taiwan, the project works with the Foreign Ministry or related think tanks. The project thus enjoys access to the most senior leaders on both sides of the Strait. Initially, the program concentrated on cross-Strait issues, various aspects of Sino-American relations, and U.S.-China military relations; more recently it has expanded its focus to include discussions of Asian regional security issues, crisis management, the war on terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.

Since the mid-1990s, the **National Defense University** has conducted a military-to-military Strategic Dialogue with the People's Liberation Army National Defense University (PLA-NDU). This dialogue is supposed to be held annually, alternating between Washington and Beijing, but it has sometimes been suspended due to downturns in Sino-American political relations. Participants include Chinese military officers from the PLA-NDU's Strategic Studies Insititute (SSI) and U.S. officers and civilian analysts from the National Defense University's Institute of National Strategic Studies (INSS). On occasion, other military officers participate as observers. The Heads of SSI and INSS chair the dialogue. Discussion topics in recent dialogues have included U.S.-China relations, mil-to-mil cooperation, Asia-Pacific security, non-traditional security cooperation and managing the North Korean nuclear crisis. The most recent meeting was in December 2006.

The RAND Corporation sponsors annual two-day conferences with the China Reform Forum (CRF), the think tank of the Central Party School, to discuss major economic and political issues, and holds less formal discussions about every two weeks with delegations of senior officials and scholars. The most recent RAND-CRF conference was held in September 2006.

Two dialogues on arms control have been hosted by the **Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)** since 2003. The **UCS-China Joint Project on Space Weapons** seeks to lay a solid technical foundation for future discussion between China and the United States of arms control measures designed to preserve outer space as a sanctuary for peaceful civilian, military and scientific activity. UCS has been working closely with past participants in its summer symposium (see below) from Beihang University to form a group of young aerospace engineers interested in space security issues. The group of eight to ten graduate students and junior faculty members has produced several working papers, including a critical analysis of pieces of the RAND study on space weapons, a critique of a paper on the military applications of the Beidou positioning system, and some pioneering work on high-velocity impacts and the problem of space debris.

UCS has also held one round of its international **Symposium on the Sustainability of Space Technology & Resources** at Beihang University. These symposia mark the beginning of an ongoing effort by UCS to engage Chinese scientists in a program of cooperative research focused on the

technical aspects of space security. Topics of discussion have included technical issues of anti-satellite weapons, contamination in space from the perspective of scientific ethics, current U.S. space programs and funding, space-based missile defense, the use of space power in the Iraq war, the effects of nuclear explosions and kinetic weapons, how U.S. space weapons would change Chinese nuclear deterrence, space surveillance and verification, dynamical modeling and simulation of orbital debris, collision probability between debris clouds and spacecraft, orbital debris simulation software, satellite miniaturization, military space and public transparency, and U.S. attitudes toward space cooperation. Future plans include expanding the group to include technically trained participants from other leading aerospace research centers.

Since 2002, **University of Colorado** professor Peter Gries has organized the **Sino-American Security Dialogue (SASD)**. What sets this dialogue apart from others is its emphasis on engaging younger security specialists at an early stage of their careers. SASD sprung from Gries' frustration with the adversarial and national identity-based discussions taking place between many of the older specialists in the course of other bilateral security dialogues. It is his hope that the younger generation of security experts involved in the Dialogue will conduct a frank exchange of opinions, and that the Dialogue will promote a "common security culture" among these specialists before they rise to prominent positions. A dialogue retreat is held annually, co-sponsored by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. To maintain the bonds created during the retreats, the Dialogue has established a website and an e-mail network in which participants can discuss their research and the latest developments in Sino-American relations. This "continuous dialogue" allows participants to maintain a frank exchange on bilateral issues in periods between meetings.

Since 2003, the Center for China-U.S. Cooperation (CCUSC) at the **University of Denver** has sponsored a periodic dialogue entitled **China-U.S. Cooperation in the New Global Context**. Four meetings have been held so far in Washington, Beijing, Berlin and Colorado, on topics including multilateral cooperation and transnational security threats, E.U.-U.S.-China relations in managing regional security and development, Sino-American relations in the Asia-Pacific context, and U.S.-China bilateral relations and multilateral cooperation. Since 2003, CCUSC has also sponsored five annual two-day symposia focusing on key topics in U.S.-China relations, including participation by academic and think tank scholars and former officials from the United States and China. These symposia are co-hosted with the China Institute of International Studies and the and Institute of International Relations at Taiwan's National Chengchi University, and have focused on such topics as U.S.-China cooperation, U.S.-Mainland China-Taiwan relations, and U.S.-China policy under the Bush and Hu administrations.

II. Multilateral Dialogues

The **Asia Foundation** has hosted several meetings of the **U.S.-China-Japan Trilateral Dialogue**, organized jointly with the China Institute for International Studies and the Japan Institute for International Affairs. At these meetings, scholars and policymakers exchange views on critical issues affecting relations among the three countries. There has been a significant focus on developments on the Korean peninsula, and what impact they have on all three countries and their relations with one another.

The **Asia Society** holds annual meetings of its **Williamsburg Conference**, an annual Track I ½ dialogue, in a different location in Asia each year. Participants include eminent foreign policy scholars and current and former foreign affairs officials. Discussions focus on issues of regional security, diplomatic and economic relations among the countries of the region, key political events, and

emerging transnational challenges such as the spread of HIV/AIDS and the war on terrorism. The last three conferences have been held in India, Cambodia and the United States.

The Asia Society also sponsors the **Annual Asian Dialogue on HIV/AIDS**, an international symposium with leaders from throughout the region that seeks to strengthen current responses in Asia. These gatherings include participants from a variety of fields, including medical doctors, members of the policy, business and NGO communities, and experts, academics and scholars in the field. The dialogue is the centerpiece of the *AIDS in Asia Initiative,* a three-year project which was launched in October 2003. The *AIDS in Asia Initiative* aims to raise awareness about the AIDS epidemic in Asia, and to mobilize Asian decision makers and their American counterparts to build a collaborative response to Asia's growing HIV/AIDS crisis.

The **Atlantic Council's** Asia Program co-sponsors a **U.S.-China-E.U. Dialogue on Strategic and Global Issues** with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and the European Institute for Asian Studies (Brussels). This dialogue seeks to create greater communication and interaction among these critical global powers on common challenges and threats to stability. Two meetings have been held so far, in the fall of 2005 in Europe and September 2006 in Beijing. American, Chinese and European foreign policy scholars have been involved, as well as some current and former Chinese foreign affairs officials. Subsequent issues-focused meetings are planned in Brussels and Washington, subject to funding.

The **Brookings Institution** and **CSIS** co-sponsor a **trilateral dialogue series** with think tank and university scholars and former government officials from China, Japan and the United States. The programming partners on the Chinese and Japanese sides are the School of International Studies at Peking University and the Keizai Koho Center, respectively. Discussion topics have including security issues, counter-terrorism, economic relations and energy concerns. Participants have frankly discussed the differences in interests, policies, and perceptions that have led to frictions between China and Japan, including issues of history, negative popular attitudes, and the role of education and media. Emphasis has been placed on building cooperation wherever possible and minimizing tensions.

Since 1997, **Pacific Forum CSIS** has hosted a U.S.-R.O.K. bilateral dialogue; as events have warranted, this program has expanded to become a trilateral and multilateral dialogue on **The Future of U.S.-R.O.K. Relations and Four-Way Cooperation with Japan and China**. This dialogue includes participation by security experts primarily from the United States and Korea, but as needed has expanded to include experts from China and Japan. Discussion topics have included strategic and military dimensions of trilateral relations, the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, mutual and divergent interests in solving the North Korea crisis, domestic political dimensions of trilateral relations, and economic dimensions of trilateral relations.

Also since 1997, **Pacific Forum** has overseen **United States, Japan and China Relations: Trilateral Cooperation in the 21st Century,** a series of policy dialogues aimed at strengthening the trilateral relationship. Collaborators are the Research Institute for Peace and Security in Tokyo and the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations in Beijing. Each meeting is planned over an 18-month cycle that includes visits by Pacific Forum personnel to China and Japan to meet with partner organizations and gather perspectives on what the format and issues of the dialogue should encompass, and to follow up on issues raised in previous meetings. According to Pacific Forum program staff, the ongoing conversations are often as useful, if not more so, than the conferences themselves.

Pacific Forum serves as the secretariat for the **Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP)**. CSCAP was founded in 1993 by Pacific Forum and nine other institutes as the first region-wide forum to foster multilateral security dialogue. Other member institutes and committees are based in Australia, Brunei, Cambodia, Canada, China, the European Union, India, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Mongolia, New Zealand, North Korea, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. Taiwan scholars also participate, increasing CSCAP's inclusivity. Under the CSCAP umbrella, each member country forms a member committee composed of individuals who will take part in CSCAP activities. The Chinese committee is managed by the foreign ministry's China Institute of International Affairs and includes think-tank scholars and officials from the Ministry of National Defense and the Chinese Arms Control and Disarmament Association, among others. International CSCAP Study Groups focus on particular issues or challenges, for instance countering the spread of WMD. Study groups meet once or twice annually. At Beijing's insistence, cross-Strait issues are not discussed and Taiwan scholars participate in their private capacity. Taipei has organized its own CSCAP member committee but it is not formally recognized. While Beijing periodically attempts to further restrict Taiwan participation, the two sides generally coexist curing CSCAP events.

The **East-West Center's Senior Policy Seminar** brings together policymakers, government officials, and academic experts from the United States and the Asia-Pacific region for annual discussions on the economic, social and strategic dynamics of U.S. policy in the region. The most recent seminar was held in August 2006.

The **East-West Center's** U.S. Asia Pacific Council is comprised of American corporate leaders and other citizens who have made outstanding contributions to the advancement of America's relationship with Asian and Pacific nations. It holds an annual **Washington Conference**, at which a group of about 15 distinguished scholars, former diplomats, and economists from the United States and Asia participate in a daylong program on a particular topic in the multilateral relation-ship. The most recent conference, held in October 2005, focused on "New Challenges in the Transpacific Partnership."

Since 2004, the **Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI)** has co-sponsored a private week-long dialogue among think-tank scholars from China (SIIS), Japan (Japan Institute of International Studies), and the United States (FPRI and the New World Institute). The most recent conference, "Improving Global Security," was held in March 2006 in Philadelphia and in Charlottesville, VA. Previous meetings have been held in Shanghai and Tokyo. After each conference, representatives of the four organizations hold a public discussion session at FPRI's offices.

From 2002 to 2004,**The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation** sponsored a series of five trilateral retreats called **Toward New Regional Relations in Northeast Asia**, consisting of three-day workshops designed to build cooperative relationships among a core group of emerging opinion makers and leaders from Japan, Korea and China. Participants included six representatives from each nation, between 35 and 45 years old and serving in positions of influence in their societies: legislators, journalists, social scientists, business leaders, writers and artists, and civil society leaders. The discussions were supplemented by half-day group activities intended to encourage networking and relationship building among the participants. Separate bilateral sessions were held with participants from Japan and Korea and Japan and China before a final general meeting encompassing all three sides. Each retreat focused on how historical legacies have hampered regional relations as well as measures that might be undertaken to overcome these legacies. The retreat participants compiled a list of recommendations, which were published on The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation's website. Co-sponsors of this program included Pacific Forum CSIS and the Asia Foundation.

Until 2004, **The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation** also sponsored annual **Mansfield Pacific Retreats**, giving leaders from the United States, China, Korea and Japan the opportunity to address some of the most complex and sensitive issues common to the Asia-Pacific region. Past retreats focused on such issues as global climate change, food security and trade, energy and the environment, and urban air quality. Each retreat convened an interdisciplinary group of 50-60 high-level officials from government, academia and industry for four days of presentations, keynote addresses, discussions and site visits. Retreats typically included congressional and ministerial participants.

Since 2000, the **Nautilus Institute** has held six sessions of its annual **Asian Energy Security (AES) Workshop**. The main theme of this regional dialogue is collaborative research, involving groups from each of the countries of Northeast Asia (including North and South Korea, Russia, China, Japan and Mongolia) on different paths to address energy security issues in the region. Collaborative research under this project looks at both national and regional approaches to energy security concerns. Workshop participants, including representatives from the United States and Australia, discuss ways to improve energy security in the region. Each three-day workshop involves a day on current national energy sector developments and their implications for energy security, including the continuation of collaborative project activities from previous workshops. The second day consists of examining the regionalized data and addressing special topics. The last day consists of a "hands-on" working session as a group, using the LEAP energy/environmental analysis software tool. A two-day "Scenarios" workshop follows each main AES workshop. This small-group exercise is devoted to exploration of important issues in global sustainable development and energy security. Nautilus' Chinese partner in this dialogue is the Energy and Environmental Technology Center (EETC) at Tsinghua University.

From 2001 to 2003, the **Nautilus Institute** also held three workshops on **Power Grid Interconnection in Northeast Asia**. These workshops focused on the technical, economic and environmental implications of the interconnection of electrical grids in Northeast Asia. The workshops also served to identify and explore potential environmental benefits of and barriers to power line interconnections, and to summarize those barriers and benefits for future reference and use. Results included the identification and elaboration of "Next Steps" in the analysis of Northeast Asian power grid interconnections, and they began the process of organizing and identifying the resources, agencies and institutions needed to move forward with such analyses.

Since 2002, the Project on Peace and Cooperation in the Asian-Pacific Region, run by Professor John W. Lewis at the **Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC)** at **Stanford University**, has conducted a **"Five Nation Project on Regional Security and Economic Development."** From 2002 to 2005, the Five Nation Project convened senior officials and specialists from five nuclear nations – China, India, Pakistan, Russia, and the United States – to discuss and produce joint proposals to resolve issues of weapons of mass destruction, the Indo-Pakistani conflict, terrorism, and regional cooperation. These meetings offered the first forum for senior diplomats, weapons specialists, and former or active-duty military officers from these five countries to discuss some of the most sensitive global security issues, to share the results of their individual research, and to present their findings to their respective governments. In 2006 the Project on Peace and Cooperation decided to narrow its focus to a "Three-Nation Project" on proliferation issues, involving China, Russia, and the United States, while other researchers at CISAC continued the effort with Pakistan and India. Where possible, these two projects integrate discussion. The Project on Peace and Cooperation is seeking funding for the future activities of the Three-Nation Project, which has been supported by foundation grants and private gifts, and others at CISAC seek funding for the South Asia project.

The **Stanley Foundation** initiated a project on **"New Power Dynamics in Southeast Asia"** in the fall of 2006, which will include several meetings in the region, including one in China. Chinese participants from a number of academic and policy institutions are taking part in this project and there is Chinese participation in all meetings. The Foundation is also planning separate programs aimed at fostering multilateral strategic dialogues between the U.S., China and Japan, the U.S., China and Europe and the U.S., China, India and Japan. Events are planned in 2007 for all of these dialogues.

The **Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)** organizes annual **Summer Symposiums on Science and World Affairs** to encourage and support the development of young scientists working on policy-oriented research on international security and arms control issues. The central purpose of the Summer Symposiums is to encourage the development of analysts in countries where there is not a strong tradition of public interest science, to integrate them into the international community of researchers with similar interests and backgrounds and to develop in the participants an inter-national view of security that is informed by an understanding of the security concerns of individual countries. These eight-day meetings have been held yearly since 1989. They bring together roughly 40 scientists from countries including Russia, China, India, Pakistan, Germany, Ukraine, Britain, France, and the United States. There are normally ten to twelve Chinese participants. UCS reports that the quality of their presentations has increased dramatically over the years. Some senior people have attended more than once; the new faces tend to be younger technical types just getting introduced to the field. The 2004 Summer Symposium was held at the Institute of International Studies at Tsinghua University in Beijing.

Since 1993, the **Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC)** at the University of California-San Diego has sponsored the **Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue (NEACD)**. NEACD is a Track I½ multilateral forum on security issues in Northeast Asia. Participants include academics, foreign and defense ministry officials, and military officers from Russia, China, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, and the United States. NEACD convenes once a year and the location of the meetings rotates among China, Japan, South Korea, Russia and the United States. In each country IGCC co-hosts the meeting with a local research institute. The current Chinese co-host is the China Institute of International Studies. There are two components to NEACD meetings: a two-day plenary session and a two-day defense information sharing study project. The plenary session, to which all participants are invited, is the centerpiece: participants, acting in a private capacity, provide national perspectives on Northeast Asian regional security and discuss a range of Northeast Asian political and economic issues. Since 2003, plenary sessions have focused on the issue of North Korea's nuclear ambitions and prospects for conflict on the Korean peninsula, reflecting the centrality of this issue to Northeast Asian security. The defense information sharing study project focuses specifically on regional security issues from a military perspective. Only defense ministry officials and military officers attend this session.

III. Bilateral Conferences

In early 2004, the **Atlantic Council's** Asia Program hosted two international conferences in China addressing U.S.-China security issues. In January of that year, the Council co-sponsored a conference in Shanghai on **"Sino-U.S. Relations: Cooperation and Management"** with the Shanghai Institute for International Studies. Numerous discussion panels were convened to scrutinize the U.S.-China relationship in the context of such challenges as cross-Strait security, non-proliferation, trade and currency concerns, human rights, the East Asia regional security framework, flashpoints in the Korean peninsula, Southeast Asia and South Asia, the United Nations, counter-terrorism cooperation, energy security and the global economy. In February 2004, the Atlantic Council and the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations co-sponsored a meeting in Beijing between U.S. and Chinese

experts and former policy-makers to discuss the issues posed by areas of instability and emerging threats. A report of the proceedings was published by the United States Institute of Peace in September 2004.

In September 2004, the **Carnegie Endowment for International Peace** held a two-day conference in Washington entitled **"China's Peaceful Rise?"** It explored a wide range of questions related to China's foreign relations and political and economic development. Participants included U.S. China experts as well as prominent Chinese scholars, businessmen and civil society leaders. Discussion topics included an historical perspective on China's rise, whether China can rise peacefully, sustaining China's rise, whether China can sustain its economic dynamism, China's impact on the global economy, and implications for American primacy.

In September 2005, **CSIS' Freeman Chair** co-sponsored with the **Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life**, a one-day bilateral conference in Washington on the topic of **"Building a 'Harmonious Society' in China: Non-Governmental and Faith-Based Organizations as Agents of Social Change and Stability."** Participants included CSIS staff, U.S.-China experts and leaders of Chinese NGOs. Discussion topics included the transformation of non-profit organizations in China, faith-based organizations, and, the "international factor." Some of the Chinese NGO leaders gave presentations on their own organizations as case studies.

In October 2003, **CSIS' International Security Program** sponsored a one-day conference on **"PRC Policy-making in the Wake of Leadership Change."** This meeting was designed to bring together leading experts on U.S.-China relations from the United States and the PRC to discuss recent political, economic and foreign policy developments in China, with a special focus on PRC leadership change since the November 2002 16th Party Congress and the March 2003 National People's Congress. In addition, the group examined economic and foreign policy-making processes in China, including the role of consensus building and negotiation within the government, the mode and venues by which decisions are made, and the increasingly influential role of think tanks. The event included participation by 33 scholars and former government officials from China and the United States.

In April 2004, **CSIS/ISP** sponsored a bilateral conference in Washington entitled **"Chinese Images of the United States."** This conference built upon a 2002 conference on "China in the U.S. Political Imagination." The 2004 conference explored the role of images in U.S.-China relations, specifically how Chinese view the United States and the American people, the origins of those images and how those images have influenced Sino-American relations. Chinese partners included CASS and Fudan University's Center for American Studies. It was an open conference with approximately 100 participants from the academic community, press, business and government. The resulting book, also called "Chinese Images of the United States," was published in May 2005.

Immediately following its May 2004 conference with the International Department of the Chinese Communist Party, **The China Policy Program of the George Washington University's Elliott School of International Relations** and the participants in that meeting held two additional conferences with other Chinese partners. The first, entitled **"Perspectives on the Evolving Global Balance of Power,"** was held in June 2004 in Shanghai with the Shanghai Institute of International Studies. The second, entitled **"The Future of American-China-Russia Relations,"** was also held in Shanghai that month, with Fudan University's Center for American Studies.

In January 2006, **Harvard University's Fairbank Center** co-sponsored with Peking University a major conference entitled **"The Rise of China: Theory and Practice."** This project sought to bring together Chinese and American specialists of international politics to participate in an international research conference. The project promoted a scholarly community among international relations scholars who share a research interest in power transitions and peaceful change as well as in contemporary policy issues. It will ultimately publish a book on this subject.

In November 2005, **The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation** co-sponsored a conference in Shanghai called **"Perception and Strategy: China-U.S.-India Relations and Interactions"** with the Shanghai Institute of International Studies. The focus was on recent events in South Asia, including the issue of China and India and their recent rapprochement, and U.S. strategies and policies in this part of the world.

The **National Bureau of Asian Research** held a workshop at Tsinghua University in January 2006 entitled **"China's Technology Standards Policy."** In preparation for this conference, NBR assembled a bi-national taskforce of eight leading scholars from the United States and the PRC to examine indigenous technology standards development in China and the resulting policy implications for both countries. The conference brought together members from the American and Chinese governments, academics from a variety of fields and members of the private sector to analyze and assess China's standards-forming process and strategies in specific fields. Findings of this workshop were presented in a final summary report, "Standards of Power."

The **National Committee on American Foreign Policy** and the **Asia Society** co-sponsored a 1½ day closed-door meeting on "**U.S.-China Relations and the Taiwan Issue"** in November 2005 in New York City. Officials from both Beijing and Washington attended parts of the conference. Discussions focused on both cross-Strait relations and on broader U.S.-China relations, comparing U.S. and Chinese perspectives.

IV. Multilateral Conferences

The U.S. Department of Defense's **Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies** organizes frequent conferences related to Asian security issues. Some of these conferences have involved Chinese security experts, including think tank, Ministry of Foreign Affairs or PLA representatives. The Center draws upon its resident China specialists to identify appropriate Chinese participants and sponsors their travel to Honolulu. Recent conferences in which Chinese experts have participated include **"Terrorism, Geopolitics and Multinational Security Cooperation in Central Asia"** and **"Inter-Korean Reconciliation and Cooperation: Challenges and Prospects."**

The **Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies** at the **Brookings Institution** convenes an annual **Regional Forum**, held each year in a different Asian city. These forums include participation by experts from a number of Asian countries, including China. These Regional Forums are funded by internal resources as well as local donors in each host country.

Brookings' new **John L. Thornton China Center** develops independent analysis and policy recommendations to help U.S. and Chinese leaders address key long-term challenges. It was launched in September 2005, with a one-day conference in Washington, D.C. entitled **"China's Emergence."** The economic, political and security implications of rising Chinese power on America and on the Asia Pacific region were analyzed by speakers from the United States, China, Japan, South Korea,

Singapore and India. Through the Thornton Center, Brookings has opened an office at Tsinghua University.

In November 2003, **CSIS** held two two-day multilateral meetings in Seoul, Korea. The first was entitled **"Assessing Key Trends in U.S.-China-Korea Relations: Implications for Korean Peninsula Security."** This in-depth discussion among 26 key government officials, military experts, and policy analysts from the United States, China and Korea addressed current trends and their implications for regional security. The second event, co-hosted by **The Asia Foundation** and several Korean and Japanese institutes, was a conference entitled **"North Korea, Multilateralism, and the Future of the Peninsula."** It included perspectives on North Korea from the United States, Korea, Japan, Germany, the UK, Italy, Russia and China. Topics of discussion included lessons of the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) process, multilateralism and North Korea, North Korean nuclear reality, responses from international society, North Korea's choice and strategic responses, and the future of multilateralism in Asia.

The **National Bureau on Asian Research** held a conference in Beijing in January 2006 entitled **"Regional Economic Implications of D.P.R.K. Security Behavior: The 'Bold Switchover' Concept."** Conference participants – representatives from the United States, South Korea, Japan, Russia and China – examined the ways in which a hypothetical relaxation of North Korea's security posture would affect regional trade, investment, output, and employment. They also explored the benefits that would accrue to the North Korean economy, and touched upon some of the potential regional responses in terms of financial aid.

In December 2005, the **National Committee on U.S. - China Relations** worked together with the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations to sponsor the first bilateral conference to compare the foreign aid policies of China and the United States. Four American specialists in the field, along with two Beijing-based international experts, met with Chinese academics, practitioners, and government officials from relevant ministries in the day and a half meeting. A monograph based on some of the discussion at the meeting, as well as additional research and interviews, was published.

In June 2005, the **Stanley Foundation** co-sponsored a conference in Berlin with the German Council on Foreign Relations entitled **"Future Multilateral Economic Cooperation With the D.P.R.K."** This conference brought together representatives of involved governments, think tanks, and policymakers to discuss opportunities and challenges for economic engagement with North Korea. Representatives from Chinese institutions, including the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and the Shanghai Institute of International Studies, took part. The Foundation also co-sponsored with CSIS a conference on **Asian Architecture** in November 2006 that included Chinese participation.

V. Delegations

The **Atlantic Council of the United States** regularly sends high-level delegations of former military and defense policy leaders to Beijing and Taipei to examine long-term issues in the relationship between the United States, Mainland China and Taiwan. These delegations hold extensive talks with civilian and military officials, representatives of non-governmental institutions, and academics in both cities. Upon returning to the United States, each delegation produces a policy paper on the current state of U.S.-China security relations. These projects take place roughly once every three years; the most recent one was in September/October 2005.

Since 2003, the **HIV/AIDS Task Force**, run by **CSIS' Freeman Chair,** has sponsored an exchange of delegations with the Chinese Ministry of Health. In January 2003 and April 2004, CSIS organized two delegations of senior U.S. and international officials to China. In June 2005, a delegation of Health Ministry officials traveled to Washington to participate in meetings convened by CSIS. During this visit, individuals from the public and private sector participated in a roundtable discussion with the Vice Minister. CSIS is planning another delegation to China in June 2007, which will include leaders from the public and private sectors including scientists and doctors. This exchange is intended to make the U.S. and Chinese policy communities aware of the problem of HIV/AIDS in China, and to integrate the issue into U.S. China policy.

Independent consultant **Bonnie Glaser** organizes an annual two-week delegation of officials from the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) to the United States. The schedule for these delegations results from consultation between Ms. Glaser and CICIR. Ms. Glaser seeks to ensure that the CICIR scholars are not always meeting with the same set of people and identifies new and interesting networking opportunities for them. The delegation always travels to Washington, D.C., and often to other locations in the United States, such as New York or the West Coast. CICIR also hosts Ms. Glaser for about two weeks, once or twice each year as she conducts research and drafts reports on Chinese security and foreign policy issues. The purpose of this exchange, which has been going on since 1986, is to promote understanding of Chinese views of the international security environment and the thinking that underpins Chinese foreign and security policies.

The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation's Congressional Study Group on Asia program has enabled a bipartisan group of members of Congress to make trips to Asia. These trips allow senators and members of Congress to build expertise on U.S.-Asia issues by meeting one-on-one with a wide range of government officials, business leaders, economists, scholars and the media. Though this program was very active earlier this decade, in the past three years only one trip has taken place: Senator Max Baucus' visit to Beijing and Shanghai in 2004, accompanied by a 24-member trade delegation.

The **National Committee on American Foreign Policy** (NCAFP) has organized three delegations to China and Taiwan since 2003 to discuss with high-ranking officials the current state of U.S.-Mainland China-Taiwan relations. These delegations have consisted of well-known academics and think-tank scholars as well as former senior foreign policy officials. Delegation meetings are often reported to top government leaders on both sides of the Strait, since the Mainland China and Taiwan interlocutors are aware that all NCAFP delegations are briefed prior to their trip by senior officials in Washington D.C. Upon their return to the United States, delegation members report on their meetings to key foreign policy-makers and draft a report, which is posted on the NCAFP website.

The **National Committee on U.S.-China Relations (NCUSCR)** has sponsored several delegations (most of which included one to two day workshops) that have sent American HIV/AIDS specialists to China and brought Chinese focusing on various HIV/AIDS issues to the United States. While these primarily focus on specific goals (such as coverage of HIV/AIDS by the media), as with the CSIS HIV/AIDS program, the hope is to integrate the issue into the Sino-American dialogue.

The **National Committee** has resumed sending Congressional delegations to China, beginning with a January 2006 trip for the founders of the recently formed US-China Working Group. Delegation members met with several Chinese senior officials in four cities, as well as with American diplomats and business leaders; was the first foreign delegation to be permitted to visit China's manned space launch facility in the Gobi Desert. NCUSCR's Chinese partner in arranging this trip was the National People's Congress. Other delegations for congressmen and staffers are planned for late 2006 and early 2007.

The **National Committee** also has made study trips to China available for potential candidates in the 2008 U.S. presidential election. Senator John Edwards made such a trip in October 2006. While in China, the candidates meet with top-level Chinese government officials, business leaders and NGO representatives. The purpose of these trips is to acquaint presidential candidates with current issues in China's politics, development and relationship with the United States, so as to help ensure a more informed debate on U.S. policy toward China during the upcoming presidential campaign. The Committee's Chinese partner for this project is the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries.

The **U.S. National Defense University (NDU)** sends four or five student delegations to China or Taiwan every year. NDU typically receives about three PLA delegations in return. In the past, these delegations have visited U.S. military facilities including the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, the U.S. NDU in Washington, DC, the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego and the Pacific Command in Honolulu.

In 2004 and 2005, the **U.S.-China Policy Foundation (USCPF)** organized an exchange of delegations with the China Institute for International Strategic Studies (CIISS). In December 2004, USCPF sent a security studies delegation to China, including USCPF staff and former high-ranking U.S. government and military officials. During their time in China the delegation members engaged in discussions with top members of China's military and engaged in a two-day workshop with CIISS during which they exchanged views on U.S.-China security issues and discussed ways in which military-to-military relations could be improved. In September 2005, USCPF co-hosted, with the Center for Naval Analyses, the visit of a delegation from CIISS. The five-person delegation included current and former high-ranking Chinese military officials and CIISS staff. The delegation visited Washington, where it participated in a full-day seminar on Asian security affairs with the China Studies Center of the CNA Corporation and a second seminar at the U.S. National Defense University. The delegation also traveled to Philadelphia, Princeton, and New York.

VI. Visiting Fellowships

Bringing military officers and foreign policy scholars to America from the PRC and Taiwan was one of the central purposes of the **Senior Fellows Program** of the **Atlantic Council of the United States** in the 1980s and early 1990s, when the program was managed by the Council's Asia Program. Between 1994 and 1996, when the program's cooperation with China reached its peak, the Council hosted 10 Chinese senior fellows. During the 1990s, the program expanded to include fellows from other regions such as South Asia and Eastern Europe, reducing the focus on China. Several years ago, the Senior Fellows Program was made independent of the Asia Program, further reducing the emphasis on East Asian security issues. Since 2000, the Council has hosted only one or two Chinese fellows per year, and it has not brought a PLA officer to the U.S. since 1997, apparently due to a lack of commitment on the Chinese side.

Under the **Visiting Fellows Program** of the **Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies** at the **Brookings Institution**, up to six fellows per year from Northeast Asia spend ten months with the Center to conduct individual and collaborative research, interact with the U.S. policymaking community and actively take part in an array of policy-oriented seminars, roundtables and discussions at Brookings and elsewhere. These visiting fellows are competitively selected and are drawn from middle to senior ranks of governments, think tanks, universities, the media and business communities of Northeast Asia. The Center hosts fellows from Russia, Japan, Korea, China, Taiwan and Hong Kong. In a given year, there are usually one or two Mainland Chinese fellows at Brookings. Through the CNAPS Working Paper Series, the Fellows present the findings of their individual research projects. Prior to 2005, the fellows also collaborated with Brookings scholars to produce the annual *Brookings Northeast Asia Survey*. (The *Survey* was recently discontinued.) In the spring of each year, the visiting fellows participate in a multi-city tour in the United States, presenting their research and expanding their professional contacts at policy organizations and academic institutions. Once a year, CNAPS fellows hold a public roundtable discussion on "Perceptions of U.S. Foreign Policy in Asia."

From 2003 to 2004, the **Carnegie Endowment's Kimsey Scholars Program** hosted five visiting scholars from the Central Party School's Institute of International Strategic Studies for two months. The initiative, funded by the Kimsey Foundation, was designed to influence political reform in China and inform U.S. policymakers about Chinese political trends, enhance the work of the Endowment's China Program and bring current, first-hand experience to Washington policy discussions on China. The program was discontinued after one year due to funding difficulties.

Pacific Forum CSIS occasionally hosts visiting fellows from its partner institutes in China and oversees the Vasey Fellowship Program for Asian college students and recent graduates to serve as interns or junior researchers at the Forum.

The **China Policy Program** of **The George Washington University's Elliott School** hosts one to three visiting scholars from China per academic year for periods of between six to twelve months. These scholars have come from institutions such as the PLA Academy of Military Sciences, PLA National Defense University, China Institute of International Strategic Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, China Foreign Affairs University, Peking University, and, the International Department of the CCP. At the Elliott School they are expected to produce a research paper of at least 25 pages. They are often funded by research grants from sources such as the Ford Foundation and the Fulbright Scholars Program; sometimes their home institutions provide support. CPP provides office space, computers and access to the School's academic resources.

Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government sponsors the **New World Fellowship Program**, which provides four-month visiting fellowships to two to five Chinese government officials per year. These visiting fellows conduct research at the Kennedy School in cooperation with the school's faculty, focusing on a particular research topic. They may also conduct research in New York, Washington or elsewhere. At the end of their fellowship, they present papers and give talks on their research. New World Fellows also take part in all policy dialogues sponsored by the Kennedy School. Visiting scholars from Tsinghua University's School of Public Policy and Management spend a semester or two at the Kennedy School as part of an informal, but institutionalized exchange program.

The **Kettering Foundation** engages in a periodic exchange of staff members with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Beijing University, which has become more frequent over the past several years. Visiting Chinese individuals are normally in residence at Kettering for five to six months, while Kettering staff members' fellowships in China vary in length.

Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC) hosts visiting fellows from numerous foreign countries, including a number of Chinese scholars in residence with the **Project on Peace and Cooperation**. CISAC fellowships are competitive and fellows are chosen based on the research topics they propose. While at the Center, they engage in research and writing. By the end of their fellowship, they are expected to submit a research paper, and are sometimes asked to give seminars and presentations. Fellows coming from China to the Project on Peace and Cooperation at CISAC have come from the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, the China Academy of Engineering Physics (the Ninth Academy), the Central Party School, the National Defense University, and the Foreign Ministry.

The **Stimson Center** regularly hosts visitors from the and Taiwan as part of its **Visiting Fellows Program**. Most fellows are mid-career academics at Chinese universities specializing in areas such as U.S.-China relations, non-proliferation issues and international security. The Stimson Center recruits individuals who show promise of being able to contribute creatively to the public debate on national security in China and in the region as a whole. Chinese fellows arrive one at a time, and stay at the Center for three- to six-month stints in an intensive work/study program that includes meetings with government officials and Washington-based policy analysts working on regional security and related issues. Since funding for this program ended in 2000, the Stimson Center now accepts Chinese senior fellows on the condition that they find their own research grants; Stimson provides the space and the facilities for each visiting fellow.

The **Union of Concerned Scientists** runs a program that brings natural scientists and engineers to the United States to study the policy implications of an arms control topic of their choice and places them in various universities and think tanks across the country.

The **University of Denver's Center for China-U.S. Cooperation** sponsors an ongoing visiting scholars program, inviting international affairs experts from Chinese universities and policy institutes to conduct research at the University for three months to one year.

Some of the surveyed organizations, including **CSIS' Freeman Chair** and **Harvard University's Fairbank Center**, have hosted individual visiting fellows, but these organizations do not have formal visiting fellows programs.

VII. Academic Exchanges and Training Programs

The **East-West Center** organizes the **Asia Pacific Leadership Program (APLP)**, which seeks to provide future leaders with the knowledge, skills, experiences and supportive community needed to achieve success. APLP participants are potential or current leaders from over 20 Asia-Pacific countries, including China. Participants study the societies and issues of the Asia Pacific region and are trained to exercise leadership in a variety of cultural, geographic and institutional environments. The duration of the program is two semesters and a regional field study. During the first semester, participants complete courses on core regional issues, leadership and professional development; during the second semester, participants complete an internship or a specialized research project.

Georgetown University conducts an ongoing program with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Beijing under which the University hosts one or two mid-career Chinese diplomats at the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy (ISD) for one or two semesters. They are part of ISD's **Associates Program**, which includes the participation of up to 15 associates or fellows per year from the U.S. government and foreign government agencies. Associates do their own research, teach students in the School of Foreign Service, provide students with career counseling and professional expertise, supervise the year-long research of seven Junior Fellows in Diplomacy and assist the Institute in its ongoing research program.

Harvard University's Kennedy School sponsors an **HIV/AIDS Public Policy Training Program** for national, provincial and local Chinese government officials. The program provides an overview of the economic and social impacts of the HIV/AIDS epidemic worldwide and lessons from the international response. JFK's partner in this effort is Tsinghua University's School of Public Policy and Management, which is the site of most of the training. Harvard, with the support of a group of public policy, law, public health and HIV/AIDS experts, has developed a two-week curriculum on the key lessons of the international experience with the HIV/AIDS epidemic. This program was launched in 2003 at a Tsinghua-Harvard planning meeting that brought together experts from China and the United States to discuss China's HIV/AIDS epidemic and the specific requirements of the training curriculum. Three training sessions have been held so far, in Beijing, Shenzhen and Yunnan.

Since 1996, the **East Asia Nonproliferation Program** at the **Monterey Institute's** Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS) has been bringing leading East Asian experts and government officials to its campus to receive training and conduct research on nonproliferation issues. This visiting fellows program combines research, training, dialogue, capacity building and networking opportunities that the fellows carry back to their home institutions. The centerpiece of the program is a specially designed 10-12 week lecture series presented by CNS senior staff members. Visiting fellows work with designated mentors at CNS to prepare and complete a substantive research project on a nonproliferation topic. The fellows present their research before CNS colleagues in the final weeks of their program. Since 2003, CNS has welcomed nine Chinese senior fellows on non-proliferation issues and another four on export control issues.

The **Nautilus Institute** has sponsored three training sessions in China on renewable energy for North Korean energy officials. These trainings are hosted and implemented by Tsinghua University's Energy and Environmental Technology Center. The most recent of these trainings was held in Shanghai in May 2005 on energy-efficient lighting.

Since 2002, the **Union of Concerned Scientists** has sponsored an annual **Summer Arms Control Seminar** at Tsinghua University, co-sponsored with the University's Institute of International Studies. This week-long annual training course for non-experts introduces international arms control issues to a select group of 30-50 young Chinese professionals whose work is connected to security issues. It includes military officers teaching at Chinese war colleges, researchers at Chinese government think tanks, instructors at Chinese universities and reporters for major Chinese news organizations. The goal of the seminar is to raise awareness of the role of arms control in the maintenance of global security and the protection of Chinese national interests.

The **Center for China-U.S. Cooperation (CCUSC)** at the **University of Denver** has a relationship with Peking University and Renmin University, whereby Chinese faculty members come to the Graduate School of International Studies to teach courses in Chinese politics, China's political economy, East Asian security issues, Sino-American relations and other topics. For the past three years, the CCUSC has also sent faculty members and Ph.D. candidates to teach in Renmin University's MA program in international studies. This is the first program of its kind in China to be taught in English.

In 2005 and 2006, the **Center for International Trade and Security** at the **University of Georgia** conducted three training programs on export controls for Chinese scholars and government officials from the Ministries of Commerce, Defense and Customs. The Center also provided two rounds of training to Chinese Customs officials and two workshops for Chinese dual-use industry personnel. Most of this work was done in collaboration with the China Arms Control and Disarmament Association.

The **U.S.-China Policy Foundation** organizes an annual seminar series and trip to China, called the **Policy-makers Program**, for congressional staffers to enhance their understanding of China and Sino-American relations. The program includes a lecture series with presentations by distinguished American China specialists on security, political, economic and other issues dealing with China. It is specifically designed for staffers who do not have extensive background in U.S.-China relations and could professionally benefit from such an experience. During the trips, the congressional staff delegation has the opportunity to meet and discuss various issues with Chinese government officials, business executives, academics and students.

APPENDIX C: ACTIVITIES OF SURVEYED PROGRAMS

ORGANIZATION	BILATERAL DIALOGUES	MULTILATERAL DIALOGUES	BILATERAL CONFERENCES	MULTILATERAL CONFERENCES	DELEGATIONS	VISITING FELLOWS	ACADEMIC EXCHANGES
The Asia Foundation		X					
Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies	X			X			
Asia Society		X	X				
The Atlantic Council of the United States	X	X	X		X	X	
Bonnie Glaser					X		
The Brookings Institution		X		X		X	
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	X		X			X	
Center for Strategic and International Studies, Freeman Chair	X		X		X	X	
Center for Strategic and International Studies, International Security Program	X	X	X	X			
The CNA Corporation	X						
East-West Center		X					X
Foreign Policy Research Institute		X					
Georgetown University							X
The George Washington University	X		X			X	
Harvard University, Fairbank Center for East Asian Research			X			X	
Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government	X					X	X
Kettering Foundation	X					X	
The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation		X	X		X		
Monterey Institute of International Studies							X

Organization	Bilateral Dialogues	Multilateral Dialogues	Bilateral Conferences	Multilateral Conferences	Delegations	Visiting Fellows	Academic Exchanges
National Academy of Sciences	X						
The National Bureau of Asian Research			X	X			
National Committee on American Foreign Policy			X		X		
National Committee on U.S.-China Relations	X		X	X	X		
National Defense University	X				X		
Nautilus Institute		X					X
Pacific Forum CSIS	X	X				X	
Rand Corporation	X						
Stanford University, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Project on Peace and Cooperation		X				X	
The Stanley Foundation				X			
The Henry L. Stimson Center						X	
Union of Concerned Scientists	X	X				X	X
The U.S.-China Policy Foundation					X		X
University of California at San Diego		X					
University of Colorado at Boulder	X						
University of Denver	X					X	X
The University of Georgia							X

APPENDIX D: PROGRAM CO-HOSTING BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE INSTITUTES SINCE 2003

Total	TU	SIIS	SASS	PU	PLA	NPC	MoH	FU	CRF	CPAPD	CPAFFC	CIISS	CIIS	CICIR	CFISS	CCP	CASS	CAIFC	BEIH	
1													X							AF
5	X	X												X			X	X		ACUS
0																				APCSS
0																				AS
1														X						BG
1				X																BRK
1									X											CEIP
2							X							X						CSIS/F
5				X				X	X					X			X			CSIS/I
2								X						X						CSIS/P
7		X			X			X				X		X	X		X			CNA
0																				EWC
1		X																		FPRI
0																				GU
4		X						X					X			X				GWU
1				X									X							HARV/F
0																				HARV/J
2				X													X			KETT
1		X																		MANS
0																				MIIS
2					X					X										NAS
1	X																			NBAR
0																				NCAFP
4						X					X			X	X					NCUSCR
1					X															NDU
1	X																			NAUT
1									X											RAND
0																				STAN
1			X																	STFD
0																				STIM
2	X																		X	UCS
1												X								USCPF
1													X							UCSD
1																	X			UCOL
1													X							UDEN
0																				UGA
	4	5	1	4	3	1	1	4	3	1	1	2	4	7	2	1	5	1	1	**Total**

Please note that this table includes only cooperation on Track II dialogues, conferences and delegations. Some of the surveyed institutions do not show a Chinese partner in this table; this is due to one of two reasons. First, some only host activities outside China and invite Chinese participants on an individual basis without the assistance of a Chinese organizational partner. Second, some institutions host only visiting fellows programs or academic exchanges, which are covered by this survey but not this table.

Key to Abbreviations for Appendix D

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

AF	The Asia Foundation
ACUS	Asia Program, The Atlantic Council of the United States
APCSS	Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies
AS	Asia Society
BG	Bonnie Glaser (independent consultant)
BRK	The Brookings Institution
CEIP	China Program, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
CSIS/F	Freeman Chair in China Studies, Center for Strategic and International Studies
CSIS/I	International Security Program, CSIS
CSIS/P	Pacific Forum, CSIS
CNA	The CNA Corporation
EWC	East-West Center
FPRI	Foreign Policy Research Institute
GU	Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University
GWU	China Policy Program, Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University
HARV/F	John King Fairbank Center For East Asian Research, Harvard University
HARV/J	John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
KETT	Kettering Foundation
MANS	The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation
MIIS	Monterey Institute for International Studies
NAS	Committee on International Security and Arms Control, National Academy of Sciences
NBAR	National Bureau of Asian Research
NCAFP	National Committee on American Foreign Policy
NCUSCR	National Committee on United States-China Relations
NDU	United States National Defense University
NAUT	Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability
RAND	RAND Corporation
STAN	Stanley Foundation
STFD	Stanford University, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Project on Peace and Cooperation
STIM	The Henry L. Stimson Center
UCS	Union of Concerned Scientists
USCPF	United States-China Policy Foundation
UCSD	Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, University of California at San Diego
UCOL	University of Colorado
UDEN	Center for China-U.S. Cooperation, University of Denver
UGA	The University of Georgia

CHINESE INSTITUTIONS

BEIH	Beihang University
CAIFC	Chinese Association for International Friendly Contact
CACDA	Chinese Arms Control and Disarmament Association
CASS	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
CCP	International Department, Chinese Communist Party
CFISS	China Foundation for International and Strategic Studies
CICIR	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations
CIIS	China Institute for International Studies
CIISS	China Institute for International Strategic Studies
CPAFFC	Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries
CPAPD	Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament
CRF	China Reform Forum
FU	Fudan University
MoH	Chinese Ministry of Health
NPC	National People's Congress
PLA	People's Liberation Army
PU	Peking University
SASS	Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences
SIIS	Shanghai Institute for International Studies
TU	Tsinghua University

APPENDIX E: FUNDING SINCE 2003

	ALF	AF	CC	CF	CK	CS	CG	CN	FGF	FF	FRF	FS	GF	GM	IR	IF	JF	JU	KF	KK	KIF	KI	KOF	LEF	LF	MAF	MLF	MC	PF	PD	RF	SPF	SRF	SF	USP	USC	UF	USG	WJ	Total
AF																																								0
ACUS		X			X																				X					X					X			X	6
APCSS																																		X			X	X	1
AS				X									X											X					X				X						4
BG																																					X			1
BRK	X			X					X		X				X	X				X			X		X				X		X			X					12
CEIP				X											X						X								X				X						4
CSIS/F				X									X						X								X												4
CSIS/I				X						X													X		X										X			X	6
CSIS/P		X						X							X		X	X				X	X																7
CNA															X																						X			2
EWC											X																													1
FPRI																																								0
GU															X																									1
GWU				X						X		X		X																						X			X	8
HARV/F										X																														1
HARV/J				X		X	X			X					X																					X			X	7
KETT															X																									1
MANS		X								X					X			X					X		X										X					8
MIIS																																									0
NAS			X																							X														2
NBAR				X																					X															2
NCAFP										X															X										X					3
NCUSCR				X											X											X														3
NDU																																					X	X		1
NAUT																									X												X	X		2
RAND				X											X																						X			3
STAN															X																									1
STFD															X																							X			2
STIM										X																														1
UCS										X																X			X											4
USCPF											X																													1
UCSD																																						X			1
UCOL										X																		X												2
UDEN			X																																					1
UGA										X																														1
Total	**1**	**3**	**2**	**10**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**10**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**11**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**4**	**1**	**6**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**11**	**2**	**Total**

Key to Abbreviations for Appendix E

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

AF	The Asia Foundation
ACUS	Asia Program, Atlantic Council of the United States
APCSS	Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies
AS	Asia Society
BG	Bonnie Glaser (independent consultant)
BRK	Brookings Institution
CEIP	China Program, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
CSIS/F	Freeman Chair in China Studies, Center for Strategic and International Studies
CSIS/I	International Security Program, CSIS
CSIS/P	Pacific Forum,CSIS
CNA	The CNA Corporation
EWC	East-West Center
FPRI	Foreign Policy Research Institute
GU	Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University
GWU	China Policy Program, The Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University
HARV/F	John King Fairbank Center For Asian Research, Harvard University
HARV/J	John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
KETT	Kettering Foundation
MANS	The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation
MIIS	Monterrey Institute for International Studies
NAS	Committee on International Security and Arms Control, National Academy of Sciences
NBAR	National Bureau of Asian Research
NCAFP	National Committee on American Foreign Policy
NCUSCR	National Committee on United States-China Relations
NDU	United States National Defense University
NAUT	Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability
RAND	RAND Corporation
STAN	Stanley Foundation
STFD	Stanford University, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Project on Peace and Cooperation
STIM	Henry L. Stimson Center
UCS	Union of Concerned Scientists
USCPF	United States-China Policy Foundation
UCSD	Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, University of California at San Diego
UCOL	University of Colorado
UDEN	Center for China-U.S. Cooperation, University of Denver
UGA	University of Georgia

FUNDERS

ALF	Alcoa Foundation
AF	Asia Foundation
CC	Carnegie Corporation of New York
CF	Corporate Funding
CK	Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation
CS	China Scholarship Council
CG	Chinese Government
CN	CNA Corporation
FGF	Folger Foundation
FF	Ford Foundation
FRF	Freeman Foundation
FS	Fulbright Scholars Program
GF	Gates Foundation
GM	German Marshall Fund
IR	Internal Resources
IF	Itoh Foundation
JF	Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership
JU	Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission
KF	Kaiser Family Foundation
KK	Keizai Koho Center
KIF	Kimsey Foundation
KI	Korea Economic Institute of America
KOF	Korea Foundation
LEF	Lee Foundation
LF	Luce Foundation
MAF	MacArthur Foundation
MLF	MacLellan Foundation
MC	Mershon Center
PF	Ploughshares Foundation
PD	Private Donations
RF	Rockefeller Foundation
SPF	Sasakawa Peace Foundation
SRF	Smith Richardson Foundation
SF	Starr Foundation
UF	Unspecified Foundations
USC	U.S.-China Policy Foundation
USP	United States Institute of Peace
USG	United States Government
WJ	W. Alton Jones Foundation

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON U.S. - CHINA RELATIONS
71 WEST 23RD STREET, SUITE 1901
NEW YORK, NY 10010

PHONE: 212-645-9677
FAX: 212-645-1695
WEB: WWW.NCUSCR.ORG
EMAIL: INFO@NCUSCR.ORG