

*Gordon Chang:* Thank you Jean and APARC and FSI for organizing this panel. And I hope I won't disappoint too many of you, because I'm not the Gordon Chang that appears on Fox News. If you were anticipating him, sorry. We have different views, but maybe you were expecting to hear from him. So in all due respect to my colleagues on the panel, I want to be very candid.

In offering my overall reaction and assessment to the report, which I find very regrettable and deeply troubling. I fear that it contributes to a rapidly growing atmosphere of suspicion against Chinese Americans by profiling them as existing or potential threats to America as potential—and both of you have used the term "potential" or "possible" throughout your presentations--and I think this is the issue of looking at Chinese in America runs throughout the report, not just from section three. And in all due respect, I have to say I believe the report is marred by substantial, by unsubstantiated allegations, guilt-by-association argument, inaccuracies, innuendo, and confused history and contextualization.

So I know those are big charges and we can only begin to talk about them here. So, in sum, it paints--it uses a very broad brush in addressing these important issues that you've raised. So let me offer some specifics. Is this--how do I get this?

*Panelist:* Oh. Thank you.

*Mr. Chang:* All right, so I assume most of you have not seen the report, so I thought the best, most constructive thing to do would be to go through some sections. I'm not going to read this entire thing, but you can read this. This is from page 41 of the report, and I'll focus on the last, bold two sentences at the end. The most troublesome are the two--this is about the Confucius Institute, which Liz just mentioned, there is a Confucius Institute here at Stanford. If you go out the front door, you can almost see it.

It's visible right from here. And this report says that the Confucius Institute is different institutions and the provisions of the contract forbids Confucius Institutes from conducting any activities that contravene Chinese law, while the other requires that the enabling contract remain confidential, making oversight by the academic community difficult. The leaders of the Confucius Institute here at Stanford say this is absolutely wrong. This is not the way Confucius Institute operates at Stanford and none of them were ever consulted about the Confucius Institute, how it operates, which is a completely independent. It did receive money, but no

strings attached. This is just a falsehood. Now there was also the issue, the problem of contextualization. That was true—undeniably true that there has been a sea shift in sentiment away from Taipei from the ROC, towards the PRC among Chinese Americans. Why is this?

Well, for most Chinese Americans, Beijing represents China. It is the capital of the Chinese country, not Taipei, and this was confirmed in 1979—40 years ago, when the United States confirmed normalized relations with the PRC. The flags flying on Chinatown reflect this simple fact that many Chinese Americans accept Beijing as the capital of China, and not the ROC. Now if you read this sentence, you get a very different sort of sense or interpretation of this phenomenon. “The Chinese government has also sought to co-opt local Chinese American community’s associations to serve its goals.”

“In the past, organizations such as regional associations, known as *Tongs* (同乡会) —” I have to go for some specificity here, for many of you don’t know this, but this is just wrong. *Tongs* are not regional associations. *Tongs* were civic, fraternal, criminal organizations that long existed in Chinese American community. You’ve all heard about *Tong* wars. Regional associations are the benevolent associations based upon their origin of Chinese in China. The confusion here, and this evidence, it’s evidence that the person who wrote this does not know the Chinese community, says the *Tongs*, using “*tongxianghui* (同乡会), *Tong* means here, as an adjective, commonplace society, versus *Tong* which is Cantonese, which means Association or Hall, which is a noun. These are two completely different words.

So the *Tongs* “had been generally close to the Nationalist government of China.” That’s true of the regional associations and the civic associations. “In San Francisco, however, that began to change as early as the 1980s, when *Soon Suey Sing*” – I don’t know what that is. There is something called *Suey Sing Tong*, which you see at the bottom. *Suey Sing Tong* is one of the Cantonese *Tongs*, which was found at 1867. It was a merchants’ association—it is a merchants’ association throughout the United States.

My uncle used to be one of the leaders of the *Suey Sing Tong* who raised the red flag, the communist flag over his organization was my Uncle Joe. So I know Uncle Joe, some of you probably ate in his restaurants, Imperial Palace restaurant, Tommy Toy’s Haute Cuisine Chinoise on Montgomery Street. That was Uncle Joe and

he was the head of the *Suey Sing Tong* who used to carry a gun because he was threatened by nationalist officials because of his sympathy with Beijing. And so he took this radical step of raising the red flag over his *Suey Sing Tong*. A “second *Tong* declared its fealty to Beijing.” I really have a problem with “fealty,” fealty is a word that describes the loyalty of a vassal to a lord. This is a buzzword. This is a provocative word. It does not have to be used “and competition broke out between the PRC” and so forth. Talking about it and so it is true.

You can see over San Francisco Chinatown a lot of the five star flag over China, but that reflects the sea change of sentiment. It does not reflect somehow that these Chinese organizations are agents of Beijing. And then you go down and see the rest of this. Now, the context is that the ROC and Taiwan controlled Chinatown with an iron hand for decades.

In 1970, when I had just graduated from undergraduate and I moved to New York Chinatown to become as President Obama did in Chicago, community organizer. And I was liberal along the left and went and worked for the New York Public Schools as a school teacher and one night when I was walking to New York Chinatown with my girlfriend, thugs jumped me, beat me up, stabbed me in the back, and kicked me to the ground, and I thought I was going to die. And these thugs were connected to the local kung-fu school, which are all connected to the Nationalist. Everyone knew, this is the way the Nationalist Party operated. And so the reaction against the ROC, in part, is a response to those decades of the heavy-handed way the Nationalist Party ruled over Chinese Americans.

Now it's very different now with the different events in Taiwan, but this is the context of these flags, and the sea change among Chinese Americans. You also remember, in 1981, Professor Chen Wen-Chen, who was a professor at Carnegie Mellon, was visiting in Taiwan. He was critical of the Taiwan regime. His body was found at the base of the national security building. He had been murdered and eventually the investigation went all the way up to the high security bureau in the ROC government. In 1984, Henry Liu in Daly City was out in his front yard. Two guys came up to him and murdered him right in his front yard. Again, connected to the ROC. This is how the ROC used to operate. It doesn't operate that anymore. The PRC does not operate this way anymore, but this is the context for the continuing civil war between the Nationalists and the Communists, which does affect Chinese Americans, because this is an unresolved issue of the recognition of who is the Chinese government.

Now, I have just a few moments left— a couple of minutes. Last I'll just have to say the poor, I really do feel and I, and I respect the sentiment with Larry said, it's not their intention. But I believe, the report seriously underestimates the tarring of Chinese as agents of a foreign power. Over the past month and a half, since the report, I've gotten e-mails or phone calls from about 50 friends around the country. Chinese American, my relatives, my cousins, uncles, colleagues. I was down in Atlanta down at the Carter Center. We had an event there just for the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of normalization, spoke to different Chinese American scholars at Emory and many different universities, and every one of them expressed alarm at this report.

Now these are sober-minded, serious professional people. We're not prone to exaggeration or hysteria, but these people are really fearful for what the tone of the report, the way the report is written, the innuendos in the report, these unsubstantiated allegations as I said, and one of them sent to me this link. Now, I had not heard about, this is in *Foreign Policy*. I don't know if you guys have seen this, this was just a year and a half ago. This is an article, the next internment: will Chinese in the U.S. be rounded up. I don't think that's possible, but the fact that this article has appeared in the public press reflects a serious discussion, at least concern, about this. Now the article goes on to make the case that it is probably not likely, because there're just too many Chinese Americans to have a repeat of what happened to Japanese Americans in World War II, but the article appears and this is what the discussion now sweeping different circles of Chinese Americans.

*[End of Audio]*