CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just a few little pointers there. The kind of two halves -- we don't mean to do A, then B during the meeting, but some discussion about principles. What do we mean by "principles"? In general, what sort of high-level things should we think about when the University evaluate a proposed IDDP?

We get quickly into ethics, and there is a University statement on ethical expectations for international programs that came out in the fall of 2019. It kind of targets faculty working as individuals. I think of that as kind of a good starting place and maybe that could be ratcheted up to something larger that applies at the unit level.

Then we have principles associated with senate engagement. What sorts of things should come our way? How should we talk about them? Are there guidelines that we can formulate so that we have productive and timely discussions in the future?

Procedures. There is an interesting vetting process. It's very extensive. It has lots of things in there that I think the faculty would like to see, but we don't see them well enough. Part of the discussion here, part of going forward, I think, will mean reviewing that sequence of approvals, making sure it's clear, making sure who sees what, who leaves what record, and so on.

I think there's kind of a job for us to do there. We have a web page that identifies all the players. They include Global Cornell; of course, the graduate school; of course, Institutional Research and Planning, that sort of oversees the production, the formal approval process of new and modified degree programs. We want to be able to pay attention to that. I sure hope during today we get thoughts about that.
Someone, please turn off their -- sorry. Let me back up just a little bit. We want to talk about both principles and procedures.

Principles, what should the University think about when one of these things comes this way? I think a good starting point might be an existing University statement on ethical considerations for international programs. Can we sort of enlarge upon that? It sort of targets individual faculty members who are doing work overseas, but maybe that's a good starting point for talking about these higher-level issues.

When we have concerns about what comes to the senate, what sort of principles, guardrails should there be? How should we engage in this approval process in an efficient and effective way?

Second, procedures. There's a very extensive existing protocol for getting these things approved. However, there is some ambiguity. There's a lot of vetting that goes on, but we just don't see it. I think going forward, we want to make sure things are extremely clear, who sees what, what kind of record they leave, and so on, in the dossier, so to speak. So going forward, we have a more effective procedure here.

We have a web page with the players. They include Global Cornell, the grad school, Institutional Research and Planning, and so on. We want to just get clear on that.

Many, many people have international experience and whatever. We have four faculty who span an interesting space, and I've asked each of them to sort of say, just informally, in ten minutes, how do you personally think of this issue.

Let's go through these. This is alphabetical order. We'll start with Eli Friedman in ILR.

Eli, take it away.

ELI FRIEDMAN: Thanks very much, Charlie. Thanks to you and to Neema for putting together this important conversation.
Relevant pieces of my background, I was on the committee that produced the guidelines on ethical international engagement, and I was chair of the ethics of engagement, specifically focused on China, that committee, until that committee was disbanded. I was also the director of ILR's international programs when we suspended ties with Renmin University in China over academic freedom concerns, and that was in 2018.

The basic point I want to make in my allotted time is we have good principles that are enshrined in the University's core values statement, as well as in the guidelines on ethical and international engagement. They need to be rigorously enforced and, currently, they are not.

The first point I want to mention is a point about the applicability of the guidelines that already exist, because they don't specifically mention dual-degree programs. To my mind, there's no question that they should apply. When we were drafting them, they were never discussed as only governing individual engagement, so I think that's an important point. If you think about it, a dual-degree program is, perhaps, the deepest form of international engagement we can have. We are cosigning for the behavior of another institution. Whatever they do, be it good or be it bad, well, to some extent will reflect on our own institution, so it demands a careful process of ethical vetting.

This should happen with any kind of international engagement, from the individual to the institutional level, and in various different kind of countries. But I think we need to take it more seriously in a country, such as China, which is where my expertise is; and, obviously, it's where Cornell has the most international engagements anywhere in the world, given that country's well-documented problems with academic freedom and, frankly, the fact they are now committing genocide against Muslim minorities in Xinjiang. This is an issue we need to take very seriously.
When we were drafting these guidelines, there was sort of the idea that individual units would self-govern, that they were not supposed to be coercive, but I don't think that's really panning out.

I want to say a bit about what the administration has done with respect to China, as sort of the most important case and, again, the one I know best, and some of the problems I see.

We have enshrined nice principles, but are so far largely unwilling to consider rigorous enforcement, and I think that leaves us open to ethical breaches, as well as reputational damage. I know this is not a meeting about rendering a decision on Peking University, but it's on everyone's mind and it is a relevant example, I think, for demonstrating some of the failures of the current system we have in place.

As just a little background, on January 31, 2019, President Pollack responded to a sense of the senate resolution regarding Cornell's institution-level collaborations with universities or other institutions abroad. She said, quote, occasionally, we decide to support programs, despite concerns about the governments of the countries in which they’re located. In making such decisions, our focus must remain on the academic partners and programs themselves, rather than on the actions and policies of their national governments.

I should note that I agree with her general sentiment about focusing, at least, first on the institutions, but we also have to acknowledge, often the case, that universities, particularly big, national universities, are oftentimes implicated in nefarious things that their governments are doing. That is true in China, as it is in the United States and many other countries.

In the case of Peking University, our university, Cornell, as quite clearly, to my mind, failed to focus on the behavior, specific behavior, of that academic partner as the president has suggested that we do, because the recent actions of Peking University, not the Chinese
government -- putting the actions of the Chinese government to the side -- are clearly at odds with Cornell’s core values and the guidelines on ethical engagement.

I want to just mention two cases that I believe were mentioned at the last meeting, but I want to briefly touch on them, two cases from 2018 and 2019.

The first has been what has been identified as the first Me-Too movement in China. A group of female students in 2018 were raising awareness about a case where a professor had allegedly raped a student 20 years prior. The victim subsequently committed suicide. The professor kept his job, and there were no consequences for him.

In 2018, when this group of students began mobilizing or demanding that the administration release information related to that case, the administration, in response to that, subjected students to intense interrogation and harassment and threatened them with expulsion.

One student wrote a detailed account of these experiences that I recommend reading, and I can put that in the chat later.

There's a second case that spanned 2018 and 2019 that relates to a labor rights campaign, and it was actually the fallout from this campaign that led to ILR suspending our exchange relationship with Renmin students, because Renmin students were also involved.

What happened, briefly, student groups from a number of universities around the country mobilized to support a group of workers in a welding machinery plant in their effort to unionize. By any reasonable measure, the repression at Peking University was worse than it was at Renmin. It was bigger in scale and more intense.

On the meeting web page, I suggested a reading on this, which is a detailed account of some of the oppression the students endured.
In addition to this widespread surveillance, threats of expulsion from the University, a number of students and alumni were kidnapped -- this is the word that they used -- on campus in at least two or three cases. They were shoved into cars, forcibly transported and held against their will. Several of these students describe being subjected to physical, as well as psychological violence.

Those are just two very-recent cases that happened on the campus at Peking University that that administration is responsible for.

The Hotel School has made no mention of these and other cases. There are other issues related to academic freedom at that campus, as well. So either they know about these problems and are purposefully avoiding open discussion of them, or they haven't bothered to do any research on their partner institution, and I'm not really sure which one would be worse.

It's very easy to find this information. You don't have to be sort of as deeply involved in it as I am. It's been widely documented in reputable international media. If you Google "Peking University and academic freedom," you get a million hits.

Looking at this as a case study, the Hotel School may feel awkward raising these issues with their proposed partners, and I understand that. Indeed, it would be awkward, but if you can't have forthright conversations about how, for instance, the University deals with sexual assault allegations or the risk of students being kidnapped for their political views, then you don't have a strong enough foundation to run a dual-degree program, in my view.

Given that Hotel has not done this, it's hard to not come to the conclusion that they're not interested in debating how these and other well-documented problems might impact the ethical availability of this dual-degree program.

Again, this is the sort of case that's on everyone's mind, but I think that's sort of the general principles about how to respond to this and how to avoid associating ourselves with
institutions that might impact the reputation of our own university or more broadly applicable. We need stronger oversight of proposed dual-degree programs in other substantive forms of international engagement. This should happen at the outset before the programs are initiated, at sort of the proposal stage, but there should also be ongoing and regular reviews, because things change.

In the case of China, things are, in every way, I think, worse now than they were ten years ago. Things change. I'm very glad the senate is taking this up, because this oversight needs to be independent from Day Hall. Given the strong financial interests, they do not have the autonomy to see these issues clearly.

And I could just briefly mention my experience chairing the China ethics of engagement committee. Without going to too many details -- although, I'm happy to talk about it later, if folks are interested -- when our committee presented the China Center with a simple plan for ethical oversight, the committee -- the China Center rejected that plan. The committee was disbanded, and I personally was removed from the China Center steering committee. That means, currently, we have the China Center with a physical presence in Beijing and there's no body tasked with overseeing the China Center's ethical issues at the moment. I see that as a real problem. Giving the oversight body independence from Day Hall, I think, would really help with that.

Again, I agree with President Pollack that these reviews should begin by focusing on concrete actions of our partner institutions. Thinking about China in particular, but other countries as well, particularly in China, you have this context of the genocide and broader political repression, and you need to pay very careful attention to what the state is doing and how the partner may be implicated.
So are they developing technologies that are being employed in the concentration camps, things like that. I imagine some sort of, like, a ladder approach, where we start with an assessment of the particular unit you are partnering with. If it passes muster, you move to the university level and on to the level of the state.

There's a big question about whether we can maintain a dual-degree program in a country that is committing genocide. This is a big debate, I think one that we should not shy away from. But, in my opinion, we don't actually need to have that debate in order to reach a conclusion about this Hotel School proposal in particular, but other kind of dual-degree programs, because if we employ this latter approach, I think Peking University likely would not make the cut.

The bottom line for me, and this is the last point, there are real ethical and reputational hazards to putting our name on a dual-degree program with a university in China or many other countries around the world. I do things that are forms of engagement that are still possible, even in China, but we need a better system in place to figure out what those forms are that will allow us to maintain fidelity to our shared values. Thank you.

JILL: Thank you, Professor Friedman. Professor Hinrichs.

TJ HINRICHIS: Thank you so much. Thank you to Charlie and Neema for organizing, and also to Eli for all the work that you've done on these issues.

I didn't want to overlap with Eli, who has been more deeply involved in these kinds of things. I just want to talk a little bit about some of the complex situations that are happening now that we need to think about when we think about ethical responses. Another way of putting this is also risk. I bring up risk because that might be more legible in some quarters.

These aspects of risk, these are things that are arising now that were quite routine in the 1980s, for example. For example, running into a professor, engaging. I was told adamantly
not to get arrested because I put them all at risk and threatened that tenuous line that they had
to research in China. But we’re like diving straight back there. Of course, I did get pulled in by
the security forces that summer, but that’s as far as it went.

I’ll just quickly talk about some of the kinds of issues that are coming up in operations,
research, and teaching that is being conducted currently in the PRC and also about issues that
are arising about teaching and advising in the U.S. And I have several, for example, for
repressive experiences among China’s scholars.

There’s a study that was published in The China Quarterly, and I’ll be posting that
citation and link, and other links when I finish talking.

In the PRC, there are general issues of safety that we need to keep in mind, safety for
ourselves as scholars, safety for our graduate and undergraduate students, and safety for our
colleagues, who are also getting hauled in by security forces and, in extreme cases, there’s the
threat of losing livelihoods, having security people come into their homes, toss their homes,
threatening interrogate family members.

A tier down, there are just risks of being denied access to field sites and archives, so you
might invest a great deal and get approvals and try to go to an archive and be turned away at
the gate. There’s data theft, which is beyond my expertise, but there’s another one. There’s
censorship in publishing and on platforms.

I am very much in favor of keeping the gates to academic exchange as wide open as we
can, including publishing in Chinese journals. But, there is censorship, and it’s become more
visible and prominent. And there have been cases, which I will post of, for example, American
faculty withdrawing from the editorial boards of journals based in China because they were in
untenable situations of providing international prestige to a journal that was censoring
scholarship.
Student research and study in the PRC, I think it is irresponsible to just leave students to figure it out for themselves. I think we need to have serious conversations with those undergraduate and graduate students who are proposing to do research in China.

Cases that my colleagues at other institutions have brought up have been things like, what should you tell a student who is studying in China and then hopes to go interview feminists? And the question they posed in this scenario was whether you should forbid students from doing research. I might put it a little differently, but you absolutely need to have serious conversations with students about their own safety and the risks they might pose to academic context.

Then, what does academic freedom mean, when we might be steering students away from sensitive topics? What does it mean when our students or ourselves self-censor?

In the U.S., we have already had some concerns with in-person teaching. There have been reports of PRC students taking or auditing classes for the purpose of reporting on fellow students. In the PRC, there are undergraduates who sign up for courses and then, because of the content, mound campaigns against the faculty in question. There have been faculty who have been fired for the content of what they teach.

In the U.S., this happened in 2008. It happened again, I think, in 2019; PRC students rallying. And they get a different set of news in the PRC -- rallying to disrupt and successfully disrupt events, for example, on the Uyghur genocide. And there was a case in Syracuse University, or could have been Rochester, and I think they actually canceled the event, which is not something I'm in favor of happening.

But you do need to think about how do you handle such situations, for example, if you're the advisor of an amnesty international student group or something like that.
There are greater risks or another set of risks in Zoom teaching. There are teaching students who are in the PRC, PRC citizens, and sensitive topics that I might talk freely about in the U.S., I am a little -- I tend to finesse; I'll be honest with you, but they bring -- they're curious. Some of them naively wander into sensitive topics and ask questions, really good questions, and I've had to think of ways to answer that. They've brought up questions, and then other classmates in the PRC have been visibly distraught. I've brought up sensitive things when all the students were actually in the U.S., but still had students who were visibly distraught, frightened, or angry, and I'd be curious to hear Eli's experience with these things. They weren't willing to talk online, so I had to arrange phone calls to talk through some of the issues.

So what does academic freedom mean? Do you barge ahead and teach Uyghur genocide to students? Do you dump that on them when they are on Zoom in from the PRC? Do you make it visible on your syllabus so that they can avoid your class? Like another type of trigger warning, do you tell students not to take your class in order to protect their own safety? A Princeton professor chose that option. What are your adjustments? What do you adjust? What do your adjustments look like, and what does that do to academic freedom?

These are all, I think, difficult questions without easy answers, but I think they are serious conversations that we need to have.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks a lot, TJ. Okay, Carmen from Food Science. Thank you.

CARMEN MORARU: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for the invitation. And I realize that I will be probably in a little bit of an interesting situation here because I'm going to talk about our approved dual-degree program with China Agricultural University in food science.

This initiative started a few years ago, about 2017, 2018. It stemmed from existing collaborations between our faculty, both at the department, as well as the college level, at the two institutions. A history of two-plus-two programs, again, both at the college level, and a high
interest from our Chinese colleagues to improve, enhance the education in food science, particularly in food safety.

We are all aware there have been several food safety-related issues in China, starting with a melamine scandal that some of you may be aware of. I think everybody was in agreement that training people to make higher quality food, safer food will benefit the Chinese students taking the courses, the Chinese population, and everybody in the world. That was the starting point for this program.

Discussions have been held for a number of years. Yes, all of these ethical issues that you mention are certainly extremely important, were and still are very important to us, to everybody. Are there still concerns? Of course there are.

On a personal note, I have to tell you I was brought up in dictatorship. I was an undergraduate student in Romania, so I have some sensitivities myself when it comes to that. But in terms of this program, we really are focused on the technical content of the program.

Just briefly, what these students would get at the end of the degree, degree in Food Science from Cornell, actually, it's going to have a distinction there. It's going to be the CAU Cornell program, so that it's not exactly the same degree -- I mean, doesn't have the same title that the Cornell students will get. And they will also get a bachelor's of engineering from China Agricultural University. The program has been approved here locally, but also by the Middle States and the SUNY system, and also obtained approval from the China ministry of education. It is slated to start enrolling students in fall 2021.

The way this would work, the students, candidates for the program would go through the Chinese admission process in the summer, and they would be enrolled at CAU in fall. Those interested in this particular dual-degree program that will be taught in English exclusively in Beijing will then have the opportunity to apply for admission into Cornell.
How will that happen? We’re still working through these details. But in recent months, through conversations with admissions, there was the understanding that the easiest would be to handle these as transfer students, so they would have to pass an English proficiency exam. And there are discussions, what type of exams are mindful of people who may not be able to afford or have access to all the exams that have been used until now. We will have a broader list of exams they could take.

Then, one thing that, as a program, we found particularly important is that each of these students would have to go through an in-person interview process with Cornell-hired faculty on the ground before they get admission to the program, and they will also -- into the Cornell program, and they would also have to write an essay. It will be handled as a transfer, so they would officially become Cornell students in fall of 2022.

The program has some committees for oversight and administration. We have a board of administration that is made up of six members from China Agricultural University. At the top of the list is the president of China Agricultural University, as well on the Cornell side, we have Kathryn Boor, the former dean of CALS and current dean of the graduate school and vice provost for graduate education. We have Wendy Wolford, the director of the Cornell China Center, the chair of the department, associate chair of the department.

We have this balanced committee that has the main oversight of the big picture item that would include the ethical concerns and questions that you-all are raising. We will also have a joint Academic and Operations Committee that will focus mostly on the curricular aspects, and then some administrative staff also balanced on those sites.

In terms of the content in food science, going from the basic foundational courses through the applied food science courses with a big emphasis on food safety, where they are
lacking currently, because they have this food engineering program, so they are lacking a lot of depth in food safety. This is something that drove them to us for assistance from us.

In terms of the size of the program, it could grow to 120 per year, but we don't know what to expect now, as the first class of students. I'm personally hoping for an organic growth, rather than enrolling at capacity, because there are many things that need to be put in place. Who will ensure the quality of Cornell education -- Cornell-level education there? It is going to be through faculty that are selected very carefully.

We have, as a program, taken the responsibility of about half the credits that will be taught, and they are food science, nutrition, food engineering, food chemistry, food microbiology, and safety; these are the topics that will be taught.

Obviously, there are ethical issues that can be reflected in these disciplines, as well, but we are very concerned about maintaining the quality of the Cornell program, and we will do so by hiring faculty -- we will select faculty that will teach those courses on the ground in China. Right now, five, six faculty, but we will have to see; that number might grow when the size of the program grows.

We'll also hire a program coordinator that will serve half as a teaching faculty and half as coordinator for the undergraduates there. That will be our boots on the ground, in a way, and our presence in China, our constant representative there that could signal issues that we have to be aware of, both from a technical point of view, as well as ethical point of view.

We will also have a mirror position here in Ithaca, as director of the program, that will be a Cornell professor. We are looking now into professor of practice for this position. That will maintain the constant dialogue and oversight of the program and have the independence from CAU because they will be located here.
We realize that even if we hire some faculty and they are on the ground in China, they are on the ground in China, so we want to have also this mirror position in Ithaca.

Other than that, I will end with the comment that the memorandum of understanding that was signed between Cornell and CAU has some special provisions on nondiscrimination, academic freedom, and termination of the program, where the parties agree to terminate the program if there are any irregularities on either side that are observed within six months' notice.

There is a way out for this. We are in the process of developing the program. I know that this forum here is meant to look at ethical issues in particular, but I will tell you, as a chair and as a faculty, we are confronted also with some administrative aspects that are very important: How do you hire those people there? What titles to you give them? How are they paid? How can you pay them across the border?

So we have large support here on campus to address these issues, but there are -- after you give the seal of approval for one of these programs, there are many things that need to be addressed. And we're learning by doing these things, and we had to go back to the drawing board a few times because, again, we had some challenges there.

I will also say, the faculty we intend to hire, they are going to be exclusively teaching faculty, and we learned that it is going to be important, because we want to focus this on teaching.

I will stop here. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks an awful lot, Carlin.


CONNIE YUAN: Hi, everyone. My talk might be slightly different because of my personal experience. This year, it's a milestone in my life, half of my life spent in China, half my life spent in U.S., so I'm going to share my view as a Chinese-American, how I see this issue.
I have some slides posted on the website. Maybe you can check it out later.

I want to start with brief comments about the genocide. I think the west and the east portray it very differently. In the western media, you see it as genocide; but when I talk to my Chinese friends, they see it as government's attempt to contain terrorism.

Actually, before the camp was established, there was several years of bloody riots against the Han Chinese and another Muslim group in China. China has more than six Muslim groups, and the Uyghur Muslim had conflict with others for many years, for centuries. A lot of the killing added to the slogan for the Uyghur Muslim: "Kill the Han, kill the Hui Muslim."

Those serious bloody events happened prior to the establishment of the camp. I have references on the slides. You guys can check it out later.

Because my time limit, I move on to the core issue, but I would be happy to share with you more the history behind what happened about the camp.

To me, I voted yes to the program for a number of reasons. I think, to me, I think the western news and eastern news is biased. I think the truth is somewhere in the middle. And I think it's Chinese government's attempt to contain terrorism, but they may have gone a little bit too far.

What I just want to caution people is be careful, because when you don't hear the complete history, you get a different view. Even that, when I voted yes for the program, I may share the same frustration that you guys have with the current administration in China. I may also, same with you, want to see changes happen in China, but how to get there may be what's different.

I am different because of my background. I will present three reasons why I think a continuing engagement is important.
First, my personal experience showed me democracy’s a culture that one can only know how it works through experiential learning.

So 1989, I was a high school student. My home was in the epicenter of the movement for democracy, so I went to Peking University, Renmin University, everywhere, every day to read the poster, participate in the protest.

1990, I got into Peking University, the most liberal in China. Because the Peking University played a leading role in the movement, the government actually required Peking University send its students to receive one year military training as a price to pay to attend that university. Because my family, they were in military academy during the cultural revolution, so I resented military academy since I was young, but I still took that one year. That was my price to go to PKU, because this is the most liberal university in China.

To me, what was interesting, after I live in the U.S. 25 years, I find we were incredibly naive back then in thinking that democracy can be achieved through political movements. To me, democracy is a culture. You need to watch it in action to know what it is all about.

Let me give you a small example. In China, a really well-known scholar has conferences. During the Q&A time, they may give you extra time because of your reputation. In the U.S., it’s like everyone has equal air time.

These are things you pick up when you are in the culture, you live and observe how democracy works in action. This is why I think the training program is very crucial for the Chinese students to learn how democracy works. This is not something that you can learn from reading a book or whatever.

Also, I think, indeed, a professor-to-professor collaboration is very important, but we need to go beyond that because faculty-faculty connection is essentially, in my mind, preaching to a choir. These are believers already, but we want to broaden the influence. We need to have
long-term programs so the Chinese students can experience a different alternative. This is reason number one.

Reason number two, I don't think isolation can work. This is partially from my present experience raising my son. It never worked -- for me, if I want to change my son, because I have taken stance.

So I invite you to think about your experiences with your partner, your spouse, your student. Had it ever worked? You want to change someone, you take a stance and they change because you had taken stance.

To me, I really think if you want to see change happen in China, engagements are the only way. Present the Chinese student alternatives and let them decide if that's the alternative that will work for them, and they are the person who decides which way to go.

Because I also teach in intercultural collaboration, multiculturalism, that is a key rule, to respect other people's decision, present alternatives that let them decide if this is a route they want to take.

The last reason -- in my slide, there were other TED talks about the Chinese system, meritocracy, how to compare with democracy. So if you are interested, there are additional backgrounds about how the Chinese system works. It's different from America. It is important to consider there's a different possibility for doing things.

Finally, being a Chinese-American, this is personal to me, and I understand not everyone will have the same motivation, the drive as I do, because I have roots in both cultures. I respect certain qualities in both cultures.

China has its own problem. I wish China had more freedom of speech, but U.S. has systematic racism. So both sides, I think, have issues, but also have strengths I truly admire.
Being a Chinese-American, it pains me to see the two countries going through this
disagreement. I want to do whatever I can to bring the two cultures together.

The other thing, being a person teaching the culture collaboration, and I truly feel
people-to-people connection can happen above beyond politics.

Also, speaking from my personal experience, I grew up Han Chinese, but right now, I'm
devoted practitioner of Tibetan Buddhism. Online, I show some pictures, I went to the Tibetan
Buddhist Institute, the largest in the whole world. That was established before the current
administration, and the founder, his vision, he want to bring Han and Tibetan people together.
He wanted people to bond beyond ethnic lines. And my root guru, he actually, when he first
started his Tibetan peers, disagree with him. They say why connect with the Chinese. But he
moved ahead. Now, he has disciples all over the place.

And my sister, we are all devoted practitioner of Tibetan Buddhism. So from any
personal experience, I do believe bonding connections can happen above politics. To me, a
university like Cornell, if Cornell wants to have global impact, I wish Cornell to be a place, a
platform where people can really export solutions for change, dream about solutions of change,
beyond our differences, our upbringings, our religion, values, whatever, to explore possibilities
to bond together.

So taken together from my personal experience, I hope Cornell, the policy will leave the
doors open to people like me, who have strong bonds at both places, to explore possibilities to
get people closer together.

I know we don't have the same background, but I think that's very important. I think
that certain issues that happen at Peking University is unfortunate, but I'm sure there's plenty of
faculty at Peking University upset about how they handled the sexual harassment case. If there
are other faculty at Peking University who are upset, can we open the door for other
collaborations for those who believe in the importance of freedom of speech and protection of students. I hope the policy will leave possibilities for people like me and for those in the field that can explore collaboration without compromising the principle of freedom of speech.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you very much, Connie.

Before we get to the second half of the session, I want to thank all four of the faculty for giving us a lot of food for thought. It is very important. You did a great job setting the stage for our discussions.

Jill, let's go to the next slide. Again, the same kind of rules. Two minutes, if you are speaking from the floor. You already know this; post questions and comments in the chat. I will do everything possible to make sure all your questions are answered, if they aren't answered in this session itself. Chat and audio will be up on the agenda page, usually by tomorrow. Also, on that same page, you can post comments anonymously.

I hope you're relaxed about time. We usually have the 5:00 p.m. cutoff, but we also have the so-called hallway discussion afterward. We can sort of slide right into that if the conversation is still extremely active. We'll keep the chat and audio on, but at some point, we turn it off and we have our usually extremely productive hallway discussions, which is just informal and shooting the breeze.

One final reminder, this is an educational event. The idea here is to learn from each other. Speaking for myself, three weeks ago, I knew practically nothing about this area, other than what you kind of read in the local papers and so on. It's extremely important. I'm really hungry myself to learn as much as I can about this, because this is extremely important, and we need the full force of the faculty, the collective wisdom to move forward intelligently.

Let's take down the slide, Jill, and go with questions and comments. If you have a question for a particular panelist, please state that. If it's general, just throw it out there. I?
See Carl Franck, and then Ken. Carl.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you so much. I think this is really fascinating. I have questions for the panelists.

For Eli, if you could give us more background on the dissolution of that committee you mentioned.

For TJ, if you could give us examples of conversations that you had that you felt you had to shift to phone work.

And then for Connie, what really occurs to me, I think this is a personal thing, but I would ask you your reaction. I have so many Chinese students, graduate students and undergraduates. I feel that by being here, we do our best job. My opinion of these dual-degree programs is very low right now, for the reasons that have been given. Why not bring students here?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Eli, Carl wanted to know a little bit about your experience there and the takedown of the program.

ELI FRIEDMAN: Initially, I had been asked to chair this subcommittee, housed within the Office of Vice Provost for International Affairs, which is where the China Center is housed. I had been raising questions about how we are going to deal with Academic Freedom with the China Center for a number of years in the planning stages, so they set up this committee, because having Cornell space in China raises a whole set of problems that we don't have with our campuses here in the United States. We set up the committee.

To be frank, there was tension between myself and the director of the China Center over how ambitious we were going to be. Ultimately, we ended up proposing a very pared-down, to my view, set of procedures.
First, a statement of principles; one, that Cornell does not engage in censorship; and, two, Cornell has to follow local laws, so acknowledging the fact we are in a different context. The example I always give, in the United States, you could be a Neo-Nazi. If you go to Germany, you can't talk openly about Nazism. That's sort of an infringement that I think we should be willing to accept.

China has its own set of laws, and we need to follow those laws, if we are operating in that country. Then I proposed that the committee would review proposals that were potentially politically contentious. They were going to be held in that space, acknowledging that things are different there, but that any discussions about how to manage those would be handled transparently and would be done by this faculty committee.

The director did not like that. I said that the committee was dissolved. Actually, what happened is I just stopped getting invited to meetings and I was removed from the steering committee of the China Center, as far as I know.

Someone in the chat just pointed out that I'm still listed on the website, so I just never heard anything else from them. I think that's a real problem, because now there's no oversight whatsoever.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Eli.

TJ, I forgot what Carl asked of you, but I'm sure you remember, if you could respond to Carl's second question.

TJ HINRICHES: Sure. The question was what had prompted me to resort to discussion with the student over the phone. Maybe it was an offhand comment I made, just pointing out that a term used -- I do premodern history, so these issues are not quite as in my face every day as they are for some people. But these were types of policies that were given the Confucian
rubric of transforming customs and moirés through instruction, through education. And those could become coercive, but mostly consisted of basically scolding or education programs.

I just pointed out that transmission through education was the name put on the Uyghur concentration camps. A grad student from the PRC looked stricken and did not speak. I chair her committee. In the moment, I just said, oh, my God, someone really looks upset. She just continued looking upset, so I moved on and arranged a phone call to talk it through.

Like Connie, she thought the issues were more complex, but she did not feel comfortable -- in the normal times, I think we could have had that conversation as a group in the classroom, but it's not so easy when there's a presumption of surveillance when you're on Zoom.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, TJ.

Connie, Carl has this interesting question about why not just bring students here. You must have thoughts about that. Please proceed.

CONNIE YUAN: I think definitely bringing students over is a fantastic experience for them, definitely, but I think the Hotel School -- I think they would spend time here. I'm not going to define that for them, but I think definitely spending time in the U.S. is really life-changing.

Regarding what TJ mentioned, students' reaction on Zoom, I think there's also another possibility. Because Chinese students, I talk to many Chinese students and also my friends in China about whether genocide is happening. All of them, they were telling me they think the western media is biased because they lived through the rise in 2008, 2009, 2014, 2015. The rise happened in crowded railway station, and 31 people got killed on the spot, 140 wounded. And these people not killed by guns; it's blade.
So you can envision how many people were involved in the attack when you have to kill 30 people, wound 140, by blade. So my Chinese friends, they saw this news. They were very upset with the western portrayal, and the Chinese students don’t feel comfortable challenging professors. A lot of them may think American professor already have biased view of the situation. They may or may not be to raise their hand. I think that’s a possibility, because I was shocked at how many people -- I talked to my high school friends, college friends, and many of them received education in the U.S., they read the English news and return back to China, and that’s the view they shared with me.

I also think of the current administration is tougher than the last ones, for sure, and that’s my frustration.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Carmen, I know you have to leave. These are dual-degree programs.

To Carl’s question, why not have students come here. Isn’t the whole greater than sum of the parts? So it’s part here, part at the other institution. Is that the positive aspect of the dual in this discussion?

CARMEN MORARU: That’s a very good question. I think there are multiple answers to that, but I will give you a very practical answer to limited capacity. Quite frankly, we have a class of 20, 30 students per year. This is much bigger in terms of what we can get.

Cornell is a prohibitive program for many because of the cost, so we would benefit more students who wanted to learn food safety from us or food science from us if we did it at the lower cost point there.

Again, these are two very pragmatic answers, and there are others, but, simply, we would not have the capacity to do it here at the scale that would be beneficial for our colleagues.
CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks an awful lot. Thank you for coming. I know you have another meeting you have to go to. I very much appreciate you helping us out and participating in the conversation.

Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah, it's more or less a question for TJ. I happen to believe that engagement is very important. I was glad that Connie pointed this out, that being exposed to people who have a different perspectives is valuable.

What I'm wondering about is how safe you felt in the sense of whether you felt that you were at personal risk of stumbling over these laws, things that are legal to talk about in a program in the U.S., but not -- the example I think that could come up for the Hotel School would be business discussions about investments that might be in Taiwan, which I take it you're never allowed to discuss in any business context in China. You could get into trouble. You mentioned you were pulled in front of the authorities.

My question: Do we have adequate protection? So if a Cornell faculty who wants to engage and wants to go over there, then innocently gets into serious trouble, would that person be adequately protected, as far as do we have the legal ability to help them out. That's kind of what I would worry about.

TJ HINRICHS: Yeah, I got pulled in as an undergraduate, and it was with a group of teenagers, for hanging out and eating ice cream together. It made a big impact on me. Even though I was able to kind of saunter out, after insisting I had to go after an hour or so, the teenagers I was taken in with were terrified, and there were teenagers in the group who were -- anyway, the point is we're not there now. You can hang out with people.

Eli will know better, but I've had conversations inside China about certain things that I wouldn't broadcast in a casual conversation outside a venue, but I'm very reluctant -- I'm risk-
averse. I'm very reluctant -- I tend to come in from an angle, which is a strategy my colleagues in China also have. If you do that, there's a lot that you can say. Yeah, that's my compromise.

ELI FRIEDMAN: Could I add something to that?

The first point is that the greatest risk is to our Chinese colleagues. And we have to acknowledge that, that Americans, even with the geopolitical tension, have a degree of -- it's not extraterritoriality, but a degree of protection that Chinese colleagues do not.

The second thing, there's no debate about whether there's, sort of, academic freedom, as the way it exists in the United States and other local democracies. I think the question that we need to ask ourselves when looking at dual-degree programs is, are those constraints on academic freedom so great, such that it poses an ethical risk and that it undermines the sort of value of the academic engagement. That was a big part of the decision that we made at ILR.

We decided that we couldn't send our students in China, in part, because of the danger posed to them, but also because talking about labor issues was so politically sensitive that you couldn't do it anymore. We could dance around the topic of does China have strikes or not, which it has a lot of, but then the academic value is really undermined. If?

We think about hotels, hotels play a key role in the state surveillance mechanism. If you are a Uyghur person and you go to Beijing or these cities, it is sometimes very difficult to get into a hotel.

I checked into a hotel one time in an area that has ethnic Tibetans, and I tried to check in. They said please wait a minute. Then half an hour later, the police showed up and took us away and interrogated us. So hotels actually play a really key role in all of this.

It's of academic value to debate the question, what role should hotels play in responding to, sort of, the demands from the security state. That seems -- you absolutely would not be able to have a forthright conversation about that on the campus of Peking University.
CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa has her hand up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks to all the panelists. I wanted to build on the point that Eli was making and to also raise the point about complicity of the organizations.

I think one point that's really important is the kind of case-by-case basis, that it feels like a lot of the discussion is around when can we have relationships with certain institutions, the Cornell-China relationship through particular universities, as opposed to, generally, should Cornell be in China. That seems to be where we're going, what's the nature of that institutional relationship, as Eli was talking about what is the nature of the program and whether the program can actually have a certain integrity to it.

Just to pick up on that for a moment, that the examples of the Hotel School, I think, are really important, because what appears to be sort of a benign-nonpolitical program, when you actually start to learn more about it and look at the layers, you see that there are many things that most of us would not even consider that Eli just gave us some insight into. I think that's a really important point is those layers.

But then, also, at what point do we not only put ourselves in a position of not being able to have a program with substantive integrity; but that, in fact, Cornell's relationship creates a complicity with what's happening because we are in partnership with them. I don't think that's just about China, as I've said before. We've raised it with regard to the Cornell Saudi Arabia program that existed. This is not just China. So I wonder if people could talk about that issue, as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I'm really anxious to hear about experiences in other countries. There have been postings on the website about research collaborations, whether they're of a different variety.
I'm sure on the call here are people who have worked in countries where there's -- enlarging the circle of discussion here would be very helpful going forward. So if anyone would like to speak to their experiences like that, either maybe as a research or you have been involved in a student-exchange program. These are all things that touch on the topic here.

David Liu.

ELI FRIEDMAN: I could briefly respond to Risa’s point, and I think Risa brings up an important point.

First of all, this should not just apply to China, when we have these conversations. We are talking about China because of this concrete proposal and, also, because -- and the vice provost will tell you this -- we have more engagements in China than we do any other country in the world, so it's very significant.

But, absolutely, if we want to do something similar in Saudi Arabia, Turkey -- lots of countries have problems with academic freedom -- we would have to go through sort of a similar process.

The second point, which really needs to be emphasized, sometimes this gets set up as a false binary, we either do every single engagement without considering the ethical consequences or we cut off ties altogether. That is a very bad way of thinking about these things.

For me, the question is not specifically with reference to China, like are we going to engage or not. The question is: How are we going to try to engage and what forms of engagement are possible that are consistent with our stated values. I think there are lots of forms.

I continue to engage; I'm talking to people, to researchers in China every single day. I have to employ secure digital technologist. I've redoubled my efforts to bring Chinese students
here, to expose them to some of the things that Connie was talking about that I think is very important.

When Connie said something like, don't close the door to people like me, I think that's extremely important. I think we need to give people, to the extent possible, an opportunity to come here or go to a third country. Those forms of engagement absolutely are possible and do not think that the proposed dual-degree program meets that standard. It's not an either/or.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: David Liu, I see your hand up.

DAVID LIU: I'm an undergrad student, if I'm allowed to speak. I'm from China, so I have a lot of personal experiences, or my friends' experience who are studying in China.

One of the reasons I'm not showing my face is because I'm afraid this is under surveillance; and, also, because I have friends in China who were interrogated by the police for attending a feminist gathering; and, also, people who were arrested for just posting stuff online.

It was funny, because one of my friends was studying at Sun Yat-sen University, and they just closed down their sexuality studies department because of the government. The university didn't allow anyone to leave the campus on the day when the U.S. embassy held a film festival, an LGBTQ film festival in the city. They did head count and everything to make sure students couldn't go to that film festival.

I just want to say academic freedom is really not a thing in China, from my personal experience. That's all I want to say.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you very much, David, for your contribution. It's absolutely fine to have you speak here.

David Delchamps, then Connie.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: A quick comment. I agree we have to look at every individual thing differently, just as Eli was saying, but I don't want to have us drive an artificial wedge between
things that benefit students versus faculty-to-faculty collaborations; one of them is more holy than the other.

I saw a lot of comments in various emails and postings and how this hotel School thing is really all about money, blah, blah, blah. It's about the students, too. It's about their benefiting from international experience and exposure, so I just wanted to throw that in.

I think when we assess these things one by one, we should not do some kind of separate category that policizes research over degree programs and students' engagement; that's all.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks a lot, David. Connie, again.

CONNIE YUAN: I appreciate, David, you share your experiences. I think there's no question, there's so many things in China that's happening that upsets me; but, equally, there's a lot of things happening in the U.S. that upset me, too.

For example, recent rise of racism against Asian-Americans. But do I give up because the things are upsetting? No. To me, both countries have strengths that I truly admire, and there are things really upsetting. But, at least right now, before I run out of my energy, I want to do something, to see if presenting alternatives, the next generation of Chinese leaders will be different.

So I really hope the doors will be open for people like me. I don't anticipate everyone will have the same as me, because I am different because of my background. But, please, make it -- to establish the possibility beyond the faculty-to-faculty interaction.

I was thinking of proposing a class to take American students to China, to see the hospitality of normal Chinese people.

Please leave the door open for people like me.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Connie.

NEEMA KUDVA: Could I step in? Thank you, everybody. This has been very helpful.
Eli, I was wondering if you could go back. You talked about a ladder approach; that’s how you characterized it. I think both you and TJ talked about it, and it came up in the way in which the food science program was being talked about, that you really start with the program, and you don't sort of -- I do think there's a distinction between individual faculty going to do research in a place and how we manage risk and how we manage relationships and the institution being involved.

If we take the institutional question, I wonder if you can talk a little bit more about that ladder approach, where you're saying let's talk program to program, institution to institution, because we can't clearly be taking an approach based on just governmental positions. So wanted to go back to that as one real strategy to explore.

ELI FRIEDMAN: Thanks for the question, Neema. This is not like a perfectly, worked-out plan, but it would need to be sort of operationalized.

The underlying principle is that lots of countries do bad things, do worse things than others, but we should make a sort of necessary assumption that partner institutions are going to be implicated in the bad things that their governments do. There's a tendency to say well, in China, it's definitely going to happen, where we know the Canadian government is doing bad things, too, but we're going to give those universities a pass.

I just think we have to not make assumptions, sort of begin at the ground level, which is to say, who is the institution we are engaging with. Do we have empirical evidence that their behaviors more or less align with ours or that there's significant enough overlap that we can imagine partnering with them?

I think the kind of engagement matters a lot here. If it's an individual research collaboration, maybe the overlap doesn't have to be as intense. But if we're talking about a joint-degree program, well, we really have to have a deeper kind of agreement and sorts of
things. If they pass muster, then you move up the chain a little bit. Because we can imagine, I think, a situation in which a university is in a state, and that state is doing things that are so heinous, we just don't want to be implicated in it or it becomes so difficult to extract the university in what it's doing from all of the nasty things that are happening in society.

You can take the comic book version of this, which is like Nazi Germany, inevitably. So after the fact, we all would say, yes, of course, if we were running a joint-degree program with a Nazi university, that we have said, well, we shouldn't be doing that because they're committing genocide. Putting aside that actual historical example, just establishing it as a principle. There may be moments where we say we just can't be involved with this country at all.

But that, to me, is a pretty high bar. It is a very complicated discussion, and it's one that has major implications.

When we are thinking about dual-degree programs in China, I think it's much easier for us to begin by focusing on what those institutions are doing, because if we go straight to the genocide debate and does the genocide mean that we have to leave China altogether, the implications for the University are massive, and that's going to be an extremely big discussion and debate; not one that I think we should shy away from, but I don't think we need to jump straight to that last step of the ladder.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you. Charlie, there was -- I think it was Peter Katzenstein put a comment in the chat asking if someone from the Cornell China Center is here. I know Connie and Eli were both involved, but somebody else who would like to speak about the experience of the Center and its work in China. I don't know if anybody else on the call --

CONNIE YUAN: Yeah, I'm on the Cornell -- same as Eli. Actually, Eli, there's no meetings, so it is not you being removed. I was not at any meeting recently either. I heard -- the director is in China now. She's very busy coordinating the program, you know, Cornell student, when
they can come back to Cornell, they can take classes from China. I was told that she was heavily involved in getting those aligned for Cornell students. Chinese students can take classes in China. I think that's what she is working on.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Maria Nixon has her hand up.

MARIA NIXON: Hi. I'm from Plant Biology. I was wondering, from what I'm hearing, this program is mostly for students that can afford to be a student in a prevalent university like Cornell University, so I'm wondering how this is helping the students that come from China who cannot afford to pay the tuition, how we are exposing those students to democracy. I think I have my doubts about that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's a good question. I'm not sure anyone on the call can answer that. We'll make sure it does get answered.

But is there anyone who would like to respond to that or anything else?

We haven't talked at all about the approval process and so on. I'd like to get a few people to talk about how the senate should be engaged in this. The senate, as you know, is advisory. I really would welcome thoughts about that side of things, if anyone would like to speak to that, what we'll hear from Wendy and Mike next week.

My guess is in terms of the procedures and the protocol and the approval process, they'll probably have some joint ad hoc committee looking into it, much like -- well, it was just Risa plus Madelyn in the University counsel's office, figuring out the free-speech statement.

If you go back maybe two years, we had a group of three senators that met with various HR folks to figure out the 6.4 procedures, so that kind of thing, where we'll go off, try to figure that out and then come back. Just trying to get a little feedback on that.

Joanie has her hand up.
JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thanks, Charlie. You are asking for input about, say, what you mentioned on the web page about this, that there's bylaw text that suggests the Faculty Senate should be involved with decisions like this, but then there's also text suggesting that the faculty senate should not be involved.

Designing an international joint program seems, by definition, an out-of-college issue. It's about crossing boundaries that are not specific to one college, and it's an act that has repercussions for the entire unit. I certainly feel the first text applies, not the second one.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: One point is there's a lot of ambiguity out there that I think needs to be settled. I think we need to have a very -- almost like baby steps, with a well-defined sequence and what should happen at each station. I think there's a real need for that.

John Brady.

JOHN BRADY: I'm from the Food Science department, so I thought I'd respond to that comment about the cost. The students from CAU who are participating in the joint degree actually pay half what it would cost to come to Cornell. Part of the motivation was that even if those students benefit personally from the education, that the society, in general, would benefit from healthier food.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you?

John.

Addition comments? We are getting close to 5:00 here. David Delchamps and Risa again.

David.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: We've been really inconsistent over the years, as far as senate participation in these goes. I've seen things that were confined to one college that have come before the senate, and other things that were confined to one college that never became before
the senate, with that excuse that they are -- I'm talking about international collaborations here. I totally agree with you, that we've really got to the get on the same page about that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It has been inconsistent. The only thing to elevate it to resolution status was from 2004, and there's been a lot of stuff between then and now, so I think it's in everybody's interest to get consistent there.

Risa again.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I was just going to agree about the senate's involvement. At least one situation where the senate would have liked to have been involved, but was cut out, had to do with Cornell Tech and the relationship with the Israeli Technion. We were kept out of it, basically told it was a secret process.

Part of the inconsistency is not simply the senate hasn't wanted to be involved, I think it's also because we have been kept out. And I think it's a great idea, as you were saying -- Charlie and David was saying, to say what can we work up as the protocol, so that it doesn't just come up and we say, oh, well, it's done and we're out of it, but to really create a protocol.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There's -- we have this hierarchy of engagement and degree programs have been put at the top there, but there's one thing above that, which is Qatar creating a whole separate college. There's a whole range of these things, and we have to sort through them. I just kind of have the feeling it's going to get more important as time passes, so it's an opportune time to think through these things as much as we can. There's not going to be any formula, there's not going to be A, B, C, check boxes, then you're okay. It is going to be much more nuanced and complicated, but I think we can still get stuff written down to provide real guidance.

Neema, do you see anything on the chat we'd like to pick up here on the very end, or we can just slide into our hallway scene?
KEN BIRMAN: I'll just summarize. You want to have a sense of the senate motion we could debate. Maybe we could debate and vote on a sense of the senate motion that engagement is better than disengagement, that it's a healthy thing to have international collaborations. Clearly, there are people who feel that some of these collaborations are a bad idea. I, myself, think they are a good idea if we take adequate steps to protect the individuals and they're better than the alternative. Anyhow, it's triggered a bunch of discussion.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. I think we have to study the chat and review what was discussed today, then we have next week. I don't think we'll do anything until we hear next week. That will round it out, then we can think about resolutions and how to move our way forward, committees that look into things and so on.

Joanie, did you want to say something? No, okay.

NEEMA KUDVA: Courtney put in a comment in the chat which I think -- Courtney, you want to speak to that? Why you don't think it's a baby-steps approach?

COURTNEY: I'm not saying we would never get there as a group, that we would never get to a place where we could pass a sense of the senate resolution, such as Ken proposes, but I really don't think, after the conversation that we've had here today, that we're anywhere near that point.

Mostly, I just meant to support Charlie, that I think this is a slow, careful process, if the senate is going to be involved, which I very much hope that we will be.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thank you. I will just add that all I wanted to say, I think what Ken is proposing actually reflects the discussion that we've been having.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. Three weeks ago, I wasn't even thinking about it. Now, suddenly, it is one of the largest things on my plate. In retrospect, this is really important, so
we've got to be careful; we've got to do it right, but I'm confident that with all the different perspectives we have, that we can really get to a better place.

With that, we'll thank everybody for coming, and we'll hang around. The chat keeps going, but we cut it all off in terms of what gets uploaded to the website tomorrow, so everything from now on is just between us.

Thank you for coming. If you want to hang around, I really love the hallway part of these meetings, because they're extremely illuminating.