Final Agenda

0. Introduction of New Speakers
   a. Jamie Satterfield, Investigative Reporter
   b. Johanna Chao Kreilick, President, Union of Concerned Scientists
   c. Edward Lazowska, Professor, and Bill & Melinda Gates Chair Emeritus, Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science & Engineering, University of Washington

1. CAPAC updates
   a. Speaker: Congresswoman Judy Chu, Chair, Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus

Congresswoman Judy Chu has been a champion against racial profiling of Asian American (often Chinese) scientists, researchers, and engineers since 2015, when she called for the Asian American community to organize around this issue. As CAPAC Chair, Congresswoman Chu has prioritized ending the China Initiative started by President Trump at the height of his effort to turn America’s attention away from Russia.

The China Initiative is unique among DOJ investigations: whereas most investigations start with a crime and then find a suspect, this initiative starts with a suspect based on ethnicity or national origin, and then searches for crime. Family ties to China or even professionally encouraged research and collaboration can be enough to trigger an investigation. The China Initiative is the only DOJ effort named for a specific country—there is no Russia, Iran, or North Korea initiative, only a China Initiative. As a result, simply doing research could be enough to have one’s life and career ruined by racial profiling and a criminal conviction.

Racial profiling associated with the China Initiative has chilling effects for both the Chinese American community and the US as a whole. First, by looking specifically at Chinese scientists, the DOJ might be missing real instances of espionage from other countries. As former CIA director Robert Gates said, there are probably a dozen or 15 countries that steal US technology but only one country, China, has been deemed to require what FBI Director Christopher Ray called a “whole of society response.” This kind of language leads to widespread mistrust of Chinese Americans.
Second, the China Initiative prioritizes convictions, not justice. That often means bringing a case without sufficient grounds, a practice that has upended the lives of people like Dr. Anming Hu (whose case was the first to be brought under trial under the China initiative) and Dr. Franklin Tao, who is awaiting trial. Both of these cases included clear FBI misconduct. Dr. Hu’s case resulted in his full acquittal. However, the damage to his career and reputation had already been done. Similarly, other scientists and researchers, like Xiaoxing Xi and Sherry Chen suffered personal and professional harm only to have their charges dropped completely.

Dr. Hu’s case echoes the situation of the 61 Chinese scientists accused who have been indicted mostly for paperwork errors and omissions of information and not actual economic espionage. These accusations affect young Chinese Americans who may decide to avoid careers in science out of fear that they too will be investigated, or worse.

For the reasons described above, CAPAC has pushed for an end to the China Initiative. There is a legitimate need for counter espionage work in the US government, but that work must be based on evidence and not race.

CAPAC has already gotten the US government to terminate the Investigations and Threat Management Service (ITMS) unit, a Department of Commerce unit that had been investigating possible security risks without any oversight. Because of their free reign over investigations, the ITMS unit had opened investigations on 2,000 employees—mostly of Asian and Middle Eastern descent—based on their ethnicity and without their knowledge. Upon hearing about this unit, Congresswoman Chu immediately called for it to be disbanded. CAPAC then met with Secretary of Commerce Gina Raimondo to press her on the issue and Secretary Raimondo eliminated the ITMS unit.

There is still more work to be done. In addition to ending the China Initiative and other similar programs, Cold War rhetoric must be stopped. When the Chinese government acts against US interests or values, Americans can and must speak out. However, Americans must be deliberate about what and who they criticize. It should be those who are responsible for acting against the US, not all Chinese people.

Americans cannot let fear become an excuse to rob Chinese Americans of their civil liberties. There are still those alive today who were forced into US prison camps during World War II because it was believed that being Japanese American made them untrustworthy and spies. This policy was wrong then, and a policy of mass suspicion is wrong today.

Last summer, Congresswoman Chu and CAPAC leadership sent every member of Congress guidance on how to speak out against China’s policies without stoking xenophobia in the US. By following this guidance, members of Congress could avoid spreading unfounded suspicions that would paint all Chinese people as threats, putting innocent Chinese Americans at risk.
Congresswoman Chu expressed her gratitude for groups like the APA Justice task force for shedding light on key issues affecting Asian Americans, especially Chinese scientists and researchers. She emphasized the importance of representation, particularly AAPI representation in Congress. Without adequate representation, Asian Americans have long suffered from invisibility and marginalization. Society has assumed that it can take away the civil rights of the AAPI community without consequence. AAPIs were victims of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and Japanese internment during World War II.

Congresswoman Chu noted the importance of speaking up against anti-Asian hate and racial profiling of Chinese scientists and engineers. She indicated that while the Stop Asian Hate movement received widespread support, it has been more difficult to garner support for the movement against racial profiling of Asian American scientists. This could be due to a lack of media attention to this issue, or because of the pressure to get tough on China amid US-China tensions. CAPAC has redoubled efforts to distinguish the civil rights of Chinese Americans from the issue of US-China's tensions.

Challenges continue to occur. Last year CAPAC fought against an amendment that a Republican Congress member wanted to add to the agriculture appropriations bill. The amendment would bar all Chinese nationals from owning US agricultural land. Because of CAPAC’s protest the amendment was changed to bar only Chinese companies wholly or partially owned by China from owning US agricultural land. However, CAPAC’s efforts to change the amendment to bar Russian, Iranian, and North Korean companies from owning US agricultural land were unsuccessful. How could it be more acceptable for Vladimir Putin to own US agricultural land than Xi Jinping?

In June 2021, one important step forward was when CAPAC member Representative Jamie Raskin hosted a House Government and Oversight Committee roundtable on effects of ethnic profiling of Chinese American scientists. The discussion featured speakers like Dr. Xiaoxing Xi and former Energy Secretary Steven Chu. After the roundtable, Congress members told Congresswoman Chu that they had not been aware of the extent of racial profiling and injustice against Chinese scientists and engineers. Congresswoman Chu expressed her thanks for APA Justice and its role in the success of that roundtable.

In October 2021, another important step forward was during CAPAC’s member meeting with the US Attorney General Merrick Garland. CAPAC pressed AG Garland on ending the China initiative. While he did not take a position on the initiative itself, he did say that he had just brought in an Assistant Attorney General to do a full review of the China initiative program and other national security cases. That assistant attorney general, Matt Olsen, is currently undertaking this review. CAPAC will have a meeting with Matt Olsen on this issue. In response to CAPAC’s complaints about FBI stereotyping, AG Garland also said that he reinstated the implicit bias training program with the DOJ, something that was dismantled during the Trump era.
Congresswoman Chu felt that the most important step CAPAC took in 2021 was to ensure that AG Garland knew that CAPAC was keeping a close eye on the DOJ. If the DOJ overstepped, CAPAC would be ready to fight back.

2. Investigative Journalism and the Humanized Story of Professor Anming Hu
   a. Speaker: Jamie Satterfield, investigative reporter

   - 2021/12/18 AASF: The China Initiative and Professor Anming Hu's Case
   - 2021/08/02 Knox News: Former University of Tennessee professor falsely accused of espionage faces second trial
   - 2021/07/08 Knox News: Former UT professor falsely accused of spying demands to know whether he'll be tried again
   - 2021/06/16 Knox News: Trump Administration's first 'China Initiative' prosecution sputters as jurors deadlock
   - 2021/06/14 Knox News: With spy case a bust, feds seek fraud conviction against University of Tennessee professor
   - 2021/06/13 Knox News: Trial reveals federal agents falsely accused a UT professor born in China of spying

Jamie Satterfield is an investigative journalist whose in-depth coverage of the trial of Professor Anming Hu shined light on the zeal of the FBI agent to find a spy in Knoxville, Tennessee. She tells the humanized story of the plight of an innocent academic in mid-America. They prompted members of Congress led by Rep. Ted Lieu to question FBI misconduct and call for an investigation of the targeting of individuals of Asian descent for alleged espionage.

When Jamie first heard of Dr. Anming Hu’s case, she had not been assigned to cover it. Jamie explained that she had looked at Dr. Hu’s case “like every other citizen” and found that Dr. Hu had been presented as a spy. The University of Tennessee, shocked that they had employed a spy, “threw Dr. Hu under the bus without any real knowledge of facts.”

The University and the US Attorney’s Office both put out press releases about Dr. Hu’s case. Jamie noted that as a journalist, it seemed strange to her that the press releases indicated that Dr. Hu was a spy for China, while the charge against him was for wire fraud. To the general public, the impression based on these press releases was that Dr. Hu was a spy and was probably guilty.

Before Dr. Hu’s trial, Jamie received a call from the clerk of Judge Tom Varlan, who would be presiding over the trial. Jamie would often be asked by Judge Varlan to cover cases he deemed a public interest, and Dr. Hu’s case was one of these instances.
Jamie quickly understood the importance of covering this case: Dr. Hu had been targeted simply because he had been born in China, and a Google search had been the basis for the FBI, DOJ, and Department of Energy, to launch a full scale investigation of Dr. Hu.

There was no evidence against Dr. Hu. The FBI, DOJ, and DOE created the crime Dr. Hu was accused of committing. The FBI, DOJ, and DOE got the University of Tennessee to give them files on Dr. Hu, in violation of Dr. Hu's rights.

Dr. Hu, a world renowned specialist in the field of nanotechnology, had applied for grants from NASA. NASA abided by a provision that it could not fund a grant that implicated the Chinese government. According to Jamie, this regulation was questionable when it was passed, and was not intended to be used in a criminal way. The NASA representative with whom Dr. Hu worked on the grant application was fully aware of this regulation.

When Dr. Hu applied for the NASA grants, he did not know that he and his son, a student at the University of Tennessee, were being stalked by law enforcement. Dr. Hu was stopped at an airport and had his electronics confiscated. Early in the investigation of Dr. Hu, an FBI agent told Dr. Hu: "I have no evidence against you. I don't think you're spy." This FBI agent reportedly asked Dr. Hu to spy for the FBI and Dr. Hu declined.

According to Jamie, this FBI agent was spurned by Dr. Hu declining to be an informant for the FBI. Having promised a case under the China Initiative and having engaged two other agencies, there was pressure for the agent to go after Dr. Hu. The FBI, DOJ, and DOE in coordination with the University of Tennessee set Dr. Hu up by allowing him to send in a grant application which they knew would be used to incriminate him. The NASA representative with whom Dr. Hu worked also approved of the grant application although he knew it could lead to Dr. Hu's arrest.

Jamie believed that at the time that the University of Tennessee agreed to cooperate with the DOJ regarding Dr. Hu's case, the University had been a welcoming place for the Asian community. The University "had no problem employing and being associated with the academic culture and the citizens of China and organized Chinese cultural events for the community. (Here, Jamie noted the distinction between creating a welcoming environment for the Chinese community and doing business with the government of China.) The University of Tennessee "threw Dr. Hu under the bus" and has never given an explanation for why they treated him that way.

While there was wrongdoing on the part of the University of Tennessee, the DOJ, the FBI, the DOE, and NASA, there was justice in the courtroom when Dr. Hu's case went to trial. Two jurors were steadfast in their belief that this was a bogus case, refused to convict, and stood guard against those members of the jury who were ready to convict solely because Dr. Hu was of Chinese descent or solely because the federal government said Dr. Hu was guilty. There was a hung jury which resulted in a mistrial.
With a 99% conviction rate, the DOJ was not expected to retry Dr. Hu. Months before, the same US Attorney's Office had lost in an appeal. This high profile case, which was overturned, involved a white American businessman convicted of defrauding his customers. Because of a technicality the businessman got a chance for a retrial. The US Attorney's office declined to retry him because it would have been too expensive. However, within two months and with a hung jury, the US Attorney’s Office decided to retry Dr. Hu.

Judge Tom Varlan is a Republican appointee not under the prior Republican administration. One could argue, simply because of that, that he would cater to the DOJ. In Dr. Hu’s case, Judge Varlan allowed the jury system and DOJ system to work. When those two systems failed, Judge Varlan stepped in and dismissed Dr. Hu’s case.

In the meantime, Dr Hu’s life was destroyed. Not only did he lose his job—he lost it with headlines accusing him of being a spy, which also impacted his wife and his children. Jamie emphasized that this injustice should not go unnoticed. She was proud that in largely white East Tennessee, once her reporting exposed what happened to Dr. Hu, she saw the community support change and begin to question the China Initiative. What threat does China pose and who represents that threat? Jamie argued that the threat is not posed by academics like Dr. Hu.

3. Union of Concerned Scientists
   a. Speaker: Johanna Chao Kreilick, President, Union of Concerned Scientists

   - Union of Concerned Scientists: New MIT Technology Review Investigation Foretells Danger of China Competitiveness Legislation

"The Union of Concerned Scientists was founded in 1969 by scientists and students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The UCS founders drafted a statement calling for scientific research to be directed away from military technologies and toward solving pressing environmental and social problems... We remain true to that founding vision. Throughout our history, UCS has followed the example set by the scientific community: we share information, seek the truth, and let our findings guide our conclusions." Johanna discussed the Union of Concerned Scientists and the "China Initiative" in her portion of the meeting.

Johanna began by commending Representative Chu’s political leadership and Jamie Satterfield’s focus and leadership in the field of independent journalism, as well as noting Professor Lazowska’s important perspective as an engineer and scientist—all of which she hoped to complement with her talk. She also acknowledged the many legal advocates and litigators in the audience: “The pillars of law, independent journalism, and science are absolutely essential, not just to science, but to democracy. We are in the shared project of protecting both.”
Johanna’s talk focused on science-based advocacy and the role UCS has played for over 50 years in protecting the integrity of science, including strengthening the ability of all scientists to do their work free from political interference and racial profiling. Strengthening the integrity of science as a pillar of democracy, justice, and good governance is not only an imperative for UCS, but has been a shaping force in Johanna’s life as a Chinese American. Her late grandfather, Edward Chao, was a scientist who came to the US from China in 1945. He attended the University of Chicago, earned his PhD in geology, and was recruited by the US Geological Survey (USGS) in 1949. Dr. Chao spent his entire 45-year career with the USGS as a federal employee.

At the time, McCarthyism was reaching its height driven by racist, demagogue-esque, reckless, and unsubstantiated accusations by Senator Joe McCarthy. In 1947 President Harry Truman had signed an Executive Order to screen federal employees for possible association with any organization deemed totalitarian, fascist, communist, or subversive. It was against that backdrop that Dr. Chao designed NASA’s first lunar sampling program. His work spanned the globe, from Arizona to Germany to Mongolia. His geological discoveries provided the basis for entire segments of industry and economy. Dr. Chao’s work demonstrates the power of scientific exchange across minds and platforms.

Despite a lifetime of accomplishments and brilliance, Edward experienced constant racism and hostility, which took a severe toll on him, his family, and his ability to make the fullest scientific contribution to people and the planet. It is appalling that over 75 years later, not only does racism remain institutionalized, it has been reinvigorated by the federal government in the form of the China Initiative and other policies.

In November 2018, the DOJ launched the China initiative to prevent the theft of information and technology from US-based corporations and research labs. While that ambition may be praiseworthy in theory, the real impacts of the China Initiative are a crackdown on scientists, the perpetuation of racial injustice, and stifling of scientific collaboration and exchange. Scientific collaboration is essential for the type of transformative change required to avoid climate catastrophe, nuclear war, and the downfall of democracy.

A recent MIT investigation of the China Initiative found a pattern of civil rights abuses tantamount to an assault on Chinese American scholars. A November 2021 analysis by Bloomberg News drew similar conclusions. For example, the very few China Initiative cases that the DOJ described as espionage were actually cases of individuals personally profiteering, not doing something that benefited China. Instead of catching spies, the bulk of the indictments were over failures to disclose affiliations with Chinese universities, usually when applying for federal research funding. It is important to note that the FBI officials themselves have admitted that their disclosure rules were unclear.
MIT researcher Gang Chen is being prosecuted on these grounds despite the fact that MIT itself facilitated his collaboration with a university in China and handled the grant funding. MIT is covering his legal fees.

Lawyers for other academics charged in China Initiative cases have rightly argued that US universities have long encouraged their faculty to collaborate with other universities, including those in China.

One scientist who moved back to China from the US identified genes for heart arrhythmia. The charges against him for failing to disclose his research in China were dropped after he produced a letter from the Cleveland Clinic, showing that he had indeed had permission.

The irony is that the China initiative has generated exactly the kind of results that the United States was trying to avoid: some of the best and the brightest scientists are now returning to China, and in many cases careers are being destroyed despite scientists doing nothing wrong.

One of the biggest liabilities associated with the China Initiative is the stifling of potential for scientific innovation. Scientific research is intended for publication and sharing, which means being shared with the wider world, not being kept secret or owned or transferred to a country’s governance.

The opportunity costs the US is paying due to the China Initiative stifling scientific freedom, exchange, and collaboration cannot be overstated.

The Union of Concerned Scientists has a long history of fighting the politicization of science in the federal government – an issue which President Biden himself has spoken out against. UCS believes that protection from political interference should extend to any place a scientist is working, especially when they are conducting research for the public good. While the Biden administration has committed to addressing long standing racial inequities, the China Initiative is the antithesis of that goal.

The Biden administration presumably knows that neither the Asian American community nor scientific organizations weighed in on the China Initiative before it was rolled out. The administration must rectify this oversight by listening to their constituents now about the program's ramifications.

Now Congress appears poised to expand on the scope of the China Initiative. The Innovation and Competition Act would require federal agencies and departments to scrutinize US governmental and non-governmental activities connected to China. If this legislation were to be passed, the head of every federal agency would designate an Undersecretary focused on ferreting out Chinese influence. US citizens, businesses, educational institutions and civic groups could be investigated for routine activities, creating a chilling effect on normal economic, social and cultural interactions between ordinary Chinese and Americans. This would only increase the troubling racial profiling of Chinese Americans.
UCS is calling on Congress to remove all of the problematic language in the Innovation and Competition bill. If lawmakers want to increase US competitiveness, UCS says that they should also focus on the measures in the House version of the bill, which is called the Ensuring American Global Leadership and Engagement Act, or the EAGLE Act. The EAGLE Act would provide investment in US science and technology.

Johanna encouraged the audience to share this message with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who is negotiating the final version of this bill with a group of representatives and senators. Johanna’s team at UCS feels that there is an opportunity to stop a lot of harm if they can convince Pelosi to hold firm on the House version of the new China bill. Pelosi has one of the largest Asian American constituencies in the country in her San Francisco district. Johanna believed that “APA Justice can carry a big bat with [Pelosi] on this” and was glad to see APA Justice’s focus on this problem.

According to Johanna, the fight against the China Initiative is important, but it looks like there is already some good traction there. This new China legislation is still flying under the radar and is far more dangerous.

Johanna concluded by saying that the White House and Congress must realize that people around the world are facing existential scientific threats. Three of these threats that UCS works on are climate change, the erosion of democracy, and the risk of nuclear war – all of which factor into the nexus of US-China relations. The world can truly only overcome these threats by working together as an international community, which means civilian scientists and government leaders must collaborate.

4. DARPA instructions on "risk levels" of Principal Investigator
   a. Edward Lazowska, Professor, University of Washington

   - 2021/12/01 DARPA: Risk-Based Measures to Assess Potential Undue Foreign Influence Conflicts of Interest or Conflicts of Commitment

Ed spoke about the Defense Advanced Projects Research Agency’s (DARPA’s) risk matrix, which was rolled out in September 2021 and later revised in December 2021. The revision of the risk matrix illustrated that there are situations in which the government has moved in a more reasonable direction when pressured by individuals and groups.

The goal of DARPA’s risk matrix can be considered reasonable. Intellectual property theft related to critical technologies exists, and universities have undoubtedly not taken that sufficiently seriously. The question is: How can these issues be addressed without racial profiling (or as Representative Chu said, “based on evidence rather than race”)?

Ed showed an image of DARPA’s original matrix (before it was revised). He pointed out various risk levels shown on the matrix: very high, high, moderate, low. The matrix also
had columns for broad qualitative metrics and specific actions. The critical issue was that essentially anyone with any connection to China or Russia (family, friends, collaborators) was deemed high risk simply based on those associations rather than based on any actions.

The issue of ethnic profiling associated with DARPA’s risk matrix was brought to Ed’s attention in October 2021 by Fei-Fei Li, a top computer scientist at Stanford. Fei-Fei forwarded Ed an email that was an exchange between a young faculty member in her department (Computer Science) and Stanford’s provost. The emails argued that following DARPA’s risk matrix was an exercise in ethnic profiling.

Ed immediately contacted the co-chairs of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST): Eric Lander, Maria Zuber, and Frances Arnold. Eric Lander is also Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). They had not been aware of this DARPA initiative.

Ed also contacted Peter Harsha, Director of Government Affairs for the Computing Research Association, which represents academic and industry researchers in the field. Peter launched an inquiry with DARPA. DARPA’s response amounted to: “This is the new normal, it’s required by law, and there has been coordination with all research agencies.” However, the claim that there had been coordination with all research agencies was quickly contradicted by Rebecca Keiser (the National Science Foundation’s newly appointed Chief of Research Security Strategy Policy) and Sethuraman Panchanathan (Director of the National Science Foundation). Sethuraman wrote to the National Science Board stating that there was a narrative circulating that the National Science Foundation had been consulted on the development of the DARPA policy, but that narrative was not true. In fact, he had only just become aware of it, and would not adopt an approach like that.

Rebecca Keiser arranged a meeting in late October 2021 between DOD and DARPA leadership, and a group from the Computing Research Association. There were four DOD and DARPA participants: the Director for Basic Research in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Contracts Management in DARPA, the Assistant Director for Policy and Oversight in DARPA’s Security and Intelligence Directorate (who was a primary author of the matrix), and the Director of DARPA’s Mission Services Office. This was a very positive meeting. DARPA and DOD agreed that the risk matrix was ill conceived, stated that it did not reflect their intent, and said they would consider suggestions made by the group from the Computing Research Association.

The group from the Computing Research Association followed up with a set of conservative suggestions to the DOD and DARPA regarding the risk matrix policy. The suggestions included the following:

- Remove specific mentions of countries so the policy does not seem to target particular nationalities.
- Eliminate the “broad qualitative metric” category; focus on specific actions of senior personnel rather than associations. Note that activities that were legal and appropriate when they were undertaken should not trigger the belief that an individual poses a risk.
- Replace or reword mentions of degrees of risk associated with people because of nationality or family. The wording implies that people pose a risk simply because of family or ethnicity, which is not what the DOD and DARPA stated that their intention was.

After some weeks without any action from the DOD and DARPA, a new version of the matrix appeared on DARPA’s website. A very important change: the column that focused on associations rather than actions was deleted. The new matrix featured a number of other changes, and came with a helpful list of Frequently Asked Questions about the associated policy. Ed felt that the FAQ reflected a more reasonable approach by DARPA while correcting previous misstatements. For example, it stated that DARPA did not coordinate with other agencies to develop this policy.

Ed added that on November 27, 2021, prior to the posting of the new matrix, he ran into Washington Senator Maria Cantwell, Chair of the Commerce Committee. Maria said she hoped to address the issue in the research bill that was being worked on and connected Ed with Richard Duane Chambers, the staffer who was coordinating the bill. Ed and Richard spoke on the last day of November. Richard said the situation was “politically very complex” and that the Commerce Committee’s strategy was to have OSTP promulgate reasonable standards that would apply to all agencies rather than leaving it to individual agencies to come up with standards of their own. Ed believed this to be a reasonable way to proceed under the circumstances.

However, Ed also noted that “my Chinese colleagues are under assault in this nation, and we have to be aware of that.” Fei-Fei Li, a global leader of artificial intelligence research and a leader of the National AI Research Resource Task Force, has had multiple death threats and has been accused of being a Chinese spy, including accusations by two members of Congress. Johanna Kreilick noted a number of scientists who have been under judicial assault. Surprisingly, with the change in administration the DOJ has not changed its approach to the China Initiative.

Ed described a young colleague of his at the University of Washington, who had a green card and had earned his PhD from MIT. This colleague had ICE show up at his door four times and subsequently left the university to work at Amazon because he felt he needed to go “underground.” He could not conduct computer systems research “underground” at a university, whereas he could do that at Amazon. He did not want his name on grant proposals, or proposal reviews or research papers.

Ed stated that instances like these are devastating to the international community and that the government’s behavior must change. He emphasized the importance of UCS, APA Justice, Representative Chu, and others continuing to focus on the topic of racial profiling of Chinese Americans in academia.
At this point, Ed handed the floor back to Jeremy Wu, who invited Professor Xiaoxing Xi (who had alerted APA Justice in September 2021 about the original version of DARPA’s risk matrix) to raise a question or comment for Ed.

Xiaoxing expressed his appreciation for the insights and efforts put forth by Ed and others. Based on the original DARPA risk rubric and based on the US Innovation and Competition Act of 2021 mentioned by Johanna, Xiaoxing feels that the US is moving in the direction of zero academic exchange with China. There will be few if any graduate students from China. Anyone who collaborates with Chinese colleagues will be severely punished. Professors who come from China, like Xiaoxing, will become an “extinct species” unless the scientific community pushes back, convinces the American public that this is bad for the country, and convinces policymakers that this hurts American science.

Xiaoxing asked Ed if he thought there was strong enough pushback from the scientific community that could stop the situation Xiaoxing described from becoming a reality. “I’m very encouraged by what you have done, and many other leaders have done. Do you think this will be strong enough to change the trend of this country?”

Ed responded that pushback from the scientific community must become far stronger. UCS and many others are working hard on this; it needs to be something that the research community as a whole embraces, not just Chinese members of the research community. Ed said that his field, computer science, was a wonderful example of the important contributions to research and technology made by Chinese, Indian, and other immigrants in the US. A staggering proportion of US technology startups have been established and led by immigrants. We cripple the nation by operating under the illusion that we are the one place, and we are the one nationality, where innovation occurs. Increasingly, advances in science, engineering, and medicine are global rather than local to one country. And increasingly, the United States is one contributor to global advancement in science, engineering, and medicine. If we isolate ourselves or fail to take advantage of the best minds in the world, we will rapidly lose our position of technological leadership. Ed concluded by restating his belief that more must be done to raise the attention of the public and policymakers to the issue of ethnic profiling. He would like to see organizations such as the AAU and other organizations of leading universities take a serious stand on this issue. One does not want to do this in a way that triggers a backlash. The scientific community should proceed in a way that gathers allies, and does not empower the opposition.

5. Anti-Racial Profiling Project and Related Activities - Asian Americans

Advancing Justice | AAJC

a. Speaker: Gisela Kusakawa, Staff Attorney, Advancing Justice | AAJC
- Sign-On Interest Form: Amicus Brief in Support of Professor Xiaoxing Xi
- Advancing Justice | AAJC: Anti-Racial Profiling Project
- Legal Referral Service: Contact 202-935-6014 using the Signal app for attorney referrals. AAJC staff can assist you in Mandarin Chinese and English.

Gisela dropped from the call and did not end up speaking at this meeting.

6. Q&A and Discussions

7. Next Meeting

- Next Meeting: Monday, February 7, 2022