

The Chinese Diaspora and Philanthropy

Nick Young
&
June Shih



GLOBAL EQUITY INITIATIVE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

This paper was commissioned by the Global Equity Initiative for a workshop on Diaspora Philanthropy to China and India, held in May 2003. The views expressed are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Global Equity Initiative.

Introduction

This paper explores philanthropic links between the Chinese diaspora and the People's Republic of China. Drawing on published sources and on interviews with some protagonists, it attempts to sketch the range and nature of those links, in the context of shifting international commercial and political relations and 'globalisation' processes.

An undertaking of this kind is beset by several conceptual difficulties. We do not propose to examine these in detail, but it is as well to note them at the outset, and to state what positions we have chosen to take.

Firstly, what is 'philanthropy'? Use of the term in a transnational context presupposes that it meaningfully identifies common ground in distinct historical, cultural and religious traditions. We work with this presupposition rather than examining it. Yet it is almost immediately apparent that 'philanthropy' often shades into, or departs from 'self-help' or 'mutual aid' on the one hand (as, for example, in giving to or through kinship networks), and may mesh with the pursuit of commercial or political advantage on the other (as in wealthy individuals making charitable donations with an eye to improving government and corporate relations). We make no normative judgements about this, not least because any attempt to pronounce on what is 'real' philanthropy would entail immersion in ethical puzzles that have plagued moral philosophers for millennia. By 'philanthropy', therefore, we simply refer to the private and voluntary transfer of resources (money, goods, services, knowledge, skills or time) for the benefit of others, irrespective of either the motives of the donor or any benefits that may accrue to the donor.

Secondly, what is 'China'? Whether we are disposed to regard it primarily as a place, a civilisation, a culture, an empire, a nation or a race, it is clear that the literal and imagined boundaries of China have shifted substantially over the centuries. Consulting an atlas to determine the present borders of the People's Republic is not necessarily helpful, since there are those who would argue passionately that some areas within those borders – notably, Tibet – are not 'really' part of China; while others (including PRC cartographers) would argue just as passionately that areas outside the borders marked on Western atlases – pre-eminently, Taiwan – definitely are part of China. We would prefer to avoid these debates; yet, deciding what counts as 'part of China' would seem critical to deciding where its 'diaspora' begins. Again our approach to this is practical rather than normative. It is certainly relevant to discuss the role of Taiwan and Hong Kong, without thereby characterising them as 'diasporan' communities, because they do form part of a diasporan chain – having served as stepping stones for emigration further afield, and continuing to serve as important nodes in diasporan networks. Taiwan and Hong Kong are also major sources of commercial and philanthropic investment in the Chinese mainland. On the other hand, in order to make our task more manageable in scope

we will only in passing consider the Tibetan diaspora, although this is large, distinctive and in many cases deeply engaged in mobilising philanthropic and political support for Tibetan communities in the PRC.

A third, generic issue is what we mean by ‘diaspora’, and how this relates to issues of identity. Although it has a very long history, the Chinese diaspora has little in common with the Jewish diaspora, which the word was originally coined to describe. In some ways it appears to have more in common with emigration, whether political or economic, from European countries; yet the assimilation of European emigrants into host communities has generally been more rapid than the assimilation of Chinese emigrants. Chinatowns around the world have at least partly preserved distinctly Chinese identities over several generations, and in places such as Southeast Asia many people of Chinese descent still appear, in some cases after hundreds of years, to constitute discrete ethnic and cultural communities; to the extent, at least, that they are vulnerable to attack in times of social stress, as was seen in Indonesia following the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s. In short, whether because of the inherent strength of Chinese culture, or because of the lack of receptivity of host communities, Chinese emigrants in the past have not been quick to lose their Chineseness. However, one important question is whether the pace of assimilation may now be growing, or set to grow rapidly. This perhaps applies especially to Europe and North America, where the plethora of available descriptors – ‘American Chinese’, ‘Chinese American’, ‘American Born Chinese’ – itself implies shifting and contested views of the roles that ancestry and ethnicity play in the construction of personal identities. From almost every point of view, ancestry and ethnicity are undoubtedly less important factors in the lives of Americans of Chinese descent today than they were a hundred years ago. (This, naturally, is less clearly true of more recent migrants). Will they in due course become as irrelevant as they are to contemporary English people, who generally neither know nor care whether they descend from Saxons, Celts, or ‘diasporan’ Normans, Danes, Huns etc.? (The Scots, Welsh and Irish care more!)

A related issue is the extent to which ‘globalisation’ is changing the nature of international migration, and therefore of diasporas. Increased international flows of capital are beginning to be matched by increased labour flows, but new migration patterns are emerging. Despite political barriers, ‘economic migrants’ continue to flow towards opportunities in wealthier countries with low population growth matched by economic demand for low-wage labour in service industries. But the restructuring of the global economy has also meant the relocation of labour-intensive industries to developing countries, and the growth of short-term migration on fixed labour contracts. (China already routinely exports fixed-contract labour, and also uses semi-skilled Chinese labour in its own overseas aid projects, such as building dams in Africa.) It is probable, therefore, that well-educated and relatively affluent populations will figure prominently in future permanent migration from China to North America and Europe, increasing

the global concentration of financial and intellectual capital. Whilst this brain drain is in many ways a loss for the China, the émigrés will be relatively well positioned to give something back to the home country in a relatively short space of time. At the same time, we are witnessing the emergence of a highly mobile international business and professional elite, many of whose members have multiple citizenship and/or homes in several countries. It is not clear whether the ethnic Chinese members of this elite can be properly regarded as part of the Chinese ‘disapora’; but they may well include a number of significant future philanthropists.

Historical background

Between 1405 and 1433, the great Ming Dynasty Admiral Zheng He led a fleet of 300 ships and 28,000 men on seven expeditions into the seas beyond China. The imperial fleet made stops in Java, Sumatra, Thailand, Sri Lanka, India, sailing as far west as the Persian Gulf, Arabia, and East Africa, where today villagers off the coast of Kenya claim to be descendants of Zheng He's shipwrecked sailors.¹ The state-of-the-art, nine-masted, 400-foot long ships might easily have made it to America – nearly a century before Christopher Columbus set off from Spain in his comparatively modest 85-foot long ships.

But before Admiral Zheng could supplant Columbus' place in history, reactionaries in the Ming Emperor's Court put an end to his travels, destroyed his records, dismantled his armada, and made it a capital offense to leave the country. Chinese communities abroad, they feared, could nurture plots to overthrow the emperor. The Middle Kingdom turned itself inward, falling into a long, bloated slumber just as Europe's own imperial aspirations began to rise.

While the Ming Court was blind to the opportunity of a millennium, many of its subjects were not. Zheng He's travels and tales of civilizations beyond the Middle Kingdom fired the imaginations of merchants and artisans who, despite the imperial edicts forbidding foreign travel, sailed for southeast Asia, establishing the first Chinese settlements in the Philippines and Thailand. Although Chinese merchants had ventured beyond the empire before, the Chinese diaspora – now a global population of 34 million people of Chinese descent living in more than 130 countries² – was launched in earnest by Zheng He's journeys. In the Qing dynasty, the trickle of traders that followed in Zheng He's wake grew into a flood swollen by peasants desperate to escape overpopulation, civil war, clan conflicts, and crop failures, especially in the southeastern provinces of Guangdong and Fujian. They went to Southeast Asia, Africa and the Americas, where cheap labor to develop and exploit raw materials for Europe's colonial masters was in great demand. More than two million people left China between 1848-1888.³ Chinese migrants to the Americas endured slave-like conditions as contract laborers in the guano fields of Peru, the sugar plantations of Cuba and Hawaii, and most famously, the gold mines and railroad camps of California. Others who went to Southeast Asia flourished as shopkeepers, artisans, and

plantation owners, amassing great fortunes as middlemen between local Southeast Asians and their European colonists.

But the imperial ban on foreign travel remained in place. The Chinese government 'shall request foreign governments to have those Chinese who have been abroad repatriated so that they may be executed,' declared a 1712 edict.⁴ While the edict was rarely enforced, things did not change until the mid-nineteenth century, when the Qing emperor, weakened significantly by conflicts with the Western powers, signed agreements such as the Burlingame Treaty with the United States in 1868 allowing Chinese to work abroad. In 1893, a new imperial edict recognized the rights of all Chinese to travel abroad freely and declared that all Chinese emigrants would be allowed to return home whenever they wish.

Chinese emigration continued to grow in the 20th century, as continuing social instability, war and revolution sent streams of Chinese out of the mainland. The majority of them did not go far. Today, more than four out of five overseas Chinese – 24 million – live in Southeast Asia, most of them in Indonesia, Thailand, and Malaysia.⁵ where they control wealth and capital far out of proportion to their population. Chinese in Indonesia, for instance, are just 2.5 percent of the total population, yet they control 73 percent of all wealth in the country.⁶ This concentration of wealth has caused deep resentment against the Chinese - and led to discriminatory laws and ethnic violence in their host countries.

While the majority live in Southeast Asia, North America has become the destination of choice for modern émigrés. Today, some 2.5 million Chinese live in the United States, where their numbers are growing faster than in any other region, and a million more live in Canada.⁷ Beginning in the mid-20th century, a new class of educated, upper and middle Chinese began to arrive on America's shores. This can be attributed in large part to America's Chinese immigration policies. Educated Chinese emigres have long enjoyed special treatment by the United States. Even as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 shut the door on poor Chinese laborers, Chinese students, many of whom had been sent by the Chinese government to master the advanced sciences and technologies of the West, continued to receive visas to study in the United States. Their numbers were such that by the 1930's most of the senior officials in Chiang Kai Shek's government had been educated in America.⁸

The Chinese Exclusion Act was not repealed until 1943, when China and the United States became allies against Japan in World War II. A new quota was created for Chinese immigrants (albeit one that was much lower than those for Europeans). But students again received special treatment. After the Communist revolution of 1949, the US Congress passed a law granting asylum to Chinese students studying in America, assuming that they had had ties to the defeated Guomintang. This enabled about 5,000 Chinese to stay in America permanently. Refugees

from the Communist revolution were also given special permission to immigrate. Some of today's most prominent Chinese-Americans are descended from this generation of elite immigrants - most of whom came from Shanghai: entrepreneur Charles Wang, architect I.M. Pei, writer David Henry Hwang, composer Chou Wen-Chung.

The Civil Rights movement in the United States forced the further reform and equalization of immigration laws, granting China the same immigration quotas as other countries: 20,000 people. Preference again was given to skilled professionals – leading to an immigration wave of Chinese students, doctors, engineers and scientists who are now comfortably integrated into America's upper middle classes. While Communist China remained closed off to the world from 1949-1979, most of the 20,000 slots were taken by Chinese immigrating from Taiwan. But with the recognition of the People's Republic in 1979, another 20,000 slots were created for immigrants from the mainland. Today, along with a new quota of 5,000 Hong Kong Chinese, some 45,000 Chinese legally immigrate to the U.S. every year. The actual numbers are larger since many people of Chinese descent enter the U.S. through quotas dedicated to Southeast Asian countries.

Chinese immigration to the United States saw its largest spike in 1989, when, in the wake of the Chinese government crackdown on protesters in Tiananmen Square, some 80,000 Chinese students studying in America were granted green cards under the Chinese Student Protection Act. Another ten thousand Chinese enter the United States as students each year.⁹ Many of them will not return to China until they have obtained green cards or U.S. citizenship. Of 580,000 mainland Chinese who have studied abroad since 1978, only around a quarter have returned home.¹⁰ The numbers applying for student visas are likely to grow as China's business and professional elites grow richer and stronger, since many parents are keen, and able to afford, to send their children overseas for high school and university education, or at least to learn English.

Meanwhile, the return of Hong Kong to Chinese sovereignty in 1997 prompted many of Hong Kong's better-off residents to apply for nationality elsewhere, buying property or investing in other countries to advance their claims to citizenship, as an 'insurance policy' against heavy handed intervention by the mainland in Hong Kong's way of life.

But if the general trend of immigration and access to developed countries appears increasingly to favour more highly skilled, educated and affluent people, it is also the case that many thousands of peasants each year risk their lives to be smuggled into Europe and the United States. Recent field research by Frank Pieke and others indeed suggests that the last twenty years have seen an 'energisation' of emigration from China, providing an 'infusion of new blood into existing communities of overseas Chinese' where there is new demand for cheap labour in Chinese

owned businesses, to replace established and now upwardly mobile immigrants.¹¹ Moreover, Pieke found that many of the new, illegal immigrants are coming from areas with little or no previous history of emigration (such as western Fujian, as opposed to the traditional labour supply areas in the south of the province), and that international migration patterns are increasingly interwoven with migration within China: the departing Fujianese are being replaced by less well-off peasants from the interior provinces. Given the dynamism and sophistication of migrant networks, and the difficulties that Western governments typically experience in controlling the flow, it is likely that Chinese communities in Europe and North America will continue to be enriched by this infusion of new and hardworking blood.

The diaspora must therefore be seen as complex and multi-faceted. It includes established communities with second, third, even fourth and fifth generations: some of these are figuratively as well as literally remote from their ancestral home (as in Africa and Latin America), but others (as in Singapore and elsewhere in Asia) have retained or renewed ties with the mainland. It includes people who left China as refugees from communism, and a newer wave of – often entrepreneurial and well educated – émigrés who have left over the last twenty years. It includes people who are perhaps not ‘disaporan’ so much as Chinese members of a global transnational class; and it also includes new migrants of more modest means who continue to make their way overseas illegally.

Managing the overseas Chinese constituency

From wanting to bring back and execute its émigrés, the Chinese state (and aspirants to government) shifted in the late imperial and republican period to wanting to recruit them as allies in reconstruction, modernisation and nation building. In the late 19th century, influential scholar-officials such as Liang Qichao (1873-1929) enjoyed some success in persuading the Qing court that overseas Chinese, especially in the flourishing communities of Southeast Asia, should be actively encouraged to return. Their capital and technical skills, he argued, would be important assets in modernising China and defending it from Japanese expansionism.¹² Similar concerns echoed through much of the following, turbulent century – although the turbulence in fact increased, rather than reversed, the outward flow.

While himself favouring constitutional monarchy, Liang nonetheless helped prepare the ground for republicanism by articulating, in writings that were read widely by overseas Chinese, new concepts of *gongmin* and *guomin*. Both terms can be loosely translated as ‘citizen’, implying political rights as well as responsibilities, but emphasising, respectively, membership of a public realm and membership of a nation.¹³ If today these seem rather anodyne ideas, at the time they signalled seismic change in a political culture that had for thousands of years attached supreme importance to continuity and social hierarchy rooted in the Confucian virtues of filial piety and

loyalty to the ruler. A concept of nationhood based on common historical identity rather than on allegiance to the emperor made possible a new kind of patriotism in which overseas Chinese could participate.

China's first republican president, Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925), took these ideas further in the Three Principles of the People (*san min zhuyi*) on which he hoped to found a new China: 'Nationalism' (*minzu zhuyi*) 'Democracy' (*minchuan zhuyi*) and 'People's Livelihood' (*minsheng zhuyi*).¹⁴ Sun came from a relatively poor rural Guangdong family that had sent kin overseas: two of his uncles died as 'contract coolies' (*huagong*) in the 1849 California gold rush.¹⁵ From the age of 13, Sun himself was educated in Hawaii and Hong Kong. Before his brief stint as president in 1912, he spent sixteen years in exile in Japan, South East Asia, North America and Europe, raising money from Chinese communities worldwide to support a series of abortive military actions. Overseas Chinese also returned to fight and die in these insurrections, as in the Canton (Guangdong) uprising of April, 1911, which is still commemorated in Huanhuaguang by a mausoleum – built with donations from overseas Chinese – to '72 martyrs', most of them from Chinese communities abroad. The birth of the republic was thus intimately connected – financially, politically, and in terms of the interchange of ideas – with these overseas communities.

Republicanism entailed a new construction of Chinese nationality, to confer (or, as some would argue, to impose) a common identity upon an ethnically diverse empire. The flag of the first republic comprised five stripes representing five ethnic groups then deemed to belong to the Chinese nation – Han, Muslim, Mongol, Manchu and Tibetan.¹⁶ In an elaboration of this theme, the present People's Republic embraces 56 officially recognised ethnic groups, although even this larger number significantly understates the diversity of the 'Han' majority, which includes many people with mutually unintelligible spoken languages (rather like grouping Italian and Spanish people together as 'Latins'). However, the overarching concept of *huaren* ('Chinese people'), although reflected in the current Republic's full title (*Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo*), is strongly associated with the cradle of Chinese civilisation along the Yellow River¹⁷, and thus with those of Han ethnicity.¹⁸ Curiously, therefore, the notion of *huaren* extends more naturally to Han people abroad – who are referred to in China as *huaqiao* ('Chinese sojourners') or, in the case of their descendants, as *huayi* ('of Chinese descent') – than it does to some ethnic minority citizens of the People's Republic. Tibetans and Uighurs, for example, would not normally count themselves as *huaren*.

The post-imperial Chinese state can therefore be said to have a strong sense of its core émigrés still belonging in some sense to China, and comprising an important constituency. The other side of this coin is a strong sense of the 'otherness' of foreign nationalities and cultures, reflected in extremely restrictive policies for immigration into China, even for foreign spouses of nationals.

Naturalisation is limited by the 1980 Nationality Law to descendants of ethnic Chinese, and each year only 70-80 non ethnic Chinese obtain Chinese citizenship.¹⁹

As the new republic descended into warlordism, Japanese incursion and invasion, and civil war, courting of the overseas Chinese constituency became divided along ideological lines. Both the Nationalist and Communist parties sought financial and political support from the diaspora. In 1937, Sun Yat-sen's widow, Soong Ching Ling, who sided with the Communists, established a China Defense League that took medical supplies and established 'international peace hospitals' behind Chinese lines (then allied in a fragile 'united front' of Nationalists and Communists), especially serving Mao Zedong's 8th Route Army and 4th New Army.²⁰ The League also set up schools and child care centres such as the 'Los Angeles Nursery', supported by the Los Angeles Chinese community, in a loess plateau cave in Mao's Yan'an 'revolutionary base area'. Such was Soong's prestige among Chinese overseas that she was able to elicit substantial donations for the League from prominent Chinese tycoons in the British colony of Hong Kong and further afield.

After the Communist victory in 1949 Soong presided over a China Welfare Fund that established 'children's palaces' kindergartens and hospitals Shanghai and Beijing. The Fund became moribund during the Cultural Revolution (1966-76); but in 1986, five years after Soong's death, a new foundation was established in her name. As well as promoting 'Soong Ching Ling thought' and managing museums dedicated to her life and work, the Soong Ching Ling Foundation today awards prizes for children's literature and raises funds for school building and scholarship programmes, notably in predominantly Muslim Ningxia Province where it has raised CNY 10 million (USD 1.2 million) to support the education of girl children. It has also conducted nationwide anti-smoking campaigns in schools. Branches in Shanghai and Chongqing municipalities and in the provinces of Hainan, Shaanxi and Henan have their own child welfare programmes. These are partly funded by donations from Chinese communities overseas, through affiliated branches in Canada, Hungary and Japan.

In 1949 the Communist party-state set up an 'All-China Federation of Returned Overseas Chinese' (*Qiaolian*). This was one of eight, Leninist 'organisations of the masses', created to oversee different constituencies: most notably, women (the All-China Women's Federation); youth (the Youth League); workers (the All-China Federation of Trade Unions), but also scientists, writers, artists and cultural workers. These did not serve to represent their constituencies so much as to disseminate the Party line among them and strengthen 'democratic centralist' political control. Although the mass organisations broadly retain this political function they have, over the last twenty years, shifted towards more of a social welfare and service provider role, as state, workplace-based and rural cooperative welfare provision has been rolled back. The Youth League, for example, established a China Youth Development

Foundation whose flagship 'Project Hope' has been highly successful in raising funds for school building and basic education scholarship programmes; and Youth League cadre training programmes now emphasise youth and community work as well as political education. The Women's Federation established, in 1981, a China Children and Teenager's Fund whose 'Spring Bud' programme supports basic education for girl children, vocational education for teenagers and, more recently, health programmes; and in many areas training for women cadres now also embraces social as well as political dimensions. The Returned Overseas Chinese Federation has evolved in a similar way, but also with a strong emphasis on promoting economic and commercial ties with the overseas constituency.

As originally conceived, the Federation was intended to oversee and help reintegrate 'returned overseas Chinese' who came back to play a role in national reconstruction. In the event, the number of returnees was far exceeded by the number who fled the revolution, and then the Cultural Revolution, for Taiwan, Hong Kong and elsewhere. Nonetheless, several hundreds of thousands of the overseas Chinese did return throw in their fortunes with the People's Republic, and many of these were settled on more than 80 large farms that are still managed by the Federation.²¹

Over the last twenty years, however, the national Federation and its sub-national branches²² have been more concerned not with those who have returned but in developing relationships with those who remain overseas. One aspect of this is promoting 'cultural exchange' and mainland tourism for overseas Chinese. (The national level Federation owns a large, luxury hotel on a prime site in downtown Beijing; and local branches also commonly own hotels). More central to the Federation's work appears to be an economic department that helps potential investors identify investment opportunities. Finally, the Federation has a social welfare department with a subsidiary registered in 1998, the Overseas Chinese Economic and Cultural Foundation of China, which raises money for public benefit cultural and educational programmes. Over the last three years, the Foundation has raised a total of CNY 500 million (USD 60.5 million), which has been spent on building 596 schools (for which local governments are required to provide 60% match funding), and providing scholarships for outstanding students from poor provinces in Western China to attend Beijing University. The funding has come from Chinese individuals (about 300 principal donors each year) and communities in Hong Kong, Macao – notwithstanding the return of the colonies to Chinese sovereignty, Federation officials still appear, at least for the present, to count their citizens as '*huaqiao*' – South East Asia and Europe. Only a relatively small proportion of the donated funds originate from North America. Apart from these efforts by the national organisation, branches in 23 provinces are encouraged to participate in a *Qiaoxin Gongcheng* ('Overseas Heart Project') that sets a nominal '100-1,000-10,000' target: each province is encouraged to find donors to build 100 schools, support 1,000 additional projects (such as equipping libraries and computer rooms), and provide 10,000 scholarships.²³

The main government body for mediating relationships with Chinese communities overseas and developing relevant policy is the Department for Overseas Chinese Affairs (*Qiaoban*), under the direct jurisdiction of the State Council (roughly, China's equivalent of a Cabinet). In common with other government departments, this has provincial and county level counterparts that both report upwards to the central Department and coordinate with other local government agencies.²⁴ It also places staff in Chinese embassies abroad to liaise with local Chinese communities.

Over the last twenty years the *Qiaoban* and other government bodies have been increasingly active in sending delegations to visit Chinese communities abroad, and in hosting return visits. According to Hungarian scholar, Pál Nyíri, in 1991 a total of 381 delegations comprising 2,093 individuals were sent overseas from Guangdong Province alone, and by 1995 this had risen to 526 delegations involving 21,966 people.²⁵ The Federation of Chinese Associations in Rome told Nyíri they had received more than 270 official Chinese delegations in 1995. (These very high figures have to be seen in light of the fact that it is hard for Chinese people to travel overseas as private tourists: trade delegations are a highly desirable junket for officials, and sightseeing is usually a major part of the agenda.) *Qiaoban* offices in Fujian Province received over 500 delegations in 1998, while their counterparts in Guangdong received more than 3,000, involving no less than 270,514 visitors from Hong Kong, Taiwan, Macau and further afield.²⁶ (Again, these visits clearly contain an element of tourism, and prominently feature sightseeing tours and visits to ancestral homes.)

At the same time, Nyíri notes, there has been an explosion in the number of publications aimed at overseas Chinese communities and produced by official mainland agencies. Guangdong and Fujian authorities together publish over 190 such magazines, newspapers and periodicals, with a total overseas circulation topping two million, mostly distributed free.²⁷ Over the last few years mainstream Chinese media have also become internationalised through websites and satellite broadcasting, enabling them to reach the overseas constituency.

This drive to reach out to Chinese communities abroad appears largely calculated to secure their investment in China, and in this respect it has been highly successful. According to one official source, as much as 70% of China's foreign direct investment, a major motor of economic growth over the last two decades, has come from overseas Chinese.²⁸ (In this context, the 'overseas Chinese' rubric includes Hong Kong and Taiwan, whose transfer of labour intensive industries to Special Economic Zones in the mainland during the 1980s was a defining feature of Deng Xiaoping's economic reform period.) A raft of policy documents and regulations have provided, or instructed local government agencies to provide, preferential terms to overseas Chinese investors. The October 1986 Regulations on Promoting Foreign Investment laid out general principles for tax breaks, access to land for establishing factories, and employment of local

labour. In 1988, Regulations for Encouraging Investment by Compatriots from Taiwan encouraged local authorities to cooperate with Taiwanese investors in Hainan, Fujian, Guangdong, Zhejiang and other coastal areas (Articles 2, 3). The 1990 Law on the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Returned Overseas and Relatives of Overseas Chinese formally guaranteed the property rights of this constituency (Article 10), including inheritance rights (Article 13) and the right to receive remittances from overseas (Article 12), and ordered local governments to support their efforts to establish commercial, industrial or agricultural ventures (Article 9). By embracing the ‘relatives of overseas Chinese’, not just the relatives of returnees, the law facilitates investment, through kin, of people who have not themselves returned. Further Regulations on Encouraging Investment by Overseas Chinese and Compatriots from Hong Kong and Macao, issued by the State Council in May 2001, seek to promote investment in real estate development and hi-tech industries.

Although current government plans to develop China’s Western provinces include urging overseas Chinese investors to relocate labour intensive industries from coastal to inland areas, it is the hi-tech sector that now most exercises the official imagination. Where the 1980s and early 90s were marked by the development of coastal export processing zones for electronics, toy, garments and footwear industries, the new emphasis is on research and development in areas such as information technology, biotechnology, new materials technology, energy efficiency and environmental protection. To this end, a number of ‘science and technology parks’ have been established in the most economically developed provinces, with highly preferential investment terms designed to attract Western-trained ‘overseas Chinese scholars’. The local government of Suzhou New District (in Zhejiang Province) has been investing 3% of its annual revenue in establishing one such a facility, where ‘overseas Chinese scholars’ with registered capital of no more than USD 10,000 can enjoy rent-free office space for a first year, followed by rental for an unspecified period at 50% of the market price (or an option to buy at 80% of the market price); the start-up companies enjoy a three year tax holiday, followed by a 50% tax rebate for two years and a 20% rebate for a further year.²⁹ An ‘Incubator Park for Returned Scholars’ in Shanghai similarly offers ‘eight supporting treatments’, including the use of a 10,000 m³ workshop for two years rent-free or for sale at a ‘preferential’ price, 50% tax rebates, low interest loans from a development fund, and an undertaking that the park will cover all costs ‘including transport, communication, accommodation and meals . . . [during] . . . the process of project negotiation’.³⁰ Beijing has established similar facilities and, according to Vice Mayor Yang Anjiang, aims to attract ‘6,000 or more returned scholars’.³¹ To woo them back, numerous conferences, conventions and fairs are held: 2,000 graduates of overseas universities attended one recent such event, in Guangzhou in December 2002.³² The Ministry for Education, meanwhile, has instructed regional educational authorities to make special provision for the children of ‘returned scholars’, including extra language coaching for those who have been schooled in English.³³

(This contrasts sharply with attitudes to the children of China's internal migrant labourers, who face considerable formal and informal barriers to state education in host communities.)

Alongside the efforts to bring back foreign trained scientists, technicians and business managers to stimulate new industries (with MBA degrees now much in demand), some government departments are also increasingly keen to recruit returned graduates from overseas (*haiguipai*) into public administration. In 2002, the government of Liaoning made 42 such appointments, and reportedly received 120 applications from appropriately qualified *haiguipai*.³⁴ In some sectors, however, there has been more official caution. During the 1990s, the Ford Foundation supported a number of new social science research centres in Chinese universities, in the hope of bringing back overseas trained social scientists to play a role in empirical research and public policy formulation. However, according to the Ford Program Officer responsible, although some of the centers flourished, 'officials [were] too suspicious of internationally trained Chinese scholars to permit much participation'.³⁵

The objects of this intense courtship are evidently not the long-established Chinese communities overseas so much as the new 'scholar' migrants who go to study, and often contrive to remain, abroad. If the available inducements indicate a sustained effort to reverse this brain drain, it is also notable that returnees are not required to make a permanent commitment to remain in China. Article 17 of the 1990 Law on the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Returned Overseas and Relatives of Overseas Chinese states that "Returned overseas Chinese and relatives of overseas Chinese shall have the right to leave the country and settle down abroad", and Article 13 permits them to own property abroad. This strongly suggests that although the mainland does not formally recognise dual nationality, the state is nonetheless accommodating itself to globalisation by allowing its intellectual elite to become transnational. Further evidence of this trend is provided by Shanghai municipality's decision to start providing its own permanent residence permit 'green cards' to Chinese foreign nationals – many of them US green card holders.³⁶

However, significant emphasis is still placed on loyalty to China, if not to communist ideology. According to Pál Nyíri, the national and local *Qiaoban* and other government departments have worked actively, and with a significant degree of success, to encourage Chinese abroad to form new professional, kinship and common-place organisations, and Chinese government agencies have even provided funding for such groups to hold conventions.³⁷ The existence of these intermediary organisations facilitates liaison with the Chinese community overseas in ways that are mutually beneficial. Nyíri notes that many of the organisations' leaders manage to meet and have photographs taken with senior Chinese leaders, and that these pictures and newspaper cuttings 'are assets of considerable importance when doing business or dealing with officials back in China.' In return for this patronage, the organisations show patriotic allegiance to the

mainland on issues that are important to the Communist Party. Many, for example, organised protests at the 1998 bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade; and the *People's Daily* English website includes dozens of stories about overseas Chinese organisations worldwide denouncing the quasi-Buddhist Falun Gong sect, against which the mainland government launched a campaign in 1999. Even more importantly, the overseas organisations are encouraged to endorse the 'one China policy' of reunification with Taiwan.

Thus, in Nyíri's view, current Chinese nationalism is quite consistent with the transnationalism of its business and intellectual elite, drawing on

. . . a triumphalist, unificatory and mobilising myth of Chineseness as an eternal cultural condition inherited with blood and, regardless of citizenship, carrying 'Chinese values' such as love for the family, subordination of the individual to the collective interests, diligence, and frugality, and thus resulting in superior business results.

On this view, the Chinese abroad are seen not as a loss to the nation but, on the contrary, as a means of strengthening the nation in a globalised world. In further support of this view, Nyíri cites an article by an anonymous 'Shanghai New Migrants Research Project Team' that, he believes, was clearly written 'on instructions from the Qiaoban and the Public Security Bureau'. It states that:

Since reform and opening, people who have left mainland China to reside abroad (called 'new migrants' for short) have continuously been more numerous. They are currently rising as an important force within overseas Chinese and ethnic Chinese communities. In the future, they will become a backbone of forces friendly to us in America and some other developed Western countries.³⁸

Despite numerous requests, it was not possible for the authors of this paper to obtain an interview with the *Qiaoban*, and we are in no position to judge whether senior policymakers are as sanguine about the 'new migrants' as Nyíri's analysis suggests. The intensive efforts to attract back Chinese who study overseas, frequently reported by the Chinese press, indicate more concern than complacency. Yet in many fields Chinese policy making is not unified or consistent, despite the appearance of monolithic government, but tends to flow in several directions at once in the effort to reconcile competing interests.³⁹ Policy towards the diaspora appears to involve both new and old elements.

For example, two universities founded by the *Qiaoban* in the early years of communist rule and intended to attract students from overseas Chinese communities are still in business. The National Overseas Chinese University was established in 1960 under the patronage of then

Premier Zhou Enlai. Appropriately enough, the university is located in a famous *Qiaoxiang* (overseas Chinese county): Quanzhou, Fujian, the ancestral home of millions of overseas Chinese. It is overseen by a board of directors consisting of prominent foreigners of Chinese origin, Hong Kong and Macao citizens, and returned overseas Chinese, and maintains representative offices in both Hong Kong and Macao. Since its founding, the university has educated some 60,000 students, 32,000 of whom came from outside the mainland. Today, 16,000 students are currently enrolled in degree programs, 1,600 of whom are from countries such as Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Japan, Korea, and the United States. While overseas Chinese comprise just 10 percent of students today, educating overseas Chinese – or at least paying lip service to the idea – remains central to the University's mission. *The People's Daily* dedicated a full story on its website to the fact that 'Huaqiao University Confers Master's Degree on 30 Macao Students in 2002.'⁴⁰ And as the University's own website proclaimed, today's Overseas Chinese University continues its aim of 'serving overseas Chinese, facing overseas, and facing Hong Kong and Macao.' The University has also set up a new campus near Xiamen, to train overseas Chinese and foreigners in the Chinese language.

Older, and more renowned, is Guangzhou's Jinan University. Founded in 1906, and re-established in 1958, this was China's first university designated for overseas Chinese. A College of Chinese Language and Culture was established to educate this student body. Today, about one-third of students at Jinan, which advertises itself on its website as 'Best University for Overseas Chinese Students', come from beyond the Chinese mainland, mainly Hong Kong and Macao. News reports in recent years have focused on the fact that Jinan has begun to draw more and more Hong Kong students – especially those who either cannot get places in Hong Kong Universities or are hoping to pursue career opportunities on the mainland. Lower tuition fees are also a significant lure.⁴¹

These institutions no doubt act primarily in pursuit of their own institutional and commercial interests. Yet the universities' ability to attract students from Chinese communities overseas, and the strong demand, among people of Chinese descent raised abroad, for Chinese language training (which a host of mainland schools now compete to provide), both suggest the enduring strength of the connection to the mainland that many 'diasporan' people feel. It is hardly surprising that the Chinese government and Communist Party should actively to seek to confirm and strengthen this sense of connection – whether by encouraging people back, or by encouraging them to remain loyal to China's national interest while 'sojourning' elsewhere, or both. For it would naturally suit Beijing very well if the Chinese diaspora were not a global scattering, but a cohesive community of globalised Chinese people, able to mobilise financial, political and diplomatic forces, with Beijing at its hub.

From remittance to endowment: traditions of diaspora philanthropy

Whether they were laundrymen subsisting on modest wages in America or wealthy Southeast Asian merchants, Chinese emigrants never forgot their obligations to the family members and home villages they left behind.

Between 1929 - 1940, remittances to China averaged \$80 - \$100 million a year, enough money to offset China's balance of payments deficit each year, and prop up entire provincial economies.⁴² The impact of such streams of cash can be easily seen in one county in Guangdong province, Taishan. For centuries, Taishanese had struggled to coax crops from the region's rocky, hilly alkaline soil, rarely raising enough to keep stomachs full. In the winter, the men would travel to the nearby port of Guangzhou in search of work to supplement their meager incomes. It was only a matter of time before the Taishanese moved even further afield – to pan for gold in the mountains of California.

By 1900, one in four Taishanese had lived abroad, the vast majority of them in the United States. In one district, 600 of the male population of 1,000 worked abroad. In the 1920's and 30's, one eighth of all remittances to China were sent to Taishan families.⁴³

As a result, by the early 20th century, the once dirt-poor county became home to countless new ostentatious two-story homes, called *yang lou* (foreign houses), that came complete with Western touches such as stained glass windows and greek columns. New banks, doctors' offices and clothing shops sprung up to cater to the county's new rich. Taishan emigres also brought home the latest technologies from abroad – electrical streetlights, telephone systems, and a movie theater. One prosperous Taishanese-American also attempted to build a railroad connecting Taishan to Guangzhou, a project that ultimately failed.

But while charity always began at home, overseas Chinese were also generous to the wider community. Between 1910 and 1949, money raised from Taishanese abroad helped build at least 86 new elementary schools and nine middle schools in Taishan. Funds were also raised to build libraries, teachers colleges and to renovate existing schools. As a result, 75 percent of all children, male and female attended school in Taishan. The Taishan education budget exceeded those of all its neighboring counties and trailed only the metropolis of Guangzhou in numbers of schools and teachers.⁴⁴

Counties built by overseas Chinese money – called *Qiaoxiang* -- can be found all across Guangdong, whose émigrés traveled to the United States; and neighboring Fujian province, whose émigrés landed, for the most part, in Taiwan or Southeast Asia.

One of the most generous – and revered – overseas Chinese philanthropists of the 20th century, was Chen Jiageng (Tan Kah Kee), a native of Fujian province who migrated to Singapore at the turn of the 20th century and built an empire of rubber manufacturing, import/export, and rice trading that earned him a reputation as ‘the Henry Ford of Malaya.’ Beginning from the age of 20, when he funded a school in his home village of Jimei, not far from the port city of Xiamen, Chen would dedicate a staggering \$100 million USD – half his entire fortune – to education projects in China. ‘Without progress in education,’ Chen said, ‘There will be no flourishing industry but degradation of people's livelihood.’ In 1913, he founded the Jimei Primary School on the banks of the Xinglin Bay. The school, which was run by Mr. Chen's brother, was known for its superior academics, drawing students from throughout the region. The school grew into a large educational complex with an elementary and high school, a college, and a vocational training center. Today, it is a fully-fledged university, offering degrees in engineering, teaching and business administration to about 12,000 students. Another 110 schools in 20 counties benefited from his largesse. In 1921, Chen also endowed Xiamen University, which remains one of China's top universities today.

Though officially a British subject, Chen was fiercely loyal to China. He was a generous supporter of Sun Yat-Sen's revolutionary activities in the 1920s. During World War II, as chairman of the Southeast Overseas Chinese General Association, he raised millions for China's war effort. He became an ardent supporter of the Communists and on September 21st 1949 led a 15 member delegation of overseas Chinese to join a historic meeting of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, at which the All China Returned Overseas Chinese Federation was founded. He was appointed to serve as its first Chairman. When he died in 1961, he bequeathed his remaining fortune to the nation.

One of the relatively few writers to have considered the topic of overseas (and especially American) Chinese philanthropy is John Deeney.⁴⁵ He locates Chinese philanthropy in a long tradition of reciprocity and giving that draws on the Confucian ideal of benevolence (*ren*), reinforced by Buddhism and Taoist teachings.⁴⁶ These engendered what Robert Lee, quoted by Deeney, describes as ‘the idea of corporate personality, not an isolated, insular self, but rather an ethos of interdependence.’⁴⁷ As a result, according to Stella Shao (also quoted by Deeney):

... philanthropy as such is not considered a separate and categorical concept. Asians give because of their understanding that benevolence, compassion, interdependence and basic respect for humankind are necessary ingredients to living, first in their families, then in their own ethnic communities, then in the greater society.⁴⁸

Against this background, Deeney describes Chinese giving as essentially private, personal and informal (as opposed to public and professional), starting with family and gradually extending to

‘institutions that support the family spirit – such as schools and churches or temples’. This certainly seems to be borne out in a preliminary overview of traditions of Chinese diaspora giving, with its progression from remitting money to relatives to social investment in communities of origin, with a special emphasis on education.

This almost invariable emphasis on education is an entirely natural extension of China’s extremely long history of respect for scholarship. The imperial bureaucracy was always a meritocracy of a kind, with positions of power, including the power to accumulate wealth, distributed in accordance with candidates’ performance in civil service examinations. The belief that education was the way to get ahead was thus written through Chinese culture many centuries before the European Enlightenment. Understandably enough, the preoccupation remains today: ‘education changes fate’ (*jiaoyu gaibian minglu*) was the slogan selected by famed film director, Zhang Yimou, for a series of Central China Television advertisements encouraging the public to donate for school building programmes in the poor Western provinces. And, as can be seen from the discussion in the preceding section, this preoccupation is today also thoroughly socialised. Advanced education, notably in science and technology, is seen as a major pre-requisite for building a powerful and prosperous nation: hence the fuss over the ‘returned scholars’ – not to mention an ambitious, ongoing programme to rapidly treble the proportion of young Chinese entering tertiary education at home. Private giving for educational causes may thus be seen both as a way to provide individuals with otherwise inaccessible opportunities, and as a way of helping to build the nation.

Deeney also notes, as a feature of the personal and informal nature of Chinese philanthropy, that:

Ties of friendship and respect are all-important; once they have been established, then personal trust counts more than anything else. Hence, many generous Chinese prefer that solicitations be made through family members or close friends rather than through impersonal direct mailings. They also generally eschew formal applications, detailed reports, and accounting details as tedious, unnecessarily complex, and time-consuming, and much prefer a more informal approach. Unless there is a major donation involved, once the gift is given there is little, if any, follow-up expected or required.

As an example of personal and private giving, Deeney mentions a group of American Chinese doctors and dentists in Pittsburgh who travel regularly to China, without doing so under the auspices of any formal organisation, to give hands-on training to Chinese counterparts. Many individuals from Hong Kong, Taiwan and South East Asia engage in similar activities.⁴⁹

However, when it comes to donating money rather than time, this personal and informal approach is in a sense problematic. It is a common theme of writing on many aspects of China

that personal relationships and connections (*guanxi*) can carry more weight than formal, institutional, contractual or legal relationships. This is, for example, cited as a significant obstacle to the establishment of anything like the ‘rule of law’ in a Western sense.⁵⁰ Too often, Western critics of China simply confuse or conflate *guanxi* with corruption, without recognising the complex traditions of reciprocity in which is based: but it is a form of social capital that people more or less consciously accumulate and draw upon.⁵¹ It is this process that Deeney is describing when he identifies

. . . a preference for appeals that are made by a friend, an acquaintance at work, or a family member – especially if these people occupy leadership positions and will invite one into their circle of wealthy and influential colleagues. This approach is also partly due to the common practice among Chinese Americans of donating to the chosen causes of friends who gave to one’s own favourite causes – another example of the obligation of reciprocal giving.

Giving to charitable causes may thus be a means of accumulating *guanxi*, and one’s own *guanxi* may be mobilised in encouraging others to give. This is problematic not because it raises questions (which we decline to examine) about the authenticity of motives, but because it naturally disadvantages causes that have few contacts with or advocates among elites. Some of China’s more independent, citizen-initiated non profit organisations have by chance happened to make personal connections with overseas Chinese donors, but these seem to be the exception rather than the rule.⁵² We also consider, below, examples of overseas organisations that pursue philanthropy actively, establishing their own projects – largely through personal networks – rather than passively contributing to mainland managed operations. But on the whole the overseas Chinese philanthropic market is dominated by Chinese government agencies (or government sponsored agencies) that can afford to make personal contact with groups overseas, or that are represented by government officials and through the *Qiaoban*.

Cementing relationships with government officials undoubtedly plays a significant role in giving to or through these agencies. Again, this raises questions of efficacy as much as motivation. Chinese government involvement in relief and charitable provision, and the attempts to recruit support from elites, is by no means new: because of the Confucian presumption of state virtue, imperial scholar officials were expected to play a leading role in such efforts, and bureaucrats in post-Mao China have resumed this role.⁵³ But government dominance and direction of China’s gradually emerging ‘third sector’, which in many ways recalls the centralised control of the command economy, may not be the best way of enabling it to play a creative and constructive role in social provision and in ‘correcting market failures’. Furthermore, of particular concern is the almost complete lack of transparency in government mobilised philanthropy. It is extremely

hard to determine whether the donor trust, that Deeney describes as typical, is justified; this is of course exacerbated by the lack of expectation for reporting and follow-up.

Present patterns of diaspora giving

The official non profit sector

As previously noted, China's 'mass organisations' have over the last twenty years shifted significantly (although by no means yet entirely) towards a social service provider role. Over the same period, a number of new, state sponsored charitable foundations have been established. These together comprise an official non profit sector that is a manifestation of government desire to recruit 'social forces' in social service funding and provision, reflecting global trends towards a reduced role for government.

In addition to this official non profit sector, the last twenty years have, with the increase in personal freedoms in China, seen the establishment of registered membership organisations including many small scale, private charitable initiatives.⁵⁴ The legal environment for these is, however, extremely restrictive, reflecting government concerns about 'social forces' that it cannot control. All registered organisations must be sponsored and supervised by a 'relevant' government department or Communist Party agency. It must have office premises, and start-up funds; and only one organisation of each 'type' (eg, one environment protection group, one self-help group for parents of autistic children) may register at each administrative level. These provisions narrowly limit the autonomy of legal organisations, and militate against the formation of genuinely 'grass roots' community or advocacy groups. Nonetheless, over the last few years a number of more independent and NGO-like groups have formed, often with international support, in sectors such as environment protection, women's rights, HIV/AIDS prevention, and disability.⁵⁵ Their strategies for negotiating the restrictive legal environment include registering as businesses or 'research centers', attaching themselves to academic institutions, or simply ignoring the rules and relying on local goodwill and networks of strategic alliances to fend off official clampdowns. Such groups have shown potential, creativity and courage in developing new forms of service provision and advocacy, but their prospects for growth are severely constrained by the uncertain legal environment.

We began this study with the firm expectation that the official non profit sector would be a major beneficiary of overseas Chinese philanthropy. In fact this turns out to be much less the case than we had supposed. Although open to donations from any sources, the official non profit organisations have not, in the main, systematically targeted overseas Chinese donors; nor, typically, do they even maintain break-downs of their funding sources – which suggests that their fundraising operations, despite experimentation with techniques such as on-line giving and

soliciting funds through cellphone short text messages, is not yet particularly strategic or professionalised. However, nearly every charity and non profit organisation that we interviewed told us that giving from ‘overseas Chinese’ based in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Southeast Asia far outstrips giving from North American Chinese.

The China Youth Development Foundation’s ‘Project Hope’ is almost certainly the most successful and professionalised fundraising operation in China. Since 1989 it has raised more than USD 200 million for education projects whose mainstay has been primary school building and scholarships. According to Gan Dongyu, of the Project’s International Department, the Foundation aggregate donations from Chinese overseas are substantial, although it is not possible to give a precise figure for these as they are not accounted separately. In particular, Gan says, ‘thousands’ of Singaporeans have donated CNY 300 (USD 36.5) each in child sponsorship programmes, and ‘tens of thousands’ of Hong Kong citizens have made similar individual donations. The donations, according to Gan, have come ‘mostly from ordinary people with a relatively small amount of money’, and generally in response to media reports on the Foundation’s work.

Gan believes that Chinese language newspaper reports were also a major factor in garnering some support in North America – combined with the fact that some of the overseas Chinese supporters had only recently left China, where the Foundation’s reputation was already established. The North American Chinese Education Foundation (NACEF), set up by Chinese students in San Francisco and linked to Chinese students associations in 33 American universities, began in 1998 to raise funds for Project Hope. Its contributions appeared relatively modest, however, amounting to only around USD 23,000 in the first year, as recorded by the NACEF website.⁵⁶ Also in 1998, according to Gan Dongyu, a Toronto association of former Beijing residents collected around CAD 100,000 (USD 60,000) for Project Hope.

These sums are, however, dwarfed by international corporate donations to the Project. It has received around USD 2 million apiece from Motorola and Coca Cola, and smaller, but still substantial, sums from many others. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that the overseas Chinese constituency has not been targeted more systematically.

It is also worth noting that, from early on, the Youth Development Foundation was plagued by allegations of inefficient use, or outright abuse, of funds, including a protracted court case in Hong Kong, starting in 1995. (In this case the Foundation was eventually vindicated but it has since been rocked by a new round of scandals.⁵⁷) Such events naturally impact on donor trust, and in the 1990s a number of Chinese organisations in overseas communities were established to raise funds for essentially rival operations: channelling the money to virtually identical projects through their own networks. One of the most successful has been the Hong Kong based Sower’s

Action, established in 1992, which now raises around HKD 17 million (USD 2.2 million) per year through public fundraising activities that include an annual sponsored walk from Hong Kong to Guangzhou, with participants not only from Hong Kong but also from Chinese communities in Japan, New Zealand, Singapore and France. Sowers Action also has a supporting chapter in Vancouver. Although the organisation has a small administrative staff of seven, all of its project identification and monitoring trips to mainland China are carried out by volunteers, who liaise directly with local education authorities. Accounts are audited *pro bono* by Peat Marwick. The higher standards of financial transparency have almost certainly played an important part in the group's fundraising success.

Perhaps learning this lesson, the mainland's China Charities Federation (CCF) appeared keen to make financial transparency and rectitude among its hallmarks when it was founded in 1994, and began by publishing annual, audited accounts. Unlike most Chinese foundations, which have very limited endowments and rely for income on public fundraising, the CCF tried hard to establish an endowment fund, attracting a donation of HKD 25 million (USD 3.25 million) from the Hongkong Shanghai Banking Corporation. The national level Federation, which has more than 70 provincial, city or county level affiliated foundations that each raise their own funds, has supported emergency relief work, care for orphans and older people, cancer research and 'dry well' digging in arid areas. In 1998 it became a member of United Way. That year was something of a zenith for the organisation, when it raised more than CNY 600 million (USD 74 million) for flood relief – mostly from domestic Chinese sources and multinational corporations.

From the outset, the Federation appointed around a dozen notable figures from the non profit sector in Hong Kong and Taiwan as 'Senior Advisers' and 'Specially Invited Council Directors'. These include Darwin Chen, CEO of the Hong Kong Community Chest; S. T. Chan, Vice President of World Vision International China Programme; Sir Harry Fang, Director of the Hong Kong Society for Rehabilitation, and Tuan Cheng Wang of Taiwan's Buddhist Compassion (Tzu Chi) Foundation. Also appointed were a Canadian Chinese photographer, Walter Poon, and an American Chinese pianist, Kong Xiaodong. The impact of this non-mainland presence was perhaps somewhat diluted by a formal governance structure that distributed positions among well over 100 people, including Honorary Presidents, Senior Advisers, Vice Presidents, Specially Invited Council Directors, and Executive Directors.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, the inclusion of non-mainlanders did suggest that the overseas constituency would be targeted pro-actively.

The Federation has indeed maintained links with a number of non-mainland Chinese organisations, notably in Hong Kong: the Hong Kong Community Chest and Hong Kong Council for Social Services, the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, Po Leung Kuk and Yan Oi. But these are 'experience exchange' rather than funding relationships, and probably owe much to the fact that the Federation's founding President, Yan Mingfu (a former Vice Minister of Civil

Affairs), was a leading advocate of non-profit sector development in China, and showed a keen interest in Hong Kong's model of social service delivery, which accords a prominent place to non-government service providers. Some funding support has come through joint programmes with the World Vision International China Programme, based in Hong Kong, and Oxfam Hong Kong; and the Malaysia's Golden Lion Group corporation, headed by Zhong Tingsen, has contributed nearly USD 1 million for disaster relief programmes. The Federation has also been an implementing partner in a Smile Train programme, funded with a USD 20 million donation from Chinese American, Charles Wang, of Computer Associates, to provide surgery for children with cleft lips and palates.⁵⁹ But this relationship was not initiated by CCF. Smile Train was actively seeking Chinese partners, and chose CCF as the best fit.⁶⁰ (Another American Chinese philanthropist, Huang Yongle, also donated USD 100,000 for cleft lip and palate operations conducted in China by the international organisation, Operation Sunrise.)

Altogether, CCF appears to have done little to reach out directly to potential overseas Chinese supporters, and in many ways the organisation seems to have lost the fresh edge with which it began.⁶¹ In terms of transparency too, the bright start of the CCF appears to have dimmed since the retirement, in 2002, of Yan Mingfu. The numerous calls we logged to the Federation in March and April 2003 yielded more prevarication than information; according to those we spoke to, the Federation does not collect funds from overseas Chinese, and our informants were unwilling to disclose present sources or level of income.

Shen Zhifei, International Department Director of the All-China Disabled Person's Federation (CDPF), was more forthcoming, but immediately made clear that his organisation does not target overseas Chinese donors, or receive much from them. In fact, CDPF, which was established by the government in 1988, seems barely to engage in active fundraising at all. According to Shen, 'We sometimes organise activities like sporting or cultural events [involving people with disabilities] but we never target specific groups. . . . Usually they [donors] come to us, to seek the possibility of having some cooperation.' Shen says the Federation has been receiving around CNY 10 million per year from international sources last year, but this included Official Development Assistance cooperation with Unicef and the government of Japan, and grants from private foundations such as the Hong Kong based Kadoorie Charitable Foundation. In addition, the Federation has recently secured support for two, large scale multi-year projects: a USD 30 million cataract surgery and blindness prevention funded by the Lions Club International (Hong Kong Lions chapters have raised funds vigorously for this), and CNY 110 million (USD 13 million) from Hong Kong millionaire, Li Kashing, to establish a series of rehabilitation centres. Li, Shen notes, has supported numerous projects through the Federation, starting in the early 90s with a rehabilitation and vocational training centre in his home town in southern Guangdong. However, according to Shen, most of the Federation's budget comes from the central

government, and the level of government support has been increasing steadily over the last few years.

Li Kashing is also the principal donor to the China Disabled Persons' Welfare Foundation, which was established in 1980 but has since been overshadowed by the much larger CDPF, of which it is now effectively a fundraising subsidiary. In 2001 its total income was CNY 19.3 million (USD 2.3 million). Of this, CNY 13.7 million came from 'overseas', of which 12.2 million was donated by of Li's companies. A further CNY 1 million came from a Hong Kong tobacco company, and CNY 0.5 million from private individuals.⁶² The funds were used to support artificial limb programmes, training of teachers for the deaf, schooling for blind children and massotherapy training for blind adults, and community based rehabilitation projects in inland and Western provinces. Again, the Foundation appeared to be a largely passive recipient of Li's and other donors' largesse. According to a spokesman, promotional activities largely consist in organisation of events such as tours by a disabled person's arts group, and fundraising is 'not targeted', although the Foundation 'welcomes support from all sorts of donors'.

The China Children and Teenagers Fund, established by the Women's Federation in 1981, currently raises around CNY 60 million per year, mostly from Chinese corporations but also from the general public. It has recently begun to appeal for donations through cellphone short text messages. According to Xu Xiaoguang of the International Department, the Fund has never attempted to attract funds from overseas Chinese donors, but is in principle interested in the possibility of doing so, and is trying to build up connections through networks of overseas alumni of Xiamen and Beijing universities. But, says Xu, 'we don't have enough information, or really know how to go about this.' In March, 2002, the Foundation sent an exploratory delegation to Europe, to try to make connections with international organisations such as the World Children's Foundation, and with European Chinese communities. This foray has not yet produced significant funding results. A follow up trip was planned for 2003, but was cancelled owing to the SARS epidemic.

A rising star in the firmament of China's official non profit sector is the Poverty Alleviation Foundation, established in 1989 but achieving little public prominence until it was reorganised in 2000 under the dynamic leadership of He Daofeng. Since then it has doubled its income to CNY 58.6 million in 2001 (USD 7.1 million); a success its Annual Report ascribes to 'researching and designing our projects to lead in the market' and developing 'famous brand poverty reduction projects' as 'leading products'. But this ambitious and aggressively marketed foundation has not explored the fundraising potential of overseas Chinese communities. A quarter of total funds raised in 2001 came from overseas sources, but overwhelmingly from international organisations, notably, the Kadoorie Foundation, Mercy Corps, Ford Foundation and Asian Development Bank.

Even the Soong Ching Ling Foundation, with its overseas branches and a brand-name historically linked with the diaspora, seems to have been unable to capitalise on these advantages. According to Deng Hongqing of the organisation's International Department, just 1.37% of income came from overseas in 2002, with a further 13% from Hong Kong and Taiwan. Despite having this breakdown at his fingertips, Deng says the Foundation does not systematically target donors overseas. This has to be seen, however, in light of the fact that, as a pillar of the nation's politico-cultural patrimony, the Foundation remains heavily subsidised by government, so its appointed officials have little incentive to raise funds aggressively.

This brief survey therefore suggests that the official non profit sector has not yet greatly exerted itself to seek funds from Chinese communities overseas. Funding that has come from these communities appears to have been received passively rather than actively sought. China's universities, by contrast, evidently see private philanthropy as a critical resource for expansion and development, and have been much more pro-active in seeking support from Chinese abroad.

The go-getting universities

Since 1994, Tsinghua University, which is considered the 'MIT of China,' has raised some CNY 420 million (USD 50.8 million). Fully 70 percent of that has come from donors living in Hong Kong and Taiwan, says Huang Jianhua, director of the Tsinghua University Education Foundation. Similarly, Deng Ya of the Beijing University Foundation reports that of the CNY 800 million (USD 97 million) raised since 1989, 65 percent has come from Hong Kong and Taiwan.

A tour of the two campuses easily yields examples of such generosity. Over the past decade, Tsinghua, China's top university for the sciences and technology, has experienced a building boom. Almost all of the buildings located on the eastern end of campus – gray concrete and granite behemoths lining a long, landscaped lawn and fountains – are brand new. This new section of campus is nicknamed the 'White District' (*Bai Qu*), since in Revolutionary times, white was the color for capitalists, while red was the color for communists, and most of the buildings were built with generous donations from Hong Kong capitalists.

Tsinghua's new library was built by Hong Kong's Sir Run Run Shaw in 1990. Li Ka Hsing provided a similar donation for Beida's new library. Li Guowei, (Q.W. Lee) President of Hang Seng Bank, provided funds for Tsinghua's business school and a life sciences building. Liang Chiu Ju, also of Hang Seng, provided the funds for the architecture school. Li Kashing pledged USD 10 million USD for Tsinghua's new IT park. Wu Shun De (of the HK restaurant chain,

Maxim's) provided the capital for the Design Institute and the Tsinghua Museum. The new Tsinghua gymnasium, was also the gift of Cao Guangbiao, a Hong Kong donor.

None of this is by accident. Once solely supported by government funds, elite universities such as Tsinghua University and Peking University have sought to raise the extra sums they need to be truly world-class institutions by creating development and fundraising arms modelled after those at major U.S. universities such as Harvard and Berkeley.

Mr. Huang says many of these donations were vigorously courted by the University. The University president travels frequently to Hong Kong and Taiwan, cultivating relationships with potential donors, Huang says. He will bring lots of brochures and persuasive fundraising materials, presenting a 'wish list' of projects for donors to look over. If the donor seems uninterested in funding these projects, then, they are asked what they would prefer to fund... and accommodations are made.

Hong Kong entrepreneurs have been such generous benefactors to Tsinghua because they believe that making a donation to a top university is one quick way to establish their own reputations on the mainland, Huang says. In 1997, as the HK prepared to return to China, Tsinghua received a tidal wave of major gifts from Hong Kong people. 'They came to us,' Huang says. 'They wanted to show their status as major business players in China. They want to show the central government, too.'

The sums donated by Hong Kong Chinese dwarf those that have been donated by Chinese Americans. 'We're not very satisfied with what we've raised from the U.S,' Huang says. However, both Tsing Hua and Beijing University have registered subsidiary foundations in the United States to develop American fundraising.

So far, most donations from Chinese Americans to the universities have been relatively small in scale: successful entrepreneurs establishing modest scholarships for needy or outstanding students. One donor, a Ms. Xin Yu Xi, a U.S. cosmetics tycoon, has set aside scholarship money at Beida for the top female student from every province in China.

Fundraising among Chinese Americans has been comparatively anemic for a number of reasons. Of the more than 10,000 Tsinghua alumni in the US, most have not reached the levels of wealth that will enable them to endow buildings or professorships. 'Most of them are just now beginning to make money,' he says. The pool of established Chinese Americans with direct ties to the mainland is relatively small, since mainland Chinese immigration was cut off after the Communist revolution and only restarted after the 'reform and opening' of the late '70s.

While there are undoubtedly successful Chinese Americans, many trace their roots to Taiwan and are more interested in helping Taiwan. Others seem to be more focused on philanthropic projects in the United States. ‘Chinese-Americans care more about what U.S. society thinks of them, while Hong Kong Chinese see China as their own market,’ Huang says. Still, Huang is optimistic, as China's place continues to rise in the world, and mainland immigrants rise to prominence. ‘Maybe in 10-20 years more Chinese-Americans will look to China for their donations.’

Beijing and Tsinghua are not the only universities to have established independent foundations to raise funds abroad. Shanghai's Jiaotong University Foundation has raised tens of millions of dollars – most from Hong Kong donors – since its establishment in 2001. Xiamen University benefits from a variety of ‘education development’ foundations – whose support mainly come from overseas Chinese and foreign enterprises.⁶³ The Xiamen University Alumni Association of America has also been active in raising funds for their alma mater. Sun Yat Sen University in Guangzhou benefits from the support of the US-based Lingnan Foundation, which was founded in 1893 to support the development of a college in Guangzhou that was later merged into Sun Yat Sen University. Shanghai's Fudan University also has an active alumni association in the United States. Recently, the organization's Northern California chapter raised scholarship funds for an orphaned student who had been accepted by Fudan University, after reading of his plight in a Chinese-American paper.

Hong Kong, Taiwan, the missing link and the international bridge

It is logical enough for the universities to target Hong Kong and Taiwan for donations, both because these parts of ‘Greater China’ have a well established philanthropic tradition – in Hong Kong’s case, with non-profit schools, hospitals and community groups dating back more than a century – and because, as the principal investors in China, the Hong Kong and Taiwan business communities have a strong interest in maintaining good relations with the mainland government. Donations from Hong Kong surged in the run-up to its return to Chinese sovereignty in 1997.

Probably the most prominent donor has been Hong Kong’s Li Kashing, whose Cheung Kong and Hutchison Whampoa companies have very substantial business interests on the mainland, including contracts to build deep sea ports. In the late 1970s, Li provided a total of HKD 2 billion (USD 260 million) to build a university with a medical school and five attached teaching hospitals in his home town of Shantou, Guangdong. On completion of the university in 1981, Li registered a foundation in Hong Kong to support a wide range of education, medical and cultural heritage preservation projects.⁶⁴ In 2001 the foundation made a HKD 300 million (USD 38 million) donation for development of education and healthcare in Western China. The funds are being used to support distance learning for middle schools, college scholarships for ethnic

minorities, an inter-college IT network and a physician's training programme at Qinghai University. A Cheung Kong Scholars Programme has provided HKD 70 million (USD 9 million) funding for academic awards and professorships in Chinese universities – with the familiar hope of attracting back Chinese scholars trained overseas. Another project, currently receiving HKD 20 million (USD 2.6 million) per year, supports the development of hospice services in 20 mainland hospitals.

Li is by no means unique among Hong Kong's millionaires in investing part of his wealth in philanthropic projects in China. Numerous less public figures do likewise and some, like Chen Jiageng (Tan Kah Kee) before them, appear to regard their contribution as the culmination of their life's work. For example, property developer, Yu Panglin, is reported to have recently invested CNY 2 billion (USD 241 million), nearly his entire fortune, in a 57 storey hotel in Shenzhen, with future profits to be devoted to education projects through a local foundation that will inherit the hotel.⁶⁵

Because of the culture of privacy surrounding greater China philanthropy, it is extremely hard to guess, much less calculate, how much is transferred each year from the accounts of the Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwanese super-rich to development or social welfare projects on the mainland. But there can be little doubt that this far exceeds the USD 80 million or so that United Nations organisations loan or grant each year to China.⁶⁶ The apparent modesty of many greater China donors is greatly compounded by the reticence of the Chinese authorities. The 1998 Public Welfare Donations Law includes two Articles explicitly stating that the Department of Overseas Chinese Affairs – the *Qiaoban* – is the appropriate body for channelling such donations. But, as far as we were able to determine, nowhere in China are such donations publicly documented, and the *Qiaoban* itself has proved unwilling to discuss the subject with us. It is evident from sporadic Chinese media reports that the assistance extends well beyond the traditional *Qiaoxiang* counties of overseas Chinese origin. But the lack of any transparency in this process leaves us guessing what gifts, favours and banquets may be involved in it, or what proportion of the funds donated may reach the intended beneficiaries. This is this is the most important missing link in our brief research.

Hong Kong may, however, also be serving as a bridgehead for philanthropy with a stronger tradition of public accountability and transparency. In the 1980s, a number of international NGOs began raising funds there. Prominent among them was Oxfam. In 1976, a small group of expatriates had established a fundraising support operation in the then British colony for Oxfam UK. This was so successful that it was soon virtually propelled into assuming an 'operational' role, not just raising funds but implementing projects under its own 'Oxfam Hong Kong' banner. Today, according to Executive Director, Chong Changyau, Oxfam has more than 60,000 regular supporters among Hong Kong's population of 7 million, and aside from this raises at least HKD

2 million per year in an annual 'Trailwalker' sponsored walk that has become a major social and charitable event in Hong Kong's calendar. Save the Children Hong Kong similarly started out as a fundraising exercise for its parent Save the Children UK but, in 1998, became independent and started implementing its own projects in China. Hong Kong also provides a secure fundraising and administrative base for the World Vision International China program, whose advertisements on subway hoardings now compete with those of Médecins Sans Frontières, which has also started to raise funds in Hong Kong to support its international operations, although a Hong Kong chapter of the organisation has not yet emerged. The success of these fundraising ventures, like that of Sowers Action, shows that there is considerable 'demand' among ordinary Chinese donors for professionalised and trustworthy charitable outlets.

Another organization that has targeted such donors is The Nature Conservancy, a US based environmental group that has been working since 1999 to protect 6.5 million acres of environmentally sensitive land in Yunnan Province. Early on, the Nature Conservancy recognized that Chinese 'wealth centers' in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Southeast Asia, and the United States could be tapped to support the work in Yunnan, according to Ed Norton, Senior Advisor to the project. The organization has opened a Hong Kong office, with a staff of three to raise awareness about biodiversity conservation in the region. In May 2002, it took a group of Hong Kong businessmen to Yunnan to visit the conservation sites. This inspired the entrepreneurs, among them Peter Wang, CEO of Tristate Holdings, which manufactures the Nautica clothing line, to form a USD 2 million Asia Conservation Trust to benefit the Nature Conservancy. Similarly, the Conservancy has sought out the support of Chinese American donors. Working through staff and volunteers in communities with a high proportion of Chinese in the United States, TNC has made efforts to promote the project among Chinese American organizations, and to place stories about the project in the Chinese American press. The Committee of 100, a Chinese American organization, had planned to visit the Yunnan project site this year, although the trip was cancelled due to concerns about the atypical pneumonia (SARS) outbreak. Still, the Conservancy has raised about USD 100,000 from Chinese American donors. This has not been entirely straightforward, says Norton, since 'We realized that the subject in which the Chinese American donors were most interested was education.' But the Conservancy has worked to create opportunities to support both education and environment. One donor, for instance, is supporting the construction of biogas stoves – to replace charcoal-burning – in a dozen village schools. 'We're very happy with the results so far,' Norton says. 'Everybody recognizes there's a job here of developing an interest, cultivating a habit [among Overseas Chinese donors] of giving for environmental causes.'

Apart from its Hong Kong fundraising operation, World Vision also targets Chinese communities in Canada, the United States and Australia, looking for donors to sponsor child beneficiaries of the China program, according to the organisation's Yunnan program manager,

Wang Chao. Videos and movies about World Vision's work have been specially prepared for and aired on Chinese-language television stations. Chinese radio stations are also targeted for fundraising appeals. All these efforts have been very successful, Wang says.

Several international organisations, including Unicef and the World Wide Fund for Nature, are now trying to find ways to start fundraising operations on the Chinese mainland, with an eye particularly on the corporate sector and the relatively wealthy urban communities along the east coast. These ambitions are currently thwarted by legal and tax obstacles, and may in future have to contend with local protectionism from Chinese non profit organisations. But Hong Kong based organisations, including both well-known brands, such as Oxfam, World Vision, the Salvation Army and Save the Children, and the many smaller groups established by Hong Kong Chinese, may have a special role in future, consistent with the entrepot nature of Hong Kong's economy, as brokers of more Westernised forms of giving with a Chinese identity.

Chinese American philanthropic organisations

Although Chinese Americans have not donated to China on the same scale as people in Hong Kong, several philanthropic organisations with a specific focus on China have emerged, along with networks of individuals who give not only money but time and care to make sure that it reaches its intended beneficiaries.

Cyrus Tang (Tang Zhongying), who left Jiangsu Province for the United States in 1950, made his fortune building a steel, scrap metal, office furniture and pharmaceutical empire. Known collectively as Tang Industries, the company appears regularly on Forbes' biggest private companies list. In 1995, he created the Tang Foundation, which supports Traditional Chinese Medicine research centers in Beijing and Chicago and has provided more than USD 7 million for school construction and scholarships for poor college students. Since 1997, some 1,300 students attending 15 colleges nationwide have received grants of about USD 500 a year. Similarly, poor communities in 12 provinces have been beneficiaries of Tang Foundation school construction grants, says Zhang Xiaoli, a representative of the Foundation's China office. Tang visits his Jiangsu hometown about twice a year – and tries to meet with scholarship recipients whenever he visits. 'Mr. Tang hopes to cultivate a sense of social responsibility among the students,' says Zhang. 'In exchange for their scholarships, students are asked to perform public service while they are in school.'

Another multimillion dollar fund is The China Foundation, founded in 1997 by Dr. Jane Hu – an immigrant to the U.S. from Taiwan and a scientist who served in an appointed position in the first Bush Administration. According to Dr. Xiang Qian Dai, the Foundation's Beijing representative, Dr. Hu had retired, and was looking for a way to help China, when she decided to

pull together her network of corporate friends to help fund health care and education programs in China. Former President Gerald Ford is honorary Chairman of the Board.

The China Foundation's biggest project to date has been to raise about USD 10 million (entirely from the Gates Foundation) for a World Bank project to build hospitals in rural areas. The Bank had allocated USD 100 million to this project, but asked China to come up with matching funds, which the China Foundation stepped in to raise.

The China Foundation also organizes health conferences on the mainland and supports a smaller project to build schools in rural areas. Seven or eight schools have been built with money from individual investors. Dr. Dai says the schools are worthier and more successful than the hospitals, simply because of Chinese values. 'If a farmer gets sick, he won't go spend money to see a doctor, but he will still do everything he can to make sure his children can go to school.'

Dr. Dai says that while the foundation is run by Dr. Hu and a raft of Chinese Americans hold honorary titles in the foundation, only a very small proportion of the funds actually come from overseas Chinese: the Taiwan and Hong Kong fundraising offices have raised very little, and Chinese Americans have not been particularly generous. The biggest individual donation came from Charles Wang – USD 100,000 for school building.

In Dai's view, Chinese Americans have not been particularly generous for several reasons. Firstly, 'Overseas Chinese with money don't want to give because they don't want to support the Communist government. They'll do business in China, but they won't donate money.' If they do donate funds, 'they see the donation as way to open doors for other business projects and investments. Taiwan people want introductions and access to leaders in exchange for their donations.' Secondly, donors are distrustful of the mainland's reputation for corruption. They feel an investment in business is the best use of their funds. Thirdly, most mainland immigrants to the US have yet to make vast sums of money.

In Dai's opinion Chinese Americans – the majority of whom still come from Taiwan or Hong Kong – still don't understand China. 'They don't like the mainland,' he says. 'It is easier to raise money from white people.' But he is also optimistic that the flows from the U.S. China would increase 'because China is now very strong. Hong Kong has returned to China... many changes are coming.'

Despite Dai's scepticism, several groups of Chinese Americans have come together to launch small-scale, hands-on efforts to tackle poverty and improve education in China. Among these is SOAR, a San Francisco Bay-Area non-profit founded by a group of Chinese Americans in 1995 to provide scholarships to middle school and high school students living in some of China's

poorest villages. The organization has provided more than a thousand scholarships of USD 85 a year for middle school students; and USD 225 a year for high school students. Forty SOAR scholarship recipients have gone on to college, including top universities such as Beijing University. 'So many Chinese have gone overseas, but they haven't forgotten their roots. To know that there are Chinese people like (the SOAR donors), I feel very proud to be Chinese,' says Wu Yueling, a freshman at the Beijing Institute of Technology. Wu, whose mother is disabled and whose father makes about USD 25-30 a month hauling passengers on his pedicab, depended on seven years' of SOAR scholarships to stay in middle and high school. 'My parents keep telling me, "so many people are supporting you, don't let them down." I hope I can find some way to pay society back.'

SOAR relies on a base of 400-500 donors, all of whom come from the Bay area, and have been introduced to the organization through word of mouth, says Albert Hu, president of SOAR and an immigrant from Taiwan. Many donors choose to sponsor a specific child, for USD 85 or USD 225 year; others donate unrestricted lump sums to the organization. Silicon Valley tycoons have provided regular, annual donations of USD 25,000, while one year a teacher donated USD 200,000. There are a few salaried coordinators in China, but no paid staff in the United States, and board members – most of whom are first generation immigrants from Taiwan – work for free. Board members undertake regular 'fact finding' missions to ensure that the money is properly spent, and that the scholarship recipients are indeed receiving their money.

The Zigen Fund, founded in New York in 1988, is a similar organization that, in addition to scholarships, helps build and refurbish rural schools, libraries and health centers. ('Zigen' means 'nourish the roots') It depends on a small base of 800 – 1,000 mostly Chinese American donors who give USD 50 – 500 per year. While discussions are underway to expand the organization, no large scale efforts at fundraising have been attempted, says President Bik Lam, an immigrant from Hong Kong.

Like SOAR, Zigen puts a premium on effectiveness and accountability. Board members make regular fact finding missions to their projects. The organization avoids working with the Chinese education authorities, which in past have not been as responsible with funds, but seeks out trustworthy local partners for projects. Lam says raising female attendance from 10 percent to 100 percent in many of their targeted villages has been one of Zigen's greatest accomplishments.

Giving of a different kind has been facilitated by the Center for US-China Arts Exchange, established in 1978 by Chou Wen-Chung. A veteran of the 'Flying Tigers' during the war against Japan, Chou emigrated to the United States in 1946 and, although already a qualified civil engineer, studied composition at the New England Conservatory. He became a renowned composer and is now Professor of Composition at Columbia University, where he established the

Arts Exchange center. In the 1980s this worked to make contemporary music scores and recordings available in China and, collaborated in the award winning film 'From Mao to Mozart' organised a Beijing production of 'Death of a Salesman', directed by Arthur Miller. During the 1990s, the Center oversaw a Ford Foundation funded program to document and preserve ethnic minority art and craft in Yunnan province. This involved establishing a degree course in traditional arts at the Yunnan Minorities Institute, and working with local authorities to design an ethnographic museum of ethnic minority culture in the provincial capital, Kunming.

New philanthropist returnees

Still other Chinese Americans have returned to China to oversee their philanthropic works in person. In 1999, Randy Yeh, the Chinese American representative for Lucent Technologies in Beijing, took early retirement and sold enough of his stock to create a USD 1 million foundation based in the United States. Hoping to make a difference in Beijing, where he has chosen to retire, he has transferred USD 150,000 of that sum to endow a new NGO under the auspices of the China Youth Development Foundation. Although the money has been officially donated to CYDF, Yeh says he retains full control of the funds, which will be used to support four main goals: NGO capacity building, facilitation of volunteering, medical assistance for the needy, and the care of elderly and disabled.

Yeh, who was born in China and grew up in Taiwan before emigrating to the United States, says it is largely coincidental that his philanthropy is directed at China: 'I just happen to be living in China.' Yet, he says, if his company had not posted him to Beijing many years ago his 'giving would have been much less, more superficial, like just giving a check'. He believes that his efforts have been easier because of his Chinese heritage. 'I can go into a much deeper relationship with the people here because of a shared cultural and language background . . . When you have a deeper relationship, it becomes a lot easier to do things here. That's the same for business.'

Yeh's highly personal vision of social development turns on helping others to contribute their time and good will as volunteers in the community. But he believes that people can only give when they are ready to, and when they have a sense of personal sufficiency. Thus, his New Path Foundation does not aggressively promote volunteerism, but rather seeks ways to create opportunities, for those who are 'ready', to make an effective contribution. The foundation has provided travel expenses for volunteers to visit retirement homes and residential facilities for disabled children, and it is now working on a scheme to provide advice and support services to groups of individuals wishing to establish new social service NGOs.

Another returned American Chinese philanthropist is Zhou Yan, who spent many years living abroad working for multinational banks, and now calls Shenzhen home. She founded the Phelex Foundation, registered in the United States, in 1995. Its goal is to help rural schools generate the income they need to subsidize tuition by running small, sustainable businesses – such as tea farms, pigeon coops and vegetable gardens.

Over the past eight years, Phelex has donated some USD 3 million to rural schools. The funds come almost exclusively from foreign donors: about 20 percent from Chinese Americans and another 30 percent from Hong Kong Chinese. Fan Ying, who manages the foundation's operations, says it is coincidental that overseas Chinese have contributed half of the funds, since the organization has made no efforts to target these communities for fundraising. In fact, the biggest donations still come from 'white' foreigners from the financial world who are friends of the founder.

Typical of another new kind of returned philanthropist, albeit one who has committed time and energy rather than money, is Dr. Tan Leshan, a native of Yunnan Province. In 1987, Tan began to study for a doctorate in anthropology at Cornell University. He was joined there by his wife and seven year old daughter in early 1989. Following the events of June 4, 1989, Tan's wife and daughter applied for and received American citizenship. His daughter has since spent twelve years in American schools, and is currently a junior at Cornell. Dr. Tan did not himself apply for US citizenship because, he says, this would have complicated travel to and from China – and he was always quite clear that he wanted to continue to play an active role in China's social development.⁶⁷

To this day, Tan remains a green card holding 'American permanent resident', but most of his time is spent in China, even though this means long periods of absence from his family in the United States. Following a short stint teaching at Cornell, he took a job in 1999 as Deputy China Programme Director of Save the Children Fund (UK) in his native Yunnan, where he oversaw a programme that included sensitive and ground-breaking work in areas such as HIV/AIDS prevention among sex workers and drug users, and prevention of the trafficking of women and children. In 2001, Tan moved on to become China Country Director of the well-known blindness prevention agency, Project Orbis International, a post he still holds.

Dr. Tan's engagement with non-profit public benefit work in China contrasts interestingly with the experience of his brother, Tan Leshui, a wildlife documentary film-maker who never left Yunnan. In the early '90s, Tan Leshui set up his own 'Man and Nature Foundation' in Yunnan, to promote environmental awareness and nature conservation. After a few years he was obliged to abandon this work when the government raised the capital endowment threshold for registered foundations to CNY 2 million (USD 240,000), a sum that he could not raise. This is richly

illustrative of the way in which the Chinese state's current 'management' of the non-profit sector constrains the creativity of some of its most public-spirited citizens. The story also shows the comparative advantage enjoyed by public-spirited Chinese people who have been empowered by their overseas experience and connections.

Tan Leshan is beginning to consider his retirement plans. He hopes to build a bamboo house in Hosai Village, a poor and remote community on Yunnan's border with Burma, and to divide his time between there and the United States. Hosai is where he spent seven years as a 'sent-down youth' during the Cultural Revolution. Although now widely reviled both in China and overseas, this forcible experiment in cultural exchange did evidently kindle, in at least some hearts and minds, enduring attachments that take Chinese philanthropy beyond traditional support for kin and the ancestral home.

It was just such an experience that eventually resulted in the Candlelight Project to help rural schoolteachers. This started in 1994 with a gift of USD 3,000 from an American Chinese scholar. The money was entrusted to a friend back in China, who was asked to use it for the benefit of schoolteachers in Baoding Prefecture of Hebei Province, where the donor and his friend had both been 'rusticated' during the Cultural Revolution. The project has since expanded and is now run under the auspices of the China Charities Federation with support from World Vision.

Wang Chao, of World Vision, is another recent émigré who found his way back to work in social development. A native of Hubei Province, and graduate of Beijing University, Wang moved to Canada to study urban planning at the University of Montreal. But, after gaining Canadian citizenship and earning a PhD in Urban and Regional Development, Wang was ready to go home. 'I wanted to do some work that was more related to China'. A friend recommended that he talk to World Vision. They warned him that he was overqualified for the job opening they had – as a rural development program officer in Yunnan province, but Wang took the job anyway. His Canadian boss offered to keep a job open for him for six months, in case he decided to come back to Canada.

'Six months turned into three years,' Wang says, and as yet he has no plans to return to Canada. Moving to Yunnan with his wife, the urban planner found himself helping villagers build schools, introduce new crops, and learn new, more efficient methods of farming. He says his 'dual identity' as a Chinese and a Canadian helped him in his work. 'Dealing with the government is easier because . . . they don't see me as a stranger, a foreigner,' he says. 'We have a common language and a common experience.' A shared cultural background has enabled him to understand both the cadres' and the villagers' points of view, he says.

Wang is not the only expatriate of Chinese descent working for World Vision in Yunnan. Ten of World Vision's 50 employees are ethnic Chinese from Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and the North America. Most are drawn to China as much by their Christian faith as their ethnicity, Wang says. 'They feel the call,' he says.

Other faith based organisations, such as Hong Kong's Christian Action and Jian Hua Foundation, and many smaller groups, actively recruit ethnic Chinese people from Hong Kong, Singapore, and further afield to work as volunteers on the mainland. Most secular international NGOs with established programs in China also receive frequent enquiries from young American Chinese looking for internship opportunities or volunteer work, often wishing to combine this with Chinese language study and the chance to become better acquainted with the land their parents left. The demography of the diaspora suggests that such returnee visitors will grow steadily in number, alongside growth of ethnic Chinese students from overseas undertaking postgraduate fieldwork in China. The numbers who manage to find suitable placements (or subjects of study) are doubtless very small by comparison with the numbers of those looking for career opportunities in the corporate world; but they may nonetheless play a significant role in fostering future philanthropic ties.

Diasporan dissidence

But, of course, not all of China's émigrés are willing to help 'build the Chinese nation' without revision to the political foundations on which it is built. The diaspora includes many people who, in the tradition of Sun Yatsen, are essentially political exiles, such as the Chinese American human rights activist labor rights activist, Han Dongfang, who left for Hong Kong after being imprisoned for his role in the 1989 Tiananmen protests. They and many like them have remained prominent critics of China's human rights performance, and irritants to the Chinese government for the damage they may cause to the country's trading relationship with the West. Yet, despite the sympathy many in the diaspora may feel for their position, there is little sign that they present a serious threat to, or a concerted movement to overturn, the Communist government. The world at large, significantly driven no doubt by commercial and political interests, has chosen 'constructive engagement' with China rather than isolation of it; and diasporan dissidents seem unlikely to be able to reverse that trend.

Perhaps of greater concern to Beijing at present is the quasi-Buddhist *Falun Gong* sect, whose self proclaimed 'divine' leader, Li Hongzhi, resides in the United States. But in this case it is almost certainly not the overseas organisation that worries Beijing so much as the fact that the movement evidently enjoys considerable support within China, despite a sustained campaign to crack down on it. Here, repressive tactics run the danger of reinforcing, rather than undermining, loyalty to the sect. Whether *Falun Gong* grows as a threat to the legitimacy of the regime is

likely to depend largely on whether the government is able to deliver adequate social protections to the predominantly elderly, 'reform loser' citizens who have been its main adherents.

Another special case is that of Tibet. Since China's reassertion of control over Tibet in 1959, well over a million Tibetans have left for India and the West, where there is widespread public sympathy for the cause of Tibetan independence. But the prospects for this seem rather remote. Perhaps for this reason, although the international 'Tibet lobby' remains vocal and strong, some diasporan Tibetans have over the last two decades also devoted considerable energy to raising funds for development projects in ethnic Tibetan areas of the People's Republic. Often these are organised by religious leaders, who evidently retain a strong sense of ministry to their home communities. A case in point is the Rinpoche Dr. Alkong Tulku. He left Tibet in 1963 and now has British nationality serving as Abbot of the Samye Ling monastic centre in the valleys of Eskdalemuir, Scotland. This has become a flourishing international centre of Tibetan Buddhist teaching and charitable activity. In addition to offering religious instruction and hosting retreats, it runs soup kitchens in Scottish cities and provides sheltered accommodation for people recovering from mental illness. The Eskdalemuir centre has become a hub for similar, but smaller facilities in numerous Western countries. In 1980, Alkong Tulku founded the Rokpa Trust, to raise funds for cultural preservation, education and social welfare projects in Tibet. By 2001, this was channelling more than USD 2 million per year to projects in Tibet, implemented through local networks and by local communities. Although he eschews Chinese government channels for delivering this assistance, Alkong Rinpoche is able to visit Tibet every year to oversee progress and identify new projects.

In 1998 another diasporan Rinpoche, Namkhai Norbu, established in Rome the Association for International Solidarity with Asia. This has succeeded in obtaining millions of dollars from the Italian government, the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the European Union for a variety of health and education projects in China. Again, the government of China has acquiesced and indeed actively cooperated in the implementation of these projects.

Thus, despite the rifts between Beijing and the self-proclaimed Tibetan government in exile, some diasporan Tibetans have chosen to support community development efforts in Tibet as a direct and immediate way of improving the lives (and preserving the religion and culture) of the people there. This does not necessarily imply endorsement of Chinese rule in Tibet, but it does imply a pragmatic determination to engage with development processes within the existing power structure.

At present, therefore, political dissidence may be a sub-plot in China-diaspora relations, but it is not one that significantly threatens the Beijing regime. A more central preoccupation of Beijing's is the status of Taiwan. This of course remains the subject of intense diplomatic efforts, which do

touch the diaspora, as one locus for the debate about independence or incorporation. But even here the trend is perhaps away from polarisation, as the growing economic links between the island and the mainland generate, if not consensus, at least a strong mutual interest in achieving a harmonious relationship on some terms.

Concluding Discussion

The economic importance of the diaspora to the Chinese state is incontestable. This makes it a constituency worth courting; and, in the case of those ‘overseas Chinese’ closest to the mainland, whose personal fortunes are most closely interwoven with those of China, the interest is clearly reciprocated. Much contemporary diasporan philanthropy appears to be bound up with this business relationship, although still significantly influenced by the cultural imperative of investing in and honouring the place of origin.

Giving directly to government agencies, through the Department for Overseas Chinese Affairs, is much less than transparent, and may involve significant leakages. (The 1998 Public Welfare Donations Law, which attends mainly to the ‘rights of donors’, may perhaps have been a calculated attempt to address these problems). The government initiated ‘official non profit sector’ appears either too disorganised, or else too disadvantaged vis à vis the *Qiaoban* and the *Qiaolian*, to realise the potential availability of income from overseas Chinese communities. Universities, which are more aggressively market driven and have the added fundraising advantage of traditional Chinese respect for scholarship, do better, but currently look first to wealthy Hong Kong and Taiwanese donors; this may change, however, as newer alumni prosper further afield. China’s independent, citizen-initiated non-profit organisations, by contrast, seem on the whole not to have considered overseas Chinese communities as a source of funds, probably in large part because they lack access to them: if they do look overseas for funding, it is in the main to non-Chinese international development organisations with representative offices in China. Yet the success of some international and Hong Kong based organisations in targeting and raising funds from ethnic Chinese communities suggests that there could be considerable demand for transparent and effective channels of charitable giving, if these were cultivated.

Although government looms large in collection of philanthropic contributions, it is also the case that active donors are quite free to explore other channels; and some of the most committed establish their own organisations, mobilising and distributing funds through personal contacts and networks.

Nyiri argues that China sees, or attempts to co-opt, its diaspora as a culturally unified group whose loyalty and patriotism – to China, rather than to the countries they have moved to – can be retained. This may accurately convey Chinese government thinking, yet the success of such a

project evidently depends on the extent of assimilation, and the extent to which diasporan people adopt the values of their host communities in core areas, such as rule of law and human rights, where China still claims a difference with Western values. The diaspora includes not only entrepreneurs and technicians in new industries, who arguably do have a vested interest in maintaining commercial and scientific links with China, but also scholars, professionals in many fields, artists, etc, whose fortunes are not necessarily interwoven with those of the mainland. Those who retain professional, personal and philanthropic links with China may not only draw cultural reinforcement from this contact, but also serve as a bridge for the introduction of ideas and attitudes acquired outside. Cultural exchange is a two-way street.

Generational change is a critically important factor here. We were told by the *Qiaolian* that donations came overwhelmingly from first generation emigrants. Their children, born and educated overseas, will certainly stand in a quite different relation to their parents' native place; particularly those raised in North America and Europe, where societies are becoming more racially heterogeneous, making acculturation easier. The changing nature of the family as a global institution is another important factor. Chinese philanthropy is strongly associated in the first place with kinship ties and obligations, but in most societies, and particularly in the richer countries, the extended family is becoming weaker, and some new family forms are emerging as second and third marriages become more common, and as tolerance grows for phenomena such as gay parenting and cross cultural adoption.⁶⁸ Migration can make relatives not only literally but also figuratively more distant. For international migrant labourers of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, family bonds and loyalties may in some ways have actually been reinforced by the hostility and discrimination they encountered in host communities; but the context is utterly different for today's American born Chinese college graduates. Our research has been far too slender to say what kind of philanthropic patterns this may produce in relation to China. As noted, the mainland receives a flow of curious and well-intentioned young people of Chinese origin who come with some hope of getting to know and also making some contribution to their ancestral home. But this is quite probably counterbalanced, and even outweighed, by those who are more concerned to develop their careers in the countries where they were born.

New migrants probably represent the largest future frontier for donations to China. Undoubtedly the Chinese state will vigorously court them as future reservoirs of intellectual and financial capital. This is likely to result in a greater degree of transnationalism, with an international elite increasingly free to cross borders as it chooses. The consequences for philanthropy are by no means clear, except that a great deal of new wealth will certainly be created. This will provide opportunities for those with the imagination and determination to reach out for it, although China's most needy communities will find it hardest to reach that far.

¹ Nicholas Kristof, *1492: The Prequel* in *New York Times Magazine*, 6 June 1999.

² This is the figure given by the World Confederation of Institutes and Libraries for Overseas Chinese Studies, whose secretariat is based at Ohio University's Dr. Shao You-Bao Overseas Chinese Documentation and Research Center. www.overseaschineseconferation.org The figure does not include Chinese living in Hong Kong, Macao or Taiwan.

³ Lynn Pan, *Sons of the Yellow Emperor*, (New York: Kodansha America, 1994), 43.

⁴ Pan, 8.

⁵ Dudley Poston *Chinese, overseas* in *Encyclopedia of Population*, 2002

⁶ Des chinois outre-mer, Les Chinois de Thaïlande, *Historiens & Geographes*, No.368 p.213.

⁷ Poston.

⁸ Irene M. Franck and David M. Brownstone, *The Chinese American Heritage* (New York: Facts on File, 1988) 110.

⁹ "U.S. Ranking World First in Number of Chinese Students," *People's Daily*, 27 February 2002.

¹⁰ *Chinese Scientists in Other Countries Encouraged to Return Home* Xinhua, February 15 2003. This report puts the number of returnees at 150,000. See also, Rone Tempest, 'China Tries to Woo Tech Talent Back Home', *Los Angeles Times*, 25 November 2002; this report gives an earlier figure of overseas students – 400,000 – and says that only a quarter of these have returned.

¹¹ Pieke F. *Global Chinese: Fujianese Migrants in Europe* in *China Review, Spring 2003* (Great Britain-China Centre, London), p. 18. This article is a curtain raiser for Pieke's forthcoming book of the same title – Stanford University Press, November 2003.

¹² Spence J D (1990) *The Search for Modern China* W W Norton, New York, pp 226-227 and 259

¹³ Goldman M & Perry E J (2002) *Changing Meanings of Citizenship in Modern China* Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.

¹⁴ *Minchuan zhuyi* is rendered as 'Democracy' in translations of Sun's work at that time. However, his view of democracy was rather more limited than that of most 21st century users of the term: like the communists who eventually succeeded him, he tended to believe that the Chinese people were not ready for full

¹⁵ Epstein I (1995): *Woman in World History: Soong Ching Ling* New World Press, Beijing, p. 52

¹⁶ The later nationalist leader, Chiang Kai-Shek, did however argue, with scant attention to historical fact, that these ethnic groups descended from common ancestry and had merely developed cultural differences as a result of adaptation to different environments. 'That there are five peoples designated in China [ie, Chinese, Manchus, Mongols, Tibetans, Mohammedans] is not due to difference in race or blood, but to religion and geographical environment.' *China's Destiny*, Denis Dobson, London, 1948 p. 40

¹⁷ *Hua* is derived from *huashan*, which is the name of a mountain in present day Shaanxi Province, that was held sacred by the early Chinese dynasties.

¹⁸ Some Chinese ethnic minorities such as the Hakka (*kejia* -- 'guest people') are also relatively easily embraced by the concept of *hua ren*. The Hakka descend from people migrants who, many hundred of years ago, went south from the Yellow River area to new lands in what are now the southern provinces of China. Many of them have since emigrated further afield and can be described as *huaqiao/huayi*.

¹⁹ Castles S & Davidson A (2000) *Citizenship and Migration*, Routledge, New York, p. 194.

²⁰ Epstein I (1995): *Woman in World History: Soong Ching Ling* New World Press, Beijing.

²¹ We are unable to determine an exact numbers of returnees. Some official Chinese sources put the figure as high as 2.2 million, but a report on the official China Internet Information Service suggests that, from 1949 to 2002, a total of 1. 14 million had returned.

²² Reflecting the structure of government departments and other mass organisations, the Federation has a national level organisation based in Beijing, but also provincial level and county level branches which are connected horizontally with local governments as well as vertically with the national body.

²³ The figures in this paragraph were given by *Qiaolian* officials during an interview the authors (April 4, 2003)

²⁴ China's administrative system embraces 33 provinces (including the 'provincial level' metropolitan areas), divided into more than 2,000 counties.

²⁵ Joseph Y. S. Cheng and King-lun Ngok, (1998), *Interactions between China's Organs Responsible for Overseas Chinese Affairs and the Overseas Communities: The Cases of Guangdong and Fujian in the Economic Era*. Paper presented at the International Convention of Asia Scholars, Noordwijkerhout, the Netherlands, 25 June 1998; quoted in Nyiri P *The 'New Migrant': State and Market Constructs of Modernity and Patriotism*, in Nyiri P and Breidenbach J (eds) *China Inside Out*

²⁶ These figures again come from Cheng and Ngok, via Nyiri

²⁷ Once again, the figures derive from Cheng and Ngok, via Nyiri. It is worth noting that some of China's liveliest and most open 'official journalism' appears in media originally designed for overseas consumption – such as the news magazine *Huasheng Shidian* ('*Chinese Voice & Opinion*'). Soong Ching Ling was, after the 1949, herself assigned to edit a magazine aimed at overseas readers, *China Reconstructs*. Political controls on Central China Television English language programming is also somewhat looser than controls on mainstream news broadcasts.

²⁸ *People's Daily* (on-line English edition), March 02 2002, *Western China Offers Huge Opportunities for Overseas Chinese entrepreneurs*, quoting Liu Huijun of the Chinese Political Consultative Conference National Committee.

²⁹ These policies are outlined in a document on the Suzhou Library website:
www.szlib.com/English_version/policy_en.htm

³⁰ www.shjd-rspark.com/procedure1.htm

³¹ *New Venue for Returned Scholars*, in *China Daily* January 4.2000

³² *Convention of overseas Chinese scholars to be held* in *People's Daily* on-line English edition, December 22 2002

³³ *Care for Children of Returned Scholars* in *China Daily* , January 14 2000

³⁴ *Government Opens Doors to Returning Students* Xinhua News Agency, January 6 2003.

³⁵ Stephen McGurk, personal correspondence

³⁶ *Shanghai Issues 'Green Cards' to 240 Overseas Residents* Xinhua News Agency, July 6, 2002.

³⁷ Pal

³⁸ The cited article is *Shanghai shi xin yimin yanjiu [A Study of Shanghai's New Migrants]*, which appeared in *Zhongguo renkou kexue*, No. 3, 1997

³⁹ See Tony Saich's *Governance and Politics of China*, Palgrave MacMillan 2001.

⁴⁰ "Huaqiao University Confers Master's Degree on 30 Macao Students in 2002." (7 November 2002)

⁴¹ Macao Students Keen on South China Universities Xinhua News Service, 12 June 2002

⁴² Pan, 205.

⁴³ Madeline Y. Hsu, *Dreaming of Gold, Dreaming of Home: Transnationalism and Migration between the United States and South China, 1882-1943*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 40-45.

⁴⁴ Hsu, 45-46.

⁴⁵ *A Neglected Minority in a Neglected Field: the Emerging Role of Chinese American Philanthropy in US-China Relations* in *The Expanding Roles of Chinese Americans in US-China Relations*, M E Sharpe 2002, Armonk, NY.

⁴⁶ See also Nick Young's paper on Philanthropy for the KSG workshop last fall; I don't know what's happened to this, or, therefore, how to reference it.

⁴⁷ Robert Lee, *Guide to Chinese American Philanthropy and Charitable Giving Patterns* Pathway Press 1990, San Rafael, CA, p. 30

⁴⁸ Stella Shao *Asian American Giving: Issues and Challenges (A Practitioner's Perspective)* in *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising* 8.

⁴⁹ See *China Development Brief*, passim. Hong Kong organisations such as the Caring for Children Foundation, Jian Hua Foundation, Christian Action and the Hong Kong Society of Rehabilitation make frequent use of the volunteer services of Chinese medical and rehabilitation professionals in hospitals, orphanages etc, as does Catholic Social Services in Macao. A Taiwanese couple, Li Baozhen and ??????, have established a rehabilitation centre for disabled children in Chongqing, providing training to dozens of parents and care assistants, and encouraging new, locally managed service centres to form.

⁵⁰ See, eg, Stanley Lubman, *Bird in a Cage: Legal Reform in China After Mao*, Stanford University Press, 1999, pp. 303-304.

⁵¹ For a detailed study of this, see Mayfair M. H. Yang, *Gifts, Favours, Banquets: The Art of Social Relationships in China*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

⁵² For example, rent on the premises of a project that cares for the children of prisoners is paid for by a Malaysian Chinese entrepreneur.

⁵³ Again, see Nick Young's 'Equity and Philanthropy in China' paper, which we don't know how to reference.

⁵⁴ Stas on shetuan and minban feiqiye danwei

⁵⁵ For examples, see *250 Chinese NGOs: Civil Society in the Making* China Development Research Services, 2001, Beijing and *China Development Brief* (www.chinadevelopmentbrief.org), passim.

⁵⁶ www.nacef.org

⁵⁷ *China Development Brief*

⁵⁸ *China Charity Federation*, pamphlet distributed by the Federation in Beijing in 1996.

⁵⁹ In fact, only a part of the funds are used for surgeries; a substantial portion of funding is devoted to research and development of software applications for teaching surgical procedures.

⁶⁰ Based on several meetings (Nick Young) in 1998 with Smile Train staff in Beijing.

⁶¹ This is, of course, a highly subjective judgement, but it is based on Nick Young's relatively sustained and close observation of China's non-profit sector, as founding editor (from 1995) of *China Development Brief*. Almost certainly, a critical issue in the eroding vibrancy of this organisation was the fact that, in 1998, it was obliged by its Ministry of Civil Affairs patrons (as the sponsoring government agency) to accept an intake of retrenched cadres from the Ministry. These newcomers, according to one dedicated staffer who left the organisation in disgust at that time (personal conversations, 1998-99) expected all the privileges of high-ranking cadres, but had no real commitment to the CCF's charitable ideals.

⁶² Xing Jianxu *Zhongguo Canjiren Fuli Jijinhui 2001 Niandu Shouzhi Juesuan yu 2002 Niandu Zhichu Yusuan Baogao* China Disabled Persons' Welfare Foundation 25 July 2002, Beijing

⁶³ Xiamen University Website

⁶⁴ www.lksf.org

⁶⁵ *Yu's Give-Away to Benefit Education*, in *China Daily* October 29 2000.

⁶⁶ This approximation is based on the current programs of UNDP, Unicef, WFP, IFAD, WHO, UNAIDS and FAO. It does not include loans from the World Bank.

⁶⁷ Information on Tan Leshan comes from personal exchanges, 1999 to date.

⁶⁸ Cross cultural adoption has not been considered here, although it is a pertinent topic, as tens of thousands of Chinese children have now been adopted into European and American homes. This has led to extremely interesting new associational forms, as white adopting parents get together to learn Chinese, to give their children the opportunity to develop relationships with peers, to travel to China and to raise funds for orphanages in China. (See, for example, the Half the Sky Foundation website). This new form of immigration may very well result, as the children grow up, in some interesting new forms of 'diaspora' philanthropy.