

## *IV. Appendices*

- 1. Alternative Models of Policy Dialogue and Study**
  - 2. Findings from US Think Tank Survey**
  - 3. Findings from US Congressional Travel Survey**
- 

### ALTERNATIVE MODELS OF POLICY DIALOGUE AND STUDY

#### *A. Germany: Issue-Oriented Approaches to Policy Dialogue and Study*

Although smaller than in the United States, Germany's extensive think tank sector is estimated to include at least 70 to 90 policy research institutes. Many of these are active in foreign affairs, the most prominent being the Berlin-based German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP), which operates with 20–30 researchers, and the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP), with more than 130 staff. Germany's think tanks have increasingly been criticized for their heavy reliance on government funding, and the country's rigid system that makes it difficult for personnel to move between the government and think tanks has limited their impact to some degree. However, they operate a number of regular exchanges with US institutions, and these have had particular success in bringing German and American policy experts to one another's countries on a regular basis.

On the other side of the Atlantic, US think tanks tend to run few programs specifically on US-German relations, but they engage extensively with German policy experts and institutions on a variety of initiatives that deal with common interests, ranging from democratization in Eastern Europe to climate change and energy security. Their interactions are reinforced by forums such as the Munich Security Conference, which regularly bring them together to discuss thematic issues of global importance.

One US institution in particular plays a central role in advancing US-German policy dialogue and study—the German Marshall Fund in Washington DC. An independent US nonprofit organization, the German Marshall Fund was established in 1972, when Chancellor Willy Brandt announced a \$47 million contribution from the

German government to create the institution as a memorial to America's postwar Marshall Plan. The German government subsequently made a series of additional contributions, altogether giving a total of roughly \$150 million (€128 million) in the organization's first 20 years. With an annual budget of nearly \$40 million, the German Marshall Fund operates wholly independently of the German government with an American board and staff, and it sponsors a wide range of activities that benefit both countries. These include policy dialogues and studies that convene experts from the United States, Germany, and elsewhere to study regional and global issues that are important for both countries. It also makes grants to American and European organizations, many of which are for projects that include a component of US-German policy dialogue and study. In 2009, the German Marshall Fund's grant making reached \$11.8 million, more than the total combined grants of the three major US-Japan foundations, CGP, JUSEC, and USJF.

Another important element of US-German policy dialogue is the high level of parliamentary exchange that has historically taken place. In the 2007–2009 period, an average of nearly 100 Congressional members and more than 100 Congressional staff visited Germany each year. These figures are likely boosted by the number of Congressional members who use Ramstein Air Base as a jumping off point for visits to Iraq and Afghanistan, but even if these were excluded, the level of Congressional travel to Germany would still be high. One reason is that a number of annual events are convened each year that attract Congressional members to Germany, including the Munich Security Conference, the US Association of Former Members of Congress's annual Congress-Bundestag Seminar, and the German Marshall Fund's Congress-Bundestag Forum. In addition, there have been a number of efforts to bring Congressional members and staff to Germany on issue-oriented exchanges, for example to study high-speed Maglev train systems and to discuss energy efficient technology.

### *B. Korea: Expanding and Institutionalizing Korea Policy Studies in the United States*

In contrast to US-German ties, US-Korea policy dialogue and study does not have deep roots; however, Korea has made a major push in the last several years to encourage American institutions to focus more on relations with Korea. This has coincided with the debate in Washington about whether to ratify the Korea-US Free Trade Agreement, but much of this initiative has focused on building up the institutional capacity for greater US-Korea policy dialogue and study in the field of security.

One key factor in the growth of Korea-related activities in Washington has been a strategic initiative by the Korea Foundation to strengthen the institutional

underpinnings of US-Korea policy dialogue and study. Although the Korea Foundation has long focused much of its funding on programs in the United States, it began to expand its American presence in 2005 when it opened a small Washington office. Soon afterward, it began to systematically reach out to Washington's key foreign policy think tanks, and it now funds dialogues and studies at all of the top think tanks with Asia programs: AEI, the Brookings Institution, CSIS, CFR, and IIE.

In 2009, the Korea Foundation started providing funding to institutionalize Korea studies inside US think tanks, underwriting new research posts on US-Korea policy at two US think tanks, a Korea Policy Chair at RAND that was established with \$1 million in matching funds and a Korea Chair at CSIS, which is held by Bush administration veteran Victor Cha. Prior to this, there had never been a Korea policy research chair at a think tank outside of Korea.

Following Japan's example from the 1970s, the Korea Foundation had already been endowing chairs at a range of universities around the United States, and it has continued doing this with a particular focus on universities that are active in Washington policy circles. In recent years it has provided institutional support for new posts at a number of universities in the Washington area such as American University, George Washington University, and the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies.

The flurry of attention to Korea in Washington was further heightened by the 2009 creation of a new Center for US-Korea Policy at the Asia Foundation's Washington Office, which is headed by Scott Snyder, and the growing activities of the Korea Economic Institute (KEI). Based in Washington, KEI is funded indirectly by the Korean government through the Korea Institute for International Economic Policy but is led by a prominent US policy expert, Charles Pritchard, who was a senior figure in the Clinton administration.

The Korea Foundation and KEI have also become increasingly active in reaching out to Congressional members and staff. KEI holds a series of roundtables for Congressional staff on issues related to US-Korea affairs. Meanwhile, the Korea Foundation has dramatically expanded its exchange programs for Congressional staff, hosting three annual visit programs for an average of 30 Congressional staff per year in 2008 and 2009. As a result, the total number of Congressional staff visiting Korea climbed from an annual average of 28 people in the 1997–1999 period to 51 per year in the 2007–2009 period, even as the numbers visiting Japan dropped from 50 staff per year to 39.

FINDINGS FROM US THINK TANK SURVEY

The following data were compiled from annual reports, records of foundation grant making, and organizations’ study reports and event listings. To supplement these data, nearly 50 interviews were carried out with Americans and Japanese involved in US-Japan policy dialogue and study. Due to difficulties in gathering accurate information, it is inevitable that some activities may have been omitted; however, this gives a fairly accurate representation of the level of activity related to Asia studies at major US foreign policy think tanks active in the Washington DC policy community.

	Japan	China	Korea
<b>Institutions (2009)</b>			
With major activities specifically on a single country or bilateral relationship	10	22	7
With major activities that include some focus on individual countries or bilateral relations	14	23	14
<b>Major projects focusing primarily on a single country or a bilateral relationship</b>			
2009 projects	20	55	16
2008 projects	13	57	8
<b>Major projects including some significant focus on a country or bilateral relationship</b>			
2009 projects	39	75	34
2008 projects	31	74	20
<b>Joint projects (2005–2009)</b>	25	46	--
<b>Senior researchers (2009)</b>	4	42	7

	1988	1998	2009
Institutions with major activities specifically on Japan or US-Japan relations	16	20	10

**INSTITUTIONS:** The survey focused on American institutions based in Washington DC or with an active presence in Washington DC that carry out policy dialogue and study. These include the following 29 organizations:

American Enterprise Institute	Hudson Institute Washington DC Office
Asia Foundation Washington DC Office	Mike & Maureen Mansfield Foundation
Asia Society Washington DC Office	(1998 & 2009)
Aspen Institute	National Bureau of Asian Research
Atlantic Council of the United States	Washington DC Office (2009 only)
Brookings Institution	National Committee on US-China
Carnegie Endowment for International	Relations
Peace	The Nixon Center (1998 & 2009)
Cato Institute	Overseas Development Council (1988
Center for American Progress (2009 only)	only)
Center for New American Security (2009	Peterson Institute for International
only)	Economics
Center for Strategic & International	RAND Corporation Washington DC
Studies	Office
CNA Corporation	Henry L. Stimson Center (1998 & 2009)
Council on Foreign Relations	Urban Institute
East-West Center Washington DC Office	US Institute of Peace
Economic Strategy Institute (1998 only)	Woodrow Wilson Center
Heritage Foundation	World Security Institute (2009 only)

**PROJECTS:** This includes only policy-oriented projects that were aimed at the US-Japan policy community and considered to be significant undertakings. Long-term policy studies and exchange programs that involved substantive policy discussion were considered to be significant activities. One-time lectures and roundtables were not counted, but full-day conferences requiring significant preparation were considered to be significant undertakings.

**JOINT PROJECTS:** These are substantive dialogues and studies that US think tanks co-organized in the five-year period from 2005 to 2009 and that involved substantive contributions (not solely funding) from both sides. Since the intent is to assess the capacity of nongovernmental organizations to partner with US institutions, projects that were carried out in conjunction with government agencies were not counted.

**SENIOR RESEARCHERS:** These were considered to be policy analysts with regional expertise who spend more than half of their time undertaking policy work related to a single country or with that country at the core of their studies.

FINDINGS FROM US CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL SURVEY

The following data were compiled from an extensive analysis of 9,659 travel records for US Congressional members and staff for travel related to their official duties. This tallies estimates of Congressional travel via all of the possible avenues for work-related travel: (1) trips funded by Congressional committees and US government agencies; (2) travel sponsored by private institutions such as nongovernmental exchange organizations; and (3) trips sponsored by foreign governments under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (MECEA).

Overseas Trips by Members of Congress

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
China	76	15	33	11	18	42	36	32	77	26	46	19	27
Germany	30	36	57	60	67	69	117	108	105	55	158	70	57
France	39	31	62	33	97	52	33	103	85	49	60	58	40
Japan	84	26	40	8	24	24	26	5	41	8	5	14	23
Korea	27	20	30	9	33	35	28	7	21	16	7	13	19
UK	51	83	65	55	52	106	95	91	79	68	51	61	28

Overseas Trips by Congressional Staff

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
China	90	36	21	79	51	105	59	145	199	160	201	114	93
France	54	48	61	70	113	107	63	120	141	61	79	77	47
Germany	47	78	82	133	107	107	153	163	120	66	145	98	64
Japan	102	55	60	55	53	94	51	37	46	44	31	63	24
Korea	30	22	37	56	69	62	40	41	24	38	50	62	41
UK	63	85	77	85	80	131	138	172	129	126	65	111	47

Notes:

- 1) Data were compiled from expense report filings for Congressionally funded travel, which are periodically published in the *Congressional Record*, and ethics reports for privately sponsored travel, which are available to the public. This was supplemented by a survey of organizations that sponsor Congressional exchanges or facilitate MECEA travel for foreign governments, as well as interviews and media reports about Congressional delegation visits.
- 2) Congressional travel tends to fluctuate considerably from year to year due to the electoral cycle, current events, and the level of political and Congressional scrutiny of overseas travel. In some cases, one large delegation visit to a country for a single day can cause the annual travel figures to balloon, so it is important to look at long-term trends rather than numbers for individual years in evaluating the level of interaction among political leaders.
- 3) Data for privately sponsored travel for the years 1997 to 1999 are incomplete, so the numbers for those years are likely to slightly underestimate the actual level of travel.
- 4) Congressional staff indicates staff in Congressional members' Washington DC offices as well as staff in Congressional leadership offices and affiliated with Congressional committees. The data exclude travel for employees of the Congressional Research Service and for the district office staff of Congressional members, who are unlikely to be involved in foreign policy issues.

- 5) Congressional staff participating in MECEA trips do not have to file disclosure forms, so it is difficult to track this category of travel. A survey of exchange programs that are covered by MECEA's exemption from disclosure requirements was carried out to fill in the gap in public information. We have high level of confidence that the figures for travel to Japan are generally accurate due the researchers' familiarity with the field. However, the figures for travel to other countries, particularly European countries, may be slight underestimates.
- 6) Data for China include travel to Hong Kong as well for all years. Travel to Taiwan is not included.