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Abstract

Cultural exchanges between the United States and the People’s Republic of China were formalized in the 1970s. With the ever-increasing interest in understanding each other’s culture, American and Chinese governments and cultural institutions organized exchange trips in different fields. Music was among the first professions that was used to establish rapport. This essay introduces some of the early efforts to facilitate the musical exchanges, including by the Asian Cultural Program of the JDR 3rd Fund and the Center for United-States Arts Exchange founded by Chou Wen-Chung. It highlights how the American non-profit sector shaped the cultural dialogue through grantmaking from the 1970s to the 1990s. Despite the legacy of fostering interests in learning the cultural differences between the two countries, archival materials show a Euro-American-centric sentiment by expecting Chinese visitors to bring American knowledge back to their home, and that Americans have the expertise and knowledge to assist Asians to better understand their own cultural heritage. With mostly white Americans in control of the visitors they could bring in, who tended to be talented performers and artists of ancient or traditional art forms, they avoided more politicized contemporary works and discourses. Chinese immigrants in America were also limited in terms of their ability to participate in these cultural exchanges. Such a narrow approach to cultural exchange also limited Americans’ understanding of China (and Asia, at-large) in the contemporary context.
Listening to Each Other? - Opportunities and Challenges in Music Exchanges between the United States and the People's Republic of China in the Late Twentieth Century

New York City and Beijing in the late 1970s were two different worlds regarding economic status, social structures, and cultures. People in the two cities were curious about each other despite the political tension. Chinese musicians and students came to the United States to be enlightened by modern trends, while the Americans’ interest in Chinese (and overall Asian) culture satisfied their curiosity about the exotic East. With music being claimed as a universal language, it was one of the first channels to establish humanistic rapport between the two countries. In this essay, I highlight three aspects of the musical exchanges between the United States and the People’s Republic of China from the early 1970s (when the Cultural Revolution was nearing its end) to the early 1990s. First, I discuss the ways musics played a pivotal role in establishing the official exchanges. I will then turn my attention to some details and criteria for selecting artists to participate in the exchanges between the two countries. These exchange programs were facilitated by various American organizations during the 1960s to 1980s, which shaped the American impression of China and the trajectory of modern music development in China. In this process, Chinese Americans, except for a few influential figures, were given few opportunities to participate in such exchanges. Finally, using the archival materials primarily from the Asian Cultural Council in the 1980s and 1990s, I reflect upon the degree to which such cultural exchange was equal on both sides, as well as on the extent to which cultural diversity was embraced on American soil.

Music as a Cultural Representative and Conversation Opener

The National Committee on United States-China Relations (NCUSCR) is a non-government organization established in 1966 with major grant support from philanthropies such as the Ford Foundation. It had played a key role in coordinating
national-level exchange activities, including the success of ping-pong diplomacy in 1971 and Nixon’s 1972 visit to China. As a tool to humanize political and social discourses, music and performance arts were among the first fields used by both countries to establish common ground for further cultural and social exchanges. Various musical performances, ranging from those at a Chinese school for the deaf to professionally staged performances, were recorded in the travel notes written by American delegations from fields such as science and education. In return, major American music institutions visited the PRC, starting with the Philadelphia Orchestra’s Beijing tour in September 1973. Beyond music, the trip enabled Douglas Murray, the program director of the NCUSCR, to better understand the PRC’s cultural ministry structure and politics through meeting the leaders of the Chinese People’s Association for Friendship with Foreign Cultures and the Institute for Foreign Affairs.

Despite being a good conversation opener, music as a medium for cultural understanding had limited depth. The quality of musical performances could create unnecessary competition, hampering the efficacy of diplomatic dialogues. In 1975, Murray suggested omitting orchestras and choral groups to “minimize the problems of Chinese attitudes to traditional and classical music and of translation,” and instead concentrate on sending collegiate bands and modern dance/ballet troupes to China. As the national exchanges continued to grow, the foci of proposed official delegations for 1976 by the NCUSCR also shifted from performance arts to media and civic issues, more in line with American interests.

But arts and musical exchanges provide emotive experiences that other civic discourses cannot create, and this was where John D. Rockefeller 3rd (1906–1978) greatly contributed with his work and philanthropy. Following the end of the Second World War, not only was he an ambassador for Special Representative for Japan John Foster Dulles, during his trip there in 1951, but he was also part of the panel called by the State Department to discuss US policy towards the newly established PRC in 1949. These experiences led to his “urge to buy objects of art … as … reminders of the countries and people visited” in Asia. His art collection, built with his wife, Blanchette, greatly contributed to earlier Asian art exhibitions in the United States, including the permanent collection at the Asia Society in New York. He established and served as the president of the JDR 3rd Fund, a philanthropy primarily for scholarly and artistic
exchanges between Asian countries and the United States and art education programs. Furthermore, he fostered the establishment of the International House in Tokyo, the Asia Society (AS), and the predecessor of the Asian Cultural Council (ACC), the Asian Cultural Program (ACP) of the JDR 3rd Fund, to name a few. These organizations maintained close ties with official bodies, scholars, professionals, and the public by coordinating professional and cultural exchanges, as well as various activities such as exhibitions and performances in America.

Looking at the grants distribution of the ACP in 1963–1975, a quarter of the total funding went to music and dance ($1.5 million), which is significantly more than the funding provided for specialists in art history and archaeology ($1 million), art exhibitions ($955,000), and museology training ($845,000). Despite the support of grants such as those from the Asian Cultural Program, American organizations seeking to tour China still had to cover most of their costs. Their proposal also needed to be approved by Chinese agencies, which could be a years-long process. But a robust arts exchange program was developed in 1979–1980, with the tireless advocacy work by the late Chou Wen-Chung (1923–2019) and the Center for United-States-China Arts Exchange (The Center) at Columbia University.

**Chou Wen-Chung – Major Contributors for US – PRC Musical Exchanges**

Chou was a professor emeritus of musical composition at Columbia University. Born in the Republic of China, he emigrated to the United States in 1946 and became a US citizen in 1958. His compositions were well-recognized, with major awards and grants. By 1966, he coordinated the delivery of American scholarly materials in sciences and politics, along with his compositions, to the National Library in Beijing. Starting in December 1972, he periodically visited China and other Asian countries to explore cultural exchange opportunities. There, he established personal connections with cultural leaders and officials in the PRC, such as with Wu Zuqiang, a composition faculty member and president of the Central Conservatory of Music, and with Chen Xieryang, the conductor of the Shanghai Ballet, who eventually received multiple grants
from the ACC to study and perform in the United States. In 1978, Chou founded the Center, one of the major coordinators in artistic exchanges, ranging from scholarly research to performances and film showings in both the US and China. In addition, he was also actively involved in the work of a number of organizations, such as the NCUSCR, which he joined in December 1973), the AS, the ACP, and the ACC. His work satisfied Eastern scholars’ and artists’ thirst for new ideas and “catching” up with the most up-to-date art trends, while American scholars and artists were exposed to the Eastern culture, thanks to the stream of visiting Chinese scholars and artists.

As a teacher, Chou also profoundly shaped the world’s understanding of contemporary Chinese music. Some of today’s most well-known Chinese composers—Tan Dun, Qu Xiaosong, and Chen Yi—studied under Chou’s tutelage at Columbia after their studies at the Central Conservatory of Music. Certainly, Chou was not the only person who recruited mainland Chinese students to America. Sze Yi-Kwei, a Chinese voice studies faculty member from the Eastman School of Music, also recruited students to Eastman from Chinese institutions. Yet, Chou distinctly created a performance arts network that promoted Asian immigrant artists in New York City, with the aid of then-active contemporary composer forums, new music ensembles, and other Chinese figures, such as dancer and choreographer Chiang Ching (b. 1946). Trained at the Peking Dance Academy, Chiang entered show business and became a successful actress in Taiwan and Hong Kong in the 1960s. She reestablished her dance career in New York in 1973, with many of her works choreographed to music by Chou Wen-Chung and his students. In addition to the artistic collaboration, Chou, in turn, served on the board of directors of the Chiang Ching Dance Company. This provided a window to the tight-knit nature of the Asian art circle in New York City, and how the minority elites create an institutional space to enable more young Asian artists to succeed on the American stage.

Despite its role in facilitating US-PRC cultural exchanges, the Center, just like many other arts organizations, struggled to secure funding and institutional support. It finished its historic mission in 2018, with a long-lasting impact in bringing Chinese arts onto the global stage.
Who Benefits from Cultural Exchanges and How?

Despite decades of advocacy, I have discussed on another occasion how Chinese music practitioners are nonetheless asked to display their ethnicity in performances. Looking at grant makers’ views on Asian grantees and applicants, I argue that these cultural exchange programs, even if unintentional, are nonetheless built on a sense of white or Euro-American-centric superiority.

To this point, the 12-year report of the JDR 3rd Fund notes,

While the JDR 3rd Fund has sought in varied ways to increase Americans’ knowledge and understanding of Asian culture, it has been equally concerned to share with Asians the best aspects of Western culture. The Asians themselves have repeatedly expressed the desire to establish contact with the best of Western culture in order that they might develop their own understanding and standards of judgment.

While cultural exchanges were bilateral, these points of contact did not mean that Chinese and American cultures and knowledge were seen as equal. Not only did Americans claim to be the best torchbearers of Western civilizations, but they also saw themselves as possessing the essential knowledge and technique for Asians to understand their native cultures and had the agency to discover new knowledge from Asian countries by sending scholars to study Asia. Though local offices were established and supported by local corporations, philanthropists, and even governments in Asia, the JDR 3rd Fund, the Asia Society, and Asian Cultural Council were ultimately American institutions led by predominantly white, elite Americans who “respect and appreciate the people” from other cultures. White elites also controlled the method of vetting potential grantees. In its earliest days, the JDR 3rd Fund approached the Institute of International Education, the Ford Foundation, the British Council offices, as well as American embassies in Asia to solicit potential grant applicants. As the ACP matured, potential grant applicants often had institutional or personal connections to former grantees and figures like Chou. John D. Rockefeller 3rd saw that as a method to “further assist artistic and cultural efforts in Asian countries... [A] network of former grantees has developed... in helping us to identify other people with talent and a need for assistance.” Despite the goodwill in embracing global cultural diversity and
acknowledging that the American methods needed to be adapted to other cultural settings, (primarily white) Americans had quite an impact on who got to learn from the “West,” what were the things that were worthy of learning, and how Asians could best apply their newly acquired knowledge and experience to embrace their heritages in sustainable or culturally aware manners.

With the rapid increase in cultural exchanges on the global level in the 1980s, some Americans still wanted to keep an arm’s length from Eastern influences. Kenneth L. Goody coined the term “Asianization of America” in 1989 and discussed how the influences of Asia in American culture, rather than being assimilated into Euro-American cultures, were visible and created a “challenge to [white] Americans.” Asian-themed cultural activities, therefore, helped Americans “prepare … for … the Asianization of America.” While the cultural exchange is seen as beneficial to the diversity of America, it triggered a sense of xenophobia towards non-white Americans, imposing a liability to the superior Eurocentric culture. Overall, grant makers like the ACC and the JDR 3rd Fund showed stronger desires to provide funding for short-term studies that would not enable Asian musicians to stay in the United States, such that their American experience “will be of value to the grantee in fulfilling professional responsibilities in his or her home country.” This had proven to be somewhat wishful thinking.

The Asian Cultural Program provided $54000 of scholarships to 41 Asian students selected by the faculty members at the Julliard School in 1967–1969, but a number of them stayed in America instead of returning to their home countries. One such “failed case” was Adolovni Acosta, a Filipino pianist who pursued a concert career in New York City and founded East-West Artists, Inc. Despite her effort in promoting Asian and American composers through annual composition contests and composers’ concerts in the New York City area, Ralph Samuelson, then program associate of the ACP and later the director of the ACC, nonetheless indicated that the pianist, who had already established permanent US residency, did not seem to have plans to return to the Philippines, suggesting that the goal of the then JDR 3rd Fund was not realized with Acosta. This early grant also led the trustees of the JDR 3rd Fund to switch the format of grantmaking for degree-seeking students, requiring individual review and
avoiding “individuals who were likely never to return home and sought out people with commitments to using their skills in their own country.”

In the Chinese context of the late 1980s, the efficacy of enabling Asians to earn a degree in the US was also somewhat questioned by the staff from the Center because of the language barrier and the reverse cultural shock caused by “envy and resentment by their peers,” in addition to the potential brain drain. In 1991, there was heightened concern from Chinese authorities about dancers’ defections to the US during their participation in the American Dance Festival. To discourage that, ACC personnel needed to create a highly secure and careful itinerary and program; Chiang also asserted her influence to convince the young dancers about the impracticality of trying to “make it” in the United States.

But this did not stop Chinese and other Asian visitors from taking advantage of their short-term visits to achieve their “real” aim—to become graduate students, seek American opportunities, and potentially become US permanent residents. Even with highly secure and prestigious musical careers in China, outstanding Chinese musicians could still be attracted to Western opportunities. Luo Jingjing, a composition faculty at the Chinese Conservatory of Music, was sponsored by the Center and the ACC to visit the US on a J-1 visa in 1983. During her visit, she applied and was accepted into the New England Conservatory and the University of Michigan for further studies, with the Chinese ambassador’s initial support. However, Chou insisted on having her return to China, such that this did not “give artists in China the impression that a Center-sponsored trip to the US leads to an extended stay here.” Eventually, Luo returned to the United States on her own and is still residing in the United States. Similar stories also happened to Chen Yi and Ni Wenzhen, who had secure job prospects upon their return to China but eventually returned and thrived in America.

With a heightened sensitivity to choosing grantees who intended to return to their home countries, ACC staff often had to speculate individuals’ intent in their grant applications. One indicator was the applicant’s social and familial connection to the US. However, such a connection displayed no definite correlation to whether the grantee was inclined to migrate. Law Wing-Fai was a well-known professor of composition at the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts when he applied for an ACC grant. After
Michelle Vosper, the Hong Kong representative for the ACC, learned that Law’s wife was a green card holder, she considered the funding of his short-term visit a “mistake.” Yet, such a “mistake” was unfounded—Law not only returned to Hong Kong early, but he also remained active and influential in the performing arts in Hong Kong.

The more complicated issue yet was the inconsistent definition of what constituted an American or a Chinese performer. Yeh Tsung, a Chinese-born-and-raised conductor with US citizenship, was granted funds in 2002 to work with his former colleague at the Shanghai Conservatory on a project on the music of Arnold Schoenberg and Paul Hindemith. By then, despite being based in South Bend, IN, Yeh was also the Hong Kong Sinfonietta music director, and it was public knowledge that he would return to Asia as the music director for the Singapore Chinese Orchestra. In fact, Ralph Samuelson and Michelle Vosper started the conversation about this grant opportunity with Yeh in Hong Kong. Despite such close ties to Asia, as stated in the first sentence of his biography, his engagement in China and Hong Kong was dismissed as “guest conducting” in the ACC docket, downplaying Yeh’s involvement in the greater Chinese region and asserting his American identity.

Yeh was an exceptional Chinese American to receive such positive treatment and grant opportunities. Being seen as an American, his participation in Asia was highly valuable to grant makers and white Americans, who sought to bring influences to the East. Meanwhile, in contrast, cultural contributions by Chinese immigrants and Chinese Americans were much less supported by the ACP, the AS, and the ACC. Amateur Chinese opera companies and performance groups, such as the New York-based Yeh Yu Chinese Opera Association and the Chinese Music Ensemble of New York, sought funding from the JDR 3rd Fund for their operations, sometimes for expanding their artistic offering through film projects and more frequent performances. However, they were disqualified from the Asian Cultural Program because it “do[es] not support the activities of ethnic groups within the United States.” But in the case of the Chinese Music Ensemble of New York, they are more than only serving the local Chinese communities—they performed Chinese music at major institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania and Lincoln Center, which proved their artistic excellence.

Such a refusal showed that they considered Asian Americans as unable to facilitate
cultural exchanges with other races in the American context, despite maintaining transnational connections and having cultural knowledge about both Far Eastern and mainstream American cultures. Another aspect that shows the privilege of Chinese visitors was the lodging arrangements. JDR 3rd Fund provided apartments on the West Side of Manhattan for their grantees, in addition to them performing at and visiting prestigious, well-educated, primarily white spaces during their stay in New York City.44

Because of cost considerations, these US-based Asian groups and artists did contribute to the Asian cultural programming offerings.45 Various American-based artists, including the two groups mentioned above, were invited to give educational performances and cultural activities, like the Chinese New Year celebration organized by the China Council of the Asia Society in 1985. From tea suppliers and art exhibitions to talks and tai chi demonstrations, most activities are supported by Chinese American merchants and groups.46 Members of the AS also kept a list of Asian American performers for lecture-demonstration performances at educational institutions. The list included Lui Tsun-Yuen (Los Angeles, CA), a leading figure in Chinese music education in America and Sushil Mukerjer (Lenox, MA), “one of the leading North Indian flutists.”47 Despite their “authentic, and thoroughly professional” skills in Asian music, they were only considered as second-liners for school assemblies and cheaper labor.

All of these instances show the complicated definition of Chinese (and Asian at large) and Americans, and the white-dominant grant makers’ social power in shaping the Asian cultural discourse in the US. In the case of Asian musicians, their countries of residency had significant implications for the opportunities they could get on American soil, and this illustrates white or elite Americans’ interests in the distant, exotic flavor more than interacting with and understanding the interests and needs of the local minority communities.
Conclusion: Breaking or Reinforcing Cultural Differences through International Exchanges

As a result of my experience as a JDR 3rd Fund grantee I was able to solidify and strengthen my own identity as a Korean. Having the opportunity to study in another culture and to pit my ideas against others broadened my perspective as a Korean.\(^48\)

Duk Hyung Yoo, former director of the Drama Center of Korea, wrote this reflection of his American experience that struck me deeply with its nationalist sentiments.\(^49\) From a positive light, it shows that cultural exchanges were crucial for Asians to enhance self-understanding and express their unique identities in the modern world. On the flip side, the experience exposes cultural incompatibility. Chinese and other Asian cultures were pitted as the opposite of occidental cultures in such narratives, and it is reflected in the design of the JDR 3rd Fund’s 12-year report, as well as many other publications about Asia. Exotic, traditional artifacts or performances with costumes were often used to depict Asian cultural activities, while Americans are often shown in modernist aesthetics. The report did not claim that cultural differences between the two groups could be overcome, but such differences “reveal[ed] the great richness of human life.”\(^50\) The great richness, however, could only be seen with Western interventions through financial, cultural, and political means in modernity.

To conclude, I reflect on how Blanchette Rockefeller discussed the importance of ancient Chinese, rather than modern, art in the post-WWII era:

It’s very hard to think of China as anything except a major influence in the Far East but we haven’t been able to do very much in exchange politically or in exchange of contemporary art. ... [Asia Society is not] necessarily excluding contemporary art but with the emphasis on the ancient art because it was so little known in this country. ... They have... given many, many exhibitions of Chinese art but in their education program they’ve tried to remain entirely historical and away from contemporary politics. ... I think they’ve done a wonderful job in showing exhibitions of the highest quality...the things are beautifully shown and are of unquestionable rarity and beauty.\(^51\)
Chou Chiu-Yeh, vice chairman of the Institute for Foreign Affairs, commented to Douglas Murray in 1973 that Americans “seemed to be interested in traditional things, but not in contemporary things,” which were considered too closely related to politics and Communist ideologies.\textsuperscript{52} As Americans connect to this romanticized, ancient, and exotic image of Chinese cultures through the activities organized by the JDR 3rd Fund, the ACC, the AS, and other cultural institutions, are we perpetuating ethnic stereotypes, or in Richard Lanier’s words, the danger of “cultural flag-waving?”\textsuperscript{53} In addition, if revolutionary works from the Cultural Revolution have been viewed as inappropriate for Americans because of their sensitive political contents, to what degree do we truly understand modern Chinese culture and history by having martial artists perform exotic moves?\textsuperscript{54} The negligence of excluding the contributions of Chinese Americans to the American cultures is equally concerning. Not only were the Chinatown and other ethnic enclaves not seen as a valuable site for cultural exchanges, but highly talented immigrant artists were also subjugated to providing cheaper labor and less opportunities comparing with their Asian-living counterparts. If so, to what degree have humanities been shared between the exhibition goers, performance audiences, or members of cultural institutions and the Asians living in both their home countries and the United States?

\textsuperscript{1} All Chinese names will be presented with last name first, following the Chinese convention. A note on Romanization of Chinese names: most of the Chinese names romanizations, except dancer Chiang Ching and Chou Wen-Chung, are in pinyin. For names Romanized using Wade-Giles systems prior to 1979 will be quoted as appeared on the American documents, with pinyin provided whenever possible.

\textsuperscript{2} I use "musics" in plural form because the term encompasses various kinds of music from both China and the West, and all these musics exist in highly different sociocultural positions and contexts.


\textsuperscript{4} Examples can be found in Travel Notes from The November 1974 Delegation from the Mid-West Region of the United States-China People’s Friendship Association, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC, 5–8, 27, 32–33, 72–73.


\textsuperscript{6} Douglas Murray, Memorandum regarding Exchanges: Performing Arts, September 28, 1973, Box 12, Folder 127, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC, 1.

\textsuperscript{7} Douglas Murray, Letter to Alex Eckstein regarding Exchange Proposal for 1975, Box 11, Folder 123, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC.
While the exchange of materials was supposed to be bidirectional, the report indicated that as of 1979, only “a limited number of music publications, recordings and instruments” were received by the Center. While the exchange of materials was supposed to be bidirectional, the report indicated that as of 1979, only “a limited number of music publications, recordings and instruments” were received by the Center.

In addition, Rockefeller Foundation was a major contributor to the former American Institute of Pacific Relations (1925–1960).

Arthur Rosen, Proposal to Hsieh Ch’i-mei, October 2, 1975, Box 12, Folder 131, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC; Jan Berris, Memorandum regarding July 17th Meeting at State Department, July 11, 1975, Box 12, Folder 132, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC; Arthur Rosen, Memorandum regarding 1977 Exchange Proposals, September 23, 1976, Box 12, Folder 134. National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC; Douglas Murray to Alex Eckstein on Exchange Proposal for 1975. No performing arts exchange was proposed by the National Committee in 1977, but a more expanded delegation list comparable to that in 1975 was seen for 1978, but the performing arts focus had mostly shifted away from music-only engagements. (See Folders 134 and 135, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC; Judith Miller, “Scaling China’s Great Wall,” Change, Summer 1974: 23-24.


The Asia Society, “Guide to the Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller 3rd Collection of Asian Art,” n.d., Box 17, Folder 125, Blanchette Rockefeller Papers, Series 3, Rockefeller Family Archives, RG53, RAC.

In addition, Rockefeller Foundation was a major contributor to the former American Institute of Pacific Relations (1925–1960).


“The JDR 3rd Fund-Asian Cultural Program Total Grants Appropriated September 17, 1963 through August 31, 1978 by Field of Interest,” Box 5, Folder 40, Asian Cultural Council Records, Administrative Files, RG1, RAC.


Department of International Exchange, National Library of China, Letter to Tong Tekong [In Chinese], January 11, 1966, Box 72, Folder 2072, Asian Cultural Council Records, Administrative Files, RG1, RAC.


Various documents from Box 15, Folder 91, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC.

“Confidential Progress Report,” 3; Raymond Ericsson, “Notes: New American ‘Missionaries’ to China,” New York Times, April 13, 1980. While the exchange of materials was supposedly bidirectional, the report indicated that as of 1979, only “a limited number of music publications, recordings and instruments” were received by the Center.


Program for 1980 Riverside Dance Festival, Box 15, Folder 91, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG8, RAC.

Victor Chen, “A Visit with Chou Wen-Chung,” Bridge, n.d., 46. Box 15, Folder 91, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG8, RAC.
26 Ibid., 8.
27 This is based on observations of multiple application portfolios filed under Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC.
28 As quoted in Moss, JDR 3rd Fund and Asia, 10, 18.
29 Kenneth L. Goody, Draft Outline, 19 December 1984, Box 16, Folder 120.
31 “Asian Cultural Council Information Brochure,” Box 17, Folder 129, Blanchette Rockefeller Papers, Series 3, Rockefeller Family Archives RG53, RAC.
34 Richard Lanier, Memo regarding the Meeting with Anita Warburg, December 19, 1975, Box 62, Folder 1801, Asian Cultural Council Records, Administrative Files, RG1; Moss, JDR 3rd Fund and Asia, 24.
36 Michelle Vosper, Facsimile to Charles Reinhart, April 5, 1991, Box 317, Folder 1, Asian Cultural Council Records, Fellowships and Training Programs, RG4, RAC.
37 Ralph Samuelson, Memorandum regarding Luo Jingjing, December 12, 1983, Box 709, Folder 4, Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC. Wu Wenguang, her colleague on the same trip to the US from the China Conservatory, was also invited to be a visiting artist at Wesleyan University and the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. Their cases also prevented an unnamed composer from China to receive potential funding from the Asian Cultural Council to study at Columbia. See Richard S. Lanier, Memorandum regarding Telephone Conversation with Chou Wen-Chung, October 11, 1983, November 10, 1083, Box 709, Folder 4, Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC.
40 Michelle Vosper, facsimile to Ralph Samuelsson, April 24, 1995, Box 717, Folder 7, Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC; His daughter was also in Philadelphia as a student, and that was already made known to members of the ACC, see 1994 Hong Kong Applicant profile on Law Wing Fai, Box 717, Folder 7, Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC.
42 Ralph Samuelson, Memorandum regarding Lunch Meeting with Tsung Yeh in Hong Kong on June 25, 2001, July 17, 2001, Box 715, Folder 6, Grants, RG5, RAC; Asian Cultural Council, docket information on “Ysung Yeh/Shanghai Conservatory of Music,” Box 715, Folder 6, Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC.
43 Porter McCray, Memorandum regarding Lynn Terreri, May 20, 1970, Box 78, Folder 2415, Asian Cultural Council Records, Administrative Files, Grants, RG5, RAC; Susan Cheng, Letter
from Ralph Samuelson, September 8, 1977, Box 97, Folder 3288, Asian Cultural Council Records, Administrative Files, RG1, RAC.

44 Rental payment receipts can be found in various folders under Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC. Through ACP and ACC, Asian grantees stayed at Lincoln Square Apartments, 205 West End Avenue, 444 Broome Street, Chelsmore Apartments.

45 Information on “The Performing Arts of Asia” Program from The Asia Society, February 14, 1964, Box 602 Folder 2, Asian Cultural Council Records, Grants, RG5, RAC.

46 List of Merchants and Groups participating in the 1985 Chinese New Year Celebration, n.d., Box 200, Folder 2361, Asia Society Records, China Council Files, Subseries 2, RAC. In the invitation to the Chinese New Year celebration, the New York Chinese Music Ensemble is referred to as “The Chinese Ensemble from Taipei, Taiwan.” See Invitation to the Chinese New Year Celebration, Box 200, Folder 2361, Asia Society Records, China Council Files, Subseries 2, RAC.

47 “Selected Listing of Asian Musicians and Dancers,” Box 492, Folder 5196, Asia Society Records, Background, Publicity and Local Programs, Subseries 3, RAC.

48 Moss, *JDR 3rd Fund and Asia*, 47.

49 Another example can be found in Chiang Ching’s Appeal to Grant Makers, n.d., Box 512, Folder 5388, Asia Society Records, General Files, Subseries 5, RAC, 3


51 Paul Cummings, Transcript for Oral History Interview with Blanchette Rockefeller, June 30, 1970, Box 16, Folder 116, Blanchette Rockefeller Papers, Series 3, Rockefeller Family Archives RG53, RAC, 7. Another curious case can be seen in Yayoi Uno Everett’s grant to research in Japan and Korea in 1999. Everett holds dual citizenship in Japan and the United States and received research funding from ACC to conduct research for her monograph. See Everett’s Application Form, Box 705, Folder 5, Asian Cultural Council Records, Administrative Files, Grants, RG5, RAC.

52 Murray, Memorandum, 2.


54 Alexander Eckstein, Letter to Charles Yost, August 8, 1973, Box 11, Folder 123, National Committee on United States-China Relations Records, RG9, RAC.