



— *Not for citation without permission* —

**“The New Day Is upon Us”: Building the Field of Chinese Studies**

**Fairbank Center for Chinese Studies  
Harvard University  
September 4, 2019**

**Pauline Yu  
President, American Council of Learned Societies**

It seems only fitting that I open the next chapter of my career at Harvard, where I took my first Chinese language class almost half a century ago. As some of you know, I’ve returned many times—for a six-year term on the Board of Overseers, and as a member or chair of countless visiting committees. It’s always good to come back, and I thank David Wang, the Fairbank Center, and the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for their gracious invitation to speak to you today.

We all know the challenge of getting Americans seriously interested in the world outside our borders. In his recent biography of Richard Holbrooke, George Packer writes that the perennial “weak spot of our Foreign Service” has been “other countries. It’s hard to get Americans interested in them,” he writes, “and the more interested you get, the worse your career prospects.” Packer was writing about Holbrooke’s involvement in South Vietnam, where “every failed American effort required an even greater American effort, because we never bothered to learn the history and never understood what we had gotten into.”<sup>1</sup> But one can easily recall other panicked realizations of cultural or linguistic ignorance—how few speakers of Japanese were in government or armed service after Pearl Harbor, or of Pashto after 9/11?

In thinking about the efforts that have been made to address these deficits, most historians focus on the massive buildup in resources for international and area studies that began in the 1950s and were funded by the federal government and the Ford Foundation. Indeed, a December 1974 article in the newsletter of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), *Items*, notes that no one can remember anything about the development of area studies before World War II because “there was so little of significance to be recalled.” In citing this remark Stephen

---

<sup>1</sup>George Packer, *Our Man: Richard Holbrooke and the End of the American Century* (New York: Knopf, 2019), 23–25.

Arum observes that this was certainly true with respect to the SSRC, but not at all to American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), which in fact had played “the dominant role” in this endeavor prior to the war.<sup>2</sup> It is this role, with particular reference to Chinese studies, which I’d like to sketch for you today: not a history of the actual work in the field but of the individuals and institutional forces that have generated and shaped it.

The ACLS was founded almost exactly 100 years ago, on September 19, 1919, to represent the American academic community in a newly created International Union of Academies, which European statesmen hoped would help to rebuild a world torn asunder by the Great War. As a federation of societies rather than an elite academy, ACLS could also embrace the broad scope of scholarly activity and embody the democratic ethos of the country it represented. At the first meeting of the Council in 1920, delegates agreed on two priorities. The first was to launch an “encyclopedia of American biography” modeled on the British *Dictionary of National Biography*; the second was to discuss “methods of research and study of the history and civilization of the Far East, especially China.”<sup>3</sup> Why China? For this we can thank attendee Paul Reinsch, then president of the American Political Science Association and historian at the University of Wisconsin, whose book *Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East*, published in 1911, had attracted the attention of President Wilson and led to Reinsch’s appointment as minister to China from 1913–19.<sup>4</sup> (Would that such credentials led to such decisions today!)

Nothing happened for a while. It may be because the net assets of ACLS totaled \$402.21 at the end of its first year.<sup>5</sup> The China agenda item was put on the docket of the 1921 meeting, then deferred again because of “lack of information.”<sup>6</sup> By the fourth meeting, in 1923, Reinsch had passed away,<sup>7</sup> depriving the initiative of its strongest advocate. Over the next few years support was secured for the biographical project from, among other sources, the Carnegie Corporation and *The New York Times*.<sup>8</sup> But China disappears from the record until after 1927, when Rockefeller Foundation funding and the establishment of a permanent secretariat enabled the appointment of Mortimer Graves (1893–1987) as assistant secretary of ACLS.<sup>9</sup>

During his 30 years in the organization, Graves served as principal architect of the China, and then Asia, initiative, and of many other area studies efforts as well. Educated as a historian at Harvard and an aviator during World War I,<sup>10</sup> he did not have a doctorate (though eventually

---

<sup>2</sup>Stephen Marshall Arum, “Early Stages of Foreign Language and Area Studies in the U.S.: 1915–1941.” (EdD diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1975), vii–viii. See also Zachary Lockman, *Field Notes: The Making of Middle East Studies in the United States* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 2016), pp. 3–19.

<sup>3</sup>*ACLS Bulletin* 1 (1920): 16.

<sup>4</sup>Kenneth Scott Latourette, “Far Eastern Studies in the United States: Retrospect and Prospect,” *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (November 1955): 4. Latourette omits “and Political” in Reinsch’s title.

<sup>5</sup>*ACLS Bulletin* 2 (1922): 12.

<sup>6</sup>*ACLS Bulletin* 2 (1922): 14.

<sup>7</sup>As noted in *ACLS Bulletin* 3 (1924): 10.

<sup>8</sup>*ACLS Bulletin* 4 (1925): 10.

<sup>9</sup>The grant was announced in the proceedings of the January 29, 1927, ACLS Annual Meeting and also enabled the appointment of Waldo Leland as executive, then permanent, secretary. *ACLS Bulletin* 6 (1927): 15. Mortimer Graves first appears in the records in *ACLS Bulletin* 7 (1928).

<sup>10</sup>As mentioned in John King Fairbank, *Chinabound: A Fifty Year Memoir* (New York: Harper and Row, 1982), 181.

was awarded two honorary degrees, from Michigan and Penn) but was an enthusiastic internationalist who had learned many languages. When I arrived at ACLS I was told by a student of his brother that “Mort read the bible every night— which, while unusual, does not make him unique. What is unique is, I am told, that he would read it in a different original language each night—Aramaic, Hebrew, Latin, Greek—a hard act to follow.”<sup>11</sup> He also boasted of having taught himself Russian and Chinese and, before arriving at ACLS, had helped to establish the American Russian Institute, which provided translations of informational materials to the public.<sup>12</sup> Described as “self-effacing but highly efficient” and “indefatigable,”<sup>13</sup> Graves was a “one-man dynamo”;<sup>14</sup> his imagination, in John King Fairbank’s words, “made him a pioneer in the development of weird-language competence among Americans . . . and his tenacity and ingenuity got results on a shoestring.”<sup>15</sup>

At the spring 1928 meeting of the American Oriental Society (of which he was a member), Graves met informally with a small group of scholars, who agreed with the ACLS plan to commission a “survey” of Chinese studies.<sup>16</sup> What was the state of the field in 1928? In his 1955 address as president of the Far Eastern Association, Kenneth Scott Latourette recalled that when he began teaching at Reed College in 1914, “the university centers for the teaching and study of the Far East could be counted on the fingers of one’s two hands and with fingers left over.”<sup>17</sup> This was actually an overestimate, for the survey outline only identified three university centers of note in the United States—at California [Berkeley], Columbia, and Harvard.<sup>18</sup>

Berkeley was there because state senator Edward Tompkins, a regent of the University of California, predicted in 1872 that “the child is now born that will see the commerce of the Pacific greater than that of the Atlantic” and believed that the university should prepare students accordingly. He also felt deeply humiliated that Asian students “pass by us in almost daily procession to the other side of the Continent in search of that intellectual hospitality that we are not yet enlightened enough to extend to them.”<sup>19</sup> Tompkins bequeathed to the university its first endowed chair, in Oriental Languages and Literatures, which he named after the naturalist Louis Agassiz. Daniel Coit Gilman, the first president of the University of California, praised this gift in his inaugural lecture as “an early recognition of this intimate relationship” that must develop between California and the cultures and peoples of East Asia.<sup>20</sup> By 1896 Tompkins’s bequest of property had appreciated sufficiently to support an appointment (to \$50,000), so the land was

---

<sup>11</sup>Murray Drabkin, letter to author, February 18, 2004.

<sup>12</sup>Ariel De, “International Understanding and World Peace: The American Council of Learned Societies, 1919 – 1957.” (PhD diss., City University of New York, 2004), 65.

<sup>13</sup>Latourette, “Retrospect,” 6.

<sup>14</sup>Paul M. Evans, *John Fairbank and the American Understanding of Modern China* (New York, Basil Blackwell, 1988) 37.

<sup>15</sup>Fairbank, 181.

<sup>16</sup>George H. Danton, a professor of German at Oberlin who had previously taught at Qinghua University, was charged with the assignment, assisted by Graves. *ACLS Bulletin* 10 (1929): 6.

<sup>17</sup>Latourette, “Retrospect,” 4.

<sup>18</sup>*ACLS Bulletin* 10 (1929): 16.

<sup>19</sup>Cited by John Fryer, “The Demands of the Orient,” in Stuart G. Masters, ed., *The Blue and Gold*, vol. 26 (publ. by the class of 1900) (San Francisco: Press of Louis Roesch, 1899), 25–27; 25. *Google Books*, accessed July 31, 2019.

<sup>20</sup>Daniel C. Gilman, “The Building of the University, an Inaugural Address Delivered at Oakland, Nov. 7th, 1872,” 17, accessed September 27, 2007.<http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/calhistory/inaugural.gilman.html>.

sold. John Fryer (1839–1928), a member of the British diplomatic service who had taught in China, was named the first occupant of the chair and brought his excellent collection of books with him to seed the library.

At Columbia, Horace Carpentier (1825–1918), an alumnus and trustee who had made his fortune in gold mining, telegraph companies, and real estate schemes, in 1901 gave his alma mater \$100,000 (to which he later added another \$126,000) to establish a professorship in honor of his loyal Chinese servant Dean Lung, whom he'd hired while in California and who, he felt, “embodied such characteristic and self-evident virtues that . . . an effort should be made to study the civilization out of which such virtue grew.”<sup>21</sup> Dean Lung himself had actually seeded the gift by previously donating what must have been a substantial portion of his life savings, \$12,000, to a “fund for Chinese learning,” signing his gift letter simply “Dean Lung, a Chinese person.”<sup>22</sup> The Dean Lung professorship was not filled until 1915, when Friedrich Hirth, a former member of the German consular service, was recruited from Munich, but among its more distinguished later occupants was our own David Wang.

And Harvard was there primarily because the Harvard-Yenching Institute had just been established in January 1928 with its \$6.5 million portion of the Charles Martin Hall estate that the university had secured as part of its postwar fundraising campaign.<sup>23</sup> As I'm sure most of you know, Hall had invented a process for extracting aluminum from bauxite in his parents' Oberlin, Ohio, woodshed and went on to found Alcoa and amass a considerable fortune. Harvard entered into a canny partnership with Yenching University, founded by missionaries in Beijing in 1886, with both institutions pledging to honor the terms of the estate by developing resources related to East Asia at Harvard, at Yenching, and at six other missionary universities. After failing to attract Berthold Laufer and Paul Pelliot and rejecting Arthur Hummel (who did not yet have his doctorate) as insufficiently scholarly, the Institute succeeded in hiring the French-trained Russian Japanologist Serge Elisséeff as its first director. He held the post from 1930 to 1955. As Fairbank tells the story, “Pelliot said in effect that no Frenchman could be lured out of Paris into the Harvard boondocks, but Elisseeff, having already come out of Russia, might be available.”<sup>24</sup>

Of course, Harvard could have been first off the block had it listened a century earlier to the lawyer John Pickering (1777–1846), who as a member of the Board of Overseers had lobbied in the 1830s for establishing a professorship in Oriental languages. Finding no response he proceeded to play a central role in the 1842 founding of the American Oriental Society (AOS), the oldest ACLS learned society dedicated to a particular humanistic field—in this case, “the cultivation of learning in the Asian, African, and Polynesian languages”—and a key player in the development of Chinese studies. Pickering served as its first president until his death in 1846.

---

<sup>21</sup>Cited by Marius Jansen in *Japanese Studies in the United States* (Tokyo: The Japan Foundation, 1988), 12. Accounts of the total amount donated differ; according to some, it was \$250,000.

<sup>22</sup>Wm Theodore deBary, “East Asian Studies at Columbia: The Early Years,” in *Living Legacies: Great Moments and Leading Figures in the History of Columbia University*, accessed February 11, 2009, <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/alumni/Magazine/Spring 2002/AsianStudies.html>. The story of the gift eventually made it into the *New Yorker's* “Talk of the Town,” March 31, 1931: 14–15.

<sup>23</sup>See Shu-hua Fan, *The Harvard-Yenching Institute and Cultural Engineering: Remaking the Humanities in China, 1924–1951* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2014). Harvard's lead negotiator was Wallace Donham, dean of HBS and associated with the vastly expanded use of the case study method in the school.

<sup>24</sup>Fairbank, 97.

Intended as an American counterpart to the Asiatic Society of London and the Société asiatique in Paris, the AOS counted among its initial 66 members 32 ministers, with especially close ties to the missionary arm of the Congregational church. By 1860 20% of the members were missionaries abroad, including the Baptist Adoniram Judson, after whom Judson Memorial Church near my home in New York is named, who declared to his family in 1810: “I shall never live in Boston. I have much further to go than that.”<sup>25</sup> And he eventually made it to Burma, where he compiled the first Burmese-English dictionary.

The role played by missionaries and their children in the development of international studies in our country has provided a rich vein of research for intellectual and diplomatic historians. Whatever their convictions about the benighted moral state of the heathen Chinese, it is also the case, as David Hollinger suggests throughout his recent book, that though Protestant missionaries may have set out to change the world, they actually changed America more. Although, as Fairbank remarked, the missionary was the “invisible man”<sup>26</sup> in American history, what Hollinger calls “missionary cosmopolitanism” was especially influential in introducing Asia, the primary arena for their proselytism, to the American public.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, while Berkeley, Columbia, and Harvard had looked to Europe and to fill their new positions, both Yale and the University of Washington filled theirs with returning missionaries—Samuel Wells Williams at Yale in 1877 and Herbert H. Gowen at Seattle in 1909.<sup>28</sup>

It should come as no surprise, then, that when Mortimer Graves convened, with Rockefeller Foundation support, the first Conference on the Promotion of Chinese Studies at the Harvard Club in New York on December 1, 1928, chaired by the president of the AOS, Franklin Edgerton, half of the 40 attendees had either been missionaries themselves or were the children of them. Of the seven attendees—all members of AOS—who were elected by the group to constitute a Standing Committee on the Promotion of Chinese Studies, four were former missionaries: Arthur Hummel, head of the Oriental Collection at the Library of Congress, who had assembled an excellent map collection while in China that Andrew W. Mellon bought as a gift to the Library;<sup>29</sup> Lucius Porter, who had been professor of philosophy at Beijing University, Dean Lung Professor at Columbia, and was now at the Harvard-Yenching Institute; Lewis Hodous, a Czech who had studied under J. J. M. de Groot and was now a professor of Chinese philosophy and religion at the Kennedy School of Missions of the Hartford Seminary Foundation; and Carl W. Bishop, associate curator of Oriental Art at the Freer Gallery. Two were children of missionaries: L. Carrington Goodrich at Columbia and Latourette of Yale. Only Berthold Laufer, who had come to the American Museum of Natural History in 1898 at the

---

<sup>25</sup>Robert McCaughey, *International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984) 10–11, 15. McCaughey notes that Pickering could be considered the “founder of American international studies,” 10.

<sup>26</sup>Fairbank, 403.

<sup>27</sup>David Hollinger, *Protestants Abroad: How Missionaries Tried to Change the World but Changed America* (Princeton: PUP, 2017), p. 1 and *passim*.

<sup>28</sup>Williams was unsalaried and died in 1884 without having taught a single student, whereas Gowen, who held the Chair of Oriental Subjects while serving as rector of a large Seattle church, routinely had 70 or more undergraduates in his many classes. See Felicia Hecker, “International Studies at the University of Washington—the First Ninety Years,” accessed August 5, 2019, <https://jsis.washington.edu/about/history>.

<sup>29</sup>See Edwin G. Beal and Janet F. Beal, “Arthur W. Hummel: 1884–1975,” *Journal of Asian Studies*, 35, no. 2 (February 1976): 286.

invitation of his fellow German Franz Boas and was now at Chicago's Field Museum, had no missionary connection. Laufer was described as "the most learned of living sinologues,"<sup>30</sup> a prolific writer who was famous for "two desks, both piled high with accumulated tasks, and with a swivel chair between them so he could turn from one to the other."<sup>31</sup> He was named the committee's first chair.<sup>32</sup>

Graves's introduction to his report of the meeting, "The Promotion of Chinese Studies," reflects the influence of Laufer's nineteenth-century learning and confidence that rigorous comparative philological research could achieve a grand synthesis of human knowledge. That would require learning about China. "That the next decade will see a striking increase in American interest in Chinese studies is no very daring prediction," Graves opens. The "world's peace rests with China," but the country's potential contribution to the humanities and social sciences has only now been recognized. "It has been estimated that prior to 1750 more books had been published in Chinese than in all other languages combined. As late as 1850, Chinese books outnumbered those in any other language. Even in 1928, the largest publishing house in the world is located not in New York, or London, or Paris, or Berlin, but in Shanghai. . . . Indeed, it would be no very difficult task to maintain the thesis that in none of the world's civilizations has knowledge for its own sake played so prominent a part over so long a time as in that of China."<sup>33</sup>

Graves goes on to note the almost "non-existent" state of sinological study in the United States, where only a few universities "even scratch the surface." He outlines the various deliberations behind the decision to create the standing committee and organize another conference. This, he declares, marks "a new day in the history of American participation in Chinese studies. If, as the new historians tell us, the event and the times are functions of each other, *the new day is upon us*" [emphasis mine]. And rather than indulging an "antiquarian curiosity" or taste for the exotic, "it cannot but lead to a broadening and deepening of our philosophy; it cannot but contribute to that new synthesis for which the past hundred years of historical analysis has been laying the foundation." He concludes, as if a more ringing affirmation were necessary, by quoting Laufer himself: "We hold that a truly humanistic education is no longer possible without a more profound knowledge of China. We endeavor to advance the scientific study of China in all its branches for the sake of the *paramount educational and cultural value of Chinese civilization*, and thereby hope to contribute not only to the progress of higher learning, but also to a higher culture and renaissance of our civilization and to the broadening of our own ideals. We advocate with particular emphasis the study of the language and literature of China as the key to the understanding of a new world to be discovered, as the medium of gaining a new soul, as an important step forward into the era of a new humanism that is now in process of formation."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>Latourette, "Chinese Historical Studies During the Past Seven Years," *American Historical Review*, XXVI, no. 4 (July 1921): 711.

<sup>31</sup>Latourette, *Biographical Memoir of Berthold Laufer 187—1934*, presented to the Annual Meeting of the National Academy of Sciences, 1936, 45.

<sup>32</sup>The committee was shortly expanded to include, most notably, Esson M. Gale, chairman of the Department of Oriental Languages at Berkeley, because it was agreed that someone from California should be there. *ACLS Bulletin* 10: 67. The committee roster is provided on p. 50.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.* 10, 11.

The next decade saw Graves hard at work to realize this “new day.”<sup>35</sup> An ambitious proposal to compile a “manual of Chinese studies” was rejected; as Pelliot argued, “since few questions have been sufficiently investigated to admit of precise answers, the compilation of a manual would do nothing but perpetuate errors which have already done irreparable harm.” Laufer agreed that more primary research was necessary. “He likened the vast area of Chinese literature and civilization to that of the Pacific Ocean; what we know of it, to San Francisco Bay. A manual should wait until we have at least crossed the ocean.”<sup>36</sup> (No one picked up on the suggestion that president-elect Herbert Hoover’s “moral support and endorsement”<sup>37</sup> for the initiative be sought.) So after agreeing to create the standing committee, the conference attendees voted to survey the organizations and resources for sinological studies throughout the world; to compile a directory of sinologists; to establish fellowships to support scholars; and to go on record as believing that Oriental languages should be allowed to satisfy entrance requirements for American universities.

Committee, subcommittee, and conference deliberations over the years would expand this agenda and reflect ongoing concerns about training the necessary teaching and research “personnel,” supporting faculty and graduate students, recruiting undergraduates into the fold, producing research tools, coordinating library acquisitions, and gaining public support. One proposal to establish a Chinese Research Institute in Washington at the Library of Congress surely reflected Laufer’s own priorities. Modeled on the Oriental Research Institute founded in 1919 at the University of Chicago, it would require three full-time researchers in Chinese and nine more in Japanese, Korean, Mongol/Manchu, Turkish, Tibetan, Sanskrit, Iranian, Arabic, and Malayan/Javanese.<sup>38</sup> (Laufer commanded most of these languages himself.)

For a variety of reasons, but perhaps most obviously the 1929 stock market crash, this idea went nowhere;<sup>39</sup> Graves concentrated on what could be done in colleges and universities.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>One index of the priority ACLS granted to this initiative was a decision by the council’s Executive Committee to provide significantly greater financial support in 1929 to the Committee on the Promotion of Chinese Studies (\$750), as compared with the \$300 maximum allowed for other committees. *ACLS Bulletin* 11 (1929): 10.

<sup>36</sup>*ACLS Bulletin* 10: 36.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, 32. Hoover had worked in China as a mining engineer.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.* 58–59. This would have required \$250,000 (almost \$6.3 million in today’s dollars), according to a letter from Hummel to Laufer. Hummel suggested that the LOC might be able to raise the funds: from a letter of October 24, 1929, in Hartmut Walravens, ed., *Kleinere Schriften von Berthold Laufer*, Teil 3: *Nachträge und Briefwechsel* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1985), 335–36. I thank Paul Kroll for bringing this letter to my attention. Ten years later, after Laufer’s death, the committee proposed the creation of a Berthold Laufer Library of Translations from Oriental Languages into Western Tongues, “not dissimilar in character from the Loeb Library in the Greek and Latin classics.” *ACLS Bulletin* 29 (1939): 47. This idea finally came to fruition in 2015 with the inauguration of the Library of Chinese Humanities coedited by Stephen Owen and Paul Kroll.

<sup>39</sup>Even before the crash, on October 4, 1929 Graves sent a letter to participants expressing the opinion that the large sum of money required for such an institute was inappropriate at that time: see Arum, 342.

<sup>40</sup>In 1935 Graves returned to the idea of a national center, but this time focused more on how Far Eastern Studies could make itself relevant to the contemporary world. In 1940 Derk Bodde pitched it to Rockefeller, suggesting that Graves himself serve as director of an Institute for Far Eastern Studies. Graves thought a permanent organization could “canalize hitherto diversified activities into a single stream” and, beyond supporting research, as Laufer had envisioned, could also serve as a public relations and employment agency. But he eventually abandoned the notion again, having become convinced that a more distributed buildup among higher education institutions still made more sense in the United States. See his *Notes on Far Eastern Studies in America* 8 (1941): 11

Laufer stepped down as committee chair late in 1929 to focus full-time on his own research and recommended that Hummel succeed him. The committee, soon joined by one on Japanese Studies, continued to meet and organized annual conferences in conjunction with AOS annual meetings. To support their work Graves worked closely with David H. Stevens (an English professor at Chicago who had been awarded one of the first ACLS fellowships in 1926 for a project on Milton<sup>41</sup>), who became head of Rockefeller's newly created Humanities Division in 1932. If Graves was, as he recalled later, to be called the "grandfather of Asian studies,"<sup>42</sup> then Stevens was surely its "patron saint"<sup>43</sup> in building the field. Over the course of a decade, almost \$750,000<sup>44</sup> went, on Graves's advice, to other organizations, colleges, and universities from the foundation, whose engagement with China had grown steadily since its founder John D. Rockefeller sent the first \$10 he made selling oil to China to the Baptist missions.<sup>45</sup> This crucial bridging role between higher education and foundations such as Rockefeller and Carnegie, and at times the government, is one that ACLS would continue to play.

Graves succeeded in directing Rockefeller money to underwrite new positions in 14 institutions [Princeton, Pomona, Colorado, Chicago, Washington, Berkeley, Yale, Columbia, Mills, Chicago, Cornell, Penn, Stanford, and Claremont] ACLS provided supplementary awards for doctoral students, one of which was won by Fairbank in 1933, perhaps assuaging the pain of having not received a Harvard-Yenching fellowship, for the second time, that year.<sup>46</sup> Graves worked with Arthur Hummel to set up a seven-year project at the Library of Congress that supported young American postdocs to work with Chinese scholars on what would become Hummel's *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period 1644–1912*. Some 50 scholars spent time at the Library, which proved a useful steppingstone to employment.<sup>47</sup> Indeed, Graves's office was more than once described as a "placement agency for Far Eastern specialists," so effective was he at connecting young scholars with new positions.<sup>48</sup> Funds from the Carnegie Corporation underwrote translation projects such as Homer Dubs's *History of the Former Han Dynasty*, which earned him a job at Oxford and the Prix Stanislas Julien.<sup>49</sup> Still other projects included Lewis Hodous's *Careers for Students of Chinese Language and Civilization* (1933); Charles Gardner's *Chinese Studies in America—A Survey of Resources and Facilities* (1935); union catalogues of library holdings; and directories.

---

and Matthew Linton, "Any Enlightened Government: Mortimer Graves' Plan for a National Center for Far Eastern Studies, 1935–1945," *Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 24 (2017), 1–20, passim.

<sup>41</sup>ACLs Bulletin 5 (1926): 53.

<sup>42</sup>As he recounted to Arum in 1971, 576.

<sup>43</sup>Frank Ninkovich, "The Rockefeller Foundation, China, and Cultural Change," *The Journal of American History*, 70 no. 4 (1984): 799–820, 814.

<sup>44</sup>According to John Lindbeck's report to the Ford Foundation, the total was \$741,047. *Understanding China: An Assessment of American Scholarly Resources* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), 79. Only about \$250,679 of it was administered by ACLS, according to our records; I thank Kelly Buttermore for doing this research.

<sup>45</sup>The foundation had invested more in China than any other philanthropy. For an extensive discussion of this, see Mary Brown Bullock, *The Oil Prince's Legacy: Rockefeller Philanthropy in China* (Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2011).

<sup>46</sup>Evans, 30; Fairbank, 100.

<sup>47</sup>The project was funded by Rockefeller, but ACLS dedicated two of its own fellowships to the program for at least two years. *ACLs Bulletin* 26 (1937): 66.

<sup>48</sup>Latourette, "Retrospect," 6.

<sup>49</sup>ACLs Bulletin 40 (1947): 1.

At the suggestion of the Dutch scholar J. J. Duyvendak, who had attended the second conference on Chinese studies, Graves organized a highly successful series of summer institutes funded by Rockefeller and designed to train scholars from other fields to offer introductory courses in Chinese, and then Japanese, civilization. The first one took place here in 1932, with Harvard-Yenching support, with subsequent sessions annually around the country that began to include language classes as well.<sup>50</sup>

Between 1928 and 1930 the number of courses in the field grew by 32%, as did the number of students. They went up another 32% by 1936, increasing fourfold between 1925 and 1940.<sup>51</sup> To stimulate further interest Graves sent scholars such as Fairbank as “missionaries” to various institutions to campaign for the introduction of Asian studies into their curricula.<sup>52</sup> He also convened a Conference on Far Eastern Studies in the Liberal Arts Colleges in 1939 at which the president of Oberlin College declared that “no American can be equipped for life . . . unless he has met the civilizations of the Far East at the intellectual level.”<sup>53</sup> PhD production began to rise as well; the number of dissertations produced doubled between 1933 and 1934 and 1934 and 1935 alone (from 9 to 18).<sup>54</sup>

In 1931 Graves began compiling with Hummel a “List of Articles on Chinese Subjects”—an essentially crowd-sourced bibliographical bulletin of digests and critical comments on new research. And at Fairbank’s suggestion, in 1937 Graves began issuing a semiannual newsletter, *Notes on Far Eastern Studies in America*, which provided updates on who was where, doing what, with occasional essays on random topics to anyone willing to pay a dollar per year for it. As Graves wrote in the first issue, the field had grown from a decade before, when “practically all of the scientifically informed American opinion on the Far East could have been gathered together in one room.”<sup>55</sup> This was, in Fairbank’s words, the growing “cohort of China specialists, baked, unbaked, and half-baked, that Mortimer Graves and David Stevens could mobilize to give America an understanding of China.”<sup>56</sup>

All this was during the Depression. On April 8, 1936, Graves prepared a “Memorandum on the Experience and Programme of the Committees on Chinese and Japanese Studies” to review the first seven years of their work. He explains that early proposals to establish chairs of sinology or a research institute were rejected as both premature and too isolating: “What was needed was a long-term program designed to assure the incorporation of the study of the Orient into the American educational process on somewhat the same terms as the study of Western Europe.” Building a field could not be accomplished by supporting a handful of distinguished scholars and hoping that they could “execute the Council’s mandate;” only a broader impact could ensure results. “Then the program almost formed itself, as emphasis on research and

---

<sup>50</sup>Interestingly, while the early institutes depended on a small cohort of imported experts, such as Hummel, by 1937 almost all faculty teaching at Michigan were drawn from the university’s own staff. *Notes on Far Eastern Studies in America* 2 (1938): 13–16.

<sup>51</sup>Arum, 403.

<sup>52</sup>Fairbank went in 1940; Evans, 65.

<sup>53</sup>*Notes on Far Eastern Studies in America* 6 (1940): 15.

<sup>54</sup>Arum, 403.

<sup>55</sup>*Notes* 1 (1937): 1.

<sup>56</sup>Fairbank, pp. 135–36.

publication gave way to emphasis on the creation of conditions under which research and publication would flourish.” Graves took great pride in what had been accomplished: “Partly as a result of these activities it can now be said that compared either with the America of a decade ago or with any other Western country of today we are in a favorable position with respect both to the numbers and the potentialities of our younger scholars in this field.”<sup>57</sup>

In its 1939 *Annual Report* the Rockefeller Foundation was also pleased to have supported “sufficient personnel in American universities to stimulate Chinese studies in various fields of contemporary importance.” J. J. Duyvendak declared that the “future of Chinese studies lay in the United States.”<sup>58</sup> Graves was able to distribute his chores to the specialists whose training he had enabled and to create elements of an independent infrastructure for the field. After 12 issues the task of his *Notes on Far Eastern Studies* was taken over by the *Far Eastern Quarterly*, which was founded with an ACLS subvention in 1941; it subsequently became the *Journal of Asian Studies*. His *List of Articles* was taken over by Earl Pritchard in 1936 as the *Bulletin of Far Eastern Bibliography* and, after being absorbed by the *Far Eastern Quarterly*, was later spun back out as the *Bibliography of Asian Studies*. In 1948, the Far Eastern Association was founded to oversee the *FEQ*,<sup>59</sup> with Hummel as its first president; it was admitted to ACLS in 1954 (Fairbank was delegate in 1955) and became the Association for Asian Studies two years later. The ACLS Committee on Far Eastern Studies, heir to the original 1928 committee, was finally decommissioned in 1953. Ten years later, on the fifteenth anniversary of the AAS, Waldo Leland sent a congratulatory letter that concluded: “I like to think . . . that the Association for Asian Studies is a successor of the ACLS Committee . . . [and] that your Association, now a constituent of the ACLS, may be regarded as its progeny. . . . I am convinced that your activities are ever more in the public interest than our present designs on the moon.”<sup>60</sup>

Meanwhile, with the run-up to World War II, a new urgency had fueled Graves’s activities. Fairbank writes that “with his usual foresight” Graves compiled a list of all Americans who could speak East Asian languages and, in 1941, hired Wilma Fairbank to compile a directory of all American organizations concerned with China. (I regret to report that his boss, Waldo Leland, the permanent secretary of ACLS, had banned all women from the ACLS offices, so Wilma had to work out of sight in a back room.<sup>61</sup>) John Fairbank writes that “On December 8, 1941, a Monday, the ACLS phone was jammed with government agency requests for names of Japan and China specialists, preferably male between twenty-one and thirty, field-experienced

---

<sup>57</sup>ACLS *Bulletin* 26 (1937): 60–66.

<sup>58</sup>Arum, 425, quoting the 1939 *Rockefeller Annual Report*, 300-1, and David H. Stevens, *The Changing Humanities* (New York: Harper, 1953), 213–14.

<sup>59</sup>A Committee on Far Eastern Studies replaced the Committees on Chinese and Japanese Studies in 1947 (*ACLS Bulletin* 41 [1948]: 53. The new committee then spent the year creating the Far Eastern Association, which held its first meeting on March 2, 1948. *ACLS Bulletin* 42 (1949): 53.

<sup>60</sup>From a letter dated March 23, 1963. Quoted in Earl Pritchard, “News of the Profession,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 22, no. 4 (1963): 513–47; p. 518. Early discussions had explicitly rejected the idea of creating a new learned society because it was felt that the AOS could oversee the process initially and then hand it over to the standing committee. They no doubt did not want to appear to be competing with the AOS, whose embrace of East Asia (which had been almost unrepresented until 1928) was eagerly welcomed. *ACLS Bulletin* 10: 9.

<sup>61</sup>Fairbank, p. 181.

and fully fluent.”<sup>62</sup> As we know, the halls of academe cleared out during the war, with some 50% of Asia specialists recruited into service.<sup>63</sup>

Mortimer Graves had already come up with yet another idea. In 1939 he realized that methods developed in a recent ACLS project directed by Franz Boas and Edward Sapir to learn and document Native American languages might also be applied to the teaching of critical languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Russian. With Rockefeller funding he created a Committee on Intensive Language Instruction that “developed an entirely new pedagogy of language acquisition that focused on imparting spoken fluency in the vernacular”<sup>64</sup> through drill sessions with native speakers, rather than teaching exclusively by reading. ACLS operated 56 courses in 26 different languages at 18 universities, teaching 700 students.<sup>65</sup> These classes were absorbed by the university-based Army Specialized Training Program in 1943 (peak enrollments of 150,000 helped keep colleges that had lost students to the military afloat<sup>66</sup>), and the methods continued to shape instruction in classrooms after the war. Meanwhile, Asian experts who were to become the leaders of the next generation, such as Fairbank, were being recruited into the Office of Strategic Services, predecessor of the Central Intelligence Agency, many of them identified by ACLS and SSRC.<sup>67</sup> As McGeorge Bundy observed in 1963, “It is a curious fact of academic history that the first great center of area studies in the United States was not located in any university, but in Washington, during the Second World War, in the Office of Strategic Services. In very large measure the area study programs developed in American universities in the years after the war were manned, directed, or stimulated by graduates of the OSS—a remarkable institution, half cops-and-robbers and half faculty meeting.”<sup>68</sup>

Capitalizing on this wartime effort would require significant foundation and government investment in area studies as a larger enterprise. Graves’s efforts had helped to make the case, address the need for training and recruitment of “personnel,” and create important elements of an infrastructure. The foundation and government investments of the next two decades mushroomed. After the war Rockefeller and Carnegie continued to provide funding for area studies directly to universities but soon passed primary responsibility to the Ford Foundation, newly refocused on solving the most pressing problems of humankind and “the establishment of peace.”<sup>69</sup> In 1952 Ford took over the Foreign Study and Research Fellowship Programs that had

---

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>63</sup>Arum, 457. The last issues of the *ACLS Notes on Far Eastern Studies*, 11–12 (1942, 1943), also make this clear.

<sup>64</sup>Steven Wheatley and Thea Lurie, *The First Century* (New York: ACLS, 2019), 36. Linton notes that Elisséeff of the Harvard-Yenching Institute opposed this initiative as too “instrumental,” 14). Of course, according to Theodore H. White, Elisséeff thought that “any study of events after 1796 was simply journalism.” Evans, 58.

<sup>65</sup>*Notes on Far Eastern Studies* 11 (1942), 27.

<sup>66</sup>Lockman, *Field Notes*, 24.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>68</sup>Cited *ibid.*, x.

<sup>69</sup>Lockman, 112–13. The Joseph McCarthy witch hunts might have played a role by asking if foundations were using tax-exempt resources to promote subversive ideas (such as understanding China). Scholars such as Fairbank and Owen Lattimore were blamed for the “loss of China.” Mortimer Graves himself came under fire, mostly because of his longtime affiliation with the American Russian Institute and the Institute for Pacific Relations, both of which were deemed sympathetic to Communism, but also for his ACLS Chinese studies activities. Indeed, Dean Rusk, then president of the Rockefeller Foundation, in 1952 was forced to justify its early funding of Graves and the Council, which he did by testifying that Graves’s expertise in the “weird languages” had made him an important resource. If

been run by Carnegie since 1948, but its real commitment did not occur until after it became vastly wealthier, starting in 1955, by selling its greatly appreciated Ford Motor stock. These were what Robert McCaughey has called the “bonanza years” for area studies; by 1962 Ford had distributed more than \$100 million,<sup>70</sup> and by 1975 it had made more than \$340 million in grants to support international and area studies in American higher education, of which at least \$27 million went to Chinese studies in the United States; by 1986 it was more than \$40 million.<sup>71</sup>

In line with its mission, Ford’s focus was on the development of modern and contemporary Chinese studies, especially at the graduate level, but they took a page from the ACLS manual on how to accomplish that. The foundation convened the Gould House Conference on Studies of Contemporary China in June 1959, which proposed a special national committee “to promote the study of contemporary China,” especially in the social sciences.<sup>72</sup> This led to the immediate establishment of the SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Contemporary China, administered by SSRC. The two Councils also took over the management of Ford’s foreign area fellowship program and, by 1970, had distributed \$3 million in research support, primarily in the social sciences. Worried that premodern scholarship might suffer and “the war between the humanities and social sciences would ravage the field,” Fairbank persuaded ACLS president Frederick Burkhardt to use the Council’s own funds to set up a parallel committee in 1964, the Committee on Studies of Chinese Civilization, which Ford began funding in 1968.<sup>73</sup> The JCCC and CSCC eventually merged in 1982 to form the Joint Committee on Chinese Studies that was administered by ACLS (and on which I served for six years). Conferences and publications supported by these committees have charted the careers of multiple generations of scholars in the field.

Meanwhile the October 1957 launch of Sputnik had sparked the government response known as the National Defense Education Act. Its Title VI funding provided key support for both university area studies centers and, through National Defense Foreign Language fellowships, graduate students. \$100 million was distributed within the first decade.<sup>74</sup> By 1975 Title VI spending totaled \$229 million, of which almost \$14 million went to China studies.<sup>75</sup>

---

Rockefeller and Carnegie found it prudent to withdraw, Ford chose to double down on funding international studies, using the Cold War as a justification. For Graves, however, questions among Rockefeller trustees and staff about his “political reliability,” as well as earlier feelings that a too-long-serving ACLS leadership had become a “bunch of querulous old men operating in a never-never land of their own making” who thought that “the only reliable and thinking scholars in this country are located east of Chicago” (De, 186, 185), led eventually to his being asked to step down as executive director of ACLS in 1957. On the foundations, see McCaughey, 159–65; on ACLS, De, 182–208.

<sup>70</sup>McCaughey, 191.

<sup>71</sup>Robert M. Rosensweig with Barbara Turlington, *The Research Universities and Their Patrons* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1982), 117. The figure for China studies to 1970 comes from Lindbeck, 79; Harvard received \$5.5 million of it. For the 1986 figure, see David M. Lampton with Joyce A. Madancy and Kristen M. Williams, “A Relationship Restored: Trends in U.S.-China Educational Exchanges, 1975–1984” (Washington: National Research Council, 1986), 84. I thank Stephen Kidd for bringing this report to my attention.

<sup>72</sup>Lindbeck, 40. Fairbank tells the story of how SSRC was selected over AAS because of its greater disciplinary credibility, 368–69.

<sup>73</sup>Fairbank, 370, and Evans, 214–15. ACLS had already set up a Committee on Asian Studies in 1958 that distributed modest funding for fellowships between 1959 and 1971; Lindbeck, 42, 75.

<sup>74</sup>Lockman, 147.

<sup>75</sup>Rosenzeig and Turlington, 113.

The 1966 creation of the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China (PRC)—through an agreement between the National Academy of Sciences, ACLS, and SSRC—provided additional opportunities for government support of Chinese studies, especially through its National Program for Advanced Research and Study in China.<sup>76</sup> From 1978 to 1985, \$7.4 million went both to graduate students and researchers, more than half of them in the social sciences and humanities.<sup>77</sup> By 1996 more than 700 scholars in Chinese studies had benefited from its support.<sup>78</sup>

ACLS assumed sole responsibility that year for what was then called the Committee on Scholarly Communication with China just as the funding was winding down; moreover, closing down the Washington office of the CSCC inflicted a \$500,000 hit to its own bottom line. The bonanza years were uneven for us, with less than \$1 million total spent on Chinese studies from foundation grants from 1950 to 1970.<sup>79</sup> The '70s tell a different story, however, with more than \$5 million coming in from Ford (\$1.1 million), Carnegie (\$50,000), NEH (\$1.4 million), the newly established Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (\$2.8 million), and other sources to support committee activities, fellowships, publications, libraries, and other scholarly activities.<sup>80</sup> One of our most important contributions, until the opening of relations with the PRC, was establishing the Universities Service Centre in Hong Kong in 1963, which provided access to publications from and opportunities for scholarly exchange with the closed-off mainland.

The Henry Luce Foundation was one of the early supporters of the Centre, with a \$45,000 grant to ACLS in 1967. It had been founded in 1936 by Henry R. Luce, the cofounder and editor in chief of *Time, Inc.*, who was one of four children—all born in China—of Henry Winters Luce, a Presbyterian missionary. Luce, Sr., incidentally, by then a professor of Chinese history and religion at the Hartford Seminary Foundation, had attended the first ACLS conference on the Promotion of Chinese Studies. He had also, while in China, played an instrumental role in the founding of Yenching University, served as its vice president for development, and had been involved in negotiating the Hall estate gift that endowed the Harvard-Yenching Institute.<sup>81</sup> Henry R. Luce wished to honor the work of his parents—his first \$1,500 grant went to Yenching University—and as a consequence the foundation's grant making

---

<sup>76</sup>Initial support was nongovernmental, but overall "more than two-thirds of its funding came from four U.S. government agencies: the United States Information Agency, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Department of Education, and the National Science Foundation." Mary Brown Bullock, "Mission Accomplished: The Influence of the CSCPRC on Educational Relations with China," in Cheng Li, ed., *Bridging Minds Across the Pacific: U.S.-China Educational Exchanges, 1978–2003* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2005), 49–68, 51.

<sup>77</sup>Lampton, 71.

<sup>78</sup>Bullock, "Mission," 58.

<sup>79</sup>This was in part owing to the loss in credibility discussed above (fn. 69), and in part to incoming president Fred Burkhardt's decision to focus on raising money for ACLS's general mission.

<sup>80</sup>I thank Kelly Buttermore and Steve Wheatley for having compiled data on ACLS Chinese studies support.

<sup>81</sup>Latourette, "Retrospect," 6–7. Luce also offered an ACLS-sponsored summer intensive course on the Far East in 1938 at what is now Auburn Seminary to future missionaries. They had always, of course, been among those better informed about China on their return, but Luce realized that background on religion, history, and culture would improve their service. *Notes 6* (1940): 18–19. I am deeply grateful to Helena Kolenda, program director for Asia, and Yuting Li, program associate for Asia, for extensive information about the Luce Foundation's history of grant making in this area.

has prioritized Asia, theology, and higher education in general. Its funding was relatively modest for 25 years, with more than half of that dedicated to promoting the scholarly understanding of Asia, but Luce's death in 1967 brought a bequest of \$68 million that enabled a substantial increase in support. The endowment has grown to almost \$900 million, and what is now called the Asia Program has awarded almost 1,500 grants since 1960, totaling \$86 million, to support teaching and research on China.

Since the first \$45,000 grant for the Universities Service Centre, \$11.5 million of that has been administered by ACLS, I'm honored to report—for the Centre, for fellowships and publications, for the Joint Committee's conference program, and, more recently, for the Initiative on East and Southeast Asian Archeology and Early History and the current Luce/ACLS Program in China Studies, which has awarded \$5.5 million since 2012. All of us in the field should be grateful that the Henry Luce Foundation maintains its steadfast commitment to deepened understanding of China, especially since the philanthropies that first charted the field now look elsewhere.

Given those shifts in priorities, the transience of other American foundations that once supported Chinese studies (such as Freeman and Starr), and the unpredictability of federal funding, Helena Kolenda, the program director for Asia at Luce, remarked recently that "We wish we had more company" in maintaining an express programmatic interest in the field.<sup>82</sup> As Kolenda knows well, she can turn to one very important philanthropic organization abroad, the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange.

In 1986 a group of senior American scholars of Chinese descent wrote a joint letter to Taiwan's President Chiang Ching-kuo urging the establishment of a foundation to promote Chinese studies worldwide. President Chiang endorsed the idea but did not live to see its realization in January 1989; the foundation was named in his honor. Speaking at a thirtieth-anniversary celebration in Pittsburgh last year, Professor Cho-yun Hsu recalled that he and his colleagues were motivated by a desire both to connect Taiwan with the larger global intellectual community and to offer the insights of the Chinese cultural heritage to that world. This thinking in many ways recalls the profoundly internationalist impulses and lofty rhetoric of the ACLS initiative to promote Chinese studies; the Foundation has declared its special commitment to fostering comparative research and cross-cultural scholarly exchange and to ensuring the growth of Chinese studies and its recognition as "a long-term and vital component of human civilization."<sup>83</sup> Like the ACLS committee, the Foundation believes that the world has something to learn from Chinese studies.

In only 30 years the Foundation has awarded over \$130 million worldwide and of that, nearly \$61 million in the United States. I am delighted that almost \$4 million of that has been administered by ACLS. I was on the Joint Committee when the possibility of a major grant from the CCKF to support its activities was broached, and I remember well the concerns about accepting foreign support expressed by some. Would academic freedom and the resolute

---

<sup>82</sup>"History of China Studies at Henry Luce Foundation," delivered on June 19, 2019, to the Luce/ACLS China Studies Early Career Seminar.

<sup>83</sup>"Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange," twenty-fifth-anniversary publication (Taiwan: 2014), 29.

nonpartisanship of deliberations be jeopardized? Would projects or scholars from the PRC be eligible for funding? But the Foundation has insisted from the start that principles of rigorous peer review and academic merit govern its competitions. The \$1 million awarded yearly to dissertation students, postdocs, and senior scholars is the largest single source of focused support for individual scholars of Chinese studies in the United States today.

So: What can we make of this hundred-year story of field-building? I would make six points by way of conclusion. First, I hope it's clear that it is indeed a hundred-year story. Chinese studies, and area studies more generally, trace their inception decades before the Cold War buildup that is usually credited (or blamed) for the growth of area studies. While national security concerns certainly accelerated the pace and scale of support, the arguments had been articulated and the groundwork laid much earlier.

Second, someone had to make those arguments and lay that foundation, and here the role of Mortimer Graves at ACLS should be singled out. This was not a spontaneous curricular evolution but required extensive planning and design on his part, in collaboration with key scholars such as Laufer, Hummel, and especially Fairbank, and working through the committee structure of which ACLS has always been so fond. As Matthew Linton observes, creating fields is rarely an organic process, and "Chinese area studies was a planned field," with Graves as primary architect.<sup>84</sup>

Third, given the relatively high research and training costs, building the field would have been impossible without a substantial influx of supplemental funding. As Gordon Turner observed in 1973, "No university can maintain adequate area programs without some outside financial assistance."<sup>85</sup> While it is true that federal support often required significant matches from universities, by my rough calculation the sum of extramural dollars approaches half a billion dollars unadjusted for inflation.<sup>86</sup> This may be decimal dust compared to funding for science, but it's hard to think of another field in the humanities or social sciences that has garnered this level of foundation and government support (private philanthropy, of course, is another matter).

Fourth, ACLS played a crucial role in brokering that early support and in creating a distinctively American structure for Chinese studies. Foundations have not always found it easy to give money away in a manner that advances their mission: a colleague of mine likes to quote one foundation's officials discussing a truculent supplicant and concluding, "Oh, let's just give the money, and tell him to go to hell." As a partner working with philanthropic organizations, ACLS has sought to deliver a rather different message and worked to channel foundation dollars directly to their college and university beneficiaries. This distributed system, Mortimer Graves

---

<sup>84</sup>Linton, 4.

<sup>85</sup> Gordon Turner, "A Note on Area Studies," *ACLS Newsletter*, vol. XXIV, no. 2 (1973): 2.

<sup>86</sup>Of this amount, \$40 million has been administered by ACLS. I am thinking of support from foundations such as Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, Mellon, Freeman, Starr, Luce, and CCK; from government agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, USIA, Department of Education (through Title VI and Fulbright-Hays), and Department of Defense (Language Flagship Program); and from PRC-funded Confucius Institutes. According to a July 2, 2019, email from Stephen Kidd, executive director of the National Humanities Alliance, since 1969 NEH has awarded \$75.2 million. and Title VI and Fulbright have provided \$116,569,584 in China-related grants. However, these numbers contain significant support not specifically designated for Chinese studies.

believed, was more in line with the American context than the centralized model of European sinology.<sup>87</sup> Some of us could fantasize about what the course of Chinese studies might have been had a national research institute been established, as recommended by the ACLS committee in 1928, but even Berthold Laufer was convinced that Chinese studies in the United States should not emulate the models and what he called the “scholastic sterility” of its European forebears.<sup>88</sup> Scholars such as Friedrich Hirth and Alfred Forke, who had to be imported from Europe to fill the Dean Lung and Agassiz chairs at Columbia and Berkeley, had no students. Graves’s concern from the start was on developing language and undergraduate curricula that could bring the students in and matter to the larger public, an effort that scholars such as Fairbank bolstered by advocating for building expertise in disciplinary departments and in modern and contemporary studies. And the ACLS reliance on committees—many of them—resonated with an American penchant for inclusiveness, as opposed to the European centralized feudal model.<sup>89</sup>

Fifth, though support for Chinese studies might have been decentralized, much of it was also initially intentionally elitist. David Stevens of Rockefeller argued for awarding support to those best positioned to deploy it: “It is highly desirable [that] attention be given to the placing of these men at strategic points of national influence. They and their followers will produce the translations and the official expositions . . . that will help the next generation to live in a ‘spherical’ world.”<sup>90</sup> Similarly, the Ford Foundation, after some initial resistance, decided that its funding was better spent at the “have” versus “have-not” universities, in large part because those who advised them on relative merits of proposals were located at those institutions. As a consequence, about one-third of its International Training and Research grants went to three universities: Harvard, Chicago, and Columbia.<sup>91</sup> Ford believed that its funding could be leveraged more expeditiously, and with less risk, at already well-resourced institutions and also, interestingly, thought that endowment-dependent private universities needed extramural funding much more than publics.<sup>92</sup> And although the NDEA Title VI program has supported centers at both publics and privates, its very focus on centers has necessarily limited funding to a small number of institutions. In this context it is important that individual fellowship programs such as

---

<sup>87</sup> Evans, 37.

<sup>88</sup>As chair of the second conference on the Promotion of Chinese Studies, Laufer “pointed out that the development of American sinology must not necessarily follow that of the same study in Europe, although the standards of perfection preached and practiced by European scholars are much to be admired; and this for two reasons, first, that most American institutions, although identical in aim with those of Europe, are widely different in exterior development, in spirit, and in relations with the public, and second, that the European tradition bears within itself the seeds of a scholastic sterility. He felt that America should profit by European experience and should look forward to the creation of a new humanism wider than that of the Mediterranean World.” *ACLS Bulletin* 11 (1929): 60–61.

<sup>89</sup>Fairbank linked this to the missionary history of the field: “Americans studying China operated inclusively in committees, getting everyone together. (The only place with more committees than an American college faculty was a Protestant missionary gathering.)” 99.

<sup>90</sup>Ninkovich, 814.

<sup>91</sup>McCaughey, 186.

<sup>92</sup>Reporting on the Ford Foundation’s work, John Lindbeck wrote in 1970: “Unless endowment funds continue to grow, private universities, despite library and research resources that are not duplicable without extravagant cost, are likely to fall behind the expanding public universities as Chinese studies develop.” Lindbeck, 80, 83.

the CSCPRC, Fulbright, ACLS, and CCK have supported scholars across an increasingly broad swath of American higher education.<sup>93</sup>

Finally, although one might be tempted to declare that the work is done, I doubt that anyone in this room believes that the field of Chinese studies no longer merits special attention. The “new day” is still upon us, and Laufer’s goal of a truly humanistic education that is impossible “without a more profound knowledge of China” yet eludes us. In 1939 J. J. Duyvendak thought that the future of Chinese studies lay in the United States for two reasons: “a steady demand from schools and colleges for teachers guarantees employment to persons trained in such specialties, and the public mind of America is open and attentive to unusual subject matter.”<sup>94</sup> I doubt we can say that either one of these conditions prevails today, with a jobless market confronting PhDs in the humanities and social sciences and an increasingly isolationist and anti-intellectual climate in this country. The world is every bit as “spherical” as it was in 1937, when Mortimer Graves aspired to have the study of China incorporated into American higher education on “the same terms as the study of Western Europe,” but we can hardly claim comparable resources in terms of faculty and library and museum collections.

And we might hope for even more, the kind of broad transformative impact that humanists from Laufer to Cho-yun Hsu have envisioned as the goal for Chinese studies. Over 25 years ago, speaking at a CCKF-funded conference, the sinologist Herbert Franke pointed to Jacob Burckhardt’s *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* and Johan Huizinga’s *Waning of the Middle Ages* as scholarly books that have managed to transform thinking beyond that of relatively narrow specialist spheres, and declared: “It would be a crowning achievement of . . . sinology if at some later date somebody would write a book of comparable status and impact, a book that will be regarded as an indispensable part of general education. Perhaps only then can we say that the knowledge of China and Chinese culture . . . will have reached the position in our intellectual life that China deserves.”<sup>95</sup>

I trust that ACLS will continue to support, with special programs, the “new” scholarship that it first promoted almost a century ago. It is also the case that over the years China scholars have competed well in our central fellowship program, which this year will boast more targeted awards in Chinese studies than any other field, thanks to term fellowships funded by Don Munro and Yvette and Bill Kirby, chair of the ACLS board, and endowed fellowships in honor of Fred Wakeman and yours truly. Time constraints have prevented me from capturing the huge variety of programs undertaken by just ACLS, much less other organizations. This has been perform an America-focused discussion of the field of Chinese studies, without the opportunity to talk about how students, scholars, and scholarship from abroad have transformed the field in recent decades. But here at the Fairbank Center, I’ll give John Fairbank the last words, from the

---

<sup>93</sup>Mary Bullock notes that “While most of the graduate students [supported by the CSCPRC] came from major research universities in the United States with well-established China programs, many of the faculty came from liberal arts colleges and regional universities. This broad support helped provide China access during these critical years to American China specialists across the country.” “Mission Accomplished,” 58.

<sup>94</sup>David Stevens, *The Changing Humanities*, 213–14, cited by Arum, 425.

<sup>95</sup>Herbert Franke, “In Search of China: Some General Remarks on the History of European Sinology,” in *Europe Studies China: Papers from an International Conference on the History of European Sinology* (London: Han-Shan Tang Books, 1995), 23.

epilogue to his 1982 memoir, *Chinabound*: “When we find, as we may a few years from now, that more people read English in China than in America, Chinese studies, heretofore in the wings, may come to center stage in American education. It will not be too soon or at all illogical. Thus my message after half a century is to keep on trying, but try harder, to study China. (What else did you expect it to be?)”<sup>96</sup> Thank you very much.

---

<sup>96</sup>Fairbank, 458.