

# The Reception of Chinese Art across Cultures

Edited by

Michelle Ying-Ling Huang

**CAMBRIDGE  
SCHOLARS**  

---

**P U B L I S H I N G**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations .....	x
Introduction by Michelle Ying-Ling Huang .....	?
Chapter Abstracts .....	?
<b>Part I: Blending Chinese and Foreign Cultures</b>	
Chapter One .....	2
Shades of <i>Mokkei</i> : Muqi-Style Ink Painting in Medieval Kamakura	
Aaron M. Rio	
Chapter Two .....	23
Mistakes or Marketing? Western Responses to the Hybrid Style of Chinese	
Export Painting	
Maria Kar-Wing Mok	
Chapter Three .....	45
“Painted Paper or Pekin”: The Taste for Eighteenth-Century Chinese	
Papers in Britain, c. 1918-c. 1945	
Clare Taylor	
Chapter Four .....	66
“Chinese Painting” by Zdeněk Sklenář	
Lucie Olivová	
<b>Part II: Envisioning Chinese Landscape Art</b>	
Chapter Five .....	88
Binyon and Nash: British Modernists’ Conception of Chinese Landscape	
Painting	
Michelle Ying-Ling Huang	
Chapter Six .....	115
In Search of Paradise Lost: Osvald Sirén’s Scholarship on Garden Art	
Minna Törmä	

Chapter Seven .....	130
The Return of the Silent Traveller	
Mark Haywood	

### **Part III: Conceptualising Chinese Art through Display**

Chapter Eight .....	154
Aesthetics and Exclusion: Chinese Objects in Nineteenth-Century	
American Visual Culture	
Lenore Metrick-Chen	
Chapter Nine .....	180
Exhibitions of Chinese Painting in Europe in the Interwar Period: The Role	
of Liu Haisu as Artistic Ambassador	
Michaela Pejčochová	

Chapter Ten .....	201
The Right Stuff: <i>Chinese Art Treasures'</i> Landing in Early 1960s America	
Noelle Giuffrida	

### **Part IV: Positioning Contemporary Chinese Artists in the Globe**

Chapter Eleven .....	231
Under the Spectre of Orientalism and Nation: Translocal Crossings and	
Alternative Modernities	
Diana Yeh	

Chapter Twelve .....	254
The Reception of Xing Danwen's Lens-based Art across Cultures	
Silvia Fok	

Chapter Thirteenth .....	278
Selling Contemporary Chinese Art in the West: A Case Study of How Yue	
Minjun's Art was Marketed in Auctions	
Elizabeth Kim	

Authors' Biographies .....	?
----------------------------	---

Index .....	?
-------------	---

## CHAPTER TEN

# THE RIGHT STUFF: *CHINESE ART TREASURES'* LANDING IN EARLY 1960S AMERICA

NOELLE GIUFFRIDA

Efforts to present the first major American exhibition of works from the National Palace Museum in Taiwan came to fruition in 1961 as *Chinese Art Treasures* (*CAT*) opened at the National Gallery of Art in Washington. Comprised of over 250 objects, with a major focus on paintings, the show also travelled to New York, Boston, Chicago and San Francisco, drawing large crowds on its yearlong tour. As the first significant postwar exhibition of paintings from the Palace collection, it drew worldwide attention. *CAT's* landing at the right time, in the right place, and with the right works, made the show a pivotal event in the history of exhibiting and studying Chinese painting in the United States.

Focusing on a discrete time period, from the inception of the exhibition in the 1950s through its US tour and ending in 1962, this chapter explores the timing, composition and presentation of the show, examining how and why each affected public and scholarly reception in early 1960s America. In addition to considering scholarly publications and popular media, this study draws upon first-hand accounts and archival correspondence to reconstruct an inner history of *CAT*.<sup>1</sup> Discussions of the planning, painting selection, catalogue negotiations, media coverage and scholarly debates will highlight political and scholarly factors that affected the show's reception. As a result of *CAT*, its accompanying catalogue and the scholarly discussions it sparked, a core group of paintings from the Palace collection emerged as monuments in the newly forming post-war canon of Chinese painting. By raising the profile of Chinese painting for the American public, *CAT*

---

<sup>1</sup> In her survey and analysis of foreign exhibitions from the Palace Museum in Beijing, Susan Naquin (2004, 344-5) recognised the importance of attempting an “inner history” exploring behind-the-scenes issues, including negotiations about object selections, budgets and finances, audience reception, show and catalogue profits, as well as display and labelling challenges. Jane Ju (2007) also explored the museum’s role, from the Taiwan perspective, in cultural representation and canon formation.

spurred increased interest in US museum collections. *Chinese Art Treasures'* combination of all the “right stuff” assured both its success with the American public and its impact on Chinese painting studies in early 1960s America.<sup>2</sup>

## Early Plans

In the early 1950s, shortly after the relocation of the Republic of China (ROC) government and many objects from the Palace collection to Taiwan, a Chinese and American group began discussing a possible American exhibition from the National Palace Museum and Central Museum. Talks between institutional and government representatives focused on the basics: when and where to hold the show, and which objects would be included. During the summer of 1953, leaders of the China Institute in New York Hu Shih 胡適 (1891-1962) and Meng Chih 孟治 (a.k.a. Paul Chih Meng, 1900-90), Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Francis Henry Taylor (1903-57), and the newly appointed ROC ambassador to the United Nations Han Lih-wu 杭立武 (1902-91) proposed a 1954 exhibition. Directors from the Museum of Fine Arts Boston (MFA), the Art Institute of Chicago, and the de Young Museum in San Francisco joined the conversations. From the beginning, Americans wanted a painting-centred exhibition. This preference came from worries about the safety and physical condition of the works as well as concerns about handling and expenses. Most had heard about the collection’s forced moves from Beijing to Shanghai, Nanjing and Chongqing on account of 1930s Japanese invasions, and eventually to Taiwan after the Communist takeover in 1949 (Jayne 1945). Many believed that humidity and potential mainland attack put the paintings in ongoing jeopardy and that bringing them to America on an extended tour would save them from harm.

The need for Americans to be directly involved in selecting artworks arose from concerns about the high cost and unknown content of the show, and it proved to be an early stumbling block. Any contract for the show would only become effective *if* and *after* the list of objects was approved by

---

<sup>2</sup> This chapter’s title was partly inspired by James Cahill’s discussion of “right” and “wrong” paintings in comparing the 1935-6 International Exhibition of Chinese Art in London and *CAT*.

each of the participating museums.<sup>3</sup> Though not intended as a formal selection of objects, the Metropolitan's Associate Curator of Far Eastern Art Aschwin Lippe's (1914-88) trip to Taiwan in 1954 laid some of the groundwork for the exhibition.<sup>4</sup> Lippe (1955, 57) examined almost all of the 400 paintings on his list and several hundred more during his month-long stay. His overview in the Metropolitan's *Bulletin* and his critical remarks from *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* provided a telling glimpse of the eventual show. For the *Bulletin*, he focused primarily on praising the collection as a whole. Lippe was especially impressed with the quantity and quality of Song (960-1279 AD) and Yuan (1279-1368 AD) paintings so rare elsewhere. His more extensive report for *Archives* contained his critical evaluations of over fifty paintings. Lippe believed that an American show could include a much higher quality selection than the paintings featured in the 1935-6 London exhibition. Limited general knowledge of Chinese painting, lack of familiarity with the Palace collection, and the fragile condition of some works meant that many of the best pictures did not travel to London. As champions of Chinese painting, Lippe and other scholars in the US believed that wider exposure through an American show would lead to much-deserved recognition for the paintings, largely inaccessible for decades. Political and physical conditions of the time prevented an exhibition in Taiwan, so an American show presented the best opportunity to raise the profile of Chinese painting and help position it among the superior artistic achievements in the history of art.

## Priming the Public

Despite Lippe's trip, there was still no agreement about an exhibition.<sup>5</sup> In the meantime, the American mainstream press piqued public interest about the collection throughout the middle to late 1950s. Articles related the dramatic saga of its many moves. These stories championed the Nationalists on Taiwan as defenders of Chinese art and gave Americans another reason to root for them against the Communists on the mainland. The American media presented possession of these valuable artworks as a Nationalist

<sup>3</sup> Director of the MFA G.H. Edgell (1887-1954) to Easby, 16 December 1953. Loan Exhibition 1961, Chinese Art 1953-1960. Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives (hereafter MMAA).

<sup>4</sup> On Lippe's life and publications, see Lee 1989.

<sup>5</sup> Edgell to Easby, 15 January and 14 February 1954. MMAA. It is difficult to determine precisely when and why the plans fell through. Correspondence between American museum directors drops off by the end of February 1954.

victory. Stories in dailies such as the *New York Times* reported on the Nationalists' determination to retain the collection and defend it against forces from the mainland (Lieberman 1956). As the first major article on the collection in a national magazine, *Time's* 1957 feature proved to be one of the most important pieces that spurred public interest. The banner headline "The Art of China: Masterpieces Rescued from the Mainland" appeared on the news magazine's cover. By describing the rescue and protection of the artworks using military imagery, the article asserted the collection's political and cultural significance. Echoing the sentiments of Lippe and other American scholars, it stressed the collection's high quality and lamentable inaccessibility. The inclusion of thirteen colour pictures focused on paintings. The *Time* feature represented a microcosm of Chinese-American cooperation and the role of Americans in mediating and promoting Chinese painting that proved essential in organising *CAT*. Correspondents made arrangements with Chinese officials and curators who selected artworks to be unpacked and photographed by *Time's* Robert Crandall. US experts helped choose the final group for publication. Thus the first colour photographs of several of the most prized Chinese paintings were taken by an American photographer and appeared in an American magazine. This is another example of how Americans not only advocated for Chinese painting but also claimed the right to expose these artworks to the US public and the world. With *Time's* circulation of over two million at the time,<sup>6</sup> the widely read article served as a key primer, shaping public perceptions that would factor into *CAT's* reception a few years later.

During the Second Taiwan Strait Crisis in 1958, fears about the safety of artworks and calls for American intervention intensified, and these concerns played out in the press. In the midst of the crisis, stories in the media discussed the collection as under threat, noting that US experts had urged sending artworks to America for safe keeping (North American Newspaper Alliance 1958). Some Americans publicly expressed beliefs that the US needed to get directly involved in protecting the collection by putting on an exhibition. In a letter to the *New York Times*, Paul Mocsanyi, former art critic of the United Press, insisted that America's pledge to defend Taiwan extended beyond political and strategic issues. Mocsanyi (1958, 26) expressed frustration with failed efforts to organise a show and argued that holding an exhibition was a political and cultural duty. These issues continued to draw attention as the ROC Embassy publicly responded by declaring the PRC "unfit custodians of objects of incalculable cultural value" and asserting its role as the proper guardians of China's cultural

---

<sup>6</sup> Circulation for 1956 as reported on 31 December 1965.

heritage. The Embassy's letter also assured Americans that negotiations for a US show might soon be resolved (Ling 1958).

While mainstream media publicised the collection's rescue and provided a forum for discussions about America's role in protecting the artworks, other publications helped set the stage for the reception of *CAT* by Chinese art scholars and collectors. Li Chu-tsing's 李鑄晉 (b. 1920) account of the collection's recent history appeared in 1958. He echoed the anticipatory sentiments of many who believed the collection could hold the answers to many key questions about Chinese art. The 1959 publication of *Gugong minghua sanbai zhong* 故宮名畫三百種 (Three Hundred Masterpieces of Chinese Painting) stirred considerable excitement. The bilingual catalogue featured 300 paintings from the Palace and Central Museums, from the earliest works through the Qing dynasty (1644-1911 AD). In his introduction, Wang Shih-chieh 王世杰 (1891-1981), referred to recent re-appraisals in the painting selection process. While several bearing inscriptions dating them to pre-Tang periods were re-classified as Tang or later, most of the Qianlong-era (r. 1735-96) attributions remained unchanged. Though Wang acknowledged that this was not entirely satisfactory, he defended the practice of accepting seals and inscriptions as genuine and, unless an attribution could be solidly proven wrong, no changes were made.<sup>7</sup> *Three Hundred Masterpieces* marked the first publication of many paintings, serving as a valuable compilation and visual record, but it did not put forward significant scholarly re-appraisals. Almost seventy paintings from the volumes would end up in *Chinese Art Treasures* just two years later. A good number of them would be presented to reflect recent research diverging from traditional attributions.

## Geneva, We Have a Problem: Negotiating Attributions for the Catalogue

In the fall of 1959, plans for an American show jumped onto the fast track. Director of the National Gallery John Walker, 3rd (1906-95) and Metropolitan Director James Rorimer (1905-66) spearheaded the renewed project. A draft agreement and budget for a 1961-2 exhibition began to

---

<sup>7</sup> *Gugong minghua sanbai zhong* [Three Hundred Masterpieces of Chinese Painting] 1959, vol. 1, 26.

circulate in January 1960.<sup>8</sup> Walker and ROC Ambassador to the United States George K. C. Yeh 葉公超 (Yeh Kung-chao, 1904-81) served as the main negotiators. The final agreement reflected pressing concerns for both sides. Chinese officials worried that the PRC might take legal action to interfere, perhaps even attempting to steal the artworks. Thus the word “loan” could never be used in connection with the show. The contract stipulated that artworks would remain ROC property. To ensure continuous legal custody, at least one Chinese curator would be allowed to remain in close proximity to the art works at all times. Parties agreed that the US Navy would bring objects from Taiwan and back again—at no charge to the ROC or the participating museums. The agreement hinged upon joint approval of works for the exhibition.

American museum directors tapped Associate Director of the Freer Gallery of Art John Alexander Pope (1906-82), Tseng Hsien-ch'i 曾宪其 (b. 1923) of the MFA and Lippe to travel to Taiwan for object selection in April 1960.<sup>9</sup> The trio joined Chinese officials and curators including Wang Shih-chieh, Chuang Shang-yen, Tan T'an-chiung, and Na Chih-liang. Lippe's 1955 reports served as one source for the committee's work. Other scholars' previous work also contributed to the process, allowing the committee to complete their work in less than a month. For instance, James Cahill (b. 1926) visited the collection on two occasions before 1960: once in 1955 to research Yuan paintings, and again in 1959 when he and C.C. Wang 王已千 (Wang Chi-ch'ien, 1907-2003) worked with Li Lin-ts'an 李霖燦 (1913-99) and others to select and photograph paintings for Cahill's *Chinese Painting*, published by Skira in 1960.<sup>10</sup> Max Loehr (1903-88) travelled to Taiwan to research Song paintings in 1957. Even though his article did not officially appear until 1961, he likely shared it with Cahill (then the Freer's Associate Curator of Chinese Art) and the selection group in advance (Fig. 10-1) (Loehr 1961). The choice of paintings for *CAT* reflected scholarly taste and priorities in 1960s America. Organisers selected works that they felt were best not only in terms of quality but also for their importance in developing the field of Chinese painting studies. Many of the 112 paintings in the final checklist of 253 objects had not

<sup>8</sup> Total projected budget was \$90,000. Other than a percentage of catalogue proceeds and admission fees, the American museums did not pay any other monies to the ROC. Walker to Rorimer, 31 December 1959. MMAA.

<sup>9</sup> The Henry Luce Foundation granted \$15,000 toward the committee's travel to Taiwan.

<sup>10</sup> Lippe shared his notes with Cahill prior to 1959. Other American scholars, who saw some works in Taiwan during the 1950s, also shared their notes with the committee.

travelled to London in 1935, including sixty-six from the early group. US scholars and students would finally get to personally examine a large selection of paintings that would permit a more rigorous discussion of early Chinese painting history.

Lippe, Pope, and Cahill immediately began crafting the exhibition catalogue (Fig. 10-2).<sup>11</sup> With production deadlines looming, the thorny issues of attributions and dating proved to be a challenging aspect of bringing *CAT* to fruition. The American trio felt the catalogue should reflect the most recent scholarship. Part of getting the entries “right” involved systematically re-evaluating many Qianlong attributions. Since the catalogue would become not only the public, scholarly, and lasting presentation of the show, but also serve as the first widely available post-war book on paintings from the collection, the stakes were high. Problems came to a head in March 1961, threatening to disrupt the exhibition. A look at some of the issues and eventual solutions peels back an important layer of *CAT*’s inner history. Correspondence between Lippe, Cahill, Pope, Walker, Rorimer, Wang Shih-chieh and Ambassador Yeh reveals points of contention and negotiations during a tense week.<sup>12</sup> After seeing proofs from Geneva, Yeh balked at some modified attributions and insisted that printing be suspended. An eleven-page missive from Wang Shih-chieh followed. Pope and Lippe felt that they had gotten the okay, during the trip to Taiwan the previous year, to include comments that reflected recent American and Chinese scholarship within the texts of the entries, even if those comments did not agree with traditional attributions. However, the Americans went even further and shifted a number of paintings’ attributions outright.<sup>13</sup> In anticipation of meeting at Yeh’s Washington residence, Lippe and Cahill lobbied for the updated attributions. Lippe contended that the altered attributions and language agreed with opinions of the majority of Palace Museum staff. Some evidence supports his claim. For instance, Li Lin-ts’an’s article (1961) on *Minghuang’s Journey to Shu* 明皇幸蜀 presented a convincing case for dating the painting, traditionally attributed to the Tang, no later than the

<sup>11</sup> Lippe and Cahill wrote the painting entries and Pope wrote the rest. The catalogue trio exchanged and commented on all contributions, including Cahill’s introduction, so they decided to present the catalogue as a collective enterprise. Lippe to Pope, 7 November 1960. SA: FGA.

<sup>12</sup> Cahill (2005a) recounts some of the events. My discussion of the negotiations incorporates research based on the original correspondence preserved in SA: FGA.

<sup>13</sup> Lippe to Rorimer, cc: Pope, 2 March 1961. SA: FGA.

Song.<sup>14</sup> Li acknowledged Palace Museum Director Chuang Shang-yen's suggestions and support for his conclusions. Both Lippe and Cahill feared that Walker was going to give in too easily and follow the customary practice of wholly accepting the attributions of the lender. With Pope in Geneva overseeing production at Skira and Lippe in New York, Cahill was the lone advocate for the updated attributions at the meeting. With plenty of jasmine tea on tap, Yeh brokered a solution: the ROC Embassy's Cultural Officer Mr Lai and Cahill would meet the next day to try to work out some compromises.<sup>15</sup>

The catalogue's final version reflected these compromises. Altogether, *CAT* converted about eighteen paintings in *Three Hundred Masterpieces* from "by" a particular artist into "attributed to" him.<sup>16</sup> Cahill and Lai reworded some entries to couch, but not completely excise, comments questioning attributions or assigning paintings to later periods. In these cases, the dynasty and date listed in the tombstone information still corresponded to traditional attributions. Some of these trade-offs created an odd hybrid: a painting's tombstone pronounced one attribution and date, while comments in the entry proposed something quite different. For instance, *CAT* #4 was labelled *Ten Views from a Thatched Hut* 草堂十志, attributed to Lu Hong 盧鴻 (early 8th century, Tang dynasty). Nestled within the entry further down the *same* page, we read:

One body of opinion, however, both Chinese and Western, holds that this is a version of Lu's composition done by some highly accomplished artist of the Song dynasty (*CAT* #4, 39).<sup>17</sup>

Authors structured the entries, so that the first section was primarily descriptive, guiding the reader in traversing the work: in effect, demonstrating how a novice should look at a Chinese painting. More detailed, nuanced information and judgments aimed at experts, appeared at the end. Scholars, collectors, and students of Chinese painting could parse these comments, recognising that the tactful wording actually overturned many attributions and dates on the same page. Because of its status as the

<sup>14</sup> Although this article was officially published after the March *CAT* negotiations, its content was almost certainly known to Palace Museum officials and curators and the Americans.

<sup>15</sup> Cahill to Pope, 9 March 1961. SA: FGA.

<sup>16</sup> Since several *CAT* paintings did not appear in *300 Masterpieces of Chinese Painting*, the total number of re-attributions in *CAT* was actually higher.

<sup>17</sup> By the 1980s, many considered this painting a Yuan or early Ming work. Cahill 1980, 15.

first major publication that did not perpetuate all of the traditional attributions, the catalogue captured and preserved an important scholarly moment in early 1960s Chinese painting studies. It played a key role in helping to put forward a new post-war canon of Chinese painting, and it functioned as a valuable reference volume for decades.

## Landing in America

From the outset, *CAT* was intended to play a range of political, diplomatic, cultural, and artistic roles. The US State Department supported the exhibition as a way to promote the ROC as *the* legitimate Chinese government. Not only would the show increase American appreciation for Chinese artistic achievements, it would also highlight the role of “free China” in preserving Chinese culture.<sup>18</sup> The State Department saw *CAT* as a political and diplomatic weapon in the American-led fight against Communism. The State Department officially announced the show in 1960 and headlines proclaimed “Art Saved from Reds in China to Be Shown.” In response, the PRC took aim at the US and the “Chiang Kai-shek clique,” calling the exhibition illegal and accusing the US of plotting to steal Chinese national treasures. Accusations and threats to disrupt the show flowed from the PRC through the end of 1962.

The exhibition itself was an act of cultural diplomacy. Prefatory materials in the catalogue served to politically and culturally package the show for the public.<sup>19</sup> To endow *CAT* with high-level cachet, Presidents Kennedy, Chiang and their wives appeared as honorary patrons along with a distinguished group of officials and benefactors (Fig. 10-3). The preface and foreword included customary acknowledgements statements about the exhibition’s significance as an event of unprecedented quality and rarity. Written from Chinese and American perspectives, each put forward carefully gauged statements that expressed cultural, national, and

<sup>18</sup> Special Assistant to the Secretary of State Robert Thayer to John Walker 3<sup>rd</sup>, 16 November 1959. Records of the Office of the Director, John Walker Office Files, Exhibition Records, Series 2B1, box 4, folder 4, National Gallery of Art Archives.

<sup>19</sup> The government-sponsored loan shows *Japanese Painting and Sculpture from the Sixth Century to the Nineteenth Century* (1953) and *Masterpieces of Korean Art* (1958) also worked as cultural diplomacy, but with different impetus, goals, and makeup than *CAT*. Those shows drew from multiple lenders, including temples and private collections. Organisers presented the Japanese show as an act of friendship and good will toward the Americans and the Korean exhibition as an expression of gratitude to American friends and the nation from the Korean people.

institutional pride. Wang Shih-chieh's preface proclaimed the political and cultural legitimacy of the ROC by repeatedly invoking its relationship with the Palace collection. He declared them inheritors of the imperial court collection, founders of the Palace Museum in Beijing, saviours during decades of war, and legitimate custodians of Chinese culture. Wang characterised Chinese painting as having the ability to lend comfort and solace to the modern man by imparting a sense of tranquillity and peacefulness. It seems likely that his emphasis on these qualities in painting also implied that the ROC, as preservers of this art, also had an intrinsically peaceful nature, quite opposite from the Communists on the mainland. He explicitly recognised the State Department and the US Navy for their help with the exhibition, while implicitly acknowledging their role in the recent political and military defence of the ROC. Political, diplomatic, and cultural roles were intertwined. From the ROC perspective, the show would foster a fuller understanding of Chinese art and culture by the American people and remind them about the plight of "free Chinese" fighting to save their cultural heritage and recover lost territories.<sup>20</sup>

The catalogue's foreword contextualised the exhibition by presenting a history of collecting Chinese art in the US, emphasising the quality and extent of American collections. Upon receiving a draft from Walker, Director of the MFA Perry Rathbone (1911-2000) suggested that

It seems to me that a more positive statement about the development of American collections would be more appropriate on this occasion. I fear, that we are rather apologetic about American collections of Chinese painting and that what we have doesn't amount to much. We all know that these collections in quality and extent are unsurpassed outside the Orient. European collections do not compare.<sup>21</sup>

Rathbone disagreed with the choice of individuals cited in the draft as important figures. Omitting Charles Lang Freer (1854-1919), Okakura Tenshin 岡倉天心 (1862-1913), Langdon Warner (1881-1955), and Laurence Sickman (1907-88) did not paint the right picture of American collections. Not coincidentally, associated institutions such as the Freer Gallery of Art, the MFA, and the Nelson-Atkins Gallery of Art possessed some of the finest museum holdings of Chinese painting. Rathbone saw *CAT* as a reward for American connoisseurship and devotion to Chinese art.<sup>22</sup> The final version of the foreword, signed by the five American

<sup>20</sup> John Alexander Pope, Aschwin Lippe, and James Cahill, *CAT* 1965, 8.

<sup>21</sup> Rathbone to Walker, 17 February 1961. SG: FGA.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. A few days later, Rathbone sent Pope a copy of his letter to Walker with an

museum directors, expressed national and institutional pride in American collections historically, while also pointing out more recent acquisitions that continued to enhance US collections, making them pre-eminent in the Western world (*CAT* 1965, 11). The foreword maintained that the range of Chinese painting and resulting discernment of American audiences made the US the right place for *CAT*.

Mainstream media coverage of *CAT* melded politics, culture, and art. Similar to press that primed the public during the 1950s, newspapers, magazines, television and radio focused on the *collection* and its preservation and protection.<sup>23</sup> Two of the most widely read features appeared in *Life* and *Time* in August and September 1961. Descriptive captions provided a reasonable guide, while the features' enthusiasm and timing encouraged readers to visit the show. *Life*'s pull-out section spotlighted large colour images, including five paintings (Sieberling 1961, 47-60B). *Time*'s coverage featured five paintings, several occupying full pages.<sup>24</sup> These magazines' praise and exposure drove readers without previous interest in Chinese art, and those who might not even be regular museum goers, to the show.

*CAT*'s exhibition catalogue proved essential for public reception and understanding. Wall labels in *CAT*'s galleries included only basic tombstone information (Fig. 10-4), without any explanation of subject matter, time period, style, technique or significance.<sup>25</sup> The catalogue's first edition of 13,000 sold out at every venue. Visitors quickly snapped up a second edition. Demand spurred the creation of thousands of makeshift catalogues.<sup>26</sup> For most Americans, *CAT*'s ties to anti-Communist politics raised the show's profile, creating appeal on political, cultural, and artistic levels. Prior to *CAT*, ceramics and decorative arts had garnered more public attention than painting. As a yearlong national event, *CAT* exposed more Americans to Chinese painting than ever before. While some of the public recognised the high quality and importance of the show's paintings, for

---

accompanying note pronouncing the foreword "ludicrous as well as misleading, and I would not like to have my name attached to what he says concerning American collections of Chinese art." Rathbone to Pope, 23 February 1961.

<sup>23</sup> The MFA's *Bulletin* used *CAT* to tout its collection. Tseng's thirty-five page essay compared paintings from the MFA and *CAT*, sometimes asserting the superiority of MFA pictures.

<sup>24</sup> "Art from a Peking Palace" 1961.

<sup>25</sup> Incomplete documentation of gallery installations makes a thorough exploration difficult.

<sup>26</sup> The booklet lifted the catalogue's foreword, preface, and introduction, along with an object list. The de Young distributed over 10,000.

most, debates that engaged scholars about dating, attribution, and authenticity were not central to the their experience of the show.

## Giving Grades, Creating Canon

Scholars, curators, collectors, and students of Chinese art across America flocked to *CAT* (Fig. 10-5). Though some had seen paintings from the collection before, none had seen them altogether or examined them for an extended time. The shared experience of visiting *CAT* occasioned many scholarly reappraisals and debates. Judgments engaged fundamental questions about methods and criteria that scholars should use to determine paintings' authenticity and date. From the early 1940s through the mid-1960s, articles and book reviews spent considerable time addressing these issues, demonstrating their pressing importance at the time.<sup>27</sup> Scholars grappled with the problem of establishing monuments for early Chinese painting. Which works traditionally attributed to the Five Dynasties (907-960 AD) and Northern Song (960-1127 AD) could be trusted as benchmarks? How might scholars best determine which, if any, paintings attributed to a particular artist were original? *CAT*'s abundance of early paintings provided a unique opportunity to gather opinions and hash out these concerns.

James Cahill solicited scholars and collectors to grade and offer opinions on the paintings. Seventeen people weighed in after seeing *CAT*; the impressive group included: Victoria Contag (1906-73), Tseng Yu-ho 曾幼荷 (Betty Ecke, b. 1925), Richard Edwards (b. 1916), Wen Fong 方聞 (b. 1930), Aschwin Lippe, Li Chu-tsing, Max Loehr, Michael Sullivan (b. 1916), Sherman Lee (1918-2008), Alexander Soper (1904-93), Laurence Sickman, Father Harrie Vanderstappen (1921-2007), Nelson Wu (1919-2002), and C. C. Wang. Cahill's rubric established grades from A to F:

- A. Genuine, find, reliable signature or safe attribution; for anonymous works, genuine, fine work of the period to which attributed;
- F. An imitation of a later period (i.e. imitation of a style, or manner).<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> For an overview of some postwar East Asian art history, see Cohen 1992, 155-99.

<sup>28</sup> Cahill's rubric: B: genuine, but not of high quality; C: an original work of the period, but not by the artist to whom attributed; D: an original work of a later period; E: a copy of a later period, probably based on an earlier painting.

Although the grades and comments ranged widely among the 112 works, a number of “A” paintings emerged. Thirteen received near unanimous “A” rankings, effectively putting them forward as benchmarks for the field. They included:

- Deer among Red Maples* 丹楓呦鹿 (10th-11th century)
- Travellers among Mountains and Streams* 翳山行遊, by Fan Kuan 范寬
- Pure and Remote View of Streams and Hills* 溪山清遠, by Xia Gui 夏圭
- Banquet by Lantern Light* 華燈侍宴 (c. 1190-1224)
- Autumn Colours on the Qiao and Hua Mountains* 鶴華秋色 (1295), by Zhao Mengfu 趙孟頫 (1254-1322)
- Dwelling in the Fuchun Mountains* 富春山居 (1350), by Huang Gongwang 黃公望 (1269-1354)
- Music under Trees* 林下鳴琴, by Zhu Derun 朱德潤 (1294-1365)
- Old Trees by a Cold Waterfall* 古木寒泉 (1549), by Wen Zhengming
- Whispering Pines on a Mountain Path* 山路松聲, by Tang Yin 唐寅 (1470-1524)

Most graders also awarded an “A” to fourteen more paintings, including:<sup>29</sup>

- Early Spring* 早春 (1072), by Guo Xi 郭熙 (c. 1020-1090)
- Breaking the Balustrade* 折檻 (1127-1279)
- Knick-knack Peddler* 市擔嬰戲 (1210), by Li Song 李嵩 (act. 1190-1230)
- Waiting for Guests by Lamplight* 秉燭夜遊, by Ma Lin 馬麟 (act. c. 1200-1250)
- Returning Late from a Spring Outing* 春遊晚歸, by Dai Jin 戴進 (1388-1462)
- Walking with a Staff* 策杖, by Shen Zhou 沈周 (1427-1509)

Though no one made such pronouncements at the time, most of the twenty-seven “A” paintings from *CAT* emerged as monuments in a newly forming post-war canon. For the remainder of the twentieth century, seminal survey books such as Sullivan’s *Arts of China* (1961-2009), Sickman and Soper’s *Art and Architecture of China* (1956-92), Cahill’s *Chinese Painting* (1960-85), and Lee’s *History of Far Eastern Art* (1964-94) features many of the “A” works and others from *CAT*.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Paintings in this tier had the support of all but one or two graders.

<sup>30</sup> See editions, for example, Sullivan 1961; Sickman and Soper 1956; Cahill 1960; Lee 1964.

## Scholarly Autopsies

With general support for just one quarter of *CAT*'s paintings as potentially secure, there was a lot more to talk about.<sup>31</sup> Cahill organised a New York gathering to discuss fourteen “controversial” paintings. The Palace Museum Exhibition Post-mortem Symposium convened in October 1962. In preparation, Cahill (1962) distributed the list of opinions to an expanded group. The forty attendees included many from the grading group and two dozen others such as Osvald Sirén (1879–1966), Henry Trubner (1920–99), John Crawford Jr. (1913–88), and dealer Nathan Hammer.<sup>32</sup> Discussion during the two-day gathering revolved around authorship, dating, and authenticity.<sup>33</sup> In order to construct a history of Chinese painting, traditional methods that relied on documentary and material evidence such as seals, inscriptions, colophons and physical condition, needed to be balanced with connoisseurship and stylistic analysis (Fong 1962). Scholars in post-war America believed they had to begin by attempting to reconstruct Northern Song style. Sherman Lee (1948) tried to classify Song painting based on overlapping general progression of four styles. He and Wen Fong's monograph (1954) for Cleveland's *Streams and Mountains without End* 溪山無盡 (c. 1100–50) described five styles: courtly, monumental, literal, lyric, and spontaneous. Though everyone did not embrace these categories, that study took an important step toward answering what Soper (1956) called the question mark at the heart of Chinese art history: What should a proper Northern Song landscape look like?<sup>34</sup> In his detailed accounting of almost 150 paintings with Song dated inscriptions, Loehr (1961) asserted that style should be the chief consideration for determining authenticity. While most agreed upon the necessity and urgency of addressing these questions, it was not yet clear how to accomplish it. Loehr called style a “visual fact,” but what methods would prevail in establishing and interpreting such facts? Soper (1959, 262) presciently predicted imminent debates, and *CAT*'s landing prompted the first major chapter of these debates.

The transcript of the discussions provides a rare window on scholarly dialogues about pressing problems in Chinese painting studies during the early 1960s. *CAT* precipitated and permitted debates among a quorum of

<sup>31</sup> During a visit to Princeton over Labor Day weekend 1961, Li Lincan, Wen Fong, and Cahill debated and graded each *CAT* painting. Li burned their grades at the time, so that no one would ever know. Li 1972, 152.

<sup>32</sup> For a complete list of attendees, see Cahill 1963.

<sup>33</sup> Cahill (2005a) briefly discussed the post-mortem.

<sup>34</sup> Also see Hochstadter 1956.

scholars who saw the paintings first-hand (Cahill 1962; 1963). Even though *Early Spring* placed among “A” paintings and was not on the docket as a controversial work, discussion about another work morphed into a debate about authenticity and style, with Guo’s painting at the centre. Fong immediately questioned *Early Spring*’s authenticity as Northern Song. Though he found it impressive, Fong believed it to be stylistically, and thus chronologically, close to Zhu Derun’s fourteenth-century *Music Under the Trees*. Describing *Early Spring*’s rendering of space as “ambiguous” and “smudged,” he declared the painting as early Ming. Fong’s rejection prompted Lee to highlight a seminal problem: upon what should scholars base a conception of Northern Song painting? Lee maintained that Fong only accepted Fan Kuan and archaeologically dated works, thus relegating anything unlike those to the Ming or later. Presumably, Fong’s restrictive view of Northern Song style prompted him and Li Chu-tsing to give *Early Spring* an “F” grade. Fong and Li awarded “F’s” to many other *CAT* paintings that a most others supported as pre-Yuan. At the time, Fong (1992) doubted the survival of more than a handful of paintings created before the early Ming.<sup>35</sup> Lee, Soper, Sickman, and others maintained that it would not be possible to build upon Fong’s restricted view. Loehr’s observations that he found *Early Spring* “somewhat dull” and “smudged in passages” seemed to resonate with Fong’s characterisation. But Loehr came to a different conclusion: *Early Spring* showed originality, so it could *not* be a later “cooked-up job.” Responding to some of the same visual features described by Fong and Loehr, Soper expressed his admiration for the painting. The same visual evidence produced different determinations about style, leading scholars to disparate conclusions about authenticity. Soper lamented that

[the] discussion so far has made obvious the personal and subjective character of many of our judgments. Fong’s pejorative “smudged” is my “visionary”; Loehr’s “passionate” might well be interpreted by someone else as a sign of nervous agitation (Cahill 1962, 28).

For the moment, hopes that more candid stylistic analysis would quickly lead to complete consensus were dashed. Even if, as Loehr (1961, 228) declared, style was a visual fact, authenticity was still a matter of

---

<sup>35</sup> Cahill 1963, 27. Fong’s skepticism in the 1960s, along with his advocacy of visual and structural analysis, helped propel the field toward establishing a solidly defensible group of works that scholars continue to rely on today. Many of Fong’s doubts faded as his professional roles expanded to include work for the Metropolitan in the early 1970s. His later catalogue of the Metropolitan’s Chinese paintings used many *CAT* paintings as benchmarks.

conclusion, an *opinion* based on that fact. *CAT* re-ignited debates about Song painting among scholars in America. It also indirectly produced consensus on a group of works from the Palace collection as canonical.<sup>36</sup>

## The Right Stuff

*Chinese Art Treasures* was the first major travelling show of Chinese art in the United States. Between 466,000 and 700,000 visitors saw the exhibition during its yearlong tour. The National Gallery boasted the highest attendance of 150,000. The de Young and the Metropolitan reported 110,000 visitors with Boston bringing in 55,000 attendees and Chicago enticing 65,000 people into the galleries.<sup>37</sup> *Chinese Art Treasures* happened at the right time. As cultural diplomacy, it occurred when the ROC needed to assert its legitimacy and shore up American political and military support. The Palace collection survived decades of hardships, but arrived in Taiwan without a museum space to inhabit. The National Palace Museum complex in Taipei would not be completed until 1965. Most of the world had not seen the collection in over thirty years, creating a compelling mystery that attracted public and scholarly attention. *CAT* landed in the right place: the United States. Reports about the collection's rescue captured the interest of the public during the Cold War in the 1950s and 1960s. American institutional and private collections of Chinese art represented some of the best assemblages outside Asia. *CAT* focused worldwide attention on the US and the critical mass of scholars based there, firmly establishing America as a centre for Chinese painting studies. *CAT* featured the right paintings. Unlike the London show, *CAT* included the right Palace collection paintings from key eras and artists, particularly those from the Song dynasty. The selection committee chose the right works and the ROC was willing to send them to America. The shared experience of examining the paintings in *CAT* provided the right first-hand fuel for scholarly evaluation and debate that led to the emergence of a group of works from the Palace collection as increasingly secure monuments in a newly forming post-war canon. American organisers saw *CAT* as way to promote Chinese painting in America and internationally. While some experts doubted that *CAT* would help the public understand and appreciate

<sup>36</sup> Cahill (2005) orchestrated extensive photography of the *CAT* paintings in Washington. The resulting high quality slides allowed scholars and students to study the paintings in colour and in detail, perpetuating interest in them for decades.

<sup>37</sup> The National Gallery estimated 700,000 visitors during *CAT*'s yearlong tour. Li Lin-ts'an estimated 465,496.

Chinese painting, many viewed *CAT* as an opportunity to stimulate interest long past 1962. Lee (1961, 212) urged that the show *should* convert audiences:

[*Chinese Art Treasures* is the] first opportunity for the West to really see more than a few great early Chinese paintings as well as numerous fine Ming and Qing examples. The exhibition should be a revelation [ . . . ] We are being tested, and if we fail we can lose an important part of our heritage, one of the truly original, creative and profound schools of painting in world history.<sup>38</sup>

Lippe reported from Taiwan in 1960: “This is going to be the best show of Chinese paintings ever seen outside of China—and I’m afraid the last.”<sup>39</sup> American newspapers and magazines touted *CAT* as an once-in-a-lifetime event. In the early 1960s, such grandiose statements seemed like hyperbole. By the middle 1990s, they proved remarkably prescient. In 1996, almost thirty-five years later, another show from the Palace collection, *Splendours of Imperial China: Treasures from the National Palace Museum, Taipei*, arrived in America. But this time, all the “right” paintings did not make the journey. Protests erupted in Taiwan over the inclusion of twenty-seven paintings from a restricted list of paintings that could only be exhibited for forty days every three years. Only four of the restricted paintings originally slated for *Splendours*, many of the early landscapes from *CAT* made the trip to appear before a new generation of visitors.<sup>40</sup> Political, diplomatic, and scholarly factors coalesced to make *CAT* possible. By providing sustained national exposure, the show ushered in an era of intense public interest in and scholarly concentration on Chinese painting that paved the way for the many American exhibitions in succeeding decades. The particular combination of “right stuff” that landed *Chinese Art Treasures* in early 1960s America secured the show’s pivotal position in the history of exhibiting and studying Chinese painting.

---

<sup>38</sup> Some of Lee’s efforts to introduce the public to Chinese painting are discussed in my *Separating Sheep from Goats: Sherman Lee’s Collecting, Connoisseurship, and Canon of Chinese Painting in Postwar America the 1950s-60s* (forthcoming 2015).

<sup>39</sup> Lippe to Priest, 17 May 1960. MMAA.

<sup>40</sup> Solomon 1996. *Splendours* was a much larger comprehensive show, not so dominated by painting.

## Works Cited

- Accinelli, Robert. 1996. *Crisis and Commitment: United States Policy toward Taiwan, 1950-1955*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- “Art from a Peking Palace.” 1961. *Time*, September 15: 54-9.
- Bachhofer, Ludwig. 1946. *A Short History of Chinese Art*. New York: Pantheon.
- Barnhart, Richard. 1972. “Li Tang (c. 1050-1130) and the Kōtō-in Landscapes.” *The Burlington Magazine* 114, 830, Special Issue Devoted to Chinese Landscape Painting (May): 304-11, 313-4.
- Binyon, Laurence, et. al. 1932. *Chinese Art: A Selection of Articles from the 14th edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica*. New York: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.
- Cahill, James. 1958. “Ch’ien Hsuan and His Figure Paintings” *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 12: 10-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. Review of Maimai Sze’s *The Tao of Painting: A Study of the Ritual Disposition of Chinese Painting*. *Ars Orientalis* 3: 232-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960a. *Chinese Painting*. Geneva: Skira.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960b. *Chinese Paintings (XI-XIV Centuries)*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. “Combined List of Opinions on Paintings in Chinese Art Treasures Exhibition of 1961-62.” Private collection.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. “Post-mortem Symposium on Palace Museum Exhibition.” Private collection.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. *An Index of Early Chinese Painters and Paintings: T’ang, Sung, and Yüan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. “Two Palace Museums: An Informal Account of the Their Formation and History.” *Kaikodo Journal* XIX: 30-29. CLP41. <http://jamescahill.info/the-writings-of-james-cahill/cahill-lectures-and-papers/236-clp-41-2001-qtwo-palace-museums-an-informal-account-of-their-formation-and-historyq-kaikodo-journal-xix-2001>
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005a. “The Place of the National Palace Museum in My Scholarly Career” *Gugong wenwu 故宮文物* (National Palace Museum Monthly) 23 (8) (November): 93-9. Also available as CLP 117: 2005. <http://jamescahill.info/the-writings-of-james-cahill/cahill-lectures-and-papers/81-clp-117-2005>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005b. “Visual, Verbal, and Global (?): Some Observations on Chinese Painting Studies.” Symposium, University of Maryland, CLP 176: 2005. <http://jamescahill.info/the-writings-of-james-cahill/cahill-lectures-and-papers/176-clp-2005>.

- papers/106-clp176-2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Wen Fong and Me." Lecture at *Bridges to Heaven: A Symposium on East Asian Art in Honor of Professor Wen C. Fong*, Princeton, April 1-2.
- Cohen, Warren. 1992. *East Asian Art and American Culture: A Study in International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cohn, William. 1948. *Chinese Painting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, Richard. 1953. "Ch'ien Hsuan and 'Early Autumn'." *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 7: 71-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1958. "The Landscape Art of Li T'ang" *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 12: 48-60.
- Fong, Wen C. 1960. "The Problem of Ch'ien Hsuan." *Art Bulletin* 42 (3) (September): 173-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. "The Problem of Forgeries in Chinese Painting: Part One." *Artibus Asiae* 25 (2/3): 95-119, 121-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. *Beyond Representation: Chinese Painting and Calligraphy 8th to 14th Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Reflections on Chinese Art History: An Interview with Jerome Silbergeld." Princeton: P.Y. and Kinmay W. Tang Center for East Asian Art: 9-42.
- Gugong kua shiji da shi lu yao* 故宮跨世紀大事錄要 [Major Events of the Palace Museum Over the Centuries]. 2000. Taipei: Guoli gugong bowuyuan.
- Gugong minghua sanbai zhong* 故宮名畫三百種, 6 vols [Three Hundred Masterpieces of Chinese Painting]. 1959. Taizhong: Guoli gugong zhongyang bowuyuan gongtong lishi hui.
- Gugong shu hua lu* 故宮書畫錄 [A Catalogue of Painting and Calligraphy in the Palace Museum], 3 vols. 1956. Taipei: Zhonghua congshu weiyuanhui.
- Herzstein, Robert Edwin. 2005. *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobson, Wilder. 1943. "An Album of Chinese Paintings." Reproductions of paintings in the Boston Museum and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. *Life* (11 October): 62-8.
- Hochstadter, Walter. 1956. Review of *Streams and Mountains without End, by Sherman Lee and Wen Fong*. *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1): 78-81.
- Jayne, Horace H.F. 1945. "Yi P'in Ch'ang: A Report from China." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 4 (4) (December): 97-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1955. "How Safe Are the Chinese Treasures in Formosa?" *Art News* (May): 32-5, 60-1.

- Ju, Jane. 2007. "Chinese Art, the National Palace Museum, and Cold War Politics." In *Partisan Canons*, edited by Anna Brzyski, 115-34. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2003. "The Palace Museum as Representation of Culture: Exhibitions and Canons in Chinese Art." In *Hua zhong you hua: Jindai Zhongguo de shijue biaoshu yu wenhua goutu* 畫中有話：近代中國的視覺表述與文化構圖 [When Images Speak: Visual Representation and Cultural Mapping in Modern China], 477-507. Taipei: Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica.
- Kuo, Jason C. 2009. "A Tale of Two Scholars: Cahill and Fong on Chinese Painting." In *Stones from Other Mountains: Chinese Painting Studies in Postwar America*, edited by Jason Kuo, 221-86. Washington: New Academia Publishing.
- Lee, Sherman. 1948. "The Story of Chinese Painting." *The Art Quarterly* 11 (1): 9-31.
- . 1961. "Review of *Chinese Painting* by James Cahill." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20 (2) (Winter): 212.
- . 1964. *A History of Far Eastern Art*. New York: Harry Abrams.
- . 1989. "Aschwin Lippe (1914-1988)." *Archives of Asian Art* 42: 84-6.
- Lee, Sherman, and Wen Fong. 1954. "Streams and Mountains without End: A Northern Sung Handscroll and Its Significance in the History of Early Chinese Painting." *Artibus Asiae*. Supplementum 14.
- Li, Chu-tsing. 1958. "Recent History of the Palace Collection." *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 12: 61-75.
- Li, Lin-ts'an. 1961. "A Study of the Masterpiece 'T'ang Ming-huang's Journey to Shu.'" *Ars Orientalis* 4 (1961): 315-21.
- . 1972. *Guo bao fu mei zhanlan riji* 國寶赴美展覽日記 [Diary of the National Treasures Exhibition in America]. Taipei: Shangwu.
- Lieberman, Henry. 1955. "Quemoy, Matsu Get Set for Communist Attack." *New York Times*, April 3.
- . 1956. "Bulk of China's Great Art Works Held in Taiwan by Nationalists: Thousands of Paintings, Porcelains, and Jades Are Stored in Remote Area 85 Miles from Taipei." *New York Times*, July 22.
- Linen, James A. 1957. "A Letter from the Publisher." *Time*, May 6.
- Ling, Samuel C.H. 1958. "To Preserve China's Art: Hope Expressed That Some Objects May Be Exhibited Here." (Letter to the editor written on 19 September) *New York Times*, September 25.
- Lippe, Aschwin. 1955. "Art Journey to Formosa." *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 9: 8-19.
- . 1955. "The Hidden Treasures of China: A Visit to Formosa." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, New Series 14 (2) (October):

- 54-60.
- Lippe, Aschwin. 1956. Review of Sickman and Soper's *The Art and Architecture of China*. *Journal of Asian Studies* 16 (1) (November): 137-42.
- . 1959. Review of Hugo Munsterberg's *The Landscape Painting of China and Japan*. *Ars Orientalis* 3: 241-4.
- Loehr, Max. 1939. "A Landscape by Li T'ang, Dated 1124 A. D." *The Burlington Magazine* 74 (435) (June): 288-9, 293.
- . 1961. "Chinese Paintings with Sung Dated Inscriptions." *Ars Orientalis* 4: 219-84.
- "Masterpieces of Chinese Art." 1957. *Time*, May 6.
- Mocsanyi, Paul. 1958. "Protecting Chinese Art." Letter to the Editor. *New York Times*, September 19.
- Mok, Harold. 2009. "Authenticity, Style, and Art History: Wen C. Fong and Studies of Chinese Art History." In *Stones from Other Mountains: Chinese Painting Studies in Postwar America*, edited by Jason Kuo, 199-219. Washington D.C.: New Academia Publishing.
- Munsterberg, Hugo. 1955. *The Landscape Painting of China and Japan*. Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle Company.
- Na, Zhiliang. 1957. *Gugong bowuyuan sanshi nian chi jing guo* 故宮博物院三十年之經過 [An Account of the Thirty Years of the Palace Museum]. Taipei: Zhonghua congshu weiyuan hui, 1957.
- Naquin, Susan. 2004. "The Forbidden City Goes Abroad: Qing History and Foreign Exhibitions of the Palace Museum, 1974-2004." *T'oung Pao* 90 (4/5), second series: 341-97.
- North American Newspaper Alliance. 1958 "Taiwan Caves Hold Rare Oriental Art," *North American Newspaper Alliance*, September 28.
- Pope, John Alexander. 1961. "Chinese Art Treasures Cross the Pacific." *The Connoisseur* (London) 147 (594) (May): 230-40.
- Pope, John Alexander, Aschwin Lippe, and James Cahill. 1961. *Chinese Art Treasures* (exhibition catalogue). Geneva: Skira.
- Priest, Alan. 1961. "Chinese Art Treasures." *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (Summer): 1-5.
- Sewell, Jack. 1961. "Chinese Art Treasures: An Exhibition of Masterpieces from Taiwan." *The Art Institute of Chicago Quarterly* 55 (4): 62-3.
- Shambaugh Elliott, Jeannette and David Shambaugh. 2000. *The Odyssey of China's Imperial Art Treasures*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Shimada, Shūjirō. 1951. "On the Landscape Paintings in the Kōtō-in Temple." *Bijutsu Kenkyū* 美術研究 [The Journal of Art Studies] 165: 136-49.

- Sickman, Laurence, and Alexander Soper. [1956] 1960. *The Art and Architecture of China*. New Haven: Pelican History of Art, Yale University Press.
- Sickman, Laurence, and A. G. Wenley. 1956. "An Early Chinese Landscape Painting." *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1): 56-8.
- Sieberling, Dorothy. 1961. "Centuries of a Vital Spirit." *Life*, August 18.
- Silbergeld, Jerome. 1987. "Chinese Painting Studies in the West: A State-of-the-Field Article." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46 (4) (November): 849-97.
- Silcock, Arnold. 1948. *An Introduction to Chinese Art*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Solomon, Andrew. 1996. "Don't Mess with Our Cultural Patrimony." *New York Times*, March 17.
- Soper, Alexander. 1941. "Early Chinese Landscape Painting." *Art Bulletin* 23 (2): 141-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1948. Review of Ludwig Bachhofer's *A Short History of Chinese Art*. *College Art Journal* 8 (1): 72-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1949. "A Northern Sung Descriptive Catalogue of Paintings: (The Hua P'in of Li Ch'ih)." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 69 (1): 18-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1949. Review of Arnold Silcock's *Introduction to Chinese Art and History*. *College Art Journal* 9 (2) (Winter): 224-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1950. Review of William Cohn's *Chinese Painting*. *Art Bulletin* 32 (1): 77-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1956. Review of *Streams and Mountains without End* by Sherman Lee and Wen Fong. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 14 (4) (June): 505-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1957. "Standards of Quality in Northern Sung Painting." *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 11: 8-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. Review of *Chinese Painting, Leading Masters and Principles. Part I, the First Millennium* by Osvald Sirén. *Artibus Asiae* 22 (3): 258-62.
- Sullivan, Michael. 1961. *The Arts of China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. "Chinese Art Treasures: Notes on the Paintings in the Exhibition of Palace Museum Treasures in the U.S. 1961-62." *Artibus Asiae* 25 (1): 45-56.
- Tomita, Kojiro, and Tseng Hsien-ch'i. 1961. *Portfolio of Chinese Paintings in the Museum (Yuan to Qing Periods)*. Boston, Mass.: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

- Tseng Hsien-ch'i. 1961. "Chinese Art Treasures." *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts* 59 (317): 63-97.
- Wallis, Brian. 1991. "Selling Nations: International Exhibitions and Cultural Diplomacy." *Art in America* (September): 84-91.
- Watson, William. 2000. *The Arts of China 900-1620*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Yeh, George K.C. 1961. "Formosa Was Well-Named." *Washington Post Times Herald*, May 28.
- Zhonghua wenwu jicheng* 中華文物集成 [A Collection of Chinese Art Objects]. 1954. Taizhong: Guoli zhongyang bowu tushuyuan guanlian he guanli chu.

Fig. 10-1. Chinese and American curators posed in front of *Magpies and Hare* by Cui Bo (act. 1050-80) at the National Gallery opening of *Chinese Art Treasures* in 1961. Left to right: Na Chih-liang, Aschwin Lippe, Tan Tan-ch'iung, James Cahill, Henry Beville (photographer), Li Lin-ts'an (holding the catalogue), John Alexander Pope. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Gallery Archives.



Fig. 10-2. *Chinese Art Treasures* exhibition catalogue (1961).



Fig. 10-3. Contemplating *Waiting for the Ferry in Autumn* by Qiu Ying (act. 1522-60). Left to right: Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador George K.C. Yeh, and Director of the Freer Gallery of Art John Alexander Pope at National Gallery opening in 1961. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Gallery Archives.



Fig. 10-4. Gallery view of *Chinese Landscape Painting* at the Cleveland Museum of Art, 1954. Left to right: *Song of the Lily Flowers and Cypress Leaves* by Yun Shouping (1633-90), *Myriad Valleys and the Flavor of Pines* by Wu Li (1632-1718), *Reciting Poetry Before the Yellowing of Autumn* by Wu Li, *Mountain in Fall after Wang Meng* by Huang Ting (1660-1730), *Landscape* by Zhang Zongcang (1686-1756), *Mountain and River Landscape* by Wang Yuanqi (1642-1715), and *Bamboo Grove and Distant Mountains* by Wang Hui (1632-1717). Cleveland Museum of Art Archives.



Fig.10-5. Crowds gather in front of *Early Spring* by Guo Xi, 1072 (left), by and *Travelers Amid Streams and Mountains* by Fan Kuan (act. 10th-early 11th century) (right), National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., 1961. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Gallery Archives.

