

4th International Sculpture Symposium

The Culture of Culture: East / West a False Dichotomy?

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, February 18 -22, 2009

East / West Dichotomy: Is There A Middle Way?

Zheng Shengtian

It is a great honour to be invited to speak to you today and to address the very important question: “Is the East/West dichotomy false?” I would also like to pose another question today: Is there in fact a “Middle Way” in the East / West dialogue instead of a dichotomy based on oppositions?

A supposed dichotomy between East and West has been a key element of the “ordering” of the East by Western philosophers, intellectuals and institutions – and a key element in the “ordering” of the West by artists and intellectuals in the East. Whether this divide is a legitimate one is an issue which moves me, and has moved me for most of my adult life, on an artistic, intellectual and on a personal level.

In addressing this issue today, in 2009, it is necessary to remind ourselves that discourses surrounding a supposed East/West dichotomy are not new. Let me begin by looking at the forms this discourse took before 1949.

1. Discourses of East/West before 1949

Western research on the East / West discourse among artists in China in the first half of the twentieth century has been remarkably rare and has tended to be the domain of a handful of specialists. In part this is due to the fact that the majority of materials on the subject were, and are, very rare. In fact, the only art exhibition in the West since the 1930s which addressed this topic specifically took place in Munich, Germany, in 2004-2005. Titled *Shanghai Modern*, the exhibition was co-curated by myself, Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, then Director of the Museum Villa Stuck in Munich, and the artist Ken Lum, then Professor at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. It was a joint project between the City of Shanghai and the City of Munich,

We conducted very intense research in preparation for this exhibition project, in both China and in Europe between 2001 and 2004¹. During our research we came across many interesting materials in both China and Europe which illuminated the relationship between East and West and the debates on this relationship amongst Chinese intellectuals and artists in the first half of the twentieth century. These debates provided a framework which has influenced art education practices in China over the past eighty years and may still stimulate dialogue among us today.

One of the key artist-curator-educators engaged in these debates was the Shanghai artist Liu Haisu² who, in 1934, organized a major exhibition of modern Chinese painting at the Prussian Academy of the Arts in Berlin that later toured to Hamburg, Dusseldorf, Amsterdam, The Hague and Geneva. The exhibition showed 297 works, representing – according to Liu Haisu - four schools of modern ink paintings in the early twentieth century. One of the four schools of ink painting is called *Zhezhongpai* in Chinese. Liu described the artists of this school as having “appropriated European perspective and the interplay of light and shade”³ in their attempt to combine both Chinese and Western styles in ink painting. In fact, Liu was referring to the famous Lingnan School – a group of Guangdong painters, led by the brothers Gao Jianfu and Gao Qifeng as well as Chen Shuren, all of whom studied in Japan and contributed to ground-breaking reforms in Chinese ink painting.⁴

“*Zhezhongpai*” is commonly used as a Chinese translation of the English term “eclecticism”. Many great artists in the art history were described as “eclectic”, such as Carracci, who incorporated painting elements from the Renaissance and classical traditions; and Pablo Picasso, whose modernist work was greatly influenced by African art. In Chinese, “*zhezhong*” means “taking the middle ground”. In her essay on the East / West debates in the *Shanghai Modern* catalogue Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker used the English term “the Middle Way” to describe the fourth category of ink painting as championed by the Lingnan school. She quoted artist Gao Qipei’s own definition of the goals of the “*zhezhong*” movement: “Blending The East and the West into a harmonious whole.”⁵

At this time in China, in the 1930s, an intense debate took place on the issue of the so-called “wholesale westernization” of Chinese culture. Many participants in this debate believed that it was necessary to make a choice between the West and the East, between modernity and tradition, between radical and conservative, between progressive and backward, between revolution and reaction. But there were also other scholars at this time who believed that such a black-or-white approach was a fallacy that should not govern the thinking of Chinese intellectuals. They sought other options, a “middle ground” between the extremes championed by their compatriots.

Liu Haisu was not the only one who recognized the persistent efforts of many Chinese artists who sought an alternative approach to that which held traditional Chinese and Western cultures apart. As early as 1924, the renowned educator Cai Yuanpei⁶ wrote a preface for the first Chinese art exhibition in Europe that was held at the Palais du Rhin in Strasbourg. He emphasized a type of art which stood apart from traditional Chinese art and Western-Style Chinese art. In the catalogue to the exhibition which was published in French, he called it “l’art nouveau” (New Art) and praised its experiment of “interpenetration”.⁷ In a Chinese language version of this text, Cai used the term “*huhuan suochang*”, which can be translated literally as “exchange strength with each other”. He stressed that

Ever since the Renaissance and particularly in our day, Chinese style has inspired European art. – This proves that interpenetration of the two styles of art, Western and Eastern, is necessary.⁸

One of the organizers of this Strasbourg exhibition, artist Lin Fengmian⁹ , was also an important advocate of cultural dialogue between the East and the West. In 1928, with support from Cai Yuanpei, he founded the National Academy of Arts in Hangzhou, now internationally renowned under the name China Academy of Art. In a statement he described its goal:

- To introduce Western art,
- To reform traditional art,
- To reconcile Chinese and Western Art,

- To create art of our time.¹⁰

Lin found intolerable that “in every art school Chinese painting and Western painting are always put in opposition and confrontation with each other.” He wrote: “As a matter of fact, the weakness of Western art is just the strength of Oriental art; and the weakness of Oriental art is just the strength of Western art. To complement each other, a new art in the World will rise right at the moment.”¹¹

Lin’s whole artistic career was an endless but tragic struggle for cultural reconciliation. The value of his modern ink painting experiment has been recognized and appreciated only recently. When I came to the Hangzhou Academy to study art in the 1950s, Lin was already forced to the sidelines and was living in virtual seclusion in Shanghai. It sounds ridiculous now but he was actually accused of “promoting new style paintings” (*tichang Xinpaihua*) and was imprisoned during the Cultural Revolution from 1968 to 1972. He left China in 1977.

Another important twentieth-century Chinese artist, Pan Tianshou,¹² also held the presidency of the Hangzhou Academy from 1944 to 1947 and from 1959 to 1966. He believed that Chinese and Western art have different values, and that their individual traditions should not be blended or replace one another. He described Western and Chinese arts as “two peaks” which should maintain distance between them. His son Pan Gongkai¹³, now the President of the Central Academy of Fine Art in Beijing, interpreted father’s viewpoints and developed his own unique “two-end” theory on the relationship between Chinese and Western art. He said: “Chinese and Western paintings should complement each other by creating a vast oval-shaped blended zone, with Chinese traditions at one end and Western modernity at the other.”¹⁴

Although Hangzhou Academy’s structure and syllabus were mainly adopted from Europe, especially schools such as the Paris Ecole des Beaux Arts, its leaders Lin Fengmian, Pan Tianshou and others had created with the Academy a very exciting, experimental laboratory for China’s modern art education. In the last century many of the most creative and independent Chinese artists either taught at the Hangzhou Academy or studied there. They include Huang Binghong, Fu Baoshi, Ni Yide, Wu Dayu, Pang Xunqin, Dong Xiwen, Li keran, Wu Guanzhong, Zao Wou-ki,¹⁵ to mention but a few.

2. The East/West discourse after 1949

Following the establishment of the People's Republic in 1949, the Chinese government began to promote Soviet art in art academies. A pedagogical system designed by Pavel Chistyakov¹⁶ was introduced into China in 1952. The adoption of this pedagogical measure is considered by many to be an example of the Chinese Communist Party's "lopsided" diplomatic policy towards the Soviet Union, as reflected in the field of art; but in fact this is an inaccurate view. Chistyakov was a nineteenth-century Russian artist and a teacher of the celebrated painter Ilya Repin¹⁷, among others. His rigorous realist painting technique is a continuation of the tradition of the European academicism. Ironically while art education in the West experienced major shifts and changes after the World War II, on the contrary, the classical European art training method was even strengthened during this period under the Chinese communist regime. From the 1950s to the early 1960s Chinese art students still spent most of their time in studios sketching plaster casts of classical Greek sculptures or nude models.

One especially important phenomenon has been overlooked by many historians in looking at the cultural policies in the early years of the Chinese communist regime. Owing to China's political inclinations in the early 1950s, the Chinese government chose to engage culturally only with countries of the "Third World". Mexico was one such country invited into dialogue with China. A major exhibition took place in July 1956. Ignacio Aguirre, then Secretary of the Mexican National Plastic Art Front¹⁸ visited China and brought 138 paintings and 258 graphic works to Beijing. The exchange continued with visits by Mexican artists, like David Alfaro Siqueiros, Arturo García Bustos and a Chilean muralist, Jose Venturelli.¹⁹ Siqueiros gave a lecture to the Chinese Artists Association in October 1956 and strongly criticized Socialist Realism. He advised Chinese artists not to follow the footsteps of their fellow Russian artists. In one of the discussions he said:

Not only new content is needed (for art); but also new form. We need a new form that is differentiated from the art of any other time....This art has to absorb all the great achievements created by artists prior to our time, including those of modern Western schools.²⁰

Mexican artists' paintings, and their ideas, excited and inspired young Chinese artists, presenting alternatives to the Soviet style. Many students in art academies tried to use this new approach to painting despite the criticism they might face. Yuan Yunsheng,²¹ then a student at the Central Academy of Fine Arts, explained why he was attracted to Mexican art: "Because their political ideals and artistic pursuits were in complete consensus, they were not forced by others".²² Yuan was labeled a "rightist student" and sent to a labor camp because he made his graduate project, *Memory of Watery Region*, in his own style.

Another event is also worth taking into account. In 1960, Hangzhou held a two-year advanced training class in painting for young teachers from all art academies in China. The instructor was a Romanian painter Eugen Popa.²³ Popa was in residence at the Academy and had been sponsored by a cultural exchange agreement between the Chinese and Romanian governments. In his orientation course he insisted that he was not taking the European painting tradition to China mechanically: "Chinese artists shouldn't blindly study and imitate European paintings. They should always pay attention to Chinese characteristics and create a Chinese style of oil painting".²⁴ His expressive painting approach quickly spread among his students in the 1960s.

But these changes quickly came to a bitter end. The entire education system shut down in 1966 when the Cultural Revolution began. China completely closed its doors to the outside world and thus the debate on cultural exchange between the East and the West was interrupted for almost ten years.

3. Cultural dialogue in the 1980s

The chaos ended in 1977 when Mao died and the members of the "Gang of Four" were arrested. China's reform and opening-up policy, a guiding principle that helped the economy recover and develop, was passed by the Communist party in 1978.

In 1979 I was awarded a grant in a national competition which allowed me to pursue advanced study abroad for two years. When I announced my intention to go to United States, the response from government officials was disapproving. "There is nothing to

learn in the U.S,"I was told." You should go to Europe, to countries such as France or Italy where they have a great art tradition." Unfortunately, my application paper was stuck in Italian bureaucracy for more than a year and finally got lost. The staff in charge at the Chinese Education Ministry eventually gave me permission to travel instead to the United States. A friend of mine Cora Li-Leger who used to study at University of Minnesota gave my name to Prof. Warren Mackenzie²⁵, the former Chairman of the Department of Art. Soon I received an invitation from him and arrived in Minneapolis in September 1981, becoming the first Chinese professor of art to come to the United States after the Cultural Revolution.

In my two-year residence at UM as an Honorary Fellow, I had a chance to experience and gather first hand information on Western art education. I also travelled throughout North America and Europe. My main observation was that art education in the West was dominated at the time by a conceptual approach, while Chinese education still placed a strong emphasis on systematic training in technique. I came to believe that in order to learn from each other it was essential for academies in China and in the West, to rebuild the dialogue that been disconnected at that point for forty years.

After my return to China at the end of 1983, I was appointed Chairman of the Oil Painting Department and Director of the International Affairs Office of my alma mater in Hangzhou. This allowed me to take some small but encouraging steps towards a major transformation of this institution. One of the key changes was to provide students with the opportunity of choosing minor courses other than their own primary discipline. I also provided more freedom to students when they were working on their graduate projects. I was invited to lecture nationwide and published a number of articles calling for education reform. To list a few of these articles which were published in mid-1980s: The Trends of Western Art Education; Western Art Education and the Cultivation of Creativity; Discover the New Horizon of Chinese Oil Painting.

My friends in Minnesota played significant roles in the cultural exchanges which then ensued in the 1980s. In 1984 Professor Cheng-Khee Chee of UM Duluth²⁶ organized the first workshop for American students to study Chinese painting and calligraphy at the Academy in Hangzhou . The program was selected as one of the five best programs of the year by the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education. It soon

became a pattern and was followed by other workshops for European and Asian students and continued to run for many years. Now, in the twenty-first century, The China Art Academy has set up a full sized college to provide courses and workshops for foreign students.

In 1985 I invited Professor Roman Verostko²⁷ of the Minneapolis College of Art & Design to Hangzhou to give a lecture series on modern Western art. This was the first time Western modernism and post-modern art were openly discussed in a classroom since 1949. The students were all extremely excited to look at slides of the art work that used to be categorized as “reactionary and decadent trash” by Soviet cultural supremo Andrei Zhdanov²⁸ and Mao’s wife Jiang Qing²⁹. Verostko’s introduction of Western modern art is considered today to be one of the key events that contributed to the emergence of the New Art Wave movement in 1985 in China.³⁰

An exchange of art exhibitions and faculty was also activated in the 1980s. The Hangzhou Academy sent an exhibition of faculty and student work to the Parsons School of Design in New York, UMD and University of Montana. Professor Wang Dongling³¹ and Hong Zaixin³², among many others, were invited to teach at UM and held workshops in several American universities.

A breakthrough exhibition of that period was *Beyond the Open Door – Contemporary Paintings from The Peoples’ Republic of China*, which was held at the Pacific Asia Museum in Pasadena, California in 1986. The show was proposed by the late Waldemar Nelson³³, a scholar on philanthropy based in New York who was a strong advocate of Chinese art in 1980s. He became fascinated by the new Chinese art which was emerging in the 1980s and recognized its great potential during his several visits with me in Shanghai, Hangzhou, Nanjing and Beijing. Encouraged by Robert Anderson, the Chairman of The Atlantic Richfield Co. (ARCO), he was able to collaborate with the Pacific Asia Museum and launched this first exhibition of contemporary Chinese art in North America. The show introduced emerging Chinese artists Zhang Peili, Geng Jianyi, Wang Jianwei, Xu Jiang and Zhang Jianjun³⁴ to American audiences for the first time. These artists are today the stars of the contemporary Chinese art scene. Henry Kissinger wrote a preface for the catalogue in which he noted:

There is no clearer prism through which to perceive these developments than in art now being created by the new generation of Chinese artists.³⁵

Later, in 1991, the Pacific Asia Museum held a second Contemporary Chinese art Exhibition titled *I Don't Want to Play Cards with Cezanne and Other Works: Selection from the Chinese New Wave and Avant-garde Art of the Eighties*. Forty-one works were brought from China including Geng Jianyi's famous painting *The Second Condition*, Wang Guangyi's *Big Dolls: Holy Mother and child*, Xu Bing's original installation *Book of Heaven*, Zhang Peili's *X*, and works by other important artists of the 1980s and 1990s such as Zhang Xiaogang, Wei Guangqing, Mao Xuhui, and Lu Shengzhong.³⁶

On June 2, 1988, the first organization of its kind in China – the Zhejiang Research Society of World Art - was established in Hangzhou. I was a founding member and wrote in a statement: "China needs to learn from the World; The World needs to learn from China."³⁷ The society immediately initiated a four page long publication, *World Art News*, in collaboration with the Library of the China Art Academy in Hangzhou. This small publication was received by readers with enthusiasm. Due to financial strains, *World Art News* published with no fixed dates. But it continued to be issued until late 1989 when political conditions changed and control of the media tightened following the June 4th incident on Tianamen Square. Despite its short life and limited circulation, this publication was a crucial project and represented an important step in the direction of more effective and direct intercultural communication between China and the West.

In June 1991, I organized the *First Chinese Art Seminar/Workshop* at San Diego State University, sponsored by The Center for United States – China Arts Exchange at Columbia University. The main reason for this event was to discuss issues surrounding relocation faced by Chinese artists who had either left China in the 1980s or were voluntarily exiled in North America after 1989. During the month of June thirteen participant artists worked in the studio during the day while they held informal discussions about their work and their experiences in the evening. This four-week program concluded with a symposium, *Contemporary Chinese Art, Crisis and Perspectives after the 1980s*, as well as an exhibition of participants' work including Xu Bing's first project created in the United States: *English Alphabet* and Chen Danqing's astonishing painting: *Expressions*,³⁸. The critic Norman Klein³⁹ from the California

Institute of Arts wrote a favourable review for an art magazine, *Fine Art* in which he noted:

A crucial shift has taken place in Chinese art. It is crucial not only for China but very likely for American art as well, as we are spun ever faster into the new global culture of the 1990s. A young generation of mainland Chinese artists, many living in North America, have developed a unique reading of Euro/American modernism, and of post-modernism, in a context really never seen before.⁴⁰

After examining the art works from the exhibition, he concluded:

This work was clearly years beyond our simplified western notions of multiculturalism, or even post-colonialism. This contained an historical diversity far more contemporary than I had expected. It also reminded me once again that there can be no primitivist ideal moment in any culture (except to imperialists), only mutating hybrids going back centuries. Clearly what was displayed here, casually in progress, contained possibilities for art of the next century."⁴¹

Norman was one of the first Western critics to foresee the potential contribution of Chinese artists to the international art scene, at a time when Chinese artists had almost no presence outside of their country at all.

4. Not a Conclusion

In the past two decades, the art world has gone through immense changes, not only in China, but also in the West. But we are still engaged in the same fascinating debates which artist-educator-curators began in the first half of the twentieth century.

Since the 1990s, we have seen more and more Chinese artists being exposed in major international biennials and in Western art museums. It doesn't happen over night. It was a collective achievement contributed by many prior generations although they more than likely never anticipated that it would come so fast, and on such a scale.

The rapid social changes in China have also had a vital impact on art education. Art academies are developing in unprecedented ways—the campuses are quickly expanding and in exciting ways; more departments are being created, and more students are enrolled. But at the same time, art education in China has become little more than a vocational training. The main focus of many students has been to keep up with the market rather than cultivating intellectual rigor. Some art educators and artists are conscious of the problems arising from the current pedagogical approach. They recognize that art academies should aim at training intellectuals and thinkers who can enrich society's intellectual strategies through visual thinking.

As I mentioned before, the question of art education has been raised amongst art educators from the last century in China. Cai Yuanpei put forward the idea of replacing religion with art education, proposing that art was a form of spiritual creation, a spiritual force that invigorated society at large. Although we shouldn't take his proposition to mean literally that religion can be replaced, there are times when art can provoke and enrich one's mind in ways that are necessary for every society.

My generation envisioned a utopia that would be generated by the Marxist ideology. Many still have faith in the idea that art is a form of creation that manifests one's intellectual character and moral refinement. They believe that art should not simply be a commercial product and they do not see that an artist can produce good art when s/he is market driven. True art, they believe, can only emerge when one's intellect and spirit are actively engaged in understanding the mechanisms of contemporary society.

Observing the current trend of Chinese art education, many have worried that idealism is being gradually replaced by pragmatism. The conflict between the ideals espoused by artist-educator-curators in China, and the reality in a market-oriented society, cannot be avoided. But will we be able to strike a balance between these two? Is there a Middle Way?

Chinese art schools are also facing other dilemmas. There is still tension between Chinese cultural traditions and the influence of foreign ideas, values and intellectual systems. There is also the antithesis between creativity and systematic learning.

Since the opening of China in the 1980s, the challenge of dealing with the sheer enormity of influences and ideas from outside China has been extraordinarily enriching but also extremely challenging. Information is flooding in through the media and through the internet in addition to the traditional channels of intellectual and artistic exchange. Travel abroad has never been easier. In these circumstances, the main criticism of the current art education system in China is that the teaching methods are too rigid. The traditional method focuses on following the master-apprentice model in a disciplined fashion. Its weakness is that students do not possess a strong creative drive. They may lose the ability to think independently under the influence of such a rigid systematic technique training. On other side, some teachers argue that if students lack the necessary technique how they can express their ideas visually? This criticism we have often heard from art schools in the West as well. It seems we need to find a balance and not go to extremes – again, that we need to find a Middle Way.

In 1998 I accompanied Professor Ken Lum and Serge Guilbaut⁴² of the University of British Columbia on a visit to the China Art Academy in Hangzhou. They were very impressed by the level of skills student commanded in their studios. Ken said something I found very thought provoking: “Is it possible to have an academy devoid of academism?” An academy system is designed to transmit knowledge and histories through formal training. However, such a system can sometimes become dogmatic, posing a restriction upon one's creativity. Is it possible for us to synthesize both creativity and discipline into one system? Or will these two elements always remain in opposition?

About two years ago, when I interviewed Professor Zhu Naizheng⁴³, former Vice-president of the Central Academy of Fine Arts in Beijing on art education for *Yishu: Journal of Contemporary Chinese Art*, I asked him the same question. He answered:

Such contention between creativity and discipline will always exist; however, it does not mean that the two cannot complement each other. Ever since the opening of China, we have been exposed to all styles and schools of Western art developed in past one hundred years. Any avant-garde or contemporary art movement you find in the West can also be found here. Furthermore, many art students nowadays have great exposure to the Western art world as many

Chinese art colleges maintain scholarly exchanges with major institutions all over the world. Therefore, they have witnessed how students in the West fully utilize their creativity under the western educational system. However, real changes do not come about through fervent imitation, not to mention the synthesis of both Western and Eastern values, which cannot take place when one leaves aside what constitutes the make-up of Chinese culture—its historical tradition, values and philosophy. My view is that before we become susceptible to foreign influences, we have to first acknowledge our strengths and weaknesses—the same rule applies when we survey other cultures—and then allow time for a period of trial and error before true integration can take place.⁴⁴

I would suggest that the artists and intellectuals of China are currently in a crucial period – not necessarily of trial and error – but of experimentation in which the enormous strengths (and weaknesses) of this rich culture are being examined in ways that are truly extraordinary. It is indeed as the critic Norman Klein predicted twenty-years ago. We have been spun into a new global culture, there is a generation of Chinese artists who have “developed a unique reading of Euro/American modernism, and of post-modernism, in a context really never seen before.” It is true as he noted, that the work of these artists contains an historical diversity far more contemporary⁴⁵ than perhaps any of us had expected. And it certainly does contain new and incredibly exciting possibilities for new understanding of art in this century.

I would like to conclude by thanking you for allowing me this opportunity to return to an academic institution that played such an important role in my own life in order to share my aspirations for new forms of cultural and academic exchange. Is there indeed a Middle Way which can break once and for all the East / West dichotomy which has acted as a divide rather than a shared path?

¹ The exhibition *Shanghai Modern 1919-1945* was held at Museum Villa Stuck in Munich and the Kunsthall zu Kiel from 2004 to 2005.

² Liu Haisu (1896-1994), Chinese artist and educator.

³ Liu Haisu, ‘Die Richtungen in der modernen chinesischen Malerei’, *Sinica*, 6 no. 2 (1931). 50. Original German text and English translation in Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, “Shanghai Modern” in

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, Ken Lum, Zheng Shengtian (eds.), *Shanghai Modern 1919-1945* (Munich: Museum Villa Stuck and Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2004), 28.

⁴ “Lingnan” refers to the region south of Wulin (five mountains) and mainly refers to Guangdong Province. The representative members of the Lingnan School are Gao Jianfu (1879-1951), Gao Qifeng (1889-1933) and Chen Shuren (1883-1948).

⁵ Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, “Shanghai Modern”, op.cit., 36-37.

⁶ Cai Yuanpei (1868—1940), Chinese educator and scholar.

⁷ Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, “Shanghai Modern”, op.cit., 23.

⁸ Exhibition Catalogue (French language), 8. Cited in English by Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, “Shanghai Modern”, op.cit., 23. Cai Yuanpei’s preface was re-printed in *The Century of Lin Fengmian* (Hangzhou: China Academy of Art Press, 1999), 28.

⁹ Lin Fengmian (1900—1991), Chinese artist and educator.

¹⁰ Cited in Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, “Shanghai Modern”, op. cit., 25. Reprinted in *The Century of Lin Fengmian*, op.cit., 47.

¹¹ *The Century of Lin Fengmian*, op.cit., 45-46

¹² Pan Tianshou (1897—1971), Chinese artist and educator.

¹³ Pan Gongkai (1947-), Chinese artist and educator.

¹⁴ Pan Gongkai’s comments in English are to be found at http://www.gdmoa.org/en_zhanting/en_zhengzaizhanchu/9112.jsp. The original Chinese text is to be found at <http://www.gdmoa.org/zhanlan/zhanlandangan/2007/15/9036.jsp>

¹⁵ Huang Binghong (1865-1955), Fu Baoshi (1904-1965), Ni Yide (1901-1970), Wu Dayu (1903-1988), Pang Xunqin (1906-1985), Dong Xiwen (1914-1973), Li keran (1907-1989), Wu Guanzhong (1919-), Zao Wou-ki (1921-), Chinese artists.

¹⁶ Pavel Chistyakov (1832 – 1919), Russian artist and educator.

¹⁷ Ilya Repin (1844-1930), Russian artist.

¹⁸ Ignacio Aguirre (1900-1990), Mexican artist.

¹⁹ David Alfaro Siqueiros (1896-1974), Arturo García Bustos (1926-), Mexican artists; Jose Venturelli (1943-1988), Chilean artist.

²⁰ Wang Qi, *Huatan Manbu* (Hong Kong: Chinese Cultural and Art Press, 2005), 261-262.

²¹ Yuan Yunsheng (1937-), Chinese artist.

²² Yuan's comment on the comparison between West and Oriental art can be found at <http://www.chinaculture.net/bbs/ShowPost.asp?ThreadID=11006>

²³ Eugen Popa (1919-1996), Romanian artist.

²⁴ Xu Junxuan, "Recollection of the Romanian Training Class and Professor Popa," *Yishu Yaolan* (Hangzhou, Zhejiang Academy of Fine Art Press, 1988), 261.

²⁵ Warren Mackenzie (1924-), American ceramic artist.

²⁶ Cheng-Khee Chee (1934-), American watercolor painter.

²⁷ Roman Verostko (1929-), American artist and historian.

²⁸ Andrei Zhdanov (1896-1948), Soviet politician in charge of the cultural policy.

²⁹ Jiang Qing (1914 – 1991), the third wife of Mao Zedong who played a major role in the Cultural Revolution.

³⁰ Roman's picture with a caption on the lecture series was displayed in the exhibition '85 New Wave - The Birth of Chinese Contemporary Art, curated by Fei Dawei, at Ullens Center for Contemporary Art (UCCA), November 5, 2007 - February 17, 2008, Beijing.

³¹ Wang Dongling (1945-), Chinese calligrapher.

³² Hong Zaixin, (?), Chinese art historian, now teaches at University of Puget Sound, WA.

³³ Waldemar Nelson (1917-2005), American scholar on African history and philanthropy.

³⁴ Zhang Peili (1957-), Geng Jianyi (1962-), Wang Jianwei (1958-), Xu Jiang (1955-) and Zhang Jianjun (1955-), Chinese artists.

³⁵ *Beyond the Open Door*, (Pasadena: Pacific Asia Museum, 1987), 7.

³⁶ Wang Guangyi (1956-), Xu Bing (1955-), Zhang Xiaogang (1958-), Wei Guangqing (1963-), Mao Xuhui (1956-), Lu Shengzhong (1952-). Chinese artists.

³⁷ *World Art News*, First issue, 1989.

³⁸ Chen Danqing (1953-), Chinese artist.

³⁹ Norman Klein, (1945-), American art critic.

⁴⁰ Norman Klein, "Underneath the Wave: New Art by Chinese Artists," *Fine Art*, New York, January 1992.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Serge Guilbaut, Canadian art historian.

⁴³ Zhu Naizheng (1935-), Chinese artist.

⁴⁴ Zheng Shengtian, "Interview with Zhu Naizheng," *Yishu: Journal of Contemporary Chinese Art*, March 2007, 71.

⁴⁵ Norman Klein, "Underneath the Wave: New Art by Chinese Artists," *Fine Art*, New York, January 1992.