

The Universities Service Centre for China Studies – Present at the Creation

Jerome A. Cohen^{*}

For the benefit of our “revolutionary successors”, I submit this brief memoir on the origins of the Universities Service Centre for China Studies (USC or the Centre), on behalf of the handful of scholars who were its first beneficiaries. I regret that I cannot be with you in person but am confident that my distinguished colleague and friend, Professor Ezra Vogel, who was also “present at the creation”, can convey more of the atmosphere, aspirations and achievements associated with the Centre’s establishment and our early attempts to analyze developments in the “new China.”

SETTLING INTO COLONIAL HONG KONG BEFORE THERE WAS A CENTRE TO HELP

First, a few paragraphs about the mundane challenges that Hong Kong presented to most itinerant academics in that distant era. In the summer of 1963, without an organization such as the USC to offer assistance, it was difficult for a visiting scholar to set up shop in Hong Kong for a family of five and to find a place to carry out research on China. The fact that my area of interest was the Mainland’s criminal justice system, even then a very politically sensitive topic, did not make it any easier.

Housing was plainly the most urgent requirement. We had no one to help us. I was a young American law school professor and had hoped to develop an academic affiliation for the year but at that time no Hong Kong university had established a law school. We were on our own. I had heard that the Carnegie Corporation in New York was about to open a facility in Kowloon near the airport to provide offices and a research library on contemporary China for visiting academics like me, but it reportedly had some difficulties getting established and, to my disappointment, was not yet open.

In order to keep our three energetic boys pacified and busy while I went scouting for an apartment, we stayed at the rather elegant Repulse Bay Hotel out on Hong Kong island instead of, more conveniently, in the island’s central district or in Kowloon. Initially our prospects for finding suitable housing seemed grim.

I was fortunate, however, in soon connecting with Ezra Vogel, a young Harvard sociologist specializing in Chinese and Japanese studies who was also preparing to spend the year researching in Hong Kong with his wife and children. Ezra was roughly my age and a friendly person, and he told us that they had found an apartment in a rather newly-developed area called Yao Yat Chun near the Boundary St. dividing line between Kowloon and the New Territories. We were lucky enough to

^{*} Jerome A. Cohen, adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, is professor of law at NYU and faculty director of its US-Asia Law Institute. Draft, January 2015.

find a similar ground floor apartment almost across the street. The area was pleasant and featured low residential buildings rather than high rises, and the residents seemed to be mostly local, middle class Cantonese, some of whom spoke English, with a mix of a few foreigners.

The problem with the location, we discovered, was that it was remote from Hong Kong island, where most of the diplomats, British and American officials, foreign journalists and Chinese and Western international business people made their homes. We did not have a car, public transport in our area was limited, and taxis were not easy to come by. Moreover, unlike today, no tunnels or bridges linked Kowloon and the island. We had to rely on public ferries to cross the harbor between them, which was colorful but inconvenient.

Having secured a place to live, we set out to find household help and through new friends on the island were introduced to a Shanghai couple. Xu proved to be a good cook who spoke some English, and his wife Wu, who spoke no English, handled the cleaning, the children and other chores with unfailing competence and good nature. We liked them very much and managed most of our communications in Mandarin.

The next challenge was to take care of the children's education. Our eldest, Peter, already six and a half, was able to enroll in a good government school in Kowloon. But Seth was only four and Ethan two and a half and just beginning to talk. One day spent in a local Chinese pre-kindergarten, where Cantonese – a language unknown to all of us – was spoken, convinced us we had to find something more international. Happily, my wife, Joan Lebold Cohen, heard that a British army wife, a Mrs. Foster, ran an informal school out of her apartment on a nearby Kowloon street, but no one recalled the address. Joan managed to find the place by watching where parents and private taxis dropped off children in the morning. Mrs. Foster ran a taut ship but the children loved it for the entire school year.

REFUGEE INTERVIEWING

With a roof over our heads and the children taken care of both at school and afterward, Joan and I began to focus on our own interests. She found a stimulating, if bewildering, opportunity to teach English to young Chinese refugee children. They lived nearby in a bare seven-storey housing development, one of many that had been newly-constructed for the flood of Mainland families that had recently descended upon Hong Kong in the wake of the starvation resulting from the failure of the "Great Leap Forward". Although their living conditions were miserable, they knew they were better off than the large numbers who were still patiently camping out in shabby shacks without running water or proper toilets on neighboring hillsides.

My own work also involved Chinese refugees, but very special ones. I had decided to do a book on criminal justice in China. I had served as a federal prosecutor in Washington, D.C. before entering teaching, and had taught criminal law, among other subjects, during my first year as a teacher at Boalt Hall, the University of California at Berkeley. Moreover, criminal justice materials relating to China were more ample than other contemporary Chinese legal materials. So the criminal process seemed a good topic with which to begin my research on Communist Chinese law. Yet the published materials were far from sufficient. Indeed, China in 1963, fourteen

years after establishment of the People's Republic, still had very little published legislation. Nor did it publish court decisions, and there was very little Chinese scholarly commentary on contemporary law, either in books or law review articles.

My Berkeley colleague, the brilliant sociologist Franz Schurmann, had convinced me that, in these circumstances, if one wanted to understand how the legal system worked as a system, it would be indispensable to resort to interviewing Chinese refugees, and that is what I determined to do during my year in Hong Kong. I decided that I needed to interview three categories of refugees.

The first, and easiest to locate, consisted of ordinary citizens who had had no specific contact with the criminal justice system. They could help me understand contemporary Chinese society, popular attitudes toward law and their own perception of the roles played by the legal system and whatever seemed to substitute for a formal legal system under a government that was not emphasizing legal formalities.

The second category of interviewees I sought consisted of those who had actual experience as targets of the criminal process – the accused. I interpreted my task to include all those who had been punished by the regime, whether or not the sanction imposed was formally labeled “criminal”. Plainly this included those who had been subjected to “reeducation through labor” (laodong jiaoyang) or other supposedly “non-criminal” sanctions that possessed a variety of names for what was all too obviously some form of incarceration.

The third category, the most important and hardest to find, was composed of those who took part in the administration of criminal justice, broadly construed. I needed to meet police, prosecutors, judges, other relevant officials and, to the extent they were participants in the process, lawyers. This was a tall order, especially for an American academic with few Hong Kong connections who did not speak Cantonese - the local dialect - and whose command of Mandarin was a work in progress. There was no Universities Service Centre to smooth my way with appropriate introductions either directly to interviewees or to those who might introduce them.

But my timing was good. I arrived in Hong Kong in early August 1963. In the spring of 1962, for a period of about six weeks, the PRC had suddenly let down the barriers that had made it difficult for Chinese to reach Hong Kong without official PRC permission. This enabled roughly 60,000 people who, in an effort to escape the starvation and other miseries brought on by the Great Leap Forward, had been massing near Hong Kong's border with Guangdong Province to enter the Colony with the acquiescence, if not the authorization, of the British government. Many more would have joined them had not the Colony closed the border to prevent utter inundation by the refugee wave that had overwhelmed its facilities.

Although most of these newcomers were rural people of lesser immediate interest to my project, by the time that I arrived many of the articulate, educated, urban members of the group had begun to assimilate and become known in Hong Kong. As I cast my net in the official, academic and business communities, I gradually began to meet intelligent newcomers who could explain life in China and where law seemed to fit in. They in turn sometimes introduced me to others who were of greater interest, such as those who had been targets of the system.

Among the most interesting and pathetic in this second category of informants were those who had been condemned to long periods of “reeducation through labor” (RETL), usually enforced confinement, often in rural labor camps, that in practice was indistinguishable from the criminal punishment called “reform through labor” (laodong gaizao). Indeed, in that era, members of the two groups were frequently confined together.

Many of the offenders who had received RETL had been declared “rightists” in 1957-58 during the infamous “anti-rightist” campaign that followed the campaign to “let a hundred flowers bloom, let a hundred schools contend” that had seduced them into openly expressing their criticisms of the Communist government. Listening to their sad tales of how their personal and professional lives had been ruined when Communist Party and police officials imposed RETL, without regard for either freedom of speech or fair procedures for defending themselves against unjust charges, was a sobering exercise.

Those who administered the criminal justice system were much harder to find, but, when I discovered one, it was a veritable treasure trove. The first of such invaluable informants was introduced to me by American officials working at the United States Consulate General. It was their job to interview refugees in an effort to learn what was going on in China, from which Americans and their government were still excluded. Although the United Kingdom did have restricted diplomatic access to China through its embassy in Beijing, it too maintained a major official interviewing program in Hong Kong, where contacts with residents were much freer than in the Mainland.

INVALUABLE FORMER PUBLIC SECURITY OFFICERS

British and American officials often shared especially informative refugees, and, if memory serves, “Eddie” Chan (Chan Chungman in Cantonese) may have first been discovered by the Brits. He proved to be a wonderful resource. Not only had he served as a young police officer in the Guangzhou municipal public security bureau during the early 1950s but he also became a target of the system in the mid-1950s and was briefly sent to a labor camp for a punishment that was the immediate predecessor to what, beginning 1957, became known as RETL.

Eddie had been born and brought up in Hong Kong by a Communist mother during the years Chiang Kaishek ruled the Mainland. His parents had separated and his father served in Chiang’s military. When the Communists succeeded in “liberating” the country in 1949, his father left the Mainland, and Eddie, then 17, and his mother moved to Guangzhou, where, despite his youth, he landed a job with the police. He eventually was assigned to a unit responsible for investigating and supervising religious organizations. By 1955, however, growing doubts about the nature of his work led him to act in ways that made him suspect to his superiors. The last straw for the security apparatus apparently was their discovery of the manuscript for a novel Eddie had written about a Chinese soldier who married a Korean woman during China’s involvement in the 1950-53 conflict with America in Korea. Eddie swam from Guangdong to Hong Kong, making a dangerous exit before the mass exodus of 1962.

Despite the fact that Eddie had never attended college, I found him to be a wonderful person to talk with. He was highly intelligent, evidently fair-minded and balanced in his view of the issues, and he spoke well in Mandarin. He also had an excellent, if somewhat cynical, sense of humor. He did a great deal to help me understand the early days of the PRC's public security system and the thinking of those who staffed it. I was so impressed with Eddie that I told Ezra Vogel about him and introduced him to Ezra, who found him even more helpful than I did because Ezra was engaged in a much broader study of the city of Guangzhou that was ultimately published under the title "Canton Under Communism". With Ezra's help, Eddie eventually earned an M.A. from Harvard and had a long teaching career in the United States before passing away in November of this year, an amazing story!

The only problem that I had interviewing Eddie was that I had to do it at home. At that time, early September 1963, no other place was available to me since the anticipated Carnegie facility had not yet opened. Interviewing at home was not convenient, especially in the afternoons when my children were home from school and sometimes distracting. Moreover, because tuberculosis was widespread at that time, every time one of my interviewees coughed, I worried about my children's health!

Eddie was not the only public security officer I interviewed. A British official later introduced me to one who hailed from Fuzhou, the capital of Fujian Province. Although a few years younger than Eddie, who was in his early 30's when I met him, this fellow, whom I will call Zhou, had much more recent experience in handling criminal cases than Eddie had and was extremely helpful to my research on the criminal process. He was able to speak of developments as recent as the previous year, 1962, since he had left his job only when he decided to depart for Hong Kong. Interviewing five mornings a week from 9 am to 1 pm, I totaled 120 hours with him, my all-time interview record.

Zhou was patient, indeed painstaking, in reviewing the details of every phase in the handling of every type of case then common to China's criminal process. He was neither as brilliant nor as charming and insightful as Eddie, and it took me a number of hours to get used to his strongly accented Mandarin. It seemed every "fu" was "hu" and every "hu" was "wu". But Zhou was detached, professional and highly competent. He did not volunteer long answers or unsolicited stories but was crisp and responsive and occasionally came through with a remark that was memorable.

In 1963, because China had not yet promulgated a criminal code, one of the topics of great interest to me was to determine what conduct was deemed criminal and sufficient to warrant prosecution rather than handling by administrative or informal means. Obviously, murder, rape, arson and other major conventional offenses that plague every society were deemed criminal, and so too were the most serious political offenses that were then often included in the vague and broad term "counterrevolution". But how, in the absence of legislative guidance, was the borderline between criminal and non-criminal behavior delineated in those cases in which various societies draw the line in different places in both law and practice?

I wanted to know, for example, whether adultery was treated as a crime in the PRC and, if so, to what extent and in what circumstances it was prosecuted. In many

countries and many American states, adultery was still recognized as a crime but was seldom prosecuted. Zhou seemed a bit fuzzy in his initial response to the first question but on reflection decided that, at least in Fuzhou at that time, adultery in principle was regarded as criminal. I then pressed him about the extent to which it was actually pursued by police and prosecutors. He then said, in an utterly sober vein: "Look, if we prosecuted all the cases of adultery, we wouldn't have time for the counterrevolutionaries"!

Apart from the humor and social insight of this statement, as a former prosecutor familiar with the problem of limited resources confronting every jurisdiction's justice department, I fully understood this practical problem.

Zhou was memorable for other reasons as well, especially because he focused my attention, as no other interviewee did, on the question of my obligation to my informants. They were indispensable to my work, helping me to see how Chinese criminal justice functioned as a system. Indeed, after the Hong Kong year ended, I published an article entitled "Interviewing Chinese Refugees – Indispensable Tool for Legal Research on China". But what duty did I have toward my interviewees? This was more than an ethical or academic question for Zhou and me.

My informants needed work once our collaboration concluded, and I felt a particular obligation to try to help those with whom I spent the longest time. They had become my friends, and I could not abandon them once they had met my needs. I didn't have to worry about Eddie, who found a good opportunity with Ezra Vogel. But Zhou was different, and he wasn't easy to assist. He spoke neither Cantonese nor English, and I was his only substantial contact in Hong Kong.

Fortunately, his aspirations were realistic. He wanted a factory job. My business contacts were limited, however, but I did my best to introduce him to potential employers. Zhou, of course, interpreted my initially unsuccessful efforts in light of his Mainland experience. When I told him on one occasion that someone else got the job because the employer thought that person better qualified than Zhou, he was plainly skeptical. When, on the occasion of my next failure, I said that the successful applicant had been recommended by someone with a much closer relationship to the employer than I had, Zhou accepted that news without question. In his world, "guanxi" (connections) always trumped ability. I was much relieved when one of my few business friends finally agreed to take him on.

PETER WANG (Wang Youjin) – A JUDGE TURNED LAWYER

It had been profoundly satisfying to have the opportunity to interview two former public security officers at great length. Yet, even though China's courts were not as important as its police, I had to find at least one valuable former judge and one able lawyer to fill out my necessarily scarce category of legal professionals. I never thought that I might find a single person who could meet both needs, and the first few months of headhunting were discouraging.

I met several refugees who, having heard that I could provide "tea money" for those who could discuss judicial matters, tried to convince me that they had worked in Chinese courts before leaving for Hong Kong. But interviews quickly punctured their

stories. One man had plainly worked in local government but his attempts to describe how local courts were organized and staffed and how they operated were pathetic. Another tried to persuade me that he had actually gone to law school, but he fell apart when asked to name the courses he had studied. But not Peter Wang!

I stumbled upon Peter, whose name in Mandarin is Wang Youjin, and Ong Yew-kim in Cantonese, through a weird combination of circumstances. By November 1963 I was coming to the view that I might never find an experienced Mainland judge or lawyer in Hong Kong. Several friends who commiserated with me suggested that I should also try the Portuguese colony of Macao, then a four-hour ferry ride from Hong Kong. Chinese refugees found it much easier to enter Macao than Hong Kong because it was a much closer and less dangerous swim from the Mainland.

Macao in November 1963 was a charming, quiet continental European outpost. Its architecture reflected both Chinese and Portuguese traditions. Neither Joan nor I had ever visited Portugal and, by the time our ferry landed in Macao, we had discovered Ferreinha Lacrima Cristy in the ship's bar. Far smoother than any port wine we had previously encountered, it had quickly cured Joan's laryngitis and predisposed us to like the new and unique environment.

Friends had urged me to start my Macao search by seeking the cooperation of a well-known Catholic mission that welcomed refugees fresh out of the water. The local priests proved to be warm and understanding, but their current batch of guests contained no obvious prospects. One man, however, tried very hard to persuade me that he knew about China's courts. When I expressed skepticism, he boldly said that, if I doubted him, after returning to Hong Kong I should consult the editor of one of the Colony's many Chinese language newspapers, the Tiantian Ribao (the "Daily Paper"). He gave me the man's name and telephone number and assured me that the editor would vouch for him.

With little hope but no other options, I did call the editor on my return. To my surprise, he said that he had never heard of the Macao person who had referred me to him but that, if I wanted to meet a real Chinese legal professional, he would be glad to introduce me to someone on his staff named Wang. This was a golden moment for my work!

Peter Wang exuded credibility. He was quiet, thoughtful, careful in his judgments and expression and eager to help. He told me that, like many Southeast Asian Chinese, he had left his native Singapore in 1950 at age eighteen in order to get a free university education in the new China that had only been established the previous year. On arrival in Beijing, he was assigned to study law at the new Beijing School of Political Science and Law, which later became today's prominent China University of Political Science and Law, the training ground for so many of the government's legal cadres, past and present. When I asked him the courses he had studied at law school, without a moment's hesitation he rattled off all the right names, and I knew immediately I had a good catch.

With the aid of Soviet legal materials and some Soviet as well as Chinese instructors, Peter had received a fairly good legal education for that era. He finished law school in mid-1954, just as the PRC was publishing its first Constitution, one that

was heavily influenced by Stalin's 1936 Constitution. Upon graduation, he was assigned to work at the special Railroad Court based in Harbin, capital of Heilongjiang Province in China's industrialized Northeast. He was the only court employee who had the benefit of a formal legal education, and court officials, mostly former military men and police officers, came to rely on him for all technical legal issues.

He proved especially valuable in the court's newly-required efforts to explain the judicial system to the masses and to win their support. The PRC had just experienced five years of revolutionary tumult, violent mass political campaigns and lawlessness, in the cities as well as the countryside. The new Communist Party line increasingly emphasized stability and rule according to law rather than the cruel class struggle that was continuing but in a more minor key.

Peter told many interesting stories to illustrate the problems of legal education for the masses. In one case, for example, the court presented a carefully-scripted and rehearsed criminal trial to several hundred workers in their factory auditorium. Things went according to plan throughout the proceedings until just after the court announced the predetermined judgment and sentence. At that point, when the presiding judge informed the defendant that he was entitled to appeal (*shangsu*), the bewildered crowd laughed because, due to the judge's accent, they thought he had told the accused that he could go climb a tree (*shangshu*)!

Not long afterward, while China was still closely following the formal Soviet legal model, the country's leadership decided to introduce the role of lawyers. Many of China's pre-1949 lawyers from the Chiang Kaishek regime had fled the country or found other, less precarious work at home. In any event, the Party did not want to rely on bourgeois holdovers and decided to staff the newly-established government "legal advisory bureaus", which resembled the Soviet "colleges of advocates", with young, recently-trained talent. In 1956, at the height of Soviet legal influence in China, Peter was assigned to join one of the newest of these socialist law firms in Beijing.

That was an exciting period for law reformers. Many codes of law were drafted with Soviet assistance, including drafts of what were slated to be the PRC's first codes of criminal law and criminal procedure, and the legal advisory bureaus were expected to help experiment with and implement these Soviet-style drafts. Sadly, those drafts were never promulgated because this era of Soviet influence came to a sudden end in June 1957, when the outpouring of criticisms elicited by the Hundred Flowers Bloom campaign stunned Party leaders and led Chairman Mao to unleash the "anti-rightist" movement that ended reliance on the Soviet legal model until after Mao's death in 1976.

Because of this radical change in policy, Peter's government-sponsored law firm was promptly terminated, and, like many other legal officials, he was soon declared a "rightist". Because of his Singapore origins, however, he escaped severe mistreatment and, by 1960, was permitted to leave for Hong Kong. He hoped to return to Singapore but Prime Minister Lee Kwan Yew's government, fearful of a resurgence of the Communist influence it had just overcome in establishing its independence from British rule, refused to permit the return of any Singapore citizens under the age of forty-five who had lived in the PRC. Thus Peter had to find a way to

support himself in Hong Kong and was hired by a newspaper as a staff writer and commentator on Mainland affairs.

I interviewed Peter for a total of eighty-five hours, and he helped me understand not only the era of Soviet influence in which he had taken part but also the period that followed it. I was reluctant to halt our cooperation, and, for the rest of the year that I spent in Hong Kong, he continued to assist me in research concerning China's criminal justice system, research that eventually helped me to publish my first book in 1968 – THE CRIMINAL PROCESS IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, 1949-63: AN INTRODUCTION. (Joan said Harvard University Press would have sold more copies had I titled it "Sex, Chinese Law and You"!)

ESTABLISHING THE UNIVERSITIES SERVICE CENTRE

Peter also helped me in establishing the Universities Service Centre. That was not a task that was on my initial Hong Kong agenda. In the early 1960s, foreign scholars who chose to make Hong Kong their base for the study of a China that excluded them had few facilities available, as I have already indicated. Office space at Hong Kong University and other academic institutions was hard to come by, and their libraries had few current Chinese language research materials. It was in an effort to improve this situation that the Carnegie Corporation in New York decided to establish a research center that would welcome and assist China scholars who were coming to Hong Kong for research visits. Carnegie intended to cooperate with a local Chinese organization, the Union Research Institute(URI), which had assembled an impressive collection of Chinese language Mainland newspapers that were an invaluable resource for learning about daily life in China.

Establishing a research center on the border of what was still called Red China or Communist China was a delicate undertaking because the British colonial authorities, always concerned to avoid offending the Mainland government, were carefully scrutinizing the preparations for the USC. They kept admonishing Bob Gray, a nice New York foundation executive who was not familiar with China or Hong Kong, but who had been sent out to set up and direct the Centre, to move slowly. Actually, the Brits seemed to suspect that the Centre was going to be a CIA front for China-watching or at least that a few of its American scholars might be connected to "the Agency". Carnegie was apparently so sensitive to the British concern about China-watching that it made the name of the new organization the innocuous-sounding "Universities Service Centre" without indicating what the focus of its work would be. From the name alone, the uninformed might have mistaken the Centre for an auto repair shop! It was not until 1993 that the words "For China Studies" were added to the name.

Some of us thought that Gray seemed rather inert and too intimidated by our suspicious hosts. He rented a few temporary rooms for us in the Peninsula Court Hotel in Kowloon and hired a secretary but appeared to be taking forever to move us to the permanent quarters that had been retained near the then airport. Moreover, there was no evidence that he had begun to arrange the work space, library, research assistants, translators and other staff required by an adequate China center and to initiate cooperation with the Union Research Institute.

Somehow, perhaps through the late Professor Lucian Pye of MIT's political science department, the senior member of our small group of Western academics temporarily in Hong Kong and a veteran China hand with good foundation and U.S. government connections, word of our dissatisfaction got back to Carnegie Corporation. It decided to replace Gray with someone more accustomed to the Hong Kong political environment, but that person had yet to be selected. The problem was that this would create an administrative hiatus of at least six months. Someone already on the scene was needed to serve as interim director. Although I was relatively junior and had had no previous contacts with Carnegie, it asked me to take on the job, which I did with some reluctance.

With the aid of URI, we soon reconfirmed our pending permanent quarters on Argyle Street in Kowloon, left the Peninsula Court and moved in. Before long, the Centre began to hum. I found the URI files to be very informative when gathering materials concerning the operation of China's legal system, and the Centre proved to be a more suitable place for conducting interviews with refugees, who were not accustomed to visiting an international hotel or a foreigner's apartment.

Since, for the winter and spring of 1963-64 I served as the principal person responsible for the Centre, the Hong Kong Government showed a special, if informal, interest in my activities. I recall with some amusement, for example, a dinner party where to my surprise and pleasure my British host seated me across from the Colonial Secretary, who served as Hong Kong's de facto foreign minister and seized the apparently pre-arranged opportunity to systematically ask me about the Center, its sponsorship and my role. His attitude, in a sophisticated way, seemed to be: if you fellows are professors, why aren't you professing instead of taking so much time off to study China?

Fortunately, through a bit of luck and the international legal "mafia", I had by then developed strong connections with at least two prominent Hong Kong Government officials who vouched for my good faith and good behavior – the Chief Justice and the Solicitor General. In the spring of 1963, several months before setting out for the year in Hong Kong, I was one of several Berkeley law faculty members who were invited to dinner to meet one of England's best-known legal experts. He was stopping in the Bay Area for a few days en route home from some Hong Kong lectures and full of excitement about the Colony. When he heard that I was about to live in Hong Kong, he volunteered to introduce me to Chief Justice Michael Hogan and to Denys Roberts, the youngish Solicitor General who had looked after him during his visit. They both proved to be good friends of mine and, indirectly, of our Centre.

My family and I left Hong Kong with the greatest reluctance in late July 1964. By then, the USC's permanent leadership was in place, with Preston Schoyer, a charming and savvy American novelist with impressive administrative experience in Hong Kong, installed as director. I felt confident that, with him in charge, I could remain at ease! The rest, as the cliché goes, is history, history that I need to learn. So I eagerly look forward to Ezra Vogel's contribution and that of the other participants in what has been a notable but little-noticed story.

Jerome A. Cohen
The Universities Service Centre for China Studies – Present at the Creation
Draft, January 2015.

Jerome A. Cohen is Professor of Law and Faculty Director of the US-Asia Law Institute at New York University's School of Law. He is also Adjunct Senior Fellow for Asia at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York and Washington.