

Fifty Years of Modern China: An International Journal of History and Social Science

Modern China

1–14

© The Author(s) 2024



Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/00977004241247275

journals.sagepub.com/home/mcx

Philip C. C. Huang^{1,2}
and Kathryn Bernhardt²

Abstract

Looking back at the past half-century since the founding of the journal *Modern China* in 1975, we can see that in the beginning non-Chinese American scholars accounted for fully 73 percent of all articles. That figure remained at a fairly high 64 percent at the end of the century, but has declined greatly since, first down to 26 percent by 2005–2009, and further to just 11 percent in 2020–2022. That decline has been partly countered by the increasing numbers of Chinese-origin scholars (US citizens or not) based in the United States. At the same time, the proportion of articles published by mainland China-based scholars has steadily increased in the past two decades, reaching the present 28 percent. If we add to that articles by Chinese-origin scholars both inside and outside the United States, citizens or not, the total proportion rises to 65 percent, nearly two-thirds of all our articles, a sea change for the journal. Alongside that change, there has been the rise and expansion also of non-Chinese-origin scholars in the rest of the English-language world outside the United States, who now account for 24 percent of all our articles. Together these changes tell about the dramatic transnationalization of English language-based China studies as a whole, from mainly non-Chinese-origin American scholars to an ever-increasing proportion of Chinese-origin scholars, and from mainly a US endeavor to an ever more transnational one.

¹Institute for Advanced Historical and Social Research, Beijing, China

²History Department, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Corresponding Author:

Philip C. C. Huang, 332 Grenola Street, Pacific Palisades, CA 90272, USA.

Email: huang@history.ucla.edu

Keywords

non-Chinese-origin American scholars, Chinese-origin scholars in the US, mainland Chinese scholars, Chinese-origin scholars outside the US, main issues discussed in the journal, future directions

Modern China, founded in 1975, began as an alternative journal to *The China Quarterly*. Ours was funded and published by private American enterprise (Sage Publications), in contrast to the US government's Central Intelligence Agency funding (through the "Congress for Cultural Freedom") for *The China Quarterly*. Our academic focus was mainly on Chinese history and society, drawing on the disciplines of history, sociology, anthropology, and literature, unlike *The China Quarterly*, which in its early years drew mainly on the discipline of political science and concentrated on contemporary affairs and policy issues. The latter studies, under the climate of Sino-American relations of the time, could not avoid a certain amount of ideological influence. *Modern China*, by contrast, was intended from the very start to be an alternative and corrective to what we saw as the excessively political nature of *The China Quarterly*. We wished to call more attention to Chinese history, society, and economy and to the people and popular movements, as opposed to policy-making issues of the United States.

The China Quarterly and *Modern China* would remain the two principal English-language journals on modern and contemporary China until the 1990s, when other major journals entered the scene (such as *The China Journal*, *Journal of Contemporary China*, *Twentieth-Century China*, and so on) along with the growing global importance of China and the continued expansion of English language-based Chinese studies. Even so, *Modern China* reflects to a considerable degree the overall changes in the field as a whole.

Modern China would expand in 2009 from four issues a year to six, and further to publish a series of eight expanded issues from September 2021 until November 2022 to absorb a backlog of accepted articles of one to two years. As for our publisher Sage Publications, it has grown from just a small number of journals in the early years to more than 1,000 journals today.

Special Emphases of *Modern China*

The emphases and subject matter orientation of *Modern China* in its early years are perhaps best evidenced in the series of special symposia that the journal organized, some of which extended over several issues. Those included such topics as "The Rural Revolution" (1975.2, 1975.3), "The 1911 Revolution" (1976.2), "Literature and Revolution" (1976.3), "Mao and

Marx” (1976.4, 1977.1, 1977.2, 1977.4), “Taiwan Society and Economy” (1979.3), “Political Economy and Popular Movements in Ming-Qing and Republican China” (1980.1, 1980.2, 1980.3), “Syncretic Sects in Chinese Society” (1982.3, 1982.4), “Peasant Rebellions in China” (1983.3), “The Making of the Chinese Working Class” (1983.4), and “Family Life in Traditional China” (1984.4). Those special issues reflected especially the rising wave of the “new social history” of the time, wherein the emphasis was on how the “little” people lived the big changes. Also, given the “Cold War” ideology of the time, special effort was made to analyze and evaluate the Chinese revolution on its own terms, to see it not as “an aberration” of history but as the culmination of longstanding processes and developments.

In those beginning years, special efforts were also made to introduce readers to non-Western scholarship, conveying early on an intent for a more transnationalized Chinese studies, anticipating the larger trends to come. We encouraged attention especially to mainland Chinese and Japanese scholarship by soliciting and translating articles by leading mainland China-based scholars, as well as by publishing a host of articles to introduce, summarize, discuss, or translate major subfields of Japanese scholarship on China. These early efforts both anticipated and participated in the opening of scholarly exchanges between the United States and China in the 1980s—developments that would in time fundamentally alter the structure of Chinese studies in the United States.

It should also be noted here that from the outset, *Modern China* was intended to be a journal of both history and social science, as its subtitle indicates (“International Journal of History and Social Science”). In the early years (1975-1979), the articles published were divided nearly equally between those from historians (53 percent) and those from all other disciplines combined (47 percent). Over time, as the China field developed and deepened both in the United States and elsewhere, especially in the nonhistory disciplines (political science, sociology, anthropology, economics, literature, and so on), the proportion of published articles from historians has dropped to roughly one-third and the proportion from nonhistory China scholars has risen to two-thirds.

From a Primarily US-Based Journal to a Transnational Journal

After its founding, *Modern China* remained for some years principally a US-based journal, drawing the majority of its articles from US-based non-Chinese-origin scholars, as shown in our tabulation of all articles published in the fifty years of the journal (see Table 1). In the beginning, nearly

three-quarters of all articles came from non-Chinese US-based scholars. That state of affairs was directly related to the fact that the United States was the first among Western nations to systematically promote modern and contemporary China studies.

Those numbers have, however, fallen quite dramatically over the past half-century, from the high of 73 percent of all articles in 1975-1979 to still 64 percent at the end of the century, but then declining rapidly to 26 percent in 2005-2009, further to 16 percent in 2015-2019, and then to a mere 11 percent in 2020-2022, as shown in Table 1, our tally of all articles published in *Modern China* in five-year blocks down to 2022. That is perhaps the most dramatic and concrete illustration of the transnationalization of the profession of English-language China studies as reflected in the journal *Modern China*.

The contraction in the proportion of China scholars in the United States who are non-Chinese has been countered to a significant extent by the expansion in the numbers of China scholars who are of Chinese origin, whether US citizens or not, the first being the small number of leading scholars who had come to study in the United States during China's Republican period, then the somewhat larger numbers of Chinese students who came not from the new People's Republic of China but rather via or from Hong Kong or Taiwan, and finally, after the establishment of exchange relations between the United States and the PRC in the early 1980s, the increasing numbers from mainland China itself. Of the latter, many had come to the United States first for advanced degrees in China or China-related disciplinary studies. Quite a few remained in the United States to teach after they obtained their degrees. Profession-wide, they helped make up for part of the decline in numbers and proportion occupied by non-Chinese American scholars, and also tell importantly about one form of the growing transnationalization of modern and contemporary China studies in the United States.

The steady expansion in the number of US-based Chinese contributors to *Modern China* after the turn of the century has helped to reverse to some extent the long-term trend of a sharp decline in the proportion occupied by US-based non-Chinese contributors. As shown in Table 1, the proportion of articles from the two groups together leveled off after the turn of the century at 53 percent in 2005-2009, but has been declining further in the past decade against the expansions of our other groups of contributors, down to just 23 percent today. *Modern China* has become no longer a principally US-based journal.

One rather surprising change has come from the steady expansion during the past twenty-odd years in our category of "mainland China-based Chinese scholars" writing in English. These authors are mainly PRC-based Chinese

Table 1. The Transnationalization of English-Language Chinese Studies, Seen through Changes in the Authors of Articles in *Modern China*, 1975 to 2022^a.

Issue No. and Total No. of Articles	US-Based Non-Chinese	US-Based Chinese ^b	Mainland China-Based Chinese	Chinese Authors Outside the United States and China ^c	Non-Chinese Authors Outside the United States and China ^d	Ratio of Non-Chinese US Authors to All Others
1975-1979						
89	65	8	1	0	15	73%:27%
1980-1984						
86	55	7	7 ^e	2	15 ^f	64%:36%
1985-1989						
80	51	10	4	2	13	64%:36%
1990-1994						
80	41	18	0	7	14	51%:49%
1995-1999						
80	51	10	4	2	13	64%:36%
2000-2004						
73	26	19	3	21	4	36%:64%
2005-2009 ^g						
90	23	25	8	17	17	26%:74%
2010-2014						
112	29	27	18	19	19	26%:74%
2015-2019						
100	16	23	18	19	24	16%:84%
2020-2022						
92 ^h	10 (11%)	11 (12%)	26 (28%)	23 (25%)	22 (24%)	11%:89%

Notes:

^aFor multi-authored articles, only the first named author is tallied.

^bIncludes US citizens as well as noncitizens.

^cIncludes PRC citizens and non-citizens in Hong Kong, Macau, Singapore, Taiwan, Southeast Asia, Europe, and so on.

^dAll other countries and places with sizable numbers of non-Chinese China scholars, such as Britain, Canada, Australia, Germany, the Netherlands, Israel, and so on.

^eSpecial efforts were made to invite and translate contributions from major mainland Chinese scholars.

^fSpecial efforts were made to develop articles that introduced or translated Japanese scholarship.

^gFrom 2009.1 on, *Modern China* switched from four issues per year to six issues.

^hEight special enlarged issues of six to eight articles each were published from 2021.5 to 2022.6 to absorb a backlog of accepted articles. The total number of articles published in the three years 2020-2022 thus approximates the number published in the five-year periods.

scholars who have studied abroad, at first mainly in the United States but in time increasingly also in Britain, Canada, Australia, Germany, and so on. They are PRC-origin China scholars who are able to write professional articles in English. To be sure, considerable numbers have remained abroad and taken academic positions abroad after completing their studies, but in recent years increasing numbers have returned to mainland China to take up teaching positions there.

The national Chinese policy of “linking up with the international” 与国际接轨 has led today, rather surprisingly, to a bureaucratized system in which foreign standards and foreign publications have been ranked above domestic ones in point counts for academic advancement. This has been perhaps most striking in the vogue field of imported American-style neoclassical economics studies (mainly of the Chinese economy). For example, a single article in the *American Economic Review* (and six other similar type journals) has been determined by the education bureaucrats involved, almost unbelievably, to be worth 20 points, compared to just 4 points for an article in China’s own two “top” journals—*Social Sciences in China* 中国社会科学 and *Economic Research Journal* 经济研究—such that it takes five of the latter to equal in “value” just one article of the former.¹ That kind of evaluation system of Chinese scholarship has been an important force propelling more PRC-based Chinese scholars to publish in English-language China studies journals abroad,² contributing almost fortuitously to the growing transnationalization of English-language Chinese studies.

There are now also substantial numbers of PRC scholars who, for similar considerations, have either arranged to have their writings translated into English—something that has in fact been systematically encouraged by leading Chinese educational institutions, many of which actually provide translation services or funding for that purpose for their faculty members—or else join with a (often younger) colleague trained abroad to write in English. The practice has been encouraged in part by the bureaucratic system giving differential point count values to differently ranked journals in personnel advancement reviews.

The expansion of representation in the published English-language China studies from both of the above sources has been most dramatic in the past 15 years or so, as shown in Table 1. “Mainland China-based Chinese scholars” have come in the decade of the 2010s to account at first for 17 percent of all articles in *Modern China*, then rising further to 28 percent of all articles published 2020 to 2022 (years that included the eight specially enlarged issues), the largest of all our categories of authors for those years.

Outside of scholars based on the mainland, there had come by the turn of the century the steady expansion of Chinese scholars trained abroad who occupy the rapidly expanding teaching positions in Chinese studies in such places as Hong Kong, Macau, and Singapore and also such English-language countries as Canada, Britain, and Australia, as well as the Netherlands and Germany, where advanced degrees can be earned in English. Together, non-US and non-mainland China-based Chinese scholars have come to account for 25 percent of all articles in *Modern China*.

If we add together all Chinese-origin scholars engaged in English-language modern and contemporary China studies, they have today reached a majority of nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of all articles in *Modern China*. That undoubtedly represents a change of profound implications for the entire profession.

Even so, we need to consider the fact that the number of non-Chinese-origin China scholars has also grown quite rapidly in the English-language areas outside of the United States. Today, they have come to account for 24 percent of *Modern China's* articles, well exceeding the 11 percent by non-Chinese American scholars. That too tells importantly about the growing transnationalization and globalization of English-language China studies.

To be sure, these data of *Modern China* may be in advance of some other English-language China studies journals, but the overall tendencies reflected should be quite representative over the longer term. Put simply, English-language China studies is no longer like that in the last century, when it was mainly an American endeavor, but has rather become a highly transnationalized and globalized profession.

Modern China and the Transnationalization of Chinese Studies

Modern China has both represented and to some degree perhaps also anticipated the new trends. We featured in the 1990s a series of symposia addressing what we termed a “paradigmatic crisis in Chinese studies,” in which old conceptual frameworks, mostly based on mainstream Western theorizing of Western experiences, were shown to be inadequate for understanding China, and in which Chinese experiences were shown to be “paradoxical” when viewed in terms only of the example of the West and its theorizing. To understand China, it is clear that new modes of analysis must be formulated. The symposia thus called for a thorough reexamination of the underlying assumptions of past conceptual frameworks and for a search for new ones to replace them.

We began with Philip Huang’s “The Paradigmatic Crisis in Chinese Studies: Paradoxes in Social and Economic History” (1991.3), which was based on further reflections following his two books—*The Peasant Economy and Social Change in North China* and *The Peasant Family and Rural Development in the Yangzi Delta*—which drew a great deal of attention in China and also in the United States (though not to the same degree). We followed it with four symposia centering around the issue of a “paradigmatic crisis” in Chinese studies: “Ideology and Theory in the Study of Modern Chinese Literature: Paradigmatic Issues in Chinese Studies, II” (1993.1);

“‘Public Sphere’ / ‘Civil Society’ in China? Paradigmatic Issues in Chinese Studies, III” (1993.2); “Rethinking the Chinese Revolution: Paradigmatic Issues in Chinese Studies, IV” (1995.1); and “Theory and Practice in the Study of Modern Chinese History: Paradigmatic Issues in Chinese Studies, V” (1998.2).

Among the topics considered were the interrelated constructs of “public sphere” and “civil society,” perhaps the most influential and important “theoretical” formulations of the time. They drew from complex Western experiences to present a one-sidedly idealized theorization to postulate that similar tendencies toward democracy would or should be found in post-Communist Russia and Eastern Europe. Those constructions had the incredible impact of actually helping to cause most of the countries involved to follow of their own accord a course of reform and change that would turn out to be very much misguided, leaving them in prolonged periods of disorganization and stagnation.

In *Modern China*’s symposium on this issue, the articles addressed the question of the applicability of those constructs to China both in the late Qing-Republican Period and in the Reform era. Within there was a range of opinion, with some authors finding in the late Qing/Republican period evidence of the development of at least a “public sphere” if not a full-fledged “civil society” and other authors arguing that the application of those concepts to China violated a complex and quite different reality.

Those constructs became quite influential also in Reform China of the 1990s, with some scholars professing to find possibly similar tendencies toward the development of Western-style democracy within China, perhaps most concretely and directly expressed, for example, in research on Chinese commercial associations of late Qing and Republican China, to identify therein tendencies toward democratic developments along Western lines. From the very beginning, we in *Modern China* have expressed deep reservations about the uncritical application of such Western theories to the Chinese experience.

Another focus of the paradigmatic crisis series was the theme of the Chinese revolution. In the symposium on “Rethinking the Chinese Revolution,” Mark Selden recounts the background context of his 1971 book *The Yanan [Yan’an] Way in Revolutionary China* (Harvard University Press), which departed from the previous focus on the Communist Party’s (top-down) “organization” of the people and which focused instead on the reasons why the people supported and actively participated in the revolution. This was followed by Joseph Esherick’s initiative to broaden the concept of “the Chinese Revolution” from the narrow victory of 1949 to an analysis of its origins and subsequent (post-1949) revolutionary measures. Also in

the symposium is an article by French historian Edward Berenson on the development of the academic research on the French Revolution, which has over time shifted from focusing on events to a more extreme and "cultural" approach—he advocates a balance between the two, an approach that would also be most fitting for the Chinese revolution. The final article, by Philip Huang, is an examination of the tension and complex relationship between the simplistic constructions of revolutionary ideology and China's objective socioeconomic reality.

Continuing with the issue of the applicability of Western constructs to Chinese realities, we then organized seven rounds of focused discussion in "Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars," published both in English in *Modern China* and in Chinese in collaboration with the new distinguished Chinese journal *Open Times* (Kaifang shidai 开放时代): "The Nature of the Chinese State: Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars, I" (2008.1); "Whither Chinese Reforms? Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars, II" (2009.4); "Constitutionalism, Reform, and the Nature of the Chinese State: Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars, III" (2010.1); "Chongqing: China's New Experiment—Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars, IV" (2011.6); "State Capitalism or Socialist Market Economy?"—Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars, V" (2012.6); "Development Planning in Present-Day China—System, Process, and Mechanism: Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars, VI" (2013.6); and, finally, "The Basis for the Legitimacy of the Chinese Political System: Whence and Whither? Dialogues among Western and Chinese Scholars, VII" (2014.2). The dialogues included not just US- and China-based scholars, but also international scholars from outside the United States and mainland China, including the United Kingdom, Germany, Hungary, and Hong Kong. These may be seen as the growing maturity of transnational Chinese studies, which was no longer content to employ only theoretical constructions from the West.

Unlike the purely theoretical constructs some of us have suggested, actual practices tend to reflect not just subjective construction but the interactions of the subjective and the objective, and are therefore more telling about real, emergent new tendencies that ideology or theory cannot reveal. We have therefore come to call for a deliberate "social science of practice" to focus on explorations of the interactions between the subjective and the objective, Western theory and Chinese realities, and discourse and practice.

A number of us suggested that the heart of the future of China scholarship is not to be found in either just US perspectives or just Chinese perspectives, but through ongoing, creative, and mutually instructive dialogues between the two as well as among other international scholars, all within the larger

new transnational framework of Chinese studies. *Modern China* had begun mainly with US China scholars, but its future was to be in continual dialogue and interchange between US and mainland Chinese scholars, as well as among a still larger framework of global China scholars, and also not just within English language-based China scholarship but also transnational and transregional Chinese scholarship, whether in English or Chinese.

In the “dialogue” series, some theorists highlighted especially how different China’s process of transition from empire to nation was from the West’s: it did not entail a break between the pre-modern and modern, but rather evinced striking continuity, both in spatial expanse as well as in the “five ethnicities in one” composition. Others focused on the differences of China’s new Reform-era market economy from the Western pattern of simply “market plus private ownership,” as well as its differences from the failed post-Soviet Russian and East European transition, including a suggestion that it has been more akin to Western Europe’s “post-capitalist” Swedish and German experiences. However, others also argued that such (neither capitalist nor socialist) “third ways,” past or present, including the experience of China’s “Chongqing experiment,” are of questionable sustainability.

Yet, whether one calls China’s current economic system a “socialist market economy” or “state capitalism” or some other name to indicate its mixed nature, the participants in the “Dialogue” symposia on the economy were all in agreement that the state continued (and continues) to play a pivotal role in the economy during the Reform era. Some emphasized the continued importance of state-owned enterprises as key drivers of economic growth. And others emphasized the continued importance of state development planning, which, though no longer “commandist” as in the past, still performs critical coordinative and service-oriented functions.

With respect to Western-style constitutional government, to be sure, numerous Chinese scholars believe the American model to be the best for China to imitate, but two of our participants (Jiang Shigong and Larry Backer) have pointed instead to the model that resembles in its structure more the British one, in which one can distinguish between a formal written constitution and an “unwritten constitution.” China, they argue, has shown a path more akin to the latter, with both a formal constitution promulgated by the National People’s Congress that applies to the Chinese government and its laws and the party-constitution of the Chinese Communist Party that serves the purpose in effect of an unwritten constitution. The former applies to the exercise of formal government, the latter to the moral visions and ideals of the substantive party. The personnel of the former come mainly from the law schools, and the personnel of the latter from the party schools. Perhaps, they suggest, we can see China’s model as a combination of the two components,

in which the final mode of operation has yet to be fixed. That effort to find parallel but different structures, rather than simple imitative copying, was another way to suggest equivalence with the West while also finding subjectivity for China.

A few of us came to suggest, in the above dialogues and multiple subsequent articles in *Modern China*, that very different conceptual frameworks are needed to grasp China's actual practices. We suggested, for example, the notion of a "third sphere" between state and society, operative both in historical and contemporary China, in which state and society exist not in a binary mode of mutually exclusive dualistic opposition, as is postulated in much of mainstream Western social science, but rather in a mode of dyadic interaction. State and society, we suggest, need to be conceptualized as something in which the two are interactive and mutually defining. While modern and contemporary China, under the duress of invasion and revolution, had sometimes veered off that path toward simplistic extremes of one side or the other, the more traditional past over the *longue durée*, as well as the present and future, point to a more creative kind of continual interaction not just between state and society but also between Confucianism and Legalism, agricultural and steppes China, Chinese tradition and the modern West, socialism and market economy, formalist government and substantivist party, and so on, in a pattern of thinking more akin to the natural and biological sciences (including medicine) than to the Newtonian physical and mechanical universe.

Looking to the Future

For the future, our suggestion is that we continue to look to the transnational pursuit of China research, whether in English or in Chinese, via a model not of simply copying the modern West, but rather of continual dialogue and interaction between China and the West, with the prospects for new and different kinds of views based not so much on either/or dualistic oppositions between China and the West, but rather of creative dyadic interactions consistent with the transnational present and future. We hope to anticipate or even lead in helping to focus attention on new questions and challenges for the Chinese studies field as a whole.

For the immediate future, we have begun with plans for three new special issues. First is the area of gender studies. Over the years, the journal has published a substantial number of articles in gender studies, reflecting not only the growing importance of that subfield but also the ever-increasing numbers of women in China studies, but it has not yet published a symposium on the subject. We hope to organize such a symposium, one that would bring together the increasing numbers of Chinese scholars of this field with older,

established Western scholars to explore not only issues that are of common concern to both but also their differences, in the hopes of generating new questions and formulations for both.

Another is the complex relationship between Western economics theory and Chinese realities. One dimension is the surprising hegemony that neoliberal economics has already established in China, exceeding in institutionalized power even that enjoyed in its source country of the United States, having been incorporated into the reified bureaucratic academic evaluation system (Huang, 2024). At the same time, however, we can readily see some major advances and challenges to that hegemony in substantive economic research studies within China, both those that share common concerns with alternative formulations in the West and those that have revealed distinctive Chinese features of development that go beyond past perspectives. This issue has been a major concern of *Modern China's* in the past decade and a half, and has received focused attention from a four-year dialogue between Philip Huang and Zhou Li-an in a large published volume (Huang Zongzhi and Zhou Li-an, 2023). It will receive still wider and deeper attention in the years to come.

A third special issue, or series of special issues, might be to take systematic account of “the social science of practice” path of research that some of us have followed for quite a number of years. It has sought to join, and transcend, the binary between the subjective and the objective by focusing on practice that results from their interaction. In a transitional China, we suggest, “practice” can be the most telling of new directions of change, consistent with the “Reform” era and its motto of “feeling for stones while crossing the river.” It can help us see beyond the opposed either/or dualism of the subjective and the objective, the Western and the Chinese.

Yet, what will that kind of syncretic approach bring over the long term remains an open question. Might it be akin to the Confucianism + Legalism dyad 阳儒阴法 that emerged with the Han, combining and synthesizing the two into a single legal system? Or might the combination be more akin to that of a balanced coexistence of an agricultural China with a steppes China, into a coexisting dyadic China rather than an either/or mutually opposed dualism, similar to, for example, the adoption of the Western Newtonian and mechanical worldview, complete with the pre-eminence of a Euclidian and mechanistic view, for the purpose of mechanization, while retaining also the more traditional Chinese view based on the organic and human universes? The relationship between the two could become akin to the present coexistence of certain (modern) Western and (premodern) Chinese knowledge systems, as, for example, Western and Chinese medicine, interacting and cross-fertilizing, yet also remaining distinct and separate.

Modern China has given sustained attention to these issues for the past decade and a half, and there is now a full-length monograph giving focused attention to the subject (Huang, 2023). It will continue to receive still broader and deeper attention in the years to come.

For the future, our suggestion, then, is to continue to move toward transnational China research, whether in English or Chinese, to emphasize trans-cultural interactions and exchanges, in search not of any simplistic China versus the West, either/or dualistic oppositions, but rather innovative interactions and unities. We believe that, within the large trend of the growing maturity of Chinese social sciences, the future will display not merely the persistence of certain Chinese “indigenous resources” or perspectives, but even more, tendencies that synthesize and go beyond what are now separately Chinese and Western, pointing to new concerns and orientations that will see beyond both.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. For more details, see Philip Huang’s short comment article “Whither Economics in China?” (Huang, 2024).
2. The Chinese government has in recent years tried to encourage scholars to give greater priority to Chinese journals, but to little or no real effect because the system of relative rankings of American compared to Chinese journals has remained in place.

References

- HUANG, PHILIP C. C. (2024) “Whither economics in China? A comment on Professor Jia Genliang’s ‘Reflections on economics education in China and suggestions for its reform.’” *Modern China* 50, 1 (Jan.): 33-40.
- HUANG ZONGZHI 黄宗智 [Philip C. C. Huang] (2023) *实践社会科学的方法、理论与前瞻* (The social science of practice: method, theory, and prospective vision). 桂林: 广西师范大学出版社.
- HUANG ZONGZHI 黄宗智 and ZHOU LI-AN 周黎安 (2023) *实践社会科学: 黄宗智对话周黎安* (The social science of practice: a dialogue between Huang Zongzhi and Zhou Li-an). 桂林: 广西师范大学出版社.

Author Biographies

Philip C. C. Huang is completing the writing, proof-reading, and re-checking of his thirteen-volume “collected works,” in Chinese, from the Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe. First are four volumes on Chinese justice from the Qing to the present and four volumes on the Chinese peasant economy from the Ming-Qing to the present. There is a separate volume on the rise of the “informal economy” (i.e., without the protections and benefits under the formal economy of the past) in China, now accounting for 75 percent of all of the urban-employed. There are three theoretical-methodological volumes from his writings in the past twenty years, separately on “experience and theory,” “practice and theory,” and “the social science of practice.” There is also a fourth volume, on “the dyadic unity of state and society.” Six of the above volumes have been published; hopefully, all volumes will be out by 2024.

Kathryn Bernhardt is professor emerita at the Department of History, UCLA. She is the author of *Rents, Taxes, and Peasant Resistance: The Lower Yangzi Region, 1840-1950* and *Women and Property in China, 960-1949*, both from Stanford University Press. The Chinese versions of the two books are scheduled for re-publication by the Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe.