Globalization of Chinese Social Sciences

Volume 1

Commemorating the 105th Anniversary of Professor Fei Xiaotong's Birth

Edited by

Stephan Feuchtwang, Xiangqun Chang and Daming Zhou

Globalization of Chinese Social Sciences

Volume 1

Commemorating the 105th Anniversary of Professor Fei Xiaotong's Birth

Edited by

Stephan Feuchtwang, Xiangqun Chang and Daming Zhou

With Assistant Editors Nick Prendergast and Costanza Pernigotti

中国社会科学全球化：费孝通105周年诞辰纪念文集（第一卷）

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE[1]

STEPHAN FEUCHTWANG

I remember Professor Fei with fondness; I think everybody who met him probably does. He smiled a lot, with a most benign look. But he was not at all complacent. Indeed, he was critical, curious and enquiring, as you can tell from his publications up to the very last. I would go further: he had such a strong sense of his own direction that it was difficult for me to know what he was making of what I said to him on the few occasions when we met.

Outside China and China studies he is not well known, and this is not surprising since he focused so resolutely on how his sociology and anthropology could help the Chinese people. He deserves to be well known for the fact that he is probably the most committed and eventually the highest-ranked policy-influencing anthropologist ever. But he certainly also thought of himself as a contributor to the social sciences, particularly sociology and anthropology, more generally. And he did not just study China. One of the points of this volume is to explore and expound his anthropology and sociology for a wider readership.

Each chapter, and the appendix, contains what we consider to be contributions made by Fei's writings on China to a more general social science, either as a deliberately comparative concept or as a mode of analysis that can be applied elsewhere.

Fei Xiaotong's first contribution is his best-known and deliberately comparative conceptualization of the basis of Chinese social relations. It is a formulation invented by Fei, which is best left in Chinese: *chaxugeju*, two translations of which are expounded here – the differential mode of organi-

zation, and social egoism – compared and contrasted by Fei with secularized and Protestant Christian individualism. I would add, here that *chaxugeju* is also comparable as a civilizational hierarchy in contrast to Hindu caste and subcaste hierarchy, and the hierarchy of Euro-North-American industrial capitalist class and status, each with their own units of social mobility up and down the respective hierarchies, each encompassing from the top down in different ways. I hope to elaborate this comparison in a forthcoming book. In this book, apart from the various expositions of *chaxugeju*, there is also its extension and elaboration by Chang Xiangqun into a larger concept of inter-personal relations, *lishang-wanglai*, which takes into account a great many studies in China of 'face', the art of connections, and the ethics of human relatedness, besides and beyond Fei's own. This elaboration is based on Dr Chang's own restudy of Fei's Jiangcun, namely the village of Kaixian'gong in Wujiang County, Jiangsu province, in the delta of the Great River, the Yang-tze. But it is set, as Fei's original concept was, in readiness for comparison with other conceptions of interpersonal relations and their cultivation in other kinds of society. The discussions with Dr. Chang in the appendix bring out the possibilities of such comparison.

The second contribution is a continuation of the theme of comparison, but through a methodological imperative of self-reflection and self-exposition by anyone, native or not, embedded within a particular society but already par-tially disembedded by the task of studying it. Self-exposition refers especially to the untranslatability, or partial translatability, of the language of social reflection used by social actors in the society concerned. But exposition must persist in finding roundabout ways in another language of conveying what is not directly translatable. All the best ethnographies do this, without conced-ing to the obscurity of either a cultural relativism or a cultural chauvinism that reduces Chinese or any other culture to just itself. In some of his late publications, Fei turned this into a special kind of self-reflexivity. It is not the reflexivity of English-language anthropology celebrated in the widely read and followed chapters (except that by Talal Asad) edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus in *Writing Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986). In these chapters anthropologists seek to make explicit and to overcome the formerly implicit power relations between the anthropologists and their subjects of study. They seek to overcome these power relations by raising the statements and expositions of the subjects to a status equal to those of the anthropologists who bring them to the attention of a readership, while Asad points out the inherent and unavoidable power relation of writing in English. Fei's is a quite different reflexivity and has so far been confined to

the Chinese language. It is a cultural reflection in which he uses the concepts derived from a culture to reflect upon itself, and crucially in addition to reflect on and with its 'heart' – the feelings as well as the reason and concepts that key words or phrases convey. One section of the Appendix expounds Fei's notion of 'heart'. Might there be a comparison and contrast here with a key text in English-language Cultural Studies, Raymond Williams' *Key Words* (Oxford University Press, 1984)? In any case, although confined to the study of China, Fei's example can be followed and varied by anthropologists seeking the culturally reflective terms of the societies and cultures they study and inhabit. And they would have to do this without insisting that only these terms are appropriate, because they want to be read in other languages and with other words and concepts, including those of the social sciences to which they contribute and into which they are finding roundabout ways to translate these culturally specific reflective words. Their very conceptualization depends on this effort of translation. Only by making this effort do they become applicable and open to comparison, though translation is merely a first step.

The third contribution is all about Fei's studies of villages in China. It would appear to be only about the study of China, no more and no less. But it does raise several more general methodological problems. Of what is a village study a so-called 'case'? And, if it is a 'case' of something claimed to be 'China', is it the appropriate unit of study?

One answer to the first question is to suggest that a village is an example of a 'community' and that Fei was following in the footsteps of the American Chicago School of urban sociology in pursuing 'community' studies, which are studies of localities within which most, but not all, relations in which the inhabitants engage are confined. Of course, urban studies since then have found just as often if not more often that the radiation of relationships from any one household goes far beyond their neighborhood and its radii do not coincide with those of neighboring households. They are especially differentiated by class and occupation. Similarly, the relationships radiating, on the principles of *chaxugeju* and *lishang-wanglai*, from the households of a village are certainly not confined to the village but at the very least to a marriage area linking several villages, and those villages are linked in their economic activities with small towns. Fei was acutely aware of this and indeed he made small towns his basic unit of study after his classic village studies. This problem of the appropriate unit of study for qualitative fieldwork – within what range are most relations stemming from households confined in their coincidence, so that this unit is the best for intensive local studies – is common in a market economy and a state that defines the limits of local political

relations. A good ethnography, precise in its descriptions, expounding well the local terms used for discussing social relations is already a contribution to potentially comparable ethnographies and the economies and states in which they are set.

Then there is the question of how to generalize to the whole of that economy and state from selected case studies. Fei hoped to do this, first by village studies but then by small-town and regional studies, by comparing them and inducing from this comparison a typology of their differences, which were called, by him and by policy-makers, 'models' of different paths of development within the same political economy. Could this method be copied elsewhere, outside China? Perhaps. Could it ever become exhaustive, covering the full range of differences to be found in a country at one time? I doubt it.

Finally, there is the question of what is a study a 'case'? Were Fei's studies cases of economic development or more? They can as well be read as case studies of gender relations, or of kinship relations, to be compared not only within China, as in Chapter 4, but with other such case studies from other contexts altogether, of development, of gender relations and of kinship relations.

The fourth contribution continues with a discussion of these questions: how and for what were Fei's studies carried out, and how can they be extended to other studies in China up to the present day? But in this chapter we come to Fei from the opposite direction, in fact from two directions. One is from outside China to his concepts. The very question of whether Fei's work, in his own estimation, should be a contribution to the 'luxury' of anthropological theorizing is raised in relation to the work of English anthropologists. Concepts from general sociology, chiefly that of urban Euro-North-America, are applied to his concepts of *chaxugeju* and economic enterprise. Readers will have to settle for themselves whether these outside concepts have to be changed in their application to Fei's Chinese concepts and studies. What further steps must we take in accepting Fei's works into anthropology, or into the sociology of social capital, or into management studies?

The other direction is from his work on other peoples in China than the Han majority to the question of 'China'. What is 'China' as bounded by its present borders, including the large border regions that Fei helped to define? How different are these border regions from the other regions of China? More currently, less historically, how are their separate paths of development, or modernizations in the plural, to be nurtured and acknowledged even as their differences grow while their sharing a state and an economy brings them together? Several potential comparisons suggest themselves, for instance

with the Russian Federation of States or with India's adivarsi (tribal peoples), though none has been carried out yet.

The fifth contribution based on an article we come at last to some country-to-country comparisons, though they must be suggestive of the far greater potential for comparison. Comparison of kinship systems, based on Fei's Kaixian'gong, and of border regions based on his Chinese border region studies, are the most anthropological. Comparison of the construction of garden cities as communities with Fei's small-town studies and policies is more sociological and has more to do with planning. And two further reviews of the relationship of Fei's anthropology to general and comparative studies extend the discussion relating to the second and the fourth contributions.

Finally, the sixth contribution is about Fei's life and work, indeed to his life as a work of Chinese political history. In his later years and since he died China has become a world power of which the rest of the world has necessarily taken notice, not least the social scientists of the English-writing world. Coming from several disciplines and not specializing in the study of China, some of them seek and find in Fei's works at least two things. One is a set of clues to the workings of Chinese society. The other is his example and the way in which the study of China can be an example of world anthropology or global sociology. Again the potential is clear, but its realization is yet to be accomplished. And that is the message of every part of this book. The potential for comparison, contrast, and contribution to general social sciences has, we hope, been made clear. Its realization is to be accomplished by further work.

TRANSCULTURALITY AND THE GLOBALIZATION OF CHINESE SOCIAL SCIENCES: VOCABULARY, INVENTION AND EXPLORATION[1]

XIANGQUN CHANG

This paper falls into five parts: raise the matter of transculturality, the importance of transculturality and invented Chinese social science vocabularies in understanding China and the world; the significance of inventing and developing Chinese social science vocabularies; Fei Xiaotong's contributions to Chinese social science vocabularies and the globalization of knowledge; and comprehensive understanding in China's social sciences and transcultural experiences in the process of the globalization of knowledge. In sum, we will consider, on the one hand, 'the creation and development of the vocabularies of the Chinese social sciences' as a part of global knowledge construction; and, on the other hand, the structure of Chinese society and its operational mechanism in a global context.

Transculturality Matters

In 2014, CCPN Global and YES Global successfully organized the First Global China Dialogue in London, with the theme of 'the experience of China's modernization from a comparative perspective'. Arising out of this was the stark realization that today's world faces numerous risks and challenges on the road to peace and development. The international system and order

are constantly changing, as is the balance of power. In such an era of great transformation, all countries, whether developing or developed, are having to adapt to an ever-shifting international and social environment, while the process of modernization in some countries has been interrupted or has spilled out to create global turmoil.

At the same time, rapid developments in technology and society have had a profound impact on patterns of thinking, behavior and interaction and on the moral principles of different countries and groups. They have also constantly challenged established ideas of good governance, including the functions of government in the globalization era and the pros and cons of the participation of non-government organizations. The changes and challenges are myriad: digital technology, mobile communications and the popularization of the Internet, the coexistence of cultural homogenization and diversity, ethnic and religious conflicts, the collision between giant multinational corporations and national sovereignty, changes in social norms as a result of scientific innovations, the decisive influence of regional economies on national economic development, the constraints of climate change and the discovery and adoption of new energy sources. Transculturality has become part of people's daily life. It is different from cross-culture, inter-culture and multi-culture.

Confronted with such challenges, national leaders devise development strategies that reflect both the status quo and their long-term goals. Business leaders and entrepreneurs have also invested substantial resources in studying the impact of the changing international economy and financial order on the development of enterprises. Experts and scholars have focused on cultural factors that have quietly exerted great influence, and explored how culture and ideology enhance global and social governance. Such efforts and initiatives are moves in the same direction: towards reaching an in-depth understanding of the knowledge systems of the human community and the development of a 'global cultural sphere' beyond any single culture, state or nationality, under the condition of global governance. Thus, the theme of the development and governance of China, Europe and the world has gradually become one of the key research interests of scholars worldwide.

There are already many work and activities on transculturality in the past two decades. For example, Uccioletta 2001/02, Flüchter & Schöttli 2015, Lewis 2002, Schachtner 2015, Slimbach 2005, Welsch 1999. In addition, there are some organizations that either publish specialized journals or organize related events: the Institute for Transtextual and Transcultural Studies publishes *Transtext(e)s–Transcultures: A Journal of Global Cul-*

tural Studies; the Transcultura International Institute holds the China-EU Intercultural Forum jointly with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS); at Columbia University there is a Department of International and Transcultural Studies; and an International and Transcultural Communication Programme exists at Universität Salzburg. Some universities have related research centers, e.g. Center for Transnational and Transcultural Research, University of Wolverhampton; Research Center for Transcultural Studies in Health, Middlesex University; International Center for Transcultural Education, University of Maryland; Heidelberg Center for Transcultural Studies. In China, Peking University founded the Center for Cross-cultural Studies and has published the journal *Dialogue Transcultural* (in Chinese) since 1998. It collaborates with the Institute of Comparative Literature and Comparative Culture, Nanjing University; the Institute of Cross-cultural Studies, Chinese Culture Academy; the Institute of Chinese Folk Culture, Beijing Normal University; and the Transcultura International Institute; and is supported by the Mayer Foundation for Human Progress. A significant development is the founding of the Beijing Forum – The Harmony of Civilizations and Prosperity for All, founded jointly by Peking University, Beijing Municipal Education Commission and the Korea Foundation in 2004, which will held its 12th Forum on 6–8 November 2015 with the theme of 'different roads and shared responsibility'.

Against this background, CCPN Global, JCCP and *Global China Dialogue* series[2] will engage broadly and work cooperatively, based on the above existing studies and activities to promote an all-round concept of transculturality, to push it from a marginal position towards the centre of mainstream discourse among academics, intellectuals and thinkers worldwide. This will provide both an in-depth and comprehensive understanding of the history of our era and accurate forecasts of the trends in development of human society.

---

[2]   The Second GCD was held on 23-24 November 2015 at the British Academy. 2015 is the Year of UK–China Cultural Exchange. This event will demonstrate transcultural practice by collaborative working between academia and governments in China and the UK, with support from international organizations and academic NGOs, and also showcase Chinese academia's participation in regional and global governance. It will discuss all facets of new global governance, encompassing national governments, international organizations, multinational companies, NGOs and citizens, as well as seeking new rules of 'civilized dialogue', encouraging both sides to listen to the other, understand cultural differences, respect local customs, accept different perspectives and acknowledge the common destiny of humanity, with a view to building a harmonious, symbiosis-based global community.

Transculturality, the Importance of Invented Chinese Social Science Vocabularies in Understanding China and the World[3]

The first article for JCCP's launch issue was chosen for its ingenuity. In 'Universal dream, national dreams and symbiotic dream: reflections on transcultural generativity in China-Europe encounters', Shuo Yu reinterprets a very complicated historical case, demonstrating not only an ability to carry out a study on China in comparative perspective but also to cross disciplines from social sciences to linguistics, showing how translation in social-cultural contexts can make a huge impact on the direction of history.

One of the major contributions of this article is that it introduces a self-made new concept of 'transcultural generativity'. The article creatively applies the 'transcultural approach or perspective' to a large social and historical field, through analysis of the encounters between Western missionaries and the Imperial Court of the Qing Dynasty. In doing so, it finds evidence for 'transcultural generativity' by demonstrating how both parties work together creatively, in direct or indirect interactions, and by exploring the mechanism of such encounters. As the author shows, the results of these encounters are neither Hannization nor Westernization, but a dynamic 'permanent transition' from a marginal position to create a third category of shared knowledge and values. This hybridization inspired the new banner image on the CCPN Global website[4].

Yu's article links the past to the present with three categories of dream: universal dream, national dream and symbiotic dream. As the author points out, 'The 21st century has to be a collaborative century, the global good and evil forces are composed of diverse coalitions'. 'Transcultural generativity' could help us to understand how global society is shaped and reshaped. Further, how the concept of 'transcultural generativity' is worked out can be understood from a set of vocabularies, such as liminal space, permanent transition, cultural agency of the in-between, China-Europe encounters and a symbiotic dream of the Earth. Although these vocabularies were derived from studies of interactions and relationships between China and the West over the past centuries, they are new for both Chinese and non-Chinese read-

---

[3]   Here 'China and the world' is a short way of saying 'China and the other countries and regions of the world'.

[4]   The new banner image on CCPN Global's homepage (www.ccpn-global.org) is adapted from a painting entitled *Fourmillements* ('Swarming', 132 x 162 cm, acrylic on canvas, 1985), by François Bossière.

ers. It is also a question for academic research whether or not they have a place in the list of general social science vocabularies.

Moreover, the key concept of 'transcultural generativity' highlights JC-CP's ethos of creativity and echoes the theme of this issue, which is the creation and development of the vocabularies of the Chinese social sciences. The author's invention of large numbers of transcultural anthropological terms is a concrete exercise bringing elements of Chinese culture to a wide audience, which accords with CCPN Global's academic mission. Finally, CCPN Global's social mission, as a bridge between China and the rest of world, the Chinese and the non-Chinese, is destined to inherit the spiritual legacy of the 500-year history of China-Europe encounters. We therefore see this article as symbolic, demonstrating the actual character of JCCP and CCPN Global, the virtual community of symbiotic humanity. We hope to enhance people's sense of community, the power of thinking with cultural diversity and complexity and the revival of a symbiotic ethical spirit[5].

The Significance of Inventing and Developing Chinese Social Science Vocabularies

In choosing the theme of this launch issue of JCCP, the aim was to build a bridge between Chinese and Western social scientists who are dedicated to making contributions to human knowledge. There are two viewpoints in Western social science: one is that the level of Chinese social science is generally low; the other is an expectation of learning from relevant research by Chinese scholars. The first article in this issue of JCCP was written by a historical anthropologist who trained in both China and France and now works in Hong Kong (China). This article clarifies a complex transcultural and historical phenomenon through description and analysis with rich vocabulary and terminology. It demonstrates a Chinese scholar's global vision and humanity. The second is a study by an American social anthropologist on the theory and method, and especially the vocabulary, employed by Chinese social scientist Fei Xiaotong in his research. The next article is a Swedish sinologist and lawyer's commentary on the application of Fei Xiaotong's methodological viewpoint. The articles that follow were written by scholars from the USA, the UK and Germany. They demonstrate, on the one hand, Chinese scholars' efforts to produce innovative ideas on a normalized social scientific basis; and, on the other hand, non-Chinese scholars' attempts to re-evaluate

---

[5]   Unfortunately, the author suffered an accident and was consequently unable to revise the article, which caused a delay in publishing this issue.

and properly understand, through in-depth studies, Chinese scholars' work. Both Chinese and non-Chinese contributors are engaged in self-reflection in doing research on China, while at the same time going beyond their own cultural limitations.

In Chinese social science circles there are also two prevalent perspectives: the first is that Chinese study by foreign scholars yields only ineffective solutions for practical problems; the second is that the Chinese should 'break out from Western academic hegemony'. This so-called 'Western academic hegemony' includes aspects of language and discourse. It can be seen in the publishing of articles in English, in the practice of writing in accordance with Western social science norms and styles, in authors being accepted by the Western academic system, and in works being understood according to Western ideology. To Chinese scholars, these requirements are seen as an 'academic hegemony', a viewpoint shared even by acknowledged great scholars such as Fei Xiaotong, only a few of whose works have been published in English because his extensive writings have not yet been translated. And even if these works were translated into English, the English version might not always accurately express the essence of his academic thought. Thus, it has little power in the discourse of the field studied. In the following, we will see detailed related views.

First, there is a basic problem with publishing articles in English. The International Sociological Association recognized this when it established its journal *International Sociology* in 1986, giving special consideration to papers submitted by those whose first language was not English, reviewing them in their first language by in-culture specialists and helping them with translation. With these aims, Dai Kejing of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and specialists from other language communities were appointed as Associate Editors (Albrow 1987). The editorial input was correspondingly heavy and expensive, but fully justified by the editor in an analysis after four years showing acceptance during that time of a higher proportion of submissions from non-first world countries than from the first world (Albrow 1991: 111).

Having foreign editors for English-language journals is made all the more necessary in view of the 'warning' by the British Academy, mentioned by Steven Harrell in his article, about 'a decline in modern language learning' (2009) in the UK. A report entitled 'Language Matters' 'discussed concerns that the future of the UK's world-class research base might be threatened by the decline in modern language learning and called for a series of measures by universities and government bodies to address this danger.' This was one