

# **Inherit or Transfer? A Dilemma in Reconstructing**

## **Chinese Social Reality**

Review XXI,3/4,1998, pp.327-382

Wang Zhengyi

Contacts between different civilizations have often in the past proved to be landmarks in human progress. Greece learnt from Egypt, Rome from Greece, the Arabs from the Roman Empire, medieval Europe from the Arabs, and Renaissance Europe from the Byzantines. In many of these cases, the pupils proved better than their masters. In the case of China, if we regard the Chinese as pupils, this may be the case again. In fact, we have quite as much to learn from them as they from us, but there is less chance of learning it. If I treat the Chinese as our pupils, rather than vice versa, it is only because I fear we are unreachable.

Bertrand Russell, 1966

Cultural revolution has been, from the notion and ideology, the reflection of political revolution and economic revolution, and served for them.

Mao Zedong, 1940

The nineteenth century is an important turning point for the whole world politically, economically, and culturally. Since the beginning of the sixteenth century, western European countries began to expand politically, economically, and geographically and established a worldwide colonial system, incorporating many other countries. Before the nineteenth century, some countries, such as the continental empire of China and the island empire of Japan still existed which were different from western European countries politically, economically, and culturally.

During the nineteenth century, as the western European countries penetrated the whole world, Western civilization conquered the world:

In its western expansion it subjected two continents, in its eastern sweep it crushed every old culture in Africa and Asia, also placing all of Oceania under its domination. A subcurrent of this gigantic hurricane, which blew in a northeasterly direction from Western Europe, has captured the whole of the land of the Slavs, and swept across the vast Steppes, still its head reaches the eastern shores of the Pacific( Hu Shi, 1943:2 ).

In the middle of nineteenth century Western civilization and East Asian civilization (mainly Chinese and Japanese) met in East Asia.

Facing penetration by Western civilization, China and Japan responded very differently.

Japan, after 250 years of successfully enforced seclusion, suddenly accepted it completely in order to save herself from national humiliation. Japan also accepted social science: “the social science implanted in Japan from the West after the Meiji Restoration had no continuity with those traditional social, political and economic ideas”(Watanuki, 1975:4). China has followed a zigzag path: on the one hand, it hoped to learn something from the West to make it wealthy and powerful, on the other, it did not like completely to abandon its traditional culture. This difference of response lead to two different, or even opposite, destinies of knowledge. With Japan being the core state of a world-system politically and economically after 150 years of development, Japanese social science now became an important part of the mainstream of Western social science. China, after the same long period fluctuating between acceptance and resistance, once again began a new discussion about convergence and conflict between Western and Chinese traditional civilization in the 1980’s. It is not my intent here to compare the reasons for such a difference between Japan and China (although it is very important to understand both China and Japan)<sup>1</sup>my interest here is only to describe and analyze the trajectory of development of social science in the modern Western sense in China since Western civilization invaded China and conflict between the two Civilizations began.

The year 1840 was an important watershed in the long history of China politically, economically, and culturally. Especially in her cultural tradition, before the middle of the nineteenth century, China, an empire state with a long history under emperors and a society paying special attention to ethical human relationships, had been influenced little by outside forces. Confucianism had been the dominant learning, although Buddhism came into China from India during the Dang dynasty. Because of the nature of tolerance espoused by Confucianism, Buddhism “acquired a definite place in the religion of the country”(Russell, 1966:190). According to the history record, as early as the Han dynasty (124BC), higher learning was established on the recommendation of the famous Confucian scholar, Dong Zhong-shu, in which Four Books (*The Confucian Analects, The Book of Mencius, The Great Learning and the Book of the Mean*) and Five Classics (*The Book of Odes, The Book of History, The Book of Changes, The Book of Rites, and The Annals of Spring and Autumn*) were appointed as textbooks. From then on, the system of official-bureaucrat (*Shi-Guan Liao*) was established (Li Ze-hou, 1986:153) and fully institutionalized in the Tang dynasty (618-907 AD), and lasted until the beginning of the twentieth century (1905) as a unique and strict genealogy of knowledge.

Any attempts to generalize all the characteristics of this genealogy in such a short article seem to me to be difficult, but compared with Western civilization we could still pick out some main points, although the genealogy of Chinese knowledge itself had been changing during its long evolution. Roughly speaking, the system has four key points: one was overemphasis on humanities (especially literature); another emphasized training of the mind and disdained physical exercise, as Meng Zi said “those who labor with their minds govern others; those who labor with their strength are governed by others”(Zhu Xi, 1983:258); the third is that the system helped to train officials and became a subsidiary of the bureaucracy; the last is Chinese intellectuals have been much more interested in the “circulation of Heaven and society” as are Western scholars. In the West, from the ancient Greek, “nature” and “society” were treated as two different categories,. Based on this division, knowledge about nature was called “natural philosophy” and knowledge

---

<sup>1</sup> As early as 1933 Hu Shi made some detailed and profound comparisons about the different response of Japan and China to Western civilization in the nineteenth century and their result in his book *The Chinese Renaissance*.

about society was called “moral philosophy”, but in the Chinese tradition, there were never such clear divisions between nature and society. “Uniform of Heaven and man” and “harmony of the whole universe” had been the main topics, and thus the base on which Chinese tradition knowledge was constructed before the nineteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

But since the Opium War broke out in 1840, followed by the collapsing of the empire state and more and more contact with the West, China has been influenced intensively by the West, and has been swaying between tradition and the West. On the one hand, facing the collapse of its ancient empire, it hoped to seek a new knowledge from the West which could make the state wealthy and powerful, on the other, indulged in its history and its unique civilization, it tried to protect its traditional culture as much as possible. How to blend Chinese traditional knowledge and Western knowledge has been a puzzling problem. Various positions have been taken since the nineteenth century. These include the “Chinese classics as substance and Western learning for function” put forward by Feng Gui-fen, Wang Tao, and Zhang Zhi-dong, representative of the “Western affairs school” during 1860-90. “complete Westernization” by Tan Si-tong in the 1890’s, “wholesale Westernization” espoused by ChenXujing, Wu Jingchao, and Hu Shi, representative of liberalism in the 1930’s, (although Hu said he supported “full worldization” in order to differentiate himself from Chen Xujing), then “blending of Chinese Classics and Western learning” after the 1930’s. Even in the 1980’s, there appear once again “culture debates” which focus on the relations between Chinese traditional cultural and modernization. All of these debates, based on Chinese culture, reflect the ambivalence of Chinese intellectuals. I shall not attempt to present here the process of disputes among Chinese intellectuals on culture itself, but to analyze the development of the Chinese academy and knowledge after the Opium War.

In this article, through an historical analysis of the development of social science in China, I try to answer the following three questions: first, why and how “social science” in the modern Western sense came into China; secondly, in what way and to what extent, Chinese intellectuals accepted and developed it; and thirdly, how to evaluate the development of “social science” in China.

Related to these three questions, I focus my research from 1840to the 1990’s, during which time, based on the structure, content, and its relations with the Chinese society and politics, four periods could be divided: the first stage 1840-1912, the gradual break with traditional knowledge and the entrance of “social science” into China from the West (mainly referring to western Europe and the United States) and Japan; the second 1915-49, the domination of Western social science in several universities and colleges of China and the resistance this faced in Chinese society; the third 1949-78,reorganization of knowledge and fate of social science under the Chinese Communist Party; the fourth 1978-90’s,emergence of a new round of reorganization of social science and debates around it following the “open-door” policy.

## PART ONE: “SOCIAL SCIENCE” COMING INTO CHINA AS NEW IDEAS (1840-1912)

It is obvious that there were a quantity political, social, and economic ideas in Chinese classics such as “political theory” by Lao Zi (Feng Yu-lan, 1948:102), “political and social philosophy” by Zhuang Zi (Feng, 1948:106), “political philosophy” by Meng Zi(Feng, 1948:73),

---

<sup>2</sup> Form more details, please refer to Hu Shi (Shih) 1934, 1963:63-78;Li Ze-hou 1986:135-76; Wang Yu-chuan, 1938:345-46; Macfarquhar, 1966:272-75; and Galt, 1951.

“way of government” by Han Fei Zi (Feng, 1948: 106), “writing of enriching state” by Xun Zi (Hu Ji-chuang, 1985:94-104)etc. But it was different from Europe where a universal social science emerged in the nineteenth century and there appeared several social scientists such as Adam Smith, Karl Max, Herbert Spencer, and Emile Durkheim who influenced the development of modern Western social science. The terminology of “social science” in the modern Western sense had not entered into China until the 1890’s, and was not wholly fixed until 1920’s. When Fei Xiao-tong talked about the relations between Chinese classics and the modern terminology of “social science” in 1947, he regretted:

It is a real pity that we still do not have any scholars who can translate these old works into modern terminology. If we can do this we would certainly make many important discoveries, not only would there be contributions to the history of thought, but there would certainly be important and stimulating effects on sociology itself. For example, Confucians saying one “worships the gods as they were present” is really the same as the great French sociologist Durkheim’s dictum that “if there are people who believe in god, the god exists” (McGough, 1979:20)

It took a long time for “social science” in the modern Western sense to come into China, accompanied by the conflict of Western and Chinese traditional civilization.

*“Chinese Classics as Substance and Western Learning for Function” (1840-97)*

The year 1840 was a turning point in the history of China. In that year the famous Opium War broke out. In 1842 the Opium War ended with the signing of the Nanking Treaty between China and British. From then on, the so-called Chinese Empire declined rapidly. In order to copy the West and later Japan (by whom China was defeated in 1895), many Chinese students began to study abroad, either sent by the government or on their own. But until 1897, what the students and the government were interested in did not lie in Western social science, but in science and engineering. This is shown in the goal of the Chinese government to send 120 students to the United States from 1872-75:

The goal of foreign study was for them to learn about the science related to army, navy mathematics engineering, etc., for ten-odd years, so that after they have completed their study and returned to China all the technological specialties of the West may be adopted in China, and the nation may begin to grow strong by its own efforts (Wang, 1966:474)

Correspondingly, with the increase of contacts between China and the Western world, the hostile attitude of the Chinese towards Western civilization in the past gradually changed, and among officials and scholars there appeared for the first time debates on whether to adopt Western civilization, how to adopt Western civilization, and what to learn from the West. Of all kinds of debates, the most prevailing opinion was the “Chinese classics as substance and Western learning for function” put forward by the “Western Affairs School” [*Yang Wu Pai*] such as Feng Gui-fen in

his article *On the Adoption of Western Knowledge* (Teng&Fairbank, 1954), and Zhang Zhi-dong in *Exhortation to Study* (Teng&Fairbank, 1954).

According to this position, China should adopted Western civilization, “now if we wish to make strong and to preserve Chinese knowledge, we must study Western knowledge” (Zhang Zhi-dong, cited in Teng&Fairbank, 1954:169). How to learn from the West? They insisted that the best way was to take the Chinese classics as substance and Western learning for function. Only through this blending, could China find a new knowledge superior to both. Feng said:

If we let Chinese ethics and famous [Confucian] teachings serve as an original foundation, and let them be supplemented by the methods used by the various nations for the attainment of prosperity and strength, would it not be the best of all procedures (Teng&Fairbank, 1954:54)

Zhang Zhi-dong also stated:

Nevertheless, if we do not use Chinese knowledge to consolidate the foundation first and get straight in our own minds what our interest and purposes are, then the strong will become rebellious leaders and the weak will become slaves of others [i.e., of the foreigners]. Scholars today must master the classics first, in order to understand the purposes underlying the establishment of education by our ancient Chinese sages and teachers. They must study history, in order to learn the rise and fall of succeeding dynasties of China, and the customs of the empire. They must glance over the philosophical works and belles letters in order to become thoroughly familiar with Chinese academic ideas and exquisite writings. And then they can select and make use of that Western knowledge which can make up our shortcomings, and adopt those Western methods of government which can cure our illness.

A Chinese scholar not versed in Chinese knowledge resembles a man who does not know his own surname, or a riding horse without a bridle, or a boat without a rudder; the more profound his Western knowledge the more severs will be his contempt for China (Teng& Fairbank, 1954:169).

Then which kind of knowledge should China learn from the West? They all hold that China should learn Western languages, mathematics, engineering and technology, ect.

Western books on mathematics, mechanics, optics, light, chemistry, and other subjects contain the best principles of the natural sciences. In the books on geography, the mountains, rivers, strategic points, customs, and native products of the hundred countries are fully listed. Most of this information is beyond the reach of our people (Teng Gui-fen in: Teng& Fairbak, 1954:51).

In the eyes of the “Western Affairs School”, the Chinese classics meant mainly Confucianism, while Western learning mainly refered to the natural sciences. During this period, the Chinese classics were still dominant although a trend to learn Western science and technology. Western

knowledge of social science had not yet drawn the attention of Chinese scholars.

### *Introduction and Translations of "Social Science" in China (1897-1912)*

It seems obvious that the emergence of "social science" in the modern sense in China was mainly due to the curriculum of Christian colleges and translations of Western works on social science. But if we think this over carefully, we could find that what happened was much more complicated than we imagined.

#### (1) CHRISTIAN COLLEGES AND "SOCIAL SCIENCE"

With the door opened in 1840, several Christian colleges in China gradually appeared. It is not our task here to evaluate the influences of these colleges on the entire Chinese society. What we are interested in here is how to evaluate the relations between the curricula of Christian colleges and the development of social science in the modern sense in China. It is very difficult to say that there was a direct relation between the emergence of social science in the modern sense in China and Christian colleges. This is because the first aim of missionary schools in China was not to disseminate Western "social science". In the United States, most of the denominational colleges at that time emphasized:

Latin and Greek, mathematics, philosophy and religious ... In China, the missionaries substituted Chinese and then English for Latin and Greek but the emphasis on mathematics and religious was retained; and the goal was a humanistic, not a technical or professional education.....In their crowded curricula, the Christian colleges gave scant attention to social science. Most students had a year of universal history, a year of Chinese history and frequently a year of geography and/or political economy (Lutz, 1971:67-69)

For example, the Tengchow college designed a six-year curriculum including algebra, geometry, trigonometry and mensuration, surveying and navigation, analytical geometry and mathematical physics, calculus, and astronomy, but which did not include any courses on social sciences in the Western sense. Secondly, a lot of Chinese students did not like to go to Christian colleges because of their different cultural background. Those who went mainly wanted to study English and prepare for future study abroad. Thirdly, the faculties of Christian colleges mainly came from Western countries. Shanghai college had several American professors from Brown University to teach sociology in 1913 (Wang, 1979:11). Political science and economics were taught at very same time at John's University, in addition to original works read as textbooks such as *Outlines of Economics* by Richard T.Ely, *Principles of Economics* by F.W.Taussig, *Principles of Economics* by Alfred Marshall, *Introduction to Economics* by H.R.seager, *Elementary of Economics* by Irving Fisher and *Principles of Political Economics* by T.N.Carver et.. In addition there was a reference book compiled by C.F.Remer, *Readings in Economics* on general economics and works on China and the Far East were selected (Remer, 1980: 677-80), but foreign teachers felt it was very difficult to teach economics in Christian colleges in China, as Remer stated:

The teacher of economics in China faces a difficult and complex task. He must get the student to understand the principles of the science. He must acquaint the student with the economic organization of his own country, he must apply the principles to the life with which the students is familiar and to the problems which China faces. These tasks are difficult enough but there is mote to be done. The industrial and the economic methods of the West are having a remarkable influence on the economic life of China and of the other countries of Fast East. The teacher must do this best to present to the student a picture of this Western economic and industrial life and to show the different effects and influences it is having upon the various Eastern countries (Remer, 1980:676).

From this, we can conclude that the curricula of Christian colleges had little direct effect on the emergence of social science in China. Otherwise, it is very difficult for us to explain why foreign teachers felt it difficult to teach economics in the modern sense if Chinese students were familiar with social science including economics, political science, and sociology. So the following conclusion seems plausible and acceptable in some sense: “until the nationalist upheaval of the mid-1920s, the social science barely existed outside the western institute of higher learning in China” (Kurt & Tong, 1993:87).

## (2) THE INFLUENCE OF JAPAN’S EDUCATION MODEL AND YAN FU’S TRANSLATION OF “SOCIA; SICENCE”

From the 1890’s on, the attitude of Chinese intellectuals towards Western learning changed a great deal. The most outstanding change was that learning from the West not only included Western science and technology, but also included Western political and social theory. Especially after the defeat of China by Japan in the 1894-95 Sino-Japanese War, most Chinese scholars owe the power of Japan to its success in education since the Meiji Restoration in 1868. So learning from the West, especially from Japan, became the focus of some officials and intellectuals. In the Reform Movement of 1898 (Wu Xu Bian Fa), Kang You-wei and Liang Qi-chao attacked traditional society and persuaded Emperor Guang Xu (Kuang Hsu) to issue a series of edicts to promote reforms, for example:

- (1) to reform the Civil Examination System to abolish “eight-legged” essays;
- (2) to reorganize the *Shuyuan* (old-style academy);
- (3) to establish elementary and middle schools all over the country;
- (4) to establish a National University in Beijing as a model for modern schools;
- (5) to establish a National Bureau of Translation;
- (6) to send students abroad, mainly to Japan (Hayhoe & Bastid, 1987:59).

In addition, they also attacked the position of the “Western Affairs School”, and criticized them that they only learned about Western armies and machines, rather than Western political institutions and political positions. Kang thought “ the rea son West becomes powerful is not because of its army and machine, but because of its master of laws and persuasion of learning

(*Qiong Li Quan Xue*)” (Snag & Lin, 1986:144). “What we call reform should begin with institution and law” (Sang & Lin, 1986:357), Liang also thought that “learning from the West should learn first of all politics, then learn their arts” (Sang & Lin, 1986:357). The views of Kang and Liang played an important role in promoting Chinese intellectuals to accept Western knowledge, especially Western political theory.

Although the “Reform Movement of 1898” did not succeed, learning from the West and Japan never ceased. In the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-05, Japan once again was victorious. Japan became the model to be imitated for many Chinese scholars and some officials. In 1905, China abolished the Civil Service Examination and established the Ministry of the Education just as Japan had done. In addition to reorganizing the system to imitate Japan’s education system (Hayhoe & Bastid, 1987:63-64), many Japanese teachers were invited to give lectures in China. It is estimated that in 1905-06 between five and six hundred Japanese teachers were invited to participate in educational programs in various regions (Hayhoe & Bastid, 1987:68). At the same time, many students were encouraged to go to Japan to study.

But if we want to know the extent of dissemination of Western “social science” during this period, besides the influence of Japan’s education system, we must evaluate Yan Fu’s work. It is through Yan Fu’s translations of Western works on social science and his commentary on these works that the terminology of social science in the modern Western sense came into China.

From 1897 on, Yan Fu translated eight Western works which were related to Western politics, economics, sociology, law, and logic. These works are: *A Study of Sociology* by Herbert Spencer (1897 and 1902), *Evolution and Ethics* by Thomas Huxley (1898), *On Liberty* by John Stuart Mill (1902), *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith (1902), *A History of Politics* by Edward Jenks (1904), *Spirit of the Laws* by C. L. S. Montesquieu (1904), *Logic* by John Stuart Mill (1905) and *Logic* by W. S. Jevons (1908).

In Yan Fu’s translation and commentary on these works, three points should be noted: first, he “searched through traditional Chinese thought for indigenous concepts to capture the Western thought system” (McGough, 1979). For example, when he translated Spencer’s *A Study of Sociology*, he translated the word “sociology” as *Qun Xue* (science of social groups) in terms of *Xun Zi* thought. He explains it in detail,

Spencer is also a native of England, and a contemporary of Darwin. His books actually appeared before the *Origin of Species*. He based himself on the theory of evolution. I call this science the *science of social groups*, for as *Xun Zi* states, man’s superiority over the beast lies in his ability to form social groups (Schwartz, 1964: 64)

This kind of understanding of the terminology of sociology prevailed at that time but was later gradually dropped when the meaning of this terminology was fixed. Fei Xiao-tong commented:

he [Yan Fu] worked very hard, searching through traditional thought for indigenous concepts to capture the Western thought system. I think that for the most part he was successful because, as I have already noted, this is one area which is relatively easy for us. However, his efforts were not passed on. At least, the terms he used to

express thoughts in his area of study, like the term Qun-Xue, were mostly dropped. Before the authority behind the traditional teachings had vanished in China, just at that Mr. Yen introduced the term Qun-Xue, there was really no way that true Sociology could take root within Chinese academic circles. The substitution of the term She-hui Xue for Qun-Xue aptly symbolizes two different periods; for the sake of convenience, the dividing line between them can be put at the May Fourth movement [which began in 1919](Fei Xiao-tong, in McGough, 1979:21-22).

The same things happened with his other translations of Western works. For example, when he translated the book *Evolution and Ethics* into Chinese, he only translated the word “Evolution” into the Chinese *TianYan Lun* which means “evolution of Heaven”; here, the reason he used the word *Tian* was contrary to Chinese traditional thought. *Tian Bu Bian, Dao Yi Bu Bian* means Heaven is unchangeable, and *Dao* is also unchangeable. He thinks:

Since the publication of this book [*The Origin of Species*], vast changes have occurred in Western learning, government and philosophy ... the greatest difference in the principles of West and East, that which is most irreconcilable, is the fact that, while the Chinese love the ancient and ignore the modern, Westerners stress the new in order to overcome the old. The Chinese think of the process of nature (*tian shi*) and human affairs (*ren shi*) in terms of a cycle of order and disorder, prosperity and decay. The Westerners make their ultimate principle of learning and political action their idea that the possibilities of daily progress are inexhaustible, that prosperity once achieved will not decline, and that order will not fall back to disorder (Schwartz, 1964: 44). Because of Yen’s understanding, “the *Tian Yan Lun Yan Fu* ‘do’ is different from Huxley’s original work *Evolution and Ethics*” (Li, 1979: 261)

Secondly, he translated Western works not as an introduction to the establishment of different disciplines but as some new ideas to reform Chinese people’s thought; in other words, the aim of his translation is beyond the academy itself. He explicitly said:

What are China’s principal troubles? Are they not ignorance, poverty and weakness? In a nutshell, any method which can overcome this ignorance, cure this poverty, lift us out of this weakness, is desirable. The most urgent of all is the overcoming of ignorance, for our failure to cure poverty and weakness stems from our ignorance. In overcoming ignorance, we must extent our utmost efforts to seek out knowledge. We have no time to ask whether this knowledge is Chinese or Western, whether it is new or old. If one course leads to ignorance and thus to poverty and weakness, even if it originates and teachers, not to speak of a person of a lower order, we must cast it aside. If another course is effective in overcoming ignorance and leads to the cure of our poverty and weakness, we must imitate it, even if our proceeds from barbarians and wild beasts, not to speak of a person of a higher order (Schwartz, 1964: 49)

Thirdly, more important is that Yan Fu had paid attention to how knowledge came to be

science, in which he includes social knowledge. He took politics as an example. China's traditional literature had abundant ideas about politics, but why had politics in the West become a science? The main reason, in Yan Fu's opinion, is because China paid attention to deduction and institution, while on the contrary, the West paid attention to induction,

Heaven, in giving birth to man, endows him with consciousness. It does not equip him at birth any a priori (*yuan chu*) institution. If one wishes to acquire knowledge, one must derive it by induction from that which is on the surface and close at hand... In induction one must rely on facts (Schwartz, 1964: 187)

But "in Chinese learning one must seek out ancient interpretations. If the ancients are wrong, their errors can not be exposed, even if they are right, one does not know why they are firth" (Schwartz, 1964:190).

During this period (1897-1911), although many Western works on "social science" as new ideas were being translated into Chinese, "social science" itself had not taken root in Chinese academic circles, let alone in the development in China. In addition to "Sociology" mentioned above, the same thing happened in "Economics" and "Political Science". As far as "Economics" is concerned, before 1902, there were some works on economics being translated into Chinese, including *Manual of Political Economy* by H. Fawcett (Chinese edition 1880), *Primer of Political Economy* by W. S. Jevons (Chinese edition 1886), *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith (Chinese edition, 1902). Because their translators translated them on the basis of Chinese economic terms and traditional expressions as much as possible in order to made their translations acceptable to Chinese readers, this not only made the original meaning of [Western works] difficult to understand, but also made it difficult to distinguish Western economic thought and Chinese traditional economic thought (Hu Ji-chuang, 1982:451). There were different kinds of translations of "economy" and "economics" such as *Fu Guo Xue* (policy of enriching the state), *Shen Ji Xue* (learning of livelihood), *Fu Guo Yang Min Ce* (learning of managing property), all of which were related to Chinese traditional thought, *Jing Shi Ji Min*, which means the ability to manage the state, and none of them were accepted popularly. From 1905 on, with debates between reformists and revolutionaries of the bourgeoisie in which many foreign economic documents (mainly Japanese) were cited, *Jing Ji* for "economy" and *Jing Ji Xue* for "economics" in the modern sense had gradually been fixed. For example, *Working Principle of Political economy* by S. M. Maovane was published with the title *Jing Ji Yuan Lun* (translated by Zhu Bao-shou) in 1908, *Outlines of Economics* by R. T. Ely was published as *Jing Ji Xue Gai Lun* (translated by Xiong Chong-xu and Zhang Qin-shi) in 1910.

Although these were mentioned above, it is not our objective to devalue the impact of Yan Fu's work on Chinese knowledge came into due to him that a genealogy of Western knowledge came into China's academy, just as Cai Shang-si remarked:

It has taken a long time for Western learning to be spread in China. What was introduced into China in the Min dynasty was almost confined to Catholicism, science and technology; after the Opium war, bourgeois reformists began to introduce Western bourgeois social science, but this was not regarded as formal if compared with Yan Fu. It was not until the time when Yan Fu went to Europe to

study, and one after another translated a lot of famous bourgeois works on philosophy and social science that a system of Western learning appeared by the end of Qing dynasty (Cai Shang-si, 1979:98).

What is the effect of this Western learning on the future Chinese academy? What was the fate of Western learning in China under Guo Min Dang and the Communist Party?

## PART TWO: "SOCIAL SCIENCE" CHINESE SOCIETY (1912-49)

With the triumph of the Republic revolution of 1911 and the emphasis on education, "social science" in the modern Western sense gradually accepted by Chinese intellectuals as labels for different disciplines. But there were two directions. On the one hand, "economics," "political science", and "sociology" as terminologies appeared in the newly established colleges or universities as "economics department", "political science department", and "sociology department"; on the other, with the break out of the "New Cultural Movement" and "May Fourth Movement", there appeared a great debate on how to accept Western thought including Western science and to what extent to accept it.

### New Cultural Movement: A Conscious Movement

Yan Fu's translation of Western works was only a prelude to deeper changes in Chinese culture and social reality. From the failure of the "Reform of 1898" and the Republic Revolution of 1911, Chinese intellectuals realized that the reconstruction of China had to come through something more fundamental than a mere change in the system of government. The most fundamental thing, in the eyes of most Chinese intellectuals as that time, was the reconstruction of civilization, namely "a rebirth of the old Chinese civilization by discovering the foundation of Western strength and absorbing its essence into their own philosophy, so as to affect a new synthesis on an intellectual and spiritual basis" (Tang, 1936: 132). The New Culture Movement and later the May Fourth Movement derived directly from the realization of changes in Chinese social reality.

The New Culture Movement and later the May Fourth Movement played an important role in the academic reconstruction of Chinese social reality. Hu Shi called the New Cultural Movement "a conscious movement" (Hu Shi, 1934: 44) compared with all renaissance movement in the history of Chinese tradition:

Each of these historical movements had its important role to play and contributed to periodic renewals of vitality in an old civilization. All these great movements which rightly deserve the term of "renaissance", suffered from one common defect, namely the absence of a conscious recognition of their historical mission. There was no conscious effect nor articulate interpretation: all of them were natural developments of historical tendencies and were easily overpowered or swept away by the conservative force of tradition against which they had only dimly and unconsciously combated (Hu Shi, 1934: 45).

The New Cultural Movement opened the door once again for the entrance of all kinds of Western thoughts, and after them Western knowledge became dominant among Chinese intellectuals, not only for those who insisted on liberalism, such as Hu Shi, but also for those who

DYNSTIES											
ANCIENT			PRE-IMPERIAL				IMPERIAL-DYNASTIC AGE				
			Early Chou	Late Chou			Age of Continuing Development			Age of Stagnation and Decline	
			1122 B.C.-781B.C.	Ch'un	Ch'in	Warring States	Ch'in				
				770B.C.-B.C.		B.C.-247B.	255B.C.-207A.D.				

The History Development of Chinese Society: Shoeing the Views of Leading Chinese Scholars

were interested in Marxism, such as Li Da-zhao and Chen Du-xiu. Western recognition of the political system, social structure, and knowledge itself were accepted for the most part, to direct Chinese political and social reality and changes of traditional knowledge itself. It was embodied in the following aspects:

First, longing for the Western scientific method, and using these methods directional the reconstruction of the structure of Chinese traditional knowledge, just as Chen Du-xiu said:

science has two meanings narrowly and extensively: the former refers to natural science, and the later refers to social science. What social science means is to apply methods used in natural science to the study of society and human affairs, such as sociology, ethics, history, law, economics ect., all that is to apply methods used in natural science, which is the function of science (Chen Du-xiu, Selected Works of Modern Chinese Political Thought, 1986: 854).

Chen compared Western civilization and Chinese traditional civilization and thought that Western knowledge was superior over Chinese traditional knowledge because Western paid attention to scientific methods and applied these methods to the study of society. Hu Shi published his famous article in New Youth in 1917 entitled “Tentative Suggestions for the Improvement of Literature” in which he also assaulted Chinese classical language, its literature, and social and pedagogical traditions, in Hu’s own words:

They (the leaders of the New Cultural Movement) want a *new language*, not only as an effective instrumentally for popular education, but also as the effective medium for the development of the literature of a new China. They want a *literature* that

should be written in a living tongue of a living people and should be capable of expressing the real feelings, thoughts, inspirations, and aspirations of a growing nation. They want to instill into the people a new outlook on life which shall free them from the shackles of tradition and make them feel at home in the new world and its new civilization. They want a new scholarship which should not only enable us to understand intelligently the cultural heritage of the past, but also prepare us for active participation in the work of search in the modern sciences. This, as I understand it, is the mission of the Chinese Renaissance (Hu Shi, 1934:46-47)

They debate over science and human life in the 1920's was directly related to the Western scientific method.

During the debate on science and human life, there were two opposite schools: Ding Wen-jiang, Hu Shi, and Chen Du-xiu, among others upheld that science not only controls the natural and social world, but also controls human life itself; and those such as Zhang Jun-mai and Zhang Don-sun held that science is not available for human life. Influenced by Liang Qi-chao who held that "the problem of human life, most of it may and necessarily be solved in scientific method, a small part-or maybe the most important part, is metaphysics"(Liang Qi-chao, in Li Ze-hou, 1987:54), Zhang Jun-mai gave a lecture entitled "The Philosophy of Human Life" at Qinghua university and held that the Philosophy of human life is subjective, intuitive, synthetic, undermined and unique, whereas science is objective, logical, analytical, causative, and uniform, so the philosophy of human life was not determined by material civilization and science. Deducing from this, he drew a conclusion that physics is science, whether geology and psychology is science is doubtful, but in the social and historical domain, it is impossible to be scientific. Ding, in an article entitled *Metaphysics and Science*, contended that a philosophy of life, even if not determined by science, is yet subject to scientific methods. While science and views of life are not unified at present, this does not mean that they will not be unified in the future. Secondly, science is omnipotent in the field of knowledge and nothing that cannot be logically studied constitutes real knowledge. Thirdly, if European civilization is bankrupt, science is not responsible for it, for the people most responsible for the outbreak of the war are politician and educators, most of whom are unscientific. Fourthly, Eastern and Western civilization cannot be distinguished as spiritual and material (Wang, 1966:382).

It is not the place here to investigate this debate in detail, but from the debate, we can at least draw the following conclusion: the New Culture Movement shows that Chinese intellectuals not only accepted Western science, but also accepted Western social science, and contributed the success and superiority of Western learning to the use of scientific methodology. So the debate was about what kind of cultural ideology should emerge, to reconstruct belief. Should it be based on Western science or on Chinese traditional thought? Just as Li Ze-hou said:

The essence of debate on science and human life does not lie in recognizing and evaluating science or research of scientific method, but in the debate on which kind of ideological notion or belief should be established, namely using science or metaphysics to guide human life and society?...Essentially it is debate on some kind of ideology (Li Ze-hou, 1987:58)

Secondly, using Western scientific methods to analyze Chinese reality at that time, intellectuals engaged in the famous debate over the nature of Chinese society and the historical division of Chinese society in the 1930's. The debate revolved around two major issues: the first focused on the past. How Marxist theory could be applied to the Chinese case, what was the Asiatic mode of production, and had China passed through such a stage; was the Chinese slave society similar to those of the Greek and Roman Empire; what were the characteristics of feudalism in China? The second major issue was nature of contemporary China, whether it was a capitalist or semicolonial society (Wong Sin-lun, 1979:25-26; Wang Yu-Chun, 1938:357).

Differing from the debate on "science and human life", this debate played an important role not only in the reconstruction of political ideology, but also in the emergence of sociology in China. Here we will analyze, although not in detail, its role.

Several works concerning the nature of contemporary Chinese society and the historical division of ancient Chinese society were published during this period. These included Tao Xi-sheng; *Historical Analysis of Chinese Society* (1926), Guo Mo-ruo's *Study of Ancient Chinese Society* (1930), Li Ji's *Criticism and Contributions to Debate on Chinese Social History* (1932), Wang Yi-chang's *History of Chinese Slave Society* (1932) and *History of Chinese Feudal Society* (1933), Hu Jiu-yuan's *Draft of the Development of Chinese Social Culture* (1933), and others. These scholars' opinions varied: (please refer to table 1). For example, for the period from the Chin dynasty in 225 BC to the beginning of Western domination in 1842, Li Ji assumes a precapitalistic mode of production; Tao Xi-sheng a developed feudalism society evolving into feudalism (Wang Yu-chuan, 1938: 358-59). It was common for most scholars, although not all, to relate academic debate to the political reconstruction of Chinese reality, just as Hou Wai-lu recalled:

after the failure of the great revolution (1927), and at the low tide of revolution, Marxists began to study the nature of Chinese society in order to probe the future and answer where is China going... There appeared a debate in academic circles on contemporary Chinese society. Is it a capital society, or feudal society or semi-colonial and semi-feudal society? Now that discussing this problem related to national conditions, it is necessary to go back to the Chinese thousand-year history, so the problem transferred from reality to history and aroused the large-scale debate on history of Chinese society (Li Ze-hou, 1987:73)

The debate on the nature of Chinese society ended with a political conclusion made by the Communist party leader Mao Zedong in his famous article *On New Democracy* in 1940, in which he commented on the nature of Chinese society since the Qin dynasty:

Since Zhou and Qin dynasty, Chinese society had been a feudal society in which politics was feudal politics and the economy was also a feudal economy. After the invasion of foreign capitalism into China and the gradual increase of capitalism as a factor in Chinese society, Chinese society gradually became a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. In contemporary China, the region occupied by Japan became a colonial society; the region occupied by the Guomindang, basically became a semi-feudal society; both in the region occupied by Japan and

in the region occupied by the Guomindang, feudal and semi-feudal systems were prevalent. This is the nature of contemporary Chinese society (Mao Zedong, 1970: 625)

From this analysis Mao concluded, as a corollary to the reconstruction of political ideology, that the Chinese revolution should be against both feudalism and imperialism. Another result of the debate on the nature of Chinese society in the 1930's which should be mentioned is that it led to "the sociological movement in China" (Hsu, 1931:283). In this movement not only had sociology been accepted as a part of social science together with political science, economics, and law, but also sociology developed towards rural sociology in which community study was given special attention. With several works on the nature of Chinese society being published, such as those we mentioned above, and works on the structure of Chinese society such as Mao Zedong's *Analysis of the Classes in Chinese society* (1926), Fei Xiao-tong's *Peasantry and Gentry: An Interpretation of Chinese Social structure and Its Changes* (1946), and others, sociology as a discipline took root in China by the end of the 1940's, just as Maurice Freedman wrote in retrospect: "It could be argued that before the Second World War, outside North America and Western Europe, China was the seat of the most flourishing Sociology in the world, at least in respect of its intellectual quality" (from Wong Siu-lun, 1976: 36).

#### *Institutionalization of Specialization of Knowledge*

During 1912-49, not only did Western social science become dominant among Chinese intellectuals, but also there appeared a tendency to institutionalized knowledge. With the shift of emphasis to Western social science and the increase of all kinds of universities and colleges during 1911-29, social science including political science, economics, and sociology developed as categories for national, provincial, and private universities and colleges. It is estimated that "in 1925-26, only 14 percent of Christian college's total instruction was given in the social science. In the leading non-Christian colleges in China, three times as much work in politics and economics was offered as in the Christian schools"(Lutz, 1971:189).

With social science in the Western sense coming into China, there appeared a tendency to institutionalize it, about which three things should be mentioned: first, the establishment of the Chinese Social and Political Science Association in 1905; secondly, the establishment of all kinds of universities and colleges imitating the Western and Japanese of education systems, and thirdly, the issue of a unified catalogue of social science by the Education Ministry in 1930.

First, the Chinese Political Science Association was established in Peking on December 5, 1915. It was the first association of this kind, just as the President said in the opening remark:

I feel the honor more keenly because his Association is the first one of its kind since the opening of China's intercourse with foreign countries. I hope this Association will help to strengthen the intellectual relations between the people of this country and those of foreign countries and I further hope that it will mark the beginning of a new era in China (Lou Tseng-tsiang, in *Chinese social and Political Science Review*, 1916:2-3).

Why establish this Association at that time? Mr. Lou continued:

China, like foreign countries, has Law, Politics, Sociology, Economics, and Administration, worthy of scientific study. But hitherto there has been a lack of such an Association as we have now formed for their investigation. Now in this age of international research in many directions, it is quite necessary that we should hasten to remedy this lack, the more so, because we are just in the midst of a transitional period from the first stage to the second in our international relations—a transitional period in which mutual understanding has become better and better and mutual appreciation has been more and more increased (Lou Tseng-tsiang, in *Chinese Social and Political Science Review*, 1916:3).

The formation of this Association was also influenced by the attitude of the West (Europe and America) to the specialization of knowledge in the nineteenth century. P. S. Reinsch put it explicitly:

as in the other fields of human enterprises, organized effort has played a great part in the development of scientific work in Europe and America... toward the end of 17<sup>th</sup> Century, these organizations were perfected and given a semi-official status, with a limited and carefully selected membership.... The Chinese Political Association is to embrace in its work the different intellectual interests which are generally grouped under the name of the social science, including public law, and more especially international law; public administration and legislation, economic, sociology, the history of Chinese political and economic institutions, and political philosophy. The founding of this Association, to my mind, constitutes an important step in the development of the scientific and intellectual life of China: it means a closer linking up and affiliation of Chinese thought with scientific activities abroad, both in Europe and in America; it promises an opportunity for a consistent interpretation, in objective and reliable form, of Chinese political and social experience in the past and the present to the general intelligence of the world (*Chinese Social and Political Science Review*, 1916: 12-13).

In 1916, *Chinese Social and Political Science Review* was published. In 1930, the Chinese sociological society, a nationwide professional organization, was also founded, and the *Journal of Sociology* was published (Yan Ming, 1992:102).

Secondly, all kinds of universities and colleges were established, including not only a national university, provincial universities, but also private universities. Although an institute of learning in the modern Western sense was established in 1861 when The Peking Language Institute was founded a foreign force.<sup>3</sup> In effect, a lot of universities was announced in 1912 under which “the objectives of colleges and universities are to instruct [students] in advanced learning, to train knowledgeable experts, and to meet the needs of the nation” (Fairbank, 1986:

---

<sup>3</sup> The school in the modern Western sense was established in 1861 in Peking, named Dongwen (Tungwen) Language School, in which foreign language were studied, for example English and French, later Russian and German, and later some curricula such as mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, astronomy, meteorology, physiology, and international law were added, which mainly concentrated on the Western natural sciences.

370). The Chinese educator Cai Yuan-pei also declared in 1918:

what we call a university is not just a palace where classes are given on schedule resulting in the production of college graduates; it is in reality a place for conducting research in areas of knowledge to offer to scholars here and abroad (Fairbank, 1986: 381).

The new knowledge, in the eyes of intellectuals at that time, meant Western knowledge.

Thirdly, the curriculum of all universities and colleges was unified by the Education Ministry. In 1930 social science was institutionalized and divided into politics, economics, sociology, and law on which separate departments were based and was attached to the law school (cited from Tiao Yu Bu, *The Form of Curricula of University*, 1930: 85-98). Meanwhile, the Ministry of Education appointed Dr. Sun Ben-wen, Dr. L. K. Tao and several writers to a committee for standardizing sociological terms (Hsu, 1931:293).

Here, there are two key questions which should be answered: first, why was “social science” in the Western sense accepted so rapidly and extensively in Chinese universities? Secondly, was it really accepted wholly by the Chinese intellectuals?

The Chinese intellectuals who accepted social science at that time had at least two reasons: first, to do so satisfied the need of Chinese social reality. When Nankai University planned its departments and disciplines in 1930, it stated the following:

Based on the lack of talented persons politically and economically in China, our University should give special attention to political science and economics... as far as the goal is concerned, the organization of social science should be confined to five departments, to which political science and economics departments should be given priority, and history department, philosophy department and education psychology department be attached (Wang Wen-Jun, 1989:207).

Secondly, many Chinese students returned to China with degrees from American and European universities in the 1920's. Most of them became teachers during this period. For example, the leading sociologists such as Tao Menghe, Sun Ben-wen, Chen Da, Xu Shi-lian, Wu Wen-zao, Wu Jing-chao, Fei Xiao-tong, and others were trained in the West. It is estimated that in 1947, there were 143 sociology teachers (including professors, associate professors, and lecturers) in China. Among them there were 107 who had studied abroad (71 in the U.S. and 12 in western Europe) (Yan Ming in Langer, 1992: 101), and they took social science in the Western sense into Chinese universities. They hoped to use Western social science to direct and guide Chinese traditional culture, just as Fei Xiao-tong said:

an adequate definition of the situation, if it is to organize successful actions and attain the desired end, must be reached through a careful analysis of the functions of social institutions, in relation to the need that they purport to satisfy and in relation to other institutions on which their working depends. This is the work of a social scientist: social science therefore should play an important role in directing cultural change (Fei, 1939, from McGough, 1979:8).

In a world, the introduction and development of social science in China has been closely related to Chinese social changes. As far as the relation of Chinese scholars with the state is concerned,

The social science were introduced to and began to develop in China on the needs of imperial collapse, during the country's period of greatest revolutionary upheaval and prior to the reestablishment in 1949, of a viable political states. The first generation of Chinese social scientist were not servants of the state, but they did consider themselves servants of the nation-social reformers in search of solutions to the country's pressing social, political and economic problems. To some extent at least, in the belief that social science could contribute to the solution of those problems (Thurston & Pasternak, 1983:15)

The terminologies of Western social science entered into Chinese universities and had been institutionalized by the end of the 1930's, but there had been contradictions between Western social science and Chinese traditional knowledge which urgently needed to be solved. As Fei said:

Although social science had not yet established its base at that time, much of the social science terminology was already fixed. The content subsumed under these terms, as far as its nature is concerned, had very little to do with traditional thought, most of which was will dogma, and still advocated ways that people ought to act. The new dogma and the old dogma were not only dissimilar, they were opposed and contradictory (Fei Xiao-tong in McGough, 1979:22).

#### *Sinicification: Reaction to Western knowledge*

Facing the institutionalization of Western knowledge in China many resistances appeared, with a common slogan: sinicification of the academy in China. Generally speaking, the sinicification of the academy included three changes.

First, it is necessary for China to go through modernization, but modernization is not equal to westernization. Ji Wen-pu summarized: China needs modernization, and needs to absorb other advanced academies and cultures in the world as much as possible, and make itself stronger and stronger. However, the Chinese have their own social structure, the own national tradition, and their own developmental stages of history. They must not to put on an American head, British feet, and make it square when they need a square, or make it a circle when they need a circle. Any better things could not be merged into their blood and body and become useful to them unless these things are chewed and digested. They can neither fill up their mind as one force-feeds a duck, nor repeat mechanically other people's worlds; they need "sinicification" in which they merge the best in the world into their own based on the needs.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In the article on Sinicification of The Academy, Ji defined sinicification as something not only different from "the quintessence of Chinese culture" in which Chinese culture was regarded as the best in the world, not from "Chinese classics as substance and Western learning for function" we mentioned before, but also from "Chinese culture standard" which upheld that both ancient Chinese culture and Western contemporary culture should be reweighed based on contemporary China and China's own established culture which was neither ancient Chinese

Secondly, knowledge should not be divided into political science, economics, and sociology separately in Chinese culture. For example, when Nankai University established the Nakai Institute of Economics (1931) and Political Science (1943), the Department of Political Science was attached to the College of Economics. The slogan of the Nakai Institute of Economics was to “chinatefy” economics, taking into account especially the so-called institutional factors (Fong, 1975: 44). Fei Xiao-tong, in 1948, also insisted on the same opinion:

Whether sociology becomes a specific science or not is still a problem which has not been solved. Regarding the classification of social science, if we think political science, economics and law have their specific domain, we in fact assess that social science could be classified based on social institutions: political science studies, political institutions, economics studies, economic institutions, ect., the result is that many institutions and social phenomena could be divided, how many social sciences there are. Previous such as Mouteagou, Adam Smith, they are also called sociologists. As far as the works such as *The Spirit of Law* and *The Wealth of Nations*, which include everything, are concerned, it is not enough to call them politics and economics respectively ( Fei, from Cai Shang-si, 1983: V,665).

Even Chen Xu-jing who was regarded as a representative of “whole westernization” also thought:

Even Chen Xu-jing who regarded as representative of “whole westernization” also thought:

in a society in which culture is not advanced or less advanced, the classification of culture into education, politics, economics and religious was supposed not to exist. The classification only exists in the culturally advanced society, because the more advanced the culture is, the more complicated the division is. Because of the limitation of human’s mental time, culture has to be classified so as to make people focus on a specific item which is called education or politics or religion or economy, but there does not exist such classification in culture itself. Culture is the complicated sum and is not separated. Classification of things (Chen, from Cai Shang-si, 1983: III, 603).

Thirdly, Chinese Marxism began to appear in the Chinese academy as a resistance to Western knowledge with the gradual dominance of the Communist party in China’s political structure. Regarding the dissemination of Marxist in China and resistance to the mainstream of Western knowledge, we can trace this conflict when several works on Marx and Marxism were introduced into China and many articles on Marxism by Chinese intellectuals were published. Some intellectuals begun to challenge Western learning based on Marxism. For example, in his article entitled “The Value of Historical Materialism in Contemporary Historical Science”, Li Da-zhao explicitly objected to over-specialization of knowledge in the West:

it has lasted for so long a time that in science, the result of overemphasis on the

---

nor contemporary Western (cited from Selected Readings on the History of Contemporary Chinese Thoughts, 1985, Vol. 4:49-61)

classification of disciplines leads one to forget that they are only parts of whole and to neglect the relations between these parts. Recently, there appeared a new tendency that while studying all kinds of disciplines, the emphasis is not on the distinctions but on the relations between them; when analyzing social institutions on which all kinds of disciplines are based, the emphasis is not on analytical observation, but on synthetic observation. This method could be applied both to the present, and to the past. Historical materialism emerged corresponding to this tendency. In the past, history was only regarded as the politics of the past and politics only consisted of constitutional law and foreign relations. It is a historical viewpoint which realizes a partial truth, not all truth (Li Da-zhao, 1920)

By the end of the 1940's, Marxism gradually became the dominant ideology in China and after 1949 when the Chinese Communist party came wholly to power in China and eventually made the Chinese academy divorce from the Western knowledge. Chinese Marxism, corresponding to its resistance to the American and the western Europe camp politically and economically, became a forceful opposition to Western knowledge, and especially Western social science. Now came the emergence of Mao Zedong's thought as a dominant ideology in China.

During 1912-49, although these oppositions arose to penetration by a Western knowledge system, by 1949 a Western genealogy of knowledge still dominated in Chinese universities and colleges. "China's academic development in 1912-49 may be seen as part of the worldwide growth of modern learning in which North and South Americans, Russians, Japanese and Indians all at one time or another turned to Western Europe for enlightenment" (Sun, 1986:367).

### PART THREE: SOCIAL SCIENCE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CHINA (1949-78)

Now let us shift to the development of social science under the Chinese Communist Party. Before we go further in detail, two points must be explained: first, Mao's works will be cited for the most part because the development of social science in this period mainly, although not wholly, related to Mao Zedong's thoughts, especially his thoughts about education during of the Great Leap Forward and the Great Culture Revolution, but it does not mean that his section studies Mao's thought. Secondly, after 1966, China begun the Culture Revolution, when many intellectuals were forced to enter "May seventh cadre school" to accept reeducation. At this time social science as an academic activity stopped, but as an ideology it still existed in a new form. Here what I call " ideology" mean that social science in this period was wholly concerned with the controversy about the structure of political and social power, and it was difficult to make a distinction between an academic and political role, as Weber's opinion of keeping " unconditionally separate the establishment from the evaluation of them" (Beetham, 1985:262).

In 1949, the Chinese Communist Party came to power and began to establish a new China politically, economically, and culturally, which took a long time. According to its condition and content social science was reconstructed and developed during the period from 1949 to 1978. We can divide it into two stages: imitation of the Soviet model from 1949 to 1956; and developing Chinese social science under the guidance of the thought of Mao Zedong from the 1960's to 1978.

#### *Reinstitutionalizing Knowledge*

After the Chinese Communist Party came to power, the first and foremost task it faced was how to build a new country, not only politically and economically, but also culturally. According to Mao Zedong's analysis of Chinese society and culture in 1940, the construction of a new society and new culture should be divided into two steps, "The first step is to change the social status of this colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and make it become an independent new nationalist society. The second step is to further the revolution and establish a socialist society" (Mao, 1970:627). Correspondingly, the first step of the reconstruction of culture and knowledge, which was called the "new democratism movement" (distinguished from the "old democratism movement" which happened before the May Fourth Movement), was intended to establish a new kind of culture different not only from the West, but also from the Chinese traditional culture. This was called "national, scientific and popular culture" by Mao Zedong (Mao, 1970: 666; 1979:959).

In (culture) belongs to our nation with the characteristics of our nation. It, uniting socialist culture and new nationalist culture of all the other nations and absorbing and developing each other, forms new culture of the world together, but never to unite imperialist culture of all the other nations, because our culture is revolutionary and nationalistic culture...

It is scientific, because it objects to all the feudal thought and superstitious belief,...

It is popular, so it is democratic, it should serve for ninety percent of the workers and peasants and gradually become their culture (Mao, 1970:668).

After the Chinese Communist Party came to power in 1949 and established an independent country, China was supposed to enter its second step, namely to establish a socialist country and culture, but how to construct a new socialist culture and knowledge?

In 1949, Chairman Mao published four important papers, *On Dictatorship of People's Democracy*, *Goodby, Stuart J. Leighton*, *Why We Need to Discuss the White Paper*, and *"Friendship", or Invasion* in which he put forward the famous policy of "leaning to one side", Mao stated,

Leaning to one side, this is the lesson we draw from the forty-year experience of Sun Zhong-shan (Yat-sen) and twenty-eight years of experience of the Communist party, and we know very well that we have to lean to one side if we want to triumph and consolidate it. Based on the experience of forty years and twenty-eight, the Chinese either leaned to imperialism or to socialism, there is no one exception (Mao, 1970:1362).

This strategy not only was embodied in economic and political reconstruction, but also in the reconstruction of culture and knowledge.

According to this logic, knowledge was bestowed by the nature of class and divided into three parts: one, bourgeois knowledge from the West; another, feudal knowledge from the

traditional Chinese society; the last, proletarian knowledge from Marxism –Leninism. The task of reconstructing culture was to follow the last one and eliminate the former two. In order to do so, the Chinese Communist Party began a new institutionalization of knowledge, which included the following three aspects:

The first and foremost was to treat Marxism-Leninism as universal truth. Many works by Marx and about Marxism had been introduced into China as early as the 1920's, but before 1949, Marxism had been treated as a social movement, which had been parallel to Liberalism and Anarchism in China especially in 1930's. With the triumph of the Communist Party in China, Marxism was treated not only as a doctrine, but mainly as a dominant political ideology. Marxism began to be transformed from a social movement to a scientific view about social reality (social science), especially its historical materialism, and gradually to play an important role in guiding the reconstruction of social science in China.

In the early stage of this transformation, China had been mainly influenced by the Soviet model until 1962 when there appeared a split between China and the former Soviet Union. This split developed because of the Chinese Communist Party's understanding of the world political situation at that time and the development of Chinese history and society.

According to the Chinese Communist Party's analysis of the world political situation, there were two kind of opposite trends. One was capitalism centered around the United States, Great British, ect., the Western world in which bourgeois culture prevailed. Another was socialism following the October Revolution of Russia, the Eastern world in which Marxism was determined to be the guiding thought. After the Communist Party came to power in China in 1949, they took socialism and Communism as their final goal which they were prevailed in the Western world. "The Chinese revolution is one part of the world revolution" (Mao, 1970:626). Marxism thus should be the guiding thought of the Chinese revolution because it had been that of the Russia revolution.

As for the relation between Marxism and Chinese society and history, the Chinese Communist Party thought the necessary result of the development of Chinese history was for the Chinese people to chose Marxism-Leninism as the compass for the Chinese revolution. According to Mao's analysis, before the October Revolution, Chinese intellectuals had sought truth from the West to change Chinese society, but they all failed. Only after the Chinese Communist Party accepted Marxism, did the Chinese revolution go from one triumph to another. So to complete the revolution, they must insist on Marxism.

The second aspect is to reform the education system and make it one part of the proletarian revolution. The principle of reform is that higher education must serve the needs of the state and not to seek knowledge for knowledge's sake. Ma Xu-lun, Minister of Education, had down this principle of reform in the speech before the First National Conference on Higher Education on June 6, 1950:

First and foremost, our higher education must tie closely with the needs of economic, political, cultural, and defense construction of our nation, and it must first serve our economic construction because economic construction is the basis of national construction. Since our higher education has the objective of cultivating high level construction personnel, we must carry out a systematic, scientific education that is at once practical and theoretical, and on that basis put into

practice a specialized scientific and technical education. Institutes of higher learning which offer an education that is void of systematic theoretical education are inadmissible. Meanwhile, this type of theoretical education must not commit the same old mistake of “knowledge for knowledge’s sake”, ignoring the needs of the people and the state.

The second important task is this: on the basis of the practical needs of the various constructions, the Ministry of Education shall co-operate with the respective organizations to strengthen the educational process of the Chinese People’s University and other types of institutions of higher learning, and to create all types of technical institutes. Within the universities and colleges, we should also create necessary departments, specialized subjects and training to meet practical needs (MacFarquar, 1966:279-80).

The higher education system which was reorganized from 1949 concentrated on the following:

#### INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

Previous education institutions under the Guo Min Dang, derived largely from the Japanese model and the Western model, had emphasized the college system. Beijing University and Qinghua University had the Literature College and Law College; Nankai University had the Literature and Finance and Economics College; private Yanjin University had the Literature College; Commerce College, and Education College. The Chinese Communist Party emphasized the professions, including science, engineering, agriculture, forestry, medicine, normal teaching, literature, finance and economics, politics and law, physical training, and art. Of the eleven kinds of professions, the Literature College (Chinese, foreign language, philosophy, history, and education) and Law College (political science, economics, law, sociology) had been the focus of reform. In 1952, sociology was canceled as an independent discipline following the Soviet model. The reasons are two: one, sociology originated in the West and thus was bourgeois, and in a socialist country sociology may be replaced by historical materialism; two, there are no social problems in a socialist country, social problems are typical of a capitalist country. Political science as a discipline was also canceled,<sup>5</sup> and anthropology department was kept but mainly of Chinese minorities, the economics department was kept but mainly centered on Marxism’s political economy. Besides economics, the other disciplines kept were history and philosophy. International politics were also kept in some universities such as Beijing University, Fudan University, and Chinese People’s University, because it focused on the history of the Communist movement and regional politics or area politics. Besides, in 1951, five new nationwide associations of social science were being prepared, namely “the preparatory committee for new philosophy”, “the preparatory committee for new history”, “the preparatory committee for new political science”, and “the preparatory committee for new law”.

---

<sup>5</sup> There was an interlude about the restoring of sociology and political science before the Great Leap Forward, in 1957, there were a few months of relaxed academic atmosphere when the slogan “Let a Hundred Flowers Blossom and A Hundred Schools of Thought Contend” was put forward, during which time some sociologists such as Fei Xiaotong, Lin Yao-hua and others put forward the idea to restore sociology in China and establish a Chinese Sociological Association. This plan was soon abolished because of the “anti-rights campaign”.

## REFORM AND UNIFY THE CURRICULUM

In 1950 *The Draft on Curriculum of all Departments in Literature and Law College of University* was promulgated by the Ministry of Education. Uniform textbook were encouraged; for example, in 1954, the *Textbook as Political Economy* was published in the Soviet Union and immediately translated into Chinese, and was treated as a classic textbook about Marxist political economy in all Chinese universities and colleges. From the following comments of Chinese scholars, we can gauge the impact of this book: “this textbook is much more substantial in content and complete in structure of all textbooks about political economy, and it is the higher result of the Marxism political economy during this period of time” (Zhang Zhongshi, *People’s Daily*, June 23, 1955).

Our previous political economy mainly treated capitalism’s national economic system as an objective of study. Since Stalin’s classical work “On the Problems of Soviet Socialism” was published, the study about socialist economy or socialist political economy entered into a new stage. At that time, the study about capitalism, because of the new opinion of basic economic regularity in *On the Problems of Soviet Socialism*, has to be revised more strictly. Until recently when *The Textbook as Political Economy* was published, the task, we can say, has been accomplished completely and satisfactorily (Wang Ya-nan, 1956:57).

## CONTROL AND MANAGE EDUCATION

Differing from education under the Guo Min Dang, all kinds of education now because national and private school was abolished. In addition popular education, mainly Communist education, was advocated.

The measure of carried out for reconstruction of knowledge mentioned above were based on the understanding of the Marxist system, which was believed to consist of three parts: philosophy (philosophy department), political economy (economics department), and scientific socialism (international politics department). All three parts of Marxism become the basic common course for all students in all universities and colleges, no matter course they studied natural science or social science or transferred from the thought of a movement in the 1920’s into the base of all social science.

## REFORM INTELLECTUAL’S THOUGHT

Institutional reform s only form, in the Chinese Communist Party’s opinion; the key problem was how to thoroughly reform the content of knowledge. The best way was to reform the intellectuals’ thought, because intellectuals are the carriers of knowledge.

Most of our intellectuals now came from the old society, and were born of non-labor families. Even if some of them were born of worker’s and peasant’s families, the education they received before is bourgeois, so basically their points of view of the world are bourgeois. They are the bourgeois intellectuals (Mao, 1963, quoted from

Li Rui, 1992:284).

The thought reform of intellectuals began with “the three-anti campaign” and “the five-anti campaign” (1951-52), and had been the key measure of resistance of the Chinese Communist Party to the West’s cultural penetration. This reform reached its peak in the “anti-rightness campaign” in 1957, although in 1956 “let a hundred schools contend” and “let a hundred flowers blossom” was encouraged. In the thought reform, both natural scientists and social scientists confessed their mistakes of accepting Western bourgeois education; for example, political scientist Qian Duan-sheng’s *Study to Reform Ourselves and To Serve Our Fatherland Better*, scientist Qian Wei—chang’s *I Escaped from the Imperialist Trap*, and Zhou Pei-yuan’s *Criticism of My Decadent Bourgeoisie Ideology*, sociologist Fei Xiao-tong’s *My Past Year* (Chen, T.H.E., 1960:209-31). Through this thought reform, the genealogy of Western knowledge which entered China in the 1890’s and prevailed in the 1930’s in Chinese universities and colleges gradually disappeared. Most of the intellectuals began to rethink relations between ideology and knowledge, just as Fei Xiao-tong said: “a discipline must have a theoretical system and a practical function. A discipline which is under the control of the bourgeois ideology and serves the goals of imperialism should not have a place in a proletarian socialist country” (Fei Xiao-tong, cited from McGough, 1979:15).

#### Social Science and Mao Zedong’s Thought

Before 1962, the reinstitutionalizing of knowledge mainly adopted the Soviet model, although some scholars noticed this point and criticized it. For example, Chinese psychologist Pan Shu pointed out,

the Ministry of Higher Education and the Ministry of Education have forsaken all the China to rely entirely on the experience of Soviet Russia. What is suitable for the Soviet may not necessary be suitable for China. The personnel in both Ministries never discuss any problems with Chinese professional experts. Their unreasonable attitudes are sometimes unbearable. This situation must not be allowed to continue...The copying from Russia in the Ministry of Higher Education has been going on mechanically and blindly some of the experience of Russia are more traditional rather than scientific. Yet the Ministry of Higher Education has time and again discarded the more logical Chinese methods for some outmoded and outdated Russia system (Pan Shu, *Guang Ming Ri Bao*, July 4, 1957, in Hayhoe & Bastid, 1987:191).

No one paid attention to this opinion.

In 1956, there appeared a trend against Stalin in the Former Soviet Union which not only influenced the former Soviet Union itself and the international Communist camp, but also influenced China, especially China’s understanding of the Soviet Marxist model and China’s socialist road. With the worsening of relations between China and the former Soviet Union, the intent to seek a different socialist road became more and more intensive, and eventually peaked in 1962 when relations between the former Soviet Union and China broke in 1962 when relations between the former Soviet Union and China broke off completely. Social science and ideology

once again became the focus of the Chinese Communist Party. From 1956 on, Mao Zedong gradually reconstructed his theory of Chinese reality which mainly was concerned with the following three questions: the relations of theory and practice; the question of class struggle; the continuity of revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, all of these influenced the direction of the development of social science. Now let us begin to examine them respectively.

#### THE RELATIONS OF THEORY WITH PRACTICE

Before 1956, in China, Marxism had been treated as a universal truth (in Chinese Communist party terms, Marxism is a universal truth no matter where it is), and the experience of Soviet socialism was imitated as universal experience. In his paper *On the Dictatorship of People's Democracy* published in 1949, Mao even said:

It was through the Russia that the Chinese found Marxism. Before the October Revolution, the Chinese were not only ignorant of Lenin and Stalin, they did not even know of Marx and Engels. The salvos of the October Revolution brought us Marxism-Leninism... Follow the path of the Russians-that was their conclusion (Mao, 1971:374).

But in his famous paper *On Ten Kind of Relations* published in 1956, Mao expressed his intention to seek a new way to establish a socialist society different from the Soviet Union. Mao said:

Our policy is to learn from the strong points of all nations and all countries, learn all that is genuinely good in the political, economic, scientific and technological fields and in literature and art. But we must learn with an analytical and critical eye, not blindly, and we mustn't copy everything indiscriminately and transplant mechanically...

We should adopt the same attitude in learning from the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries (Mao, 1977a: 28).

In 1961, he gave more clear comment on Marxism-Leninism,

Marxism-Leninism is basically the same, but the leaves and branches are different, just as [trees which are all] trees, but have different leaves and branches. Conditions are different in each country. In the past we suffered from paying attention only to the universal truth [of Marxism-Leninism], without paying attention to investigation and research...(in Wilson, 1977: 43).

Correspondingly, Mao also made some comments on social science:

In the social science and in Marxism-Leninism, we must continue to study Stalin diligently wherever he is right. What we must study is all that is universally true and we must make sure that this study is linked with Chinese reality. It would lead to a mess if every single sentence, even of Marx's, were followed. Our theory is an

integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution (Mao, 1977a: 30).

As for relations of theory and practice, in his early paper *On Practice* (1937), Mao insisted that knowledge has two origins, one from the book, another from practice, and admitted there is a dialectic relation between knowledge and action. But during the period of the Great Leap Forward and the Great Cultural Revolution, Mao went to an extreme, paying much more attention to direct experience and ignoring knowledge from the book. In 1964, he strongly criticized knowledge from books,

There are too many courses of study at present. They are harmful to people and cause the students of middle and primary schools and universities to lead a strained life every day. Myopia has been on the increase every day because of poor equipment and lighting. Half of the courses of study may be dropped away. Confucius taught only the six arts—propriety, music, archery, charioteering, poetry, and writing—but his teaching brought forth four great means of virtue—Yen, Tseng, Tzu and Meng. It won't do for students to go without cultural recreation, swimming and sports... One cannot read too many books; Marxist books should be studied but we also cannot read too many of them... Should one read too many of them, one would proceed to the negative side and become a bookworm or a revisionist" (Mao, 1964, cited from Hawkins, 1974: 111).

Under the guidance of this thought, students were encouraged to go outside campuses and participate in "practice experience". Consequently the Soviet education system model established in the 1950's collapsed.

## THE THEORY OF CLASS STRUGGLE

Class struggle has been the focus of the Chinese Communist Party, both during the period of socialist transformation and socialist construction. "Never forget the class struggle" had been the prevailing slogan in Chinese society until 1976. In the period of socialist transformation (1949-56), Chinese society was successfully transformed based on the theory of class struggle, and in the English Congress of the CCP it was declared the class struggle tended to disappear. But the "Hungarian event" and an anti-Stalin strand in the former Soviet Union in 1956, the "anti-right campaign" in 1959, made Mao think that class struggle had not disappeared. Mao even thought there were two kinds of knowledge, "once type of knowledge is knowledge about the struggle for production; the other is knowledge of the class struggle. What other knowledge is there apart from these? There is none" (Mao, 1963, in Wilson, 1977: 161). Subsequently in the Socialist Education Movement (1964) and the Cultural Revolution (1966), class struggle and mass movement were exaggerated in every aspect of Chinese society. In education, Mao even thought students had not graduated unless they participated in political struggle, just as he said, "the class struggle is a principle subject for you. Your college should go to the countryside to carry out the four cleanups and to the factories to carry out the five-anti campaign...[if] you know nothing about the class struggle, how can you be considered as university graduates?" (cited from Hawkins, 1974: 114).

## THE THEORY OF CONTINUING REVOLUTION UNDER THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

The theory of permanent revolution had been the focus of Mao and the CCP, and was believed for a long time to be a great contribution to Marxism. According to Mao and the CCP, now that class struggle exists every time and everywhere, it is necessary, as a corollary, to complete the revolution in order to consolidate proletarian power. Class struggle was supposed to disappear in The Eighth Congress of the CCP in 1956, but with the emergence of the Hungary event, the anti-Stalin strand in the former Soviet Union and China, class struggle was amplified and thus became the logical premise of continuous revolution. Not only is revolution needed in the domain of culture, namely criticizing bourgeois culture and revisionism, but it is also needed in the economic domain. Politics commands economy. “Capture revolution and promote production” became a popular slogan during the Cultural Revolution. Mao even followed Lenin and thought Communism equals politics plus technology. He said,

Stalin’s two slogans are insufficiently dialectical. [If you say] “technology decides everything”, what about politics? [If you say] “Cadres decide everything”, what about the masses? Lenin put it well: “Communism equals the Soviets plus electrification”. The Soviet mean politics, and electrification means technology. The union of politics and professional work leads to Communism (Mao, 1958, in Wilson, 1977:56).

When all classes disappear in the future, is the revolution necessary? Mao said yes,

In my point of view, revolution is still necessary. The social system needs to reform, the world “revolution” will still be used. Certainly the nature of revolution at that time is different from that in the period of class struggle. There are still contradictions between productivity and relations of production, superstructure and economic base. If superstructure (including thought and public opinion) protect the relations of production people do not like, it will be reformed (Mao, 1977b: 319).

These three questions mentioned above constitute the main body of Mao’s thought during the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution, of which the theory of class struggle was the focus. Although these opinions were mainly the understanding of Mao himself of social reality at the time, because it was accepted by the Chinese Communist Party, it became a dominant political ideology. By this time, China was convinced that it had found a different socialist road, namely the socialist system plus a mass movement.

Under the influence of Mao’s thought, there were a series of changes in Chinese social science:

First, differently from the nature of natural science, social science is supposed to include the nature of party and class. In other words, natural science is mainly knowledge about the facts of the physical world. The physical world is neutral; as a corollary, China could learn natural science from the West; whereas social science is knowledge about values of and within human society

including the dominating class and the dominate class, the advanced class and the backward class, etc. Within different societies, knowledge about society is science; knowledge about social thinking should come from Chinese social reality. The direct result of this change of attitude about social science was to force intellectuals to participate in social practice.

Secondly, compared with the Western social science model which dominated Chinese universities and colleges in the 1930's-40's and Soviet social science model of the 1950's, social science under the guidance Mao's thought in this period mainly included philosophy, political economy, history, literature, and political instruction. There were great changes in content, namely class struggle because the main line or all social science, and class analysis thus became the departure point and most basic methodology of all social science. By 1967, social science as an academic activity wholly stopped when many intellectuals were forced to "May seventh cadre school" and all universities and colleges were closed, but as a political ideology, Chinese social science still existed incorporated into Mao's thought.

Thirdly, the boundaries of disciplines became unclear and ambiguous under Mao's thought. He insisted on the dialectic relations of an economic base and superstructure, and objected to Stalin's political economy because it was confined to a "pure" economic domain and neglected political elements of economic activity, namely counteraction of superstructure, especially politics to economic activity. For example, when he read Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism* he commented,

From the beginning to the end of this book Stalin does not say a word about the superstructure. He gives no thought to man, he sees things but not people...[The Soviets] are concerned only with the relations of production, they do not pay attention to the superstructure, they do not pay attention to politics, they do not pay attention to the role of people. Without a communism movement, it is impossible to reach communism. (Mao, 1958, cited from Wilson, 1977:57).

It is worth noting that there was resistant in academic circles to Mao's making social science the slave of politics. The philosopher Feng Yu-lan, historian Jian Bo-zan, Wu Han, and economist Sun Ye-fang all criticized Mao's exaggeration of the class struggle. Differing from Mao's opinion that "the history of every society is all the history of class struggle" and the peasant revolution was the impetus of Chinese history, Jian Bo-zan objected to applying the theory of class struggle to explain Chinese history and objected to the study of history to "pure" history itself and put forward his so-called "concession theory". He thought the improvement of peasant life in Chinese history was not due to class struggle but class reconciliation. In his opinion:

After a dynasty was overthrown, the new unifying dynasty temporarily its suppression of the peasants. It offered concessions to them, such as reducing taxes, parceling out small plots lands, and opening up new land. These actions were not revolutionary; on the contrary, they prevented revolution by contributing to the peasant's welfare (MocFarquhar & Fairbank, 1987:XIV, 453-54).

Sun also tried to confine economics to "pure" economics activity and criticized the exaggerating of class struggle and politics in the economic domain. He contended that "general

line”, “great leap forward”, and “people’s community” are all confined to superstructure and politics, he argued that “ the relations of productivity need revolution, but the revolution is not simple”.

These years [we] have been talking relations of production without any evidence to make it metaphysics, and did not study concrete questions in relations of production such as system of management, the forms of labor organization (Sun, in 1967 *yearbook on Chinese Communism: A Summary of Chinese Communist Situation From 1949 to 1966*, 305)

He noted “ we want to reach heaven in one step and so think the bigger [the project] the better, and as a result we have encouraged blind direction...We have forgotten productivity and over-exaggerated man’s subjective initiative” (MacFarquar & Fairbank, 1987: XIV, 454–55). He insisted that economic development should pay attention to value regularity and profit, and in a rural economy, that individual family economy should be encouraged.

Although these oppositions to Mao’s theory of class struggle were found history, political economy, and philosophy, they could not hinder the influence of Mao’s theory on Chinese social science. Some intellectuals say ironically that “only Mao Zedong thinks. And thousands of people need not think: (Li Ze-hou, 1987:181). In China, social science became divorced, although not completely, from the Soviet model with the further development of a mass education movement. A standardized system was formed under the guidance of the thought of Mao Zedong, which included history, politics (referring to political instruction), economics (political economy of socialism), and philosophy (Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Zedong). Unfortunately, during the Great Cultural Revolution, this syetem of knowledge was replaced by Mao’s thought. Which lasted until 1976.

During 1949-76, the development of social science in Chinese had centered around the construction of a new state and new society. Under the principle of “education serving proletarian politics and education associating with physical labor”, social science went to an extreme in China and separated from all traditions of knowledge, both of the West and China.

#### PART FOUR: A NEW ROUND OF REORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, AND DEBATE

The year 1978 was another turning point for Chinese society and Chinese. After forty years of insularity and resistance to the West, the Chinese Communist Party put forward reform and openness, and China experienced, and is now still experiencing, unprecedented and drastic political, economic, and social changes. With nationwide discussions about “criterion (Hu Qiao-mu, 1992), Chinese social science got rid of some restrictions reconstructing Chinese social reality.

Compared with the introduction of Western social science in the 1890’s, adoption of social science in the 1910’s (Japan’s model), 1920-30’s (European and American model) and 1950’s (Soviet model), and the divorce from mainstream Western social science in the 1960’s, the development of mainstreams of social science in China after 1978 focused on two aspects: one, reconstruction and further institutionalization of disciplines; and two, reorientation of the content

of Chinese social science. Let us discuss these two aspects in detail.

First, let us look at how social science in China after 1978 was reconstructed and further institutionalized.

In addition to some disciplines such as political science and sociology which were canceled in the 1950's, the Chinese Association of Sociology (1979) and the Chinese Association of Political Science (1980) were reestablished and several Western works on social science were translated into Chinese. Emphasis on "specialization" or "profession" and "division of labor" in knowledge became the focus. In order to enforce this "professionalization" institutionally, not only "doctorate degrees", "masters degrees", and "committee of evaluation and examination and examination for degrees" (*Xue Wei Ping Shen Wei Yuan Hui*) were established in all these disciplines in the 1980's for the first time in Chinese academic history, but also the "National Program Group for Philosophy and Social Science" (*Guo Jia Zhe Xue She Hui Ke Xue Gui Hua Xiao Zu*) and different kinds of "professional committees" (*Zhuan Ye Wei Yuan Hui*) for different disciplines under the leadership of the State Council and Education Committee were established. The "State Fund for Social Science" was also established in 1986 in order to encourage the development of social science.

Under these efforts, the structure of knowledge about society once again come close to the mainstream of Western social science, and the categories which shaped Western social science and were institutionalized in the nineteenth century also gradually became those by which Chinese intellectuals shaped their own knowledge about society, i.e., Chinese social science. For example, "Chinese political science" mainly focuses on the study of "state", including categories such as government, political party, congress, power, and constitution.<sup>6</sup> "Chinese economics", besides Marxist political economy, is gradually shifting from a centrally-planned economy to a market economy namely focusing on value regularity, price, free exchange, competition, and mathematicization of economics. "Chinese sociology" mainly concentrates on problems within society such as social structure, way of life, social stratification and class, family, just as some Chinese some scholars were portrayed as following while summarizing the fifteen-year development of sociology in China. Before China adopted a policy of economic reform, the state monopolized almost all important resources, including not only material resources, but also opportunities for employment, and information resources. Based on this monopoly, the state exercised strict and complete control over restricted or became the organs of the state. Thus, until the mid-to late 1950's, there was no autonomous society. Fundamental changes have taken place in the relationship between the state and society in the fifteen years since the introduction of reforms. Conspicuous changes can be observed in the following areas: society has become a relatively independent source of resources and opportunities; the formation of relatively independent social forces: the rise of the level of non-government associations. In all of these "state", "market" and "society" are treated as three separate categories on which political-science, be constructed economics, and sociology can be constructed. However, even now, mainly scholars still complain that the knowledge their students get is too general and not specialized enough (Easton & Schelling, 1991: 18-22).

Secondly, how has the content of Chinese social science been reorganized?

---

<sup>6</sup> Political science was introduced into China in the 1890's and The Chinese Political Science Association was established in 1915 as the first one of this kind of academic association, but political science developed much more slowly compared economics and sociology before 1949. Even in contemporary China, political science has not developed as expected. For more details please refer to Han Shu-zhi (1991); Harding (1980); Yi Yao (1988).

Two reasons should be given for the reorganization of Chinese social science: one is political-economic and social changes which need and require Chinese social scientists to respond correctly. Another is discussion about the “criterion for truth” which played an important role in the emancipation of Chinese intellectuals’ thought although it also has a critical political meaning. It is due to these two reasons that Chinese social science transfers

from a simple explanation of some classic theory into creation of theory about Chinese social practice; from a kind of superficial theory solely serving politics and guiding class struggle into a scientific one, guiding practical construction of China; from dogmas binding one’s thought into advocating scientific spirit based on fact (Yi Yao, 1988).

Chinese social science has made great progress in redefining content, which mainly focuses on the following aspects:

(1) Reevaluating Chinese social reality theoretically. Following the discussion about the “criterion for truth” in 1978, Chinese intellectuals and some officials began to reevaluate Chinese social reality and drew a series of conclusions, two of which are critical to the development of Chinese social science: one, the Cultural Revolution was an unprecedented catastrophe to Chinese society politically, economically, and culturally; another, Chinese society now is in the primary stage of socialism, and thus all theories now is in the primary stage of socialism, and thus society of social science about the development of Chinese society should be based on this assumption. “Modernization” and “development” become the focus of social science, and are the center of extensive debates about reform of the political and economic system, democracy and authority, stability and development, human rights, function of government, ect. There even appeared debates about “new authoritarianism”<sup>7</sup> which mainly discussed relations of new authoritarianism with freedom, fight, and democracy; the feasibility of new authoritarianism in China; and debates on the “constructing of civil society in China”<sup>8</sup> which concentrated on theoretically separating the state from society.

(2) Development Marxism. With the continuity of reevaluation of Mao Zedong and The Cultural Revolution (Hu Qiao-mu, 1992: Li Rui, 1992) and the introduction of “Western Marxism”, developing Marxism conditioned on Chinese social reality once again dominated Chinese social science, insisting that every discipline of social science should be based on the guidance of Marxism. The key problem is how to develop Marxism. Some scholars insist that posing a problem and solving it based on Chinese social reality is in fact developing Marxism; some scholars think that developing Marxism should first return to historical materialism and go beyond religious attitude and blind worship to Marxism classical works (Li Ze-hou, 1979: 203-08).

From the above mentioned, we could find that after 40 years of insularity and resistance to

---

<sup>7</sup> “New authoritarianism” was introduced into China in 1986 and arrived at its peak in 1988. This had extensive influence on history, political science, economics, and philosophy. For more details, please refer to New Authoritarianism in Han Shu Zhi (1991:52-61)

<sup>8</sup> The debates about the “constructing of civil society in China” happened in 1990 and have lasted several years. For more details, please refer to Deng Zheng-lai, Jing Yue-jin Constructing Chinese Civil Society, Deng Zheng-kai Civil Society and the State, Jing Yue-jin Summaries of Meeting about “Civil Society and Modernization in China” in Chinese Social Science Quarterly (Hong Kong) 1993.1.2.4; Yu Ke-ping Socialsit Civil Society: A New Topic in Tian Jin Social Science, 1993.5.

Western social science, the mainstream of Chinese social science once again comes back closer and closer to Western knowledge in the sense that “profession” or “specialization” and “division of labor” in knowledge are given more attention.

At the same time, as well as official resistance to “bourgeois freedom”, officially, there appears some opposition in academic circles to the tradition of Western knowledge. This is accompanied by a new round of debate about relations between Western and Chinese civilization, but in mainland China and in Taiwan, although these debates are not strong enough that they could wholly change the mainstream of social science.

In the mainland, with the new round of important of Western social science (mainly from the United States and western Europe) in the 1980's, there once again appeared “culture debate”, which mainly discussed relations between Western culture and Chinese traditional culture, Chinese traditional culture (especially Confucianism) and modernization, Marxism and the Chinese traditional culture, “nature of the nationality” and the tendency of Chinese culture in the future (Deng Wei-zhi, 1991: 246-373). In all the debates, most scholars their own typical characters, but there are controversies on how to absorb Western and Chinese traditional culture in the process of modernization. Some scholars, especially those overseas Chinese scholars, think Chinese traditional culture, especially Confucianism, has a special internal rationality which explains why Confucianism has been eternal in spite of penetration by Western culture since 1840. These scholars also cite the “four dragon” economic success, and insist that we should carefully study Confucianism and develop “Confucianism capitalism”. Some scholars even think Eastern civilization should be reconstructed (Luo Rong-qu, 1995); others argue now that since modernization originated from the West, it should be our main task to learn from the West in the process of modernizing China. As for the reconstruction of social science, there are tendencies again over-classification of disciplines which mainly focus on two points: one is emphasis on the study of over-classification on the study of cross-discipline. For example, in economics, some scholars such as Li Yi-ning (see *The Institutional, the Target and People-challenge to Economic* published in 1986) think:

The study of pure economics is too narrow, and it must associate with sociology, political science and history, and it is very necessary to do comparative analysis to the occident and the Oriental civilization. Only based on this, can political and economic questions in modern China be understood properly (Who's Who in Contemporary Chinese Economics, 1990: 575).

The second point of view emphasizes the sinification of social science. This view holds that economics should center around Chinese economic problems, political science should study Chinese political problems such as the system of the people's congress. Political institutions and political system, democracy and party, etc., and that sociology should focus on Chinese social problems such as family questions. Fei Xiao-tong summarize this:

The task of reconstructing sociology is not very easy...social science is very different from natural science, natural science, more or less, could be copied from that abroad, but social science must grow from indigenous soil, so this discipline must start from the beginning (Fei, 1983:5)

In Taiwan, after copying Western knowledge for about 40 years, there appear reflections on Western knowledge under the slogan of “sinification of behavioral and social science”<sup>9</sup> in the 1980’s (Yang Guo-shu, Wen Chong-yi, 1982; Fu Da-wei, 1993:81-94). The focus is how to change the subsidiary status of China in the division of knowledge in the modern world-system.

For many years, the social and behavioral science circle in China has laid particular stress on absorbing the West’s research result, and imitated its research activities... we think this imitating period is not too short and should be terminated. Now it seems to be the time to reexamine the experience obtained in the imitating period, and try to establish the research tendency which belongs to our own behavioral and social science (cited from Yang Guo-shu & Wen Chong-yi, 1982:69-70).

Some scholars even criticize a division of Chinese knowledge following Western knowledge. Their representative opinion is that

culture is academy. China has been paying attention to convergence, and the west emphasizing classification. Since the Republic of China was established, in Chinese academic circles there were many experts respectively for different kinds of [knowledge], which go far away from the Chinese tradition emphasizing, Confucianism and humanities. After reviewing the Chinese classics, [I find it] is incompatible with [this situation]. It will exert great influences on the academy in the future, and so must be discussed (Qian Mu, 1984:1).

## CONCLUSION: CONTINUITY OR DIVERSITY OR BEYOND

When we come to the end of our analysis of the development of social science in China since the nineteenth century, we could find its fate has been very different from that in the West and Japan, both in content and in form. Contrasted with establishing a place within a century mainly in the West, social science in the Western universities and colleges in the 1890’s, but, from the beginning to the end, it met all kinds of blocks. These included being treated coldly during 1840-97, being unevenly developed in 1930-49 (sociology, economics, and Chinese history developed comparatively more quickly), and meeting the obstacle of sinification, being replaced by Soviet Marxism in the 1950’s and by Mao Zedong’s thought in the 1960’s, and canceled wholly as an academic activity during the Cultural Revolution. What lies behind the fate of social science in China? In my view, there exist at least two problems that need to be resolved or explained: one, the rationality of the division of knowledge; another, the possibility of the transfer of knowledge between different cultures. These questions are posed in the retrospection of the

---

<sup>9</sup> In Taiwan, the “Sinification of behavioral and social science” began in the 1960’s and arrived at its peak in the 1980’s. In 1966, Jing Yao-ji published his book *From Tradition to Modern* (Chong Chuan Tong Dao Xian), which marked the introduction of Chinese intellectuals to Chinese culture. In 1971, another book *The Character of Chinese* (Zhongf Guo Ren De XinGe) was also published which concentrated on “Sinification of behavioral and social science” was organized and the symposium *Sinification of Social and Behavioral Science* was published in 1982. In all mentioned above, the focus of debate is that as early as in the 1960’s there were academic challenges in Latin America to the “center of the world academy” such as structuralist economics, “dependency theory” in sociology etc. Why in south East Asia had the problem of core states been accepted so passively?

development of social science in China from 1840 to the 1990's; they are also the questions I try to answer in this conclusion, although I am not sure whether I can answer them completely and satisfactorily.

First, the rationality of division of knowledge. You may say it is a very knotty question. Different cultures give very different persons with the same culture answer this question variously based on their era and social context. But when you examine it carefully you will find, in the West, that rationality of division of knowledge mainly means knowledge can be divided into social and natural. This division of knowledge into natural and social is intrinsically involved with the Western academic tradition. At one time all knowledge about human, social, and physical nature was thought of as one indivisible unity, which was called "philosophy" by ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle. But over time, this single unit was divided into two main strands, "natural philosophy" which concerned human society. Later came the triumph of knowledge about nature and the seventeenth century. Newtonian doctrine convinced many scholars that does exist "universal regularity" in the natural world, which was called "natural science", and from then on, scientific pursuit of the prestige of "science", scholars who studied human relations began to legitimize their knowledge as "scientific" and tried to seek a universal truth about human society regardless of time and space. They first labeled "moral philosophy" as moral science at the end of the eighteenth century, and then by the middle of the nineteenth century assumed the title of social science following Auguste Comte. Even today it has been presented as completely plausible to set up a bridge between knowledge about nature and knowledge about society in mainstream Western social science, for example the mathematicization trend in economics, sociology, and political science, in which we still find the influence of Newtonian science. The change of rationality of the division of knowledge before and after the seventeenth century in the West has never happened in the Chinese academic tradition. The Chinese tradition of knowledge differs from the Western intellectual tradition in two ways. One, in Confucian tradition the emphasis is on the "uniform of Heaven and human" and the "mysterious interaction of Heaven and human" rather than the division of human society and nature as in the West; also Chinese tradition has never made such progress in the study of nature as Newton did. This academic tradition made it difficult for Chinese intellectuals to believe there are "scientific" or "positive" methods which also are applicable to the study of social reality. This is also the main reason why Chinese intellectuals did not accept Western social science for a long time. If not for a political crisis, it is difficult to imagine how of this situation would have lasted.

Secondly, the possibility of transfer knowledge between different cultures. Two questions arise related to the development of social science in China, one, whether there exists universal truth in the understanding of society: another, how possible is the transfer of knowledge from one culture to another.

During the long process of the development of social science since 1840. First, the Japanese model in the 1910's, then the Western model in the 1930's, and last, the Soviet model in the 1950's. All these base on an elementary belief that there exists a universal knowledge, namely the Western (or core) social science and humanities along with their disciplinary forms of organization, which are universally applicable to other non-Western (peripheral) societies, regardless of time and space. Consequently the transfer of knowledge from one society to another very different society, was conceived to be possible and plausible. This belief was produced during the nineteenth century in the West and spread into China at the beginning of the twentieth

century. This is the intellectual reason why Chinese officials and intellectuals sought knowledge from the West and Japan. But all these attempts failed. This is because, on the one hand, there had been and by now still is some opposition in China adopting a trend such as Chinese classics as substance and Western learning for function during 1840-90, sinification of social science in the 1930's and, cultural revolution in the 1960's and cultural debate in the 1980's; but on the other hand, we have to admit that in value-free social science. All the concepts and categories are based on certain social environments and constructed. Now that there does not exist a universal social science or a universal truth, why can Marxism be transferred from the West to Chinese society? How to explain it? Our answer is that there is nor a universal knowledge is still possible, and this transfer is a completely political choice. The evolution of social science in China has been connected closely with Chinese political choice. They treated it as "universal truth" which was expected to be available to Chinese social reality as "enlightenment and salvation ideas".<sup>10</sup> This was the first academic to core states (the West and Japan) after the Chinese Empire collapsed and China became a peripheral country politically and economically. With the dissemination of Western social science in China, the Western knowledge system appeared and gradually dominated in universities and colleges and China became consumers of Western knowledge products. There was always opposition to this kind of cultural penetration, but to no avail, because politically the government of China at that time was dependent on the core countries. After the Communist Party came to power in China, social science broke away from the West but copied the Soviet model because politically and economically China depended on the former Soviet Union. During the Cultural Revolution, Chinese social science eventually divorced itself from ideology. The process of social science became a kind of political ideology. The process of evolution of science in China shows that transfer of knowledge is a choice of value. In this point, Wallerstein's argument seems reasonable: "I do not believe there is or could be such a thing as value-free historical social science. Every choice of conceptual framework is a political option"(Wallerstein, 1979:x).

History seems to make a big joke on Chinese intellectuals. When China had its unique tradition of knowledge in the middle of the nineteenth century, its scholars racked their brains to learn from the West (first science and technology, later social science) in order to make their nation wealthy and powerful; but when the mainstream of its knowledge come closer to the West after 150 years fluctuation of acceptance and resistance, they tried to differentiate themselves from the West (Confucian capitalism, East Asian civilization). How Chinese social science will develop in the future will be responsibility of Chinese intellectuals.

---

<sup>10</sup> Some Chinese scholars separate "salvation ideas" from "enlightenment" and think during the May Fourth Movement the former surpassed the latter (Li Ze-hou, 1979: 7-50), I completely agree with this separation, and think we had better distinguish the New Cultural Movement and May Fourth Movement based on their respective roles. The New Cultural Movement played a very important role in the transformation of the old geneology of knowledge into a new one., but the May Fourth Movement's role mainly was in the reconstruction of political ideology.

## REFERENCES

- Beetham, David (1985). *Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cai Shang-si (1979). *Zhong Guo Wen Hua Shi Yao Lun*. Hu Nan Ren Min Chu Ban She. (The Essential to the History of Chinese Culture ).
- Cai Shang-si (1982-830). *Zhong Guo Xian Dai Si Xiang Shi Zi Liao Jian Bian*. Zhe Jiang Ren Min Chu Ban She: Di Yi Huan, Zhu Wei-zheng, 1982; Di Re Juan, Li Hua-xing, 1982; Di San Juan, Jiang Yi-hua, 1983; Di Si Juan, Jiang Yi-hua, 1983; Di Wu Juan, Li Hua-xig, 1983. (Selected Readigs on the History of Contmporary Chinese Thoughts, Vol. I , 1982; Vol. II , 1982; Vol.III and Vol. IV,1983; Vol. V , 1983).
- Chen, Theodore H.E. (1960). *Thought Reform of the Chinese Intellectuals*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Univ. Press.
- Chinese Social and Political Science Review(1916).I.I.Apr.
- Deng Wei Zhi, ed. (1991). *She Hui Ke Xue Zheng Ming Da Xi* (1949-89).
- Deng Wei Zhi. (1949-89). *She Hui Xue Juan*. Shanghai Ren Min Chu Ban She. (A Counteding Series of Social Science-Sociology).
- Easton, David & Schelling, Corinnes, eds. (1991). *Divided Knowledge: Across Culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fairbank, John K. (1980) *The Cambridge History of China, XI: Late Ch'ing, 1800-1911, Part 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Fairbank, John K. (1986). *The Great Chinese Revolution: 1800-1895*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Fei Xiao-tong (1983). *Chong Shi She Hui Wu Shi Nian*. Tian Jin Rne Min Chu Ban She. (Fifty Years as a Sociologist).
- Feng You-lan(Feng Yu-lan)(1948). *A History of Chinese Philosophy*. New York: Macmillan.
- Feng You-lan (1958). *Zhong Guo Jin Dai Si Xiang Shi Lun Wen Ji*. Shang Hai Ren Min Chu Ban She. (Collected Works on the History of Modern Chinese Thoughts).
- Fong, H. D. (1975). *Reminiscences of a Chinese Economist at 70*. Singapore: South Seas Press Ltd.
- Fu Da-Wei (1990). *Zhi Shi Yu Quan Li De Kun Jian, Gui Guan*. (The Space of Knowledge and Power).
- Galt, Howard (1951). *A History of Chinese Educational Institutions*. London: Arthur Probsthain.
- Han Shu Zhi, ed. (1991).*She Hui Ke Xue Zheng Ming Da XI(1949-1989)-Zheng Zhi Xue Fa Xue Juan*. Shanghai Ren Min Chu Ban She (1949-1989). (A Contending Series of Social Science- Political Science and Law, 1949-1989).
- Hawkins, John N. (1974). *Mao Tse-tung and Education: his Thoughts and Teachings*. Hamden, CT: The Shoe String Press.
- Hayhoe, Run & Bastid, Marianne, eds. (1987). *China's Education and Industrialized World: Studies in Cultural Transfer*. White Plains, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Hsu, Leonard Shih-lien (1931). "The Sociologist Movement in China", *Pacific Affairs*, IV, 4, Apr., 283-98.
- Hu Ji-chuang (1981). *Zhong Guo Jing Ji Si Xiang Shi Jian Bian*. Zhong Guo She Hui Ke Xue Chu Ban She. (The Concise History of Chinese Economic Thought).
- Hu Qiao-mu (19920). *Zhong Guo Wei Shen Me Fan 20 Nian De " Zuo" Qing Cuo Wu, in Xin Hua Wen Zhai, IV* ( Why China Made Twenty Year "Leftness" Mistakes).
- Jiao Yu Bu (1930). *Da Xue Ke Mu Biao. Zheng Zhong Shu Ju*.( The Form of Curricula of Universitied).
- Jing Ji Ri Bao Zhu Bian (1990). *Zhong Guo Dai Jing Ji Xue Jian Zhuan Lue*. Di Wu Juan, Liao Ning Ren Min Chu Ban She (Who's Who in Contemporary Chinese Economics).
- Jing Yao-ji (1990). *Cong Chuan Tong Dao Dai, ShiBao Wen Hua*. (From Tradition to Modern).
- Kurt, Werner Radtke & Tong, Saich, eds. (1993). *China's Modernization: Westernization and Acculturation*.

Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

- Langer, Josef (1992). *Emerging Sociology: An International Perspective*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing.
- Li Da-zhao (1920). "The Value of Historical Materialism in Contemporary Historical Science". *New Youth*, VIII,4.
- Li Rui (1992). *Mao Zedong De Zhao Nian Yu Wan Nian*. Gui Zhou Ren Min Chu Ban She. (The Early and Old years of Mao Zedong).
- Li Yi-yuan & Gao-shu (1972). *Zhong Guo Ren De Xing Ge, Gui Guna*. (The Character of Chinese).
- Li Ze-hou (1979). *Zhong Guo Jin Dai Si Xiang Shi Lun*. Ren Min Chu Ban She. (On History of Modern Chinese Thought).
- Li Ze-hou (1986). *Zhong Guo Gu Dai Si Xiang Shi Lun*. Ren Min Chu Ban She. (On History of Ancient Chinese Thought).
- Li Ze-hou (1987). *Zhong Guo Gu Dai Si Xiang Shi Lun*. Dong Fang Chu Ban She. (On History of Contemporary Chinese Thought).
- Luo Rong-qu (1995). *Dong Ya Kua Shi Ji De Bian Ge yu Chong Xinq Jue Qi*. Beijing Da Xue Xue Bao. (Across-century Reform and Rerise of East Asia).
- Lutz, Jessie Gregory (1971). *China under the Christian Colleges 1850-1950*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press.
- MacFarquhar, Roderick (1966). *China under Mao: Politics Takes Command*. Cambridge: The M. I. T Press.
- MacFarquhar, Roderick & Fairbank, John K. (1987). *The Cambridge History of China, XVI: The People's Republic, Part I: The Emergence of Revolutionary China 1949-1965*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- MacFarquhar, Roderick & Fairbank, John K. (1991). *The Cambridge History of China, XV: The People's Republic, Part 2: Revolutions within the Chinese Revolution 1966-1982*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- McGough, James P. (1979). *Fei Hsiao-t'ung: The Dilemma of a Chinese Intellectual*. White Plains, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Mao Zedong (1970). *Mao Zedong Xue Ji (1926-1949)*. Ren Ming Chu Ban She. (Selected Collections of Mao Zedong: 1926-1949).
- Mao Zedong (1971). *Selected Readings From the Works of Mao Tsetung*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.
- Mao Zedong (1977a). *On The Ten Major Relationships*. Beijing: Foreign Language Press.
- Mao Zedong (1977b). *Mao Zedong Xue Ji (1949-1957)*. Ren Ming Chu Ban She. (Selected Collections of Mao Zedong: 1949-1947).
- Qian Mu (1984). *Xian Dai Zhong Guo Xue Shu Lun Henq*. Dong Da Tu Shu Gong Si. (On Contemporary Chinese Academies).
- Remer, C. F. ([1922] 1980). *Readings in Economics for China*. New York: Garland.
- Russell, Bertrand ([1922] 1966). *The Problem of China*. London: George & Unwin.
- Sang Xian-zhi, Lin Qiao-qiao (1986). *Zhong Guo Jin Dai Zheng Zhi Si Xiang Shi*. Zhong Guo Ren Min Da Xue Chu Ban She. (History of Modern Chinese Political Thought).
- Schwartz, Benjamin (1964). *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and The West*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Sun E-tu Zen (1986). "The Growth of the Academic Community", in J. Fairbank & A. Feuerwerker, eds., *The Cambridge History of China, XIII: Republication China 1912-1949, Part 2*. New York: Cambridge Univ, Press, 361-420.
- Tang Leag-Li (1936). *The New Social Order in China*. Shanghai: China United Press.
- Teng, Ssu-yu & Fairbank, John K. (1954). *China's Response to the West*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Thurston, Anne F. & Pasternak, John K. (1995). *The Social Science and Fieldwork in China*. Boulder: Westview.
- Tian Jin She Hui Ke Xue, May, 1993. (Tianjin Social Science).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1979). *The Capitalist World-Economy*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

- Wang Wen-jun, ed. (1989). *Nan Kai Da Xue Xiao Shi Zi Liao Xuan 1919-1949*. Nan Kai Da Xue Chu Ban She. (Selected Collections of Nankai University: 1919-1949).
- Wang Ya-nan (1956). *Zheng Zhi Jing Ji Xue Jiao Ke Shu De Jie Chu Gong Xian in Zheng Zhi Jing Ji Xue Jiao Ke Shu Ping Lun Ji*. San Lian Shu Dian. (Collected Works of Comments on the Textbook for Political Economy).
- Wang Yi Chu (1966). *Chinese Intellectuals and the West, 1872-1949*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina.
- Wang Yu-chuan (1938). "The Development of Modern Social Science in China." *Pacific Affairs*, XI. 3, Sept., 345-62.
- Watanuki, Joji (1975). *Social Science in Japan*. Sophia: Sophia Univ.
- Wilson, Dick (1977). *Mao Tse-tung in the Scales Of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Wong Sin-lun (1979). *Sociology and Socialism in Contemporary China*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Yan Ming (1992). "The Rise, Fall and Rebirth of Sociology in China", in J.Lawer, ed., *Emerging Sociology: An International perspective*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 100-10.
- Yang Guo Shu & Wen Chong-yi, eds. (1982). *She Hui Ji Xing Wei Ke Yan Jiu De Zhong Guo Hua*. Tai Bei. (Sinification of Behavioral and Social Science, 1982)
- .Yi Yao (1988). *Shi Dai Dui Li Lun De Hu Huan: Zhong Guo She Hui Ke Xue Shi Nian*, in *She Hui Ke Xue Zong Lun*. Zhong Guo Ren min Da Xue Shu Bao Zhong Xin Fu Yin Bao Kan Zi Liao, 1988. (Recall of Era to Theory: Ten Years of Chinese Social Sciences).
- Zhong Guo Jin Dai Zheng Zhi Si Xiang Lun Xuan Ji* (1986). Zhong Hua Shu Ju (Selected Works of Modern Chinese Political Thoughts).
- Zhong Guo She Hui Ke Xue Ji Kan*. (Hong Kong) (Chinese Social Science Quartely).
- Zhu Xi, d (1983). *Si Shu Zhang Ju Ji Zhu*, Zhong Hua Shu Ju, July.
- 1967 Nian Fei Qing Nian Bao: 17 Nian Lai Fei Qing Zong Lan. Fei Qing Yan Jiu Za Zhi She*. (1967 Yearbook on Chinese Communism: A Summary of Chinese Communist Situation From 1949 to 1966)..