



Review: [Untitled]

Reviewed Work(s):

Mainland China, Taiwan, and U.S. Policy. by Hung-mao Tien
William Kirby

The Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. 44, No. 2. (Feb., 1985), pp. 387-388.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-9118%28198502%2944%3A2%3C387%3AMCTAUP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O>

The Journal of Asian Studies is currently published by Association for Asian Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/afas.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

permitted to visit any site in the Chinese countryside for more than fourteen days. The imbalance of the exchange in quantitative terms is not so important, of course, as its less visible dimension—the imbalance in qualitative terms. We do not need to send ten thousand Americans to the People's Republic, but the scholars and students we do send should be given reasonable access to opportunities for field research. If American social scientists do not raise their voices in protest, will policymakers in Washington and Beijing pay the slightest heed to the presently dismal state of fieldwork for visiting researchers in China?

RANDY STROSS
Colorado School of Mines

Mainland China, Taiwan, and U.S. Policy. Edited by HUNG-MAO TIEN. Cambridge, Mass.: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain, 1983. xvii, 270 pp. Appendixes, Notes on the Contributors. N.p.

This volume gathers together the scholarly and personal views of twenty scholars of Chinese origin on a wide variety of contemporary issues. The participants include historians, political scientists, economists, and professors of literature, most of whom attended a 1981 conference at the Wingspread Center of the Johnson Foundation in Racine, Wisconsin. From the summary of discussion provided here, the conference may be said to have succeeded in its aim of providing "channels of communication among overseas Chinese intellectuals who hold different views regarding the mainland, Taiwan affairs, and their prospect for future development." As an academic *Sammelband* on the issues it addresses, however, the volume is less successful.

The book is comprised primarily of the work of conference panels on U.S.–China policy, political and economic change in the PRC, cultural and social change in China and Taiwan, recent political developments in Taiwan, and prospects for PRC–Taiwan relations. Four essays have been added, for a total of twenty-six contributions. To all this, sixteen documents on Sino-American relations have been appended. Although this overburdened structure—in which panel introductions and summaries sometimes take up more space than the papers themselves—impairs the volume's usefulness as a whole, several contributions deserve special notice.

Hung-mao Tien's preface provides a helpful guide through the recent history of the Taiwan issue in Sino-American relations, with special attention to the Taiwan Relations Act and the 1982 joint communiqué on U.S. arms sales to Taiwan. James C. Hsiung offers a convincing characterization of the China policy of the Reagan administration as being determined above all by the direction of U.S.–Soviet relations. Alan P. L. Liu and Chu-yuan Cheng contribute balanced, thoughtful discussions of recent PRC political and economic developments, respectively. Several essays on literature, which were commissioned after the conference, are among the volume's better pieces: Leo Ou-fan Lee's discussion of recent PRC literary policy, focusing on the Bai Hua case; Ch'en Jo-hsi's article on the "Democratic Movement and Popular Journals" (to which is added a helpful, though unfortunately not annotated, bibliography of "non-official" journals); and Joseph S. M. Lau's analysis of particularist *hsiang-t'u* literature on Taiwan, which updates his earlier work on that subject.

Several important topics, such as the future relations between the PRC and Taiwan, are given short shrift (the two papers of that panel run to a total of three and one-half pages), with the result that little is said that is new. Indeed, although the issues presented here remain sufficiently current (thanks in good part to the speed of

the editor), scholars generally will find few surprises in the volume. One exception may be Hungdah Chiu's contention that the "1.5 million Mainland Chinese born on Taiwan . . . have been discriminated against in private and public employment because of their provincial origin" (p. 161).

Sixty pages of appended documents that range over the decade from 1972 to 1982 should prove a useful reference source for teachers and students of recent Sino-American relations. Less helpful is the fact that the book has no index.

WILLIAM KIRBY
Washington University

The Relationship Between Scholars and Rulers in Imperial China: A Comparison Between China and the West. By KAI-FU TSAO. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984. xi, 247 pp. Notes, Bibliography, Index. N.p.

The topic of this book is a worthy one for investigation, but the author's approach is too ambitious, and in the end he fails to provide us with any new insights. The subtitle encompasses the ancient Near East, classical Greece, the Hellenistic world, the Roman empire, and the modern West. Moreover, Kai-fu Tsao does not confine himself to the imperial age in China but devotes a third of the discussion to the Shang and Zhou periods. In the China sections, Tsao ranges over a variety of intellectual and cultural developments. For example, fifty-nine pages covering the entire period from Sui through Qing (590–1912) discuss, *inter alia*, the founding of successive dynasties, the reestablishment of a civil-service examination system in Sui-Tang, the great Tang poets, painting styles, inventions, Song scholars and Neo-Confucian developments, the continuing role of Buddhism in intellectual life, Ming bureaucratic structure, government school systems, Manchu-Chinese dyarchy in the Qing, the school of Han Learning, the influx and influence of Western ideals, social change, Sun Yat-sen and Yuan Shikai, warlordism, and the New Culture movement. For the most part, the presentation is sloppy and unfocused, and some obvious matters are neglected. Can there be any possible explanation for total silence, for example, on the censorial function in imperial China? Another mystifying omission comes in the discussion of Eastern Zhou intellectual development: Confucian theories of self-cultivation and statecraft are briefly presented, but nothing is said about Taoist, Legalist, or other schools of thought.

In the preface the author recognizes the pitfalls of such a large undertaking, but he justifies the attempt in terms of intercultural understanding. Tsao hopes to find "larger patterns" of historical experience in China and the West and convey them to the general reader, not to the specialist. The results are inconsistent with the intent even here. The text is sprinkled liberally with technical terms and Chinese words and phrases (and characters). How many general readers will want to follow a six-page discourse on the meaning of the term *shi* (usually translated as "scholar" or "scholar-official") in early Zhou literature?

The lack of a strong editorial hand—in fact, was there one?—is evident throughout. Notes (and text) contain needless trivia, grammatical and spelling errors abound (the name of Confucius's leading disciple is rendered variably as "Mancius," "Muncius," and "Mencius"), pedantic flourishes cover the pages, and quotations from source material are too frequent and too long.