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Hoyt Tillman (ASU) and Wu Chan-liang (NTU)

Description of Project: “Culture and Power in China’s History,” an international conference at Arizona State University; March 29-30, 2019 (arrival & welcome dinner on March 28 and departure March 31, 2019)

Principal ASU Sponsors: Center for Biology & Society at ASU’s School of Life Sciences; and Professor Jeffrey Cohen, Dean of Humanities, ASU’s College of Arts and Sciences

Co-sponsors: China Studies Faculty in the School of International Letters and Cultures; the School of International Letters and Cultures; Confucius Institute; Professor Jane Maienschein; Mr. Budd Peabody; Institute for Humanities Research; Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies; School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies

Significance: Political power was embedded in Chinese culture in extraordinarily intense and uniquely complex ways. For instance, University of California, Berkeley, Professor Frederick Wakeman characterized the contested relationship between imperial rulers and their scholar-officials as “counterpoised collaborators.” The court and the social elite shared considerable interests in “parenting” the people, but Chinese elites nevertheless held diverse views and approaches to state ideology, cultural values, social norms, and state policies, etc. Whereas the landed aristocracy of Europe ruled, educated men of imperial China only governed and only outside of their home prefectures. The qualifying requirement that ministers successfully pass the civil service examinations placed more emphasis on a constructed and evolving canon of cultural knowledge as the justification of power (and as a practical tool for its implementation). In contrast to the “divine right of kings” in Europe, Confucian scholars sought to hold rulers in China to the moral standard of Confucius’ “sage kings” and to competency at least in employing “talent” to govern the empire, or else lose the “Mandate of Heaven.” In other words, intellectual contestations over culture and morality had real-life implications for evaluating and sometimes reforming political programs, but often also served the interest of those holding power in polity and society.

Today, officials and public intellectuals in China continue to utilize and manipulate China’s traditions to shape the currency of cultural capital and its role in the realm of power; thus, the issue of “Culture and Power in China’s History” is particularly important now. Greater understanding of the dynamics between culture and power in China should enhance our ability to comprehend and deal with China’s reasserting its status and power in today’s global interactions. The conference topic is also timely because of the prevailing partial explanations for China’s selective revival of its traditional culture in its defense and offense against what many Chinese regard as unrelenting cultural and power encroachments and pressures from the West.

To enhance our grasp of the nuanced interactions between culture and power, we are planning a forum of selected international scholars to examine crucial cases or diverse examples of the tensions and collaborations between culture and power in China’s history. These individual case studies will serve as a basis for our collective effort to clarify this perennial issue of the relationship between culture and power in defining how Chinese people understood the social and natural order. It is time to have a conference and volume on this seminal issue. It has been about twenty-five years since the publication of the landmark conference volume, *The Power of Culture: Studies in Chinese Cultural History* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1994), edited by Willard J. Peterson, Andrew Plaks, and Ying-shih Yü. The Princeton
conference in 1988 celebrated “the power of culture” 文德 at a time of much greater optimism and idealism about the world at large and especially about China than we enjoy in our present day. Without any intent to be critical of that landmark volume, we perceive a need to revisit the issue from the context of our own day and current scholarship. Moreover, whereas that earlier volume focused on culture’s power to influence other people, our volume will tend to center on tensions or complex relationships between culture and power. Furthermore, that volume’s range of cultural history allotted primacy to literature, language and art, our conference and projected volume will cast a different net of cultural history, as well as additional areas not included in the Princeton conference. Willard Peterson’s Introduction to the earlier volume inspires us when he acknowledged and highlighted how open-ended the issue of the power of culture remains.

Individual papers will address the complex relationship between culture and power from a wide range of topics from diverse disciplines. Disciplines range from the history of science and medicine to philosophy, religious studies, ritual studies and various subfields of history. Each of the four delegations are led by renowned senior scholars: Thomas Höllmann, President of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities, and Hans van Ess, Professor of Sinology and Vice President of International Relations at Ludwig-Maxilians-Universitaet, Munich, and also President of the Max Weber Foundation; Xiao Yongming, Director of the Yuelu Academy at Hunan University, and He Jun, Professor of Philosophy at Fudan University; Wu Chan-liang, Professor of History at NTU; and Yeh Wen-hsin, the Morrison Professor of History at UC Berkeley. However, there is also a range of scholars, including two postdocs and three assistant professors, to enhance diversity of perspectives and lively discussions.

Outcomes: First, selected research outcomes and revised papers from this international conference at Arizona State University should result in an edited book and/or a special issue of a journal. Second, one thread in Tillman’s research since the 1970s has been inquiring into what power or influence culture has had in China. Thus, although some of Tillman’s publications since the late 1970s sought to reflect on the question of the power of culture in China’s history, this conference will challenge Tillman to concentrate on this issue of culture’s power and its limitations more fully and from a wider range of disciplinary approaches and contextual perspectives.

Schedule: We will have a welcome dinner for international guests early Thursday evening. On Friday morning, we will have brief welcomes from ASU’s two principal sponsors and then a cameo greeting and perspective statement from Professor Ying-shih Yü via electronic media from his home in Princeton. Afterwards, co-directors Tillman and Wu will present their goals and guidelines for the conference, which will be followed by a keynote address. There will be three regular sessions on Friday and four on Saturday. At the end of the afternoon on Saturday, we will have a concluding discussion of what we have learned to advance our understanding of the relationship of culture and power in China’s history. Thus, ten papers will be discussed each day. We will circulate the papers beforehand, so our discussions will be more efficient and effective. We will give each presenter ten minutes to highlight or to contextualize the contents of a paper before an assigned discussant makes comments and poses questions as a catalyst for the larger group discussion. Co-directors Tillman and Wu, as well as designated discussants, will strive to challenge the presenters to enhance the implications of their specific case study for our exploration of the complex relationship between culture and power in Chinese history.
Presenting Participants, emails, paper topics and abstracts:

WU Chan-liang, wuwei@ntu.edu.tw  (Professor of History, National Taiwan University): “Counter-Enlightenment and Early Chinese Communism (1919-1927).” Abstract: In the decades before the end of the WWI, most Chinese intellectuals worshiped the modern world created by the West, together with the Enlightenment rationality behind it. However, when China lost Shandong at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, most Chinese intellectuals felt trapped in an unjust world in which not rationality but only power matters, and the majority of young Chinese intellectuals turned to socialism and communism to save China. With strong resentment toward the injustices and brutality embedded in “rationalized” capitalist world, modern Chinese intellectuals soon turned to all kinds of collectivist, holistic, romantic and highly idealistic projects. Chinese communism was the most radical and thorough form of this kind of collectivist, holistic and romantic “idealism.” Strongly dissatisfied with the global order dominated by the capitalist "Old West," Chinese communists believed they were marching toward a newer modernity, which, nevertheless, carried with it a strong counter-Enlightenment and anti-modernity nature. With its emphasis on evolution and becoming, dialectical logic, "the unity of theory and practice," and the inseparability between one’s thought and one’s position as a social being, Marxism has undermined the philosophical basis of Enlightenment rationality in many ways. This tendency, combined with the highly non-Enlightenment and often counter-Enlightenment traditional Chinese mode of thinking, made Chinese Marxism even more counter-Enlightenment than is often assumed. This research seeks to provide better understanding about why the “Enlightenment Project” has never been realized in modern China.

HE Jun, jackhe1963@126.com  (Professor, School of Philosophy, Fudan University): "The Paradox of the Rise and Fall of the Hu School of Learning and the Options for Song Confucians." Abstract: The Hu school of learning initiated by the forerunner of Song Learning, who arose from the local to the central government, participated in Northern Song political affairs and realized his own intellectual objectives. However, in the Southern Song, Zhu Xi and his colleagues discovered that the Hu school of learning had already declined; from this they were cautioned to ponder taking Confucianism into a new direction.

Jack Hiu-yu CHEUNG, hycheung@cuhk.edu.hk  (Assistant Professor, New Asia College, Chinese University of Hong Kong): “Consolidating a New Tradition: The Intellectual Endeavor of Cheng Yi’s Disciples in the Early Twelfth Century.” Abstract: Modern scholars and historians generally regarded Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033–1107) as one of the pioneers of the Song Daoxue 道學 movement. Compared with Cheng Yi, his students received less attention, and historians have conventionally relegated to the category of “minor” scholars. Through an in-depth analysis of the epistolary writings between Cheng Yi’s students and their remembrance about Cheng Yi, I argue that it was his students who actually consolidated the intellectual tradition founded by Cheng Yi and utilized it to enhance their own political status in the transition period from the Northern to the Southern Song in the early twelfth century. By emphasizing the role played by these “minor” scholars, I am supplementing the traditional portrait of the “Cheng School” in the Song Yuan xuean 宋元學案 (Scholarly Annals of Song and Yuan Periods) with a more objective evaluation of the early history of Daoxue. The ones that standard authority portrayed as “minor” scholars actually were major contributors to the construction of a new intellectual tradition.
Christian Soffel, soffel@uni-trier.de  (Professor and Chairman of the Department of Sinology, University of Trier, Germany): “Innovation and Metaphysics: On Early Uses of the Term ‘Neo-Confucianism.’” Abstract: My paper traces the origins of the Western term ‘Neo-Confucianism’ back to European sources from the early 19th century. It will reveal a rather narrow understanding of ‘Neo-Confucianism,’ mostly restricted to the metaphysical ideas of Zhou Dunyi and the yin/yang theory, which in the beginning was discussed in the context of Chinese medicine. There is also a link to early Jesuit discussions (from the 17th and 18th centuries) on the relationship between the original teachings of Confucius and the Cheng-Zhu school. Thus, this essay will shed light on the issue of cultural and political orthodoxy.

Hans van Ess, ess@lmu.de  (Professor of Sinology and Vice President of International Relations at Ludwig-Maxilians-Universitaet, Munich, and also President of the Max Weber Foundation): “Who and What is a Barbarian in the Writings of a Confucian Family in the 12th century?” Abstract: It has been more than twenty years now since I started doing research on Hu Anguo and his sons Hu Yin and Hu Hong. The three Hu formed a group of Daoxue thinkers who are often forgotten in writings on the transmission of the thought of the Cheng brothers to Zhu Xi. The contribution that they had made to the Daoxue tradition remained known throughout the empire until the end of the Ming period was ensured by the fact that Hu Anguo’s commentary on the Classic Spring and Autumn Annals became the standard exegesis that was used during the palace examinations for the civil service. An important factor among the many reasons why the Hu family did not receive as much attention as they should have certainly is that there is a very strong anti-Barbarian element in their writings, which Zhu Xi did not really support and was rejected outright by the Manchu emperors of the Qing dynasty. Taking into account recent scholarship on the “barbarian question,” this paper explores what the three members of the Hu family really thought about the Hu/Xia problem.

YIN Hui, yinhui@hnu.edu.cn  (Associate Professor, Yuelu Academy, Hunan University): “Culture and Power in Chinese History: on Zheng Xuan’s and Zhu Xi’s Scholarship on the Rites.” Abstract: Both Zheng Xuan and Zhu Xi were masters of ritual learning. In their discourse on culture and power, their interpretation of ritual had a profound impact on the politics, culture and scholarship of traditional China.

XIAO Yongming, wyythsl@126.com  (Professor and Director, Yuelu Academy, Hunan University): “Forming Cultural Images: The Making of Zhu Xi's Image before and after the 13th Century.” Abstract: Beginning from the middle and late periods of the Southern Song, Zhu Xi's image was constantly being formed, and during the Yuan period was fashioned to a status almost equal to Confucius' cultural image. During this process—Zhu Xi himself, his disciples, dynastic courts and numerous scholars during the Song and Yuan dynasties—all played a role in the formation of Zhu Xi's image. That process reflected trends in the evolution of cultural and political orthodoxy.

Charles Hartman, chartman@albany.edu  (Professor of East Asian Studies, the University at Albany, State University of New York at Albany): “Lu You’s Draft Entries for the Sagacious Policies of the Restoration (Zhongxing shengzheng cao).” Abstract: The Zhongxing shengzheng cao 中興聖政草 is a small relic of Song dynasty historiography compiled by the famous poet Lu You 陸游 (1125-1210) in 1163, shortly after the abdication of Emperor Gaozong in favor of the new Emperor Xiaozong. The book, recovered from the Yongle dadian 永樂大典 and printed for the first time in 1996, selects twenty historical events from the first two years of Gaozong’s rule.
(1127-1129). Lu You wrote a commentary for each event. A topical analysis of these twenty events and a close reading of Lu You’s comments demonstrate that he selected his topics in order to present Emperor Xiaozong with precedents on how to reform the contemporary administration. What at first sight appears as praise for Gaozong’s early actions as emperor turns out to be criticism of the political decay into which, in Lu You’s view, his reign had degenerated. In short, the work shows Lu You’s dreams both for the founder he wished Gaozong had been and for the ruler he hoped Xiaozong would be. So understood, the work reveals much about the character of mid-12th century politics and society.

HUANG Kuanchong, huangkc@mail.ihp.sinica.edu.tw (Emeritus Senior Researcher at the Institute of History & Philology, Academia Sinica; currently Professor at Chang Gung University): “Power and Influence in Political Culture during the Southern Song: the Case of Liu Zai 劉宰.” Abstract: Liu Zai (1166-1239) was an exceptional scholar-official in the Southern Song. After passing the civil service examination and serving in government for eighteen years, he resigned from office on the pretext of illness and lived in countryside for thirty years. Yet, he maintained extensive contacts with court and local officials and continued to express opinions about state affairs and border defense. He also established comprehensive relations with local society by compiling local gazetteers, writing biographies of county worthies, and advocating for famine relief; using social resources to promote the three largest famine relief projects in the world at that time, he became the spokesperson for local society. His network and reputation led Grand Councilor Shi Miyuan 史彌遠 and others to repeatedly invite him to become a court official, but he refused and continued to be a critic of current policies. His reputation for integrity in bravely saying no to power was recognized in the official posthumous title “Wenqing 文清.” Through this case study of an extraordinary individual, my essay analyzes the political choices of scholars in dealing with power and their influence in political culture.

CHEN Xi, chenxi.history@whu.edu.cn (Professor of History at Wuhan University): "Buddhism and Local Society along the Middle Reaches of Han River during the Song: An Observation Focused on Stone Inscriptions." Abstract: During the Late Tang and Five Dynasties, Buddhist monks of the Caodong Sect and the Linji Sect successively entered the middle reaches of the Han River, in such places as Xiangzhou, Suizhou, and Yingzhou. Caodong sect Buddhist monks, such as Dahong Bao'en 大洪报恩 (1058-1111), Furong Daokai 芙蓉道楷 (1043-1118), Danxia Zichen 丹霞子淳 (1064-1117), Huizhao Qingyu 慧照庆预, Jingyan 净严, and Mingwu 明悟, took as their center the Chongning Baoshou Chan Temple in Suizhou. Going back and forth between the political center and local officials, they expanded the influence of their Buddhist group and formed a center for religious belief in a rather large geographical area.

Achim Mittag, achim.mittag@uni-tuebingen.de (Professor of Sinology, University of Tübingen, Germany): “The Late Version of Zhu Xi’s Shijing Commentary (Shi jizhuan): Notes on its Genesis and its Early Reception.” Abstract: Zhu Xi's commentary to the Book of Odes (Shijing), titled the Shi jizhuan 詩集傳, became part of the state examinations' curriculum by 1315, and is primarily known for its dismissal of the “Small Prefaces” 小序 and Zhu's much-debated interpretations of more than thirty Guofeng odes as “depraved songs.” These are the most characteristic features of the Shi jizhuan's late version, the received text in 20 chapters, which significantly revised from an initial 1182 version. Building from modern research pointing to a middle version, I will present evidence for a “middle version A” and a “middle version B.” My
aim is fourfold. First, based upon references mainly found in Zhu Xi's letters, I will outline a reconstruction of when and how the late version came about, from revisions of some odes interpretations as contained in the middle version in 1186/87 to the late version's printing around 1190. Second, I will point out the main differences between the late and the middle version(s). Third, I will probe into the late Southern Song history of the printing, transmission, and reception of the *Shi jizhuan*. Special attention will be paid to Zhu Xi's grandson Zhu Jian, who prepared a new edition of the *Shi jizhuan*, which was accompanied by a compilation of an anthology concerning Zhu Xi's *Shijing* studies entitled the *Shizhuan yishuo*. In the "Preface" of this anthology, dated 1235, there is information on three early *Shi jizhuan* editions, i.e., the Yuzhang, the Changsha, and the Houshan editions. Fourth, based upon the foregoing inquiry into the early *Shi jizhuan* editions, I will offer an explanation regarding the divergence of the "middle version's" two recensions.

LIU Bo-hong, lowbow@gate.sinica.edu.tw (Assistant Professor, Institute of Chinese Literature & Philosophy, Academia Sinica): “Rituals Education as Cultural Power: The Case of the 《酬世錦囊正家禮大成》 during the Qing.” Abstract: The *Choushi Jinnang Zheng Jiali Dacheng* was compiled from *Zhu Xi’s Family Rituals* and other ritual works by Lü Zizhen 呂子振 from Zhangzhou, Fujian. After publication in 1735 during the Yongzheng era, it became popular and had a far-reaching impact on local customs in Fujian and Taiwan. Researchers regard it as guidebook for folk rituals, but my aim is to clarify the nature and significance of this compilation. I first discuss its nature and significance; moreover, I posit that Lü’s purpose was to promote ritual education. I next analyze ritual education’s relationship to the Confucian classics and *Zhu Xi’s Family Rituals*. Lastly, I explain the compilation’s significance in promoting education in folk rituals. Overall, the essay should enhance understanding of the circulation of *Zhu Xi’s Family Rituals* and the cultural power of rituals education.

HSIA Chang-pwu, cphsia@ntu.edu.tw  (Professor of Chinese, National Taiwan University): “Toward the Construction of a Scholarly View of History Using the Example of the Compilation of the *Comprehensive Table of Contents of Complete Library of the Four Treasuries* 四庫全書總目.” Abstract: The compilation of *Complete Library of the Four Treasuries* was a highlight of the Emperor Qianlong’s cultural undertakings, and the process of creating a collection of notes on its content in *The Comprehensive Table of Contents* was perhaps an even greater achievement. It was not only the greatest achievement in Chinese bibliography since Liu Xin 劉歆 (46BC-AD23) first made his book classifications but also a representative work of Qing scholarship. Its overall scholarly viewpoint is evident when all its components are taken into account, i.e., its general prefaces to the divisions on the Classics, Histories, Masters and Collections, other prefaces, explanatory notes of compilation, catalogues, summaries of each book and comments on these summaries. These contents concretely implemented the idea of “distinguishing the different academic schools, tracking down their source,” which Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠 had articulated. Thus, the compilation of *the Comprehensive Table of Contents* fully displayed Qianlong’s view of academic history and his ambition, which included all academic schools, as well as his ambitions, which were not restricted to governance and his ten great military victories. The large number of photocopies of the *Comprehensive Table of Contents* published in recent years provide concrete and credible materials to discuss the compilation process. We can now explore how the compilers settled on themes from complicated and divergent abstracts and constructed a distinct and complete scholarly view by writing, revising and superseding their own earlier drafts.
Thomas O. Höllmann, thomas.hoellmann@lmu.de  (President, Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Germany): “The Authority of Words: Poetry, Calligraphy and Power in Ancient and Medieval China.” Abstract: Chinese emperors, princes, and ministers were famous not only for their military campaigns and for administrative reforms, but also for their poetry and calligraphy. To gain charisma and prestige, a command of literary skills and brush techniques seems to have been even more important from time to time than a grasp of military victories or administrative justice.

Kent Guy, qing@uw.edu  (Professor, Department of History and the Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington): “Culture and Power at Emperor Kangxi’s Court: Viewed through Censorial Indictments.” Abstract: One of the moments when culture and power came into salient conflict in Chinese imperial history was in the latter half of the seventeenth century when Manchus faced Chinese resistance in the wake of Qing conquest and subtle adjustments were required to establish the foundations of the high Qing order. I will focus on three censorial impeachments, launched against a Chinese bannerman, a Manchu aristocrat, and Chinese scholars, by a courageous if somewhat naïve Chinese Censor Guo Xiu (1639-1700?). His charges produced lengthy discussions at court, in which both Manchus and Chinese participated, reflecting their respective attitudes, loyalties and senses of entitlement. It is possible to capture the tone of the discussion in some detail, as it occurred at a moment documented fairly thoroughly in the Kangxi Diaries of Action and Repose, which provides almost verbatim transcripts of a three-day discussion. Drawing on this record, I propose to assay the relationship of power and culture, Manchus and Chinese at a little studied, but crucial moment, of the evolution of Qing government.

Wen-hsin YEH, sha@berkeley.edu  (Morrison Chair Professor of History, University of California, Berkeley): “Power, Culture, and History: Yan Fu in 1895.” Abstract: There has been a wealth of scholarship both about Yan Fu and the year 1895. Recent works in media studies, urban history, and theories of translation have further enriched an understanding of journal publications and Tianjin. My proposed essay will draw on a broad range of relevant scholarship to engage in a close reading of Yan's 1895 writings. Specifically: What were the resources that Yan had drawn upon as he advanced his thinking? How did thinkers and political commentators of 1895 define and construct their intellectual community? Above all: How might a comprehensive approach to Yan Fu either yield new insights or uphold the established interpretive reading?

Guy S. Alitto, guy.alitto@gmail.com  (Professor of History, University of Chicago): “Twentieth Century Unity of Confucian Theory and Practice: Liang Shuming and Wang Yangming’s Taizhou Disciples.”

Lionel M. Jensen, lionel.jensen.21@nd.edu  (Associate Professor, Department of East Asian Languages & Cultures and the Department of History, Notre Dame University): “The Trouble with ‘Confucianisms’ in the Age of Hexie: Wandering Souls or Hungry Ghosts.” Abstract: “Revisiting a problematik taken up thirty years ago by Wm. Theodore deBary, the paper considers the trouble of Confucianist pluralism in an era of resurgent authoritarianism. Under the ideological banner of “socialism with Chinese characteristics” and “socialist spiritual civilization,” capitalist Confucians, new Confucians, academic Confucians with financial objectives, cultural entrepreneurs, research institutes, and the Party-state—all hold one thing in common: Kongzi nostalgia. What does it say that so many different readings of Kongzi and the
ru legacy can exist simultaneously, all of them distinct and in many cases contradictory? One might worry that in this case the lines of commerce, authoritarianism and scholarship have drawn too close, but then the relationship between literate elites and the offices of the dynastic state in traditional China was uniquely intimate. It is this past and present trouble that engenders my recommendation that today’s many Confucianisms be considered as mediating spiritualities for autocracy. The distinctive cultural values of Chinese antiquity putatively embodied in the Sage’s teaching have been given ideological effect as appropriated by the government’s redundant, aggressive advocacy of “harmony above all.”

Christine Yi Lai LUK, chrisluk@hku.hk (Postdoc, University of Hong Kong): “Knowledge of Marine Biology in pre-modern China.” Abstract: This paper is part of my second book project about the history of marine biology in modern China. The driving question of this chapter is, “What was known about Chinese marine life before 1900?” By bringing together Chinese and Western accounts of sea life found in China before the turn of the twentieth century, this chapter will provide the historical and intellectual context necessary to consider the coming-of-age of modern marine biology after 1900. Specifically, I will discuss the preface of Catalog of Marine Creatures (海錯圖) which begins with a quotation from The Doctrine of the Mean (中庸), and consider the Chinese records of “hai cuo” 海錯—variegated stuff from the sea—which is the pre-modern Chinese term for “marine biology” in late-imperial classics and local gazetteers.

Lijing JIANG, Jiang.lijing@gmail.com (Postdoc, Colby College): “Power and Cultures of the Life Sciences in Twentieth-Century China: Knowledge of Life and the Changing Imagination of Generations in Twentieth-Century China.” Abstract: Because the Communist revolution in China brought in the dominance of Lysenkoism, which denied a hard heredity between generations, scholars often attribute the greater emphasis on life’s potential to change and generational malleability in the Communist era to Lysenkoism. My paper argues that this association is only one minor link. For instance, a significant factor in the fascination about changing life forms was the rising tide of nationalism during the Chinese Republic. The biology students whose nationalism led them to return to China from abroad in the late 1940s and early 1950s were not usually geneticists. Some biochemists aimed at artificially synthesizing vital molecules for life, as in the case of insulin, while physiologists continued to experiment on changes in living forms through physiological intervention. Although these projects seemed to have an affinity with Lysenkoism, they developed out of the expansion of the range of life sciences Chinese scientists were working on; moreover, such scientists continued the intellectual debates about potentials of life that have fascinated scientists since the period of the Republic.

Wrap-up Comments by:
Stephen H. West, Stephen.H.West@asu.edu (Foundation Professor of Chinese, School of International Letters and Cultures, Arizona State University).
Margaret Mih Tillman, mmtillman@purdue.edu (Assistant Professor of History, Purdue University).
Co-directors Hoyt Tillman and Wu Chan-liang