

Whither China?

中國的未來與未來在中國



International Conference

Organized by the

Department of East Asian Studies

University of Vienna, Austria

via Zoom,

October 1-3, 2020

This conference brings together scholars of Chinese Studies on the occasion of the retirement of Prof. Dr. Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik and scholars that worked with her together during different stages of her academic career at Bochum, Beijing, Heidelberg, Berkeley, Brandeis University and in Vienna. Taking account the historical legacies and Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik's strive for interdisciplinary approach into the unexplored or what is not understood, this symposium tries to demonstrate how Chinese Studies with their historical, cultural and political expertise are necessary to understand China's path into the future.

Online-Conference via zoom after registration to aleksandar.novakovic@univie.ac.at with the subject "Whither China"

We have opted out of China as a data center region. Read more here: <https://blog.zoom.us/data-routing-control-is-here/>

Every panelist has 20 minutes for presentation, there will be a Q & A after the talks in an panel. If you want to raise a question or want to contribute with a comment during the Q & A, please use the chat and/or "raise your hand" button.

For participants exclusively, the organizers have set up an ucloud folder where participants can have access to papers and presentations uploaded by the speakers. See the email of organizers.

The "*Susanne's spaces of memory*" is a different panel format with greetings and interactions among all participants.

Conference organizer

Department of East Asian Studies, University of Vienna

Contact to the organizers:
Sascha.klotzbuecher@univie.ac.at,

Tel:+43-4277-43859

Content

Conference schedule.....	4
Abstracts	10
Keynote lecture.....	10
Panel 1: Keep it or discard it? Utopias and dystopias	11
Panel 2: Literary narratives of the future and their role for identity-formation.....	12
Panel 3: Cooperation, transformation and confrontation of systems.....	13
Panel 4: Tianxia and the future of international cooperation in (East) Asia.....	14
Panel 5: Looking back into future histories.....	16
Panel 6: The monetary and fiscal future of China	18
Panel 7: The future of treasures: Forests and waste	20
Panel 8: Migration of Chinese populations: Where to go and stay in future?	21
The list of participants (in alphabetical order)	26

Conference schedule

DAY 1, 1.10.2020

17.15-19.00

Keynote lecture (joint lecture with the Center for East Asian Studies (CeMEAS) at the University of Göttingen, Germany)

Timothy Cheek: Fractured Mirror: New Revolutionary History (新革命史) and the Search for China's Future

Chair: Sascha Klotzbücher

Introduction and comment by Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik

Zoom-link:

<https://uni-goettingen.zoom.us/j/92488442758>

Please be advised that this lecture has a zoom link different from the conference zoom-link.

DAY 2, 02.10.2020

09.00-09.15

Opening remarks (Sascha Klotzbücher, Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, Rüdiger Frank)

09.15-10.30

Panel 1: Keep it or discard it? Utopias and dystopias

Axel Schneider: How to harness greed: on progress and other dystopias in modern China

Olga Lomová: Socialism with Chinese characteristics: Contradictio in adiecto?

Chair: Irmy Schweiger

10.30-10.45

Break [for talking to other participants during the breaks and having coffee together, please use separate zoom-link provided by the organizers]

10.45-12.00

Panel 2: Literary narratives of the future and their role for identity-formation

Christian Uhl: Evolution, Eternal Recurrence, and Lu Xun's Struggle with the Aporetic Temporalities of Capitalist Modernity: Reapproaching Lu Xun's Yecao (Xu, Guoke, Ying de gaobie)

Andrea Riemenschneider: Ge Fei's Fictional Utopia Project

Chair: Rossella Ferrari

12.00-12.45

Lunch [for talking to other participants during the breaks and having coffee together, please use separate zoom-link provided by the organizers]

12.45-13.10

Susanne's spaces of memory (I): China, 1976

(with Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, Johnny Erling und Harro von Senger, David Zweig etc.)

13.10-13.15

Break

13.15-13.45

Susanne's spaces of memory (II): Bochum, Heidelberg and other places in Europe

(with an intro by Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik; greetings of Martin Gieselmann et al., Christine Moll-Murata, Felix Wemheuer etc.)

13.45-14.00

Break [for talking to other participants during the breaks and having coffee together, please use separate zoom-link provided by the organizers]

14.00-15.15

Panel 3: Cooperation, transformation and confrontation of systems

William Kirby: The Future of Chinese Universities—In the Light of Their Past

Christine Moll-Murata: Communist Party of China and Kuomintang: A history of system competition

Chair: Christian Göbel

15.15-15.30

Break

15.30-16.45

Panel 4: Tianxia and the future of international cooperation in (East) Asia

Felix Wemheuer: The Current US-Sino Relations: Is the world facing a “New Cold War“?

Wolfgang Schwentker: A Controversial Legacy: Abe Shinzō and Japan's China Policy

Chair: Nele Noesselt

16.45-17.00

Break

17.00-18.15

Panel 4 continuing

Ban Wang: Why Does Tianxia Need the Nation-State?

Viren Murthy: Rethinking Universality: Tianxia and Beyond

Chair: Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer

18.15-18.30

Break [for talking to other participants during the breaks and having coffee together, please use separate zoom-link provided by the organizers]

18.30-19.15

Susanne's spaces of memory (III): The United States

(with welcome and greetings by Marilyn Levine, Wen-hsin Yeh, Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik etc.)

DAY 3, 03.10.20

09:00-10.45

Panel 5: Looking back into future histories

Cui Jinke: Politics of Chaos: Local Cadre in Early Cultural Revolution 混乱政治学：文化革命初期的地方干部

Liu Hong: 中國 1980 年代改革的一項歷史遺產和啟示 ——以 1984 年中共十二屆三中全會確立“有計劃的商品經濟”目標的運作過程為例

Helmut Opletal: How China's leaders and high-ranking officials viewed the Xidan Democracy Wall Movement (“Beijing Spring”) of 1978-81

Chair: Daniel Fuchs

10.45-11.00

Break [for talking to other participants during the breaks and having coffee together, please use separate zoom-link provided by the organizers]

11.00-12.15

Panel 6: The future of China: New currency, new governance?

Zhu Jiaming: 中國數字經濟與數字貨幣的現狀與展望——中國 21 世紀以來經濟的一個側面

Jenny Qu Wang and Minquan Liu: Epidemiologically Strong Governance Systems: The Case of China

Chair: Dr. Dagmar Balve-Hauff

12.15-13.15

Lunch [for talking to other participants during the breaks and having coffee together, please use separate zoom-link provided by the organizers]

13.15-14.30

Panel 7: The future of treasures: Forests and waste

Benjamin Steuer: Recycle or perish: The role of resource recovery for China's future development

Julia Marinaccio: Failing to reach the ground: Institutionally embedded paternalism in China's technical extension service

Chair: Agnes Schick-Chen

14.30-14.45

Break

14.45-16.30

Panel 8: Migration of Chinese populations: Where to go and stay in future?

Sarah Hanisch: “Those who go abroad are small bosses, a real entrepreneur will not leave China.” Some reflections on recent changes in the preception of migration in China

Lena Springer: Chinese Medicines and Migration

Ute Wallenböck: Preliminary Research on Vienna’s Chinese Youth Community and Its Absence in Services of Open Youth Work

Chair: Carsten Schäfer

16.30-16.45

Break

16.45-18.00

Panel 9: The legacies and futures of Chinese Studies

Mechthild Leutner: Sinology in Germany before and after WWII

Sascha Klotzbücher: The future of Chinese Studies: How to overcome the stigma of the Maoist seduction

Chair: Julia Strauss

18.00-18.15

Break

18.15-19.30

Conclusion

Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik: The changing position of China in world politics and the role of Chinese Studies: memories, assessments and options

Chair: Wen-hsin Yeh

19.30-20.30

Meeting follow-up publication of “Whither China”

Abstracts

Keynote lecture

Prof. Dr. Timothy Cheek, University of British Columbia

Fractured Mirror: New Revolutionary History (新革命史) and the Search for China's Future

“Whither China?” requires, of course, a clear sense of “whence China?” Chinese historiography over the past century or more has continued to contribute to this retrospective assessment and prospective speculation. Any assessment of Chinese historiography perforce reprises many of the central themes in the work of Dr. Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik: the internationalization of the study of Chinese history (both inside China and outside), the centrality of politics and morality in Chinese historiography, and the search today for a new master narrative. I follow these themes in the case of recent Chinese historiography that has been reconsidering China’s Twentieth Century revolutions, what is often referred to as “New Revolutionary History” (新革命史). I see three important worlds of conversation about China’s recent past: the official 官方, the academic 学术, and the social 民间. Xi Jinping has led an official Party effort to re-assert an orthodox reading of “the first thirty years and the second thirty years” of the PRC. Scholars in PRC universities have produced a wide range of empirical and theoretical studies, many of which seek a scientific understanding of China’s revolutionary past. Increasingly, independent scholars, artists, and activists have availed themselves of the new media (from convenient video recording to the internet) to offer unofficial readings of this history from which to draw their own meaning. Each seeks to shape the collective memory of “China,” yet different official policies, different academic schools, and different communities across China’s continental-sized society offer distinct, often different and sometimes conflicting narratives. As both Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik and Arif Dirlik have noted for historical universality, any comprehensive Chinese history must be a sum of these particularities.

Panel 1: Keep it or discard it? Utopias and dystopias

Prof. Dr. Axel Schneider, University of Göttingen

How to harness greed: on progress and other dystopias in modern China

The belief in progress is a core element of the modern condition and has therefore been central in the Chinese intellectual encounter with the modern West. The intellectual mainstream adopted notions of progress, albeit in different variations and with some adjustments. There were, however, quite a few, hitherto by and large neglected intellectuals who from very early on voiced serious doubts about notions of progress, seeing progress not as a promise for the future, but as a dystopian endeavor characteristic for the modern project. These doubts were marginal for most parts of modern Chinese history and hence for a long time overlooked in research, but in our troubled times, they are double interesting.

Prof. Dr. Olga Lomová, Charles University, Prague: Socialism with Chinese characteristics: Contradictio in adiecto?

After briefly tracing the history of the concept of “socialism with Chinese characteristics” I will concentrate on the meaning of this relatively new concept in the context of earlier general theories and practice of Marxism-Leninism. Comparative perspective will include Stalin’s Soviet Union after WW II and socialist Czechoslovakia after the failure of the 1968 Prague Spring.

Panel 2: Literary narratives of the future and their role for identity-formation

Prof. Dr. Christian Uhl, University of Ghent

Evolution, Eternal Recurrence, and Lu Xun's Struggle with the Aporetic Temporalities of Capitalist Modernity: Reapproaching Lu Xun's Yecao (Xu, Guoke, Ying de gaobie)

One of the arguably most intriguing and productive sources of inspiration for May Fourth intellectuals were Darwinist ideas on evolution. As is well known, such inspiration has manifested itself also in the work of Lu Xun. In Lu Xun's case it did so in an especially fascinating, and idiosyncratic fashion, shaped by Lu Xun's simultaneous perception of, and attraction to certain elements of the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. At first glance, the philosopher of the rise of the *Übermensch* may appear as yet another Darwinist. Yet, Nietzsche's philosophy of the eternal recurrence of the same can hardly be compatible with Darwin's notion of evolution, and especially not with any Darwinist conception of history as a directional evolutionary "progress". Departing from a hint by Wang Hui at a clash of two conceptions of history and time in Lu Xun's writings, I will wrap around my earlier inquiry into the subject an additional theoretical layer. This operation shall allow me to demonstrate that Lu Xun's eventually failing enterprise to amalgamate two fundamentally opposed philosophical paradigms only reveals its true significance as one of the most striking literary expressions of the struggle with modern condition humaine in the light of an analysis that doesn't shy away from using capital as a concept of historical analysis.

Prof. Dr. Andrea Riemenschmitter, University of Zurich

Ge Fei's Fictional Utopia Project

A growing number of contemporary writers and artists across the globe imagine the planetary future as dystopian: their narratives of moral decline, human suffering and environmental destruction suggest that modernity's civilizational achievements are degenerating due to the large-scale, institutionalized support of delusional ideas about what is needed for human happiness. Against this background, several short stories and novels written by Ge Fei revisit modernizing China's various experiments with utopianism from the end of the 19th century till today. Since the 1980s, his fiction continuously reflected on the repercussions of utopian political agency in individual people's lives as well as society at large. I will argue that Ge Fei's fictional project illustrates how, along with the transition from the revolutionary to Anthropocene utopianisms, Mainland China's transformation has happened in a circular movement, moving from overzealous industrialization in the countryside to urban hyper-development, and from there to the post-reform era's ecological restitution. While the official utopia narrative still holds on to the dream of a homogeneous national modernity based on ideological unification, economic competition and technological progress, Ge's protagonists throughout these epochal changes reach happiness when, and because, they find satisfaction in modesty, caring and sharing rather than allowing material pursuits to compromise their personal integrity

Panel 3: Cooperation, transformation and confrontation of systems

Prof. Dr. William Kirby, Harvard University

European universities led the world in the 19th century

American universities set global standards by the end of the 20th century. No system of higher education is growing faster and stronger today than that of China. What, then, are the prospects for Chinese leadership in the world of universities in the 21st century? Modern Chinese universities were founded more than a century ago as institutions open to the world and committed to education in the liberal arts and sciences. If they are to lead in the 21st century, they would do well to recall, and emulate, their founding principles of Lehr- and Lernfreiheit, of free and open inquiry in an interconnected world.

Prof. Dr. Christine Moll-Murata, Ruhr-University of Bochum

Communist Party of China and Kuomintang: A history of system competition

For most of the twentieth century, the conflict between the revolutionary socialist and several varieties of more reform-minded liberal systems caused harsh struggles and civil warfare in China. These clashes stand next only in importance to the contest for national sovereignty and regional dominance within East Asia. In the twenty-first century, ideological contention seems to be less centred on the issues of social equality and planned versus private entrepreneurial economic systems, and rather evolves on issues of political participation and the distribution of power. This paper will focus on the two main groups of antagonists, the political parties of the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China which have experienced enormous changes in impact on the national and international scale. The long perspective of about one hundred years and the enormous body of literature devoted to these conflicts requires a synoptic view. Therefore, this paper will first outline the largest controversies and their arenas, as well as the reflections thereof in party histories, with special reference to Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik's pathbreaking study on CPC party historiography. Certain periods will be presented in greater detail: the first KMT-CPC cooperation that was coordinated under Sun Yatsen's Canton government between 1923 and 1925; the "battle of the mind" or psychological warfare (xinzhhan 心戰) of the 1950s, and the turning point under President Ma Ying-jeou's government (2008-2016). In view of the latest results in the 2020 elections, the question arises whether the KMT stands on the verge of becoming history, or whether it will be able to strengthen its profile and membership, also in consideration of its historical trajectory.

Panel 4: Tianxia and the future of international cooperation in (East) Asia

Prof. Dr. Felix Wemheuer, University of Cologne

Current US-Sino Relations: Is the world facing a “New Cold War“?

In the context of the worsening of the US-Sino relations, US politicians and media are using the label of a “new cold war” to describe conflicts between the two countries. The Trump administration first introduced trade restrictions arguing to stop “theft of intellectual property” by China. The long term goal would be a “decoupling” of the economies of both countries. Furthermore, in July of 2020, the Secretary of State, Michael Pompeo, declared that President Nixon’s vision to integrate China into the global economy, did not transform China into a “normal nation”, but would have produced a “Frankenstein”. Pompeo warned: “If the free world doesn’t change – doesn’t change, communist China will surely change us.” In addition to the “trade war”, the US government claims that the CCP would be a serious threat to political system of Western democracies.

The paper will discuss how the narrative of a “new cold war” is used in the Western discourse by the supporters and opponents of Trump’s policies against China. Moreover, it will be evaluated whether or not the analogy to the Cold War with the Soviet Union (1947-1991) is useful to understand the current relation between the US and China.

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Schwentker, Osaka University

A Controversial Legacy: Abe Shinzō and Japan’s China Policy

When on 28 August 2020 Abe Shinzō announced that he would resign due to a chronic illness after governing Japan since December 2012 he was the longest serving prime minister in modern Japanese history. On 16 September Suga Yoshihide, his former chief cabinet secretary, was elected as his successor.

Soon after Abe’s announcement there was lively and controversial debate in Japan and abroad about his political legacy. The issue of foreign policy, especially Japan’s relations to China, figured prominently in this debate. Kawashima Shin, a political scientist at Tokyo University, argued that the past six years were characterized by a slow, but steady improvement in Japanese-Chinese relations. Others were more sceptical and emphasized that Abe’s nationalism and historical revisionism were counterproductive and served to alienate China (and South Korea).

The paper will address this debate. I will start off by analysing Abe Shinzō’s political writings, especially the chapter on China in his book “Towards a Beautiful Country” (2006, rev. 2012) in which he outlined his political agenda. Then I will discuss whether in practice Japan’s strategy of “seirei – keinetu” (政冷・経熱) proved to be successful or not. Finally I will reflect on the impact of Abe’s foreign policy for future Japanese-Chinese relations. In this context I would like to take up a topic I often discussed with Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik in recent years: What is happening in the region when the center of political, military and economic power is shifting from one country to the other?

Prof. Dr. Ban Wang, Stanford University

Why Does Tianxia Need the Nation-State?

Tianxia discourse has viewed modern nation-state system as the stumbling block to the peace and unity of the world. Yet thrust into the midst of clashing nation-states, modern China must engage the Western national model. In the wake of the fall of the Qing empire, reformers and revolutionaries devoted themselves to building a modern nation-state in order to survive as a polity with a cultural tradition. Liang Qichao, Sun Yatsen, Mao and others were nationalist thinkers, but in the process of nation building they harbored and projected a tianxia vision beyond the nation-state. This paper will focus and elaborate on how Liang, Sun, and Mao invested in nation-building as a necessary means of realizing the cosmopolitan and internationalist vision a la tianxia. Tianxia discourse has viewed modern nation-state system as the stumbling block to the peace and unity of the world. Yet thrust into the midst of clashing nation-states, modern China must engage the Western national model. In the wake of the fall of the Qing empire, reformers and revolutionaries devoted themselves to building a modern nation-state in order to survive as a polity with a cultural tradition. Liang Qichao, Sun Yatsen, Mao and others were nationalist thinkers, but in the process of nation building they harbored and projected a tianxia vision beyond the nation-state. This paper will focus and elaborate on how Liang, Sun, and Mao invested in nation-building as a necessary means of realizing the cosmopolitan and internationalist vision a la tianxia. I will retrieve certain motifs in the Confucian classics that inform this nation-international continuum.

Prof. Dr. Viren Murthy, Madison University

Rethinking Universality: Tianxia and Beyond

In the past few decades, scholars have criticized the concept of universality for being Eurocentric and committing violence to the particular. On this reading, Western nations universalize their particular conceptions in the process of imperialist endeavors. And yet, without the concept of universality, there would be little possibility of transregional dialogue and the fostering of larger communities. In response to this double-bind, the Japanese pan-Asianist, Takeuchi Yoshimi contended that Asian nations had to resist imperialism, but could not be satisfied with merely affirming the greatness of their own particular traditions; they needed to change the world and create a new universality. Although, he never outlined in detail the nature of this new universality, he envisioned a world where particularity and universality co-constitute one another. Recent theories of tianxia continue Takeuchi's vision. However, when applying Confucianism principles to tianxia, we should not think of this body of theory as static. Rather, following Confucius, we must understand the complex causal nexus that conditions its becoming (观其所由). Tianxia is a process of realizing a different universality in a world of capitalist imperialism. Consequently, I argue that we need another version of Gan Yang's uniting the three teachings (tongsantong) (i.e Confucius, Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping). We have to bring tianxia in dialogue with Marxism, but this cannot be conceived as a linear progression from Confucianism to the present to legitimate the latter. Rather, the processes of Chinese history generates visions beyond the opposition between particularity and universality, which in turn must be mobilized to transform the contemporary world.

Panel 5: Looking back into future histories

Cui Jinke, M.A., University of Vienna

Politics of Chaos: Local Cadre in Early Cultural Revolution 混乱政治学：文化革命初期的地方干部

Since Xi Jinping took power in 2012, comments have been filled with voices that the political system has returned to the Mao era. Centralization, charisma, fundamental ideology, and cadre purging have become the key words. The Cultural Revolution was the only successfully political attempt to break the authoritarian bureaucratic system after 1949. Although it was fully promoted by Charismatic leader and the enthusiastic masses, it still encountered various resistances from the cadres. Meanwhile, many local cadres were thrown out mercilessly by their colleagues and became targets of criticism. This research focuses on the original local archives of purging cadres in the second half of 1966, including official records, informal publications of the Red Guards, and self-criticism of themselves. Many Studies have emphasized the fate of cadres in the culture and education system during the initiation of the Cultural Revolution. Local evidences show that half of the thrown-out cadres are outside the above system. The internal mobilization of local party agencies deeply undermined the stability of the bureaucracy and evolved into strong factional conflicts aftermath. The experience of the Cultural Revolution has shown that the chaotic results brought by political changes are very likely to tear apart the bureaucratic system, and ultimately trigger a full-scale factionalist politics. The powerful charismatic leader and centralized system cannot stop this process.

Dr. Helmut Opletal, University of Vienna

How China's leaders and high-ranking officials viewed the Xidan Democracy Wall Movement ("Beijing Spring") of 1978-81

China's official reform debates in 1978 focused on economic changes, but there was also a growing sentiment for a need to change the political system. More radical views demanding freedom of press or a democratic system of government came from a grass root civil rights movement symbolized by Beijing's "Democracy Wall". Some high-ranking cadres sympathized with this movement; even Deng Xiaoping expressed support when he declared the dazibao debates a "good thing". But Deng eventually decided that the "socialist system" were not open to debate, between 1979 and April 1981 (when Deng ordered a final crackdown), many activists became arrested and sentenced to harsh prison terms.

In recent years, some documents and accounts of how the Chinese elites debated the Democracy Wall Movement became public outside China. Leading participants (many exiled abroad now) talked about personal memories (about 30 interviews have been published by the author on the website <https://beijing-spring.univie.ac.at/>), and retired party cadres have written about their role at that time. Although many details are still kept under tight wraps in the archives, the analysis of available materials reveals a diverse picture of considerations, contacts and evaluations made by CPC officials during that period, with strong criticism, but also sympathies from a small number of reformists, suggestions to integrate moderate democracy advocates into the Youth League and some face to face discussions between activists and Party leaders. The ideas of the "Beijing Spring" continued to influence reform

debates inside and outside the CPC only for some years, culminating in the movement of 1989.

Liu Hong, M.A., University of Vienna

1980 年代中国改革决策中的沟通理性——以 1984 年中共十二届三中全会确立“有计划的商品经济”为例

中国三十年高速经济增长，很大程度利用了“1980 年代改革红利”。然而，对于 1980 年代改革，主流媒体或歌功颂德或遮蔽；当事人各自表述/表功，形成一个改革派与保守派较量的叙事模式，缺乏具有解释力的理论分析。在新的历史条件下，尤其是面临国内外困局，有必要回顾和重新理解 1980 年代改革的经验教训，寻找其对当下和未来的启示。

时至 1984 年，农村改革已取得初步进展，需要开启城市改革时，“计划经济”依然是难以逾越的障碍。本文以 1984 年中共十二届三中全会确立“有计划商品经济”为例，揭示将这一提法写入中央决议的过程，以及围绕它在各种不同意见/利益主体间进行的沟通与博弈。本文借鉴哈贝马斯的交往行为理论及其沟通理性来考察和分析整个事件的两条线：一是文件起草小组内；二是起草小组外。它们彼此独立又联系，非正式行为与正式行为相结合。其间，国务院总理赵紫阳利用经济学家去向中共元老投石问路，并在新老提法中建构历史和说理逻辑等一系列策略行动，促成共识的达成。在 1980 年代，但凡成功的改革决策无不开放决策过程，对话渠道，社会协商，它体现了在不同主体间沟通理性的运用对于谋求体制改革的价值。

Panel 6: The monetary and fiscal future of China

Dr. Zhu Jiaming, China Institute of Digital Assets, Beijing

中國數字經濟與數字貨幣的現狀與展望：中國 21 世紀以來經濟的一個側面

數字經濟是基於互聯網，以大數據為主要生產要素，集合雲計算，數據分析，人工智能，物聯網，以及區塊鏈的經濟形態。數字經濟來源於三種模式：（1）對傳統經濟的數字化改造，例如“智能工業”、工業 4.0；（2）將數字化與現存產業結合，形成新的產業；（3）數字化過程中創造出全新產業，例如知識、科技、文化和觀念產業。總的來說，數字經濟本質是信息經濟、知識經濟和智慧經濟的結合體和融合體。

數字經濟的形成與發展改變了世界經濟格局。數字化差別，或者數字經濟在 GDP 中的比重，以及數字化企業的數量和規模，正在成為發達國家和發展中國家差別的重要標誌，成為一個國家是否可以實現可持續發展的重要條件。自 1990 年代，先是美國，之後是歐盟和日本，積極推進數字革命，創造了 10 多年的經濟繁榮。中國在 2000 年之後，利用數字經濟中的後發性優勢，迅速縮小與發達國家的數字鴻溝，成長為數字經濟大國。

以比特幣所代表的數字貨幣問世和發展，不過十年左右時間。但是，數字貨幣不僅直接影響了傳統貨幣金融體系，而且迅速融入數字經濟系統之中，展現了數字經濟和數字貨幣“一體化”的趨勢。中國在數字貨幣方面，特別是在中央銀行的法定數字貨幣的開發方面處於領先地位。

本文將通過對中國數字經濟和數字貨幣的歷史分析，以及對現狀的描述，探討其未來趨勢及對近、中期世界經濟的影響。

Dr. Jenny Qu Wang, Peking University HSBC Business School) (UK) and Prof. Dr. Minquan Liu (School of Economics and Center for Human and Economic Development Studies, Peking University)

Epidemiologically Strong Governance Systems: The Case of China

The spread of the Covid-19 pandemic across the world has caught every country by surprise, with each struggling to control the spread with measures that it favors and deems effective. There is, however, mounting evidence that some measures, or some set of measures, are epidemiologically sounder than others, if adopted in the right time, with the right rapidity, strength and stringency. This raises questions over the governance structure of a country that underpins the opportune, rapid and effective adoptions of the measures in question. Current research indicates that those that have been traditionally favored by mainstream liberal and democratic values have not, in fact, fared well in the current epic battle (Sebhatu et al., 2020). Rather, countries such as China with long traditions of centralization of power, and cultures

that favor subordination of certain individual rights to the larger good of the society, have stood better against the new threats.

This paper aims to study these issues through the example of China, where the epidemic first broke out and where it has first been successfully controlled. As well as reviewing the short history of China's thus far successful attempt to control the disease, the paper intends to uncover some of the key governance structures and cultural values that have underlain and undergirded China's nation-wide effort. In particular, the role of China's long institutional tradition of having the central body of power lead all the efforts against any major natural or non-natural disaster, and the long cultural tradition of seeing that central body as the ultimate source of deliverance of the population from any major calamity, is emphasized. Almost as in the spirit of a Social Contract, the population at large also gives up some of their individual rights. Given the long and troubled history of China with frequent natural disasters, famines and wars, this arrangement seems to have been befitting the country in times of calamity, even though it may not have excelled as much in its dealing with other challenges.

Panel 7: The future of treasures: Forests and waste

Dr. Benjamin Steuer, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

Recycle or perish: The role of resource recovery for China's future development

After decades of stunning economic growth, expanding international influence and only a few steps short of reaching leadership in various sectors of the digital economy, the PRC suddenly appears to be stumbling. Domestic growth rates in decline, a straining trade war and a menacing virus epidemic – it seems that black swans and grey rhinos are haunting the Chinese bull. Evaluations on China's future outlook are always subject to individual perspective and thus quite often pretty speculative. Yet prudently speaking there is one particular challenge that bears a highly devastating impact on the country's prospects: That is the question of resource availability and utilisation, especially in the context of industrial production.

More than any other country China has depended on easily available natural resources to feed its resource-intensive growth model. Yet, low resource productivity, increasing natural resource prices and the need to maintain growth for the sake of political legitimacy enforced a modification of the Chinese development model. As of now, various sustainability concepts, such as Green GDP, Cleaner Production, Circular Economy and Ecological Civilisation, reached prominence as key topics in five-year plans and national laws. However, can these measures deliver? Is top-down statism, the administrative coordination of the economy the proper approach to realise a sustainable development model? On the basis of field research on China's Circular Economy between 2012-2019, this paper will assess why and when state initiatives prove effective and under which conditions they fail. To answer these questions the paper will use institutional, i.e. rule-related, dynamics to analytically tackle cases in the fields of urban waste recovery and industrial symbiosis.

Julia Marinaccio, University of Bergen

Failing to reach the ground: Institutionally embedded paternalism in China's technical extension service

Socio-environmental challenges to sustainable development abound. Sustainable practices in agriculture and forestry are particularly dependent on the knowledge of those managing the land on a daily basis. This article draws new attention to the conflicting relationship between cultivators and extension officials and systematically prescribed and performed roles within state technical extension service systems as impeding factors to effective knowledge transmission that could otherwise benefit both farmers and the environment. Based on textual research and interviews with local actors conducted between 2012 and 2017 in China, we argue that the state's training of extension staff constructs a paternalistic orientation towards farmers that seeps into the extension service system's local practice. This manufactured and reified distance between staff and local farmers in the field exacerbates other well-established problems that plague the state extension service system vis-à-vis effectively promoting sustainable practices in agriculture and forestry.

Panel 8: Migration of Chinese populations: Where to go and stay in future?

Dr. Sarah Hanisch, FWF (Austrian Science Foundation): „Those who go abroad are small bosses, a real entrepreneur will not leave China.” Some reflections on recent changes in the perception of migration in China”

Until the mid-2000s, overseas migration was celebrated as promising ‘lucrative opportunities’ (Pieke et al. 2004, 45) in Fuqing- a county-level city in Fujian. Migration was both an individual project aimed at pursuing one’s own aspirations (establishing a business and becoming successful), as well as a family project aimed at diversifying income opportunities (Ong and Nonini 1997; Ho 2002; Pieke et al. 2004). The local state in Fuqing counted on donations from overseas migrants to build schools, roads, and other public projects. Overseas migrants readily donated and were, in return, publicly praised by the state as models to be emulated by others. However, when I conducted my field research in Lesotho (2014) and in Fuqing (2015 and 2018), it seemed that overseas migration was no longer considered to be a desirable option. To make this argument, I present a bricolage of encounters in 2015 and 2018 with my key informants. Taken together, these encounters allowed me to reflect on the diverse meanings that my informants ascribed to returning, staying or leaving.

Dr. Lena Springer, King’s College London

Chinese medicines and migration

Migration studies tend to focus either on a privileged elite – socially and spatially mobile middle-men, brokers, explorers and cosmopolitans –, or on outcasts – marginalized minorities lacking certified skills. Throughout the long twentieth century, however, medical culture in China has seen changes that affect both 1) mainstream academia and outstanding individual itineraries in increasingly specialized science, and 2) complicate the small-scale businesses of local Chinese medicine-manufacturers as well as their cross-regional rural-based production-lines. Their careers in occupations and disciplines, such as pharmacy for example, and their educational and heritable status as suppliers of Chinese drugs are subject to territorialized legal restrictions – national, provincial, branch-specific or Euro-American. Still, just these drugs and modes of pharma-knowledge are surprisingly connected on a global scale.

Based on fieldwork in China and in Vienna, this paper brings urban elite life-worlds together with rural ones to investigate how Chinese pharmacists handle highly complex materials and their transformations, both in institutions of transnational healthcare science, and through mobile material-cultural techniques at local workplaces. What is it that drives their supply of Chinese commodities forward both globally and locally, either despite mainstream Chinese standards, or through reclaimed alternative histories of an experimental China and its multi-ethnic medicines?

Dr. Ute Wallenböck, Masaryk University Brno & Palacky University Olomouc

Preliminary Research on Vienna’s Chinese Youth Community and Its Absence in Services of Open Youth Work

It is striking how little the presence of young people with Chinese migration background is discussed in academia within migration studies as well as social work; This community seems to be well integrated into the host societies of the receiving countries despite differences of their ‘culture and mentality’. In accordance with China’s ‘tradition’, even the Chinese youth in the host society is under

pressure to acquire a good education in order to get a good job, consequently, they have limited free time to spend on social activities. Hence, the question arises about the Chinese adolescent immigrants' activities during leisure time in welfare states. In general, young immigrants often make use of the Western host country's services of Open Youth Work, which gives young people the opportunity to have voice or to have an impact on decisions that influence their lives. But much to my surprise, social workers in Vienna hardly have ever faced East Asian teenagers as their clients. Therefore, in my current research, a cross-disciplined case-study, which applies multidisciplinary research methods, I investigate the young Chinese immigrants in Vienna. My paper deals with the question why adolescents with Han-Chinese migration background do not take use of the services of Open Youth Work in Vienna. I assume that Open Youth Work is in contradiction with China's Confucian hierarchical and power relationship between parents and children as well as with the strength of traditional family network. By applying Alfred Schütz's theoretical framework of the life-world ("Lebenswelt"), I want to investigate the social reality of these adolescent with Chinese migration background in terms of culture, identity and society.

Panel 9: The legacies and futures of Chinese Studies

Prof. Dr. Mechthild Leutner, Free University of Berlin

Sinology in Germany before and after WWII

The Nazi dictatorship also had serious consequences for the still young subject of sinology: numerous China scholars had to emigrate, including most of the young academics; others such as Erkes (Leipzig) and Rousselle (Frankfurt/Main) had been dismissed. After 1945, it was not only the dramatic effects of the Nazi dictatorship on the institutional situation and professional development of the discipline that became apparent, it also became clear that different policies were now being pursued in the divided Germany in the rehabilitation of the persecuted sinologists and the repatriation of emigrants. This process of reorientation and rebuilding of the discipline will be presented, with particular reference to the example of Eduard Erkes (Leipzig) and Erwin Rousselle (Frankfurt/Main), in order to show continuities and discontinuities.

PD Dr. Sascha Klotzbücher, University of Vienna/University of Göttingen

The future of Chinese Studies: How to overcome the stigma of the Maoist seduction

In the 1960s and 70s, many China scholars in the West have approached China with their sympathy for Maoism or Marxism in general. In contrast to the later understanding that China scholars should not see and analyze China as the exotic other, Sinologists have played a substantial role in establishing and nurturing Maoism as the chinoiserie of the 20th century in their home countries. Realizing the discrepancy between their seduction by Mao and the disciplinary understanding to analyze China from within, the Maoist Cultural Revolution and their affective involvement created their powerful stigma. The conflicting experience of this exotic seduction was later excluded in protecting speech taboos and non-conflicting disciplinary self-understandings and research approaches. Silence in these communities and camouflage of many scholars have created a form of "phantom normalcy" (Goffman) with powerful group taboos and questionable disciplinary self-identities and -images. In these communities with their implicit and hidden hierarchies, the reflection about this ambiguous experience is *unerhört*, unheard and outrageous: Those who dare to do so quickly find themselves outside what Sinology or Chinese Studies should be.

First, this article aims to break these inherent taboos, aims to speak out and explain the character of these stigmata with the case study of Rudolf G. Wagner, a Professor for Sinology in Heidelberg and his early Maoist texts. He is probably not so unique case, but in contrast to others, his Maoist convictions and analyses are traceable in his edited journal. Based on his texts and my experiences as a student in Heidelberg, I will explore first the quality of this stigma, and how he handled and contained that stigma later in this local setting. Second, I will analyze how a preferred conception of research helps the researcher to guarantee a conflict-free approach to China and the Chinese with an untouched stigma. Today's sinological self-image of an 'observation of the indigenous observer' is also a professional offer of defense and relief for a denied knowledge about ourselves. This methodological self-comfort and zones of the disciplinary unconscious have transferred Sinology into a self-marginalizing position because these scholars cannot talk about something that they could share with the public of non-Sinologists: how to deal professionally with overwhelming feelings of sympathy, distrust when we approach China as not something distant, but part of our society, economy and our own "Lebenswelt". When distancing is failing and is not appropriate, I will outline elements

for the re-integration of positionality and resonance.

Conclusion

Prof. Dr. Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, University of Vienna

**The changing position of China in world politics and the role of Chinese Studies:
memories, assessments and options**

The list of participants (in alphabetical order)

1. Dr. Dagmar Balve-Hauff, German Federal Ministry of Economy and Energy
2. Prof. Dr. Timothy Cheek, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
3. Jinke Cui, M.A., University of Vienna
4. Johnny Erling, M.A.
5. Prof. Dr. Rossella Ferrari, University of Vienna
6. Dr. Stefan Friedrich, Konrad Adenauer-Foundation, Berlin
7. Dr. Daniel Fuchs, Humboldt-Universität Berlin
8. Dr. Martin Gieselmann, University of Heidelberg
9. Prof. Dr. Christian Göbel, University of Vienna
10. Dr. Sarah Hanisch, Austrian Science Foundation
11. Prof. Dr. William Kirby, Harvard University
12. Prof. Dr. Marilyn Levine, Central Washington University
13. PD Dr. Sascha Klotzbücher, University of Vienna/University of Göttingen
14. Prof. Dr. Mechthild Leutner, Free University Berlin
15. Hong Liu, M.A., University of Vienna
16. Prof. Dr. Minquan Liu, Beijing University
17. Prof. Dr. Olga Lomová, Charles University, Prague
18. Dr. Julia Marinaccio, University of Bergen
19. Dr. Michael Meyer, Boston Consulting Group, Singapore
20. Prof. Dr. Christine Moll-Murata, University of Bochum
21. Prof. Dr. Viren Murthy, Madison University
22. Prof. Dr. Nele Noesselt, University of Duisburg-Essen
23. Dr. Helmut Opletal, University of Vienna
24. Prof. Dr. Andrea Riemenschnitter, University of Zurich
25. Prof. Dr. Michael Rudolph, University of Southern Denmark
26. Prof. Dr. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, University of Göttingen
27. Prof. Dr. Dr. Harro von Senger, University of Freiburg
28. Dr. Carsten Schäfer, University of Cologne
29. Prof. Dr. Agnes Schick-Chen, Department of East Asian Studies, University of Vienna
30. Prof. Dr. Axel Schneider, University of Göttingen
31. Prof. Dr. Arny Schweiger, Lund University/University of Hannover
32. Dr. Lena Springer, King's College, London

33. Dr. Benjamin Steuer, University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong
34. Prof. Dr. Julia Strauss, SOAS, London
35. Prof. Dr. Ralph Thaxton, Brandeis University, Boston
36. Prof. Dr. Christian Uhl, Ghent University
37. Dr. Ute Wallenböck, Masaryk University Brno & Palacky University Olomouc
38. Prof. Dr. Ban Wang, Stanford University
39. Dr. Jenny Wang, Peking University HSBC Business School (UK), Oxford
40. Prof. Dr. Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, University of Vienna
41. Prof. Dr. Felix Wemheuer, University of Cologne
42. Prof. Dr. Wen-hsin Yeh, University of California, Berkeley
43. Dr. Jiaming Zhu, China Digital Assets Institute, Beijing
44. Prof. Dr. David Zweig, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

