

In This Issue

In DAVID WASHBROOK's critique of Immanuel Wallerstein, he agrees with Wallerstein that world capitalism is unitary, but believes that Wallerstein has gone wrong in proposing core/periphery dichotomies among its critical features. Washbrook dissects and rejects Wallerstein's thesis that the world since 1750 has seen capitalism establishing its dominance in core regions over peripheries while rendering huge regions, including South Asia, as unimportant semi-peripheries. Instead, Washbrook suggests a more complex approach in which economic and social forces within regions such as South Asia have interacted with European capitalism to remake Europe as much as Europe changed them. In place of Wallerstein's call for socialist liberation based on notions rejecting universalism and venerating particularism, Washbrook prefers the classic Marxian view of socialism. He concludes that movement toward meaningful socialism must come through confronting the capitalist world system's contradictions rather than what he regards as Wallerstein's hope to dismantle the world system into its precapitalist components.

MYRON COHEN presents a new interpretation of Chinese lineage organization based on field work conducted in north China during 1986 and 1987. This north China variant, which Cohen calls "the fixed genealogical mode," is contrasted with the southeast China pattern first described by Maurice Freedman. In the southeast China pattern, which Cohen distinguishes as "the associational mode," corporate property is seen as the chief factor providing cohesion to the lineage. Claims on corporate holdings give the lineage its fundamental organization, and status within a lineage or the segmentation of lineages are determined primarily on the basis of such claims. In contrast, Cohen argues that lineages retain a central role in village life in the north China "fixed genealogical mode" even though they may lack corporate property. Cohen believes that pressures have stripped away most tangible resources of north China lineages, but have left behind strongly hierarchical relations based on seniority among lines of descent from a founding ancestor. He finds that these lineage bonds are expressed in the annual ritual cycle of the region.

DONALD SUTTON deals with some performances in a Chinese ritual cycle. He is concerned with ritual dramas performed by specialized troupes during festival processions in southern Taiwan. He finds that while the predominant message of such festivals is one of support for the established moral order, divergent viewpoints are expressed. Thus he believes the troupes' performances can be seen as an implicit discourse on the local social order. Through analyzing several commonly performed ritual dramas he shows the established social order is also contravened, especially by the comic troupes. Sutton notes that these troupes continue to adapt their performances to changing social values and that today they inevitably are marked by commercialization and folklorization.

JULIA F. ANDREWS takes a fresh look at the tangled skein of debate about pictorial art in China during the 1950s. She finds a pattern behind the discussions of stylistic preferences among prominent artists, the Party-sponsored debate over proper terminology, and the resulting criticisms and denunciations. She finds that although everyone started from strong criticism of old artistic standards in which

both the Chinese and Western forms were condemned, the new terms of discourse were still oppositional. One trend derived from Soviet art and favored socialist realism; the other affirmed native Chinese traditions on nationalistic grounds. The Communist Party, as well as the leadership of the new art academies, alternately supported one of these positions, but never for long. The consequence was that a struggle between nativist and Soviet approaches has shaped Chinese pictorial art, as it did so many spheres of Chinese intellectual endeavor, from the early 1950s up until Mao Tse-tung's death in 1976. In some fields, this same struggle has extended into the reform decade, 1979–1989.

Finally, in a review essay that deals with several recent books on contemporary Chinese art, RALPH CROIZIER emphasizes the attention now given to a field formerly ignored by Western scholars. Croizier's article echoes many of the themes in Andrews's article, especially his discussion of the continuing fascination both artists and critics have found in discovering either native or foreign sources for various trends in Chinese art.