

## Editor's Note

This issue of the *Journal* is alive with reviews of all descriptions: more pages of standard reviews in the area review sections at the back than are usually published; a review article by Thomas Trautmann of Michigan on a major new book by Ronald Inden of the University of Chicago; and a symposium on Edward W. Said's provocative book, *Orientalism*. The review symposium offers essays by scholars from the South Asia, China, and Japan fields, and tackles Said's work from a variety of critical perspectives. Though *Orientalism's* geographical concerns lie outside the domain of the *Journal*, the intellectual issues which Said raises merit consideration by *JAS* readers in all areas of geographic interest. One of Said's points, in fact, is that today's "area studies" are a postwar continuation of many of the habits and assumptions traditionally embodied in the Orientalism with which he deals.

The short research note by Professor Zhang Kaiyuan of Central China Teachers College also deserves special mention, as it marks a modest milestone in the history of both the *Journal* and U.S.-Chinese scholarly contact. Professor Zhang, from Central China Teachers College, and his colleague from Wuhan University, Professor Xiao Zhizhi, visited a number of American campuses in October 1979. Both scholars have specialized in research on the 1911 Revolution, and their visit to this country offered them and their American colleagues a chance to exchange information and ideas about scholarly work in this important area of modern historical research. Publication of Professor Zhang's report on the "state of the field" in the study of the 1911 Revolution in the People's Republic of China is, we hope, part of a trend toward greater inclusion of material from the People's Republic of China in American scholarly discourse. The *Journal* should, it seems to us, do as much as it can to bring to its principal audience's attention the issues, interpretive positions, and organizational bases with which scholars in Asian societies conduct their work. As in the case of Professor Carol Gluck's article (*JAS*, November 1978) on a significant aspect of current Japanese historiography, this brief research note—the first in the *Journal* from the PRC—may serve to open the doors to greater scholarly communication and cooperation across national boundaries.

The research article with which this issue opens, Professor Lee Yearley's analysis of Xunzi's concept of mind in the context of the Mencian and philosophical Taoist conceptions operating in Xunzi's time, explores one of the central issues of classical Chinese thought.