Professor Tan Chung, a recipient of the China-India Friendship Award, Visva-Bharati University’s highest honour Deshikottama, and the Padma Bhushan, India’s third highest civilian honour visited CCSEAS on 26 September 2014 and delivered a special lecture titled “India and China: You in me and I in you.”

The lecture was chaired by Prof. Aslam Islahi, Dean SLL&CS. Centre Chairperson Dr. Hemant Adlakha briefly introduced Professor Tan’s tenure in the CCSEAS between 1978 and 1994, and the contribution he had made to the Centre and China studies in India.

Prof. Tan, a renowned historian and an authority on Sino-Indian relations and cultural exchanges spoke about the civilizational interaction between India and China.

Quoting Prof. Ji Xianlin, Padma Bhushan and doyen of Indologists in China, he said that “China and India have stood simultaneously on the Asian continent. Their neighbourliness is created by Heaven and constructed by Earth.” Citing archaeological finding from Sanxingdui (三星堆), an ancient civilization in ancient Sichuan, which was at its prime at the extinct of Indus Valley Civilization around 1500 BC, had brisk exchanges with India. He said that various products such as cowries from Indian Ocean regions (IOR), huge quantities of elephant tusks, willow leaf shaped bronze daggers, the sculptures of human faces; suryachakra protected by garudas had definite connections with various regions of India, particularly the Northeast India.

He said that while Buddhist connections have been studied and explored, these are some of the new areas of research that scholars from India and China should jointly explore. After the lecture professor Tan who was accompanied by his wife Prof. Huang Yishu interacted with the students and answered to their queries.

Reflecting back on his days during the CEAL (CCSEAS’s predecessor), he apprised that he had to struggle with the School and the University administration for faculty positions and other infrastructural related issues in a Eurocentric environment when Chinese was not in vogue.
At the sidelines of the lecture, the Centre also felicitated Mr. D S Rawat for devoting three decades in teaching and research of Chinese language and literature. Later Prof. Tan also conferred 2014’s Vimla Saran Gold Medal to Divya Sarkar for securing highest CGPA in MA Chinese. The lecture ended with a vote of thanks proposed by Professor B R Deepak.

Faculty Focus

Prof. Priyadarsi Mukherji invited to the Symposium of China Studies 2014

In order to foster new developments in Chinese studies and Sinological research worldwide, the Ministry of Culture of the People's Republic of China, and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences—invited Prof. PriyadarsiMukherji to share his expertise in Sinological research by presenting a paper at the Symposium of China Studies 2014 in Beijing. The symposium, which was held between 27 October and 01 November 2014, focussed on the "Values and Pursuits of Contemporary China" with various topics for discussion.
Dr. Hemant Adlakha, Associate Professor, CCSEAS, SLL&CS, JNU participated and presented a paper at the International Symposium: 100 Years after the Simla Conference – 1913-14, held in Shimla on 6 – 7 June 2014. The symposium was jointly sponsored by the Institute of Chinese Studies (ICS), Delhi and the Indian Institute of Advance Study (IIAS), Shimla. The organizers had circulated a concept note of the symposium, outlining the purpose and the theme. Concept Note: During the last hundred years the “Simla Conference” (06 Oct 1913-03 July 1914) has had and continues to have a major impact on the geo-strategic, history and sociology of the region. The Conference amongst the British, Chinese and Tibetan plenipotentiaries was convened to consider the status and boundaries of Tibet vis-à-vis China and India. On 14 April 1914, a map delineating the McMahon line as the border between India and Tibet and the Irrawaddy-Salween line between Outer and Inner Tibet was signed by the British and Tibetan representatives and was initialed, but not signed by Ivan Chen, the Chinese plenipotentiary. Subsequent efforts by the British failed to resolve this issue.

However, over the decades, many more layers have been added over the rigid and frozen positions of the parties involved. The rugged Himalayas only broken by broad valleys have tended to inhibit communications in the past. As a result the Himalayan region is complex, with several traditions prospering in isolation by themselves. The closure of border in 1959 had a significant effect on the political, economic, religious and social life of the Himalayan people.

An objective reflection on these and related issues would hopefully yield new insights and perspectives. We also now have the benefit of the experiences of negotiations among the respective parties over the years. The people in the Himalayas have lived in different political systems during these decades. The aim of the Symposium is to encourage scholarly discussions to evolve fresh approaches on the complex boundary and other related issues, which have evaded resolution. This will be done in a holistic way to include examination of the social, cultural and economic life of people living in the affected border regions. The two-day Symposium at the same historic locale would focus on the following broad themes: a) Spaces and boundaries; b) People and communities; c) State and geopolitics.

Dr. Adlakha’s paper was on the topic “Simla, McMahon Line and South Tibet: Emergent Chinese Discourse on Fears of Losing Territory to India”. The paper positions the emergent political discourse in the Peoples’ Republic of China about the Sino-Indian territorial dispute into a larger historical context. It then turns to a detailed explanation of the heterodox stances on the 90,000 sq. km area under dispute in what is called the eastern sector, at least as claimed by China. The paper then focuses on what is mostly unknown in India, i.e., a widespread public debate in China on the fears of losing the whole of the Chinese Southern Tibetan region to India. Interestingly, the Chinese have even coined a new expression, a rather nuanced expression, the South Tibetization in reference to the loss of Chinese territory under the control or occupation by the foreign powers. The conclusion notes that such nuanced iconoclastic approaches to the loss of Chinese territory still stand outside the official discourse. However, the paper maintains that the Chinese debates that form the focal point of our discussion have nevertheless begun to carve out a space for re-imagining China's current approach to its territory.


At the invitation of the Organizing Committee of the seminar, Prof. Deepak attended and presented a paper titled “Bangladesh, China, India, Myanmar Economic Corridor (BCIM-EC): The Evolution, Opportunities and Challenges” during the proceedings of seminar on 22 September 2014.

Prof. Deepak argued that as China is unfolding a new economic and foreign policy with its neighbors by promoting ‘one belt one road’ initiative, the revival of the ‘southern silk route’, one of the earliest routes of communication between China and India is perhaps less talked about comparing ‘northern silk route’ and the ‘maritime silk route.’ His paper located the BCIM Economic Corridor in history, discussed its evolution in the context of China’s aggressive economic engagement in the region, and the opportunities and challenges it faced in the region. The paper also evaluated the pre BCIM-EC regional cooperation in terms of air connectivity, overland rail and road links, waterways, and trade and commerce scenario. It held that the BCIM– EC would mean deeper integration amongst countries concerned, and will open vistas of opportunities in many diversified areas including trade, transport, tourism, as well as cooperation in traditional and non-tradition security. Above all, some of the landlocked regions of the
BCIM_EC could be turned into nodal points of connectivity, enable them to mitigate poverty and backwardness; the region as such will act as a bridge between the Indian Ocean and Pacific Ocean which is necessarily beneficial for the regional integration.

The seminar was jointly organized by Visva-Bharati University, The Institute of Chinese Studies and the Association of the Asian Scholars and was attended by scholars from China India and US.

Prof. B R Deepaak at the International Conference on "Asian Perspectives on China and Tibet: Geography, History and Buddhism", Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, October 7-8, 2014

At the invitation of the Chulalongkorn University, Prof. Deepaak attended and presented a paper titled “Translation of Classics and Civilizational Dialogue between India and China: Role of the Buddhist Scholar Monks” at the International Seminar on Asian Perspectives on China and Tibet: Geography, History and Buddhism on October 8, 2014.

Prof. Deepaak evaluated the role of Buddhist scholar monks in initiating, strengthening and furthering civilizational dialogue between India and China through translation of Classics. Prof. Deepaak enunciated that Buddhism, that acted as an umbrella for exchanges at various levels resulted in a translation industry at unprecedented scale under the very patronage of Chinese emperors. Citing historical records, it argues he argued that in a span of 734 years starting from 10th year of the Yongping Era in Han Dynasty (67 A.D.) to the 16th year of Zhenyuan Era in Tang Dynasty (800 A.D.), in all 185 prominent translators translated 2412 sutras that ran into 7352 fascicles. Of these the five, namely Kumārajīva, Paramārtha, Xuan Zang, Yi Jing and Amoghavajra were evaluated for their works, style and contribution. He posited that besides Buddhist sutras, non-Buddhist classics such as Brahman Sutra of Astronomy (婆罗门天文经), Astronomy of Brahman Rishi Garga (婆罗门竭伽仙人天文说), Astronomy of Brahman (婆罗门天文) etc. were rendered in Chinese. The paper concluded these very monks were responsible for creating the core of East Asian Buddhist literature.

The conference was attended by a range of scholars from Southeast Asian countries, China, and Europe.

Visitors at CCSEAS

CCSEAS felicitates an International Youth Ambassador’s Delegation from Taiwan on 18 September 2014

The Centre welcomed and felicitated members of the International Youth Ambassadors delegation from Taiwan on Monday, 18 September 2014. The IYD is part of the good-will exchange programme of the foreign ministry of the government of the ROC. The IYD team to JNU was led by the Ambassador Hsin-Chiang Hsu. Mr. Yi Ta Chen, Education Section, Taiwan Education and Cultural Centre (TECC), New Delhi and Mr. Lukas, First Secretary, TECC, New Delhi had accompanied the IYD members. The delegation was comprised of 20 young scholars representing various disciplines belonging to the social sciences, the natural sciences and the humanities. The students and faculty members of the CCSEAS received the IYD team members in the SLL&CS committee room and had an extremely warm and friendly interactive session which lasted for nearly two hours. Several students from the CCSEAS and delegates from the IYD made brief speeches and presented cultural programmes in Chinese language. Ms. Rani Singh, an M.Phil scholar at the CCSEAS, sang a Chinese song.

Dr. Hemant Adlakha, Chairperson, CCSEAS delivered a brief welcome address and introduced the members of the IYD delegation to the CCSEAS students and faculty. Dr. Adlakha observed this was the first-ever visit to JNU by the IYD members from Taiwan. Professor B R Deepak, CCSEAS, in his brief remarks recounted the increasing profile of academic and institutional interaction between JNU and Taiwan. Professor Varun Sahni, Chief Advisor, International Collaboration Cell (IC), JNU, in his keynote address, presented a brief outline of the profile of JNU. Former Ambassador Hsin Chiang Hsu, in his special address explained the purpose and functions of the International Youth Ambassadors delegation. Amb. Hsin Chiang Hsu also discussed the pre-eminent position the IYD has come to enjoy in the international activities undertaken by the foreign ministry of Taiwan. Amb. Hsin highlighted the special attention the Education Ministry in Taiwan has been giving to JNU and promised to make the visit into an annual event. He mentioned the number of countries in the Asian and the Asia Pacific region, the Taiwanese foreign ministry sponsors the IYD exchange visits.
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CCSEAS and Xi Jinping’s India Visit

狄伯杰：印参与“海上丝路”可破“珍珠链论”

印中都是文明古国，两国在过去的两千多年中互相交流文化，互相学习，从而发展和充实了彼此的文明。印中两国在历史上没有像今天这样的严峻防守的边界。无数印中文化使者，如法显、鸠摩罗什、菩提达摩、玄奘、义净等，自由来往于两国之间。正如季羡林教授所说的因为有了这种交流“一直到今天，我们尚蒙其利”。

印中两国是亚洲大国、发展中国家、经济发展速度最快的国家，又是金砖国家和多个多边组织、论坛的成员。当全球经济和战略重心逐步转向亚太，印中关系将定义亚洲乃至世界的新国际政治、经济秩序。正因如此，习近平访印及与印度的双边关系发出明确信号。可以预见，各领域双方的游戏规则将发生变化。

毫无疑问，这次访问将极大地促进两国经贸关系。印度不会因为需要日本的投资和技术，就忽略中国的投资和技术。印度仍是印度最大的贸易伙伴，近占印度全部贸易总额的9%。尽管如此，中国在印度的投资不如日本大。这次访问将改变这种不对称的格局。中国希望在印度建立工业投资园区。我认为这一方面在印度创造更多就业机会，另一方面减缩贸易逆差。中国在基建方面的技术还是算成熟的，价格有竞争力，印度何苦不干？

从战略角度来看，双方互信也将进一步增强。双方有可能进一步地探索包容性和共同安全体系。两国正在推动孟中印缅(BCIM)经济走廊的建设，实际上是印中之间的最早的南方丝绸之路。习近平所提出的“一带一路”的想法是高明的。

虽然印度在“海上丝绸之路”方面持怀疑态度，不过我认为印度一旦回应参加此建议，美国对中国扩张的“再平衡”政策将落空。印度能够与中国推动 BCIM 经济走廊即南方丝绸之路，为什么不能加入“海上丝绸之路”呢？

“海上丝绸之路”在自从汉代开始中印文明对话中起着非常重要的作用。中国历史学家班固写的《汉书》里就有有关记载。隋唐、宋、明清时两国之间在海上的交流更为频繁。印度西海岸的各大小港口上挤满了来自中国的其他东南亚国家的船，中国各港口也有类似的情况。我认为若印度能够参与此构想，西方所谓的中国制约印度的“珍珠链论”就站不住脚了。其二，“海上丝绸之路”将把亚洲各国的经济命运连在一起，大大地发展各国之间的经贸、人文交流。

今年正好是“中印友好交流年”。当前虽然两国的学者、游客、商、媒体、智库等都在进行不同层面的交往，但是因各种阻力交流还是有限的，我们的签证政策还不够开放。许多学者无法参加印度召开的学术会议，更不用说为了正在形成“汉语热”交换老师。这些都是亟待解决的。
The trade and economic relationship should be strengthened further, because there are lots of complementary aspects in relations between China and India.

From a regional perspective, India should join hands with China. I am very impressed by the proposal of "One Belt and One Road" (the Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road) raised by the Chinese government. India tends to benefit from such projects. If we look back into history, both India and China have been partners in the Silk Road.

How can the two countries cooperate with each other?

China’s technology is mature enough. From India’s point of view, China’s technology is good, and the price is better.

China no longer would like to invest in heavy industry because its economy has reached a certain level and scale, and it can think of investing in high-end products. But India is the opposite; it doesn’t have a strong industry. So with China’s experience, capital and technology, India could see a difference.

What do you think are the challenges in the relationship between China and India?

The "trust deficit" is the biggest challenge for the two countries. They have not been able to have a full handshake across the Himalaya due to lack of trust.

Border issues are the biggest problem that caused the trust deficit, and they should be resolved. Even though there are problems, there should be no hindrance in expanding our relationship. Both countries should work out a mechanism to resolve this issue.

We have also made lots of progress because we had maintained peace along the border for the last so many decades. We have not fired a single shot across the border since 1967. So we should have confidence.

There are also challenges at the global level, including terrorism that both China and India are facing.
Can we overcome red tape?

It is not! Forget about the Chinese business operations in India, which has been held hostage by our 'security' ghost; many global investors including Honda’s global Chairman Fumihiko Ike and British telecom giant Vodafone has expressed that doing business in India is difficult. First and foremost, while Modi offering the investor 'red carpet in place of red tape' is a welcome gesture, however, the reality is different on ground. It would be a herculean task to eradicate the red tape, which according to Akhil Gupta, the author of Red Tape (2012) is a structural violence. Gupta calculates that poverty results in over 2 million excess deaths per year in India. The inclusion of the poor in social development through various welfare and poverty alleviation schemes systematically produces arbitrary outcomes. Channelizing the files, reports, orders, and complains through clerical levels to the highest levels has bred corruption, delays, inefficiency, status quoits etc. approaches. If the people have to receive the public services, these have increasingly become 'paid' as a result of rampant corruption. And imagine the plight of 400 million poor people – one third of the population according to World Bank that earns less than $ 1.25 per day paying for such services! If it is not the structural violence then what is it?

We sincerely need to take a leaf out of the Chinese experience in effectively managing the large population. Here, it is got nothing to do with the forced ‘one child’ family planning, rather the way they have benefitted from the globalisation. China, perhaps is the largest country in the world that has benefitted its people in the shortest ever time whether it is the question of alleviating over 300 million people from poverty in a span of 30 years or the neck breaking speed of its modernisation.

Can we build capacities?

Thirdly, hope we are thinking of building the capacities in the infrastructure sector too, for these are crucial for attracting investment one the one hand and facilitating exports on the other. China boasts of 86,000 kilometres of railways comparing India’s 64,000 kilometres, of which over 11000 kilometres are high-speed whereas India has none. If the reports are to be believed, India added a meager 11,000 kilometre in 67 years comparing China’s 14,000 in recent five years! In Tibet alone, China plans to build 1,300 kilometres of rail lines and 1,10, 000 kilometres of roads by 2020. It just completed Lhasa-
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China's aggressive economic engagement with the ASEAN has greatly benefitted its adjoining regions of Yunnan and Guangxi. Yunnan has a border line of 4061 kilometers, bordering on Vietnam, Laos, Burma, Southeast Asia and South Asia. A Free Trade Area (FTA) between China and the ASEAN has prompted China to invest heavily in Yunnan and Guangxi and connect these provinces with the ASEAN and turn these into logistical and trade centers. A 179.2-kilometer expressway between Nanning, the capital city of Guangxi and Youyiguan (Friendship Pass) connected China with Hanoi in 2006. There are over hundred flight routes originating from Yunnan to ASEAN and South Asian cities. A network of railways, highways and waterways to Vietnam is already in place, and construction of Kunming-Bangkok highway and Kunming-Singapore railway is under way. Do we have the same resolve?

Why China is important to India?

If Modi’s top 10 priorities for India, pronounced soon after becoming the Prime Minister, making the charge is any pointer, then definitely China is the country we need to focus on. India could universalize mobile phone connectivity in India with such an affordable rates is not because of Nokia and Ericsson, but because of the tough competition these companies received from Chinese telecom giants Huawei and ZTE. Similarly, if India would like to build state of the art high speed railways and expressways, it could be built in tandem with China with latter’s expertise, capital and competitive prices not with the exorbitantly high western technology. Prime Minister Modi perhaps understands it better than any other political leaders in India, for he has been to China and Taiwan many times. In 2011 while addressing a crowd of 200 Chinese investors at a Beijing five-star hotel, he told them that Gujarat offered them ‘governance, transparency and stability’. If Gujarat has attracted much of the 900 million dollars of Chinese investment in India, India could attract billions from China in infrastructural development and manufacturing sector.

Finally, greater economic and political engagement between India and China demands that constructive and cooperative partnership transcends bilateral and regional configurations and has global implications. As the 21

regional configuration of this dream. Initiatives such as BCIM, Silk Route, Sea Silk Route that link the countries and regions by a network of roads, railways and markets are welcome steps. Active participation from India will render the 'string of pearls' and 'China’s containment of India' etc theories meaningless, and prepare India for a bigger role not only in the regional economic development, but also in the security architecture of the region. Will Modi-Xi meet prove a game changer, we will have to wait and see!

Can we integrate our economy with neighboring countries?

Capacity of India’s waterways and port system is also limited. It just has 14,500 kilometers of waterways comparing China’s 110,000 kilometer strong navigable waterway! India’s largest deep water port, Jawaharlaral Nehru Port also known as NhavaSheva, is the largest container port with a capacity of 4,307,622; China’s largest port Shanghai has the capacity of 31,739,000, almost 7.5 times bigger than the Indian port. Besides, other ports such as Qingdao, Guangzhou, Shenzhen and Tianjin are also 4 to 6 times bigger than our largest port.

Shigatse line which is 251 kilometres and less than 100 kilometres from Indian borders. Our border provinces such as Uttrakhand, Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal and north-eastern states do not even have good roads forget about railways! Since these states do not have much representation in the parliament, the infrastructural development has been held hostage to seat calculations.

India’s roadways that according to 2013 figure stood at 4,689,842 kilometres may not look bad comparing to China’s 4, 106, 337 kilometres. However, the condition of our roads is extremely poor and expressways are invisible. Most of the freight in India is dependent on the trucks, who in turn are subjected to dual taxation and harassed at various transit points across the states. In contrast, China boasts of having world’s largest expressway system. It had 104,500 kilometers of expressways.

India’s roads are also 4 to 6 times bigger than the Indian port. Besides, other ports such as Qingdao, Guangzhou, Shenzhen and Tianjin are also 4 to 6 times bigger than our largest port.

Can we integrate our economy with neighboring countries?

China’s aggressive economic engagement with the ASEAN has greatly benefitted its adjoining regions of Yunnan and Guangxi. Yunnan has a border line of 4061 kilometers, bordering on Vietnam, Laos, Burma, Southeast Asia and South Asia. A Free Trade Area (FTA) between China and the ASEAN has prompted China to invest heavily in Yunnan and Guangxi and connect these provinces with the ASEAN and turn these into logistical and trade centers. A 179.2-kilometer expressway between Nanning, the capital city of Guangxi and Yoyiguan (Friendship Pass) connected China with Hanoi in 2006. There are over hundred flight routes originating from Yunnan to ASEAN and South Asian cities. A network of railways, highways and waterways to Vietnam is already in place, and construction of Kunming-Bangkok highway and Kunming-Singapore railway is under way. Do we have the same resolve?

Why China is important to India?

If Modi’s top 10 priorities for India, pronounced soon after becoming the Prime Minister, making the charge is any pointer, then definitely China is the country we need to focus on. India could universalize mobile phone connectivity in India with such an affordable rates is not because of Nokia and Ericsson, but because of the tough competition these companies received from Chinese telecom giants Huawei and ZTE. Similarly, if India would like to build state of the art high speed railways and expressways, it could be built in tandem with China with latter’s expertise, capital and competitive prices not with the exorbitantly high western technology. Prime Minister Modi perhaps understands it better than any other political leaders in India, for he has been to China and Taiwan many times. In 2011 while addressing a crowd of 200 Chinese investors at a Beijing five-star hotel, he told them that Gujarat offered them ‘governance, transparency and stability’. If Gujarat has attracted much of the 900 million dollars of Chinese investment in India, India could attract billions from China in infrastructural development and manufacturing sector.

Finally, greater economic and political engagement between India and China demands that constructive and cooperative partnership transcends bilateral and regional configurations and has global implications. As the 21

regional configuration of this dream. Initiatives such as BCIM, Silk Route, Sea Silk Route that link the countries and regions by a network of roads, railways and markets are welcome steps. Active participation from India will render the 'string of pearls' and 'China’s containment of India' etc theories meaningless, and prepare India for a bigger role not only in the regional economic development, but also in the security architecture of the region. Will Modi-Xi meet prove a game changer, we will have to wait and see!
现如今，两国都有着这样一群热爱彼此文化的人们，在各自的国度里从事着与对象国相关的教育事业，只为了让更多的年轻人去了解彼此国家的语言和文化等各方面信息，以至于能够增进两国间的相互交往和了解。

来自印度尼赫鲁大学中文系的教授狄伯杰老师就是这群辛勤园丁中的一个代表。狄伯杰出生在印度的喜马偕尔邦，他于1986年考入尼赫鲁大学中文系，最终成为了尼赫鲁大学中文系的一位老师。回想起那个时候中文系的情景，狄伯杰不禁感慨到：“那时候学生数目有限，对中国感兴趣的学生比较少。我记得当时有个别年级都没有学生生源，老师就是把两个年级凑在一块儿一起上课。现在就不一样了，现在我们全系有130多人，而且有系统的本科，有硕士，有副博士和博士，这些课程我们都有。”

狄伯杰教授的中文十分流利，而且他有关中国的知识面也非常广。狄伯杰老师教授的中文课程内容广泛，涉及到中国的历史、文化、经济、政治等。他认为中国和印度在很多方面有共通之处，因此他经常在课堂上将中印两国的情况比较说明，也鼓励学生发表自己的观点，以此提高他们的汉语口语水平。

日印“秀恩爱”难掩中印关系超双边范畴事实
2014年09月10日11:45第27期我有话说(1,185人参与)

印度总理莫迪8月30日至9月3日访问日本，期间多次与日本首相安倍晋三“秀恩爱”，声称将双边关系提升至“特别战略和全球伙伴”关系。长达56点的东京宣言作为两国未来合作的蓝图，更是设计了包括基础设施、投资、能源安全、农业和食品、地区联系、防务和海上安全、科学和技术及人员交流等多个领域。

莫迪此行是否意味着印度和日本将绕开中国走得更近？中国国家主席习近平将于9月12日至19日对塔吉克斯坦、马尔代夫、斯里兰卡、印度进行国事访问。届时中印关系会有何发展？

尼赫鲁大学中国和东南亚研究中心中国问题研究教授狄伯杰的文章分析了日本、印度和中国三国战略关系的发展。

9月3日，印度总理莫迪结束了为期5天的日本之行后回国。此行被认为很成功，因为两国将双边关系提升至“特别战略和全球伙伴”关系。莫迪和日本首相安倍晋三也承诺加强经济和安全联系。

莫迪发表的“日本是印度最密切和最可靠的伙伴”、“日本在印度基础设施现代化方面所作的贡献是最多的”等言论清楚地反映了两人的密切关系。莫迪还在东京的一个商业领导人聚会上称：“世界被分裂成两大阵营，一个阵营相信扩张主义政策，而另一个阵营则相信发展。”、“我们不得不管定让世界被扩张主义政策控制，或由我们引领世界走上发展之路，为其走上更高层次创造机遇。”他的此番言论自然是为取得安倍首相同意在访印日的第一站京都，安倍为莫迪举行了非正式宴会。

印度日本首脑峰会后于9月1日公布的长达56点的东京宣言是两国间未来合作的蓝图，涉及的领域包括基础设施、投资、资源安全、农业和食品、地区联系、防务和海上安全、科学和技术及人员交流等。峰会的最大成果是日本承诺在五年内向印度投资350亿美元，向日本提供4.8亿美元基础设施贷款。
尽管日本自1958年以来就一直在向印度提供日元贷款，并一直是印度最大的援助国，但考虑到印度巨大的市场规模、日本的资本积累和技术发展等因素，两国之间的贸易和经济关系仍然很弱。尽管在印度与日本建立外交关系27年后，中国才与印度建立外交关系，中日两国还存在钓鱼岛争端，但中日两国贸易关系对于两国来说是极端重要的，没有人愿意退出，因为这对于两国、乃至整个地区都将是灾难性的。

在防务和安全领域，两国没有达成实质性的内容。印度方面希望在民用核能合作、购买US-2水上飞机等方面取得突破，现在双方已指示相关部门继续谈判工作。印度将防务工业的私人股权比例提高至49%，两国可能在未来进行防务技术的联合研发。日本取消因印度1998年核试验而对6家印度防务企业的制裁措施也表明，两国可能强化在防务领域的合作。

中印关系超越双边范畴获全球意义

尽管存在着两国在安全保障方面的分歧，但当中国和日本之间存在争端的风险之下，两国必须保持警惕。印度必须追求其公布的战略自主的外交政策，因此与一个具体或多个国家结盟来对付另一个国家或者滑入美国的怀抱不是印度的选项。莫迪在东京所发布的一些国家“扩张主义政策”的言论完全是不适宜的，因为非常显然，虽然没有点名，大家都明白莫迪在说哪个国家。

印度需要日本，也需要中国。我们需要两国的投资和技术。毫无疑问，中国是印度最大的贸易伙伴，占我们总贸易额的近9%。不过，就外国直接投资而言，它还没有被排进前十。日本是印度第四大外国直接投资国。我认为，随着中国国家主席习近平9月访问印度，中国和印度是战略伙伴，都寻求共同发展。中国对莫迪日本之行的反应可以从它对日本的技术实力和外国直接投资，我们无法忽视中国人的技术、过去35年中进行现代化、解决人口问题、拥有世界第一高的外汇储备的种种经验。今天，在不考虑“安全议题”的情况下，是中国的电信公司使印度的电信业发展了革命性的变化。在反对日本的中国“遏制印度”等说法毫无意义，这将为印度发挥更大作用作好准备，不仅是在地区经济发展，而且在地区的安全架构方面。

因此，印度和中国的关系超越了双边范畴，已获得了全球意义。两国正在金砖国家、20国集团、东盟地区论坛、上海合作组织、南亚区域合作联盟等多边论坛上合作，甚至在阿富汗和反恐议题上合作。

是的，中印两国关系存在一些问题。但是，处理这些问题的最好方式是进行谈判，不要让这些问题危及总体关系，加入一些所谓的国家“联合阵线”永远都不会符合印度的利益。
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A two days seminar on "Indonesia Post Presidential Elections Views from Young Scholars" was organized by the Centre for Chinese & Southeast Asian Studies, SLL&CS, JNU and Indonesian Students Union of India on 13-14 August 2014 in JNU.

As India, the largest democracy of the world has just concluded its general elections this year, one of its oldest allies in Southeast Asia – Indonesia, was in the queue to elect its 7th President in July 2014, and it was concluded democratically and peacefully.

Seminar on Indonesia Post Presidential Elections: Views from Young Scholars

A two days seminar on "Indonesia Post Presidential Elections Views from Young Scholars" was organized by the Centre for Chinese & Southeast Asian Studies, SLL&CS, JNU and Indonesian Students Union of India on 13-14 August 2014 in JNU.
The world's largest archipelagic country is the third largest democracy after India and the US. Indonesia is heading towards stronger democratic setup after 10 years of stable government led by the current President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono popularly known as SBY.

Indonesia transited from 31 years of long dictatorship of Soeharto, when he was ousted from his office in May 1998. The 10-year rule of the current government pushed the country to a rather better economic status amid ever increasing corruption being carried out by the government officials. As Indonesia grappled with economic crisis coupled with ethnic and sectarian clashes in 1998 the country saw three consecutive short

term Presidents - BJ Habibie, Abdurrhaman Wahid and finally Megawati Soekarnoputri, who was defeated by the current President Yudhoyono in 2004.

The country's political system is based on constitutional democracy. The legislature is made up of two bodies, having a total of 692 MPs. Out of this are the 560-member House of Representatives (DPR) and the 132-member Regional Representatives' Assembly (DPD) with four representatives from each of the 33 provinces of Indonesia. Indonesian system of selection of legislators is complex unlike the Indian parliamentary system. In Indonesia, someone can be a member of DPR even though he/she has got lesser votes than his/her opponent. For the DPR, each province has been divided into 1-10 constituencies or electoral districts which finally has 3-10 seats dependent on its size and population.

On 9th July, 2014, the voters elected the 52-year old Joko Widodo popularly known as Jookowi, as he was the most popular candidate among the youth of the country during the election campaign. Mr Jokowi is a moderate, workaholic and committed to the welfare of the poor section of the society.

Jokowi became popular when he was nominated by his party, the Indonesia Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P), run by the former President of Indonesia, Megawati Soekarnoputri, to run for the Jakarta gubernatorial election in 2012. He defeated the incumbent governor Fauzi Bowo and he was regarded as a clean and committed leader by many.
Indonesia, a country rich in human and natural resource, has been faced with massive unemployment problems. According to The President Post, one of the leading business media, Indonesia ranks highest in the youth unemployment rate for the Asia Pacific region. Despite having 173 big multi-tower shining malls in Jakarta alone, the country lacks basic amenities in its rural areas which is scattered over thousands of islands. The costly education system in the country prevents many aspirants to go for higher education in the country leaving many younger students between 14-17 years of age to seek low paid jobs in order to support their parents.

As the world looks up to the Indonesia to throw a viable and strong leadership, its mature electorate is gearing up to show the power of democracy.

The Student Union of Indonesia in India chose the right topic for the two seminar. Professor BR Deepak, the then Chairperson of the Centre inaugurated the Seminar highlighted the prospects of strengthening India-Indonesia relations post elections, followed by Mr Edy Wardoyo, the Political Councillor, Professor Iwan Pranoto; the Education Attaché of the Indonesian Embassy and Dr Gautam Kumar Jha, the Assistant Professor, from the centre were the key speakers in this seminar.

Mr Edy Wardoyo spoke regarding the election system of Indonesia and its various aspects. He highlighted the steps of the Election Commission’s step and Indonesian system of electioneering process. Professor Iwan Pranoto, expertise in Mathematics compared the education system of China, India and Indonesia.

He emphasized on the demand of academic collaborations which may fill certain gaps between India and Indonesia.

Dr Gautam Kumar Jha, in his speech emphasized upon the strength and potentials of Indonesia in natural and human resource, its geographical position and its much needed roles in the international politics and understanding. He elaborated the present condition of bilateral ties between India and Indonesia and appealed from the Indonesian students who currently pursuing their academic interest in India to be the ambassadors of India in their country and play important role in strengthening bilateral ties between India and Indonesia.
From our international guests side Drs Zulkarnain S, the Vice Rector, highlighted the teaching methods of Indonesia and expressed their willingness to reinforce the existing ties between India and Indonesia through the academic collaboration. He discussed the signing of Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between JNU and his university IAIN, Bengkulu for bilateral cooperation in the academic filed. The other participants also shared their views and discuss their queries in the workshop.

(Report Compiled by Dr. Gautam Jha)

‘China’s ongoing Quest for Cultural Modernity into 21st century: Lu Xun and his Legacy’

Editor’s Note: Considering the relevance of Lu Xun and importance of Lu Xun Studies in contemporary world, the CCSEAS Newsletter is reproducing a Report of the proceedings of November 2012 International Seminar on ‘China’s ongoing Quest for Cultural Modernity into 21st century: Lu Xun and his Legacy’

From 15 – 17 November 2012 the Institute of Chinese Studies (ICS) in collaboration with the International Society of Lu Xun Studies (ISLS), Seoul, hosted a highly successful conference to mark the 130th birth anniversary of the great Chinese writer Lu Xun, specifically focussing on the continuing legacy of Lu Xun and Lu Xun’s Spirit – the greatest living force in contemporary Chinese literature and its crucial role in the country’s nearly a hundred years’ old ongoing search towards realizing a cultural modernity. The international conference was part of the ‘Lu Xun Culture Week-India’ and was jointly sponsored by the India International Centre (IIC), the Beijing Lu Xun Museum (BLM) and the Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi. On the opening day of the conference, a parallel special session was also held at the JNU under the ISLS 2nd International Academic Forum on the theme ‘Lu Xun in the World, Lu Xun’s World’. Other events as part of the Lu Xun Culture Week included a photo exhibition on Lu Xun at the IIC mounted by the BLM; three short theatre shows in Chinese performed by the students of the Chinese Centre, JNU on each evening of the conference at the IIC and JNU respectively, followed by film shows based on Lu Xun’s fiction.

The Chairperson of the ICS, Professor ManoranjanMohanty, a leading social scientist and eminent China expert, formerly a professor of political science in the University of Delhi, wished the conference a grand success in a message which was read out at the inaugural session: “I congratulate the Institute of Chinese Studies for organizing this historic international conference on China’s ongoing quest for cultural modernity: Lu Xun and his legacy. For the Indian and international participants this effort to grasp the Lu Xun legacy has much special significance while the Chinese continue their momentous struggle for defining a cultural agenda for the twenty-first century.”

The 2012 New Delhi Lu Xun Conference was unique in many ways. It was for the first time some of the world’s leading Lu Xun scholars had gathered in the Indian capital city, New Delhi. Perhaps, it was also the first occasion that so many diverse themes from different Asian literatures were presented in an Asian city. The conference had the distinction of bringing together world’s four leading cultural critic and Lu Xun scholars: Professor Qian Liqun from China, professor Park Jae Woo from Korea, professors Nanwar Singh and G P Deshpande from India. Last but not the least, the conference also brought together on one platform papers on Lu Xun in more than one linguistic and cultural background, i e, English, Chinese, Hindi, Tamil, Bengali, Korean, German and Japanese.

China’s ongoing quest for modernity

In China, the notion of ‘modern’ is often defined as (re-)construction of the post-Opium Wars modern and strong nation; as reviving the civilisation state at the centre of the world civilisations following suffering humiliation at the hands of the militarist Japan; and as building a ‘new’ China desperate to rejuvenate the ‘China Dream’ of its past glory. As a result, the Chinese discourse on modernity often tended to be – and continues to be – a closely contested and often irreconcilably acrimonious ideological positions between
the state and society. Following the first taste of defeat at the hands of the barbaric ‘foreigner’ during the Opium Wars, and subsequently continuous ‘sufferings of a victim’ for the next one hundred years into the twentieth century at the hands of successive foreign imperialist powers, including the Japanese military imperial invasion in the 1930s, China’s quest to transform witnessed a trajectory of struggles for regaining lost national essence, from the mid-nineteenth century Qing Empire’s imperial attempt to the early twentieth century individual efforts on the part of ‘awakened’, ‘enlightened’ intellectuals and thinkers, to the May Fourth period radical, liberal as well as the left-wing scholars and so on. In other words, it was a political trajectory of the early twentieth century Chinese efforts to revive and restore the Qing Imperial order and therefore a fierce contestation between the revival of the national essence and the construction of a modern, democratic and just social order, respectively. Essentially, as many Chinese scholars of modern Chinese literary and cultural history have argued, it was a period for contestation not only between and/or among different competing ideologies but also there already was existing complex matrix of incipient modernities.

In a profoundly thought-provoking and incisive keynote address in the opening session of the conference, the octogenarian professor Namwar Singh, described in India as the country’s leading Marxist literary critic and a professor emeritus in JNU, kicked-off the conference by recollecting the impact of Lu Xun’s writings on his own ideas and thoughts during his formative years five decades ago. Singh emphasized by underlining the importance and relevance of Lu Xun’s views on the ‘westernisation’ and on modernity, especially when viewed in contrast with the then Indian discourse on modernity, in particular the nuanced perceptions of Tagore, Gandhi and Prem Chand. In response to current debates in China on the relevance of Lu Xun in present day China, Singh observed not only Lu Xun will continue to be important in China but that the great Chinese writer will continue to enjoy popularity in other parts of the world too. Endorsing Lu Xun’s views on ‘westernisation’ and modernity, Singh in a very forthright manner advocated the need for India, China and other developing societies to strive in building their own specific modernity. He categorically dismissed the notion that modernity could be ‘imported’ or ‘implanted’. In a strongly worded message directed at those criticising Lu Xun, the Indian ace literary critic declared, it would be unfair and unjust to attribute to Lu Xun of attempting to construct a western-style cultural modernity in China. Professor Alka Acharya, the ICS Director had opened the conference by welcoming the delegates. Recounting her nostalgic relationship with the creative works of Lu Xun, professor Acharya confessed how she feels refreshed and intellectually provoked each time she reads afresh The True Story of Ah Q. Professor Qian Lipun, leading expert on Lu Xun in the Chinese speaking world and eminent Chinese cultural and literary critic, delivered a special keynote on the theme “On Lu Xun”. The theme of the inaugural session, following the keynote speech by Professor Namwar Singh, was a perfect tribute to both Lu Xun and to the theme of the Singh’s address: ‘Asian Literatures and anti-Modernity Modernists’. Professor B R Deepak (JNU) opened the first session by drawing upon the controversy surrounding Lu Xun’s attitude towards Tagore. Deepak focussed on comparing the critique made by the two Asian literary giants on ‘westernisation’. His paper was a successful attempt to put in a proper historical perspective Lu Xun’s criticism of Tagore’s views on western modernity in general and on the prevailing Chinese discourse on how to define ‘the west’. Deepak’s central argument was that there was an Asian symmetry in the views of the two greatest cultural thinkers of the time, but owing to lack of communication between the two there emerged misconceived understanding of each others’ stance on the subject. The paper also highlighted that due to the prevailing political atmosphere in the two colonial/semi-colonial societies respectively, the two literary ‘masters’ were more the victims of the misunderstanding between the two. The paper concluded by laying emphasis on the fact that a lot more information is now available to researchers and scholars in India and China on Tagore’s 1924 visit to China and on the diverse political reactions the visit generated among different ideological groups in China, and therefore the newer knowledge on the subject has made it possible to claim there is considerable convergence in views of both Lu Xun and Tagore on the question of what constitutes ‘the west’ and ‘modernisation’. Subsequent papers in the session by SuvroParui (Kolkata), Kalathi Veerasami (JNU) and Sun Saijin (Qinghua University, Beijing) were excellent addition to the fast expanding reservoir of comparative studies of Lu Xun with other literatures.SuvroParui, in his meticulous study of Lu Xun’s A Madman’s Diary, attempted to understand the Chinese intellectual’s unrelenting struggle to search for a viable choice to ‘save China’ through ‘democracy’ or ‘revolution’. Kalathi Veerasami, a young researcher pursuing PhD in Tamil literature, in his paper discovers a surprising similarity between Lu Xun’s Ah Q and the Tamil writer Paudumappithan’s short story Kuppanin Kanani. Kalathi finds in protagonist Kanani an exact replica of Ah Q. The paper created a kind of heightened excitement among the conference participants by bringing Ah Q and Kanani face-to-face. Kalathi’s paper was acknowledged as the most original and a significant contribution to the
establish a rapprochement between Lu Xun and Confucius has become a necessity in China today. M V Rappai’s (ICS) paper aims at reconstructing the map of political trajectory of the rapidly changing cultural landscape from the May Fourth era either Confucius or Lu Xun dichotomy to the present-day attempts at establishing ‘harmony’ between the two. Recalling the hostile anti Confucius fervour during the May Fourth period and comparing it to the late-twentieth early twenty-first century non-hostile Confucian voices, Rappai succinctly pointed out the changing political tone of the ruling establishment in the Peoples’ Republic. The paper drew the conclusion that in accordance with the new realities, the politics in China is certainly moving in the direction of finding a new meaning of culture. By drawing inference upon the seventeenth party congress of the CPC, Rappai was able to show the increasing useful role being attributed in the present day China to both Confucius and to the glorious traditional culture. The other paper in the session was by Professor Huang Jian of the Zhejiang University, who elaborated on the pioneering role of Lu Xun in the development of a modernist consciousness in the twentieth century Chinese culture and literature. MadhaviThampli (DU), a well-known Indian scholar specialising in the twentieth century historiography of China, the chair of the session, expressed her excitement on being part of the extremely interesting deliberations of the session. She found an echo in all the papers of her own ongoing work in recording the ever-changing trajectory of history writing as well as the evolving methodologies during the past hundred years of the modern Chinese history. She elucidated on the new frameworks and refreshing approaches being employed in the charting out of the several unknown and under-researched political, cultural and intellectual discourses from the May Fourth period to the birth of new China in 1949.

Lu Xun and His Relevance

In the third session on the opening day, Emily Mae Graf (University of Heidelberg, Germany), a young doctoral candidate working in the area of transcultural studies, strongly argued on the changing fortunes of Lu Xun in China from being worshipped to facing ‘consecration’ following the changes in the prevailing political order during the past nine decades or so. Graf’s paper offered to investigate and examine the phenomenon of how an author once considered as saint and who then subsequently was rendered as ‘irrelevant’? Her paper concluded on a high-note by claiming that Lu Xun cannot be declared as dead in the 21st century China. ChamanLal (JNU), a professor of modern Hindi literature and a well-known Punjabi writer and translator of Lu Xun’s short stories. ChamanLal began his paper by recounting his internationally growing pool of comparative studies on Lu Xun’s short stories. The session ended with the outstanding paper by Sun Saiyin, who drew attention to how little attention has been paid in China on the opaque nature of available studies on the relationship between Lu Xun and his contemporary GaoChanghong. Sun’s paper was a revised and updated version of a chapter ("Beyond the Iron House: Lu Xun and the Chinese Literary Field in the 1920s) of her doctoral thesis which she completed in 2009 at the Cambridge University, London. Sun’s research on Gao’s life and works is a pioneer contribution in exploring the highly complex and yet most crucial period in the history of the early twentieth century discourse on what was later on called as the new cultural movement or the Chinese ‘enlightenment’. Sun claims while GaoChanghong remains un-researched in China, he is virtually non-existent in the western writings on the history of literature in China during the period. The paper concluded by suggesting that a thorough investigation is in order to look into the power struggles going on during the time involving various competing ideological tendencies and intellectual interest groups, and Lu Xun was no doubt an active player in these power struggles. Sun asserted in proclaiming that Gao Changhong was not only an important historical figure of the time but that his works may have had a considerable influence on Lu Xun. SreematiChakrabarti, eminent professor of Chinese politics at the University of Delhi and who chaired the session, complimented all four paper presenters in her concluding remarks for bringing to the conference complete originality and several hitherto unexplored themes and issues in the study of Lu Xun.

Lu Xun versus Confucius

In popular Chinese perceptions, Confucius and Lu Xun are described as two sages, one belonging to the tradition and the other to the revolution. Moreover, the two sages, it is said, are never destined to come together. However, with winds of change sweeping across China, a plethora of new voices can be heard in the emerging Chinese intellectual discourse calling for reconciliation between what has so far been considered as the two great antagonistic rival schools of thought. The next session ‘Lu Xun, Confucius and New Socialist Culture’ was the perfect theme for the three papers attempting to derive some sense of what many view as ‘absurd’ topic. D S Rawat (JNU) in his paper ‘Lu Xun and Confucius: an attempt towards reconciliation’ was an exploration into the nature of emerging debates in China on the subject. Rawat thoughtfully and provocingly asked: Why is it so that when we think of Lu Xun, the spectre of Confucius keeps haunting our mind? The paper concluded by wondering in an optimistic manner if the attempt to
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‘nostalgia’ for Lu Xun and sharing with the participants that he had earlier in 1981 took part in the Lu Xun birth centenary conference in new Delhi. His paper was appropriately titled ‘Re-reading Lu Xun after Three Decades’. The paper deliberated upon the greatness of Lu Xun as a poet and looked into the contemporary relevance of Wild Grass in the literary debates in China and in India. The paper concluded by critically acclaiming Lu Xun as ‘an unwilling poet but a willing writer’. The next paper was by Patricia Uberoi, who has been teaching in India for over five decades and is currently the vice-chairperson of the ICS. (Owing to a sudden illness, Professor Uberoi could not be present at the conference to read her paper. The paper was read by Ms. Emily Graf.) She is India’s foremost sociologist and a leading authority on gender issues and feminism in India. In a powerful presentation on the theme ‘Life after Death in the Chinese Revolution: the Dialogism of Ritual and Political Discourse in the May Fourth period’, Uberoi compared and contrasted discursive structures across period of time, across segments of space, and across the functional domains of society. She put her focus on the cross-examining the contrast in the collective representations in two universes that are usually viewed as sharply opposed to one another: the revolutionary political discourse of the westernised Chinese intellectuals of the May Fourth on one hand, and the traditional ritual discourse of Chinese popular religion on the other. Notwithstanding the apparent contrariety of the two discourses, Uberoi insightful tried to establish a commonality of purpose in the two, i.e., the theme of ‘immortality’. The paper went on to persuasively conclude on the potential possibility that ‘each discourse may significantly illuminate, compliment or complete aspects of the other in some mode of dialogue interrelation’. Suresh Sharma. A former professor and director at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) in Delhi, who was in the chair at the extremely thought-provoking session, summed up the session by calling the three papers a significant contribution in the currently available discourse on the debates of Lu Xun’s intervention as a philosopher and thinker in the twentieth century social discourse. In particular, Sharma was impressed by both Graf and Uberoi in highlighting some pertinent issues Lu Xun raised in the Chinese context and which uncannily resonate with what the Indian intellectual discourse is trying to come to terms with today.

**Lu Xun in the World and Lu Xun’s World**

The venue for the final session of the day was shifted from the IIC to the Convention Centre of the beautiful JNU campus, where the Centre for Chinese and Southeast Asian Studies (CCSEAS) hosted a special session on the September-October 2014 impact of Lu Xun in the world. Professor Park Jae Woo, an eminent Lu Xun scholar in Korea and currently the President of the ISLS, took special initiative in staging the session by bringing together a galaxy of several of the world’s leading scholars on Lu Xun. The theme of the session was Lu Xun in the World and Lu Xun’s World. Professor S K Sopori, the vice chancellor of JNU inaugurated and delivered the keynote. Sopori, an internationally reputed scientist, took everyone by surprise by making a well-informed and impassioned speech on the life and works of Lu Xun. He highlighted the early life of Lu Xun in Japan as a student of medical science. Professor Sopori justified his interest in Lu Xun by having sat through the entire two-hours-long session, despite his very busy schedule. Professor manager Pandey (JNU), Professor Park Jae Woo (ISLS, Seoul), Professor Sebastian Veg (Hong Kong), Professor Shu Akiyoshi (Japan) spoke at the JNU session. Following the special session, an evening of short play and film show was held at the auditorium of JNU’s School of Arts and Aesthetics (SAA). The evening concluded with a dinner hosted by Professor Sopori.

On the second day of the conference at the IIC, four academic sessions were held. The first session of the day (Session IV) was on the theme ‘Realism in 20th Century Asian Literatures’. This session was chaired by Varayam Singh (JNU), a professor of Russian and India’s pre-eminent expert and translator of the modern Russian literature. Raman Prasad Sinha (JNU) kicked-off the day with a paper ‘Reality in non-Realist Form: Short Stories of Lu Xun and Muktibodh’. Like Lu Xun in China, Sinha explained, Muktibodh in India too was misunderstood as ‘realist writer’. Raman’s comparing Lu Xun with Muktibodh was the first-ever attempt by an Indian scholar to study the two together. Though not contemporaries, Gajanan Madhav Muktibodh (1917-1964) emerged on the horizon of the Hindi literature around at the time of Lu Xun departing from this world. Muktibodh is famous in the Indian literary world as one of the most influential poet, writer, essayists, literary and political critic of the independent India. He is widely celebrated as one of the pioneers of the modern poetry in India. His ideas and thoughts were highly influenced by Marxism, Socialism and Existentialism. His best known works include long poems *The Moon Wears a Crooked Smile, Brahma-rakshasa, In the Dark* and *The Brown Dry Dust*. His complete works extending to 6 volumes were published in the year 1980. The paper by Devendra Chaubey (JNU) ‘Lu Xun and Prem Chand’, as the title suggested, was a comparison between two contemporaries who described the dark realities of their two respective societies in an almost similar fashion. Chaubey argued in his paper how both the writers wrote about the marginalised sections of society and through
their creative works advocated the need to build a new society based on democratic structures which would include the dreams and desires of the downtrodden masses. The paper concluded by articulating that the two writers created characters in their fictions ‘who fought for their existence in the contemporary feudal world and they repeatedly lost their battle, yet there was some unknown force which kept their determination and hopes alive’. SabareeMitra (JNU) raised some pertinent issues by comparing the iconic status Lu Xun enjoyed in China through the 1950s to the mid-1980s, and then suddenly falling out of favour with the post-Reform regime beginning the late 1980s. Her paper was titled ‘Contextualising Lu Xun in the CPC Discourse on Culture: From the Left League to Yan’an Talks to Cultural Reform’. Mitra provides detailed accounts of how Lu Xun, following the establishment of the Left League Writers in 1930, continued to maintain an independent non-doctrinaire attitude towards Marxism, literature and party organisation. Yet, Mitra contends, despite Lu Xun continuing to take positions on various issues, both political and literary in nature, which were completely different from that of the CPC, why was it that Mao Zedong, contrary to everyone’s expectations, decided to hold Lu Xun in such high esteem and went on to declare Lu Xun as the highest icon and symbol of the revolutionary literature in China? The other important issue Mitra raised in her paper was that despite the CPC having continuously celebrated Lu Xun as the literary icon during the pre-Reform period, what led to the post-Reform CPC regime to not favour Lu Xun in the new project of the ‘cultural reform’, launched at the seventeenth party congress in 2007? The session was to end with an interesting paper by the Russian scholar from the St. Petersburg University, Alexei Rodionov under the title ‘Lu Xun’s True Story of Ah Q in Russia’. Unfortunately, Rodionov could not arrive in time.

Lu Xun: A Critical Appraisal

Questions of greatness, patriotism and nationalism – issues controversial to the extent that Lu Xun had to continuously reply to his critics until his last days – continue to be thrown unabated at him even today. In the mid-1980s, for example, following the changing socio-political and economic trajectories as a result of the country’s reform policies first implemented in late-1970s, formed the overall theme of the next two sessions (Sessions VI and VII). Professor Rukmini Bhaya Nair of the Humanities Department and Social Sciences (Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi) chaired the session titled ‘Lu Xun: A Critical Appraisal’. Sebastian Veg (Hong Kong) opened the session with his paper ‘Reinventing Lu Xun as a Patriot: An Increasingly Difficult Task’. Veg raised the fundamental question being debated in China’s political, literary and academic debates for decades, i.e., how to exactly define and describe Lu Xun? Observing that Lu Xun’s life, spanning from the last days of the Qing Empire to the May Fourth and culminating during the anti-Japanese War period, Veg was at his insightful best when he averred how Lu Xun began to be perceived, under the Mao period, as an explanatory model for the entire historical evolution of the first half of the twentieth century. The paper generated a lot of heat by rather candidly bringing to the surface by asking some very complex questions, such as how the polity makes use of literary practices as the instrument in the service of reducing the historical complexity, as had happened to Lu Xun during both pre-and post-reform periods. Continuing the thematic symmetry with Sebastian, Hemant Adlakha’s (JNU and ICS) paper on ‘Who is Lu Xun?’ allowed him to elucidate on the question of whether Lu Xun’s writings, especially his not-any-more ‘savoury’ description of the China during his own times, have fallen out of favour in today’s economically prosperous China. Echoing on the overall theme of the conference, Adlakha’s paper was an incisive comment on the controversies surrounding Lu Xun and Lu Xun’s Spirit in the current debates in China. The paper concluded on the note by pondering over how Lu Xun had once bitterly observed ‘it is very difficult to change China’ and today almost nine decades later, it is as if the Chinese are mockingly asking Lu Xun to change! Professor Rukmini summed up the session in her inimitable style by observing how the session had been full of rich polemics while also well-informed on the current debates and controversies surrounding Lu Xun and his writings in China in the new millennium. In seventh session, Anna Stecher (LML University, Munich) kicked-off with a comprehensive review of the stage adaptations and screen versions of Lu Xun. The well-researched paper provided a rich chronology of the seventy years of Lu Xun on stage and on the silver screen, accompanied with an enriched interpretation of the changing times in which these were adapted. Anna concluded her paper by showing how under changed situations, attempts were made to give a twist to the original forms and contents in order to suit the need of the changing times. She successfully managed to bring on the agenda the problematique of the fundamental issue of why and how to stage Lu Xun by studying the at times unfriendly experiences of the directors, script writers and actors who had been engaged in the exercise. C. Usha, an independent scholar who has just recently earned a PhD in the area of gender issues in contemporary Chinese society, added a new dimension to the theme of the conference. Her paper ‘Whatever happens to Lu Xun’s Nora’ looked into Lu Xun’s short story Regrets for the Past and essays What Happens after Nora Leaves Home, On Women’s Liberation, Shanghai Girls, Women are
not the worst liars and My Views on Chastity, to analyse how Lu Xun comprehended issues of women’s subjectivity and liberation in China. The paper wonders how Lu Xun would have responded to the present-day “Noras” in Beijing, Shanghai and elsewhere in China who are leaving their homes in search for economic identity. Professor Shu Akiyoshi (Kyushu University, Japan), an eminent scholar of comparative literature in Japan and an expert on Lu Xun’s Wild Grass, presented the final paper of the session from a comparative studies’ perspective. But in his paper, interestingly enough, he drew the comparison between Lu Xun and his brother Zhou Zuoren. The paper was a good attempt to put fresh light on the literary as well personal relationship of the two brothers and how both exercised creative influence on each other. The focus of Akiyoshi was on the study and analyses of Lu Xun’s essay The Shadow’s leave-taking. The highlight of the paper was the attention Akiyoshi paid to the by far most neglected aspects in the writing of Wild Grass, i.e., on the largely overlooked fact by the researchers that Zhou Zuoren was also an equally competent and accomplished poet. The paper wondered why Zhou’s creative talent in the prose genre and essays had been preferred over his skill in verses. The paper concluded by underlining the fact that had the two brothers continued in close touch with each other, the brotherly bond would certainly have reflected in Wild Grass which Lu Xun completed in 1924, just a year after the brothers had severed their contacts.

Lu Xun on Modernity

Earlier during the day, just before the commencement of the post-lunch session, the pre-eminent Indian public intellectual Professor G P Deshpande (retired, JNU, who passed away recently) was invited to deliver a special lecture on Lu Xun’s writings and life. Deshpande, who has taught Chinese politics and foreign policy for four decades, is well known in India as leading political playwright, Marxist critic, and a founder-editor of the country’s only distinguished intellectual journal Arts & Ideas. In his powerful address, Deshpande elaborated on the complexity of dealing with the issue of ‘the west’, westernisation and modernity. Acknowledging that China’s greatest modern writer had captured the dilemma of modernity in Asia succinctly, Deshpande proclaimed Lu Xun was extremely comfortable with the Chinese resistance to anything foreign. Comparing the Indian attitudes towards the west with the Chinese discourse, Deshpande noted that the rejection of ‘the west’ and ‘the western’ is a theme that has recurred time and again in recent Asian history, and certainly so in the Asia’s two largest neighbours. Fielding a strong defence of Lu Xun’s Nalaizhuyi, in a telling comment Deshpande advised to all those critical of Lu Xun that there is no escape from the West. He ended on a thoughtful note by saying ‘we cannot become the west; nor can we deny the west, for to do so would be tantamount to placing our modernity outside history.’ He left the audience wondering with his cheeky concluding observation that Deng Xiaoping’s 1979 ‘reform and open door policy’ was yet another latest instance of Lu Xun’s nalaizhuyi. The final session of the conference was a tribute to the ISLS and was organised under the ISLS 2nd International Academic Forum on the theme ‘Lu Xun and the East Asian Literatures’. Hemant Adlakha, the convener of the conference agreed to chair the session at the last hour cancellation by Sabaree Mitra, who was originally schedule to conduct the final session. Professor Ge Tao (Lu Xun Museum, Beijing) kicked-off the session by positioning Lu Xun in the cyber world. Ge very competently presented two distinct worlds of Lu Xun on the internet. On the one hand, Lu Xun’s cyber world has been composed of the online debates in e-publications, e-magazines with focus on Lu Xun and Lu Xun specialist websites; and on the other hand is what Ge has called the Lu Xun Fan-clubs. Professor Young UK (National University, Seoul) took the perspective of highlighting the influence of Lu Xun on the contemporary Korean literature and writers. Young pointed out the manner in which the Korean writers found it inspiring to draw lessons from Lu Xun’s writings in their struggle and fight against Japanese imperialism, especially during the 1930s. The paper acknowledged how Korean public intellectuals during the period felt they owe a great debt to Lu Xun for becoming the source of spiritual leadership in their political movement for nationalism and independence. The paper concluded by laying down the importance of the coming together of the literatures and of the creative writers in East Asia in the wake of the Japanese military onslaught and exploitation. Professor Park J Woo (Korea) chose to look into the literary discourse in Korea comparing who had exercised greater influence on the Korean intellectuals, Tagore or Lu Xun? Paying sincere tributes to both Tagore and Lu Xun, Park profoundly acknowledged the debt and gratitude of the peoples of East Asia towards these two Asian literary giants. Park also noted the ongoing influence of the twentieth century Asia’s two tallest literary figures’ influence in not only Korea but throughout the Asian region. Professor Tomiko Yuyama (Japan) presented the only paper at the conference looking into Lu Xun’s essays. By drawing attention to the continuing plight of the lives of millions of women and children, especially in the rural areas, Yuyama’s paper was a compelling commentary on the continuing need and relevance of Lu Xun and his works in the 21st century China. Yuyama’s paper was entitled ‘Lu Xun and his Essays: Analysing from the poin of view of “Weak” and its significance in the 21st Century’. Professor Huang Qiaosheng, vice president of the Beijing
Lu Xun Museum, who also inaugurated the Lu Xun Photo Exhibition at the New Delhi conference, presented Lu Xun’s critical appraisal of the Indian society. Many participants from India expressed their deep gratefulness to Huang for introducing for the first time to the Indian scholars Lu Xun’s views on India. The original paper of the day was by Professor Zhu Shoutong (Macao University, Macao) under the title ‘Lu Xun: Pioneer of New Literary Writing in Chinese’. Zhu opined there were many ways in which Lu Xun had contributed to the richness and to the development of modern Chinese literature. However, viewed in the context of the growth of the modern Chinese, Lu Xun’s pioneering contribution was his new style of prose. Moreover, Lu Xun’s new style paved the way to enable the modern Chinese literature to integrate with the world literature. Besides, Lu Xun’s contribution must not be forgotten in the development of vernacular Chinese. Professor Zhu concluded his paper by noting that the unique and new style of Lu Xun continues to inspire and influence the current generation writers and critics in China today. Referring to a write up published in the Chinese journal Jing BaoSupplementary (jingbaofukan) in 1925 in Beijing, Huang Qiaosheng shared with the Indian scholars how Lu Xun had clubbed together the “un-exciting” books from India. Of course, Professor Huang hurriedly added, Lu Xun made an exception on the invaluable contributions of the Indian Buddhist literature in China. Huang, perhaps keeping in mind the Indian sensibilities, took pains to explain in his presentation that ‘Lu Xun’s views on Tagore and India were based on largely incorrect and inadequate materials and were provided by others’. Professor Huang concluded his arguments by appealing to the younger generations of scholars in both China and India to re-examine the new available information on Lu Xun’s views on both India and Tagore.

Qian Liqun on Lu Xun

The New Delhi International Conference had the unique distinction of beginning and ending with keynote address and special address, respectively. The conference concluded with Qian Liqun’s powerful and highly provocative speech on ‘The Fate of Lu Xun in China Today’. Emphasising on the profoundness of the conference theme, Qian Liqun proposed that how China is looking at Lu Xun today is extremely crucial in determining the direction in which China will move from now on. He said the Lu Xun ‘agenda’ is a big and complicated agenda and engulfs the entire Chinese society, be it politics, history, culture and literature, and so on. Professor was extremely humble and modest when he expressed his incompetence in doing justice to the topic the Lu Xun Agenda. However, he admitted to do his best to justify he being invited to deliver the special address by attempting to utter a few words based on his own experience of living in China for nearly over seven decades now. He began by invoking an essay by Lu Xun in which the Master had warned his fellow countrymen of having had lost faith in themselves. It is a very controversial but nevertheless famous essay in which Lu Xun had advised the people of China to discuss things not on hearsay but on the basis of what is real and practical. By invoking Lu Xun’s this essay, Qian Liqun was essentially reminding the Chinese people of not losing the sight of the real problems and actual issues they are faced with today. Professor Qian Liqun concluded by alerting the Chinese people of making a clear distinction between the official and real China. As such since the special address does not entail a question-answer session, it is not an exaggeration to say that Qian’s address generated considerable discussion at the conference.

Conference conclusion and publication

The conference was highly successful which engaged participants from over 10 countries, including India, China, Japan, Korea and Germany. Overall there were over 25 papers presented and deliberated upon. The conference proved out to be a major step in unveiling the launch of a new research agenda that aims to give Lu Xun studies a more prominent place in research on ‘Lu Xun in contemporary China and World’. The conference also brought to the fore several hitherto unknown themes and issues in Lu Xun studies in India and in Asia. Space does not permit a more detailed report, but a publication is underway at this stage. The slow pace of the translation of all the papers into English is the cause for delay of the publication of the conference volume. The next conference on the theme ‘Lu Xun’s China, China’s Lu Xun’ will be held to celebrate the 135th birth anniversary of Lu Xun on 15-17 November 2016, New Delhi.

The week-long Lu Xun Culture Week, including the International Conference on Lu Xun would not have not been possible without the generous support from the Institute of Chinese Studies, the ISLS, the BLM, the JNU and the IIC; and in particular, the ICS’s Director, Professor Alka Acharya, who provided enthusiastic encouragement for the intellectual framework of the Lu Xun Conference and also the full logistics support to the event.

(A report prepared by Hemant Adlakha, Conference Convenor, Associate Professor of Chinese, JNU, New Delhi, and an Honorary Fellow with the Institute of Chinese Studies, Delhi, India).