1. Expanding on themes of week 4
2. Consider the arguments & evidence in the two Schoppa articles in order to offer at least one if not several ways to consider connecting the two pieces into a common framework.
3. Next, read McCord readings and assess the different ways he and Schoppa view the province and its possible relations to the “state,” in the sense of some central authority.
4. Then read Elvin and consider the elements of “self-government” in this case and in those Schoppa’s self-government article consider.
5. Finally, consider the ways in which the previous four readings can and/or cannot fit into the kinds of contrasts Wong proposes for thinking about late imperial, Republican era, and early 21st-century relations between “state” and “society.”
6. Compare (similarities & differences, implications of each) Rowe & Ma readings and how they each do (or do not) address the concerns Gunn sketches out in his introduction to the journal issue.
7. Consider William Rowe’s argument in his article just read about a city’s guilds’ abilities to build “urban community” (last paragraph beginning on p 125) complemented by Schoppa’s review of his second volume on Hankow. Then assess the contrast he draws with Bryna Goodman’s article. Can you think of alternative ways to assess and relate historiographically these two historians’ arguments about native place, urban community, and nation?