

Editor's Note

This issue of the *Journal* is particularly rich in the kinds of articles that we alluded to in the editorial of November 1978: integrated sets of essays, review articles, research notes, and research articles with broad interpretive implications. Professor Park's presidential address speaks to the perennial problem of reporting and interpreting a vast and distant nation's affairs to an often ill-informed audience. Professor Tu's research note elucidates the implications of the dazzling documentary discoveries at Mawangdui for the history of early Chinese thought. Professor Blake's essay on the Mughal state calls into question a major interpretive assumption long dominant in historiography of the period, and offers illuminating suggestions as to how the patrimonial-bureaucratic ideal type might be used to analyze Mughal rule; in the process, he raises the possibility of interesting comparisons between Mughal India and other great imperial states. Professor Metcalf's review essay on the work of Eric Stokes draws on a large body of interpretive work on the social history of modern rural India, and should ring familiar bells not only in the minds of social historians of modern South Asia, but also those of East Asia.

The centerpiece of this issue is the set of three essays dealing with the problem of fascism in twentieth century China and Japan. Professor Gregor and Ms. Chang's article on the affinities and contrasts between Sun Yat-sen's later programmatic ideology and the thinking of leading pre-Fascist Italian Nationalists puts Sun into a seldom used analytical framework, and suggests some overarching rubrics which apply to this Chinese political thinker and to certain modern Italian Nationalist ideologues alike. Professor Fletcher's essay analyzes the thought of four Japanese intellectuals, who in the 1930s found elements of European fascism compatible with their own visions of Japan's needs, and who sought to put their ideas into coherent programs through the instrumentality of the *Shōwa kenkyūkai* (Shōwa Research Association). Professors Duus and Okimoto, who contributed their comment to the *JAS* at our request (and in astoundingly short order), then take up the whole question of the usefulness of fascism as an analytical tool in the study of twentieth century Japan. Though they have not explicitly addressed the problem of fascism's interpretive usefulness in the study of modern China, their comments should provide food for thought in conjunction with the Gregor-Chang article.

This is, it should be added, the place to thank all the authors who have contributed articles to this issue of the *Journal* for their extensive labor and kind cooperation in preparing their essays for publication.

Two minor housekeeping matters need to be mentioned. The *Journal* regrets that it was partially responsible for publishing an incorrect price for *Essays on T'ang Society* (edited by John Curtis Perry and Bardwell Smith) in the review by Professor

Robert Somers (*JAS*, August 1978). Last, but of special importance to potential contributors, from now on the *JAS* will use the University of Chicago Press's *A Manual of Style*, twelfth edition, as its regular style manual, instead of the 1977 MLA Handbook it has used recently. Contributors' efforts to conform to the usages prescribed in the *Manual of Style* will be greatly appreciated.