



# **A concise history of sociology's 'indigenization' in postwar Taiwan: Emergence, transformation, and invisibilization**

*International Sociology Reviews*

2021, Vol. 36(5) 662–673

© The Author(s) 2021

Article reuse guidelines:

[sagepub.com/journals-permissions](https://sagepub.com/journals-permissions)

DOI: 10.1177/02685809211057494

[journals.sagepub.com/home/iss](https://journals.sagepub.com/home/iss)



**Feng-Tsan Lin**

The Center of General Education, Tunghai University, Taiwan

**Huang-Chang Wu**

Department of Sociology, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

**Chih-Chieh Tang**

Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan

## **Abstract**

In Taiwan, sociology is 'the Western knowledge' by its origin, and inevitably will be indigenized, especially in the process of teaching or researching. The development of sociology in postwar Taiwan takes a crooked path. It is in the crooked path to postwar that the indigenization in Taiwan's sociology takes different faces, employing different terminology and constellating around different academic figures to embody the indigenization as we have known today. Although the path from sinicization to Taiwanization may nicely capture the basic line of Taiwan's sociology after the Second World War, it does fail to reveal the details that can suggest to a more dynamic, more controversial side of indigenization. In this short article, we review the emergence, transformation, and invisibilization of indigenization in postwar Taiwan in the following three aspects: its periodization, the socio-political background in which the debate is embedded, and the key issues involved. While the indigenization debate has been subsiding in last decade, we will argue that the ideal which the debate evinces is still significant and influential. In conclusion, we propose an alternative view to rethink the indigenization of Taiwan's sociology. In terms of reciprocal comparison and connected histories, Taiwan's case exemplifies an alternative trajectory

---

## **Corresponding author:**

Chih-Chieh Tang, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, No. 128, Sec. 2, Academia Road, Nankang 11529, Taipei, Taiwan.

Email: [ctang@gate.sinica.edu.tw](mailto:ctang@gate.sinica.edu.tw)

of modernity, which is potential to correct the hitherto double historical misrecognition of modernity upheld by classical sociological theories, and to build a new synthesis or a new theory of modernities.

### **Keywords**

Indigenization, modernity, sociology, Taiwan

In Taiwan, sociology is ‘the Western knowledge’ by its origin, and inevitably will be indigenized, especially in the process of teaching or researching. However, it is no corollary that the sociological indigenization would become an issue or even constitute a debate. The development of sociology in postwar Taiwan takes a crooked path. Actually postwar, almost everywhere in the world, is a crooked, prolonged, and amnesiac path (Judt, 2005). It is in the crooked path to postwar that the indigenization in Taiwan’s sociology takes different faces, employing different terminology and constellating around different academic figures to embody the indigenization as we have known today. Although the path from sinicization to indigenization may nicely capture the basic line of Taiwan’s sociology after the Second World War (Chang, 2005), it does fail to reveal the details that can point to a more dynamic, more controversial side of indigenization. In this short article, we attempt to review the emergence, transformation, and invisibilization of indigenization in postwar Taiwan in the following three aspects: its periodization, the socio-political background in which the debate is embedded, and the key issues involved.

From the end of the Second World War to this day, the sociological indigenization in Taiwan has undergone the following four periods: the end of the Second World War to the early 1980s, the early 1980s to 1990, 1990 to 2000, and 2000 to the present day. In each period, the military, diplomatic, and economic confrontations, both across the strait or beyond the straits, constrain the development of Taiwan and aspires the academics of sociology to think or unthink what it really means by indigenization.

The indigenization of sociology was not really an issue in Taiwan before the early 1980s. In the first period, what sociologists did was a ‘natural’ indigenization, automatically to adapt sociology to local context without a second-order observation of adaptation. And indigenization could only imply sinicization at that time. To sinicize sociology was to ‘nationalize’ it (e.g. Wu, 1971). The indigenized sociology with nationalistic flavor provided the Kuomintang’s (Nationalist Party, KMT) regime with an ideological support, and was allowed to be institutionalized in public universities.

The historical background for such development was that the KMT’s regime was defeated in civil war after the Second World War, and retreated to Taiwan. In 1950, the Korean War erupted, and brought the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) into military and diplomatic confrontation, which unexpectedly prevented the annihilation of the KMT’s regime. With the escalation of the Cold War in East Asia in the following two decades, the KMT’s regime in Taiwan joined containment against the communist countries and actively collaborated with the United

States in various diplomatic and military affairs. Claiming to build Taiwan as “base for irredentism,” the KMT’s efforts to reconstruct and modernize Taiwan resonated with the ideology of “development,” which was first initiated by Truman in 1949 and became the United States’ guideline for its reconstruction of East Asia in the heyday of the Cold War.

When the KMT retreated to Taiwan, higher education encountered the ‘double transplantation’; however, the scholars from the mainland filled the academic vacuum left by Japan regime, and however, social sciences, regarded as the Western knowledge, started to be taught and studied in Taiwan. But the institutionalization of sociology in public universities, due to its assumed affinity with socialism and ‘critical ethos’, had been postponed until 1960. Since sociologists had to struggle to survive the political adversity, it was a reasonable strategy for them to follow the American model, especially when the United States was the leader of ‘liberal democratic camp’ and gave a push for the rebuilding of sociology in Taiwan (Chang et al., 2010; Tang, 2008).

It should be noted that only in the early 1980s, to indigenize sociology ‘naturally’ by imitating the United States’ sociology was critiqued strongly by the academic movement as ‘sinicization of social and behavioral sciences’. ‘Officially’, it is in this academic movement that the first emergence of sociological indigenization in Taiwan really took place. Interestingly, this movement, with a highly contested implication, did not bring into a real controversy because it just followed the social currents outside the academic life.

In 1969, as Nixon was elected the president of the United States, his policy to end the Vietnam War and to bring the Americans home not only led to the entente with Mainland China, but also the diplomatic disaster to the KMT’s regime. In the early 1970s, the KMT’s regime was no longer taken as the legitimate representative of China. The legitimacy crisis resulting from diplomatic predicament stimulated a general trend of ‘return to reality’. The well-known movement as ‘Homeland Literature’ could be regarded as a part of this trend.

In the atmosphere that to reform was the best way to defend Taiwan, the nationalism reached its high tide in the 1970s. As the ‘sinicization of science’ was voiced, there was nothing that could block the way to the sinicization of social sciences. The sociological indigenization in the early 1980s embodied therefore a kind of academic nationalism that resisted the Western hegemony. However, there was an ambiguity both in the political nationalism and the academic indigenization. A potential competition or conflict between Chinese and Taiwanese identities hid behind the identification with ‘homeland in reality’, that is, Taiwan.

It was assured that ‘return to reality’ in sociological field gained its impetus when actively responding to the social criticism that the intellectuals were regarded to be locked in academic ivory tower. The indigenization of this period was not simply a product of nationalism. It also attempted to adapt to the local reality and to seek for a ‘genuine’ social science for Taiwan. A telling fact is that the leading figures in this movement were mostly bequeathed with PhD degree of social sciences from the United States. For them, to indigenize was to criticize the academic tailism which only imitated and followed the mainstream of the Western sociological knowledge, though the positivistic spirit of social sciences was firmly upheld and scientific knowledge was undoubtedly cosmopolitan by its nature. They thought that we could go beyond the Western

knowledge only after we had professed it (e.g. Yang and Wen, 1982). By hindsight, the appeal to a combination of double hermeneutics and double criticism, namely to search for a higher synthesis based on the critical interpretation of both the Western and our own tradition, became its concluding remark.

The second period of indigenization could be seen as an attempt to criticize, from Taiwan's viewpoint, the development ideology of the Cold War, and to challenge the paradigm of modernization theory. It became much clearer as the indigenization had steadily unfolded in the 1980s. Two among several new issues were much significant, and left a far more influential legacy on the following debate: Weberian studies, and Confucian ethics and its relationship with the rise of 'Four Asian Tigers'. In the meantime, National Taiwan University and Tunghai University were allowed and started the PhD programs to enroll graduate students in 1981 and 1986, respectively. Some researchers bequeathed with 'native' PhD degree, that is, receiving PhD degree from Taiwan's own universities, constituted the backbone of indigenization debates from the second to the third period, of which the study of Taiwan's small and medium business (e.g. Chen, 1994a), and the exploration on the Chinese logic of practice (e.g. Zhou, 2000 [1995]) were representative.

Against the advancement in the establishment of sociology, Taiwan's politics was gradually drawn into turmoil around the 1980s. The authoritarian regime of the KMT could no longer effectively hold back the democratic wave. Worse than ever, the independence movement did attract its supporters. Around 1990, as indigenization became a fashionable concept in social and academic nomenclature, another twist was added to indigenization debate, and to indigenize then implied two different subjects: to relocate the overlapping between Taiwan and China, and to discern the specific path in which Taiwan modernizes. It is justified to say that the dominant ideology of sino-centrism was not only challenged but also confronted with severe criticism, along with the coming crisis occurring within KMT's regime.

The crisis was coming, but never so easily overthrown KMT's domination (especially under the rule of the first Taiwanese president, Teng-hui Lee), let alone derange the KMT's supporters in academic field. From the time when the KMT's regime retreated to Taiwan to 1990, the majority of teachers in universities and colleges were prone to support or at least approve the KMT's regime. A great part of them were either retreaters from the mainland or their descendants, so it was difficult for them to abandon their identification with China, no matter which regime would and could represent China. Therefore, long before the indigenization debate was reignited in academic field in 1990s, Taiwan's independence had been already under severe controversy outside the academic life. In contrast, sociology then was really an exception. Its active role in political and social reform in the 1980s allowed it to rename its association from Chinese Sociological Association to Taiwanese Sociological Association in 1995 (Hsiao, 2013).

As a sudden collapse of communist regimes around the world occurred, the era of post-Cold War came. The indigenization debate in the 1990s mainly constellated around two issues mentioned earlier, but the researchers from different generations did attend to different issues. At least, four discourses could be identified. Some senior researchers would emphasize the Taiwanese 'subjectivity', and re-portray the genealogy of sociological studies, by means of which Shao-Hsing Chen, the neglected Taiwanese

forerunner was highlighted (Hsu, 1991). Remarkably, in this discourse, indigenization dropped its connotation of sinicization. To indigenize was to emphasize the specific path that Taiwan modernized. For some other senior sociologists, indigenization still contained sinicization, which formed a contrast to internationalization. Some of their earlier cosmopolitanism was discarded (Wen, 1991). The third type came from the younger generation, who criticized that the 'exile mentality' had kidnapped the studies of Taiwan. They distasted the older paradigm of 'sinicization' for it being fouled with nationalism, and saw it as an instrument to consolidate power in academic field. Instead, they emphasized the Taiwanese subjectivity of academic practices by means of a political-economic analysis of the academic reproduction (Fu, 1990, 1991). The fourth discourse, gaining its inspiration from postmodernism, aimed to deconstruct the fermenting Taiwanese nationalism as well as to interrogate the current studies of ethnicity and national identity (Chao, 1996; Island Margin, 1993). One researcher, who was criticized by this discourse and had the origin of the so-called 'mainlander of second generation', responded with an accusation that it was really a witch hunting (Chang, 1996). The followers of this discourse often labeled themselves as 'international-local left', and criticized fiercely the imperialistic tendency within the Taiwanese nationalism (i.e. political indigenization escaping the framework of the 'great' China). But it seems astonishing that they intended to reserve their opinions, while dealing with the Republic of China's (ROC's) or People's Republic of China's (PRC's) Chinese nationalism (Chen, 1994b; Robbocop, 1991).

Consequently, indigenization had replaced sinicization and become a fashionable concept since the 1990s. The distinction of indigenization and internationalization did appear in the third period, but they never constituted an opposite pair. In two contexts, we can clearly perceive the change of meaning by the word 'indigenization' (bentuhua, 本土化); the debates mentioned earlier and the booming 'grounded' or 'rooted' studies of Taiwan. These studies, inspired by the ideal of indigenization, addressed the issues such as the characteristics of Taiwan's capitalism, the relationship between business and politics, KMT's authoritarian rule, or ethnic relations. As Taiwan's economic and political miracles successively attracted the international audiences in the 1980s and 1990s, indigenization and internationalization did not contradict but complement each other. Behind the all kinds of Taiwan Studies was a new generation with foreign sociological doctorates. Their empirical studies enriched the sociological indigenization, both in quantity and quality. It was difficult for them to cooperate with those who gained doctorates in Taiwan's own universities for their research orientation, knowledge taste, and academic habitus were so different. More decisively, they distrusted the native institutes' ability to train Taiwan's own sociologists. Due to the higher social reputation about 'overseas' doctorates, as the time went, the 'native' sociologists had a little chance to get positions in the leading sociological departments, and had gradually lost their influence on the direction of indigenization. This tendency could also be explained, if partially, by another fact that research topic of Chinese practice logic, advocated by some 'native' sociologists, seemed to run against the current in which Taiwan's autonomy was extremely underlined. To take the long view, the marginalization of the 'native' sociologists causes irrefutable losses; an obvious lack of theoretical and historical studies, and an insufficiency in structural indigenization, that is, autonomous reproduction of locally trained researchers.

After 2000, two extraordinary events, the rise of China and the end of the KMT's authoritarian regime, influence the further debate of indigenization. The end of the KMT's regime may democratize academic life, but the rise of China certainly marginalizes the status of Taiwan. In contrast to the huge and radical change of China since its reform and opening-up policy in 1978, the economic and democratic miracle of Taiwan has slowly lost its audience and interest in the international academic communities. Thereafter, internationalization has been decoupled with indigenization, or, even worse, become its opposite. This tendency testifies to the main argument of the fourth period in indigenization debate.

In 2000, KMT lost the campaign, and the candidate of Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), who was pro-Taiwan's independence, became the president of Taiwan. This great change and its effects bring two important influences on indigenization. First, it leads the indigenization debate definitely away from the controversy between sinicization and indigenization. The relation between internationalization and indigenization became the focus of debate. Second, the 'native' DPP regime, which was benefited from indigenization, unexpectedly becomes an obstacle to the advancement of indigenization. Since the late 1980s, the great pressure, both from the international competition and the rising China, has reinforced its eagerness to highlight Taiwan's existence and its statehood. The professional evaluation of academic performance therefore becomes an urgent, significant issue in policy making. At the same time, the massive expansion in higher education during the last two decades undoubtedly actuates its urgency (Chang et al., 2010). Under the influence of past entangled political-economic interests, the planned differentiation between research and community universities is never really realized. Instead, many colleges without qualified teachers are upgraded to universities (Tai and Lin, 2015). Confronting this situation, the DPP's government regards the institutionalization of performance assessment and faculty promotion review as a good policy to catch up the mainstream of the international academic community, and as an efficient way to incentivize researchers to publish their findings in English.

However, since the DPP's government takes almost singular standardized index of performance assessment and faculty promotion review as its policy, discontent and criticism burst, eventually triggering another wave of indigenization debate. At this time, the indigenization debate revolves around the competition and coordination between internationalization and indigenization. Despite the loud protest against standardized index, the policy is implemented anyway after being slightly modified.

In the controversy on standardized index policy, the opposition often targets at the ranking system which evaluates the published articles in international journals higher than those in local ones. It should not be mistaken as the opposition against the internationalization of scientific publication. Some senior researchers opine that it is a false dichotomy between indigenization and internationalization because the quality of indigenized studies ensures their international reputation. However, this kind of opinion might sound adequate and persuasive, but proves to be irrelevant in real academic life. To publish, or to perish, causes a heavy impact on the younger generation in academy. The older one is much safer and stayed on the higher ground, just because of its seniority. Undeniably, those who have voiced against the standardized index policy and the flaunting internationalization are mostly junior academics or researchers who profess

qualitative approaches (Working Group for the Conference of Reflection, 2005). The difficulty to publish internationally, mostly in English, which varies with the qualitative or quantitative approaches, might play a role here. What we can assure is that the institutional design of assessment causes a strong but reverse effect on both the direction of indigenization and the academic ecology.

Under the expansion of higher education in last decades, most sociologists have taken three different coping strategies to survive the changes. The majority of them continue to engage with Taiwan studies and are not so active in international publication. The inferior of this largest group hardly pay any attention to the international dynamics of academic communities. Facing the contestable standard of assessment in the name of international competition, they could not avail of their contribution and reputation to protest against the improper ranking system, let alone protect the juniors from unnecessary and unsound pressure. The second type is to take English publication as their main strategy. Definitely, they are the minority in number. Some of them only chase after the issues that have received close, intensive review in international academic communities, and are in danger of losing contact with local context of Taiwan, then losing most of audience and readers outside the academy. The third type of strategy is to engage in indigenization and internationalization at the same time. Around Taiwan, only a handful of researchers can operate this strategy successfully, and make good records in both Taiwan studies and international publication.

The transition of ruling party from KMT to DPP brings to the fore the problem of 'academic autonomy', which deeply influences the development of indigenization in general, but is less discussed in the hitherto indigenization debates. It is a long Chinese tradition that good scholars should actively or passively serve as officials or 'mandarins'. Those who are seconded from universities to government under the KMT's authoritarian rule would be severely criticized as 'the scholars patronized by the government'. The transition of ruling party does not change, but continued this convention. Without revolving door regulation, academics, including those from sociological field, could choose to take official position in government or public sectors. To be fair, the secondment may not incur damage to the public interest, except the damage to academic ethics. The problem it reveals is the inadequately regulated one-way channel which consolidates the asymmetric power relation, and endangers the academic independence against politics. In another context, academic ethics is also problematized. Economic boom since the 1980s has brought extra material benefit to academics. In the late 1990s, they become more and more ambitious for popularizing 'knowledge economy'. However, seen from the traditional Chinese perspective, it is a taboo to earn money by using knowledge, let alone make any open praise or promotion of it. Correspondingly, without open discussions and debates, there are no clear, adequate norms or legal regulations about such activities. This leads to a peculiar, dubious consequence that academic independence goes without legal guarantee. To pursue personal economic reward in the gray areas, where legal and illegal benefits intersected, is always risky. Nevertheless, there is another side of the story. As the burden of universities to finance themselves grows after 2000, economic forces get more chances to interfere in the academic activities. Two recent cases exemplify how serious these problems are the presidents of Academia Sinica and National Taiwan University, two leading academic institutes in Taiwan, are involved in a lawsuit

of technology transfer and a controversy of election without disclosing the information for his employment by one elector, respectively. In one sense, the indigenization will not be accomplished, as long as the traditional mentality of literati and mandarin is still buttressed.

As the government plays the role of locomotive, sociology steps soon into a mature period of professionalization and routinization. The controversy stirred by the indigenization debate slowly and moderately subsides. However, the absence of the indigenization debate does not suggest that the internationalization of sociology has definitely gotten the upper hand. Actually, the tendency that the status of Taiwan has been marginalized in international academic communities goes hand in hand with the policy of internationalization in Taiwan's own context. The marginalization of Taiwan's international status does push the internationalization of social sciences a great step forward, but this anxiety leads to a distorted mode of internationalization which provides a shortcut for academic success. Recently, the scandals of 'predatory' journals, whose authors include many Taiwanese researchers, have already given a warning that some academics have gone astray under the guide of distorted internationalization. Even though the warning is sounded, it is unrealistic to expect a resurgence of indigenization. A more benevolent reciprocity between indigenization and internationalization should be anticipated.

By 2010, when some key figures of 'sinicization' movement are about to retire, their retirements provoke and inspire the younger generation to rethink the indigenization. One alternative reflection is proposed; taking the history of concepts as a basic but transformative step to indigenization in sociology. This approach consists of two dimensions that can reinforce each other. First, it encourages a comprehensive study of Indigenous concepts that implies a reciprocal comparison of commonly known sociological concepts with their Western origins, and serves as foundation for the development of native theory. Simultaneously, the historical study of concepts not only illustrates how the different concepts are introduced, translated, and reinterpreted in Taiwan's sociological communities, but also characterizes the specific path that sociology become indigenized (Tang, 2009, 2010a, 2010c, 2014). The incrementalism of this proposal incurs a criticism which takes it as positivistic model pro empirical induction, and sparks off another wave of debate (Huang, 2010; Tang, 2010b). Notwithstanding this, its effects are far more limited.

In the early 2010s, the low birth rate in Taiwan becomes a fashionable issue inside and outside the academy. Following the trajectories of advanced countries, the overexpansion in higher education in last two decades, along with low birth rate, results in an unexpected consequence; deficient enrollment of undergraduates and graduate students devitalizes universities. For academics, deficient enrollment also renders their working condition deteriorated. Actually, their status has already changed from the respected knowledge nobility to the hired academic laborers. Now, the closing down of universities and department becomes the worst nightmare for them. Some of sociological students propose to re-characterize the social role that sociological knowledge can play, and encourage to make use of the 'public sociology' to engage into public affairs (Chang, 2015; Wang, 2015). Although public sociology attracts numerous academics and agitates them to participate in public affairs, its achievement is still to be evaluated.

After the debate about indigenization and internationalization in the 2000s, the indigenization seems no longer to be an issue that needs intensive, close review, and becomes invisible. But the debate actually continues without the name of indigenization. Assuming the indisputable legitimacy and necessity of Taiwan studies, the problem is now framed as 'predicament of small nation sociology' (Huang, 2013). This framing may justify a solution to this academic predicament; to follow the logic of international competition. As a response, there is another way that can arouse interest in the international sociological communities; to highlight Taiwan's specific, historical contingencies (Lee, 2021).

More importantly, what the hitherto indigenization debates problematize neither disappears, nor is answered. For instance, it is acknowledged but meagerly carried out that to enroll sociological graduate students in Taiwan's own universities is a consequential way to avoid intellectual tailism. If to indigenize implies to transplant, translate, and reinterpret, and then the students bequeathed with 'local doctorate' should be regarded as 'double connectors' by means of which sociological knowledge in Taiwan can make double connection with the mainstream of international community and local community as well. Nevertheless, long before the crisis of low birth rate is coming, PhD programs in Taiwan have been impoverished by a vicious circle, which consists of the unproductive teaching or supervising, the deficient enrollment, and the difficulty of finding jobs after PhD degrees received.

In contrast to the predicament in PhD program, another issue that the indigenization debate tantalizes is whether or not the standardized index policy can prevent the marginalization of Taiwan in international academic communities. It is argued that to bring academics' findings to English publication poses no contradiction to the indigenization, and the quality of researches guarantees the academic reproduction in Taiwan. However, as the option to publish becomes destiny, and to publish in English becomes the only way to avoid being perished, what the standardized index policy can bring about is anything but the ideal that the indigenization debate evinces.

Perhaps, in the crooked path to postwar, as well as in the prolonged path to indigenize social sciences in Taiwan, the standardized index policy is only transitory and symptomatic, which indicates the marginal position that Taiwan has taken. It also testifies to the marginalization that Taiwan has encountered in last decades, especially when China's rise is vindicated. To be optimistic, to be marginal is never identical with to be insignificant. The miracles, both economic and democratic, which Taiwan has made after the Second World War, may reveal the other side of story; some marginal, small countries can take advantage of their marginality as well as connectivity to make extraordinary contribution to their people and the world. In the academic field, we think, it makes no great difference.

In terms of reciprocal comparison and connected histories, Taiwan's case in fact exemplifies a new, alternative trajectory of modernity (Tang, 2018, 2019). In other words, indigenization has the theoretical implications, being potential to correct the hitherto double, historical misrecognition of modernity (i.e. to overrate the progress of modernity in Europe and to undervalue the development of non-Western civilizations) upheld by classical sociological theories, as well as to build a new synthesis or a new theory. On one hand, Taiwan occupies the space where different great powers intersect. Since the late Ming, it has experienced the interplay between the east and the west. After

1850s, when the Qing Empire is on its verge to collapse, Taiwan becomes a laboratory where the Qing government attempts to carry out its modernization experiment. Around the early 1890s, the end of the first Sino-Japanese War makes Taiwan a colony of Japan. The colonial government of Japan implements numerous policies to modernize Taiwan. Although the effects left by Japanese colonial government can be reevaluated, the colonial legacy truly empowers the KMT's regime to survive the civil war with communism after 1945. We can argue that Taiwan's marginality never decreases its significance in world politics and economy. Its connectivity certainly demonstrates the specific path to modernity. The historical trajectory after the Second World War only can be regarded as some episodes, which partakes the long story that Taiwan has told. However, both the standardized index policy and slogan of internationalization in last decade distract attention from what the indigenization debate really problematizes. They are inevitably trapped in the myth of 'catching up with international mainstream'. After the very long debate, it is assured that to indigenize is not to nationalize the sociology, but to use sociological knowledge and ideas to re-narrate, rethink, and unthink the specific path that Taiwan modernizes. To re-narrate, rethink, and unthink this specific path, we should persistently criticize and problematize the so-called mainstream of sociological knowledge. After all, the reason why the indigenization debate still matters in Taiwan is that the present paradigm of sociology is more or less occidentalistic, and to 'really' multiply the modernity and its experience, for most of sociological students, has a long way to go.

### Authors' Note

In loving memory of our best friend, Dr Huang-Chang Wu (1976–2020), whose energetic figure and thoughtful insights are well preserved and cherished in our hearts always.

### Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### References

- Chang MK (1996) Critique of ideology, or hunting for witch? *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies* 23: 255–269.
- Chang MK (2005) The movement to indigenize social sciences in Taiwan. In: Hsiao AC and Makeham J (eds) *Bentuhua: Cultural, Ethnic, and Political Nationalism in Contemporary Taiwan*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.221–260.
- Chang MK (2015) Generality and particularity in Taiwanese sociology. *Global Dialogue* 5(4): 32–33.
- Chang MK, Chang YH and Tang CC (2010) Indigenization, institutionalization and internationalization. In: Burawoy M, Chang MK and Hsieh MF (eds) *Facing an Unequal World*, vol.2. Taipei, Taiwan: Institute of Sociology at Academia Sinica, Council of National Association of the International Sociological Association, pp.158–191.

- Chao K (1996) New nationalism, or old? *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies* 21: 1–72.
- Chen CH (1994a) *Networks of Collaboration and Life Structures*. Taipei, Taiwan: Linking.
- Chen KH (1994b) The imperialist eye. *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies* 17: 149–222.
- Fu DW (1990) From flight from calamity to anti-dependency. In: Fu DW (ed.) *The Space of Knowledge and Power*. Taipei, Taiwan: Laureate, pp.81–93.
- Fu DW (1991) Historical construction, marginal strategy, and ‘sinicization’. *Island Margin* 1: 103–127.
- Hsiao HM (2013) The triple turn of Taiwanese sociology. *Global Dialogue* 3(2): 19–20.
- Hsu CK (1991) The formation and changes of a research paradigm. *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15: 29–40.
- Huang HM (2010) Sociological theory and sociological indigenization. *Journal of Social Theory* 13(1): 1–35.
- Huang SJ (2013) The predicament of small nation sociology. *Global Dialogue* 3(2): 21–22.
- Island Margin (1993) *Island Margin 8: Special Issue ‘False Taiwanese’*. Available at: [http://intermargins.net/intermargins/IsleMargin/fake\\_taiwanese/index.htm](http://intermargins.net/intermargins/IsleMargin/fake_taiwanese/index.htm)
- Judt T (2005) *Postwar*. London: Heinemann.
- Lee C (2021) Making Taiwan relevant to sociology. *International Journal of Taiwan Studies* 4(2): 289–309.
- Robbocop (ed.) (1991) *Taiwan’s New Oppositional Movement*. Taipei, Taiwan: Tangshan.
- Tai PF and Lin TH (2015) *The Coming Collapse of Taiwan’s Higher Education*. New Taipei City, Taiwan: Socio.
- Tang CC (2008) A reconstruction of the local sociological tradition. In: Shieh GS (ed.) *Interlocution*. Taipei, Taiwan: Socio, pp.553–630.
- Tang CC (2009) A proposal for the historical study of indigenous concepts. In: Zhou CX and Su FS (eds) *A Reflection and a Prospect of the Indigenization of the Social Sciences*. Chiayi, Taiwan: The Institute of Educational Sociology, Nanhua University, pp.313–366.
- Tang CC (2010a) Public and private in China and the West. In: Conference for comparative studies of ‘public’ and ‘private’ in Japan and China, Hong Kong, China, 8–10 August.
- Tang CC (2010b) Theory as observations of second order. *Journal of Social Theory* 13(1): 37–79.
- Tang CC (2010c) Yundong. *East Asian Sport Thoughts* 1: 73–104.
- Tang CC (2014) The paradoxical coexistence of civilization and violence. *Router: A Journal of Cultural Studies* 19: 91–152.
- Tang CC (2018) A rewriting experiment of modernity from the perspective of connected histories. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 31(3): 330–345.
- Tang CC (ed.) (2019) *Modernity in Reciprocal Comparison*. Taipei, Taiwan: National Taiwan University Press.
- Wang HZ (2015) Streetcorner sociology. *Global Dialogue* 5(4): 34–35.
- Wen CI (1991) Chinese sociology. *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15: 1–28.
- Working Group for the Conference of Reflection (ed.) (2005) *Globalization and Knowledge Production*. Taipei, Taiwan: Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies.
- Wu ZH (1971) Chinese sociology. *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 1: 1–13.
- Yang KSH and Wen CI (eds) (1982) *The Sinicization of Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Taipei, Taiwan: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica.
- Zhou CX (2000 [1995]) *Chinese Sociological Practices*. Taipei, Taiwan: Hungyeh.

### Author biographies

Fengtsan Lin, 林峰燦, receiving his PhD degree from the department of Sociology in National Taiwan University, is the adjunct assistant professor in the Center of General Education of Tunghai University,

Taiwan. During 2016–2018, he conducted post-doctorate research in Academia Sinica, Taiwan. His publication covers the topics as the ideas of secularization and culture or civilization in European history. Now, he is working on the mass society debate around 1900 in Europe.

**Dr Huang-Chang Wu, 吳鴻昌**, got his PhD from department of Sociology of National Taiwan University. He worked as a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan and as an adjunct assistant professor at Shih Hsin University before passing away in February 2020. His research focused on sociological theory, cultural sociology, economic sociology, and political sociology. He published several articles, including ‘China: Ancien Régime, Revolution and After’ (with Fengtsan Lin and Chih-Chieh Tang) and ‘Economics Imperialism or Reconstructing Action Theory: Reflections on the Sociological Rational Choice Theory’ (in Chinese).

**Chih-Chieh Tang, 湯志傑**, (PhD Universität Bielefeld, Germany, 2002) is Research Fellow of the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan and an editorial board member of *Soziale Systeme: Zeitschrift für soziologische Theorie*. His research interests include systems theory, historical sociology, sinology, and Taiwan studies. His work centers on a reciprocal comparison between East and West. He is currently engaged in developing a new understanding of modernity from the perspective of connected histories and reciprocal comparison.

## Résumé

A Taiwan, la sociologie est à l'origine un savoir « occidental » qui s'est nécessairement indigénisé, en particulier à travers la recherche et l'enseignement. Le développement de la sociologie dans l'après-guerre à Taiwan a pris un chemin tortueux et l'indigénisation des visages différents, employant une terminologie différente au grès des figures académiques qui ont incarné l'indigénisation que nous connaissons aujourd'hui. Bien que le passage d'une sinisation à la Taiwanisation capture assez bien l'évolution de la sociologie taiwanaise de l'après-guerre, il masque une dynamique plus controversée de l'indigénisation. Dans ce court article, nous passons en revue l'émergence, la transformation et l'invisibilisation de cette indigénisation selon les trois aspects suivants : sa périodisation, le contexte socio-politique dans lequel s'intègre le débat, et les principaux enjeux. Bien que le débat sur l'indigénisation se soit apaisé au cours de la dernière décennie, il reste significatif et influent. En conclusion, nous proposons un changement de perspective pour repenser l'indigénisation de la sociologie taiwanaise. En termes de comparaison réciproque et d'histoires connectées, le cas de Taiwan illustre une trajectoire alternative de la modernité. Il permet de corriger une perception biaisée de la modernité dans les théories sociologiques classiques, tout en offrant une esquisse de synthèse ou une nouvelle théorie des modernités.

## Mots-clés

indigénisation, modernité, sociologie, Taiwan