laggards. The first case study Ang presents is one that is between the movers and the laggards, that of Forest Hill in Fujian province. Specifically, Forest Hill developed through the coevolution of property rights and markets, and the coevolution of development strategy and markets. Throughout her analysis, Ang points out that the problem with development theories is that they are designed to be universal, when in reality different approaches are needed for different stages of development. She then presents Blessed County (Zhejiang province), which she describes as entrepreneurial and located on the coast. Her contrasting example, that of Humble County in Hubei province is her example of a laggard, being located farther from the coast. Ang notes that although the speed and outcomes at which the two counties have developed differ, their pathways of state-market coevolution are strikingly similar. She points out that laggards will not take the same steps of first movers, because the former face different challenges than those of the latter. These challenges notably include a rise in factors costs, the finite availability of industrial land and the degradation of the environment. However, Ang reminds us that although endowments instinctively play an important role in predicting a locale's potential for development, she argues they are not deterministic.

Ang concludes her effort by examining the coevolution processes during medieval Europe, the antebellum United States and the development of Nollywood in Nigeria. The presentation of these case studies seeks to prove that China's development model is not necessarily unique or unprecedented.

Ang's book, with its demonstration of how the state and the market interact with each other, is an exemplary model of political economy research. Her final product is ambitious in claiming that political and economic phenomena are not complicated, but rather complex, in that a single explanatory variable cannot comprehensively address China's development narrative. In some ways, her approach challenges conventional thinking, in that social scientists strive to demonstrate that one variable can explain a certain outcome, and the argument is presented in a way that construes their argument as superior to others. Instead, Ang argues that it is not the single variable development scholars need to look at, but rather the *interaction* between variables.

This book leaves the development community with a number of more normative questions for development studies. Can we achieve directed improvisation in other countries without authoritarianism? If not, would these countries succeed without drawing criticism from Western governments? Ang's book will prove to be an influential book in the years to come, for both its findings and research methodology.

The Board of Rites and the Making of Qing China. By MACABE KELIHER. Oakland: University of California Press, 2019. 288 pp. $80 (cloth).

REVIEWED BY TAE YEON EOM, Department of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia

To discuss early Qing history, this book focuses on "the symbolic practices that structured domination and legitimized authority" in the Qing court instead of the usual discussions of war-making and bureaucracy (p. 5). Keliher refers to the symbolic practices as ritual or rites, and argues that the Board of Rites systemized them to increase the domination and legitimacy of the Qing emperor in the process of Qing state-formation in the seventeenth century.

One of the characteristics of the Sinocentric world was its ritual-based world order, called *li*. The concept of *li* is not limited to ritual. It is a much more complicated term that extended into interpersonal relationships to control "behavioral practices, administrative norms, and sumptuary"

regulations (p. 9). By carefully defining the historical, philosophical, and functional meanings of *li* in the introduction, Keliher provides some clear and helpful theoretical background information before diving into his main argument.

The author further describes what changed in *li*, particularly during the transition period from Ming to Qing. He identifies "three key changes in the practices of *li*: the nature of sovereignty, the expansion of rule, and the composition of the political order" (p. 14). He vividly elaborates on the changes through various specific examples, from greetings and attire to imperial relative relations and New Year's Day ceremonies in the seventeenth century.

Part 1, including the introduction, shows that the Jurchen (later Manchu) leaders became more concerned about their early organization and future direction towards an empire. They endured internal struggles to articulate their hierarchical role and position within their political boundaries. Part 2 illustrates the Qing emperors' interest in how they were positioned and represented as rulers and performers in several different ceremonies. Their participation in ritual performance itself gave them a more symbolic legitimacy in the highly hierarchical political order.

Part 3 is dedicated to explaining the specific process of institutionalizing the political order in collaboration with Chinese advisors after Qing emperors settled in Beijing and ruled over the whole of China. The author also shows how *li* was codified and functioned as administrative law by discussing the compilation of the first Qing administrative code, the *Da Qing huidian*, which is an excellent example of the harmony between the ideal conception and actual practice of *li* (p. 191). He further shows how the Ming administrative code, the *Da Ming huidian*, and the *Da Qing huidian* are both interconnected with and disconnected from each other and highlights distinctive features of the latter as the national codes of the Manchu empire.

There are some topics readers might want to know more about, such as whether the Qing version of *li* was smoothly recreated without any turmoil. Keliher states that "the Manchu political organization and administrative apparatus was constructed out of rival groups and conflicting individuals tussling over both power and institutional assumption" (p. 44). He notes, "This system of *li* and the practices and regulations associated with it … emerged out of early contests for power, first over visions of the state, and then for control within the emerging institutional and symbolic frameworks" (pp. 197–198). In Chapter 6 the author also touches upon the factional disputes among imperial relatives. All in all, the administrative regulations based on *li* seemed to mitigate political tension to a certain extent. However, *li* could be a double-edged sword. As in the Grand Rites Controversy in the Ming dynasty, it could be used as a political apparatus to get rid of political rivals and create turmoil. The Qing emperors might have established and used the institutionalized version of *li* very wisely, but the author seems to neutralize the functions of *li* and miss the role of *li* in power contests.

The Qing emperors wanted to extend their influence and exercise their own discipline of *li* not only in domestic households but also in foreign affairs. Keliher also briefly discusses foreign relations in *Da Ming huidian* and *Da Qing huidian* in Chapter 8 and in his explanation of the second shift in *li* in the introduction. The Qing emperors' world of *li* may have been much more extensive than that described in the book. Keliher's specific focus on *li* within the imperial court is impressive, but it limits the world of *li* to the court space or the people surrounding the Qing emperors.

The author does not specifically articulate his view of ritual. The defining explanation about Qing court ceremonies might be helpful to understand the meaning and function of ritual (pp. 75–80), but readers can be further advised that his co-authored journal article on Qing ritual might offer a better understanding of ritual or rites.[1]

Keliher clearly presents an informative and useful framework for clarifying how the authority, legitimacy, and compliance surrounding the formation of Qing China in the seventeenth century were established, constructed, and secured in accordance with the foundation of the Board of

Rites in the Qing court. The book exists in an intersecting zone of institutional, political, and legal histories of Imperial China while dealing with various primary sources in Manchu and classical Chinese. As he concludes his book while locating the specific Qing institutional history in world history, it will also provide a useful backdrop not only for historians of Imperial China but also for researchers conducting comparative studies of the political system of East Asia, including Chosŏn Korea (1392–1910), which also adopted the Six Boards System with the Board of Rites.

NOTE

1. Gazi Islam and Macabe Keliher, "Leading through Ritual: Ceremony and Emperorship in Early Modern China," *Leadership* 14.4 (2018), 435–459.

The Wrong of Rudeness: Learning Modern Civility from Ancient Chinese Philosophy. By Amy Olberding. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019. 200 pp. $29.95 (cloth).

Reviewed by Matthew Hamm, Department of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia

In *The Wrong of Rudeness*, Amy Olberding argues that the increasing incivility of modern life (specifically American life), in both private and public spheres, is eroding the potential for interpersonal dialogue and connection. Using the theories of the *Analects* (*Lunyu* 論語) and the *Xunzi* 荀子, Olberding argues that Confucian practices of "civility" and "good manners" (modern translations that capture different shades of the broader concept of "ritual" *li* 禮) are effective means for combatting those problems and becoming a better person (pp. 4–5). Olberding's goal in the book is to defend that claim against what makes rudeness and incivility seem so appealing: the release from cognitive effort and emotional strain that poor manners provide and the belief that incivility is a moral act of resistance against those who would toxify daily life and public discourse (pp. 2–3 and 14–15).

To make this argument Olberding builds on a virtue ethics interpretation of Confucian ritual theory that is shared by many in the field of early Chinese studies. The central tenet is that rituals are morally valuable because they inculcate pro-social dispositions (such as respect, tolerance, and humility) that operate in both public and private spheres (thus erasing the distinction between civility and good manners) (p. 28). Rituals cultivate these dispositions through behavioral feedback loops, for example acting as though one is humble helps generate the feeling of humility (pp. 71–72 and 90). At the same time, rituals signal one's dispositions to others, triggering further positive reactions of reinforcement (p. 90). By acting as an accessible method for cultivating pro-social feelings, sincerely expressing those feelings, and fostering connection with others, rituals thus fulfil and refine the basic human need to connect with other people (pp. 65 and 51–56).

In presenting this interpretation, and arguing for its contemporary relevance, the book builds upon Olberding's past specialist publications, primarily journal articles, that engaged in detail with primary texts and secondary literature. As a result, this work addresses a non-specialist audience and is written as a first-person philosophical reflection that connects the findings of contemporary psychological and sociological studies with Confucian ideas and the personal experiences of the author.