in its capitalist flowering at the beginning of the last century the roots of its new economic efflorescence.

Kirby reviewed the government’s success in building infrastructure and the dynamism of Chinese entrepreneurs. He highlighted the remarkable expansion of Chinese higher education—“a great and welcome challenge to American universities”—and raised the critical issue of academic governance: the degree of autonomy granted to institutions, public and private, to pursue their “broader public purpose” of educating leaders for the future—a mission, he said, that two “not-quite-democratic institutions,” Harvard and China, pursue together.

Looking ahead, Kirby foresaw a century “for all of us, in a world of shared aspirations and common problems.” In the past, he said, “We used to say about the Chinese-American relationship, in so many areas, that we were tong chuang yi meng (sleeping in the same bed, while dreaming different dreams)...We are without question now, together, embedded in a global system of learning and teaching...from each other, as never before, and sharing many, if not all, of the same dreams” tangibly in the Harvard Center Shanghai.

One of Kirby’s themes—acknowledgement of China’s development, but frank recognition of past costs and continuing challenges—sounded throughout the day. In “Architecture and Urbanism,” GSD dean Mostafavi, as moderator, asked the panelists how India and China could cope with their “phenomenal processes of urbanization”—prompting expressions of concern about pell-mell construction of trophy skyscrapers without regard for livable community (evident in the immediate environs of Pudong) and about the loss of historic structures and farmland.

Carswell professor of East Asian languages and civilizations Peter K. Bol and professor of Chinese literature Tian Xiaofei asked, “Who Cares about Chinese Culture?”—illuminating the ways