EDITORS’ NOTE

This special issue of the University of Pennsylvania Asian Law Review is the second in a series focusing on Chinese administrative law. This two-part collection features original work by ten of China’s leading scholars of administrative and constitutional law. The first installment was published in April 2018,¹ and consisted principally of revised and updated versions of papers presented at a symposium on “The Future of Administrative Law in China,” held at the University of Pennsylvania Law School.² This second volume presents articles specially commissioned for publication here and—along with the first set—provides audiences outside of China with a fuller and richer picture of the field of Chinese administrative law, as it continues to develop in breadth and complexity.

The articles in the first volume addressed some foundational concerns of Chinese administrative law, including the basic structure of, and reform agendas for, administrative litigation and administrative reconsideration; efforts to enhance public participation in local government decisionmaking; possibilities for administrative “self-regulation” (for example, through the process of “filing and check”, or bei’an); and the prospects for ongoing regulatory reform more generally. The current volume features work at the cutting edge of the field today, with articles from a new generation of Chinese administrative law scholars. These articles examine judicial review of so-called “regulatory documents” (guifanxing wenjian); facilitation of public participation in governance through “e-rulemaking”; attempts to increase transparency in the operation of “public enterprises and institutions” (gonggong qi-shiye danwei)—entities that are distinctive features of China’s organizational landscape; and legal and regulatory issues raised by China’s nascent and controversial “social credit” system.


In our assessment, the articles in this two-part series present the most comprehensive discussion to date of Chinese administrative law by Chinese scholars writing in English. The bridge they offer—between Chinese and Anglophone administrative law scholarship, and between Chinese and Western legal academic cultures—has become even more vital and urgent since the publication of the first volume. Today, the relationship between the United States and China has reached perhaps its lowest point since the normalization of relations forty years ago. Prospects for cooperation—or even comprehension—between Americans and their Chinese counterparts have dimmed across many fields, including administrative law and law more generally. It is our hope that the contribution to U.S.-China scholarly dialogue made by the articles in this collection, and the further discussion and thinking they have prompted and will further provoke, may help to revive and sustain the recently imperiled channels for fruitful exchange and learning.

We are grateful to all of the authors who have contributed their work to this series. We especially thank the authors in this second volume for their steadfastness, and the current editors and staff at the University of Pennsylvania Asian Law Review, as well as their predecessors over the last several years, for their diligence, patience, and invaluable contributions in bringing this two-part series to fruition.
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