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Abstract: Chinese anthropology has been attempting to locate anthropology in China, rebutting the legitimacy of its lens use, or "colonization." However, a second careful look will take us to a more complicated landscape. While China, as one of the "extra-imagined" heterogeneous world-level communities has to face the West, its minority groups, whether imagined or not, have to confront both the Han world and the West. In connection to the hegemony of a market economy, which sidelined the minorities, the "ethnicity" of anthropologists reflects their respective upbringing or "habitus." A subspecies of Sapi-sapiians, linguistic relativity here: anthropologists who master different languages tend to emerge into linguistically delusional anthropo-interest groups. Looking at the underlying implications will lend our analysis metaphorically a broader view of the entire dilemma global social sciences and humanities have been trapped in.
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Hierarchical orders of particularism

Universalism and particularism are two extreme edges of a global frame of reference in scholarship. This statement is oversimplified to cover the "order of things" nicely. In order to have a more authentic picture, we need some theoretical complication and as much oppositional contrast as interdependence. Thus, hierarchy expels power relations that pervade the knowledge in the head of an armchair professor. Power contrasts within the spectrum of opposition and grades of distinction while the shift itself is not just dimensional. What I mean here is that contrast does not always take place between East and West, South and North. Each has its own headstream: the contrast are possibly sharper within a particular social space than between.

A united front can redraw a boundary and then an intercrine fight into a "class war." Many national minorities in the state of China were...
through roughly the same Democratic Reform after 1949 (the year in which the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, the first of the five Chinese autonomous regions, was founded). Communism won the hearts of millions of minorities who were willing to jump into socialism by acceptance of rapid social, cultural and economic transformation, which coincided with the Nationality Identification Project, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. Many anthropologists and ethnologists who converted themselves into Marxists through re-education participated in this project. In the following years, the Identification Project took priority in the research of Chinese anthropologists and ethnologists. Soviet style 'struggle' (ethnology) became the mainstay by way of a paradigm. It is fair to say that ethnology at that time was a top-down political agenda rather than a horizontal academic pursuit. The main task then was to 'save the underdeveloped' (pingshu fukou), help promote social transformation and democratic reform in minority areas, ensure equal political participation in state affairs, and enrich and improve Marxist social theory of human development through the use of data on the primitive, slave and feudal-slard societal forms of the Chinese minorities (Nationality Committee of the National People's Congress, 1956).

Studies of the majority Han Chinese and minority studies within the 'bourgeois' discipline of Western anthropology and sociology had to give way to minority studies of Soviet ethnology, and later, 'nationality studies'. The latter were far more urgent for reshaping the configuration of a new Chinese nation-state, and more effective for reversing the nationalistic (kouminqiang) government's neo-tribal ethnic policies and Western anti-Marxist 'pseudo' scholarship in the relevant field. There was, from the start, a movement to native social sciences in China, and the movement continues today. At first it was to render the social sciences proletarian. More recently and more nationally it has actually been called 'nationalization' (minzu hua). Actually, there have been double standards in terms of social evolution, at least on the part of most Han officials and some Han intellectuals. 'Nationalization' of anthropological means to study all 'ethic groups' equally in China, since there are no racial differences within this country. That means that Chinese ethnology should study indiscriminately all nationalities within the territory. However, it was not that simple because study meant hierarchization of different sociocultural communities in China by order of social evolution underscored by Marxist evolutionary theory, be it in a Soviet or a Chinese version. Inside China, the Han should have equal status as a research subject but they do not. The distinction between sociology and ethnology is often used to hierarchize minority separation from minorities. Westerners themselves study the Han along with other minority groups in this country as anthropological subjects because they all represent Otherness to them. It is no accident that Marxist revolutionary theory and the academic disciplines of ethnology and sociology come from the West and share important theoretical origins.

Therefore, based on the above-mentioned, there have been different versions of 'nationalization' of anthropology in China. One is 'nationification' for Han studies, a blending of sociology and anthropology, a meeting point between East and West. The other is ethnologization of minority studies. Having said that, we have to concede that such a vision of 'nationalization', that is, the blending of ethnology with sociology, has not been recognized by most 'true' sociologists in China. They insist on being sociologists, as did the doyen of sociology Fei Xiaotong said, in the 1980s, he agreed again to the designation 'anthropology' so long as it was closely linked to 'sociology'.

Many colleagues, in China and outside, tell me of their impression that Chinese anthropologists do too much on Other, minority societies and too little on the Han. Yes, I would say that too much has been done on minorities outside social and cultural anthropology as a discipline and too little has been accomplished in order to slot Chinese anthropology into its international niche. We tend to confuse paradigm with agenda. As far as paradigm is concerned, there have been more Western-style and more influential anthropological studies of the Han than of minority nations.

Sociocultural anthropology returned after China started to reform and academic research in the 'strict sense' became possible. This is a time when the official configuration of Chinese nationalities (minzu) and the locals' own versions of lingua-cultural autonomy can co-exist, as long as there are no serious political consequences or implications. While Western anthropology had gone through a long development before it plunged into a debate on 'postmodernist' criticism, the discipline in China has yet to go through such a rite of passage. Foundations are weak both in fieldwork and theoretically. With some after taste of ['culture'] cuisine, Western anthropological theories came through translations and academic exchanges into the unprepared embrace of the then eager-learning Chinese sociocultural anthropologists. The reflexive writing culture, reinforced by Saidian onslaughts upon orientation, has deepened 'nationalization' fetishization, writing and practice in the recovering discipline, largely based on fieldwork conducted in researchers' own ethnic communities. The value of traditional cultures increased overnight and anthropology is best poised to represent and interpret them. To some degree the 'culture' cuisine found in anthropology a useful tool for digging up old roots. Partly due to linguistic and cultural readiness, some anthropologists in China tend to study their own groups, which used to be studied by Western ethnologists as Other. Cultural roots embrace ethnic feelings easily, and resist class boundaries towards ethnic boundaries. Anthropologists and ethnologists in China with different ethnic origins center on their own linguistic communities in a bounded imaginative space. Minority scholars, benefiting from their Han mentors and teachers, colleagues and classmates, have found a foothold in their own subalternity and cultural sensitivity. They have gathered to form new breeds of local cultural promoters. However, they seem also to have
withdrawn from the main anthropological arena in China, relying on their linguistic capital, placing their own 'lingoes' games. It is a time in China when cultural sensitivity creates tension, and political suspicion structures the ethnicity of anthropology.

Some Mongolian anthropologists have told me that they tend to avoid their Han colleagues because they are 'charismatic'. It is true that they seldom talk to their Han counterparts. Tibetans and Yi anthropologists do not often show up at major anthropological events in China. We do not hear about as many minority case studies as Han. No doubt, the Damon system (very roughly, [Work] Unit System),12 together with the registration system, has been always persuasive, but, important for social control in China. Even now, the impact of academic politics in China is exalted and retracted more often by Han than individual, whatever their social and cultural background. But that is not all. Besides Damon boundaries, we also have ethnic boundaries, though I reluctantly use the word 'ethnic' and only use it very loosely and pejoratively to refer to linguistic and cultural uptaking.

Scholars in China talk about 'nationalization' in similar terms, but differing overtones. Han colleagues talk 'nationalization' meaning China versus the West; Mongolian scholars advocate 'nationalization' hinting at Mongolia versus Han and the West. And so do Tibetans, Miao scholars, and many others. Within the Mongolian scholarly community, 'nationalization' can mean mother-tongue or even dialect-based scholarship. The checklist has to stop here, though, further fragmentation is still possible. Particularism in China, as in the rest of the world, therefore, is hierarchically ordered. It is not that one whole camp versus the other is universalistic. Each higher order can use 'universalism' against the 'particularism' of the lower order. It can also use 'particularism' against still higher orders. Each order likes a dialectical scholarly life, like fire and water, birth and death. Ethnicity can be a rallying cry for particularistic self-aggrandizement. It is not only a rallying cry but also an 'embodiment'. Ethnically distinctive linguistic practice, inherited from ancestors, together with other kinds of contacts (rituals, Shamanistic formulas, consumption, etc.), collapse the duality of cultural mind and social body. Once, a professor of social anthropology at Cambridge asked me whether the Mongols could express their identity in Chinese, by which she meant at the losing situation of the Mongolian language in China. However, it is not a question of the language in its physical sense (acoustics, orthography, etc); it is rather a deeply felt somatic symbol. Linguistic imagination is often more important than the language itself. Many younger Mongolians have lost their mother-tongue but they still regard themselves as members of the Mongolian community. They 'borrow' images and linguistic practice from their kith and kin who can still use Mongolian, and build them into their embodied ethnicity. As is commonly seen, Mongolian urbanites, including practitioners of anthropology and folklore, are more ethnically identified than their rural folks, disregarding the fact that they have lost almost all of Stalin's 'four components'. It seems that there is a wealth of cultural 'hybridity' in them: they are also 'Mongolized' in China, dressed in Western-style attire, and bargaining on the market.13

However, 'hybridity' is a fuzzy term, the undefined use of which has the danger of weakening the edge of such concepts as 'hybridity' and 'power' and obfuscating academic ethnicity. 'Hybridity' provides us with useful food for thought in the anthropological literature.14 Hybridity means time and power relations, not 1 + 1 = 2 in the 'act of resistance' can easily win the war and gain an equal footing with the power center, and create a merger of equal opportunity. An analysis of interaction without time and hierarchy would omit the point and can hardly explain sudden bursts of hostility and riots some time after the merger. 'Hybridity does not replace the corresponding old trait in a culture but is juxtaposed to it in function. Borrowing does not necessarily mean indiscriminate blending. We should agree that 'incorporation of the ideology of the dominant group ... does not represent a triumph of hegemonic discourse but rather a successful challenge mounted on the center.' (Turok, 2000: 9). We should also recognize that it is only a challenge. Hybridity and power still hold, especially for the embodiment of ethnicity in a new age of globalized flows of capital and information, and madness for roots.

Hierarchies do not mean 'fixity' either.15 Diachronic structuralism also excludes the role of time and disrupts the link between the past and present in linguistic process (Pomorska and Rozy, 1985: ix). Order can change over time. Western (including Japanese) anthropologists have helped bring up a new generation of 'native' anthropologists with different linguistic, cultural or identity backgrounds, serving as intellectuals that produce transcultural insights. These new orders ignore, contain, even reify the previously held hierarchies and they themselves can also suffer the same fate at any time. However, the nullification of the previous hierarchies will create new hierarchies into which ethnicity finds its way. Here we spot an emerging platform of multi-voices for 'nationalization', where ethnically embodied anthropologies from China are embraced in a real imagined culturally hierarchical topography. 'Simicization' of anthropology, with the help of metropolitan arts and their followers, such as digitized printing technology and a wider readership, has been put on top on the topography, while the 'ethosication' effects by minority advocates, who lack such priorities, have to be content with their pigeonholes down below.16 Both are 'nation' efforts, but their actions, treatment, visions and hidden meanings differ. Whether you like it or not, ethnicity is part and parcel of the 'nationalization' endeavor, uncomfortably situated in the pecking order of scholarship, behind which there are cultural embodiments of different breeds.
Linguistic relativity.27

The French are most sensitive about their language. Even in China we know that quite well. We learn to school how a French schoolmarm emotionally taught her pupils to love their French mother tongue when their homeland was under German occupation. One of our colleagues recently wrote a letter in broken French to a research institute in France and received a rather better beginning with "Thank you for writing the letter in French." French literature on anthropology is directly translated far less than English. Works by Fourier, Rousseau and other French authors were largely introduced via English translations. Anglo-Saxon anthropology, he is updated with French-German methodology and theoretical, is in the mainstream in China as elsewhere.

In the same vein, anthropology in China under the sway of Mandarin. Not a single textbook of anthropology is written in Mongolian, Tibetan, Uighur, Miao, Yi, or in any other of the 17 minorities' traditional writing systems. Most field studies are well known within the mainstream anthropological camp and even beyond, while other studies are less known, or even unknown to scholars studying the Han. Is it because of Han cultural centerism? Is it because of reverse diasporism on the part of minority scholars? It is because of language barrier, or lack of resources? Is it because of historically maintained centre-periphery hierarchy? It could be an interaction blending of all three.

There are some felt linguistic demarcations or boundaries along the line of 'ethnocracy' among anthropologists in China. No doubt, those who have the 'gift' of English have easy access to all kinds of 'capital', (writing scholarships, international conferences, last-versions of new theories, academic debates and so forth). To make is more complicated and intriguing, there is a Japanese tradition represented by a different strain of anthropologists who learned to use Japanese and have the chance to stay in Japan for a period of time. These different linguistic strains of 'native' anthropologists have had more chance to meet at international conferences that domestic ones, as if comparative studies are possible only in the West, where they are not need in a search for exotic. As Roethel notes argue, the socio-cultural origins of an anthropologist influences his point of departure, development and results.

If this influence will vary when the ethnocentrics are part of the same national (i.e. socioeconomic, religious, regional language, ethic, gender and age group, etc.) system as the ones study, or when they usually live in an integrative and socio-cultural condition totally different from those of the people they are temporarily observing or even living with. (1997: 94-5)

We should admit that 'influence' does not mean 'determination'; anthropologists of the same cultural origin can have different points of departure, development, and results, and those of different social upbringing can reach paradigmatic or therapeutic agreement. Disagreement or agreement, is a matter of degree and gradation rather than absolute cut-offs.

In China, and not only in China, 'linguistic ethnicity' is at the same time a politico-economic relativity that is based on the egalitarian ideology of a country with a vast economy booming large on China, minorities are on the losing end with regard to both language and culture. There are three lines of argument over language teaching in Hohhot, capital of Inner Mongolia. One suggests that, for native Mongolians speaking children at the level of higher-middle school, Chinese should replace Mongol; One argues that Mongolian is a viable carrier of native culture and that it is against state policies to mandate the Mongolian language. The law advocates bilingualism, the learning of Mongolian, Chinese, and either English or Japanese (Zhi, 1998: 48-51). Here cultural revitalization means different things for Han and non-Han. While Confucian temples are rebuilt by the Han to resist Western cultural invasion, a Chinghia tribe man suffisively is required by Mongols in parallel. The Nuo are busy reconstructing their own images by re-presenting their anthropological and their Dongba pictographic writing. The Yi are rewriting and rewriting their history of civilization, jumping the pecking order, some Mongolians and Uighur native speakers go abroad and pick up English, Turkish and Japanese, studying Mazarite. To a moderate extent, Mongolians' anthropologists, Uighur anthropologists, Yi anthropologists and Tibetan anthropologists have each formed their own camp. There are thus many Han anthropologists studying minority cultures. What is in the past, we can offer some reasons. As previously mentioned, at first the Western-trained anthropologists in China were re-educated, had to reject their previous academic discipline and go to work on the national identification project. They had had no topic their Han studies, denounced as 'bourgeois'. These, due to unforeseeable causes, they could not go abroad to conduct fieldwork. Reacting to this and working within the limits of many constraints, political considerations included, subsequent generations of anthropologists are now reluctant to study minorities, even less learn their languages. Psychological and linguistic barriers stand in their way to other cultures. The same coincides with the postmodern thought: Study Your Own Culture! What is more, it is a tradition that dates back to the major anthropological work conducted by Professor Pei Xiaoqiang and Lin Yaohua during the 1980s and 1990s, who did fieldwork in their hometowns. Third, other academic genealogies, which also originated from the West, such as M bodily, Tiberian, Uyghur arystology, Yi studies and Dai studies, coexist with anthropological. These 'logics' or 'esthetics' are usually triplicate sciences that include linguistics, literature and history, each with its own corpus ofargon and practice. These esoteric trades of learning rely heavily on textual research, mostly in Chinese, and have developed a linguistic and disciplinary cemetery, showing no alien branches of learning, anthropology included, to step in. Fourth, minority scholars induct their Han colleagues by asking them of not knowing
the target language and therefore being ignorant of the cultural essence the language carries.

**Nation-building complex**

Western thought, via Japan and Russia, has had great influence and continues to function in a localized way in China and the interpretation of its history. The idea of "One Nation, One State" matches easily the trajectory of Chinese History. China of the olden times used to center itself on a vast expanse of land with imagined "civilized" boundaries that were marked out according to the judgment of the Center of knowledge, orthography, civilization, and an authority of civility and cultural exploitation. The great difference of emphasis in Western thinking about nation-building in the way territorial sovereignty, its physical and substantial sense, is fought over, negotiated, defined and redefined. It is, however, not difficult for a modern China to adjust its focus of view from Center to Periphery, from imagining to materializing; Imperial rights of nomination and naming substantiated in the strained and effective literary canon, traditionally reinforced by the visual art of landscape painting and calligraphy, are held in high esteem and are still in force. The efforts to build a modern nation-state parallel those of reorganization through redefinition and reclassification. In terms of 'ethnicity' or something nearer to the term, New China organized many campaigns to ideally classify and rename, in a formalized and polarized fashion, its minority groups. Officially designated institutions and experts constructed a 'literary' standard for grammars of minority languages, new or revised Latin-based scripts were introduced for them, colloymas and language names were grasped. Here we have the structure of languages and power in China:

1. The national standard, Mandarin Chinese.
2. Regional minority languages, including regional varieties of Mandarin Chinese and regional minority standards, such as Y. Mongolian, Tibetan and Uighur. (3) Primary minority language, those with historical and/or modern progenitors, usually large populations, and modern political status. These include Uighur, Kvash, Manchu, Zungarian, Naxi and the non-standard Chinese dialects.
3. Secondary minority or sub-minority languages, including numbers of speakers with no close such as Formosan, Seto and Y. Often these groups have larger numbers of speakers wherever, hence their designation as Depressed Nationalities by the government.
4. Unofficial languages, usually classified mixed languages such as Wixun (Gamin) and Nu (Ningbu). (Dwyer, 1998: 71)

For academics, including anthropologists, in China there is an unsolved grammar of 'ethnicity' in their scholarly pursuits. China's anthropologists, like other scholarly communities at large, are no more an independent 'class' or 'stratum' than their counterparts beyond the political boundaries.

Their mental imaginings and physical conditions have long been tied to the fate of national nation-building efforts of the state by way of re-education, working in the field or workshops during the Anti-Rightist Campaign, the Cultural Revolution, and others. Some of them have been rebuilt and reformed into the nation-building complex and tend to look at things, as if to a touch of consanguinity, in line with the centre, throwing themselves deep into a Chinese version of French Revolution.

The story for anthropologists of minority origins is more complex. They have to keep a watchful eye on where they set foot. Their recent broken history is still beyond the reach of historical amnesia. Their fathers' or grandfathers' had fought for self-determination with the full support from the Third International and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) at an earlier stage. They had then to change position with the changing world political configuration and military landscape. All 'ethnic' parties, organized directly or indirectly by the Third International, disbanded themselves and collectively joined the CPC. This historicaliliated took many of their lives. They were charged with treason, put in jail, tortured, humiliated, and died a brutal or suicidal death. All these, together with historical records and folklore about inter-ethnic fighting and slaughter, were built into the upbringing of the next generations. Generations have not yet estranged far enough to forget this history. They are willing to join and have indeed joined the nation-building efforts, but are worried and mistrusted.

Their Han counterpart has a different version of recent broken history, exhumed in hatred for the Eight-Power Allied Forces that took humiliating and devastating revenge for the Boxer Rebellion and for the later Japanese invaders. All are 'foreign devils'. Han society has revived conventional and many national and social traditions that suffered persecution during the May Fourth Movement of the 1920s and the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, as a form of resistance against foreign material and financial advantage. However, such cultural revival is 'ethnically' coloured and minorities with their traditions are doubly marginalized due to the fact that they must face up to both foreign 'capitalist' ethos as Han Confucian tradition. Bound by the sovereignty of a nation-state, that is, China, both Han and minority anthropologists are positioned and faced in culturally repressive nation-building efforts. In such an irreversible endeavor, how to balance the elements, or rather relations of elements, categorized as the Western, the Han and the minorities, is a really delicate and time-consuming operation. Anthropologists who are based in Beijing or similar metropolises are not yet prepared to confront such a scenario, since not many minority colleagues are within reach for them. And we must record that no whole army of anthropologists, in its strict sense, is far smaller in number than, say, those of sociologists, even less historians and literateurs.
Encompassment and partiality: discourse that makes sense

This description of the academic ‘ethnicity’ curtain I have unfolded, not without reluctance, is not just intended to sound a cautionary note. We need to balance essentialism with constructionism, particularism with universals. But the dialectic of this process is that of growth and not death, of clarification and not the installation of a new dark age, where only idiosyncratic approaches are celebrated at the expense of communal or shared understandings” (Parks, 1992: 442).

To redress the balance, do we need a Mangelian anthropology, a Tibetan anthropology or something similar to Anthropologies of the South? Can we really find or create and maintain the boundaries between us and others? In discussing Sallnin’s account of Polynesian ‘heroic history’ with regard to the fact that chiefs used the pronoun ‘I’ in reference to their whole group and his consequent emphasis on ‘encompassment’ as ‘the modality of entry action’ (1981: 13-14, 1985: 35-6), and Stratton’s on ‘paritahiti’, ‘the effacement of persons or the action of condition of action’ (1988: 272-8), Alan Romey argues that moments of both encompassment and partiality are inherent in language — and that close attention to the interaction between the two can yield new insights into the nature of personhood and social agency’ (2009: 101). Here I would further develop his theorizing, though my use may not be faithful to his original insight, and argue that anthropological encompassment (universalism) and partiality (particularism) are also ‘mutually presupposing dimensions of social interaction’. If our discourse is meaningful or is should contain both ‘odd’ and ‘even’. Differences and particularities create information, similarities or generalities make decoding possible. China’s anthropology should be put in the globalized academic milieu, which is based on relations of relations rather than relations of elements.

Among these relations are the isolating constraints of official and academic life in China, the work unit and the continuing effects of the designation: Ethnology (wuminzu) and of the Identification Project. With the work unit come expectations of family-like loyalty. They silence or at least mute academic criticism of upper colleagues, but they do not prevent internal seminars and factions, which in turn reinforce personal ties of loyalty. In younger, particularly foreign-trained academics have been able to some extent to break free from such constraints and form new networks of comradeship across institutional and ‘ethnic’ boundaries. Here lies hope for an academic profession of anthropology, with its own standards of fieldwork and academic criticism, with more case studies and more exchanges between fieldworkers, whatever their nationality. Workshops where case studies are presented and discussed could include chief informants from the cases studied and thus networks of lateral scope will increase contact not only between academics but also between their subjects, breaking down the ‘locking categorizations’ of state.
These purifiers, shall we not give up. On the basis of recognition of the inequality we are born into and brought up with, we fight it out together, hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder with the prejudiced environment, beyond the role of "ethnocracy". Freeing ourselves from the chains of facetedted and self-defeating and exaggerated over-essentialized nationalisms.

Mongolian anthropology, Tibetan anthropology, Anthropology of the South or not, they should never replace the singular, universalized or universalizing Anthropology at a much higher level. Particularization or essentialism is just one side of the dialectic relationship, which substantiates it when unified with universalism. For another way, they are two sides of the same coin. Individuality makes change more dependent on each other. To deny this is to cut oneself off.

Notes

1. Before the founding of the People's Republic of China, it had never been made clear how many ethnic minorities there were in China. After the founding of the People's Republic of China, in implemental policy of equality among ethnic groups, in an all-out way the state has organized large-scale investigations since 1953 to identify the ethnic groups. Proceeding from conditions both past and present and in accordance with the principle of combination of scientific identification and the wishes of the given ethnic group, every group which accords with the conditions for an ethnic group is classified as a single ethnic group, regardless of its level of social development and the size of its inhabited area and population. In 1953, the Chinese government had identified 38 ethnic groups in all, after careful investigation and study. In 1964, the Chinese government had identified another 15 ethnic groups. With the additions of the Lhoba ethnic group, identified in 1965, and the Jiao ethnic group, identified in 1970, there are 55 officially recognized ethnic groups which have been formally recognized and made known to the public. Now, in New China, many minority ethnic groups which had not been recognized in the rules of old China have been recognized as they should, and they all enjoy equal rights with other ethnic groups in China. (Reform Office of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, 1990).

2. The Chinese short title for this project is "Chada, Avan Shiye, eranlaleke as the National Minorities Identification Project."

3. "Dagul" in Russian literature is "ethnography", but it is often translated as "minor race" or "tribe". Actually, the Russian term "etnografiya" is reserved for theory while "emol*dzy" is for description.

4. One exploration given in Professor Fu Xiaoqiong states that after the founding of the New China, the government tried to establish a People's Congress of supreme power, experimenting all nationalities (or ethnic groups), thereby realizing the Marxist thought of people's dictatorship. No one, however, could then tell convincingly the number of nationalities and their languages in

China, nor their exact conditions (Fu, 1990). Hence the Identification Project became a political-political task.

5. All nationalities are now undergoing rapid changes, and we pretty much struggle to accurately grasp the phenomena, history they experienced so far for a while. As a whole, we always regard at the original social features. Each nationality will have developed their nationality consciousness by themselves and they still have unique feelings for their ethnology, and will6 inevitably ask for scientific evidence for their history, for devolution of their positions in the national hierarchy. (Fu, 1988: 15-20)

6. Imperialism and reduced research of Chinese minorities to serve their aggressive purposes... trying their best to impose and spread materialistic base for all kinds of splits and fragmentation, to prejudice the ethnic consciousness, to fabricate history and facts, covering up our history and facts, in a way to split the unity of the Chinese nationalities, submerge Chinese, and at the same time to build Chinese nationalities to imperialism. (Hu, 1996: 74-85).

7. There are no social classes from the Chinese nationalities, and China has no revolution... the ethnology we need to develop from the East-West American-style (Yao, 1992).

8. In Chinese discourse, Han scholars are "native" in Western eyes while their minority colleagues are also "native" in the Han society. It hangs in a "pecking order" (Hu, 2000).

9. A central principle of the Chinese government's policy is that the Han people in the West and the minority societies in the Central Han (China) together. What is left is the "minority" studied without strict ethnic or linguistic boundaries or by a less version of "nationality studies". According to the Han people, the term "national" (ethnically, culture or race) is the same as "Han" (Han, 2000). Basically, the same theory, the same concept, and the same ideology, but are the emergence of the State Council of the People's Republic of China. (Zhang, 1990).

10. Wang Nongqing points out that many investigation subjects of academic status were censored at the time, and that experts were null of political struggles, forcing reality into the proverbial model of Marx-class studies (Wang, 1996: 85).

11. Theirs is no contradiction in fact that anthropological fieldwork carried out in Vietnam, one of the most important field sites in modern China, by Han anthropologists, has been mythic in antiquity area.

12. There are over 30 anthropologies and folklorist on Mongolian origin written and outside China, who received degrees or training from the UK or USA.
It also have more than six anthropologists and folklorists with the same academic background. Therefore, they are considered to have achieved the same status and influence in their field.

13 Mongolia scholars trained in Cambridge, UK, set up a Social Anthropology Center at the Inner Mongolia Teachers' University during the 1990s. This center received the first PhD in cultural anthropology in China. However, these scholars are seldom invited to important meetings or conferences on social anthropology. This is because the few anthropologists who visited the center during this period were invited by individual professors or research groups and not by the center as a whole.

14 It is a traditional ritualist workplace that includes everything for the staff, such as marriage, funerals, welfare and housing.

15 "Phlegm" is a term that reflects the relationship between sex and body, essentially, the body and the mind as a whole. (Stratten, 1996:181)

16 A nation is historically formed, while the language of nation, economy, life and psychological makeup are manifested in a community of culture. (Mallin, 1942:12)

17 In the context of language, we mean that the term "national" is more often used to describe what is seen in Chinese. This is an official change.

18 The Tibetan term "phlegm" is bhumdunska, which bears the same word root as "bhumidun". It is commonly held that traditional Mongols do not know how to gargle. However, they learn how to gargle from others. (Stratten, 1996)

19 The standard is a scientific tool that is used to make clear the problem and find new evidence. It is a method that should be respected. (Pasquali, 1987:12)

20 For example, facing the West, both Han and minority scholars are "treated as subjects" in the study of the nation and its development of minorities. This is because they are not found in the Chinese cultural system. (Stratten, 1996:96)

21 It is more difficult nowadays to publish anthropological works in Mongolian or other minority languages. The previous prerogatives for publishing ethnic research are no longer in force. Publishers would rather publish less in minority languages and more in Chinese to present further统一 in the Chinese economy.

22 The "Sapi-Whorf hypothesis" proposes that the structure of a language will affect the way in which speakers of that language think. (Bard, 1996:499). To use it to refer to, however, is to use it to refer to the "structure" of a particular language (in this case) to affect the way in which speakers (anthropologists) of that language practice, since the nature of language is a social and cultural practice (Duranti, 1997:1). For example, it does not make sense to expect people to speak a culture that does not exist, or to expect people to speak a language that does not exist. (Pasquali, 1987:12)

23 Thus, we see that the "Chinese" and its "nation" are not separate entities, but rather are connected in a complex and dynamic manner. (Pasquali, 1987:12)

24 In the 1990s, Chinese newspapers began to use the term "national" more often. (Pasquali, 1987:12)

25 In the 1990s, Chinese newspapers began to use the term "national" more often. (Pasquali, 1987:12)

26 The term "national" is more often used to describe what is seen in Chinese. This is an official change.

27 In Chinese, the term "national" is more often used to describe what is seen in Chinese. This is an official change.
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