The Third Eye

Towards a Critique of 'Nativist Anthropology'

Wang Mingming
Beijing University, China

Abstract ■ China is a vast country. Ethnic minority nationalities (*shaoshu minzu*) located in different parts of the Chinese nation could have provided possibilities for the majority Han Chinese anthropologists to imagine 'internal others'. Even among the Han, social life does not follow a uniform pattern: it includes great regional cultural diversities that could have allowed fieldworking anthropologists to develop their own arguments about cultural difference. However, throughout the 20th century, such internal differences have not been treated as a reflexive and contrasting mirror of the national Han Self. On the contrary, anthropological interpretations have been institutionally determined to favor official political projects of national revitalization (*minzu zhenxing*). Are the perspectives of characteristically 'native' – in this case Chinese – anthropology not creating some intellectual pitfalls that anthropologists in many parts of the world have attributed chiefly to the 'West' and its orientalism? This article sets out to develop an answer, by way of a broad overview of the history of 20th century Chinese anthropology. It questions the nativistic characteristics of Chinese anthropology and raises issues about the development of a 'natives' own scholarship'. By so doing, it also implies a reflection on postcolonialist critiques of anthropological disciplines as well as a hope for a liberal anthropological critique which the author defines in terms of 'the third eye'.

When talking to my students about the future of Chinese academia, I am not at all sure about where Chinese anthropology will go. In my work, I have placed a heavy emphasis upon training students, upon introducing them to anthropological concepts and ethnographies from Chinese or non-Chinese scholarly worlds. But I am still faced with great difficulties. The transdisciplinary power of some 'big subjects' – the disciplines that are conceived to facilitate political economic work of the state – has dominated our curricula and has set up obstacles to our plan of anthropological teaching. Notorious institutional and inter-collegiate contradictions have taken up a lot of time that should have been invested in developing our academic future. Certain tendencies of isolating Chinese understandings from other available understandings have had some worrying effects.

Where is the future of anthropology in China? To me, the future of Chinese anthropology lies in the hands of young Chinese anthropology students who still have the opportunity to develop their own cross-cultural perspectives – their 'third eyes' or 'mental windows' towards non-Chinese cosmologies and methodologies. In my teaching work, I have thus insisted that the quality of anthropology has consisted in its refusal to take the familiar for granted. Although 'foreign' perspectives have their own limitations, our understanding of them is important for our awareness of our own and others' cultures and for the peaceful co-presence of different life-styles and world-views.

To some colleagues, my perspective may sound problematic. As many Chinese colleagues too clearly remember, more than 60 years ago, Malinowski encouraged Fei Xiaotong – his Chinese disciple and one of our disciplinary ancestors – by honoring Fei's work on his native place as a landmark in world anthropology. Malinowski foretold that Fei's *Peasant Life in China* (1939) would be a transition in the development of anthropological field-work and theory. He said:

> The book is not written by an outsider looking out for exotic impressions in a strange land; it contains observations carried on by a citizen upon his own people. (Malinowski, 1939: xix)

Malinowski's sentence was short; but it has become a prime quotation in Chinese anthropological writings, serving as a Western advertisement for an emergent Eastern tradition of anthropology. Judging by this fact, one may say that to advocate the third eye perspective is to take the risk of omitting the fact that native anthropology has its own advantages, and it has such even in the eyes of Western scholars like Malinowski.

Recently a point of view similar to Malinowski's has emerged. Some 'Southern' anthropologists have made their different North/South distinctions between the West and the 'rest' – often only including the Central and Southern Americans (Krotz, 1997) and Africans (Prah, 1997) – to make us conscious of 'Northern hegemony' and, to different extents, 'Southern de-hegemonization'. For Southern anthropologists, such a calling for a 'native anthropology in the South' is beneficial not only to the de-hegemonization of the North but also, in the same way that Malinowski congratulated Fei, for bringing the perspectives born in the South into international anthropological debate. It thus seems to be the case that 'anthropologists of the South' in the past few decades are developing some native forms of knowledge that are regarded as critical both to the development of Third-World anthropologies and the reforming of Western anthropologies.

Both what Malinowski taught us and what Southern anthropologists have recently tried to demonstrate may continue to be incorporated into Chinese anthropology. But I have decided to insist on the 'third-eye' perspective. I do not intend to de-value the 'transnational' value of the studies done by natives about natives themselves, nor am I ignorant of the modern fate of native peoples' cosmologies in the 'world system'. Surely, many anthropologists from the non-Western worlds are not wrong in following social theoreticians from the Western worlds in viewing anthropology as a discipline that emerged at a particular moment in the history of culture contact between the 'West and the rest'. In the contexts of East Asia, critiques of colonial anthropology (Bremen and Shimizu, 1999) and colonial modernity (Barlow, 1997) have also alerted us to the dark sides of data-collecting and West-to-East theoretical/ideological translation/transplantation. However, scholars from the South and the East have given their attention mainly to the effect of domination of one subject (North) of the contact over the other (South). They forget that what they have just said had been said in the West some decades ago. They also forget the other side of the coin, 'nativist movements' that later become molded into modern nationalism, a very important aspect of the natives' responses to the contact that have not been independent from their European consciousness of citizenship. Placing this one-sided view in the center of their arguments, they thus pay little attention to the fact that, in many parts of the world, native anthropology has engaged political and cultural concerns with 'imagined communities' (Anderson, 1991), or what we in China call 'national revitalization' (*minzu zhenxing*).[1]

In this regard, Chinese anthropology provides a good example. As is widely known, in different periods in the past two centuries, China has experienced different historical changes that can, paradoxically, be associated with those 'foreign impacts' brought about by the imperial and the 'world system' in what has been called the 'South'. China's experience in the past two centuries has been too complex to be conceptualized with the civilization-versus-tribes model, or even with the not unproblematic model of Fairbankian 'Western impact, Chinese response'. But the modern regimes in China have had their own justifications in regarding our political economy as a part of the 'Third World' – which has been an alternative terminology to the 'South'. Throughout the 20th century in Chinese anthropology, distinctions between the East (China) and the West (Europe, the USA and, ironically, Japan) have been made to enhance an 'anthropology with Chinese characteristics' (*you zhongguo tese de renleixue*).

'Anthropology with Chinese characteristics' does not take an exclusionist attitude towards foreign – including Euro-American, Japanese and Soviet – methodologies; on the contrary it often incorporates them. However, to many Chinese anthropologists, the modern experience of the Chinese nation automatically means that we have to characterize our anthropology in terms of our political, economic, ideological and epistemological situations. As participants of the movement, native anthropologists (*bentu renleixuezhe*) in China have sought to detach our anthropological practices from their foreign historical origins and contemporary counterparts. And many of them regard the sense of detachment as what can revitalize our civilization.

To *question* nativism and nativization is not to blind us to the postcolonialist critiques of the possible dangers of imposing modern Western disciplines on non-Western cosmologies. In the global mood of 'postcolonial' anthropological resistance to Western hegemony, it seems impossible or even foolish to argue against any intellectual 'national liberation movements'. For this and other 'politically correct' considerations, one should not simplify the matter by way of suggesting a comfortable solution – reifying native anthropologies with authentic Western rules. But even if we agree on the un-reifieablility of the 'natives'' scholarship, can we be so sure about the 'benefit' of isolating our anthropology from its foreign counterparts? Are the perspectives of characteristically 'native' – in this case Chinese – anthropology not creating some intellectual pitfalls that anthropologists in many parts of the world have attributed chiefly to the 'West' and its orientalism? In this article, I set out to develop an answer. First and foremost, I will present something about the not-quite international or, for some, not quite Western-determined, characteristics of Chinese-speaking anthropology as it has developed so far.

Internality of 'internal others'

In contemporary Europe and America, recent historical studies of anthropological subjects within and outside the discipline have engaged a great number of anthropologists in criticizing the arbitrary aspects of contrasting cultural discourse. In Marcus and Fischer's 'experimental moment' (1986) or in Rabinow's 'anthropology of reason' (1997), they even call for a 'repatriation of anthropology'. I agree that sometimes using 'other cultures' to critique native Western cosmologies has made anthropologists ignorant of the 'West in the rest' in the context of which anthropology has evolved as a discipline. I also like Rabinow when he suggests that studying others with the West's own Reason has ultimately challenged the otherness of anthropology itself.

Western/Northern anthropology is not a totality**.** It *comprises* several different scholarly traditions. But through the years of studying anthropology, I have found that the concept of 'the Other' stands at the core of anthropological thinking and debates in the West. Current, different senses of otherness are received and *give rise to* several critiques of representation; but the attempt to derive alternative cosmologies and social practices from afar, or from outside anthropologists' own societies and cosmologies, remains the central and most effective practice of anthropological narratives. Anthropologists are looking at forms of knowledge and patterns of sociability that are strange to the researchers themselves. Out of what they observe, anthropologists, as outsiders, seek to track the paths of culture in order to reflect on their own 'local knowledge'. To me, the advantage of anthropology over other humanities and social sciences lies in the fact that this particular discipline has cultivated such sophisticated styles of learning.

Viewing the cultural Self in the mirror of the Other has enabled Western anthropologists to transcend ethnocentric cosmologies and facilitate intercultural reciprocation of knowledge.

In a personal conversation, a couple of prominent Chinese anthropologists tried to prove to me that certain Chinese anthropologists also started their profession with a concern with non-Chinese – including non-Han Chinese – cultures. Indeed, a Chinese sense of Other can be found in Li An Che's study of the Zuni (Li, 1931) and in Fei Xiaotong and Wang Tonghui's study of the Yao (1988 [1937]) as well as Fei's travelogues of America (Fei, 1985a [1948]). While this is important, an examination of the history of Chinese anthropology validates the argument that the Chinese anthropological circle has been overwhelmingly concerned with the Chinese cultural Self. That is not to say that Chinese anthropologists entirely lack a sense of Other that is often explicitly emphasized in different ways in Western anthropology. In fact, recently, the American anthropologist Louisa Schein (2000) observed that a strong sense of other can be detected in Chinese representations of ethnic minorities within China's national boundaries. China is a vast country. Ethnic minority nationalities (*shaoshu minzu*) located in different peripheral parts of Chinese society provide possibilities for the majority Han Chinese anthropologists to imagine 'internal others'. Even among the Han, social life does not follow a *uniform* pattern. On the contrary, it includes great regional cultural diversities that allow fieldworking anthropologists to develop their own arguments about difference.

However, as Schein also points out, 'internal Orientalism' is different from 'external Orientalism' in the sense that 'those othered in dominant representation may simultaneously be considered an integral part of their representers' people or nation' (2000: 106). One important consequence of the internality of 'internal others' has been the impossibility of the 'othered' to be viewed as a reflexive and contrasting mirror of the national Chinese Self. In general, Chinese anthropological interpretations thus lack the intention to go into the 'local knowledge' of the internal natives for the sake of cross-cultural translation. They are instead institutionally determined to favor official political projects of national revitalization (*minzu zhenxing*).[2] Such a characteristic of Chinese anthropology has persisted throughout the 20th century.

Sinicization of anthropology

Many forerunners of Chinese anthropology spoke of classical China as a source of anthropology (e.g. Cai, 1993 [1926]), in the same way as Alfred Haddon spoke of Hippocrates, Aristotle, Herodotus, etc., as the pioneers of Western anthropology (Haddon, 1980 [1910]). Although, conventionally, historians of anthropologists regard anthropological sciences as a particular form of knowledge deriving from a particular civilization (the 19th century global expansion of Europe), a long pre-history of Chinese anthropology existed in imperial China. Representations of internal others in Chinese writings existed long before anthropology was introduced into China.

Elsewhere, I have demonstrated how this pre-history of anthropology could be found in the classical period in the Chinese cosmology of 'All-Under-Heaven' (*tianxia*) (Wang, 1999b). Long before anthropology was introduced into China, Chinese imperial record keepers and map-makers had begun to survey mountains, rivers, seas, peoples, species, and divinities of the world, which were regionalized into zones of different extents of civilization. Later, the classical descriptions were transformed into a tributary system of representation, in which all peoples of the world were incorporated and hierarchically allocated a position in the imperial order of tributary exchange and pilgrimage. I think that, for the purpose of writing a history of anthropology in a non-Western context, these changing cosmological and cultural geographic representations of others should be examined. They can serve to highlight the twists and turns in the developmental cycles of the Chinese Empire and their continued impacts upon Chinese conceptions of human beings and their cultures in the world which are essential to anthropology. But here it suffices to say that since the 19th century such cosmological patterns have undergone significant changes *including* those resulting from the conjuncture of such representations and Western anthropology.

In his *Saga of Anthropology in China* (1994), Gregory Guldin, a Western historian of Chinese anthropology, argues that a uniquely Chinese anthropology has derived directly from the triumph of the Chinese Revolution in 1949. Comparing the development of anthropology before and after the 'Liberation', he says:

> Before 1949 the Chinese adopted Western approaches wholesale, but with the triumph of revolutionary forces the advisability of the entire Western perspective was placed in doubt . . . (Guldin, 1994: xi)

It is true that, since the 1950s, Chinese anthropology has evolved, step by step, into a de-Westernized discipline. Between the 1950s and 1970s, even the name of anthropology was changed into '*minzu yanjiu*', namely 'nationality studies'. But the difference between pre-1949 and post-1949 anthropology in China is only relative. Relatively speaking, prior to 1949, more Western elements were incorporated in Chinese scholarly debates. But once anthropology was introduced into China, it became Chinese. Efforts to Sinicize anthropology and other social science disciplines began far back in the 19th century (Wang Hui, 1997). To a great extent, the process of incorporation and transformation in Chinese anthropology has unfolded in the past century, in much the same way as the whole process of culture contact between non-Chinese and Chinese worlds has.

Today, few refute the common argument that Chinese anthropology emerged from the late 19th-century translations of social Darwinism (Pusey, 1983). As a very important branch of the Chinese Enlightenment and modernity, works by Huxley – whose *Evolution and Ethics* (1898) was first translated into Chinese in 1901 with a new Chinese title, *On the Changes of Heaven (Nature)* – and other evolutionist anthropologists were absorbed into Chinese ideas of social reformation. The translators were the first generation of modern Chinese nationalists who viewed European biological metaphors for inter-societal conflicts as the medicine to cure Chinese cultural illnesses. With an interest in European scribes of civilization, the fathers of Chinese anthropology involved themselves in the critique of their own culture by means of subjecting ideas of the European social philosophical Other to the native trajectory of modernity.

The translation of evolutionist anthropology at the beginning of the 20th century was part of a movement to rescue China from Heaven's misfortune. So, from the outset, anthropology, like many revitalization movements in many parts of China during the same period, was part of Chinese cultural responses to challenges from the outside. It participated in the enlightening of 'backward China' during the Republican Revolution (1911), the New Culture Movement (1915) and the May Fourth Movement (1919). But efforts to establish a Chinese anthropological discipline were not made until the 1920s, when more systematic introductions to the disciplinary, independent research and theoretical debates gradually emerged.

Notably, around 1926, two articles published in Chinese signaled the arrival of the second phase in Chinese anthropology, the beginning of formal domestication of the discipline. Cai Yuanpei's 'Saying Something about Ethnology' (Shuo minzuxue) looked at how ethnology was important to China and could be associated culturally with Chinese tradition (Cai, 1993 [1926]). The core content of Cai's article was concerned with the ways in which ethnology could contribute to Chinese understandings of indigenous ethnic diversity and civilization. Evolutionism was not the central theme of the article. Instead, drawing mostly upon German theories of diffusion, Cai Yuanpei was interested in presenting a historical geography of China to illustrate a new relationship between the center and periphery of the 'divine empire' (*shenzhou*). The use of Chinese materials for anthropological theorization was emphasized too, so far as they would serve the reconstruction of the history of the Middle Kingdom (Zhongguo, or China).

The other article was published in a Chinese journal for Chinese scholars in the USA in the same year. Written by Wu Wenzao, it was entitled 'Nationality and State' (Minzu yu guojia) (Wu, 1990 [1926]). Wu Wenzao, the teacher of the first generation of professional field anthropologists in China, at that time was still a graduate student at Columbia University, learning anthropology and sociology. This earliest piece of his work focuses on the interrelationship between nationality and state, as its title suggests.

Reviewing German, French and British mainstream theories of national states of the time, Wu Wenzao suggested a different line for Chinese state-building. To him, the European idea of 'one nation one state' was inapplicable to the Chinese context. Instead, Wu Wenzao suggested that the Chinese modern state should learn from the lesson of European nation-building and concern itself with tolerating and incorporating a diversity of nationalities and cultures. Culture should be separated from politics to the effect that the ancient civilization could be preserved in a modern form. Anthropology enabled China to find a national path distinct from the dominant European model of 'one nation one state' (see also Wang, 1999–2000).

In the years between 1927 and 1948, Chinese anthropology advanced to equal the international standard. The key players in this arena were able to write both English and Chinese. Encouraged by what was conveyed in Cai Yuanpei and Wu Wenzao's articles, Luo Xianglin, Ling Chunsheng, Fei Xiaotong, Lin Yaohua, Xu Liangguang, Tian Rukang, Lin Huixiang and others forged forums of anthropological studies in various parts of China. As has been noted (Wang, Jianmin, 1997: 139–44), Chinese anthropology during that period prospered in two major camps. The Southern Forum was centered in Academia Sinica in Nanjing. Drawing upon Cai Yuanpei's article and many translations of German and American anthropological works, the group of Southern anthropologists were mainly concerned with historical studies of ethnic cultures. The Northern Forum was centered in Yanjing University and led by Wu Wenzao who had become a Professor of Sociology after his return to Beiping – Beijing after 1949 – in the late 1920s. The Yanjing school of sociology and anthropology was centered on two lines of inquiry, of which rural ethnographies of small villages and their social change was the most famous. The Northern Forum also promoted the study of ethnic minorities. Contrasting with the Southern Forum, the members of the Northern Forum were less historical and more political. Consequently, the study of ethnic groups was actually termed '*bianzhengxue*' or the 'Political Study of China's Frontiers'.

Although 'international' could indeed be the word to describe Chinese anthropology during that period, Chinese anthropology in these two forums was international mainly in the sense that it used many European and American social science concepts. By domesticating the idea of the Other into visions of the internal ethnic and cultural diversity of China, Chinese-speaking anthropologists became concerned mainly with identity politics and state-building projects within the boundaries of the 'Middle Kingdom'. Anthropologists such as Li An Che and Fei Xiaotong were keen to study American and Indian lifestyles. Their works never became the central focus of theoretical debates within China, however.

The domestication of the anthropological Other into an empire of cultures between the 1930s and 1940s paved the way for the emergence of ethnic minority and social reform policy studies between the 1950s and

1970s, skipping the empty chapter of the Cultural Revolution (1966–76).[3] From 1950 onwards, most anthropologists were involved in the research work known as 'nationality identification' (*minzu shibie*). This is policy work aimed at classifying other cultures within China. Using Stalin's criteria for nationality identification, Chinese ethnologists accepted only 15 percent of the more than 400 applications from ethnic groups seeking to be recognized as official ethnic minorities (*shaoshu minzu*). The job was a tough one, as Fei Xiaotong recently reflected (Fei, 1998a). It was necessary, however, for the new government's attempt to impose a great socialist reconstruction on the Chinese nation. To facilitate social reform in the ethnic regions, social histories of ethnic cultures were created to fit into the five-staged theory of human history of Stalinist Marxism. Like colonial governments in the 19th century, the Chinese government in the 1950s provided funds for ethnologists to describe ethnic cultures in detail, for the sake of rescuing the disappearing cultures within the socialist modernizing nation.

Up to the early 1980s, the rural ethnographies of the Yanjing School were denounced for their functionalist opposition to Marxist historical materialism. However, the methodology of small community studies, which first evolved in Mao Zedong's peasant movement studies and later more systematically developed in the Yanjing school of sociology, was quietly merged into 'typical' (*dianxing*) case descriptions of land reform and 'model village' (*mofan cun*) promotion including Dazhai (Fei, 1985b: 16–17). The interpretive framework was a Sinicized version of Soviet readings of German social philosophy rather than a native viewpoint or the non-Marxist stand of Euro-American cultural theory.

Internal and external natives' points of view

Considering 'native anthropology' in China, several questions emerge. What difference has Sinicized anthropology produced? Has this 'characteristically Chinese anthropology' not had its own 'crisis of representation'? In terms of the influence of power structure over scholarship, to what extent can we distinguish this national anthropology from its counterparts in other parts of the world? Although limiting the arbitrary contrast between West and the East is problematic, I feel comfortable continuing the discussion by an excursion into a further comparison between Chinese anthropology and its Western 'other'.

In a recent publication, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology 1922–1972*, Henricka Kuklich (1991) argues that much of social anthropology was created out of cross-cultural contrasts that anthropologists were making to reflect upon European totalitarianist state building. The 'ordered anarchy' of Africa aptly provided certain opposing features to European conceptions of the nation. The advancement of political anthropology between the 1940s and 1960s offered a mirror in which European anthropologists looked at the national 'savages within'.

My brief discussion above points to the fact that, as in European social anthropology, Chinese-speaking anthropology until the 1960s was related to the projects of nation-state building and modernity. However, in contrast to its European counterpart, Chinese anthropology did not engage in setting up a mirror in which to reflect the 'savages within'. Instead, Chinese anthropological ethnographies have treated the savages as the enemies of the 'great tradition' of modernity and the state. The significance of anthropology has been understood as the bearing it has on the re-making of Chinese civilization and nation. It was in pushing anthropology of the Other toward the nationalization of cultural diversity and urban–rural differences that Chinese anthropologists in the past had become 'innovative'.

Most Chinese anthropologists did not believe that the empire should dissolve into national states in which to create new citizenship and borders of modern sociality. Alternatively, as Cai Yuanpei and Wu Wenzao were proposing in the 1920s, it was believed that a Chinese nation should be built upon the basis of the ancient multiculturalism of the empire. It followed that anthropology of other cultures should be domesticated into anthropology of potential 'internal enemies' but not 'external noble savages'. In the same way, anthropology as a meaningful enterprise was targeted at the social transformation of 'people without selves', namely the ethnic minorities and the producers of 'little traditions' in the countryside.

So Chinese anthropology is perhaps best described as anthropology with Chinese characteristics. With regard to this issue, Guldin echoes some Third-World scholars' perspectives on the indigenization of anthropology. He says the following about Sinicization of anthropology:

> Some in the West may not like what this Chinese 'Other' had done with these disciplines. But no matter. To paraphrase Mao Zedong, Chinese anthropologists have stood up, and have fashioned *their own* anthropological sciences. (Guldin, 1994: 244)

Guldin's comment is limited to the period prior to the 1990s. But what he observes of Chinese anthropology – mainly the four-fields style anthropology in Zhongshan University – has continued to grow in the manner that he applauds. Not that Chinese anthropology has not changed in the last decade. What I mean to emphasize is the fact that much of the recent development shares the Sinicizing concern developed in the earlier writings of Chinese anthropology.

For the past 20 years, many regional traditions of Chinese anthropology have been re-established. In Guangzhou, Xiamen, Beijing and Kunming, anthropologists converged into units with their distinctive local scholarly traditions. Cultural anthropology, sociology and social anthropology, ethnology and ethnic minority studies (*shaoshu minzu yanjiu*) developed in earlier periods have their contemporary counterparts. Meanwhile, one can hardly resist the encouraging observation that the new ways of pursuing the old quest for indigenization / nativization (*bentuhua*) have come together with new translations of new works from Western languages. Exchanges with foreign scholars have also become possible. Many students have been able to go abroad and study anthropology. Conferences, seminars and workshops on anthropology have become part and parcel of the new academic life in Chinese universities and attracted many old and young scholars.

As an active element in the promotion of anthropology in China, I have been most delighted to observe the gradual return of 'other' – foreign – voices in Chinese anthropological circles. In the past years, I have engaged myself in organizing several national projects of translation. I have become committed to translation partly because I have much hoped for the interlingual flow of ideas. I hoped that, in the long run, translated ideas and ethnographies would become effective as altered concepts ready for debates in Chinese anthropology to involve. However, through implementing these projects, I have become aware of the fact that, as Lydia H. Liu argues, 'language transaction has always been a contested territory in national and international struggles' (Liu, 1997: 86). In Chinese anthropology, translation has been contested too. Although we should not be too pessimistic about the future influence of translated ideas, we should pay attention to the fact that they have so far not been taken into account (critically) in particular studies conducted in the past decade. In fact, most studies have continued to serve the national revitalization project, now defined in terms of modernization or marketization, instead of revolution. In the new period of China's reform, anthropology has continued to distinguish itself from its foreign counterparts, setting itself aside even from the works done by Chinese academics abroad.

Since the late 1980s, village studies have become an important part of Chinese anthropology and sociology both within and outside China. In the United States, Yan Yunxiang (1996) and Jing Jun (1996), both from mainland China, have studied at Harvard University and published their studies of Chinese rural life.[4] Trained in the Western anthropological tradition, they provide two very creative styles of ethnographic decipherment. Working in the village Xiajia in northeastern China, Yan Yunxiang has been most intrigued by the 'flow of gifts' in that location. Drawing upon existing anthropological interpretations of gift economy and culture, he reflects on the ways in which state socialist hierarchy and the processes of a popular gift economy interact. To Yan Yunxiang, what is so interesting in Xiajia is the fact that new and old forms of sociality and lifestyle have jointly created a site for a theory of unequal and multiple contextual exchange which has not been sufficiently interpreted in existing anthropological theories of reciprocity. Yan Yunxiang's case study is both local and comparative. It is specifically about the 'native's point of view'; but it also illustrates a general – if not intended as ‘universal’ – point of social interaction.

Jing Jun’s study of a northwestern Chinese village concerns itself with the politics of memory in opposition to the politics of forgetting. In his vivid description, memories of bitterness coincide with efforts to forget the eras of socialist modernization. Although I hold a reserved attitude toward his bifurcation, and towards his duality of the state and the peasant histories, I regard his work as a good example of a third-eye anthropology, which in this case is an ethnography engaging a convergence of local unofficial and non-state perspectives of ‘development’. In a recent article on a similar theme (Jing, 1999), Jing Jun takes us to a place with an even more dramatic exemplary effect. This is where a hydroelectric dam was replacing the village. He successfully reveals a different viewpoint, that is, the local indifference to modernist visions of development. He highlights how social memories of the past are reconceived as a vision for the future in a process of repossessing tradition. Critically composed, Jing Jun’s study sheds light on our understanding of state–peasant relations in modernizing China.

Neither Yan Yunxiang’s nor Jing Jun’s study is aimed at the intellectual facilitation of economic reform. Neither of them seeks to promote modernization projects. Instead, both seek to discover an alternative trajectory of history, a ‘mental other’ for the critique of dominant ‘native ideology’ of the modernizing state. Like most native anthropologies done within China in different historical times, their works draw upon Western ideas of society. Yet they are not eager to press these ideas into a political romance of China’s revitalization. Neither are they driven by a wish eventually to do without what has been originally gained from the West. They are good ethnographic works produced out of long-term efforts to learn ethnographic practices and to make available relevant social theoretical insights that can open a window to local understanding of reality.

By now, internally, there are also several village studies in Chinese sociology and anthropology. These internal studies of village life have mostly been concerned with modernization. For example, various village studies conducted in many parts of China have been solely concerned with the concept of urbanization (*dushihua*). In these studies, which repeat much of Fei Xiaotong’s work on rural social change done in the 1930s (Fei, 1939), village communities seem to be important only in the sense that they provide examples of disappearing villages and of emerging small towns and big industries. Modernization is emphasized at the expense of examining possible spaces of cultural difference. One other type of study shares some of Yan Yunxiang and Jing Jun’s concerns. Such studies entertain as much local detail as an ethnographic account. However, the ‘remaking of the village’ (*cunzhuang de zaizhao*) seems to be their central theme (e.g. Zhe, 1997). All villages have transformed somewhat since reform. Therefore, even though these two kinds of studies have academic outlooks, they are deeply rooted in the projects of modernization. Scholars within these studies are hardly distanced from the official accounts. On the contrary, attesting the interest of the state is their prime concern.

More serious problems exist in ethnic minority studies. In France, Cai Hua from Yunnan has produced a good study of the Na (Cai, Hua, 2001). In his description, the Na are interesting in the sense that their lives are so different they offer an alternative perspective of gender relations and kinship to the modern ones that have limited modern anthropological thinking about kinship. Among the Na, there is no fixed marriage relationship. What is important to local society is a kind of 'visiting relationship' that normally does not end up in marriage. Throughout the past 200 years of imperial, Republican, and People's Republican regimes, modern marriage laws have been constantly imposed. But among the Na, they have not been effective. 'Visiting society' has continued to be the 'mainstream' of the Na's lifestyle.

Writing within China, most Chinese anthropologists have produced their works in a very different way from Cai Hua. Many ethnology institutes have now been restored in different parts of China. Part of their work has been the study of ethnic minority cultures. In terms of theory, while new ideas from the West are introduced, interpretations of ethnic cultures are still overshadowed by Morgan's *Ancient Society* and Stalin's theory of 'nation'. For the purpose of attracting foreign funds, some of these institutes have added 'anthropology' to their names. Along with the gradual opening up of publishing business, some ethnologists are writing for the promotion of the utilization of ethnic cultures in tourism. A sense of 'other' that is closely related to the promotion of tourism can be found in such writings. Good relations between the Han and the minority are always their central theme. Alternatively, some 'local flowers of the national garden' may be emphasized to highlight the cultural value of ethnic minorities to the state and the emerging 'socialist market economy' in the ethnic minority regions. Such 'studies' usually do not base themselves on thorough ethnographic research; instead, they are usually abstract generalizations of ethnic cultural traits, ethnic group relations and economic development. Anthropologists such as Naran Bilik have introduced most of the debates in the West concerning the characteristics of ethnicity (Bilik, 2000). But so far such introductions are not discussed in particular writings on nationality. In a recently written history of Chinese ethnology, Wang Jianmin, a young anthropologist in the Central University for Nationalities, still maintains the old principle of producing national unity through studying ethnic diversity. As he says:

> Western ethnology is an output of colonial institutions. It adopts comparative methods for the purpose of hunting the alien. Looking for differences, Western ethnologists seek to achieve the goal of colonialist rule. By contrast, the background against which Chinese ethnology has developed is the fact that our country is a multi-ethnic nation. The culture of the Chinese nation stems from the assimilation of different ethnic cultures. We adopt comparative

> method not for the sake of hunting for the strange but for the very purpose of looking for unity and of pointing out the unity and inseparability of Chinese national culture. (Wang, Jianmin, 1997: 286)

Modernity as 'self-awareness of culture'

In 1998, during the centenary anniversary celebration of Beijing University's establishment, Fei Xiaotong delivered an extensive lecture. The lecture, entitled 'Reflections, Dialogues, and Self-awareness of Culture', was intended to urge Chinese anthropologists to contribute to Chinese self-awareness of culture (*wenhua zijue*). According to Fei, near the end of the 20th century, scholars in many Western countries had begun to reflect upon their own cultures. They had sought to envisage the future adaptation of their civilization to the development of other civilizations in the world by way of introspection and cross-cultural studies. By contrast, in China, self-awareness of culture was yet to be developed.

To achieve the sense of awareness, Fei said that Chinese anthropologists should take it as our own 'mission' – he indeed applied this rather Western concept – to make people know their own culture and its position in the world and to participate in the creation of 'common measures' of cross-cultural relationship. But what is 'self-awareness of culture'? Fei says the following:

> Self-awareness of culture refers to nothing more than people's self-knowledge of their own culture in which they live their lives. People must know the origin and the historical process of formation as well as the characteristics and developmental trends of their own culture. Self-awareness of culture does not convey any meaning of our own 'culture's return' (*wenhua huigui*). It is not meant to revive the old. Nor does the concept convey an argument for 'total Westernization' (*quanpan xihua*) or 'total otherization' (*quanpan tahua*). Self-knowledge of culture is meant to call for the strengthening of self-determining capability in cultural transformation, which is important for our adaptation to new environments and our autonomy in the selection of cultural elements in the new age. (Fei, 1998b: 52–3)

In fact, when Fei made his call for 'self-awareness of culture', one that many distinguished modern Chinese had long tried to achieve, it was once again becoming the core concern of many Chinese social scientists. To those who have paid attention to contemporary Chinese academia, an important shift of focus in scholarly debates among the new liberal Chinese intellectuals is easily observable. About three years ago, the new generation of intellectuals in Beijing, Shanghai and other central places of China were still engaged in the controversy over whether the great Chinese tradition encompassed a culture of capitalist spirit and democratic modernity. By 1999, small showers of debates between liberal economists, political scientists and culture researchers had evolved into a veritable storm.

A group of intellectuals who would soon lead cultural studies in China came to realize the importance of the critical spirit of Neo-Marxism for China. Arguing that the China Problem was no longer that of socialism but of globalizing capitalism, the Chinese New Left, as they were sometimes called, sought to rethink the modernity of China. For them, culture, or the great tradition of Confucianism and Neo-Confucianism, was no longer important. The issue now was the spirit of modernity that had infiltrated dominant modern discourse and continued to exert its influences upon post-reform state ideological apparatus and political economy.

A young generation of Chinese intellectuals who jointly fought for the national dignity of China from the same stance as some liberal economists and political scientists has responded to the 'New Left'. These enthusiastic scholars critique the condemnation of modernity and development. They argue that tasks of the Chinese New Culture Movements of the early 20th century are not yet complete. The May Fourth Movement, together with its rejection of tradition, is still perceived to be desirable. Critical of 'official accounts' of history, the liberal economists postulate that the real danger behind the underdeveloped state constitutional apparatuses is the lack of 'spontaneously evolved modernity'. The liberal political scientists argue that Western critiques of modernity are either premature for China to imitate or already too out of date to be adopted. The China Problem is the Chinese reality. It is a reality of the necessary struggles against the ideological justification of a feigned social justice that hinders constitutional development of political economy and market.

Most Chinese anthropologists have distanced themselves from the political debates over the issue of culture. But we should not forget that, even though the 'liberalist' and 'New Left' camps say little about culture, both are engaged in certain teleological struggles for China in which the issue of culture is at the core. What is contended here is whether globalizing modernity has 'civilized' us to such an extent that the boundaries of our culture are no longer obstacles to future advancements. This is the archetypal Chinese anthropological question which our disciplinary ancestors have tried to answer.

By translating European, American and Japanese anthropological ethnographies and ideas, some Chinese anthropologists have in the past century tried to look at our cultural Self from the point of view of the Other. In particular, between the late 19th century and the early 20th century, European evolutionism, translated through the medium of the Japanese language, provided a progressive vision for intellectuals in China to become reflective of their own culture. Between the 1920s and 1940s, a combination of Malinowski's functionalism, Robert Park's sociology and American historical particularism provided two important bases upon which the Northern and Southern forums were developed. It can even be argued that a Sovietized German historical materialism was domesticated as the sole theory of social progress and reform between the 1950s and 1960s, and post-reform translations of Euro-American theories have further facilitated the development of new anthropological ideas.

However, persistence in the translation and juxtaposition of foreign anthropology has not prevented Chinese anthropologists from pressing their discipline into a part of the politics of modernity and culture. Seen from another perspective, the intended or unintended consequence of the nativizing quest has been that a sense of national 'self-awareness of culture' has overwhelmed Chinese anthropological debate. In other words, the sense of otherness and academic distance that has been essential to Western anthropology has not matured in China.

Except for a couple of not entirely successful examples, Chinese ethnographies of other cultures have not been written. In the past century, there has been an opportunity for Chinese anthropologists to write up ethnic minority cultures on the margins of 'Chinese civilization'. But the overwhelming influences of social Darwinism and historical materialism, and the state policies in scholarly debates, have hindered the development of such ethnographic decipherment. Not only that, rural social studies in Chinese-speaking anthropology have not 'evolved' into 'self-critical ethnographies'. In my own studies, I have found it possible to become 'culturally relative' by distancing myself from the state discourse of modernization. In such a distancing enterprise, from a native's point of view, folk cultures of the villagers provide sufficient materials for reflection. Nevertheless, few other sociologists and anthropologists traveling internally have shown similar interest as yet.

As I emphasized above, the 'third eye' that has been rendered by Western disciplinary training to Yan Yunxiang, Jing Jun, Cai Hua and others has allowed the development of an ideologically and culturally distanced style of description and interpretation of China. None of these anthropologists is limited to the idea of 'social progress' and the monopolizing concept of one Chinese culture. Instead, they are able to create an 'other cultural background' out of their close readings of Western ethnographies and theories in Western colleges and set this background against their home cultures in which to facilitate an international anthropology.

Contrasting the internal and external anthropology of China has alerted me to the fact that 'self-awareness of culture' should always be gained by posing the Other against the question of the Self, and by distancing the intellectual debate from political teleology. If external Sinological anthropological studies have made their contribution to the 'self-awareness' of Chinese culture, then this contribution has mainly consisted of the point that Chinese culture should not be studied in isolation as a fixed totality. It could be analyzed in terms of orthodox cosmology as de Groot, Marcel Granet, Maurice Freedman, James Watson and Steven Sangren have done from their different perspectives. It could also be analyzed in terms of the lasting interactions between state cults, specialist religious systems and folk traditions as Stephan Feuchtwang, Kristofer

Schipper, Kenneth Dean and many others have done. With regard to ethnic minority studies, works done by Western scholars have also become available as critical references. In fact, the new generation of Chinese anthropologists like Yan Yunxiang, Jing Jun, Cai Hua and others have developed certain novel perspectives from which traditional perceptions of 'Chinese culture' are less important than the particular ways of life, exchange and memories of the common people.

After several years of personal involvement in Chinese academic debates, I have come to use a Chinese phrase, 'embodied knowledge' (*tihui*), for different nativist concerns. Very few seek Fei's self-awareness of culture and its teleology in China. To be sure, this nativist concern has emerged from particular histories of inter-cultural contacts and mutual influences.[5] For many postcolonialists, such histories have not been separable from the process of imperialist civilization of the 'modern world system'. But for me, an insider anthropologist, they have been more profoundly involved in the 'indigenization of modernity', in which local differentiation has developed in reaction to global homogenization (Sahlins, 2000: 512) in a complex pattern to revitalize the Heaven of an old oriental civilization. That also means a history of native Chinese anthropology is waiting to be written from the perspective of culture contact, in which Chinese appropriations of modernity define Chinese politics of culture, the background against which Chinese anthropology has been evolved so far. My discussion here is merely a step towards such a history, although it is sufficient to indicate that native anthropology in China has not 'liberated' itself, through emptying foreign imperialism out of China, from the 'structure of power'.

Conclusion

In the early 1960s, British social anthropologist Maurice Freedman criticized some anthropologists of China for their 'de-sinicization'. Freedman recalled Malinowski's anticipation of a Chinese anthropology of civilization. But he was dissatisfied with his students' simple imitations of his ethnographic method. He argued that 'a Chinese phase of social anthropology' was yet to come into being. Ethnography, that was invented in the West and applied by Fei Xiaotong and several other first generation fieldworking Chinese anthropologists led by Wu Wenzao, was not adequate for the study of China, a large country with long-standing historical tradition. As an alternative, he proposed that a combination of Sinological emphases on history, sociological emphases on extensive surveys of social strata and ethnographic data should be developed to create an anthropology of China (Freedman, 1963).

At that particular historical moment (the early 1960s), Freedman's Sinological anthropology derived from a temporary shortage of field research opportunities; but it changed into a Western synthesis of East and West,[6] of native Chinese understandings of history and Sinological reluctance to accept Western ethnographic tradition (Wang, 1997: 25–64). In the late 1990s, when it was being translated into Chinese, Fei Xiaotong read a summary, and he gladly said that Freedman's anthropology of civilization was indeed what was needed in China (Fei, 1998c). Fei knew of Freedman's resistance to his own ethnography of Kaixiangong and comparative studies of 'village types' in Yunnan; but he accepted his challenge in consideration of its benefit to the clarification of Chinese characteristics of anthropology.

Nearly four decades after Freedman, Stephan Feuchtwang, a European social anthropologist, one of my teachers and friends, recently has somewhat reversed Freedman's argument. He makes two positive points about 'natives studying natives' in China. Feuchtwang argues that anthropologists who are also insiders in China not only have linguistic advantages over outsider anthropologists but also have better access than outsider anthropologists to historical sources of culture and political consciousness within local social settings. Insiders' anthropology thus has its own good characteristics, its Sinological competence and political advocacy. It can offer complementary insights that are not easily available to Western outsiders (Feuchtwang, 1999).

Feuchtwang's ambition is a cross-cultural dialogue, a de-centered negotiation over epistemological issues that I am also in favor of. Particularly in this regard, he admirably says that 'a cultural critique in both directions would have to be mounted and both the Chinese insider and the European insider would have to keep a distance from their "own" discursive assumptions' (Feuchtwang, 1999: 263). In consideration of the European insider's distance, Feuchtwang encourages his colleagues in the West to gain a 'more general awareness' of anthropology in this particular non-Western context. I admire Feuchtwang's sense of distance. Particularly because in the end it brings his encouragement of insiders' anthropology into question, and makes me also think that one ought to explain why foreign anthropologists like him have encouraged the natives' points of view.[7]

To an extent, from different perspectives, Freedman and Feuchtwang have done the same good thing for Western anthropology. They dare to raise the issue as to how to gain 'self-knowledge' of Western problems with reference to non-Western native Chinese perspectives. That is what Feuchtwang refers to as 'distance'. Nonetheless, is it not possible for the insider's perspective 'translated' Westwards in an argument to become in reverse translation to those who, as native anthropologists, are still trying to make anthropological science a culturally – and most often also nationally – specific discipline? From the point of view of an insider, does the introspective anthropological search that has characterized his and others' explanations of Chinese anthropology not convey something relevant to our rethinking of our own Chinese anthropology? Are we, non-Western native anthropologists, not courageous enough to consider how to know our own problems?

In recent years, many non-Western anthropologists have imitated much of the tone of postcolonialist and postmodernist anthropologists who have come to enjoy ascendance in the last couple of decades in the West. In China, anthropologists had long been excited by former Soviet criticisms of Western anthropology before we came to know postcolonialism. Now, the critique of anthropology in the 'colonial situations' has offered a new opportunity for the old criticisms to remake new native anthropologies. Meanwhile, far away from China, in South America and Africa, anthropologists such as Krotz have (re-)elaborated a set of 'contradictions', which 'have been caused by the development of anthropology in a world shaped, until now, by the power of the very same nations that also generated our discipline' (Krotz, 1997: 241).[8] They have also argued that conventionally, '[Northern] anthropology rooted itself and acquired its life in the South itself' and now it is the turn of anthropologists from the South, the 'main habitat of the objects' of ethnography, to contribute to the 'study of anthropological science' (1997: 240).

With a sense of embarrassment, I know nothing about anthropology in the South except what anthropologists from the South have told me. I can only take a risk, venturing to say that if Krotz's history represents a reality in the South, then it is also a delightful myth for native anthropologists in the East. In the South, native anthropologies have only developed in the past three or four decades. In the East, they can be dated back to the beginning of the 20th century. To Krotz, and many of those native anthropologists in the camp of nativist postcolonialism, a distinctive Chinese anthropology may have already 'proven' to be a model.

Like some anthropologists in the South, in the historical process of national discipline-building, many anthropologists in China have lost faith or become superstitious about the naturally good outcomes of having characteristically non-Western perspectives. Although non-Western perspectives are not limited to a national perspective, they are often reduced to it. The chief characteristic of an anthropology of the South has been said to be that 'those who study and those being studied are the citizens of the same country'. But the idea of 'citizens' here is paradoxical. The notion of national citizenship is not a tradition of the South, while it has ironically been supposed to be the natives' invention. Likewise, in China, characteristically Chinese anthropology has been most closely related to Chinese national identity that had not been a tradition of the imperial cosmology of Heaven. The chief characteristic of Chinese anthropology has been its emphasis on practical applications and policy studies, in which political intentions have always overwhelmed scholarly discussions and lacked a distance. That is not quite traditional; it is still what the idea of 'citizenship' implies, the responsive interaction between the nation-state and the conscious people.

Chinese anthropologists are not all the same. In the past decade, an intellectual movement aiming at creating a 'self-determining space' (*zizhu kongjian*) for social sciences in China has come to exert some influence in Chinese academia. A handful of the younger generation of Chinese anthropologists has emphasized the importance of keeping scholarly studies separate from politics. Meanwhile, more and more studies of internal cultural diversities are being done. These relatively independent studies, hand in hand with similar studies done abroad, are gradually adding new aspects to the discipline's celebration of cultural heterogeneity. Progressively, cultural heterogeneity that has so far been emphasized merely as a partial reflection of Chinese civilization will gain some recognition.

But the old tension has not gone. Consciously or unconsciously, most other anthropologists have continued to conflate the relationship between politics and scholarship. Towards those who are trying to develop a less nationally confined discipline, these colleagues hold conservative attitudes; and they fear that the new perspectives may push the Chineseness of anthropology into a long-term suspension. Together with the ideological apparatuses of the state, they regard such points of view as hiding dangers. Old and new measures have been taken to make sure the heterodoxy of self-determined space does not grow into an opposite to Chinese national integrity and, in the end, into a challenge to the orthodoxy of the state itself.

Conversely, Feuchtwang's point about in-depth historical data and political pressures can be a good proposition for insider anthropologists like me, who seek a distance from insiders' politics; but it can do something quite different to others. Too many native Chinese anthropologists believe that such data and pressures are good for our national revitalization. The outcome has been that 20th-century Chinese anthropology was inseparable from the history of Chinese nationalism and state-building (He, 1999). In this particular sort of anthropology, concepts of cultural selves and others have not been entirely ignored. But they have been considered merely from the perspective of the temporal continuum of different evolutionary historical stages. Envisaged as the cultural unification between the Han Chinese self and its internal others, the continuum in question has been a political project that vitalizes itself by way of its hierarchical allocation of different levels of progress.

Thus, it is more than obvious that a characteristically native anthropology makes nothing anthropological, unless it examines histories and politics from the perspectives that we develop through a less locally confined process of learning and communication. In the context of native Chinese anthropology, the more or less distanced – but not simply value-free – perspectives can stem from a sense of autonomy in the same way as that in which Feuchtwang and other foreign anthropologists of China have distanced themselves from their 'home' Eurocentrism. Distance can be gained by way of long- or short-term stays 'away from home', which can facilitate ‘a new understanding of Chinese culture from a position peripheral to the mainland’ (Yang, 1994: 30). In the examples that I have discussed in the comparison of internal and external natives’ points of view of anthropology, the authors of ethnography are temporary – but relatively long-term – academic visitors who have gained good training in anthropology. These academic visitors have gained more access to non-Chinese anthropological approaches with which they have critically reflected upon our ‘home cultures’.

In the future, some new generation Chinese anthropologists will conduct field research among peoples living outside China, apart from going to remote places and culturally distant ethnic groups or even to the ‘centers of the world system’. Surely, when they have opportunities to do so, they will not simply repeat what modern Western ethnographers have done. Instead, as I also hope, they will become as creative as they can be; and to be creative, in their narratives and analyses, they will engage different cultural constructions of social relationship, history, economy and politics, including our own. They will even feel free to experiment with new ways of anthropology, those that not only translate non-Western cultures into Western languages but also translate Western cultures into non-Western – for example, Chinese – languages.

Nonetheless, not all Chinese anthropologists will have such opportunities. Currently, the situation is not encouraging. Hardly any Chinese anthropologists have opportunities to conduct overseas field research. Most are still trying to gain self-awareness of our own culture by investigating places and ethnic groups within China. But even if they still seek to gain a sort of self-awareness of culture, good anthropologists will keep a distance from both imperialism and our own state’s politics in so far as it can benefit our understanding. They will join in advocacy of the ‘third eye’ perspective, a perspective consisting of this or another sort of mental travel between cultures and of explorations of available non-Chinese social forms.

The mission may be a hardship; but some interpretive models relevant to our studies have become available. As examples, the theoretical and ethnographic sources of Sinological anthropology from outside China are among them; they are potential alternatives to our self-awareness of culture that are important to us as ‘other voices’. If ‘Cherishing men from afar’ (*huairou yuanren*) was an important aspect of ancient Chinese civilization (Hevia, 1995) then it should also become one of the characteristics of Chinese anthropology, even though we still ought to extend the attitude also towards ideas and cosmologies from afar.

Notes

The first draft of this article was presented as a special seminar in the Social Anthropology Wing, Department of Anthropology and Center of East Asian Studies at

Harvard University in April 2000. I am grateful to Professor James W. Watson for his invitation and comments. Professor Stephan Feuchtwang of London School of Economics made several useful suggestions for revision. To him, I am equally grateful. I am also indebted to Professor Marshall Sahlins for arranging a six months visiting professorship in Chicago where I had the opportunity to continue and rethink what I was trying to do. A sequel to this article, something on the pre-history of anthropology in imperial China, was discussed in Bologna University, upon the invitation of Professor Umberto Eco and Alain Le Pichon, who gave admirable comments.

1 Krotz imitates much of the tone of postcolonialist and postmodernist anthropologists who have come to enjoy ascendance in the last couple of decades in the North. Such a conscious or unconscious connection makes one understand that to bifurcate the world is to run the risk of bifurcation itself (e.g. isolating the South from the North). Not only that, Krotz is mainly concerned with anthropology in the South, not noting that the same problems have been related to other subjects of study in the North. Thus he makes it easy for Quinlan to argue for an 'interdisciplinary' project that is, as it were, to replace disciplinary divisions and their 'transnational' consequences (Quinlan, 2000). Moreover, Krotz's explicit emphasis is upon a 'native's point of view' of anthropology; but his background view derives from cultural relativism that is hardly a Southern cosmology. Thus, even if he is not interested in exploring native cosmologies for anthropological purposes, his equally indigenous critic, Prah, has every reason to suggest, in an opposite direction, another sort of anthropology, one that aims to 'achieve universalism of all voices' (Prah, 1997).

2 Here I do not intend to suggest that Chinese anthropologists should not study themselves, or that they should replicate their Western counterparts and engage only in the study of other cultures. On the contrary, I advocate greater reflexive knowledge of our own cosmologies. But what I am concerned with here are the ways in which the anthropological Other has been domesticated in China and transformed altogether.

3 From the 1920s, Chinese ethnological studies of nationalities had been similar to North American cultural anthropological studies of native Amerindians in the earliest decades of the 20th century. Apparently, Wu Wenzao was influenced by the internal colonialism of Boasian anthropology during his Columbia University years (the early 1920s). Boas sought to retain a certain connection with the Bureau of Ethnology for purposes of museum display of cultural diversity in the USA. In China, Wu tried to forge a similar connection as early as the 1930s. Since the 1950s, Chinese anthropologists have been connected with the Commission of Nationality Affairs (Minzu Shiwu Weiyuanhui) that has dealt with affairs similar to those of the Bureau of Ethnology in the USA and has almost completely determined what ethnology should do in China. Nonetheless, since the Second World War, along with the expansion of American power, area studies on non-American societies have become an important part of American social sciences. As a result, American cultural anthropology has for some time not been limited by internal colonialism, while Chinese ethnology retains its political internality.

4 Similarly, in Liu Xin's more recent study of a northern Shaanxi village, a critical awareness of post-reform conditions of the countryside is heavily emphasized (Liu, Xin, 2000).

5 In a recently published work (1999a), I have examined history from an anthropological perspective to illuminate the means by which the nation as a

culture has become the key concern in China. In my study site, the city of Quanzhou on the southeast coast, prior to the Ming Dynasty, frequent interactions between overseas cultures and local Chinese culture were made possible by maritime trade. The government, elite and common people did not think of themselves as entirely distinct from outsiders. Instead, they shared the city as a market place, conducting symbolic interactions with Indian, Arab and European merchants. From the Ming Dynasty on, along with the imposition of 'maritime prohibition policy' (*haijin zhengce*) and orthodox Neo-Confucian state cults, a tendency to purify Chinese civilization transformed this situation. The nativist civilizing process later paved the way for the emergence of proto-nationalism and nationalism in the later contacts with European cultures in the 19th century. While I place a lot of emphasis upon the origination of the nation as a culture, I also pay considerable attention to the roles of the 'enemies of great tradition', the pirates, emigrants and local religious folk practitioners who made efforts to create alternative branches of culture and politics. My case study of Quanzhou is intended as an illustration of the process by which the historical and culturo-ideological originations of Chinese nativisms can be disclosed to present-day residents of Quanzhou – today's 'insiders' who may not be aware of alternative traditions in their own past.

6 In the late 1960s, and especially in the 1970s, Taiwan was opened to anthropological fieldwork concerning Chinese culture. But before that, Singapore, Malaysia and Hong Kong served as places where Freedman himself got to know Chinese culture.

7 In his article, Feuchtwang treats me as a good example of native anthropological historian. Thus I feel obliged to return the gift by a slightly different thought. I regard my historical inquiry as part of a project that is to take into account some foreign social historical perspectives. Likewise, foreign anthropological studies of China published in the past couple of decades have shown the same interests in the contemporary pressures of politics as we, the insiders, have.

8 Although Krotz's argument sounds consistent, one should not forget two simple facts. First, a few decades ago, such a power had been analyzed as deriving from a 'dialectic', a combined concern to rescue indigenous forms of life from disappearing and to maintain colonial structure of dominance (Asad, 1973). Second, as early as in 1939, the call for 'natives to study natives' in order to make a new anthropology had been made by Malinowski, a Western/Northern anthropologist who had a job in London. These two facts are simple but they are not trivial, for Krotz's two points of view about the historical dilemma and future orientation of anthropology are not only repetitive but also involve many problems that deserve our attention.

References

Anderson, Benedict (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun (1986) 'Theory in Anthropology: Center and Periphery', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28(2): 356–61.

Asad, Talal (1973) 'Introduction', in Talal Asad (ed.) *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, pp. 9–20. Atlantic Highland, NJ: Humanities Press.

Barlow, Tani, ed. (1997) *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Bilik, Naran, (2000) *Xiandai Beijingxia de Zuqun Jiangou* (Ethnic Constructions in Modern Settings). Kunming: Yunnan Jiaoyu Chubanshe.

Bremen, Jan van and Akitoshi Shimizu, eds (1999) *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.

Cai, Hua (2001) *A Society without Fathers or Husbands: The Na of China*. New York: Zone Books.

Cai, Yuanpei (1993 [1926]) 'Shuo minzuxue' (Saying Something about Ethnology), in *Yiban* (The General Pattern), from *Cai Yuanpei Xuanji* (Selected Writings by Cai Yuanpei), pp. 1112–21. Hangzhou: Zhejiang People's Publishing House.

Fei, Hsiao-Tung (Xiaotong) (1939) *Peasant Life in China*. London: Routledge.

Fei, Xiaotong (1985a [1948]) *Meiguo yu Meiguoren* (America and Americans). Beijing: The Joint Publishing Company.

Fei, Xiaotong (1985b) *Shehui Diaocha Zibai* (An Autobiographic Narrative of Social Investigation). Beijing: Zhishi Chubanshe.

Fei, Xiaotong (1998a) 'Jianshu wode minzu yanjiu silu' (A Brief Reflection on the Lines of Thought with which I have Studied Nationality', in *Conshi Qiuzhi Lu* (Pursuing Knowledge through Practice), pp. 119–36. Beijing: Beijing Daxue Chubanshe.

Fei, Xiaotong (1998b) 'Fansi, duihua, wenhua zijue' (Reflections, Dialogues, and Self-awareness of Culture), in Ma Rong and Zhou Xing (eds) *Tianye Gongzuo yu Wenhua Zijue* (Fieldwork and Self-Awareness of Culture), pp. 38–54. Beijing: Qunyan Chubanshe.

Fei, Xiaotong (1998c) 'Chongdu jiangcun jingji xuyan' (Re-reading Malinowski's Preface to *Peasant Life in China*'), in Ma Rong and Zhou Xing (eds) *Tianye Gongzuo yu Wenhua Zijue* (Fieldwork and Self-Awareness of Culture), pp. 1–27. Beijing: Qunyan Chubanshe.

Fei, Xiaotong and Wang Tonghui (1988 [1937]) *Hualan Yao Shehui Zuzhi* (Social Organization among the Yao in Hualan). Nanjing: Jiangsu Renmin Chubanshe.

Feuchtwang, Stephan (1999) 'The Pressure of Contemporaneity: A Personal View of Insiders and Outsiders in the Politics of "Cultural" Anthropology in Taiwan', in Hsu Chengkuang and Huang Yingkuei (eds) *The Development of Anthropology in Taiwan*, pp. 241–80. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Freedman, Maurice (1963) 'A Chinese Phase in Social Anthropology', *British Journal of Sociology* 14(1): 1–19.

Freedman, Maurice (1974) 'On the Sociological Study of Chinese Religion', in Arthur Wolf (ed.) *Religion and Ritual in Chinese Society*, pp. 19–41. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Goody, Jack (1998) *Food and Love: A Cultural History of East and West*. London: Verso.

Guldin, Gregory (1994) *The Saga of Anthropology in China*. New York: Sharpe.

Haddon, Alfred C. (1980 [1910]) *History of Anthropology*. London: Watts and Co.

He, Cuiping (1999) 'Cong zhongguo shaoshu minzu yanjiu de jige ge'an kan "ji" he "yiji" de guanxi' (An Examination of the Relationship between 'Self' and 'Other' in Ethnic Minority Studies in China), in Hsu Chengkuang and Huang Yingkuei (eds) *The Development of Anthropology in Taiwan*, pp. 357–404. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Hevia, James (1995) *Cherishing Men from Afar: Qing Guest Ritual and the Macartney Embassy of 1793*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Jing, Jun (1996) *The Temple of Memories: History, Power, and Morality in a Chinese Village*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Jing, Jun (1999) 'Villages Dammed, Villages Repossessed', *American Ethnologist* 26(2).

Krotz, Esteban (1997) 'Anthropologies of the South: Their Rise, their Silencing, their Characteristics', *Critique of Anthropology* 17(4): 237–51.

Kuklich, Henrika (1991) *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology 1922–1972*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, An Che (1931) 'Zuni: Some Observations and Queries', *American Anthropologist* 39(1): 62–76.

Liu, Lydia H. (1997) 'Translingual Practice: The Discourse of Individualism between China and the West', in Tani Barlow (ed.) *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, pp. 83–112. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Liu, Xin (2000) *In One's Own Shadow: An Ethnographic Account of Post-reform Rural China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Malinowski, Bronislaw (1939) 'Preface', in Fei Xiaotong *Peasant Life in China*, pp. xix–xxvi. London: Routledge.

Marcus, George and Michael Fischer (1986) *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Prah, Kwesi Kwaa (1997) 'North / South Parallels and Intersections: Anthropological Convergences and Divergences in the Study of Africa', *Critique of Anthropology* 17(4): 339–45.

Pusey, James (1983) *China and Charles Darwin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Quinlan, Tim (2000) 'Anthropologies of the South: The Practice of Anthropology', *Critique of Anthropology* 20(2): 125–36.

Rabinow, Paul (1997) *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sahlins, Marshall (2000) ' "Sentimental Pessimism" and Ethnographic Experience: or, Why Culture is not a Disappearing "Object" ', in Larraine Dasto (ed.) *Biographies of Scientific Objects*, pp. 158–202. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Said, Edward (1978) *Orientalism*. New York and London: Penguin.

Schein, Louisa (2000) *Minority Rules: The Miao and the Feminine in China's Cultural Politics*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Stocking, George, ed. (1991) *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Uribe, Carlos A. (1997) 'A Certain Feeling of Homelessness: Remarks on Esteban Krotz's "Anthropologies of the South" ', *Critique of Anthropology* 17(3): 253–61.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (1997) 'Social Science and the Quest for a Just Society', *American Journal of Sociology* 102(5): 1241–57.

Wang, Hui (1997) 'The Fate of "Mr. Science" in China: The Concept of Science and its Application in Modern Chinese Thought', in Tani Barlow (ed.) *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, pp. 21–82. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Wang, Jianmin (1997) *Zhongguo Minzuxue Shi* (History of Chinese Ethnology). Kunming: Yunnan Jiaoyu Chubanshe.

Wang, Mingming (1997) *Shehui Renleixue yu Zhongguoyanjiu* (Social Anthropology and Sinology). Beijing: Sanlian Shudian.

Wang, Mingming (1999a) *Shiqu de Fanrong: Yizuo Laocheng de Lishi Renleixue Kaocha* (Prosperity that Has Gone by: A Historical Anthropology of an Old City). Hangzhou: Zhejiang Renmin Chubanshe.

Wang, Mingming (1999b) 'Empire to Nation, or The Relevance of Reciprocal Understanding to China', unpublished paper, presented to the International Conference on Reciprocal Knowledge, Bologna, Italy, December 2000.

Wang, Mingming (1999–2000) ‘Minzu yu guojia: cong Wu Wenzao de zaoqi lunshu chufa’ (Nation and State: Departing from the Early Writings of Wu Wenzao), *Yunnan Minzu Xueyuan Xuebao* (Yunnan Institute for Nationalities Journal), part 1, 1999 (6); part 2, 2000 (1).

Wu, Wenzao (1990 [1926]) ‘Minzu yu guojia’ (Nationalities and the State), originally in *Liumei Xuesheng Jibao* (A Quarterly Journal for Chinese Students in the USA), 1926(1), from *Wu Wenzao Shehuixue Renleixue Yanjiu Wenji* (A Collection of Essays on Sociology and Anthropology by Wu Wenzao), pp. 19–36. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Yan, Yunxiang (1996) *The Flow of Gifts: Reciprocity and Social Networks in a Chinese Village*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Yang, Mayfair (1994) *Gifts, Favors and Banquets: The Art of Social Relationships in China*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Zhe, Xiaoye (1997) *Cunzhuang de Zaizhao: Yige ‘Chaoji Cunzhuang’ de Shehui Bianqian* (The Remaking of a Village: Social Change in a Super-Village). Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe.

■ **Wang Mingming** is Professor of Anthropology at Peking University and founding editor of a new Chinese journal, *Cultural Worlds: The Chinese Review of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. He has published extensively on Sinological anthropology, cultural theory, rural China and history. *Address*: Institute of Sociology and Anthropology, Peking University, Beijing City, 100871, China. [email: wangmingming@263.net.cn]