Coming to Terms with the Nation

Ethnic Classification in Modern China

Thomas S. Mullaney

With a Foreword by
Benedict Anderson

Introduction

Fifty-six stars
Fifty-six flowers
Fifty-six brothers and sisters together form one family
Fifty-six national languages together form one sentence:
I love my China, I love my China

—LOVE MY CHINA, LYRICS BY QIAO YU

User msohu: "Legally, how can I marry a girl from each of the fifty-six minzu?"
User qhfzfj: "Simple. First you marry someone from one minzu, then you get
divorced. After that, switch minzu and get married again. Then get divorced,
then get remarried, . . . and you've got it."

—EXCHANGE POSTED ON QIHOO, CHINESE ONLINE COMMUNITY SITE,
SEPTEMBER 23, 2007

From the sacred to the profane, the idea of China as a "unified, multinational country" *(tongyi de duo minzu guojia)* is a central, load-bearing concept within a wide and heterogeneous array of discourses and practices in the contemporary People's Republic. China is a plural singularity, this orthodoxy maintains, composed of exactly fifty-six ethnonational groups *(minzu):* the Han ethnic majority, which constitutes over ninety percent of the population, and a long list of fifty-five minority nationalities who account for the rest.[1] Wherever the question of diversity is raised, this same taxonomic orthodoxy is reproduced, forming a carefully monitored orchestra of remarkable reach and consistency: anthropology museums with the requisite fifty-six displays, "nationalities doll sets" with the requisite fifty-six figurines, book series with the requisite fifty-six "brief histories" of each group, Olympic ceremonies with fifty-six delightfully costumed children, and the list goes on. Fifty-six stars, fifty-six flowers, fifty-six minzu, one China.

China has not always been home to fifty-six officially recognized groups, however. In the late Qing (1644–1911), gazetteerists reported to the imperial center about a wide variety of "barbarians" living in the frontier regions. For one province, Yunnan, such accounts portrayed the region as home to over one hundred

MAP 1. Yunnan Province

distinct peoples, with nearly one hundred more in the neighboring province of Guizhou. Only a few decades later, however, in the China of Chiang Kai-shek, the Nationalist regime vociferously argued that the country was home to only one people, "the Chinese people" *(Zhonghua minzu),* and that the supposedly distinct groups of the republic were merely subvarieties of a common stock. At the same time, a counterdiscourse emerged among Chinese scholars in the newly formed disciplines of ethnology and linguistics, a discourse in which China was reimagined as home to many dozens of unique ethnic groups—a newly imported concept also translated using the term *minzu.* Early Chinese Communists began mounting a comparable argument, railing against Chiang Kai-shek's vision of a mono-minzu China, and on behalf of one in which the country was seen as a composite of politically and economically equal ethnonational constituencies.

Following the revolution of 1949, this ethnotaxonomic volatility persisted. In the first census of the People's Republic of China (PRC), carried out in late 1953 and early 1954, officials tabulated over four hundred different responses to the question of minzu identity. This deluge came in response to the Communist Party's promise of ethnonational equality, which entailed a commitment to recognizing the existence of ethnonational diversity to a greater extent than their predecessors had ever been willing to do. Over the course of the subsequent three decades, however, only fifty-five of these were officially recognized, which entailed a remarkable level of categorical compression: from four hundred potential categories of minzu identity to under sixty. The most dramatic case, again, was that of Yunnan Province. Out of the four-hundred-plus names recorded in the 1953–54 census, more than half came from Yunnan alone. Over the following years, however, only twenty-five of these were ultimately recognized by the state.

How do we account for this polyphony of ethnotaxonomic theories? Were there in fact more distinct ethnocultural groups living in the territories of China during the Qing than in the early twentieth century? Had there been a mass exodus? On October 1, 1949, did these communities return, eager to be recognized by the new Communist regime? Clearly, this is not the case. These differences in ethnotaxonomy cannot be accounted for at the level of the categorized. Rather, what changed over the course of this period were the ethnopolitical worldviews of the different Chinese regimes, the modes and methods of categorization they employed, and the political commitments that guided their respective efforts to reconceptualize China in the postimperial era. There was no single "search for a nation in modern Chinese nationalism"—rather, there were searches, in the plural.[2] The Nationalists did not assimilate or expel hundreds of minority groups from the country following the 1911 Revolution. Rather, late republican Nationalists adopted and promoted an ethnotaxonomic worldview wherein the very meaning of the operative term, *minzu,* was defined in such a way so as to disallow the very possibility of a multi-minzu China. Like a "four-sided triangle," a multi-minzu China was for Chiang Kai-shek and others a logical impossibility, a contradiction in terms. Continuing into the Communist period, it is clear that the revolution of 1949 did not prompt an influx of minority communities. Rather, the emergence of the "unified multinational" People's Republic is understandable only when we take into account the radical changes in the very meaning of term *minzu* and the new regime's distinct approach to the "national question."

With these considerations in mind, then, the goal of this book is to move toward a deeper understanding of how the People's Republic came to be composed of fifty-six minzu by examining the history of ethnotaxonomic discourse and practice in the modern period. In other words, the present study will produce what Jane Caplan and John Torpey have described in a Western context as a "history of identification rather than of identities."[3] The centerpiece of this study is China's "Ethnic Classification Project," or *minzu shibie,* a collective term for a series of Communist-era expeditions wherein ethnologists and linguists set out to determine once and for all the precise ethnonational composition of the country, so that these different groups might be integrated into a centralized, territorially stable polity.

By means of the Ethnic Classification Project, the Communist state determined the number, names, and internal compositions of China's officially recognized ethnonational groups. As such, I argue that the project stands at the center of practically all questions of ethnicity in contemporary China, being itself part of the history of each of the minzu categories to which it gave shape and, in some cases, existence. Despite its centrality, however, the details of the project have remained virtually unknown, clouded in a great deal of confusion. When the project is directly addressed in English-language scholarship, which is rarely, it is caught between starkly different interpretations. By some it has been summarily dismissed as "arbitrary"[4] and "procrustean,"[5] and by others vaunted as "ethnographic inquiry into the minutiae of everyday life and local custom"[6] and "perhaps the most extensive series of fieldwork projects ever conducted anywhere on earth."[7] The project, as we will see, was neither of these things—neither a Communist-imposed scheme whose ethnological dimensions can be dismissed as pseudoscience, nor a purely social scientific endeavor that can be treated apart from the broader history of modern Chinese ethnopolitics.

In 1995, the first (and until now, only) dedicated analysis of the Classification was published in the PRC by Shi Lianzhu.[8] For the first time, some of the most basic questions about the project were finally answered: the names of the researchers involved, the timeframes in which they conducted their field research, the ethnonyms of those investigated, and so on. However, the study cautiously and uncritically portrayed the Classification as little more than a process of discovery. Candidate by candidate, phase by phase, the researchers who carried out the project are portrayed as systematically excavating true, preexisting identities of China's minority peoples. The identities of China's non-Han minority groups, it would seem, were carefully unearthed from beneath accumulated layers of misunderstanding.

The tone and analytical approach of the book was a direct reflection of its authorship and the ethnopolitical environment in which it was published. Although written by Shi Lianzhu, a researcher in the Ethnic Classification Project, it was published under the name of Huang Guangxue, a government official in the Nationalities Affairs Commission. Having no interest in raising questions about the accuracy of the project or its taxonomic conclusions—and even less so in revealing that the Chinese state played a significant role in the construction of the country's officially recognized minzu—the text treats the Classification as having played absolutely no role in the ethnogenesis of China's non-Han peoples, an argument that the present study will refute. China's fifty-six-minzu model was not, as Shi and Huang's study suggests, an immaculate conception.

Having announced my central focus as the history of ethnotaxonomic discourse and practice in modern China, and the role of the Classification in the development of the fifty-six-minzu model, I should state clearly that this is in no way meant to suggest that we can discount the findings of historians who have examined the *longue durée* histories of China's non-Han peoples. One simply cannot understand ethnic diversity in Yunnan, for example, without taking into account the topography of the province. Cut up by complex river systems and marked by rapid fluctuations in elevation, Yunnan's geography doubtless has contributed to the splintering of communities and linguistic diversification. Likewise, another key factor has been the province's location at the crossroads of migration and cultural exchange emanating from the civilizational centers of modern-day Southeast Asia, Tibet, and China. This complex and layered history of migration is undoubtedly constitutive of modern Yunnan and its resident communities. The fifty-six-minzu model was not produced by way of discourse alone.

As vitally important as these factors are in the production and enactment of identity, however, an approach based entirely on geography, migration, and deep history ignores the significant role played by taxonomy, and treats categorization unproblematically as the passive description of "pre-existing properties of the world."[9] In doing so, we fail to distinguish between two related but very different histories: the history of *diversification* and the history of *categorization*—that is, between the history of how and why human communities undergo differentiation and/or amalgamation along linguistic, cultural, religious, physical, and other trajectories; and the history of how and why, at different moments in time, specific types of difference are privileged over all others as the organizing criteria of taxonomic work and state infrastructure. The first of these issues is undoubtedly a historical one requiring a *longue durée* perspective that takes into account migration, geography, cultural interaction, and so forth. On its own, however, such a perspective helps us understand only the present-day "plurality" of the region in an overall and nonspecific sense of variation, and not how these communities have come to be categorized into the specific number of minzu recognized today. In order for us to move from the unbounded and ever-shifting plurality of the region to the bounded and fixed "diversity" of the PRC, these *longue durée* histories must be considered in relation to the Ethnic Classification Project, which crafted the prism through which the modern Chinese state, and increasingly the people of China and the world at large, have come to view and understand non-Han Chinese identity. In other words, to explain the present-day diversity of Yunnan, I argue that we must adopt a bifocal view that takes into account both long-term, on-the-ground processes of differentiation and amalgamation, and what Lorraine Daston has described as "salience," a term she employs as "shorthand for the multifarious ways in which previously unprepossessing phenomena come to rivet scientific attention" and thereby "coalesce into domains of inquiry."[10] Only then can we understand how and why contemporary China is understood to be home to fifty-six distinct peoples, as opposed to many hundreds (as in the late Qing imaginary) or one (in the eyes of Guomindang authorities during the first half of the twentieth century).

Our limited knowledge of the Classification derives in large part from the long-standing absence of primary source materials. Until very recently, firsthand reports from the project had been off-limits, greatly limiting our understanding of even the most basic facts about the project: who was involved, when it was undertaken, which ethnonymic groups were investigated, and so on. Fortunately, in reconstructing the history of the 1954 Ethnic Classification Project, I have benefited immensely from five new bodies of sources, compiled from archives, libraries, institutions, and private collections in Beijing, Kunming, Chengdu, London, and Worcester, England.[11]

First, this book constitutes the only study to date to draw upon the actual text of the 1953–54 census registers. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of this source. For the first time, rather than simply recapitulating the oft-cited fact concerning Yunnan Province—namely, that it accounted for more than half of the four-hundred-plus minzu names registered in the inaugural census of the PRC—we will finally be able to see these names, the specific counties from which they hailed, and the populations of each. Rather than starting in the present day and trying to reverse engineer the logic and practice of the Classification, then, we will now be able to understand both the impetus for the project and the specific problems that the team, and the Chinese state, were attempting to resolve. To my way of thinking, this text offers us a vantage point that, although not standing outside of taxonomy in general, does stand outside the "black box" of the fifty-six-minzu paradigm.

A second set of documents, and the one on which the majority of this study is based, is a remarkable collection of recently declassified reports from the 1954 Ethnic Classification itself. These are firsthand (and mainly handwritten) reports from the project that contain unprecedented detail regarding groups who, in terms of the official discourse of the PRC, no longer exist as minzu. As with the census materials, these reports allow us to witness taxonomy in action, rather than trying to reconstruct the logic of Classification based on evidence from the post-Classification world. A sample of the titles of these documents bespeak the vast differences between pre- and post-Classification sources:

"The Languages of the Shuitian, Luoluo, Zhili, Ziyi, Lang'e, and Talu Minzu of Yongsheng County"

"Report on the Investigation into the Situation of the 'Liming' Minzu of Yongsheng County"

"Transcript of the Visitation with the 'Liude' Minzu of Lude Village in the Second Area of Yongsheng County"

"Materials from the Investigation of the 'Mili' Minzu of Xinping County"[12]

Anyone familiar with the fifty-six minzu model will know that *none* of the minzu listed here—the Liming, Liude, Mili, and others—officially exist in the contemporary PRC. There is no Liming display at the ethnological museum in Beijing, no Liude figurine in the minority doll set, and no "Brief History of the Mili." But owing to the unique historical context of these documents—after the Communist revolution, yet before the stabilization of a standardized ethnotaxonomic orthodoxy—we will finally be able to follow the classification process when the future was still "to be determined," at a time when there could have been a Shuitian minzu, a Liude minzu, a Mili minzu, and so forth. What is more, these reports enable us to hear something we have never been able to hear before: the voices of Classification interviewees whose self-reported ethnonyms circa 1954 have, by the present day, all but disappeared, unknown even to seasoned Chinese ethnologists. We will hear from those who opposed the Classification team's taxonomic hypotheses, those who supported them and, most intriguingly, those whose opinions and worldviews changed *during the course of the Classification itself.*

Third, my analysis of Chinese ethnotaxonomy in the first half of the twentieth century has benefited greatly from the Republican Era Periodicals Reading Room at Sichuan University. Thanks to this first-class collection of original edition academic, professional, and regional newspapers, magazines, journals, and short-run series, I was able to investigate the development of early Chinese ethnology in its original context, rather than through the lens of "collected volumes" that have since been republished for each of China's foremost anthropologists, linguists, sociologists, and ethnologists. These latter collections, while doing a wonderful service to scholarship by preserving and republishing the seminal works of key scholars, cut out of the picture those scholars not considered worthy of republication and those articles not deemed essential to an understanding of each given scholar's overall contribution. The first editorial process canonizes ethnology on a scholar-by-scholar basis, and the second process canonizes the individuals themselves on an article-by-article basis. At each step, the historical context of early Chinese ethnology disappears from view, particularly the work of ethnotaxonomy, considered as merely the "means" to the more significant "ends" of ethnological research.

Fourth, this is the first study to draw upon the unpublished materials of Henry Rodolph Davies, the turn-of-the-century British military officer who, as we will see, is responsible for developing an ethnic taxonomy of Yunnan that was later adopted by early twentieth-century Chinese ethnologists and linguists and, ultimately, by the Ethnic Classification team in 1954. Read in collaboration with his book *Yün-nan: The Link Between India and the Yangtze*, published in 1909, these unpublished journals offer unprecedented insight into the early taxonomic work of this practically unknown figure.

Finally, I was immensely fortunate to be able to conduct oral history interviews with five of the members of the 1954 Yunnan Province Ethnic Classification re-

search team: Shi Lianzhu, Xu Lin, Zhou Yaowen, Yan Ruxian, and Wang Xiaoyi. Surprised to find a foreign researcher interested in, and even cognizant of, a project that has been all but forgotten in China, each of these scholars went out of his or her way to provide assistance, information, and encouragement. In particular, I am indebted to Professor Wang Xiaoyi, whose centrality to this story deserves a special introduction.

I met Professor Wang in the winter of 2003 at the Central University for Nationalities. During our initial interviews in his Beijing apartment, I could sense that his memories of the early 1950s were remarkably vivid. Most stirring was the account of his 1951 trip to Tibet with the Eighteenth Army and his professor Lin Yaohua. The experience started rather precipitously for Wang, who was still a nineteen-year-old student of sociology at Yanjing University when he was approached by his professor. Lin, the esteemed anthropologist and ethnologist who had come of age professionally in the latter half of the Republican period (1911–49), asked Wang if he would be interested in joining the expedition. Wang agreed without hesitation, with the exuberance and impetuousness befitting a young man his age. Lin Yaohua sought out Wang's other professors and negotiated on his student's behalf: Wang rushed to complete his remaining graduation requirements and set out for Lhasa with Lin in June.

Professor Wang recounted to me the severity of the mountain ascent, the oxygen-depleted atmosphere, and an audioscape punctuated by the heaving breaths of the team's pack animals. The yaks respired with the struggling cadence of a steam locomotive, Wang recalled, a sound that he reproduced for me in the form of three exaggerated expulsions of breath. The last stretch of the journey was particularly unforgettable: a two-month march from Chamdo—the site of a devastating battle for Tibetan forces just months earlier—to Lhasa, during which the terrain had grown so steep and the air so thin that the team could sometimes manage only a dozen or so yards each hour. From Chamdo onward, moreover, Wang began nursing a dull but persistent pain in his jaw. Over the next sixty days, as the team forded a series of mountain peaks, the toothache grew worse. Naïvely, I remarked, "So you had to wait until Lhasa to have your tooth taken care of?" He chuckled courteously and responded, as if recalling the sensation: "I had to wait until I got back to Beijing, two years later."

The conversation turned then to the Ethnic Classification Project of 1954. "What month was the team formed?" I inquired, aware that this was a rather specific question to ask of events which took place nearly one half-century ago. Wang's eyes reoriented upwards and paused for five long seconds. Just as I began to resign to what was clearly a reasonable lacuna in his otherwise formidable recall, Wang exited the room for a few brief moments, and returned holding a plainly bound book. "1954," he repeated, and began to leaf through the pages. "February . . . March . . . April . . . " he spoke in the muted, elongated syllables of one reflecting out loud. It was then that I realized what he was holding: this book was Wang Xiaoyi's diary from 1954, a diary that, as I would soon learn, he updated in detail on a daily basis throughout the Classification project. He took precise notes on each meeting, each lecture, each preparation session, and each interview. Just as importantly, he kept close tabs on the quotidian rhythms of the expedition: haircuts, visits to the bookstore, laundry, visits to the infirmary, and even nights at the opera.

Over the course of our meetings, Wang led me through the expedition on a day-by-day basis. As I shuttled back and forth between Beijing and the archives in southwest China, moreover, I had the unique pleasure of comparing and corroborating Wang's diary accounts against those of the original Classification reports, and also of re-presenting both Professor Wang and other members of the team with photocopied versions of the 1954 documents. Looking over the pages of the reports, some of which were written by his own hand, Wang was caught off guard. I received a similar reaction from Shi Lianzhu. When presenting him with his writings from the project, the tempo and cadence of Shi's normally robust and commanding temperament subsided noticeably. In an uncharacteristically subdued and self-reflective moment, he remarked: "I haven't seen these since I submitted them to Professor Lin in 1954."

Together, these new sources unveiled to this student of twentieth-century Chinese state formation, ethnicity, social science, and taxonomy a window of unprecedented clarity through which I was able to observe the very earliest stages of perhaps the largest social engineering project in human history: the construction of the "unified, multinational People's Republic of China."

STRUCTURE AND METHODOLOGY

The creation, animation, and maintenance of the fifty-six-minzu model is a topic whose scope far exceeds the bounds of any single volume. The goal of this study is more circumscribed, but at the same time ambitious in its own right. Here we will investigate the 1954 Yunnan Province Ethnic Classification Project, the single most complex piece within China's ethnonational puzzle. Chapter 1 opens with a close analysis of the reasons for the expedition, with particular attention paid to the inaugural census of the People's Republic of China. When designing the census schedule, Communist authorities decided to break with convention and pose the question of ethnonational identity as an open-ended, fill-in-the-blank inquiry. Quite unlike most modern censuses, there were no predetermined ethnonyms from which to choose and no check boxes—just a blank in which registrars were instructed to record faithfully whatever answer was provided by the registrant. As we will see, this led to the creation of one of the most intriguing registration documents in the history of the modern state, one in which no less than twenty of the resulting "nationalities" in Yunnan Province were registered with populations of *one person each*, and

many others with populations of two, five, ten, and so forth. More importantly, we will see how the Communist state's initial approach to the question of categorization—one in which each registrant was permitted to self-identify at will—resulted in failure and prompted the formation of the Yunnan Province Ethnic Classification Research Team. To undertake a highly objectivist categorization of the peoples of Yunnan was the state's second choice, a "Plan B" prompted by a political crisis.

More broadly, chapter 1 places the early Communist period in a framework with which it is still not commonly associated, China's postimperial transition and the tortuous history of transformation from empire to nation-state. As James Townshend, Pamela Crossley, Magnus Fiskesjö, and others have argued, the Communists were attempting to resolve a problem that, in effect, was left over from the collapse of the multiethnic Qing empire, and that subsequent regimes had failed to answer.[13] By carrying out the systematic recognition of minority populations, particularly in the distant western borderlands, the Communists were attempting to reintegrate the former Qing territories into a unified polity, left in pieces after the revolutionaries of 1911 initially rejected those Qing discourses and practices designed to legitimate Manchu rule over non-Manchu subjects. I see the endeavors of early Communist state officials, and their social scientific advisors, as an attempt to reestablish territorial integrity and to legitimate a state in which a predominantly Han Chinese regime would govern a highly diverse polity encompassing peoples of strikingly different linguistic, cultural, religious, and social backgrounds. In our ongoing attempt to understand "how the Qing became China," I argue that we must include the early Communist period, and the Ethnic Classification Project more specifically, in our narratives.[14]

Chapter 2 takes us to the opening weeks of the project where we find a small group of Beijing scholars attempting to make sense of the overwhelming task confronting them: to categorize the minorities of Yunnan Province, one of the most ethnically variegated on earth, *in less than six months*. Under these draconian time constraints, this group of ethnologists and linguists had no chance to develop an ethnotaxonomic framework *de novo*. Rather, as we will see, they came to rely on an existing framework, one whose genealogy traces back through the Republican period and, ultimately, to the work of an obscure, turn-of-the-century British colonial officer by the name of Henry Rodolph Davies. The Davies model, as we will see, came to define the ethnotaxonomic worldview of Republican-era Chinese ethnologists and, incredibly, the work of the Classification team in 1954.

By delineating this relationship, my objective is to demonstrate that the epistemological and methodological foundations of the Classification trace their genealogies, first, beyond the "1949 divide," and second, outside of the political circles in which scholars often ground their studies of contemporary Chinese ethnopolitics.[15] It was not the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, nor even its team of experts at the Nationalities Affairs Commission, that first decided that Yunnan was

home to roughly two dozen minzu. Instead, this decision was reached by Chinese ethnologists and linguists in the 1930s and 1940s, well before the Ethnic Classification ever existed, and before anyone knew that the Chinese Communists would proclaim victory on October 1, 1949. And when the Classification was undertaken in 1954, my research shows that Chinese ethnologists and linguists were at the helm of the project, not the limited number of Communist cadres who took part. Rather than caricaturizing twentieth-century Chinese taxonomists as handmaidens of the state, then, I pay close attention to the ways in which these "establishment intellectuals" articulated, defended, and ultimately attained paradigmatic status on behalf of their epistemological, ontological, and methodologically approaches to minzu and minzu taxonomy.[16] It was they who designed the blueprints of ethnic diversity in Yunnan; they who, to answer Partha Chatterjee's question to Benedict Anderson in a contemporary Chinese context, first imagined these communities.[17] To adopt a broader, more comparative perspective, then, the objective of this chapter is to place the Classification within the larger, transnational history of the modern social sciences (ethnology and linguistics, in particular), modern governmentality, and the intimate relationship that has long existed between the two.[18]

In chapter 3, we follow these Beijing scholars to the capital of Yunnan Province, where they convened with the other half of the Ethnic Classification team. The Yunnan contingent, which comprised the team's only state and party representatives, attempted to enforce its epistemic authority over the project, particularly over the team's academic contingent whose metropolitan and "ivory tower" backgrounds made them somewhat suspect in the eyes of local Communist leaders. In particular, the political directors of the Classification instructed the team's ethnologists and linguists to assess the claims of local minority communities in accordance with the Soviet definition of nationality (*natsia*) as articulated by Joseph Stalin. According to Stalin's criteria, a *natsia*—which Chinese Communist authorities took as the Russian equivalent of the Chinese term *minzu*—could only exist in the capitalist mode of production, for only in the capitalist stage could a community come to share the four "commonalities" that Stalin regarded as the essential ingredients of nationhood: common territory, common language, common economic mode of production, and common psychology or culture.[19] For groups who had yet to enter the capitalist stage, they were to be classified not as full-fledged minzu, but as one of the three other forms of human organization: clans, tribes, or tribal federations.

The research contingent did not accept this mandate, as we will see, and instead undertook a sophisticated reconceptualization of minzu that departed from the one prescribed by Communist state authorities. Based on a dynamic concept I call "ethnic potential," team leader Lin Yaohua developed an enlarged definition of minzu that encompassed not only fully realized national minority groups, but also embryonic or inchoate assemblages that, while lacking the four commonalities outlined in the Stalinist definition, demonstrated the "potential" of achieving such com-

monalities in the future. This definition of minzu had the dual effect of liberating the team's social scientific contingent from the dictates of the Stalinist model, while also opening up a wide space into which the Chinese state would be free, and indeed required, to intervene and oversee the actualization of these "potential" minzu in the post-Classification period.

These findings require us to revisit our prevailing assumptions about the Classification, the most persistent of which has been that the project was undertaken in slavish obedience to Soviet theories. It was not. And for those scholars of Chinese ethnicity who have long doubted this oversimplified view, but who have been unable to provide empirical corroboration, chapter 3 confirms their suspicions. In his pioneering work of over a decade ago, for example, Dru Gladney delineated how the Hui were able to achieve official minzu status despite their failure to comply with Stalin's definition.[20] Louisa Schein has since brought to light similar contradictions vis-à-vis the Miao, as has Ralph Litzinger for the Yao.[21] James Millward has speculated that, "in the days when Marxist-Leninist approaches were still de rigueur, many Chinese historians often simply book-ended their articles with boiler-plate recitations of Marxist themes and then went about their own business in the central sections."[22] Through an analysis of recently declassified sources from the Classification, this chapter finally provides evidence for what these scholars have long suspected.[23]

Chapter 4 accompanies the Classification team into the field, observing taxonomy in action. Here, the researchers' categorical models began to buckle under the pressure of a new set of requirements that Chinese ethnologists and linguists in the past had never had to deal with: the consent of the categorized. To secure such consent, which was a crucial factor in determining the ethnic potential of a proposed minzu grouping, researchers came to rely on methods developed by Communist organizers, strategies designed to transform the worldviews of their minority informants *during the interview process itself.* As we will see, these strategies varied greatly, depending on the extent to which interviewees either agreed or disagreed with the team's taxonomic hypotheses. At one end of the spectrum, scholars carefully orchestrated the interview process, gathering together representatives of those candidate groups that it intended to merge and then, through a set of techniques I term "participant transformation," setting the conditions under which these candidates came to "realize" (seemingly on their own) the bonds they shared with one another. On the other end of the spectrum, entrenched opposition prompted the team to draw upon an even more complex, covert, and epistemically violent repertoire, including what the team called "persuasion work" *(shuofu gongzuo).*

More broadly, this chapter enables us to see more clearly how Lin Yaohua's concept of "ethnic potential" played a central role in the taxonomic practice of the team. Researchers based their taxonomic recommendations on an estimation of whether or not, based on both objective linguistic data and more affective interview data, a given cluster of applicants could reasonably be merged and transformed into a cohesive minzu unit by the state *after* the Classification was over. In one example from the chapter, that of the Achang, we will see that the team based their proposed merger of three applicant communities according to their hypothesis that such communities would be susceptible to a process we might call "Achangization." Insofar as their languages were similar enough, and owing to the malleability of self-consciousness, these communities demonstrated enough potential for unification, the team felt. The same was true for the category "Yi," which, by the close of the project, would inherit more than three dozen new "branches." As with the Achang and "Achangization," each of the subordinated groups would, the team advised, need to undergo a process we might call (somewhat clumsily) "Yi-ization." Non-Han citizens in the post-Classification period have thus been the subject of two state-led programs of nationalization: one geared toward "becoming Chinese," and the other toward becoming Achang, Bai, Lisu, Wa, Yi, Zhuang, and so forth.[24]

Chapter 5 expands our temporal purview and reviews the wide and seemingly disparate array of discourses and practices in the post-Classification era that have contributed to the Achangization of the Achang, the Lisu-ization of the Lisu, and so forth. Whereas I will not claim that such projects have been completely successful, or that every individual in China categorized as Lisu, Miao, Yi, or otherwise everywhere and always self-identifies with the official designations, nevertheless I do contend that the post-Classification period has witnessed the development of an immense, robust, and virtually ubiquitous infrastructure whose objective is to bring the quotidian, on-the-ground experience of ethnicity into ever-closer concordance with the fifty-six-minzu model. Whatever the private sentiments of party cadres, state authorities, ethnologists, linguists, publishers, filmmakers, choreographers, musicians, tour guides, museum curators, toy manufacturers, clothing designers, or otherwise, the development and dissemination of policies, knowledge, cultural artifacts, and artistic productions must necessarily abide by the country's ethnotaxonomic orthodoxy. And whatever the sentiments of average non-Han citizens, all but those willing to adopt openly confrontational postures vis-à-vis the state and the party must interface with the political and economic infrastructure as a member of the Lisu, Miao, Yi, Zhuang, or one of the other official minorities.

At the same time, chapter 5 poses the inverse yet intimately related question: as the fifty-six officially recognized categories have become increasingly reified and ubiquitous, where have the unrecognized categories gone? Where are the hundreds of ethnonyms that refer to communities not recognized as minzu by the state? As we will see, many remain accessible, although they are dispersed in some unlikely places. Others, however, are probably lost for good. I argue that by fostering these simultaneous processes of emergence and disappearance, the Chinese state has been remarkably successful in bringing about a "convergence" between ethnotaxonomic theory and practice, a term Geoffrey Bowker and Susan Leigh Star describe as the

purposive act of changing the world "such that the system's description of reality becomes true."[25]

Having outlined the structure of the book, a few further words are necessary regarding certain methodological issues. Much like the 1954 Ethnic Classification research team, the reader will encounter a bewildering array of ethnonyms all from a large, landlocked province of southwest China slightly smaller than California. Some of the historical figures we will meet regarded Yunnan as home to over two hundred distinct groups, whereas others saw it as home to one hundred, two dozen, or only one. Each of these competing taxonomies, moreover, contain names that differ, not only from the official ethnic taxonomy of the PRC today, but also from one another. This is all to say: Yunnan in the early 1950s was not merely "illegible," to borrow from the terminology of James Scott.[26] It was a taxonomic labyrinth.

This poses a distinct challenge to both the reader and the author. Confronted with this confusing array of names, the initial temptation is to begin by sorting everybody out, outlining their ethnic names, their customs, the languages they speak, and the parts of Yunnan they inhabit. Ideally, we might start with a distribution map, thereby anchoring our analysis in a clear sense of the provincial ethnoscape. We might also provide an overview of Yunnan's history, showing where each of these contemporary groups originated and how they came to reside in their current locations. To make sense of the province's hopelessly complex mosaic of ethnic names, we might also provide a concordance detailing the relationships of taxonomic synonymy that connect Shan and Dai, Yi and Lolo, Miao and Hmong, or Hani and Woni, to name just three common commensurations.[27] Another set of "a.k.a." commensurations could be used to link contemporary ethnonyms with historical categories, tracing lines from the minzu of today to various "barbarians" inscribed in imperial Chinese texts. Furthermore, we might rehearse the etymological history of the term *minzu*, that notoriously contested word that, since its importation to China from Japan in the late nineteenth century, has been used by widely different communities of practice to translate no fewer than four politically charged concepts: race, nation, nationality *(natsia)*, and ethnic group. In other words, the editorial inclination is to *classify* the peoples of Yunnan in advance, so that we would know about whom we are talking.

At first glance, the benefits of disambiguation seem readily apparent. By providing a "starter classification" of the ethnic groups of Yunnan, we would be able to study the Classification in two discrete steps: first, by identifying who the people of Yunnan *really* are, and second, by figuring out how various taxonomists in Chinese history categorized them (and by extension, how well or poorly they performed their tasks). The reader could use this author's taxonomy to assess the integrity of the one formulated in 1954, akin to a gemological test in which the hardness of one stone is assayed by scratching it against another. As a study of taxonomy and identification, however, I have decided that each of these inclinations needs be to resis-

ted and, in both the analysis performed and the narrative produced, replaced with an approach that leaves unresolved the very taxonomic ambiguities and complexities that our historical agents were attempting to disambiguate and simplify. When confronted with scholars and politicians who were, through the formulation of a variety of classificatory schema, trying to "combine likes" and reduce complexity, my analysis of their actions will not be predicated on the goal of evaluating their conclusions or attempting to replace them with my own. Phrased more broadly, my contention is that one cannot examine taxonomy by assuming the role of taxonomist. What I am interested in understanding is, as Alain Desrosières has described it in a Western context, the "social history of the creation of equivalence."[28] In this respect, my study resonates with the insights of Nelson Goodman, Mary Douglas, Paul Feyerabend, Bruno Latour, Ian Hacking, Geoffrey Bowker, Susan Leigh Star, and others whose scholarship has inspired us to look more deeply into "how classification works."[29]

With this in mind, my study observes a set of principles that, insofar as they are rarely cited explicitly in the course of the book, merit outlining here. First, following Bowker and Star, I will assume that, if a category "did not exist contemporaneously, it should not be retroactively applied."[30] As such, I have opted not to examine the Classification through the lens of one or another of China's fifty-six recognized minzu. Whereas this approach is virtually axiomatic among scholars who investigate ethnicity in China, and has undoubtedly advanced our understanding of the Chinese ethnosphere to an unprecedented degree, it has also produced unintended side effects, particularly with regards to the Classification. First and foremost, since the groups officially recognized now were not recognized at the time of the Classification, the use of any one contemporary group as an optic through which to study the Classification confines us to a teleological reading. Moreover, a single-minzu approach pushes from view one of the fundamental characteristics of the project, namely, the sheer number of applicants groups between which researchers had to adjudicate. The Classification in Yunnan was not carried out on a candidate-by-candidate basis, but was rather a differential process wherein the categorical fate of each community was highly dependent upon its relationship to other communities in the region. To work on any one group in particular would render these relationships invisible.

Second, I will not attempt to fix the definition of *minzu* in advance, nor will I pit my own definition thereof against the historical agents in my book. Unlike Walker Connor and others who lament the "terminological chaos" that surrounds concepts such as nation, ethnic group, and so forth—and who have made clear their desire to demarcate such concepts so as to facilitate more rigorous, cross-comparative work—I consider the ambiguity of these terms, as well as ongoing efforts to standardize them, to be a fundamental part of the history of the social sciences, the modern state, and the ongoing collaboration there-between.[31] For Chiang Kai-shek, for

example, his objective vis-à-vis the term *minzu* was to link it inextricably to the ideas of singularity and indivisibility, and thereby advance a concept of a unitary "Zhonghua minzu" within which no divisions could be recognized. Opposing him were not only the Chinese Communists, but also Chinese ethnologists, both of whom advocated (in different ways) a concept of minzu grounded firmly in notions of plurality and diversity. Thus, the reason that minzu, circa 1954, is inextricably tied to the concept of diversity has less to do with the etymology of the term than with the particular history of this ethnopolitical debate and, to put it crudely, the fact that the Communists won. Rather than providing one consistent translation of minzu, then, I do my best to adjust my translations to match the particular worldview of the writer in question. For Chiang Kai-shek, the *Zhonghua minzu* signified a broad, indivisible totality—as such, I have decided to translate his minzu as "Chinese people" and/or "Chinese nation." For Chinese Communists operating within a decidedly Marxist-Leninist nomenclature, the translation of choice is "nationality." For Chinese ethnologists, by contrast, the concept of minzu was set equal to the English-language terms "ethnicity" and "ethnic group" (as evidenced by their choice of "minzuxue," or "the study of minzu," as the standard translation of the disciplinary title "ethnology"). At the same time, because ethnologists also found themselves operating within the ethnopolitical terrain of the era, there are multiple occasions in which I translate minzu as "nation," "nationality," or "people," even when issuing forth from the pens of Chinese social scientists.

There is only one major exception to this otherwise flexible approach, and that pertains to my translation of the most important term in my study, *minzu shibie*. Despite the fact that this term can be translated as a "Nationalities" Classification Project, thereby privileging Chinese Communist nomenclature, I am committed to "Ethnic Classification" for one very simple reason: whereas there has been a long-standing assumption that the project was a Communist-directed enterprise, and that the participating social scientists played a minor role, my study demonstrates that the Classification was primarily the work of ethnologists and linguists.

In one final point, I should note from the outset that this study makes no attempt to falsify the findings of the 1954 Classification or the broader fifty-six-minzu model to which it contributed. I do this not because they are nonfalsifiable—they most certainly are—but because such an approach actually prevents us from understanding the logic according to which the project was undertaken, and the logic according to which "nationality work" has been carried out in the post-Classification period. As we will see, those who helped build the fifty-six-minzu model, and those who help maintain it today, did and do not think of it as a high-fidelity representation of presently existing realities, but rather as a semidescriptive, semi-prescriptive blueprint of what could exist in the future with the help of state intervention. The objective of the team in 1954 was never strictly that of describing already existing, already stable "imagined communities," but rather that of outlin-

ing a set of plausible, or "imaginable" minzu categories that it would be feasible for the state to actualize in the post-Classification world—categories that would be "good enough for government use," we might say. Thus, for those who would attempt to disprove the fifty-six-minzu model by citing contradictory fieldwork findings, the architects of the model need only respond that the framework is still under construction, and that the realization of these categories is still a work-in-progress. This actualization, I argue, has been one of the fundamental objectives of the coordinated set of projects and enterprises collectively referred to as "nationality work" *(minzu gongzuo)*.

With this structure and method in mind, we now travel to Beijing circa 1952, where we find a fledgling Communist regime attempting to consolidate its political control and establish a stable government on the mainland. In doing so, one of the primary challenges they faced was the so-called nationality question.

2

Ethnicity as Language

Among those who research ethnic groups in the southwest, there is no one who does not take H. R. Davies' taxonomy as his starting point.

—DING SU, 1941

In the closing weeks of April 1954, a small group of scholars in Beijing began to discuss the Herculean task that awaited them in Yunnan. The Classification team would have less than six months to prosecute a coordinated, multisite investigation and produce a series of definitive taxonomic recommendations about the province's minority groups. Their findings would result in a complete reassessment of the country's ethnonational demography, moreover, and not simply in the development of ethnological knowledge. They would influence not merely the direction of their discipline, but also China's administrative geography, the allocation of economic and political resources, and entire domains of cultural production. In this chapter we will examine how the team was able to fulfill this immense task in the time allotted. In particular, we will examine the criteria and methodology they adopted in response to the census and the chaotic and confusing body of demographic data contained therein.

The Beijing group was led by Lin Yaohua, who had been appointed vice-director of the Ethnic Classification research team. Lin was a native of Fujian Province, having received his master's degree in 1935 from the Department of Sociology at Yanjing University. As one of the star pupils of the renowned Wu Wenzao, he went on to Harvard University in 1937, where he completed his doctoral work over the next few years. Upon graduating, Lin immediately made a name for himself, garnering praise for his first two books, *The Golden Wing: A Sociological Study of Chinese Family* and *The Lolo of Liangshan.*[1] Following 1949, Lin went on to conduct ethnological field research in Inner Mongolia (1950), Tibet (1951), and Inner Mongolia once again (1953). During the first of his trips, Lin was accompanied by many of the scholars who were now part of the Classification team, including Shi Lianzhu, Wang Furen, Huang Shuping, and Wang Xiaoyi.[2]

TABLE 2 Yunnanese Groups Outlined by Luo Jiguang

Achang	Minjia
Benglong	Naxi
Burmese	Nong
Chashan	Nu
Dai	Puman
Hani	Qiu
Jingpo	Sha˙
Kawa	Tibetan
Lahu	Xifan
Langsu	Yao
Lisu	Yi
Miao	Zaiwa

On April 26, during a late afternoon session, the team met to tackle the problem of taxonomic criteria. Lin, who had departed for Kunming that morning, was not present at the meeting, inviting Luo Jiguang to address the team in his absence. Luo (1914–78) was a specialist in the minority languages of the southwest, trained at Peking University under Luo Changpei, one of the most influential linguists in modern Chinese history. He graduated in 1936 and went on to teach at National Yunnan University and at the Linguistic Research Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Along with his colleague Fu Maoji, he became increasingly involved in minority language script development, one of the major priorities of the early PRC period for the Communist state.[3]

During that late April session, Luo argued that the profusion of ethnonyms confronting the Classification team could be reduced at the outset to just over twenty discrete groups. There was only one proviso: the team would need to treat language as a surrogate for minzu identity, in essence ceding the question of ethnic taxonomy to the discipline of linguistics.[4] Luo outlined twenty-four groups in all (see table 2).

Luo Jiguang was not the sole exponent of this position. Three days later, on the afternoon of April 29, the Classification team invited linguist Ma Xueliang (1913–99), also a Republican-era graduate of Peking University. Ma's lecture, entitled "The Utility of Language in the Course of Investigations," elaborated upon Luo's point and rephrased it with even greater simplicity and precision: before conducting ethnological investigations in Yunnan, linguistic categorization should be carried out first. Once language-based comparisons and classification had yielded the basic contours of identity in the province, researchers could follow up with studies of local culture, customs, and so forth.[5]

In addition to these advisors, the Ethnic Classification team also comprised a group of linguists who shared an identical outlook. The most important was Fu Maoji, a specialist in the minority languages of the southwest and prize student of

TABLE 3 Yunnanese Groups Outlined by Luo Changpei and Fu Maoji in 1954

Achang	Naxi
Benglong	Nong
Burmese	Nu
Buyi	Puman
Chashan	Qiang
Dai	Qiu
Hani	Sha
Jiarong	Tibetan
Jingpo	Wa
Lahu	Xifan
Langsu	Yao
Lisu	Yi
Miao	Zaiwa
Minjia	Zhuang

SOURCE: Luo Changpei and Fu Maoji, "*Guonei shaoshuminzu yuyan wenzi de qingkuang* [The Situation of Linguistic Scripts for Domestic Minority Nationalities]," *Zhongguo yuwen* (1954).

Luo Changpei. Fu Maoji was appointed to work alongside Lin Yaohua as vice-director of the Yunnan Province Ethnic Classification research team, and to oversee the team's corps of language specialists. In collaboration with Luo Changpei, Fu had published a largely identical taxonomy even before the advent of Classification, proposing the very same argument that their colleagues were now presenting to the Classification team. In a March 1954 article published in *Chinese Philology,* Luo and Fu contended that "among the approximately 140 ethnonyms in Yunnan, many are the same in reality and different in name alone. If one treats the possession of an independent language as our criterion, then these ethnonyms could be merged into twenty-five or so groups."[6] In that article, Luo Changpei and Fu Maoji produced a taxonomy that included the groups shown in table 3.

With the exception of the Buyi, Jiarong, Qiang, and Zhuang, the pair's taxonomy was identical to the one proposed by Luo Jiguang to the Classification team. The similarity of their taxonomies is even more pronounced when contrasted against those of the central and provincial Nationalities Affairs Commissions seen in chapter 1, as well as the inaugural census of the PRC. Whereas these texts listed hundreds of minzu, leading Chinese linguists regarded Yunnan as home to roughly two dozen. As we will see in this chapter and the next, the Classification team ultimately did accept this commensuration, adopting language-based categorization as the taxonomic foundation of the project. Where, however, did this paradigm come from? How did language become an accepted surrogate for ethnic identity? More broadly, where did the taxonomic and epistemological foundations of the Classification come from, most notably its commitment to the formulation of a highly limited and mu-

tually exclusive set of identity categories? Traditionally, the answer to this question has been to treat the Ethnic Classification Project as a uniquely Communist affair, one in which CCP officials at the central and provincial levels more or less indiscriminately created such categories and imposed them upon both ethnic minorities and ethnologists. To the extent that scholars have pointed to pre-1949 antecedents, or deeper historical continuities, attention has been paid in large part to a presumed Sino-Soviet connection—the idea being, once again, that the Chinese Communists undertook this categorical imposition in lock step with the dictates of Soviet precedent and Soviet advisors.

In this chapter we will see that the origins of this taxonomic worldview fall well before the 1949 divide and bear the imprint, not of Soviet colonial practices, but of those emanating from the British Empire and its loose, transnational network of amateur ethnologists and linguists. This story takes us back to the waning years of the Qing dynasty and to an unlikely starting point: the work of an obscure British military officer by the name of Henry Rodolph Davies. It was his 1909 work, championed and only partly modified by Republican era Chinese social scientists, that became the foundation of Chinese ethnological studies of the southwest, the 1954 Ethnic Classification Project and, indeed, the present-day classification of ethnic groups in Yunnan. In the ongoing story of colonial anthropological practice in Africa, South Asia, North America, Taiwan, and so forth, we must now include southwest China.

H. R. DAVIES AS THE LINK BETWEEN INDIA AND THE YANGZI

Henry Rodolph Davies was born on September 28, 1865, the second son of Henry Fanshawe Davies and Ellen Christopher Alexander Hankey. Centered in Worcestershire, the Davies family was steeped in a long tradition of military service to the British empire. Davies' grandfather and great uncle were both veterans of the Peninsular War. Davies' father had become a "young gentleman" in the British Navy at the age of twelve, and at age fifteen was dispatched to South Asia to serve in the Second Anglo-Burmese War. By the time his son Henry Rodolph was born, he had acceded to the rank of lieutenant colonel, and was later promoted to lieutenant general.[7]

Davies received his education at Eton and excelled at the study of languages. In addition to French, "Hindustani," and Persian, in which his school records listed him as being highly proficient, he had also reached intermediate levels in Burmese, Pushtu (Pashto), and Chinese.[8] As evidenced by this assemblage of languages, Davies had his eyes trained on Britain's colonial sphere of influence in Asia. Cartographically, his linguistic schooling traced a long crescent, originating in Afghanistan and sweeping through northern India, Burma, and the Sino-Burmese border region of southwest Yunnan.[9]

Having obtained his commission in August of 1884, Davies was dispatched first

to British-controlled Burma in October 1887, and then to Siam in November of 1892.[10] Davies' experience in China began in 1893, when he was enlisted to serve on the Burmese boundary commission alongside William Warry, the British government's advisor to the government of Burma; the district superintendent of police; fifty men from the Nineteenth Yorkshire Regiment; and two Chinese delegates. Starting on November 17, the team set out for Yunnan from the Burmese side, traveling through the Kachin Hills and the Northern Shan states. Their goal was to find the Chinese passes or "gates" that demarcated the border between Burma and the Qing imperial domain.[11] Over the course of late fall and early winter, the team located three such gates—the Huju Guan (Crouching Tiger Pass), Tianma Guan (Heavenly Horse Pass), and Hanlong Guan (Han Dragon Pass)—fulfilling their objective by January 7, 1894.

Upon completion of their official business, the Chinese deputies invited Davies to stay behind and travel through the province. Davies agreed, and spent the subsequent months sojourning and collecting piecemeal observations of the terrain and the people. On April 3, 1895, he arrived in Simao, only to learn that the local elites were expecting a visit from French travelers in a few days. The local "mandarin" only knew the Frenchman's Chinese name, and so Davies was unable to decipher who it might be. As he discovered later, the traveler was none other than Prince Henri d'Orléans, en route from Tongking. Davies would later read this sojourner's account and find out that d'Orléans and his companions "must have reached Ssu-mao [Simao] the day after I left it."[12]

For Davies, one of the most arresting features of the region was its cultural and racial diversity. During this excursion through southwest China, Davies had his first encounter with a group he recorded as "Nga-ch'ang," whom he described as a "distinct race who do not exist anywhere else."[13] The "Mohammedans," or Hui, also caught his attention, in particular their relationship with the local Chinese. "The two races naturally hate each other and always will do so," he later noted, "but there is no enmity on the outside."[14]

Davies was not alone in his fascination with the non-Chinese peoples of Yunnan. Numerous sojourners, missionaries, and colonial officers found themselves intrigued by the people of the region and the seemingly irreducible complexity of the cultural, linguistic, and social mosaic they formed. Constituting the Other to the Chinese, which in turn constituted a global Other in the minds Euro-American observers, these groups appeared to colonial onlookers in the context of a double, nested alterity. A. R. Colquhoun recounted his journeys through the region, published in the form of meandering travelogues as well as brief articles.[15] In 1911, Samuel Clarke published *Among the Tribes in South-west China* in which he outlined Protestant missionary penetration into the local non-Chinese communities. "There is no family of the human race," he lamented, "of which so little is accurately known as of the non-Chinese races of Southern China. This is in great measure due

to the perfect maze of senseless names, taken from the Chinese, in which the subject is involved."[16] In 1913, French physician A. F. Legendre published *Au Yunnan*, documenting his travels through China's distant frontier regions.[17] One decade later, and perhaps most famously, the Austrian-American polymath Joseph Rock began writing prolifically about the Naxi.[18] For Clarke, Davies, and others, the "perfect maze of senseless names" referred to prevailing conceptualizations of southwest China as a place inhabited by hundreds of groups. In late imperial writings such as the *Yunnan Gazetteer (Yunnan tongzhi), Record of Guizhou (Qianji)*, and other texts, southwest China was presented as a phenomenally complex region where groups were not so much categorized as cataloged.[19]

For European and American observers, such compendia were anathema to the increasingly comparativist and reductive mindset of the social sciences and modern governmentality. Centered in Western Europe and North America, political and academic elites were undergoing a fundamental transformation in the way they went about "knowing" their populations and research subjects. As Alain Desrosières has summarized it, "between 1895 and 1935 the norms presiding over legitimate descriptions of the social world were completely changed."[20] This transformation began in the late nineteenth century, when the development of the comparative social sciences, coupled with the demands of direct political control, prompted state authorities in Europe and elsewhere to abandon existing modes of demographic knowledge and deploy a repertoire of new technologies in their stead. Designed to tame the heterogeneity of their populations and to render them "legible"[21] and "open to the scrutiny of officialdom,"[22] these included national identification cards, passports, birth certificates, composite portraiture, and other forms of demographic technologies. Nicholas Dirks has outlined similar trends in late nineteenth-century India, where state representatives began to criticize earlier demographic manuals and gazetteers as "prolix and insufficiently statistical" and replace them with a highly systematic and comparative form of anthropology.[23] Only generalizable data lent itself to the sort of extrapolation required by modern state bureaucracy.

Davies returned to England where he was honored with the McGregor Award, and where he soon caught the attention of British authorities and business magnates interested in the region.[24] One entrepreneur in particular, John Halliday of the newly formed Yunnan Company, invited Davies to lead an expedition in 1898 to investigate a potential railway route linking India and the Yangzi River by way of Yunnan Province.[25] The British were in competition with the French, their colonial neighbors to the east who, like them, were eager to be the first to develop shorter trade routes into the Qing empire. Were the empire to disintegrate—a geopolitical potentiality never far from the minds of either power—whoever developed this rail link would become the new center of economic gravity for China's resource-rich central and southern provinces, the new magnet toward which the Chinese needle would reorient.[26] Davies would be dispatched to take precise notes on the topography of

northern Burma and southern Yunnan, information critical to the British government and the newly established Yunnan Company in their deliberations over whether to invest in railway development in the region. Davies agreed to the request and was assigned to lead the Burma division of the expedition, along with Lieutenant W. A. Watts-Jones, Captain C. M. D. Ryder, and two engineers from the Yunnan Company. They would be accompanied by the Shanghai group, led by Captain E. Pottinger and Lieutenant C. G. W. Hunter, who would ascend the Yangzi from the east.[27]

In November 1898, Davies arrived in Burma, equipped with a plane-table, a prismatic compass, two aneroid barometers, a boiling-point thermometer, a six-inch sextant, and sketch books.[28] With these instruments, the thirty-four-year-old officer took almost daily measurements of longitude, latitude, altitude, and temperature, maintaining all of these notes in a register he updated methodically. In addition to this information, Davies' register detailed the names of the towns through which they passed, the mileages separating different locales, the directions traveled, and the total distance traversed.[29] Between the start of his journey on November 15, 1899, and the close of his travels on June 29, 1900, Davies crossed 2,442.5 miles of terrain, for a daily average of 10.8 miles during those 226 days.[30]

At the same time, Davies expanded upon the budding ethnographic interests that had begun to take shape three years earlier. Upon encountering different tribes in the region, Davies turned his attention away from his cartographic work and toward the collection of vocabularies, inquiring after local language translations of a long series of words. To each respondent Davies posed a list of over one hundred words:

Man (human being), man (male), woman, child, father, mother, son, daughter, elder brother, younger brother, elder sister, younger sister, husband, wife, head, body, face, nose, mouth, ear, eye, hair, tooth, tongue, back, stomach, leg, arm, hat, turban, coat, trousers, shoe, bag, sword, spear, gun, bow, arrow, stick, house, door, hatch, floor, post, plank, horse, buffalo, cow, pig, goat, dog, cat, chicken, chicken's egg, bird, fish, tiger, gold, silver, copper, iron, village, road, river, hill, field, paddy, rice, cooked rice, tree, leaf, flower, fruit, grass, boat, day, night, fire, water, wind, earth, sand, stone, sky, sun, moon, star, good, big, small, long, short, tall, short or low, broad, narrow, hot, cold, heavy, light, many, few, near, far, thick, thin, wet, dry, old (men), old (things), new, red, yellow, black, white, I, thou, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, one hundred, one thousand, ten thousand, three men, two houses, white house, good man, pound, cook, grind, hold, cut, pierce, shoot, spoil, hurt (transitive), a Chinaman, Lolo, Hsi-fan, Miao-tzu, Tibetan, Lo'p'u, Ku-tsung.[31]

Through the collection, transcription, and comparison of this sample set of vocables, or "specimens" as he referred to them, Davies was drawing upon and placing himself within a long tradition. He was engaging in the collection of what is known as "core" or "basic vocabulary," a practice dating back to the seventeenth century. In 1642 Johannes de Laet defined his sample as "the names of those things which are domestic and most common to that nation."[32] Eventually reified as the "Swadesh list" after the American linguist Morris Swadesh (1909–67), the basic vocabulary contained only those words that pertain to the basic aspects of daily life, are learned early in childhood, and appear frequently in speech, qualities which render them comparatively resistant to replacement by foreign loanwords, making them particularly useful to those engaged in comparative philology.[33] The practice of collecting basic vocabulary developed over the course of the late seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, in the works of Olaus Rudbeck (1675), Gottfried Leibniz (1698), Hiob Ludolf (1702), Rasmus Rask, Johanns Friedrich Fritz (1748), Iwarus Abel (1782), W. Carey (1816), David Bailie Warden (1825, 1834), Jules Sébastien César Dumont d'Urville (1833), Arthur James Johnes (1846), Robert Gordon Latham, S. W. Koelle (1854), and Daniel G. Brinton (1891), among many others.[34]

In southwest China specifically, the collection of vocabulary had become standard practice for sojourners like Davies. In 1872, Abbé Desgodin collected a series of linguistic "specimens" from the "Lu-tzu" and "Mo-so" peoples, publishing his findings in the *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie* in the following year.[35] Others who published or who reported collecting vocabularies in the region included Holt S. Hallett (1886), Paul Vial (1890), Prince Henri d'Orléans (1896), and R. F. Johnson (1908).[36] To supplement his own collections, Davies drew on Desgodins, as well as the collections of E. C. Young and Edward Colborne Baber. Davies organized his "specimens" into a single table, listing the names of the groups he encountered along the top axis, the English terms along the vertical axis, and then transcriptions of local equivalents in the body of the table. Comparative lexical tables of this sort date back to the mid-eighteenth century, seen in the work of Dumont d'Urville, Robert Gordon Latham, and others.[37] Scanning over the transliterations, Davies then set about discerning patterns, which he notated to himself with small checkmarks and marginal codes. For the Hsi-fan and Pru-mi Hsi-fan, he annotated certain vocables with the letter *L* to indicate their similarity to corresponding terms in his Lolo sample. By comparison, a marginal note *T* indicated equivalence with Tibetan, *LT* a more pronounced correlation to Lolo than Tibetan, and *TL* the opposite. For those terms that observed no similarity to others, Davies made no annotation.

Through this method, and in consultation with the vocabulary lists of Desgodin, Davies began to work out a theory of equivalence between the languages of the tribes he encountered in the region.[38] "The Munia Sifan vocabulary and the Sifan vocabulary given by Baber seem nearer Lolo than Tibetan," he noted in his journal. "The P'rü-mi Sifan seems nearer Tibetan than Lolo." "Moso appears rather nearer Munia Sifan than Lolo." In a practice that would later come to be called "lexicostatistics," Davies tabulated rough percentages of similarity, as we see in his comparison of "Lu-tzu," "Lo-Lo," and "Tibetan": "Of 61 Lu-tzu words," Davies noted in the margins of the table, "35 appear closely connected with Tibetan and 6 connected with Lo-Lo where the Lo-Lo words differ from Tibetan."[39]

From these classes of linguistic equivalence, Davies also began to postulate classes of ethnic equivalence. "Lisu near P'u-tu-ho and the Lolos near them call themselves Lei-su," he wrote, "but they are not Lisu. Lei-su are probably the same as Nesu." Further on he noted: "Wo-ni is a general name for the three tribes called Pu-tu, Pi-o, and K'a-tu (or K'a-to as it is pronounced in some districts). These three tribes speak dialects which differ so little that they are mutually intelligible."[40]

Through his postulation of ethnic classes of equivalence by way of linguistic classes of equivalence—particularly a nested set of relationships in which certain dialect subsets were understood to belong to parent categories—Davies was drawing upon the highly influential *stammbaum* or "family tree" theory of language and linguistic reconstruction as first articulated by August Schleicher in the 1860s. Influenced heavily by Charles Darwin, Schleicher's method of genealogical reconstruction relied upon the comparison of grammars and word lists to infer the existence of a common ancestry between seemingly disparate groups.[41] As Bernard Cohn has explained, "the theory of language implicit in the comparative method is that there are 'genetic' or 'genealogical' relations among languages that have been determined to belong to a 'family.' "[42] "As with genealogies," Cohn explains, "which could represent all the members of a family or descent group visually as a tree with a root, trunk, branches, and even twigs, so could dialects and languages be similarly represented."[43] Schleicher's views on language were even more explicit than those suggested here by Cohn. He saw in linguistics the capacity to lend empirical support for Darwin's theory of evolution, perhaps to an even greater extent than could naturalists. With that in mind, he regarded the categories of linguistic taxonomy and those of the natural sciences as correlated: the naturalist's genus (*gattung*) corresponded to linguist's family (*sprachfamilie*), and species (*arten*) to language (*sprachen*).[44] In this way, language provided a window into the ethnic and racial structure of humanity, a structure which could be revealed through the comparison of grammars and vocabularies.

By the nineteenth century, the allure of "ethnological philology" was widespread in Europe and the United States. As one scholar has argued, it was "the maturest and apparently most precise of the disciplines by which . . . men were attempting to trace modern phenomena in an unbroken line to a remote or historical past."[45] Its popularity can be witnessed in the wide array of ethnological and racial treatises whose taxonomies were based on linguistic division. In 1883, for example, Robert Needham Cust (1821–1909) published his highly influential *Modern Languages of Africa*, which subsequently played a central role in the categorization of African ethnicities and tribes.[46] In the United States, one finds the taxonomic work of Swiss philologist and ethnologist Albert Gallatin (1761–1849), who helped to found the American Ethnological Society and later undertook an extensive categorization of Native American languages.[47] Carrying on this tradition and applying it to the classification of Native American identity was Major John Wesley Powell (1834–1902), who served as director of the Bureau of Ethnology from 1879 until his death, publishing his immensely influential "Indian Linguistic Families North of Mexico" in 1891.[48] Powell's language-based taxonomy would later form the basis for the *Handbook of American Indians* published in 1907 and 1911 by the Bureau of American Ethnology.[49] A. L. Kroeber, who would later critique his taxonomy, nevertheless had to acknowledge "the extent and depth of influence which the Powell classification of linguistic stocks has from the day of its promulgation exercised on every aspect of American ethnology."[50] In 1892, Horatio Hale proclaimed this nascent view perhaps most forcefully. "Solely by their languages," Hale contended, "can the tribes of men be scientifically classified." "Linguistic anthropology," he continued," is the only true science of man."[51]

In 1909, Cambridge University Press published Davies' *Yün-nan: The Link Between India and the Yangtze*, a travelogue intended for a more general audience. Accompanied by glossy black-and-white photos of the region and a map of the terrain, the manuscript recounted the warp and weft of his daily travels, tickling readers with tales of the exotic quotidian, complete with accounts of local tribal chieftains, near-death experiences, and the local environment. Whereas the text meanders somewhat disjointedly, reflective of the genre of travel writing popular in the era, one dimension of the province had clearly made an enduring impression on the author: namely, the province's non-Chinese ethnic groups. On the opening page of *Yün-nan*, Davies proclaimed, "It is not only to the statesman and the merchant that Yün-nan will appeal. For the geographer and the explorer there are still many blank spaces on the map. To the geologist and the mining engineer its great mountain ranges must contain much of interest. For the ethnologist, above all, it is a wide field of research in which he might work for a lifetime and still leave much to be done by his successors."[52]

With regards to the ethnic groups of Yunnan, Davies summarized his taxonomic work in the appendix of his manuscript. In the course of roughly forty pages—in every sense the afterthought of an amateur linguist and ethnologist—Davies put forth a revolutionary claim about the demography of Yunnan Province and of southwest China more generally. Whereas imperial gazetteers, local provincial authorities, and popular lore portrayed Yunnan as home to dozens or even hundreds of disparate non-Chinese groups, Davies proposed an ethnic taxonomy which contained only twenty-two (see table 4).

Davies organized Yunnan's non-Chinese population into three broad stocks: Mon-Khmer, Shan-Dai, and Sino-Tibetan. According to his working theory, these original stocks had dispersed across Yunnan and, due to the mountainous terrain, had disintegrated into small enclaves that underwent subsequent processes of estrangement and divergence. Over the course of this history, these three original stocks

TABLE 4 Yunnanese Groups Outlined by Davies*

A-ch'ang (aka Nga-ch'ang)	Miao (aka Mhong)
Hsi-fan	Min-chia (aka Pe-tsö)
Kachin (aka Ching-p'aw)	Mo-so (aka Na-shi)
K'a-mu	Palaung
La	P'u-man
La-hu (aka Lo-hei)	Shan (aka Tai)
La-shi	Tibetan (aka Pê or Pö)
Li-so (aka Li-su)	Wa
Lo-lo (aka Nei-su or Ngo-su)	Wo-ni
Lu-tzŭ (aka A-Nung)	Yao
Ma-ru	Zi (aka A-si or Tsai-wa)

*All "aka's" are those indicated by H. R. Davies in the course of his text.

splintered into twenty-two, whose boundaries could be discerned with the aid of comparative linguistics. Structurally, his taxonomy appeared as shown in table 5.

By his own admission, Davies' taxonomy was based on a very limited number of factors, all of which were linguistic. "I have not as a rule," Davies explained, "attempted to give much detail about the customs and beliefs of these tribes, as it is difficult to get information of this sort of sufficient accuracy to be of value."[53] He went on to acknowledge the limits of his methodology, but nevertheless defended its legitimacy. "That resemblance of language is not necessarily a proof of the relationship of two races is undoubtedly true. Conquest or other causes may have introduced an alien tongue. But if supported by probability and if not contradicted by historical facts or great physical diversity, connection of language may be accepted as affording a *prima facie* case for connection of race."[54]

Davies' self-imposed limitation is reminiscent of observations made by Michel Foucault regarding the efficacy of modern forms of knowledge production. Modern scientific practice derives its power not by expanding the taxonomist's range of observation, but conversely by "limiting and filtering the visible."[55] Depending upon the "systematically negative conditions"[56] one establishes, one is able to model the social world in multifarious ways by canceling out entire fields of potential data.[57] Having chosen this particular form of limited observation, Davies transformed Yunnan and its people into a practically boundless source of readily available data. Every person he met during his travels was a viable research subject.

THE DAVIES MODEL IN REPUBLICAN CHINA

When *Yün-nan* was published in 1909, H. R. Davies was in China celebrating his marriage to Isabel Warwick, daughter of the late Major-General D. K. Evans. The ceremony was conducted in Shanhaiguan, the eastern terminus of the Great Wall

TABLE 5 The Davies Model (groups are in italics)

1.	Sinitic Languages of Yün-nan and Western Ssŭ-ch'uan	1.3.1.1	*Tibetan or Pê or Pö, including probably some Hsi-fan dialects*
1.1	Mon-Khmer Family	1.3.2	Hsi-fan group
1.1.1	Miao-Yao Group	1.3.2.1	*Hsi-fan*
1.1.1.1	*Miao or Mhong*	1.3.2.2	*Mo-so or Na-shi*
1.1.1.2	*Yao*	1.3.2.3	*Lu-tzŭ or A-Nung*
1.1.2	Min-chia Group	1.3.3	Lo-lo group
1.1.2.1	*Min-chia or Pe-tsö*	1.3.3.1	*Lo-lo or Nei-su or Ngo-su*
1.1.2.1.1	Lama-jên[1]	1.3.3.2	*Li-so or Li-su*
1.1.3	Wa-Palaung Group	1.3.3.3	*La-hu or Lo-hei*
1.1.3.1	*Wa*	1.3.3.4	*Wo-ni*
1.1.3.2	*La*	1.3.3.4.1	Ma-hei
1.1.3.3	*P'u-man*	1.3.3.4.2	K'a-to
1.1.3.4	*Palaung*	1.3.3.4.3	Pu-tu
1.1.3.5	*K'a-mu*	1.3.3.4.4	Pi-o
1.2	Shan Family	1.3.3.4.5	A-k'a
1.2.1	[No third order of classification]	1.3.3.4.6	San-su
1.2.1.1	*Shan or Tai and its dialects*	1.3.3.4.7	K'u-ts'ung
1.2.1.1.1	Lü or Shui Pai-yi	1.3.3.4.8	P'u-la
1.2.1.1.2	Sha-jên	1.3.3.4.9	Lo-pi
1.2.1.1.3	Lung-jên	1.3.4	Burmese group
1.2.1.1.4	Tai Che or Tai Hke	1.3.4.1	*A-ch'ang or Nga-ch'ang*
1.2.1.1.5	Tai Nö	1.3.4.2	*Ma-ru*
1.2.1.1.6	Tai Long or Tai Taü	1.3.4.3	*La-shi*
1.2.1.1.7	Tai Lem[2]	1.3.4.4	*Zi or A-si or Tsai-wa*
1.3	Tibeto-Burman Family	1.3.5	Kachin group
1.3.1	Tibetan group	1.3.5.1	*Kachin or Ching-p'aw*

[1]Davies, *Yün-nan*, 372. Davies does not include the Lama-jên in his chart, but does expressly outline them in the text of his study.

[2]Davies, *Yün-nan*, 380–81. As with the Lama-jên, Davies outlines his opinions regarding the Tai Che, Tai Nö, Tai Long, and Tai Lem, but does not include them in his chart.

in Hebei Province.[58] This would be the last time that Davies would spend any extended period of time in the country that had served as his temporary home for much of the preceding decade. In 1911, as the Qing empire was disintegrating, he was dispatched to the European theater, succeeding Brevet-Colonel Fanshawe as head of the Second Battalion of the Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Light Infantry. In the early 1920s, Davies contributed infrequent reviews of books relating to southwestern China, but never again returned to the region.[59] With this, Davies' relationship with China came to an end.

Unbeknownst to Davies, his work began to receive attention in China in the early 1920s, discussed among a small coterie of broadly read and Western-trained scholars. Mention of Davies first appeared in the work of the eminent polymath Ding

Wenjiang, whose university lecture titled "On the Tribes of Yunnan" was based on the British officer's taxonomy.[60] In 1925, the esteemed anthropologist and archaeologist Li Ji based considerable portions of his influential study *The Formation of the Chinese People* on Davies' classification, praising it as a "great advance."[61]

More focused attention began to develop shortly thereafter, particularly following the establishment of the first division of Chinese ethnology in 1928. Upon the foundation of the new discipline, the first and most pressing challenge its practitioners faced was the creation of a rational and reductive ethnic taxonomy—a shared standard by which to categorize their objects of study, the minzu of China. These early Chinese ethnologists were dissatisfied with imperial texts such as the *Yunnan Gazetteer*, disparaging them as unsystematic and unscientific. Texts such as the *Record of Guizhou* and the *Yunnan Gazetteer*, they argued, idiosyncratically divided non-Han groups into an excessive number of categories according to a mixed bag of taxonomic criteria: geographical origins, cultural practices, and sartorial habits, among others. The classificatory schema found in these texts were simply not viable candidates for becoming the ontological foundation of the new discipline.

Cen Jiawu (1912–66), a young researcher of southwestern ethnicity (and, later, professor at Zhongshan University and Lingnan University) took aim at *Record of Guizhou*, arguing that, from the perspective of new and more scientific methods, imperial scholarship such as this was simply incorrect.[62] What the discipline required, scholars agreed, was a systematic means of overcoming these myriad particularities and arriving at a reductive portrait of China's minority populations—a "standardized gaze," in modern parlance.[63] In 1932, Rui Yifu set out to tackle the problem of ethnonymic rationalization on a global scale, with plans to develop standardized Chinese transliterations for all of the world's ethnic groups. Rui compiled a list of more than four thousand names and began work on northeast China. The project was slated to finish in April 1934, but Rui was sidetracked by a trip to the Miao areas of western Guangxi Province.[64] He never fulfilled his objective. Ling Chunsheng (1902–81), a Miao expert who held a PhD from the University of Paris, shared Cen's and Rui's concerns, arguing against the classificatory schema found in late imperial materials. There was a deeper architecture to the ethnic world of southwest China, he and his colleagues believed, which earlier research had failed to uncover. At best, earlier modes of ethnic taxonomy produced "enumerative" compendia of ethnonyms that, as Ling phrased it, were mired in particulars and "could not be synthesized."[65] Ling and others believed that most of the groups in Yunnan were in fact of "the same stock, just with different names" *(tongzhong er yiming)*.

In many respects, this emerging critique was a valorization of the British colonial episteme and a simultaneous downgrading of Ming and Qing colonial worldviews. Indeed, if Laura Hostetler's comparison and interpretation of Ming and Qing gazetteers is correct—and that the secular increase in the quantity and descriptive breadth of southwestern barbarian categories signified "increased familiarity on the part of Qing officialdom with the region, and with the distinctions (or similarities) among the peoples dwelling there"—then it is all the more striking that Chinese ethnologists in the 1930s and 1940s should have pointed to these very same texts as proof of the dynasty's unscientific appreciation of the region and its ability to perceive the true, underlying order that structured ethnicity. Whereas Hostetler sees continuity between the Qing, Republican, and PRC ethnotaxonomies, Chinese ethnologists vociferously rejected it.[66]

For Republican era scholars, the problem became one of seeing past or through this confusion of names to the order that lay beneath. As they searched for a new form of X-ray vision, scholars soon discovered that the most effective means of seeing the minzu of southwest China might in fact be to *stop looking and start listening*. They began to pay close attention to the neighboring anthropological discipline of linguistics—and, in particular, the language-based ethnic taxonomy articulated by one "Dai Weisi," one of the four Chinese names by which Davies would come to be known.[67]

Davies' linguistic model attracted attention for two primary reasons. First, compared to late imperial texts such as the *Yunnan Gazetteer*, it facilitated the creation of at-a-glance models that were incomparably more economical. To borrow from the language of the information theorist Edward Tufte, Davies' model came closer to a design strategy that was "transparent and self-effacing," "giving the focus over to data rather than data-containers."[68] What imperial sources presented baroquely in dozens of elaborate woodblock prints and page upon page of exegetical prose, Davies could present in a single diagram.

One look at Davies' diagram could provide a sense of both Yunnan's ethnological present and well as its ethnic past, facilitating both synchronic and diachronic readings. Originating at the first order of classification, the first three orders of Davies' diagram represented historical time, showing how the protolanguages and speakers of southwestern China branched outward and gave rise to ever wider and more abundant differences. Moving from the third to the fourth order, the diagram moved from history to the present, to the realm of groups existing in the ethnographic present. The taxonomy diverged further at the fifth order, arriving at an outermost stratum of dialects and ethnic subgroups, also called "branches." The structure can be summarized as follows:

First Order:	The Sinitic languages
Second Order:	Language families
Third Order:	Language groups
Fourth Order:	Languages/Ethnic groups (i.e., speakers of said languages)
Fifth Order:	Dialects/Ethnic branches (i.e., speakers of said dialects)

For Chinese ethnologists concerned with the professionalization of their fledgling discipline, the interplay between the fourth and fifth orders of classification

was critical. The fourth order of classification, simply put, was perfectly suited to serve as the discipline's ontology: an economical, agreed upon space of attribution that could determine the vital infrastructural question of "what will be visible or invisible within the system."[69] In defining the ethnic ontology of the region, this collection of minzu would thereby also serve as the boundaries of disciplinary subspecialization, demarcating discursive spaces in which Chinese ethnologists (and later foreign anthropologists) could house their careers and self-identify as specialists in the history, language, and culture of this or that ethnicity or minzu. At the same time, the fifth order constituted a space in which a boundless number of "branches" and "dialects" could be stored without disrupting the discipline's core ontology. For those whose subspecialization required a more fine-grained analysis, as in dialectology or regional specializations, the taxonomy could be expanded to reveal the fifth order of dialects and ethnic branches. In those instances when a coarse granularity was more desirable, however, the fifth order could be collapsed into the fourth. Owing to this scalability, Davies' taxonomy could *absorb* complexity without requiring expansion, something that imperial catalogs could not.

Additionally, in contrast to late imperial texts, which relied heavily on exogenous markers of identity such as clothing or customary habits considered peculiar to observers, linguistic categorization focused on a feature of individual and communal identity that could be considered fundamentally personal, at once the foundation of group identity formation and the result thereof. This notion of language-based ethnotaxonomy being more emic, natural, and meaningful fed into the early Chinese ethnologists' view of themselves as the advocates of these marginalized groups, opponents of ethnocentric ethnography, and inheritors of the May Fourth tradition of fieldwork and direct contact with nonelite members of Chinese society. Although a colonialist, Davies had nevertheless based his taxonomy on extensive, direct observation, a fact that distinguished him from the bibliocentrism of imperial elites and aligned him with the fieldwork-centered model of modern social science. Exemplified by eminent figures such as Gu Jiegang, May Fourth era scholars had searched out communities minimally influenced by mainstream Chinese culture, a search motivated both by a desire for unmediated knowledge about these communities and also an exoticizing and paternalistic sentiment.[70] As Changtai Hung has shown, scholars of the era began to look for research subjects in China's peripheral areas, believing that people in these parts of the country were the "least contaminated by Confucian values" and most in touch with the fundaments of humanity. Since "the greater distance from the Confucian-dominated center, the better for folk literature," Hung summarizes, "folklorists believed that, in peripheral, rural, and remote areas, especially among the national minorities, folk literature thrived, so the intellectual revolt against the traditional Confucian order encouraged young folklorists to seek inspiration and fresh ideas from the relatively un-

charted territory of the minority cultures."[71] In this respect, the non-Han peoples were ideal research candidates: doubly marginalized figures, silenced within canonical texts on account of being both rural and non-Han.[72] Equipped with linguistic methodology, researchers now had the tools with which to access these marginalized communities to an unprecedented degree.

At the same time, however, comparative linguistics enabled taxonomists to avoid the pitfalls of other available modes of inside-out categorization—for example, the collection of oral histories or folktales in which communities voiced their own understandings of their origins, migrations, and relations to neighboring groups. Unlike the folktale movements of decades prior, comparative linguistics did not need to concern itself with the subjectivities or sensibilities of those being categorized. Ironically, the marginalized communities of the borderlands were given a voice in this new form of categorization, but only to the extent that they provided taxonomists with "core vocabulary" such as man, woman, hat, pig, goat, river, sun, moon, and star. Once such data was elicited, the taxonomist could (and indeed needed to) retire to various "centers of calculation" to construct their ethnotaxonomic models.[73]

Over the course of the 1930s, Davies' language-based taxonomy became a focus of widespread attention within Chinese ethnology, received and debated by scholars who were at once intrigued by the model yet hesitant to adopt it wholesale. Even when accounting for this hesitancy, Davies' model would go on to have an immense impact on the ways in which early Chinese ethnologists went about categorizing their objects of study, the minzu of China. Building upon Davies' work, Ling Chunsheng, Ding Wenjiang, and Ma Changshou each published articles during the 1935–36 period in which they responded to the British officer's categorization. While taking issue with his categorization of certain groups, such as the Minjia, the adjustments that these scholars made were slight, restricted to largely cosmetic modifications of Davies' nomenclature. For example, each of these scholars dropped Davies' title and its explicit language-centered posture ("The Sinitic *Languages* of Yün-nan . . . ") replacing it with one more ethnological (e.g., "The Geographic Distribution of Ethnic Groups in Yunnan"). Ling Chunsheng, whose three-part categorization mirrored that of Davies' (a point Ling and his colleagues openly acknowledged), adopted presentational measures to differentiate his work from that of his British counterpart, adopting Davies' categories of "Shan language family" and "Tibeto-Burman language family," but amending them to read "Shan category" and "Tibeto-Burman category." He claimed that "basing ethnic categories on language is sometimes not entirely reliable" but that his work, although based "mainly on language," also drew upon aspects of history, culture, geography, and physical anthropology.[74] Ding Wenjiang and Ma Changshou performed similar adjustments in their respective articles.[75]

Ling's colleague and research partner Tao Yunkui saw past these aesthetic ad-

TABLE 6 Comparison of the Davies Model against Those of Key Chinese Ethnologists

Davies (1909)	Ding Wenjiang (1935)	Ling Chunsheng (1936)	Ma Changshou (1936)
		Taxonomically stable groups	
Miao	Miao	Miao	Miao
Yao	Yao	Yao	Yao
Minjia	Minjia	Minjia	Minjia
Puman	Puman (Puren)	Puman	Puman
Dai	Dai (Baiyi)	Dai (Baiyi)	Dai (Boyi)
Tibetan	Tibetan	Tibetan	Tibetan
—	—	Guzong	—
—	—	—	—
Xifan	Xifan	Xifan	Xifan
Naxi	—	Naxi (Moxie)	Naxi (Moxie)
Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu
Luoluo (Yi)	Luoluo (Yi)	Luoluo (Yi)	Luoluo (Yi)
Lisu	Lisu	Lisu	Lisu
—	—	Aka	—
Luohei	Luohei	Luohei	Luohei
Woni (Hani)	Woni (Hani)	Woni (Hani)	Woni (Hani)
Jingpo (Kachin)	Jingpo (Kachin)	Jingpo (Kachin)	Jingpo
—	—	Qiu	—
		Taxonomically volatile groups	
		Burmese Groups	
Achang	—	Achang	Achang
Laxi	—	Laxi	Laxi
Zi (A-si, Tsai-wa)	—	Axi	Axi
Malu	—	Malu	Mala
—	Burmese (Mian)	—	—
		Wa-related groups	
Benglong (Palaung)	—	Benglong	—
Wa	—	Wa (Kawa)	Wa
La	—	La (Kala)	La
K'a-mu	—	—	—
—	—	—	Pula
		Zhuang-related groups	
—	—	—	Zhuang
—	—	Zhongjia	Zhongjia
—	—	Nong	Nong
—	—	Sha	Sha
—	—	Lü	—

justments, however, and in 1938 rearticulated the key issue at hand. Referring to the works by Davies, Ding Wenjiang, and Ling, Tao Yunkui wrote that "using language as a standard of categorization is, in actuality, linguistic classification. Ethnologists have simply taken the results of linguistic research and quietly transposed them atop their question." He continued by pointing out that these three scholars, "although quite knowledgeable about language, nevertheless are not experts. Thus, as for the question of language-based categories, we will have to wait until experts have a chance to conduct analyses before we can get a clearer picture."[76] Despite this critique, and despite their clear anxiety about their nearly wholesale adoption of Davies' model, these three taxonomists ultimately preserved Davies' language-based organizational structure and the great majority of his conclusions.

As tables 6 and 7 demonstrate, there was a remarkable degree of consistency across each of these taxonomies, and a vast gulf which separated all of them from earlier imperial modes of categorization. In each taxonomy, the Miao, Yao, Minjia, Puman, Dai, Tibetan, Xifan, Naxi, Nu, Luoluo (Yi), Lisu, Luohei, Woni (Hani), and Jingpo (Kachin) were uniformly recognized, and still others were recognized with nearly complete consistency (such as the Achang and the Wa). For those ethnic categories that were less taxonomically stable, they fell into one of three main categories: Burmese groups, groups related to the Wa, and groups related in some way to the Zhuang. The taxonomic uncertainty of Burmese and Wa groups such as the Laxi, Zi, Kamu, and others seems to have had a great deal to do with the contested and uncertain status of the region where they lived (due to the longstanding conflict between China and colonial Burma over border demarcation). Moreover, for the Burmese and, to a lesser extent, groups like the Kamu, their status as transnational groups in possession of (or at least associated with) a sovereign nation contributed to their taxonomic volatility. Their status as "stated" groups appears to have led to confusion over whether they were best framed in ethnic terms as Chinese minorities or in political terms as foreign nationals. The same debate pertained to the "Annam" people of modern-day Vietnam, who Ding Wenjiang included in his taxonomy. Ling Chunsheng and others criticized Ding's inclusion of the category Annam, arguing that such individuals should be understood not as Chinese minzu, but simply as Vietnamese expatriates. Even with these debates and adjustments, however, one fact was clear: these taxonomies were both completely unlike any ethnic taxonomy that had come before and remarkably similar to that of the Davies Model from which they drew their inspiration.

Beyond this immediate, surface-level continuity, an even clearer consistency obtained between the structures of Davies' model and the taxonomies of early Chinese ethnologists. In a word, the taxonomies of early Chinese ethnologists obeyed exactly the same taxonomic structure as the Davies Model, organizing them into the five orders of classification. Moreover, like Davies, they consistently identified the fourth order of classification as the domain of minzu and languages—that is,

TABLE 7 Taxonomic Structure (detail of Tibeto-Burman category only; ethnic groups are in italics)

H. R. Davies (1909)	Ling Chunsheng (1936)	Ma Changshou (1936)
1. Sinitic	1. Yunnan minzu	1. Minzu in Southwest China
1.1 Tibeto-Burman	1.1 Tibeto-Burman	1.1 Tibeto-Burman
1.1.1 Tibetan group	1.1.1 Tibetan group	1.1.1 Tibetan group
1.1.1.1 *Tibetan*	1.1.1.1 *Tibetan*	1.1.1.1 *Tibetan*
	1.1.1.2 *Guzong*[1]	
1.1.2 Hsi-fan group	1.1.2 Xifan group	1.1.2 Xifan group
1.1.2.1 *Hsi-fan*	1.1.2.1 *Xifan*	1.1.2.1 *Xifan*
1.1.2.2 *Naxi (Mo-so)*	1.1.2.2 *Moxie*	1.1.2.2 *Moxie*
1.1.2.3 *Nu (A-Nung)*	1.1.2.3 *Nuzi*	1.1.2.3 *Nuzi*
1.1.3 Lo-lo group	1.1.3 Luoluo group	1.1.3 Luoluo group
1.1.3.1 *Lo-lo*	1.1.3.1 *Luoluo*	1.1.3.1 *Luoluo*
1.1.3.2 *Lisu*	1.1.3.2 *Lisu*	1.1.3.2 *Lisu*
1.1.3.3 *Lahu*	1.1.3.3 *Luohei*	1.1.3.3 *Luohei*
1.1.3.4 *Wo-ni*	1.1.3.4 *Woni*[2]	1.1.3.4 *Woni*
1.1.3.4.1 Ma-hei		1.1.3.4.1 Mahe
1.1.3.4.2 K'a-to		1.1.3.4.2 Kaduo
1.1.3.4.3 Pu-tu		1.1.3.4.3 Pute
1.1.3.4.4 Pi-o		1.1.3.4.4 Piaoren
1.1.3.4.5 A-k'a		1.1.3.4.5 Aka
1.1.3.4.6 San-su		1.1.3.4.6 Shansu
1.1.3.4.7 K'u-ts'ung		1.1.3.4.7 Kucong
1.1.3.4.8 P'u-la		1.1.3.4.8 Nuobi
1.1.3.4.9 Lo-pi		
	1.1.3.5 *Aka*	
1.1.4 Burmese group	1.1.4 Burmese group	1.1.4 Burmese group
1.1.4.1 *Achang*	1.1.4.1 *Achang*	1.1.4.1 *Achang*
1.1.4.2 *Maru*	1.1.4.2 *Malu*	1.1.4.2 *Mala*
1.1.4.3 *Laxi*	1.1.4.3 *Laxi*	1.1.4.3 *Laxi*
1.1.4.4 *Zi (A-si, Tsai-wa)*	1.1.4.4 *Axi*	1.1.4.4 *Axi*
	1.1.4.5 *Qiuzi*	
1.1.5 Kachin group	1.1.5 Kachin group	1.1.5 Kaiqin group
1.1.5.1 *Kachin (Jingpo)*	1.1.5.1 *Yeren (Kachin)*	1.1.5.1 *Kaiqin*

[1]Whereas Davies regards the Guzong as a subset of the Tibetans, Ling treats them here as a standalone group.

[2]Ling does not indicate the groups he sees as composing the Woni (Hani). When compared to Davies and Ma, however, it appears that he maintains the same structure, with the exception of the Aka. Whereas Davies and Ma consider the Aka to be a branch of the Woni, Ling sees them as a standalone group. Otherwise, the three taxonomic structures are virtually identical.

the domain where category intersected present reality to form an ontology, much in the way that "species" constitutes the key ontological domain for naturalists. At least within the discipline of ethnology, language had become de facto the proxy for ethnic identity in China's hyperdiverse southwestern provinces, an approach that was first fully articulated by H. R. Davies.

Equipped with this new, highly economical system of categorization, Chinese ethnologists began to flesh out this taxonomic framework in the late 1930s. In 1937, the outbreak of war with Japan further accelerated this process, prompting unprecedented growth in the new field of study. In the wake of the Japanese invasion, approximately half of the one hundred and eight institutes of higher learning—concentrated in coastal cities such as Beijing, Nanjing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou[77]— were forced to retreat to the country's southwestern interior, bringing with them a wave of Chinese academics and a group of the nation's most renowned social scientists.[78] The interior regions were suddenly imbued with momentous geopolitical significance. Collectively, they became known as "Free China," the "Great Rear" (*da houfang*), and, in general, as a place of national preservation in the face of war. With interior China as their new home, minzu scholars no longer divided their time between the office and the field. The two were now one and the same.[79]

Practically every Chinese social scientist went west. After a two-year visit to Europe and the United States in 1936 and 1937, Wu Wenzao returned to China in 1938, where he took a post at Yunnan University and established a research cooperative funded in large part by the Rockefeller Foundation.[80] Wu's prize student Lin Yaohua followed three years later in 1941 after completing his doctoral degree at Harvard University. Lin would later go on to Yanjing University in Chengdu and, in 1943, conduct intensive research on the Yi peoples of Liangshan. As he noted in the resultant study *The Lolo of Liangshan*, it was in the summer of 1943 that Lin first saw an Yi person with his own eyes.[81] Wu Zelin (1898–1990), whose postgraduate training was split between the University of Wisconsin, University of Missouri, and Ohio State University, made his way westward during the war, giving him the opportunity to live in Guizhou for three years and in Yunnan for five.[82] Originally trained in sociology, his wartime refuge was an experience that gave Wu "the opportunity to see with my own eyes and to come in contact first hand with more than ten minorities I had never even heard of before."[83] In a matter of a few years, Kunming became one of the most important bases of academic research, making it significantly easier for scholars to study the nation's interior and the non-Han peoples who populated it.

Fei Xiaotong captured it best when, in his celebrated study *Earthbound China*, he praised Yunnan as a "cultural laboratory par excellence"—a place wherein "the whole process of cultural development—from the primitive headhunters to the sophisticated and individualized city-dwellers—can be seen in concrete form."[84] "In a single day," Fei Xiaotong rejoiced, describing the experience of walking from the outskirts of Kunming into the city proper, "we will have traveled from Polynesia to New York."[85]

Fei's description of Yunnan as a "cultural laboratory" is revealing. During this period, the nascent discipline of ethnology, and the enterprise of ethnic categorization which structured it, developed traits normally associated with laboratory science. A laboratory, as Karin Knorr Cetina explains, constitutes an "enhanced" environment in which scientists free themselves from the limitations of the natural world. Operating within laboratories, scientists are no longer bound to studying natural objects or phenomena as they occur in nature—that is, from the ontological, spatial, and temporal limitations of understanding a given object or phenomenon "as it is," "where it is," or "when it happens."[86] Rather than dealing with objects "as they appear in nature," laboratory science "works with object images or with their visual, auditory, or electrical traces, and with their components, their extractions, and their purified versions."[87] Instead of examining the natural world contextually, laboratory science collects and mobilizes samples thereof, bringing them back to the lab to "manipulate them on their own terms."[88] Temporally, laboratories can "dispense with natural cycles of occurrence and make events happen frequently enough for continuous observation."[89]

In wartime-era ethnology, Yunnan province became just such a laboratory. Spatially, the concentration of non-Han peoples in local schools and universities provided researchers with unprecedented access to a wide range of non-Chinese languages and non-Han peoples. In 1942 and 1943, for example, Luo Changpei teamed up with a young student from Tengchong studying at National Dali Normal University. Over the course of two consecutive spring terms, the fourteen-year-old speaker of the Baiyi language of Lianshan provided Luo and his colleague Xing Qinglan the data necessary for their study *A Preliminary Investigation of the Baiyi Language of Lianshan*.[90] Despite the peculiar and circuitous geography of this arrangement, with interviews being conducted in Dali with a teenager from Tengchong representing the Baiyi language of Lianshan, comparative linguistic methodology placed little premium upon the examination of subjects in their representative social contexts. This combination of linguistic methodology and Fei's "cultural laboratory" enabled Chinese scholars to take full advantage of the region's many synthetic congregations of non-Han peoples, and thereby to split the difference between their commitment to field research and their need for an efficient means of extracting large quantities of data. By means of comparative linguistics, Davies' work demonstrated a method by which one could rapidly tame the taxonomic chaos of southwestern China. As a criterion, it would seem language was nothing short of a categorical silver bullet.

Temporally, this new ethnological laboratory enabled researchers to elicit data from their subjects on a far more intensive schedule. In the course of a few hours, for example, linguists could extract enough data from an informant to establish the rudimentary grammar of a given language and sufficient lexical data to locate that language within an ever-expanding classificatory framework.[91] Repeated over the course of months and years, researchers could start to assemble taxonomic models that encompassed, not just specific communities, but the entire province.

As ethnologists and linguists capitalized on this new cultural laboratory, the Davies Model became all the more axiomatic to and embedded within their work. Indeed, if Yunnan had become the laboratory of Chinese ethnology, the Davies Model had become its periodic table of elements. Closely following the outbreak of the war, Davies' work was translated into Chinese for the first time by historian and political philosopher Zhang Junmai (Carson Chang, 1887–1969).[92] Zhang's translation, which focused solely on the appendix of Davies' original work, was graced with a preface by the famous scholar, statesman, and calligrapher Zhou Zhongyue (1876–1955), a native of Yunnan who at one point served as secretary general of the Yunnan Provincial Government and a member of the board of directors of Yunnan University.[93] One year later, the work was translated into Japanese by Suyama Taku, prepared with a foreword by Ōkawa Shūmei.

Among many others, linguist Luo Changpei praised Davies' work for its scientific rigor[94] and Ling Chunsheng lauded it as the first standardized method for categorizing ethnic groups in the area.[95] At this time, ethnic taxonomy became a cottage industry of sorts within wartime Chinese ethnology. In 1938, Ling Chunsheng published a revised version of his earlier taxonomy, as did Ma Changshou in 1941.[96] These were followed closely by those of Ding Su (1941), Wei Huilin (1942), Rui Yifu (1943, 1944, and 1946), Lin Yaohua (1944), and Cen Jiawu (1944).[97] With each subsequent article, the discourse surrounding ethnic taxonomy became increasingly mired in details. However, as the Columbia-trained sociologist Huang Wenshan (1901–88) noted, by the close of the 1940s, most Chinese social scientists who encountered Davies' taxonomy tended to uphold the British officer's approach.[98] In 1941, National Central University Geology Professor Ding Su captured the essence of this trend with unmistakable clarity: "Among those who research ethnic groups in the southwest, there is no one who does not take H. R. Davies' taxonomy as his starting point."[99]

THE DAVIES MODEL IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Following 1949, the Davies Model was carried into PRC ethnology by the very same scholars who had integrated it into the discipline in the 1930s and 1940s. In fact, the Davies Model achieved an even greater level of saturation in the Communist period, owing to the unprecedented centralization of the discipline during the educational reforms of the early 1950s. Unlike Chinese ethnology in the Republican period, which was a multicentered consortium of scholars, institutions, publishing houses, and funding agencies, the early Communist state brought ethnology within a unified academic network. In mid-1951, state authorities commenced development of a countrywide network of nationalities institutes designed to help train minor-

ity cadres. At the core of this new network was the Central Institute for Nationalities (CIN), founded in Beijing in the summer of 1951. In addition to cadre development, the CIN was also designed to bring together the nation's leading ethnologists. The CIN incorporated the Ethnology Department of Yanjing University, the Sociology Department of Tsinghua University, and other centers of ethnological research, bringing together under one roof scholars such as Lin Yaohua, Fei Xiaotong, Wu Zelin, Yang Chengzhi, and others who had been directly involved in wartime scholarship.[100] Regional divisions of the CIN were established in the south, southwest, and northwest, creating a nationwide network entrusted with training minority cadres and engaging in ethnic scholarship. With this centralized academic structure, and the ascendancy of Republican-era scholars such as Lin Yaohua, Luo Changpei, Fu Maoji, and others, the Davies Model had become axiomatic.

We find this continuity most clearly in the work of ethnologists and linguists Luo Changpei and Fu Maoji who, during the early Communist period, managed to extend the linguistic model outside of academic circles and into the taxonomic worldview of local officials in Yunnan—again, the same officials who would later oversee the Classification. Two years prior to the project, in 1952, the pair convened in Yunnan to continue and complete a survey of local languages which Luo Changpei had begun during the war. This team of seven scholars, all of who would later take part in the Ethnic Classification Project in 1954, was overseen by Zhang Chong, who directed Fu and his squad to concentrate on minority script development and cadre training.[101] The team operated out of the Yunnan Institute for Nationalities, where they had easy access to students of many different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.[102]

This extended interaction between Fu and Zhang over the period from 1952 through 1954 had a demonstrable effect on the way in which the Yunnan administration understood the ethnic demography of its province. The influence was subtle, but is readily apparent when comparing locally produced ethnic taxonomies between the years of 1951, prior to the visit by Fu, and 1953, after Fu had been in the province for approximately one year. In the ethnic distribution maps published by the Yunnan Province Nationalities Affairs Commission in 1951 for internal circulation (those first outlined in chapter 1), provincial accounts listed groups according to population size, without any attention paid to taxonomic structure (that is, to parent and child categories).[103] In the map published in 1953, however, roughly the same set of ethnonyms was organized, not according to population, but according to the same orders of classification articulated first by Davies and later by Republican-era Chinese ethnologists.

This new attention to categorical structure, particularly language-based structure, shows up elsewhere in 1953 documents as well. In late 1953, the Yunnan Nationalities Affairs Commission produced a "Chart of Yunnan Minorities who are the same but have different names."[104] In this chart, roughly the same 120-plus names

are listed as on the various distribution maps, but this time organized into a clear hierarchy, topped by thirteen "large zuxi," under which were classified twenty-six "branches" (zhixi), and then finally, the inventory of ethnonyms. The Provincial Nationalities Affairs Commission, in other words, was clearly adopting the language-based paradigm, as communicated to them by Fu Maoji, and using it to reorganize the ethnonyms they had been investigating since the formation of the PRC. When Fu and his colleagues looked at the people of Yunnan, they saw roughly twenty-six groups. Now, after only one year of interaction with Fu, Zhang and the Yunnan Nationalities Affairs Commission were starting to as well.

Returning to April 1954 and the opening weeks of the Classification project, we find the enduring presence of the Davies Model evident in the lectures by Luo Jiguang and Ma Xueliang. Reproduced here in one final tabular juxtaposition, the genealogy becomes clear (see table 8).

When Lin Yaohua, Wang Xiaoyi, and their colleagues departed for Kunming on May 7, 1954, this was the conventional model and working hypothesis that they brought with them and that would end up guiding their taxonomic work. Quite unlike Communist authorities in Yunnan and Beijing who, prior to the inaugural census, regarded Yunnan as home to upward of one hundred minzu, the ethnotaxonomy set forth by Chinese ethnologists and linguists included less than thirty.

CONCLUSION

Whereas scholars have become accustomed to treating the Ethnic Classification project as a Communist affair, the pedigree of the project's underlying taxonomic logic requires us to adopt a broader historical outlook that spans the 1949 divide. As this chapter has shown, and subsequent chapters will bear out, the official demography of Yunnan as it currently exists is but a partially modified version of the leading taxonomic theories of the Republican period, all of which regarded Yunnan as a province inhabited by roughly two dozen minzu. This paradigm was already quite robust by the end of the Republican period, developed by Chinese social scientists in a time before the country's academic community had been incorporated into the official state structure. It was their taxonomic worldview, not that of the Communist party, which argued on behalf of a radically synthetic mode of ethnic categorization. In order to understand how the ethnotaxonomy of the PRC was formed, therefore, we are behooved to abandon what might be termed the "Communist imposition hypothesis," and to pay much closer attention to PRC state's social scientific advisors.

This leads us to a second, related conclusion. Whereas conventional accounts of China's Ethnic Classification are quick to point out its political and methodological affinities with that of the Soviet Union, here we find much stronger ties to British colonial practice—particularly in its reliance on a mode of ethnic categorization

TABLE 8 Continuation of the Davies Model into the Classification

Taxonomically stable groups

Davies (1909)	Ding Wenjiang (1935)	Ling Chunsheng (1936)	Ma Changshou (1936)	Luo Changpei & Fu Maoji (March 1954)[1]	Luo Jiguang & Ma Changshou (Classification Team)[2]
Miao	Miao	Miao	Miao	Miao	Miao
Yao	Yao	Yao	Yao	Yao	Yao
Minjia	Minjia	Minjia	Minjia	Minjia	Minjia
Puman	Puman (Puren)	Puman	Puman	Puman	Puman
Dai	Dai (Baiyi)	Dai (Baiyi)	Dai (Boyi)	Dai	Dai
Tibetan	Tibetan	Tibetan	Tibetan	Tibetan	Tibetan
—	—	Guzong	—	Qiang	—
—	—	—	—	—	—
Xifan	Xifan	Xifan	Xifan	Xifan	Xifan
Naxi	—	Naxi (Moxie)	Naxi (Moxie)	Naxi	Naxi
Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu
Luoluo (Yi)	Luoluo (Yi)	Luoluo (Yi)	Luoluo (Yi)	Yi	Yi
Lisu	Lisu	Lisu	Lisu	Lisu	Lisu
—	—	Aka	—	—	—
Luohei	Luohei	Luohei	Luohei	Lahu	Lahu
Woni (Hani)	Woni (Hani)	Woni (Hani)	Woni (Hani)	Hani	Hani
Jingpo (Kachin)	Jingpo (Kachin)	Jingpo (Kachin)	Jingpo	Jingpo	Jingpo
—	—	Qiu	—	Qiu	Qiu
—	—	—	—	Jiarong	—

Taxonomically volatile groups

Burmese groups

Davies	Ding Wenjiang	Ling Chunsheng	Ma Changshou	Luo Changpei & Fu Maoji	Luo Jiguang & Ma Changshou
Achang	—	Achang	Achang	Achang	Achang
Laxi	—	Laxi	Laxi	—	—
Zi (A-si, Tsai-wa)	—	Axi	Axi	Zaiwa	Zaiwa
Malu	—	Malu	Mala	—	—
—	Burmese (Mian)	—	—	Burmese	Burmese
—	—	—	—	Chashan	Chashan
—	—	—	—	Langsu	Langsu

Wa-related groups

Davies	Ding Wenjiang	Ling Chunsheng	Ma Changshou	Luo Changpei & Fu Maoji	Luo Jiguang & Ma Changshou
Benglong (Palaung)	—	Benglong	—	Benglong	Benglong
Wa	—	Wa (Kawa)	Wa	Wa	Kawa
La	—	La (Kala)	La	—	—
K'a-mu	—	—	Pula	—	—

Zhuang-related groups

Davies	Ding Wenjiang	Ling Chunsheng	Ma Changshou	Luo Changpei & Fu Maoji	Luo Jiguang & Ma Changshou
—	—	—	—	Zhuang	—
—	Zhongjia	—	Zhongjia	Buyi	—
—	Nong	—	Nong	Nong	Nong
—	Sha	—	Sha	Sha	Sha
—	Lü	—	—	—	—

[1] Luo and Fu, "Guonei shaoshuminzu yuyan wenzi de qingkuang," 21–26.
[2] Wang Xiaoyi, Interview, Beijing, January 21, 2003, citing his journal from the 1954 lecture on "The Utility of Language in the Course of Investigations (*Yuyan zai diaocha li de zuoyong*)."

derived from historical linguistics and, most importantly, its direct, genealogical connection to the scholarship of H. R. Davies.

As for Davies himself, the retired officer passed away in 1950 at the age of eighty-four.[105] By all accounts, he lived out his days entirely unaware of the immense impact that his work had on the disposition of Chinese ethnology. Had he witnessed the development of the discipline over the course of the 1940s, he might have been surprised to see a clear thread—an unbroken methodological and discursive genealogy—winding from his research in the late 1890s straight through to the Communist period. Following his death, and the tremendous political changes that swept the mainland, all memories of Davies were quickly buried or transformed. On May 11, 1951, for example, Liu Geping delivered a speech to the Government Administration Council entitled "Summary Report on the Central Nationalities Visitation Team's Visits to the Nationalities of the Southwest." One foreigner in particular was mentioned by name—Henry Rodolph Davies. Unlike the late Republican period, however, where his 1909 work was celebrated as the starting point for all ethnotaxonomic work conducted in the southwest, Davies was now summarily dismissed as an "imperalist spy" whose life history and work illuminated little more than the European violation of Chinese sovereignty.[106] In late 1954, the irony became even more pronounced. In September of that year, Yang Yucai, a high-ranking political member of the Yunnan Province Ethnic Classification, published an article in *Geographic Knowledge* in which he dismissed Davies' research as the "antiscientific" nonsense of a "capitalist careerist."[107] Little did Yang realize, it seems, that it was Davies' "antiscientific" theories that Republican-era Chinese ethnologists had used to make a sharp break with earlier, imperial modes of ethnotaxonomy and that, in the early People's Republic, guided the ethnic categorization of China's most diverse province.