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In 1964, during the celebrations of the 15th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China (PRC), comrade Ni Su of the [Dwags po] Nationality was noticed by Chairman Mao. Chairman Mao asked her what national minority she belonged to, and because she was too moved to speak other people responded for her: "She is a Baima [i.e., Dwags po] Tibetan from Sichuan."... When the happy news got back to her hometown there was much rejoicing, but there appeared some doubt with respect to this ethnic moniker, because both the history which had been passed down to them by their ancestors and the current situation all revealed that they were not like the Tibetans [Zangzu] of Aba Prefecture, nor were they like the Qiang of Maowen (Fei, 1980: 2).

The Dwags po people are definitely Tibetans [Zangzu]! (dMu dge bSam gtan, 1980b: 64)

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

The articles that follow this introduction are not only important examples of the work of dMu dge bSam gtan, a highly respected contemporary Tibetan scholar from Amdo, but also represent the ways in which historical, ethnological, and even Marxist-Leninist arguments are employed by native Tibetans in challenging official representations of their history and culture made by the Chinese state apparatus. dMu dge bSam gtan was born in 1914 in the eastern Tibetan region of dMu dge, located in the present-day rNga ba' Tibetan-Qiang Autonomous Region of Sichuan Province. At the age of 12, he took his religious vows before the bDe tshang sprul sku Blo bzang bstan pa, whereupon he adopted the religious name of Blo bzang bsam gtan and entered the dMu dge bKra shis khor lo Monastery to begin his monastic training. He received instruction from such scholars as Pnyogs glang, dKon mchog dge 'dun, and Chos dar, with whom he studied works on logic, and Blo bzang chos ldan dpal bzang po, who gave him many empowerments. From dMu dge he went to Bla brang bKra shis khyil Monastery in Gansu to receive further instruction, and in 1947 he was granted the dGe bshes degree.

After the Communist takeover of what is now rNga ba Prefecture, dMu dge bSam gtan served in several official Chinese government posts and—in addition to continuing his own writing and publishing in the fields of logic, history, poetry and medicine—also contributed greatly to such important academic works as the first edition of the massive Tibetan-Chinese dictionary published in Beijing in 1985. He continued to teach and lecture periodically from the 1970s through the early 1990s, both within rNga ba Prefecture and at institutions such as Lhasa Hospital, the Central Nationalities' Institute (now University) in Beijing, the Bla brang Tibetan High School in Xiahe (Gansu), the Southwest Nationalities' Institute in Chengdu, and the Northwest Nationalities' Institute in Lanzhou. At the Southwest Nationalities' Institute (where I recently studied Tibetan), dMu dge
bSam gtan is widely remembered by his former students and colleagues for his lectures, and both his erudition and his outspokenness are somewhat legendary there. dMu dge bSam gtan passed away in 1993, leaving behind a large body of work and a multitude of former students who benefited from his instruction.1

The articles translated below address the controversy surrounding the so-called “Dwags po,” who are often referred to as the “Baima Zangzhu” or “Baima Zangren” in Chinese publications. A population living mainly in present-day northern Sichuan Province, an area which has long been part of the ethnic borderland settled by a mixed population of Tibetans, Han Chinese, Hui (Chinese Muslims), Qiang and other ethnic groups, the Dwags po were classified as “Tibetan” or “Zangzu” during the official ethnical classification project of the 1950s, a classification which at least some members of the group have challenged in the intervening years.2 They came under close academic scrutiny in the late 1970s and early 1980s, when a team of researchers from the Nationalities’ Research Institute of the Chinese Academy for Social Sciences, the Sichuan Provincial Nationalities’ Affairs Commission, Sichuan University, and the Sichuan Provincial Museum paid a research visit to the region. Following this research visit, the research team published reports that suggested the Dwags po were not Tibetan but rather constituted a unique ethnic group in and of themselves. A collection of essays on the controversy issued by the Sichuan Provincial Nationalities’ Research Institute3 in 1980 includes a copy of their initial research report (Sichuan Minzu Yanjiusuo, 1980: 119-151) and summarizes the early stages of the debate as follows:

The “Baima Tibetans”4 are divided between Pingwu and Nanping Counties in Sichuan Province and Wen County in Gansu Province. Since the Communist Liberation, they have reported many times that they are not Tibetan [Zangzhu], and have asked to be reclassified. The Sichuan Provincial Nationalities’ Affairs Commission has twice organized [research] teams to investigate [this issue] (once in 1978 and again in 1979), and has held two academic conferences [on the matter]. Famous historians such as Prof. Xu Zhongshu, Mou Yue, Zhao Weibang, and Deng Ziqin; Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Sichuan Province People’s Consultative Conference Zhang Xiushu; and Vice-Secretary of the Pingwu County Party Committee and cadre [representative] of his own nationality [i.e., the Baimas], Niu Wa believe that the “Baima Tibetans” are the descendants of the ancient “Di” nationality. The Tibetan scholar Dr. Sang Mudan [i.e., dMu dge bSam gtan] believes they are Tibetans. Prof. Rcn Naiqiang believes they are the descendants of the ancient “Dangchang Qiang” nationality and attracting a lot of strong interest (SMY, 1980: preface [no page number given]). Other people also support the idea that they are yet another nationality. [With] each [participant] airing his own views [and] speaking without any inhibitions, the academic atmosphere [of the meetings] was very dynamic. Because the investigation and research of the “Baima Tibetans” is of relatively high academic value, the famous Chinese scholar Fei Xiaotong used the “Baima Tibetans” as a typical example in his essay “On the Question of the Classification of China’s Nationalities,” introducing [the case] both at home and abroad, and attracting a lot of strong interest. (SMY 1980: preface [no page number given]).

That Fei Xiaotong—godfather of Chinese ethnology and perhaps the most politically prominent social scientist in the PRC—should turn his eyes to the question of the problematic classification of the Dwags po is perhaps indicative that this was no minor debate. Indeed, much more was at stake than simply the classification of the Dwags po: in the essay mentioned above, Fei also brings up the problematic identity of such other “Tibetans” as the “Zheng” and “Xia’erba” [Sherpa] of the Tibet Autonomous Region, the “Jiarong” [rGyal rong] of rNga ba and dKar mdzes Prefectures in Sichuan Province, and the “Pumi” Tibetans of Muli County in the Liangshan Yi Autonomous Prefecture of Sichuan Province (Fei Xiaotong, 1980: 1). In most cases members of these groups had themselves requested reclassification, but in the eyes of many Tibetans the official reopening of these cases represented yet another attack by the Chinese state on a Tibetan identity that had been severely fractured by the social and political upheavals of the previous 20 years.5

As dMu dge bSam gtan’s articles attest, the claim that the Dwags po were not Tibetan was met with much disbelief on the part of Tibetan intellectuals, but he was one of the few to openly challenge the official arguments, and in doing so has provided us with a wealth of local historical and cultural information about Tibetan customs in the borderlands.6 Through careful comparison of the customs of the Dwags po as related in the official reports with his own knowledge of the history (or at least historiography), language, and social and religious practices of other Tibetans living near the Dwags po, dMu dge bSam gtan carefully deconstructs the official argument using a classical Tibetan debating style wedded with dialectical-material analysis—truly a mark of a scholar well-versed in both the Tibetan and the modern Chinese systems.7 His writings therefore represent not only an important contribution to a growing body of contemporary native Tibetan history and ethnology, but also a revealing example of the willingness of at least some Tibetan intellectuals working within the PRC to challenge the stories the Chinese state would tell about them. In their strategic deployment of both local knowledge and classic Marxist-informed social science arguments, the articles translated here reveal much about the ways in which Tibetan scholars of the modern period engage with and survive within the Chinese academic and political system.

The first article translated below was originally published in the Tibetan journal stBrang char (Gentle Rain) in 1981, and was recently re-issued in a collection of dMu dge bSam gtan’s works published by the Sichuan Nationalities’ Publishing House (dMu dge bSam gtan, 1993: 135-154). The arguments contained in the Tibetan version roughly parallel those of his two essays in Chinese published in the collection of essays on the Dwags po (dMu dge bSam gtan, 1980a, 1980b), but there are enough differences in both content and presentation that I feel a translation from the Tibetan is both warranted and appropriate. My reading of the Tibetan text has been informed by the Chinese articles, however, and where questionable points in the translation have occurred I have used the Chinese texts as a cross-reference—such instances will be noted in the footnotes. The second article was also published first in stBrang char (1989 2: 70-72), and was reprinted in the volume of dMu dge bSam gtan’s collected essays mentioned above (1993: 154-58). The text was dictated by dMu dge bSam gtan in 1987 at sGo mang Monastery in rNga ba County, was transcribed by Shes rab ral gri, and appears to be a rather impatient response to the resurfacing of
questions about the identity of the Dwegs po in the mid- to late-1980s. In this article, the author adds additional documentation of ancient Tibetan customs as recorded in such classic works of Tibetan literature as the *rgyal rabs gsal ba'i me long* (bsod nams rgyal mtshan, 1981) to his ethnomedical analysis of Dwegs po culture, thereby enriching not only his argument and our understanding of Tibetan customs, but also our awareness of how such classic folk-historical texts are put to use by contemporary Tibetan intellectuals as they seek to craft an indigenous historical and ethnological narrative.

My purpose in translating these articles and offering them to the readers of *The Tibet Journal* is not to present and analyze the entire controversy surrounding the Dwegs po and its position in the contemporary debates about Tibetan identity within the PRC, for that is a full time research project in and of itself. Neither is it my wish or intention to settle the problematic question of the "true" identity of the Dwegs po, for that is a task which should be left to the people whose lives it most directly affects. Instead, my goal is to make two important pieces of contemporary Tibetan scholarship accessible to a wider audience while simultaneously providing some insight into the complex social context in which Tibetan academics in the PRC operate. Only with an understanding of that context can we truly appreciate the skillful artistry Tibetans employ in crafting their lives and their stories under Chinese rule.

In preparing these translations, I received a great deal of assistance from Tibetan scholars at the Southwest Nationalities' Institute in Chengdu, Sichuan Province, PRC. I am particularly grateful to Tshe btan skyabs, Thogs med and mChog Idan thar of the Tibetan Language Department for their help as I was initially working through the texts. Because none of them know English; however, our discussions of the original texts were conducted in Tibetan and Chinese, and the absence of a careful comparative reading of the translation by an English-speaking Tibetan has most likely led to some errors in translation and interpretation, for which I take full responsibility. I am also most grateful to Larry Epstein for providing detailed criticism and corrections as I prepared the translation and to Ton Huber for his editorial assistance and comments on this and earlier drafts. Grant support for the preparation of these translations was generously provided by the Blakemore Foundation, the Pacific Cultural Foundation and the Academy for Educational Development.

**ANNOTATED TRANSLATION I: “ON THE QUESTION OF THE ’Dwegs po’ NATIONALITY”**

In what follows, I will set down a bit of Tibetan history according to what I have read and heard. When the Tibetan kings such as Srong btsan sgam po were consolidating control over the boundaries [of their empire], there were constant battles for several years between the Tibetan and Tang empires. Because of the struggle [that developed] after the Tibetan emperor dispatched several hundred thousand soldiers, the need arose for the Tang and the Tibetans to mediate with each other. At that time, areas presently located in Sichuan—such as the Chu dkar River drainage (in the region of Nanping, and Pingw), the Chu nag drainage (both Chu nag and Khro chu), and the Tsha ba Valley—were occupied by the army of the Tibetan emperor. When they mediated, a monument was erected between China and Tibet. Other than saying that the Chinese would live in China and the Tibetans would live in Tibet, it was determined that it was not acceptable for them to send soldiers against each other.

The Tibetan emperor issued a decree that the Tibetan army, not being permitted to return, must settle and remain as defense forces in the border region between China and Tibet. The soldiers that came from Dwegs po and Kong po were made to settle around the "Chu dkar." They are the Dwegs po of Pingy and the Khon po of Nanping. The Dwegs po are still called the "Dwegs po today, since the term Dwegs po has not changed even a little bit. But the Koi po are today called the "Khon po," the term having changed a little bit. The soldiers from Shar ba in Western Tibet settled along the Zung chu drainage ("Minjiang" in Chinese) and are the Tibetans of Zung chu County. Since the term has also not changed, they are still called Shar ba today.

A large number of soldiers who came from one of the four great lineages of Tibet, the sBra people, under the command of General "Kho phan" settled and remained along the rGyal mo rngul River. These people are also known as the Bswi people. It is stated in the *mDo smad chos 'byung* that the sBra people are the Bswi people and that the Bswi people are one and the same. The indigenous name for the region around the rGyal mo rngul River is "rGyal mo Tsha ba rong." When the king of the Tibetan emperor came down, they were written to as "rGyal mo Tsha ba rong gi Kho phan," but later on this name was abbreviated as "Tsha kho," and then it became the name of the people and the region. Today both the place and all the people who live in Tsha rong are called "Tsha kho."

The three "Zangs dkar" settlements of pastoralists who live at the headwater of the rGyal mo rngul River came from Zangs dkar in Western Tibet, so the name has not changed.

So, the people all the way from the Dwegs po in the The bo and Pingwu area to those of the IChags la [Dar rtse mdo] region of Khams arrived during the era of Srong btsan sgam po and it is said that a group of additional people came during the eras of Khrir srong and Khrir ral.

It is said that the large number of Tibetans who came to the rMa chu [Yellow River] basin during the era of Srong btsan sgam po were soldiers from the IDon lineage. For that reason it says in the genealogies that:

Because the sBra occupied three hard-to-get-at places,
They are known as the "Really Brave sBra."
Because the IDon occupied three high mountains,
They are known as the "High-Hatted IDon."

As for these people, they came to this area long ago.

And because they went to the borders of Tibet, in these areas the practices of ancient Tibetan religion "Bon po" remained for a long time even though the Tibetan area of dBus became Buddhist. For example, places like Dwegs po Khon po, Upper Zung chu, a few parts of Chu nag, and some villages in Khro skyabs in rGyal rong were "Bon po" even up to the time of [Communist] Liberation. Most of the villages in places like rGyal rong Chu chen became Buddhist during the era of the Manchu Ching emperor Chen-lung. Only about 10 years have passed since the region around 'Bar khams became Buddhist. 
It is clear in the catalog of the Co ne, bsTan ’gyur that the Tibetans of upper and lower mDzo dge and Co ne are the descendants of those who settled there after coming as the retinue of Minister dGa’ Ye shes dar rgyas at the time of the Tibetan emperor Khris ral.

Bits and pieces of this information are contained in such sources as: *Bod kyi rus mdo zhen mo* [The Great Tibetan Genealogy], *Rus mdo thur bu* [Assorted Genealogies], *rgyal rong gi dpod cog rite* [The Supreme Lords of *rgyal rong*], *So mang gi io rgyus* [The History of So mang], mGo log a skyong gi rus mdo z [The Genealogy of A skyong of mGo log]*, *Co ne dpod shtang gi rus mdo z* [The Genealogy of the Lords of Co ne] (in Chinese), gShen rab mi bo’i rnam thar [The Biography of gShen rab mi bo], Bzrag bya rgo dkar chog [A Guide to Bzrag bya rgo], bsTan ’gyur dkar chag nor bu’i phreng ha [A Catalogue of the bsTan ’gyur: A Garland of Jewels], and Deb ther rgya mtho [The Ocean Annals]. Since I presently neither have these books at hand nor have time to get them, I am unable to cite references for what I have previously seen.

So, the current claims of some that [the people of] *rgyal rong* and Dgags po, etc. are not Tibetan are but groundless nonsense. The *Dgags po* of the Pingwu region of Sichuan are located on the border of the *rNga ba* Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture and the Minyang Administrative District, and they belong to Pingwu County. However, they are neighbors to the Tibetans of Nanping, and their customs, habits, and religious system are all like those of the Tibetans of Nanping and Zung chu counties. Moreover, from ancient times there has been absolutely no question that they are reckoned as Tibetans. But lately, the baseless rumor has been spread that the *Dgags po* are not Tibetan but are the “Tibetan Nationality.” Additionally, the group of Tibetans in Kham called the “Bod mi” has also been separated out, it being said that they are not Tibetan but are instead the “Bod mi” Nationality. [And there are even those] who are diligently planning to make Muli [County] a non-Tibetan [County].

In August, 1978, representatives of the Nationalities’ Research Institute of the Chinese Academy for Social Sciences and the Sichuan Provincial Museum went together as an investigation team to the *Dgags po* region and carried out a little over a month of research. Although their point of view was not unified, one research report has been widely distributed. Its content established the premise that the *Dgags po* are not Tibetan, and definitively determined that they were the “Tibetan Nationality.” But there is not a single word to support the premise that they are the “Tibetan” nationality. In fact the very grounds for saying that they are not Tibetan have become the grounds for saying that they are Tibetan according to the following explanations:

1. As for those that say that because the *Dgags po* language is not the same as the standard dialect of Gannan, [the *Dgags po* are not Tibetan, they can be refuted in this way: Although the language of all of Tibet has one root, there have developed differences in pronunciation due to the large area of land and the great dispersion of settlements [in Tibet]. In some areas, such as *rgyal rong*, such changes of the old words as the tone of voice becoming deeper and heavier have taken place. In some dialects like those of *dBus gtsang*, old words have been replaced by new words. In some dialects like mGo log Nya mtsho and in ’Dzam thang Count Gannan there have been very great changes arising on their own. Although they are a Tibetan, due to changes which have made the dialects mutually dissimilar, there is some difficulty in mutual communication. Is this true? Look and see. Even within Xioahe County in Gansu this is the case: nominal speech [has retained] the earlier clear tone of voice and great purity, while the speech of agriculture areas lacks the former clear intonation and has slight distinctions in high an low tone and in vowel length.

Thus, how is it possible to say that [Dgags po dialect] is not Tibetan because it is not identical to the speech of some Tibetan settlements in Gannan? As for the statement that someone who does not know Tibetan “mastered the basic nature of spoken Tibetan” during a little more than a month, that is hard to imagine. There are many Tibetan dialects which are not identical to the standard dialect of Gannan, but although the Dgags po dialect contains many dissimilarities with Gannan dialect, it has more than a few similarities with the dialect of the Tibetans of Nanping and Zung chu—just look and see!

Those who say that the Dgags po people are not Tibetan since most of them do not know written Tibetan can be refuted as follows. In the greater part of the Tibetan region, there were no schools [for learning] the written language. So with the exception of a few lamas, monks and religious practitioners who possessed great knowledge of culture and literature, the other common people usually were illiterate and did not understand the meaning of the scriptures. The *Dgags po* region also being like this, with the exception of the studies of the “Bon po” and the “sNgags pa,” other common people usually did not study. It is most of the Tibetan region in the past, the uses of written Tibetan were few aside from its use in religious work; in the *Dgags po* region it was also thus. So even according to what you say it is possible to say that the customs of the Dgags po people are the same as [those of] all Tibetans.

As for those that say that because the production belongs to the feudal system but there remain remnants of primitive society, [the *Dgags po* are] no Tibetan, [they can be refuted] as follows:

In the border areas inhabited primarily by Tibetans, the manner of production belongs to the feudal system of production but there also remain a few remnants of primitive society. For example, in areas such as *dMu dge*, *rNga ba*, and Zung chu, the primary method of exploitation by the local landlords and rich peasants: was not [a system of] debt and interest, but was rather a wage-paying relationship, just as in *Dgags po*.

In addition to an on-going wage-paying/labor relationship, there were also such short-term labor relationships as spring labor [wages for spring plowing] and autumn labor [wages for autumn harvest], just like *Dgags po*.

Most of the cattle used for plowing [in *Dgags po*] are mDzo, [a cross between a cow and a yak]. When a household divides both fields and cattle are bestowed [on each new household], and [household] divisions due to marriage are also [handled] in the same way. Control over forests and pasture is afforded to the entire settlement. In these ways (and also in the way in which permission to plow uncultivated land is handled) the other areas settled by Tibetans that were mentioned previously are just like the *Dgags po* region.
Furthermore, at planting time in areas settled by Tibetans everyone unites together [to do the planting]. A few families work together, or two families exchange labor. Those with plowing cattle working together with those who lack them, and so on. Not only are all the Tibetan settlements in the borderlands (such as dMu dge, Shar khog and Ta khog) like this, but you yourselves have said that Dwaugs po is also like this!

Not only Dwaugs po but also some of the [other] border regions settled by Tibetans have a very backward method of production, so there are many [groups of] people that have failed to reach a fully developed feudal system, for example the Tibetans around the borders of D’zam thang.

3. The claim that the system of conflict resolution [shows that] they are not Tibetan, can be refuted as follows:

In some places in Zung chu and in dMu dge and Chu nag, things are just like in Dwaugs po. Disputes are settled by well-spoken headmen and well-known elders, and [they have] the practice of payoffs, the so-called “gZu zan mgd rdung”, and unwritten laws, etc. This is just like Dwaugs po—see if it is or is not so!

In areas settled by Tibetans, there exists every type of social system, from feudal society to systems of tribal alliances. For example, the [social] system of dBus gtsang and that of the far reaches of A mdo were dissimilar, and if we take Zung chu alone as an example, the system [employed] near the county seat is dissimilar to the system in places just a little away from town.

4. With respect to the Dwaugs po’s jewelry, food, architecture, etc., as for the claim that because they wear felt hats they are not Tibetan, [it can be refuted] as follows:

Felt hats are a pan-Tibetan custom: that this is a Tibetan style of dress is stated in the Deb ther dkar po and the Klu sgrab dgos gspan, with respect to the image of the god mRa chen which is made with a felt hat.3 Pastoralists wear cylindrical felt hats and farmers wear round felt hats with a band. Not only did those in dMu dge and Ta khog, etc. previously wear hats like the hats of the Dwaugs po, but the Dwaugs po of dBus also continue to wear felt hats like that. [Some people] claim that because they [i.e., the Dwaugs po] stick a feather in their hat they are not Tibetan, even though sticking a feather in one’s hat is a Tibetan custom! Not only is the great scholar Padma[sambhava] drawn adorned with a feathered hat according to Tibetan tradition, but when drawing the figure of Gesar [he] is drawn with a feathered hat, and many paintings are put on images and the helmets of oracles. This is the Tibetans’ own way of dressing! The ancient custom was for heroes to wear the feathers of vultures and for cowards to wear the feathers of crows. Even the Lama of dBus called Rig’dzin gnod ’phrul can [lit. “Rig’dzin with vulture feathers”] is named for his hat. Thus it is not necessary to say that the wearing of felt hats and the sticking of feathers on your head is not a Tibetan custom.

It is said that because they wear clothes made of flax they are not Tibetan, but wearing clothes made of flax is a Tibetan way of dressing. In agricultural areas where flax is produced, people wear flaxen clothes, in areas where livestock are a bit more plentiful people wear woolen clothes, and in pastoral areas they wear clothes of felt and hides. The clothes worn by men in Dwaugs po are mostly plain while the women wear showier clothes and ornaments, and this is a pan-Tibetan custom. Men have a large space inside the robe, and women wear braids join together at the ends, wrap [themselves] with multicolored belts and cloth belt wear conch and cowry shell decorations,49 and have wide sleeves. Not only this the same as in individual Tibetan areas in A mdo such as The bo and H’gtang, it is also the way of dressing in the Tibetan region of dBus. The custom of wrapping one’s legs with cloth leggings is also a custom of Tibetans in isolated areas. Aside from the Dwaugs po of A mdo, [the Tibetans of] Chu nag, tGyal mo Tsha ba Valley and those of other isolated areas such as the Dwaugs po of Kong po, and sPo bo in dBus also wrap [their legs with leggings]. Even putting oil on the hair is a Tibetan custom: thus pastoralists put butter on their hair a farmers put lard on their hair.

Eating things like oats, buckwheat, turnips, vegetables, and so forth is a widespread custom in Tibetan agricultural areas. One can understand this by looking at such Tibetan areas as lower Zung chu, Chu nag, and the rGyal mo rmg River. While it is indeed the case that in Tibetan pastoral areas they eat meat in agricultural areas they eat less meat, it is a pan-Tibetan custom not to eat horse meat, donkey meat, or dog meat. In pastoral areas, due to the cold, they eat raw meat, but in agricultural areas like Dwaugs po they mostly do not eat raw meat. Liking or not liking butter and cheese is different among the pastoralists and pastoralists all over Tibet. [Some say] that because they do not drink Shar [ba] tea50 they are not Tibetan, but the Tibetans in Khams and dBus do drink Shar [ba] tea either! [In terms of] mutual respect between old and young and mutual respect between men and women, Dwaugs po people are identical other Tibetans. Such customs as sitting cross-legged, men cutting the meat, and women kneading the dough for noodles are also pan-Tibetan customs.

Houses are square and made of stone, and have a south-facing enclosed yard. They have a wooden ladder-like staircase. The livestock live downstairs as people live upstairs. These are Tibetan customs; just look at places like Zung chu, Chu nag, dMu dge, rNgA ba, and mTSho sGon.51

Offerings are arranged on top of a cupboard and such things as porcelain bowls and brass platters are arranged in the cupboard. In the center of the hou there is a metal brazier with three legs, and the head of the household sits at the head of the hearth or toward the north. There is a room for religious offerings at the top floor [of the house], and grass and straw are stored above that. At night except for the head of the household and old people, everyone sleeps around the hearth. The roof is covered by shingles. All of these things are Tibetan customs.It is like this even now in such places as The bo, Co ne, Zung chu, dMu dge, With the exception of officials and rich people, no one has stools or tables—this is also like other Tibetans.

Dwaugs po’s marriage and funeral customs are also like the rest of Tibet. For example, in dMu dge, Shar khog and some parts of mTSho sGon they practice cremation in the winter and earth or water burial in the summer. The reason for this, it is said, is that if one practices cremation in the summer, the local gods and earth deities will be made angry and the harvest will thus be damaged. Earth and water burial are practiced.

Dwaugs po’s religion is also none other than the ancient religion of Tibet: Bo Bon has two phases: the early diffusion of Bon and later diffusion of Bon. Ti
possible to contemplate that they are not Tibetan. Not only are these pan-Tibetan customs, but it is even stated clearly in the legal codes of Srong btsan [sgam] and Khri srong [lde btsan] that the brave, the noble and the virtuous will revered and rewarded while the evil and the lowly will be punished; that old ten doing housework and related tasks, women may not express their opinion about politics, and so forth. So even though Dwags po’s customs are a bit different, is it not the case that the customs of every area are a bit different? According to this principle, Dwags po’s customs are fundamentally Tibetan customs.

How is it possible to say that due to their gentle nature, [the Dwags po] are not Tibetan? The Tibetan people are by nature gentle, [so] they are just like the very gentle-natured Tibetan people! [And] as for song lyrics, because the local style of Tibet each have their own special qualities, not only [are] the lyrics [different] but the intonation of the voice is also lighter or heavier depending on the region.

Not being called by a clan [or family] name and being called by a person name is a custom throughout Tibet. But [the Dwags po] are just like those other Tibetans who have this custom, having been influenced by and assimilated the customs of other nationalities. [For example,] there are northern Chinese influences in the language and customs of the Tibetans of the northern Sino-Tibetan border. And there exist similar influences on the language and custom of those Tibetans who live in the south along the Sino-Tibetan border.

Thus the very grounds for saying that [the Dwags po] are not Tibetan have become the grounds for saying that they are Tibetan. The Tibetan word “Bon po” used to describe the religious system, has a different pronunciation in each region of Tibet. For example, when pastoralists say “Bon po,” it sounds a little like the Chinese word “ben po” so it is usually written that way in Chinese. But when they say “Bon po” in Nanping, Zung chu, Chu nag, and the agriculture areas of Khams, it is very close to the sound when one says “bei bu” in Chinese. On this basis, some who have investigated this have decided to say that the religious system [of the Dwags po] is not Bon po but is “Beibu!” If that is the case, then who is the teacher of such a religion as that? Who developed it? From where did it spread? And moreover, are not the Bon of Zung chu and Nanping followers of none other than that religion? According to what those [researchers] say, their pronunciation of Bon po as “bei bu” has a different origin than that of the speech of the nearby Dwags po. Now as for this method of research, what sort of dialectical materialism is this? Pretending to have totally mastered everything by means of a little more than a month of research, they sit there, sit there without even looking at or coming to know the customs and habits of those Tibetans who are so close to the Dwags po such as those in Nanping and Zung chu, and, after trotting out those customs and habits which are one and the same as those of the Tibetans of Nanping and Zung chu, they sit there postulating that [the Dwags po] are not Tibetan!

Besides, reliable sources say that those researchers found in the Dwags po region a stele on whose face exists an inscription that is not Chinese, and a volume of writing in Tibetan script. There was not a single word [about this] mentioned in their report, however. If they were to trot out their photographs it would be invaluable to current historical research, but instead they sit there placidly.
their blind, ignorant way. One can even imagine that the words on that stele are probably ancient Tibetan.

In conclusion, according to the basic rules for the classification of a nationality according to the theory of dialectal materialism, if we analyze on the basis of the themes of the aforementioned research, in whatever respect—language, customs, traditions, means of production, social organization, etc.—the people of Dwan po have most [things] in common with the Tibetan nationality. Therefore there exist both the premise and the authoritative evidence [for stating that] the Dwan po people are Tibetan and [there exists] absolutely no evidence that they are the "Tis" Nationality.

**ANNOTATED TRANSLATION II: "A DISCUSSION OF [MY] VIEWS ON THE MATTER OF THE DWANPS NATIONALITY"

With regard to the matter of the Tibetans [living] within the present-day boundaries of Pingwu County who are known as "Dwan po," I have written two analytical essays, [the first of which] has been published in Chinese in the journal of the Sichuan Nationalities' Research Institute and [the second of which has been published] in Tibetan in Qinghai's sBrang char (Gentle Rain) (1981, Vol.2). But because I have heard that this [question] is being investigated yet again, here I will once again express some of what I know.

Some people have published that [because] they wear feathers on their heads it proves that [the Dwan po people] are not Tibetan, but wearing feathers on one's head is an ancient Tibetan custom. In the metal type-set edition of tGyals rabs gsal [ba'i] me [long] (bSod nams tGyal mtsan, 1981) on the second line of page 236, it states:

As the three—dGe 'byung of gYo, Rab gsal of gTsang, and Shakyu mu ne of dMar—were meditating, dGe 'byung of gYo saw a monk change his clothes [to that of a lay-person], take bow and arrow in his hand, and—having fastened feathers to his head and with a dog close at hand—go off hunting.⁶²

And in the Klong chen Chos 'byung it says that when Rab gsal of mDzad pa in gTsang, dGe 'byung of Bo dong in gYo and Shakyu mu ne of Stod lung in dMar were meditating at Chuo bo ri, they saw a monk. The monk was leading a dog, beating a tambourine and sticking feathers on his head. With his robes flapping back and forth, he prepared to shoot an animal. But since they saw him he did not shoot. The old monk looked at him and, based on what he saw, said: "The monk is crazy." The monk replied: "Teachers, do not be mistaken—this monk is not crazy. The king has ordered [this] monk to leave the order." This reply refers to Glang dar ma's command that monks must wear feathers on their heads as a symbol that they have left the order [on his command]. And in the accounts of Zhur ba od [sic] in the Mi la'i mgur 'bum, it says: "having stuck two vulture feathers," referring to the feathers worn on Zhur ba od's head.⁶³ Accordingly, it can be said that even 800 years ago the young people of Tibet wore feathers on their heads. Even though this custom gradually disappeared, in some places this custom is still evident.

Moreover, in the Gesar epic there are many songs about the way in which feathers are worn on the head. And on the wall to the right of the door in the gTsug lag khang [Jokhang] in Lhasa, there is a painting of physical exercises of ancient times, in which there are feathers painted on the heads of the exercisers I have seen this myself. Later on in Tibet, up until [Communist Liberation] there existed the custom of wearing feathered hats on such occasions as military drills, festivals such as gTor rgyag, etc.⁶⁴ And aside from all this, in some Tibetan areas such as rGyal rong, on the occasions of gTor rgyag, etc. it was traditional for the drafted soldiers to wear armors on their bodies and feathered ha on their heads. For these reasons the wearing of feathers on the heads of the Dwan po people of Nanping, Pingwu, etc. is a genuine ancient Tibetan custom. This is a pure sign that the people of Dwan po are Tibetan.

As for their name, it is clearly stated in the Early and Later Annals of tBri Tang⁶⁵ that Tibetan soldiers were left in the Sino-Tibetan border regions. So, for these [particular soldiers], since the vast majority of them were soldiers who came from the Dwan po region, Tibetans call them Dwan po, and Chinese people call them "Bai Ma"⁶⁶ or Pe ma Tibetan. Those characters represent the sound of the Tibetan word "Bod dma" [i.e., Tibetan soldier] when it is pronounced [by those Tibetans]: in the pronunciation of the [Tibetan] dialects of the areas around Zung chu, Chu nag and Nanping, the pronunciation of "Bod" sounds like "pe" and the pronunciation of "dma" sounds like "ma." Even in their pronunciation, "Bod dma" is pronounced "pe ma," which is the same as the pronunciation of the [local] Chinese pronunciation of the characters "bai ma."⁶⁷ For that reason, Chinese people call the "Pe ma Bod rgi" the "Baima Zangzu."⁶⁸

Their habits and customs are like those of the Tibetans called Shar ba in Zun chu and those of the Tibetans in my own native place called dMu dge. Additionally, their style of architecture, the way in which they make offerings to the gods, and their burial practices are similar. Women's fashions are identical to those of central Tibet. And their language is archaic Tibetan. As a result, it is well established that the Dwan po people are Tibetan.

Their religion is mostly the early Tibetan religion Bon. In the pronunciation of their dialect, the word "Bon" sounds like "pe." To suppose that for that reason their religion is a religion called "pe po'u" is rash.⁶⁹ The written language is none other than the Tibetan language. Tibetan is used in religious writings, contracts, etc. They say that there is a stone monument [there marking] the early Sino-Tibetan border with both Chinese and Tibetan writers on its face. I have indeed seen this written in both the earlier and the later reports by those who conducted research prior to now. As for the customs of that region which were discussed on those occasions, one can only argue that [the Dwan po people] are Tibetan. There is absolutely no basis for saying that they are the so-called "Tu Tso" Nationality.

Since I have already criticized those two reports, I will not repeat [myself] here. Prior to this there were no doubts about whether or not the Dwan po [were Tibetan], but lately, since the notion that they are the so-called "Tu Tso Nationality has been propagated, more and more people have been paying attention [to this issue]. But Tibetans living from Central Tibet all the way to those settlements on the Amdo border have always believed they [i.e. the Dwan po people] were Tibetan. In particular, if you were to say to the vast majority of the common Tibetan people in their area that they are not Tibetan, they will get angry and say they are just like [other Tibetan] farmers. (Dictated by dMu dge
are Tibetan or closely related to Tibetans: the Baima Zangzu in Nanping and Pingwu Counties (and indeed even a few in Zung chu County itself); the Qiang in Zung chu, Maotian and parts of Minyang District; and the Jiaron (rgyal rong) Zangzu in Heishui and the southern parts of Hongyuan County. Add to this boiling pot of ethnic discontent the very cultural similarities that he finds between many of these problematic populations and the Tibetans of Zung chu (as well as their differences from the more stereotypical Tibetans of the grasslands) and it becomes easier to see why the reclassification of groups such as the Baima may have seemed like the tip of a rapidly advancing bureaucratic iceberg, one that ran the risk of sinking the official Tibetan classification of the residents of these and other areas. Note that the case of other problematic Tibetan groups such as the Sherpa was also addressed in official scholarly journals by concerned Tibetan scholars (e.g. bsod nams, 1983).

10. The controversy has died down somewhat since the Chinese government has not yet actually formally recognized the group as a separate nationality. Instead, the consensus seems to be to refer to this particular group of people as “Baima Zangzu” or “Baima Zangren,” thus marking them as both Tibetan and not quite Tibetan (since they require an adjective to qualify their identity). Such a compromise remains a sensitive issue for Tibetans, however, especially those living in and coming from the borderlands. As long as qualifying adjectives can be added to the Tibetan classification based on local cultural variation, there exists the perceived danger that the qualifiers will eventually become more important than the root noun, thereby leading to ever greater factional- and fractionalization (both social and political) of the Tibetan population within the PRC.

11. It is interesting to note that dMu dge bsam gtan himself reveals in one of his Chinese essays (but not in the Tibetan) that he has never been to the area in question—but then again, neither has Fei Xiaotong. As dMu dge bsam gtan (1980b: 64) puts it:

I have never been to the area where the Dwags po people live, but in looking at the materials supplied by the two reports [of the official research team] I have come to exactly the opposite conclusion: the Dwags po definitely are Tibetans! Is it not strange that [we can] arrive at exactly opposite conclusions based on exactly the same material? I believe this is because the investigation team lacked a thorough understanding of the customs, religion, history, etc. of Tibetans.

Confident in his knowledge of things Tibetan, dMu dge bsam gtan sees himself as the equal (if not the superior) of his Chinese counterparts and is not afraid to write in a style that lets them know it.

12. At the time of writing, I have not yet been able to locate any published sources from that particular time period that reflect the reopening of the issue, though later published sources seem to indicate that the question of the proper classification of the Dwags po is far from resolved. An article published in a collection of local historical materials in 1991 (Zeng, 1991:132-168) reflects such an attempt to reopen the issue, as does the recent publication of an expensive volume on the cultures of the “Di” (i.e. Dwags po) and Qiang peoples (Deng, 1996). This volume, full of glossy pictures reproduced with a quality rarely seen in Chinese publications, leaves the reader with the impression that the “Di” and Qiang are the descendants of China’s legendary first rulers, the emperors Yan and Huang. The volume thus seems to directly challenge the official classification of the Dwags po as a Tibetan population. It should be noted that the general word among ethnologists in China is that the reclassification of the Dwags po as a separate minzu was blocked by the tenth Panchen Lama (see Harrell, 1996: 285-86 n.6), so it is possible that the issue may have resurfaced again in the wake of his death.
13. I am grateful to Toni Huber for discussing the importance of the rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long with me, and for allowing me to make use of his copies of both the Beijing edition of the Tibetan text (bSod nams rgyal mtshan, 1981) and the available English translations (Sørensen, 1994: Taylor & Yuthok, 1996) as I prepared the first draft of this article. For a brief discussion of the use of the rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long in contemporary historical and social writings by Tibetans, see Huber 1996: 58-67.

14. Notes on the translation:

1. Where I have added words or phrases that do not appear in (but are implied by) the Tibetan original, they are indicated in [brackets].

2. I have tried to reach a balance between a "literal" and a "literary" reading of the Tibetan original, and have therefore chosen to rework some sections that translate into awkward English when the Tibetan is adhered to too closely. I have, for example, frequently elected to break up long sentences and have inserted paragraph breaks in certain places. I have frequently relied on the structure of dMu dge bsam gtan's Chinese articles as a guide when making such editorial changes.

15. Chu dkar translates as "White River," currently rendered as the Baihe on Chinese maps.

16. Nanping County in Chinese, Lan phin in Tibetan. Note that the Tibetan spelling given here is derived from the pronunciation of the Chinese characters in Sichuan dialect, which often replaces the initial "n" with an "m".

17. Pingwu County in Chinese, Phin wu in Tibetan.

18. Both translatable as "Black River," but apparently referring to both the Heihe (in present-day Nanping County) and the Heishui (in present-day Heishui County) in Chinese.

19. Located in rGyal mo rong, or Jiarong in Chinese.

20. In present-day mNga'ris (Ali in Chinese), Western Tibet; stod shar ba in Tibetan.


22. Songpan County in Chinese. The Tibetan name is sometimes spelled Zong chu (e.g. Karmay, 1994: 2) or Zing chu.

23. In the local dialect, the Tibetan name is most often pronounced [xar wa] and the people it refers to probably have very little, if any, historical connection to the people known as Sherpas today, in spite of what the title of Nagano's (1980) treatise on the local dialect seems to imply.

24. Khri sron lde bsan (b.755-d.797).
25. Khri ral pa can (b.815-d.841).
26. Tib. sBras dbal rtbal che ba.
27. Tib. lDong zhwa mgo mtho ba.
29. Qing in Chinese.
30. Qianlong in Chinese (b.1736-d.1796). Note that the conversion of the peoples of rGyal rong from Bon to Buddhism (in most cases that of the dGe lugs pa) referred to here takes place in the context of the infamous Jinchuan Wars. For more on this historical period see Mansier (1990), Martin (1990), Karmay (1990) and Greatrex (1994).

31. Ma'erxiang in Chinese.

34. The text from which this account is taken is named in the Chinese version of this essay (dMu dge bsam gtan, 1980a: 63) as Zanggu Liu Zhong Xiaoaren Zuxing Zanggu Quanji for which no publication data is given.

35. The text named in the Chinese version of this essay (dMu dge bsam gtan, 1980a: 63) is Zhuoni Tusi Zupu for which no publication data is given.

38. This is apparently a reference to the "Pumi" Tibetans of Muli County, also mentioned by Fei Xiaotong in his essay on classification problems (Fei, 1980:1). Known as Prmti in their own language, they have been classified as "Zanggu" usual glossed as Tibetan) within Sichuan Province due to their historical and political connection with Muli Monastery, but are classified as "Pumizu" in Yunnan. Sir Harrell (1996) for a more detailed discussion of the classification process and the controversy which surrounded it. The Tibetan discussion of this controversy is loaded with irony and makes the re-classification process look totally ridiculous. By choosing to gloss Prmti as "Bod mi" (i.e., the Tibetan term for "Tibetan people"), the author is clearly poking fun at the official position that would separate the Prmti from Tibetans. For additional examples of related classification controversies on the Sino-Tibetan Frontier, all connected to the pre-PRC practice of classifying non-Han peoples of the border regions as "Western Barbarians" see Pen (n.d.)

39. Lest the rather awkward translation here be read the wrong way, I wish to clarify that this is most likely a reference to official discussion of revoking or changing; Muli County's status as a Tibetan Autonomous County within the Liangshan Yi Autonomous Prefecture of Sichuan Province, and not a reference to the extermination or resettlement of a Tibetan population.
40. Since the credibility of the Chinese researchers is being challenged, it is perhaps worthwhile to translate here their own account of their activities in 1978 and 1979: related in their research report (Sichuan Minzu Yanjiusuo, 1980: 150-51):

8/5/78: Formally organized the "Sichuan Province Nationalities' Affairs Commission's Nationality Classification Investigation Team," with Zhou Xiyi (of the Second Department of the Sichuan Nationalities' Affairs Commission), Sun Honghai (of the Ethnology Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), Ran Guangrong (of the History Department of Sichuan University), and Wang Jiayou (of the Sichuan Provincial Museum).
8/8: Ma Bingxiang (Vice-Chairman of the Sichuan Provincial Nationalities' Affairs Commission) and Shang Li (Department Head of the Second Department of the Sichuan Nationalities' Affairs Commission) meet with the members of the investigation team.
8/11: Investigation team arrives in Pingwu County.
8/12: She Kaixia (Vice-Chairman of the Pingwu County Party Commission) and Yang Jianzhi (of the Standing Commission) introduce the situation of the county's national minorities and the requests of the cadres and masses to the investigation team.
8/13: Arrive in the parts of Pingwu settled by the "Baima Tibetans"—Baima and Muzuo Communes—to begin work.
8/14: Together with Wang Zuolin and Xuan Gen of Pingwu County, the members of

9/20: The investigation team carry out research in every brigade of Baima Commune and in those brigades of Muzuo Commune made up of national minorities, conduct 11 discussion meetings and individually interview over 40 members of the population (common people and officials). [List of those participating omitted]
9/21: Party Secretary Xing of the County Party Commission hears reports from the investigation team, and expresses their hope that the issue of the classification of the nationality will be resolved as soon as possible.
50. Tib. Shar ja. Prior to the communist takeover of Shar khor, the tea trade in eastern mdo was virtually monopolized by the Shar ba, who would purchase tea in large quantities from the authorized Chinese distributors in the Zung chu (Songpa county seat) and then travel in large caravans to other parts of A mdo to sell it. In a Chinese article (dMu dge bsam gtan, 1980a: 60), the author uses the phrase “Son, pan zhuancha” in the place where Shar ja is used in the Tibetan. For a detailed discussion of this trade route and its influence on the culture and economy of the mdo region, see Baimacuo [Padma 'tsho] (1994). A brief account in English can be found in Karmay (1994: 2-3).

51. Qinghai in Chinese, referring to the province.

52. Tib. Khym snags. Another term for snags pa.

53. Tib. Rab byang.

54. Tib. "yod pa red." In Sharba dialect, the equivalent phrase used in colloquial speech is "yod rgyu red," and implies a sense of uncertainty or even doubt about the statement being made. In translating this phrase—which is not generally used elsewhere in these essays—I have used the phrase "seems to have," since I feel that the author may perhaps be beginning to let his dGe lugs pa prejudices show, denigrating Bon practices while at the same time utilizing them as evidence of iUr- or pan-Tibetan identity. At the Southwest Nationalities' Institute, many of dMge bSang gtan's former students and colleagues remember his frequent and vociferous attacks on Bon, but some believe that he began to soften his views later on in his life. This article perhaps best represents his earlier viewpoint, but I think the strategic use to which Bonpo practices can be put in positioning himself as an ancient yet ongoing Tibetan identity (cf. Kvernø, 1993), it is possible to see how a negative assessment of Bon might gradually start to change.

55. Refers to the residents of Shar khor.

56. Lab rtses are ritual caimans usually built collectively by a settlement on a mountain summit. For a discussion of the role of the annual lab rtses renewal ceremony in the construction of Tibetan identity, see Karmay (1993).

57. Tib. mChod dmars. A reference to the making of animal sacrifices or blood offering which are referred to as "sha sheng ji si" in the Chinese version of this essay. (dMge bsam gtan, 1980a: 61).

58. Tib. sMon lam chen mo.

59. Here, another name for Shar khor.

60. Tib. mChod lha.

61. My reading of this passage (dMge bsam gtan, 1993: 151), which is difficult to understand in the Tibetan, has been substantially informed by the arguments in the first Chinese essay (dMge bsam gtan, 1980a: 62).

62. For two different English interpretations of the passage in the rGyal rabs gsal bshear long to which dMge bsam gtan is referring here, see Sorensen (1994: 43) and Taylor & Yuthok (1996: 263). Both translations of the passage can also be found in full in Huber (1996). In this and the other passages quoted from Tibetan texts that follow, I have occasionally employed readings based on other published versions of the text that are slightly different than the version recited by dMge bsam gtan. I have done so in the hope of making the translation more readable, since what is at issue in this passage is the presence of feathers, not the relation between relative clauses. Where I have made such substitutions or departures from dMge bsam gtan's text, I have indicated them in the footnotes and as provided a translation of the author's original. Note also that in his original text dMge bsam gtan's quotation is identical to that found in bSod nams rgyal mtsha (1981: 236), with two exceptions: the addition of a shed following the phrase "sha thabs brtse" (change his clothes) and the spelling of "kyin dug pa" (bSod nag...
rgyal mtshan (1981: 236, line 5) as "gyin du'ga pa." Both of these differences may have been due to editorial decisions.

63. Note that the spelling here should be Zhi ba'od. The reference mentioned in the text can be found in Rus pa'i rgyan can (1981: 332, lines 12-13). Many thanks to Toni Huber for locating and directing me to this reference.

64. gtor rgyag refers to the ritual practice of breaking apart gtor ma and casting the pieces as a type of magical weapon to destroy or subdue bad or obstructive spirit powers. The most famous use of this practice occurs during the annual Great Prayer Festival (sMon lam chen mo), when soldiers would traditionally dress up in old armor or uniforms, which included plumed hats or helmets. Thanks to Toni Huber for a detailed explanation of this practice. Excellent pictures of men thus attired can be found in Normanton (1988: front cover, 147-149).

65. Tib. Thang yig gser rnying. dMu dge bSsam gtan is most likely referring here to the Tibetan digest of the Chinese historical annals of the Tang Dynasty, translated by Don grub rgyal and Khirin chen dbyin (1983), rather than the Chinese originals. Thanks again to Toni Huber for directing me to this reference.


67. In Sichuan Chinese dialect, the characters "bai ma" are pronounced "bei ma."

68. Baima (or "White Horse") Tibetans, which represents a quite different change from the postulated original "Tibetan Soldier Tibetans." For an additional discussion of the relationship between the Chinese term "Baima" and the Tibetan term "Bod dngag" as it relates to the Dpas po, see Tshogyal gnyis rdo rje (1987).

69. Here "pe po'u" represents a Tibetan transliteration of the Chinese characters (bei bu).

70. The spelling the author employs here is different to his previous usage of "Ts'a" to refer to the proposed Chinese ethnonym for the Dpas po. As I have been unable to locate the more recent reports to which this article is addressed, I do not know whether he is referring to yet another change in the proposed Chinese name or if the Tibetan spelling has simply been changed to provide a closer approximation of the local pronunciation. Since this second article was transcribed rather than written by dMu dge bSsam gtan himself, I assume the latter.
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### Appendix 1: Chinese Terms Used in the Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pinyin Romanization (In Alphabetical Order)</th>
<th>Chinese Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aba</td>
<td>阿坝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>阿里</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baihe</td>
<td>白河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baima Zangren</td>
<td>白马藏人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baima Zangzu</td>
<td>白马藏族</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beibu</td>
<td>北布</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benpo</td>
<td>芬波</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangchang Qiang</td>
<td>定昌羌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di</td>
<td>氐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizu</td>
<td>氏族</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannan</td>
<td>甘南</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gansu</td>
<td>甘肃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heihe</td>
<td>黑河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heishui</td>
<td>黑水</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiaron</td>
<td>嘉绒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinchuan</td>
<td>金川</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'erkang</td>
<td>马尔康</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mao'ergain</td>
<td>毛尔盖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mianyang</td>
<td>绵阳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minjiang</td>
<td>岷江</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muli</td>
<td>木里</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanping</td>
<td>南平</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pingwu</td>
<td>平武</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumi</td>
<td>靖米</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PumiZhu</td>
<td>晋米族</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qianlong</td>
<td>乾隆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qing</td>
<td>青</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinghai</td>
<td>青海</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>