



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Anthropology and the Chinese century

Pieke, F.N.

Citation

Pieke, F. N. (2012). *Anthropology and the Chinese century*. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19589>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19589>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Prof.dr. Frank N. Pieke

Anthropology and the Chinese century



Universiteit Leiden

Anthropology and the Chinese century

Inaugural lecture by

Prof.dr. Frank N. Pieke

on the acceptance of his position of professor of

Modern China Studies

at Leiden University

on Friday March 2, 2012



Universiteit Leiden

Mr Rector-Magnificus, honoured guests,

Maurice Freedman was the founding father of the modern anthropology of China in the 1960s. Like me, he ended up in Oxford, but, unlike me, he failed to return on time where he really belonged.

Exactly fifty years ago, Freedman foresaw the coming of a “Chinese phase in social anthropology”.¹ The anthropology of China undoubtedly grew and developed in the decades that followed, but I believe that it is only now that the anthropology of China is ready for the qualitative leap that Freedman implied. However, I would contend that this has as much, or even more, to do with the rise of China as a global power as the efforts of China anthropologists. Suddenly, anthropologists, like other social scientists, have to come to grips with a society outside the western core that self-consciously and self-confidently seeks a place at the centre of the global stage. With this, the anthropology of China almost coincidentally has a unique opportunity to make a lasting contribution to the discipline of social and cultural anthropology.

In his 1962 lecture, Freedman spoke of the new China anthropology as a harbinger of an active engagement with the complexity of Chinese society and civilization. In the event, quite the opposite happened, and Freedman’s “Chinese phase” never materialized. Because of the impossibility of fieldwork in what was then commonly referred to as “Communist China”, anthropologists worked almost exclusively in Taiwan, Hong Kong and among the ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia. The culture that the new China anthropologists in the 1960s and 1970s were talking about was therefore largely an artificially constructed “China”, a narrowly defined slice of kinship, gender relations, marketing, religion and ethnicity carefully dissected from complex and rapidly modernizing societies outside China itself.

In the event, the start of the Chinese phase in anthropology had to wait until China opened its doors to first-hand fieldwork in 1979. In the 1990s and 2000s, fieldwork in China became progressively easier to arrange, and many foreign anthropologists have now built up extensive contacts in their field sites, in government and among Chinese social scientists. China has become a mainstream ethnographic area that self-respecting anthropology departments can ill afford to leave out. Yet, China anthropologists are only very gradually beginning to make an impact beyond their China colleagues, and it has been less than ten years that China-related articles feature more or less regularly in the pages of mainstream anthropology journals. China anthropology still shows clear signs of immaturity, chiefly in a hesitation explicitly to take on questions of a more general rather than a China-specific nature. Ironically, this “mainstreaming” of China is much more pronounced in other disciplines that anthropologists routinely accuse of western ethnocentrism, such as economics, political science, or sociology.

Much like China itself, the anthropology of China in the first decade of the twenty-first century is still caught between ethnographic superpower status and the continued insularity of a self-contained ethnographic field. Yet it is unlikely that this situation will persist for very much longer, and there are indeed clear signs of a rapidly maturing mainstream status. Apart from the sheer number of researchers and volume of publications, more anthropologists from elsewhere are turning to China for their next project or trip, while China anthropologists themselves are notably bolder in exploring the implications of their work beyond an understanding of China itself.

So if this century will indeed be a Chinese one, what will its anthropology bring?

New lines of inquiry

Traditionally, anthropology’s place in the division of labour between the social sciences was the study of people and places

not or not yet incorporated in the sweep of western modernity across the world. This has, of course, long since been overtaken by events. As Marshall Sahlins convincingly argued about ten years ago, anthropological work even on traditional cultures supposedly at the brink of extinction shows how the opportunities of modernization and globalization have in fact served to, as he puts it, “hunt money” in order to strengthen traditional culture.²

China anthropologists, too, have begun to turn their investigation to life styles, consumption patterns, mobility strategies, realignments of ethnic and religious affiliations, education, health and health care, and other aspects of China’s newly found modernity or, perhaps better, modernities. In my own research on Chinese emigration I have had ample opportunity to witness how the growth of transnational communities is shot through with aspirations to achieve modernity and preserve tradition at the same time. In Fujian province, the most important source area of recent Chinese immigrants in Europe and the US, for instance, international migration is a much more socially, culturally and politically embedded phenomenon than the image conjured up by the term “snakehead” would lead one to believe. Moreover, in certain villages, prior international migration as long as one hundred years ago can be part of a remembered tradition, a cultural resource that later generations draw upon to start afresh their own international migrations. However, I also found that the start and maintenance of migratory flows cannot be understood purely locally or even transnationally: the state, its agents, and even modern financial institutions very actively “hunt money” too. In one village in Fujian, for instance, the main reason for the sudden surge of international migration in the 1990s lay in the support from the local government. Making emigration the key to achieving modernity and prosperity, the county government established a migration guarantee fund that gave loans to potential migrants to help them fund their migration overseas. Money for the fund was provided by the county’s International

Economic and Trade Office, the Agricultural Bank, and the Department of Finance. Subsequently, a new policy allowed banks directly to fund migration rather than through a government fund, thus widening the scope of such practices and integrating migration even further into the local economy.

This example shows that anthropologists no longer limit themselves to traditional (or rather non-modern) cultures. Yet an important legacy remains in that anthropologists are uniquely sensitive to the problematic, local and often tentative nature of modernization. To anthropologists, modernity is anything but self-evident, monolithic, inevitable, or indeed antithetical to tradition, and this is something that we take with us in our research of even the most ostentatiously modern institutions or phenomena.

Genealogies, modernity and localization of the state

When studying the production of written genealogies in rural China in 1999 and 2000, I found that the nation and the state inscribe on these genealogies their own narratives of China’s national unity and modernity.³ Both the practical work of compiling genealogies and the content of the finished product incorporate the life of each individual Chinese in a larger historical narrative of migrating ancestors and proliferating branches, a narrative that in turn is firmly embedded in the much larger master narrative of a unifying Chinese history that speaks of inexorable expansion through migration and conquest. In other words, genealogies always represent local roots in the language of origins elsewhere. I argue that this Chinese “genealogical mentality” has profound implications for our understanding of the tension between unities and diversities in Chinese culture, society and politics. By reading the past into the present and the present into the past, the genealogical mentality provides the flexibility simultaneously to separate and unite. In order properly to belong somewhere, Chinese first have to affirm the fact that, ultimately, they are from somewhere else.

After many years the Chinese party-state may finally be relearning this lesson. Under the Nationalists and later the Communists, the state penetrated society to a degree unparalleled during the Empire. The new, modern pattern of rule summarized under the twin captions of state building and nationalism leaves insufficient room to enmesh the state with society, and culture and religion with politics, as the Empire had done so effectively. Enlisting the genealogical mentality helps soften the grip of the central state. It also adds a further instrument to the repertoire of containing the political implications of market reform that now chiefly relies on setting up local elections for village leaders, strengthening the cadre system, and the recruitment of successful entrepreneurs directly into the party. The proliferation of genealogies and local descent groups can be a powerful tool for the localization of the state, contributing rather than running counter to the strengthening of a vertically integrated state apparatus. Contrary to the collective period when we could argue over the exact “reach” of the state, state control is becoming more and more diffuse, graded and a matter of give and take. Local officials, or cadres as they are known in China, are the agents of such a symbiosis that inserts local interests and preoccupations into the state apparatus, while simultaneously promoting the state’s grip over of these interests. In this regard, it may be argued that local cadres again begin to look like the famous *gentry* under the Empire, something that may have profound implications for the continuation of Communist Party rule.

The Chinese bureaucracy as a framework

In subsequent research on Communist Party schools I have developed these ideas further, specifically returning to the issue of the nature and implications of the localism of party and state officials.⁴ To leading cadres in a particular area or organization, the local committee of the Communist Party is not only the concrete manifestation of the party and its power to discipline, reward and punish, but also the focal point of a local community of cadres. Cadres are recruited from among

the best and brightest in an area, and for them, serving the party includes service to their native place. Furthermore, serving the party means working and often living together with other cadres of equal rank and from the same place. From the perspective of cadres, the party and its administration are not faceless institutions, but a community of peers of equal rank serving in the same jurisdiction. Yet this community and jurisdiction are at the same time embedded in a larger jurisdiction one bureaucratic level higher: townships are part of a county, counties are part of a prefecture, and prefectures are part of a province. Ambitious local cadres hope and expect that, one day, they will be promoted, leaving their local area and its community of cadres to become a member of that larger jurisdiction and community. Because a cadre’s original area is a part of, and hierarchically subordinated to, this new jurisdiction, cadres who are promoted in a sense never really leave their native area, but simply see the area they belong to expand first to include a county, then a prefecture and ultimately a whole province.

At a practical level, the Chinese bureaucracy is therefore less a simple hierarchical organizational framework than a set of hierarchically overlapping communities. With the connection between areas and hierarchy the party’s orchestration of cadre careers achieves a powerful fusion of habitual particularist localism and universalist loyalty to the national party and state organization.

During my fieldwork at local party schools in Yunnan I was in an excellent position to observe this process in action. Cadres who are trained or educated at a party school are all drawn from the jurisdiction that the school belongs to. To these cadres, their stay at the party school helps them not only to strengthen and broaden personal connections with cadres from their own locality, but also to get to know cadres from other areas within the school’s jurisdiction. Staying at the school helps cadres build a broad range of informal ties

that are both the lubricant and glue of the administration. Crucially, these ties are not only with the community in their area of origin, but also with the much larger community one tier up in the hierarchy.

It is in this respect that party schools make perhaps their greatest contribution to the party's rule. Training at a party school helps cadres not only in their current job, but, if and when they get promoted, also in their future one, reinforcing and creating the hierarchically nested administrative communities of cadres that are the backbone of the Chinese administrative system. Translating formal vertical and horizontal administrative lines of command into human relationships, such relationships reproduce the delicate balance between localism and centralism that has been a long-time characteristic of the Chinese party-state. Many times cadre localism has proved to be a stumbling block for ambitious central initiatives. However, the local roots of cadres equally often have helped the party-state survive in times of upheaval, if not near-anarchy at the centre.

Anthropology is a discipline that always questions the divide between tradition and modernity and is therefore uniquely equipped to understand this. However, this is not the same as saying that anthropology does or should always seek the point of view of people at the margins, in the localities, or who otherwise are looking from the outside in. In studying the life of the Chinese state, anthropology has important contributions to make, not only to China studies, but also potentially to comparative politics and political history. André Gerrits and I are currently preparing a comparative project on the futures of authoritarian rule in Russia and China. There is little point, we think, in trying to predict how and when a dictatorship will become a democracy, for example because of the growth of a capitalist market economy or the rise of the middle classes. There is also little sense in pointing out "sprouts" of democratic politics in the growth of civil society, formal elections, or the increased autonomy of parliaments.

These messages might be reassuring to those that think that democracy is the only acceptable way of political life, but they tell us little about what is happening in a country like China.

In contemporary China, neither the word dictatorship nor the wish for democratic transition capture what is going on. Instead, state-strengthening and an obsession with social stability have led to a focus on what the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) calls "social management". This means that the state believes that it can and must build a new Chinese society that is prosperous and harmonious. The surgical application of force is an important but only relatively minor, tool to do so. The rule of law, strengthening of local communities and the non-state public sector, social security and fairness have been firmly co-opted into a statist corporatist strategy to deal with the requirements of a rapidly developing capitalist economy and society. The question that we therefore really should ask is whether the CCP will indeed manage fully to shape Chinese society according to its bland blueprint of a happy and docile society.

To understand this, quick and easy theorizing on democratic transition will have to be replaced by meticulous research on the nature of everyday politics and administration of such stubbornly authoritarian countries. Authoritarian regimes have continued to evolve, modernize and diversify, deploying a wide range of governmental techniques, some of which have been borrowed from western democracies, while others are home-grown. Anthropological fieldwork that looks at the state as society will help us understand how and why these techniques have helped authoritarian rule to survive.

Chinese globalization

China's contribution to anthropology can, and in my view, should be much more than a way of looking at the state. Twenty years ago, Michael Herzfeld argued that the Mediterranean sat uneasily within the discipline of anthropology, because its history and location straddled the

western-modern and non-western-traditional divide.⁵ I would argue that currently China brings the problematic nature of this divide out in even sharper relief and not only because of the unique pace and impact of its modernization. Equally important, in China modernization is not seen as simply “catching up”, but first and foremost as a recovery of China’s rightful 18th century place as the richest and most civilized place in the world.

China, like the Mediterranean, until recently presented an ambiguous image to the anthropological gaze: a great civilization and centre of the world, yet poor, downtrodden and, under the Communist Party, hermetically isolated. China therefore for a long time remained strangely irrelevant to mainstream anthropology. In the Mediterranean this issue seems to be “resolved”, so to speak, by the split between an increasingly European North and an African and Middle Eastern South. China’s rise, however, presents us with a revitalized global centre and an energetically competing modernity. With that, it also promises to bring a fundamentally new set of issues to anthropology.

After the rise of Japan in the previous century, China is the first country that is making the transition from simply a part of the non-western periphery of the world system to being a superpower and core of its own regional and increasingly global system of political, strategic, economic, religious and cultural dominance. For anthropologists this means that they will have to find ways of thinking and writing about a society that is much more than just another culture. As a global power, China not only self-consciously draws upon its remembered civilization to realize the wish to be in charge of its own version of modernity independently from western civilizers. China also does not hesitate to become a civilizer in its own right, imposing its modernity upon others. With it, anthropologists of China will bear ethnographic witness to global processes of domination, expansion and exploitation from the vantage point of a newly emerging centre.

Taking such a global view of Chinese culture has many implications for the anthropology of China. Most immediately and obviously, we can no longer afford to talk about issues and places just in China. Ethnography on things Chinese have, as Arjun Appadurai put it, to “deterritorialize” itself by following the footsteps of the culture that it studies and investigating the impact of Chinese people, power and culture across the globe.⁶

Several elements can be identified in developing such an approach. The new China anthropology should also unmask the constructed nature of the entity called China, identifying how “China” or parts thereof are differentially constructed in a variety of arenas and circumstances across the globe. The challenge is to understand China as part of and interwoven with, yet at the same time separate from other areas and a world system still dominated by the West.

This process of what I have called “Chinese globalization” includes much more than just the transnational flows of goods, money, ideas and people. Chinese institutions - the state, businesses, banks, voluntary associations, religious organizations, criminal gangs and so on - are nowadays deeply interwoven with the world beyond China in ways that were unimaginable only a few years ago. In other words, the new China anthropology as a driving force in the anthropology of the 21st century should pack its punch by setting out to do exactly the opposite of what the (re)inventors of the field did fifty years ago. Where our predecessors tried to distil the essence of unspoiled Chinese culture from rural Taiwan and Hong Kong, we must now focus on what Ulf Hannerz has called global and local creolization processes in which Chinese culture is rapidly becoming one of the dominant ingredients.

There are many ways that this can be done. Recent ethnographic work on transnational Chinese religious organizations, the extraterritoriality of Chinese investment zones, the localization and marketing of Chinese manufactured goods, Chinese traditional medical practitioners, or

employment practices in Chinese-invested firms are examples of this kind of work, looking at China as it is constructed beyond China's geographical borders.

In my own work, one example has been the internationalization of Communist Party cadre training. Cadre training involves a great deal of mobility. Both students and teachers commonly travel far and wide to party schools, universities, academies and other institutions across the country and indeed abroad. Such travel is predicated on the notion that superior and more modern knowledge is hierarchically and spatially distributed, a hierarchy that explicitly also extends to the developed nations, with the US at its apex. The establishment of foreign training programmes and study tours has been much facilitated by the enthusiasm of international organizations and foundations, foreign governments and foreign universities. Funding for international programs mostly comes from foreign donors or partners, who see these programs as an opportunity to have an impact on the modernization of China's administration and the new generation of Chinese leaders, and to establish invaluable personal and institutional relationships with the Chinese government and the Communist Party.

The booming industry that off-site cadre training programs and study tours have become is predicated as much on the new wealth of China and the increased solvency of the Chinese administration, as on the cheapness of travel and the convenience of long-distance communications that are familiar drivers of globalization processes anywhere. However, national and international study tours and training programs also draw on China's long-standing administrative culture, most strikingly perhaps the practice of establishing advanced models. During the Maoist period, models illustrated by example what a leader wished to achieve. Models were faithfully studied by visiting delegations from across the nation, which were supposed to emulate the famous example upon their return home. International and national programs

for cadre training can thus be read as a specifically Chinese, and Maoist-Leninist, way that globalization processes play out. The outcome of at least this aspect of Chinese globalization has not been a weakening of the Chinese government, the Communist Party, or Communism, but a modernization of Leninist administration. Currently, large numbers of Chinese cadres routinely take part in pilgrimage-like trips across the nation and abroad to the sacred sites of China's revolution, market reform and the world capitalist system, such as Jingtanshan, Yan'an, Shenzhen, Shanghai, Oxford, or Harvard University, thereby reinforcing the message that China's new administrative civilization somehow is spawned by economic success and exposure to the West. Most importantly, it reinforces the notion that modernity is unequally distributed; by necessity, modernity is to be found elsewhere, to be studied, emulated and, ultimately, surpassed.

Migration and the new proletariat

Beyond cadre training, I have researched Chinese globalization mainly by building on my earlier work on overseas Chinese communities started as a Masters student in Amsterdam in 1981. In this work, carried out with several other colleagues like Xiang Biao, Pál Nyíri and Mette Thunø, I have looked at the growth of transnational communities, the professional "production" of emigrants in cities and villages across China, and the logic of the regulatory and technological weapons race between these migration professionals and their counterparts, professional border agencies.⁷ Shortly before my return to the Netherlands, I also investigated how in recent years Chinese migrants in the UK have moved beyond the traditional Chinese catering trade, inserting themselves in what I have called a "neo-proletarian" sector of the labour market where they work alongside other, mostly illegal immigrants from Asia, Latin America, Africa and Eastern Europe. Chinese new proletarians work often under terrible conditions in agriculture, construction, meat or fish processing, cleaning services, garment manufacture, or prostitution.⁸ Without the new proletariat, many goods and services in our economies

would be much more expensive or have to be imported from low wage countries such as China. These facts are routinely ignored in debates on immigration. The problem with immigration is not so much immigration itself as the segmentation of the labour market in Western Europe and North America. Our economies need the cheap labour of immigrants who can be hired and fired at a moment's notice completely outside the careful regulation of our welfare states and legal systems. The issue is not illegal residence, but the Dickensian exploitation of illegal labour. Without this acknowledgment, any debate, tweet, or policy proposal on the immigration problem is just an exercise in demagoguery, hypocrisy and self-delusion.

China, a country of international in-migration

We in Europe are of course not alone in this. Many Asian countries as well are haunted by the spectre of the hungry immigrant, eager to fatten up on the new wealth of these nations. And despite all the fear in Europe and North America surrounding unfettered immigration from China, there too the tide seems to be turning.

Currently, I am working on a research project that brings together my two areas of specialization - society and governance in China and international migration. The project focuses on an entirely new field of research: China as a country of international in-migration.⁹ China's wealth and global prominence attract increasing numbers of foreigners who settle in China, sometimes for good. These immigrants not only include people from surrounding countries and Chinese return migrants, but are also from places that one perhaps would expect less, such as Africa, the Middle East and South Asia, and westerners from Europe, North America and Oceania.

The project focuses on the mobility patterns and community formation of these immigrant groups and policy making and implementation of the Chinese state in dealing with this new challenge, and in this regard builds on earlier work

anthropological work on communities of internal migrants pioneered by my former Ph.D. student Xiang Biao. In the short to medium term, the rise of China as a major immigration country is mostly predicated on the continued growth of its economy and its gradual transition to an urban, service-based economy. In the long term, it seems certain that because of China's family planning, the impact of population ageing will be much more extreme in China than in the West, or even Japan and Korea. Economic and social development and demographic trends will combine to create increasing shortages of labour. In twenty years from now, China will be a country defined by its cities rather than by its countryside, and the latter will no longer be able to act as a limitless reservoir of labour migrants. Moreover, China's alarmingly unbalanced sex ratio means that there will be many more men than women, creating a surge in demand for women (mainly as wives, but also as mistresses or prostitutes) that will fuel international migration and trafficking.

China currently has an estimated foreign population of over two million people. With the rapid increase in the number and diversity of immigrants, China is beginning to be faced with the formation of more permanent immigrant communities, many of which are, like internal migrants earlier, residentially clustered and occupationally specialized. This will have considerable repercussions for the kind of country that China will be in ten or twenty years from now. Foreigners generate specific demands for housing, education, health care and other aspects of infrastructure that can no longer be ignored in an analysis of China's increasingly cosmopolitan urban forms. Immigrants also have a direct impact on China's social, cultural and religious diversity, and the associated issues of inequality within and between ethnic groups, greater sensitivity of ethnic, religious and race relations, and state policy making. Immigration is also a key aspect of the formation of borderland societies, especially in the northern part of Southeast Asia, Northeast Asia, and Central Asia. Regionally, China has become a centre of gravity in places

where borders no longer divide but have created regions where people, cultures, groups and state power meet and interact, and cross-border mobility has become a crucial issue in China's engagement with its neighbours.

This project is about the profound implications that this development is beginning to have for contemporary China, both as a culture and as a nation, polity and society. As China's policies for migrant communities mature, how long will it take before the old overseas Chinese and national minority policies also come across as out of touch with reality? Will China, as a new global centre, be able to resist the easy temptations of imagined autochthonous homogeneity, immigration-phobia and aggressive nationalism? Will we eventually see the emergence of a general set of policies aimed at pluralism in the context of rapid mobility and social change that includes overseas Chinese, new returned Chinese emigrants, indigenous minorities, internal migrant communities and international migrant communities?

10

China anthropology not only follows the globalization of China abroad, but is also attuned to the globalization of China from within. Immigration, arguably more than any other aspect of the emergence of China as East Asia's leading metropolitan area, forces us to acknowledge that Chinese society and culture are no longer just Chinese. Urban areas with tens of million inhabitants like Guangzhou-Shenzhen and Shanghai-Suzhou-Hangzhou forge a new, creolized China from the mobility and interaction of a plethora of Han Chinese groups, indigenous minorities and foreign visitors and residents. A focus on migration will also encourage the renewed integration of China anthropology into East Asian and Southeast Asian anthropologies that remains still largely unexplored. The new life-styles and consumer patterns in China's cities have much in common with cities in South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Southeast Asia. Unlike twenty years ago, therefore, anthropologists can no longer study China as if it has nothing to do with the region that it is part of.

Continuities and transformations in China anthropology

China anthropology will continue to be firmly grounded in ethnography in China itself, yet at the same time will increasingly venture beyond its borders. Explicitly teasing out the continuities and transformations of civilizing projects that take both Chinese themselves and external others as their object will allow anthropologists to make ethnographically informed comparisons with civilizing projects elsewhere (for instance, India, Europe, the US, the Islamic world). In this way, the new anthropology of China should not only help reinvigorate what Peter van der Veer calls an explicitly comparative sociology within anthropology itself⁰, but also enable anthropologists to enter larger debates about the rise of the world's next superpowers. In my view, making ourselves heard outside the confines of our own discipline is equally as important an aspect of mainstreaming China anthropology as is achieving a more prominent place within it. The quest for the essential aspects that make Chinese culture fundamentally different continues to generate a ready demand for decontextualized and generalized treatises on snippets of Chinese culture. I consider it to be one of the major tasks of anthropology to debunk such generalizations. Anthropologists continue to be uniquely equipped to show how native systems of meaning interact with the constraints of the political and social environment, informing highly specific local reactions and actions in response to global processes and challenges. When we add to these strengths a new willingness to embed our analysis in long-term globalization processes and comparative sociology, China anthropology has good reason to be confident in its contribution to debates both within and outside anthropology.

It is customary to end an inaugural lecture with a word of thanks, which I am most happy to do. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my wife Alka Shah and my sons Thomas and Michael for allowing me to work stubbornly and seemingly forever on an esoteric subject like the anthropology of China, and being away from home without good reason for

long stretches of time. I would also like to thank my relatives that they already long ago stopped making silly jokes about the sense and nonsense of anthropology and China studies. Although they are unable to be here in person today, I owe a deep debt to my former supervisors and mentors, Hans Vermeulen and Gregor Benton in Amsterdam long ago and, only slightly less long ago, John Gumperz and Nelson Graburn in Berkeley. Without their encouragement and support I would not have given this lecture today.

First in Leiden, after than in Oxford, and now again in Leiden, I have worked with many people, making many friends and, surprisingly, only very few enemies. I also supervised hundreds of students. I have learned something from all of you.

And I hope to continue to do so for many years to come.

Ik heb gezegd.

Notes

- 1 Maurice Freedman, "A Chinese Phase in Social Anthropology." *The Study of Chinese Society: Essays by Maurice Freedman*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 380-397 (1979).
- 2 Marshall Sahlins, "What is Anthropological Enlightenment? Some Lessons of the Twentieth Century." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28: i-xxiii (1999).
- 3 Frank N. Pieke, "The Genealogical Mentality in Modern China." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 62(1): 101-128 (2003).
- 4 Frank N. Pieke, *The Good Communist: Elite Training and State Building in Today's China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2009).
- 5 Michael Herzfeld, "Anthropology through the Looking Glass: Critical Ethnography at the Margins of Europe." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 6 Arjun Appadurai, "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination." *Public Culture* 12(1): 1-19 (2000).
- 7 Frank N. Pieke, "Transnational Chinese: Fujianese Migrants in Europe." Stanford: Stanford University Press (first author with Pál Nyíri, Mette Thunø and Antonella Ceccagno, 2004).
- 8 Frank N. Pieke and Biao Xiang, "Legality and Labor: Chinese Migratory Workers in Britain." *Encounters* 3: 15-38 (2010).
- 9 Frank N. Pieke, "Immigrant China." In Frank N. Pieke and Elena Barabantseva (eds), *Old and New Diversities in Contemporary China*. Special issue of *Modern China* 38(1): 40-77 (2012).
- 10 Peter van der Veer, "The Comparative Sociology of India and China." *Social Anthropology* 17(1): 90-108 (2009).

PROF.DR. FRANK N. PIEKE



Frank Pieke (1957) studied cultural anthropology at the University of Amsterdam and the University of California, Berkeley, where he received his Ph.D. in 1992 on *The Ordinary and the Extraordinary: An Anthropological Study of Chinese Reform and Political Protest*. Between 1986 and 1995 he was university lecturer in the anthropology and sociology of modern China at Leiden University. Between 1995 and 2010 he was university lecturer in the modern politics and society of China and fellow of St Cross College at the University of Oxford. In Oxford his duties included founding director of the university's China Centre, director of the British government-funded British Inter-University China Centre, and Vice-Master of St Cross College. He was appointed chair professor in modern China studies at Leiden University in 2010. His research focuses on the anthropology of the Chinese administration and politics, international migration to and from China, and globalization, ethnicity and diversity in China and Europe. His most recent book is *The Good Communist: Elite Training and State Building in Today's China* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).



Universiteit Leiden