

Restore history in association and symbiosis——History of the New Qing Dynasty, Inner Asia Studies, and the Concept of the Chinese Nation

Wei Li *

Xijing University, 1 Xijing Road, Chang'an District, Xi'an City, Shaanxi Province, China.

* Corresponding author: 928635950@qq.com

Keywords: Qing History Research; New Qing History; Inner History; Association and Symbiosis

Abstract: In traditional Qing history research, the study of New Qing history, and the history of Inner Asia, the traditional Qing history puts too much emphasis on the view of the Chinese nation, the Central Plains dynasty, and the integration of Man and Han, etc. The New Qing history emphasizes the Manchu factor in the rule of the Qing Dynasty. The study of Asian history also emphasizes the use of multiple Central and Western languages and the main subject of Inner Asia. It emphasizes that Inner Asia is the center, which makes the research tend to be based on academic evidence and academic arguments. Because all three emphasize the Manchu factor, use the Manchu language and other minority languages, research from the development trajectory of the Manchu, and restore the historical truth to reshape history, so it is gradually integrated and innovative in the debate. History Institute is really oriented.

Regardless of whether it is the New Qing History, the Inner Asia Study, or the traditional Qing History research with the perspective of the Chinese nation, the starting point and the end point are the same, that is, to restore the history to the maximum extent, and to discover the truth of history instead of obvious bias. To understand the connection between the three, it is necessary to sort out the differences between the three.

Differences between Traditional Qing History Studies and New Qing History and Inner Asia Studies

The traditional study of Qing history from the perspective of the Chinese nation view has continued the grand narrative model of the existing historiography, emphasized the continuity and inheritance of history, emphasized the process of changing China into a foreign country, and integrating Manchu and Han, and emphasized the Chinese orthodoxy, Central Plains Dynasty view. The New Qing History is quite the opposite. It is a school of Qing History research that has emerged in the United States since the 1990s. It is a mixture of various types of academic viewpoints, including Manchurian studies in Japan and Manchurian studies in Europe And Mongolian Studies. It opposes "Han-centered theory", emphasizes the difference between the Qing dynasty and previous Han dynasties, and emphasizes the Manchu factor in the Qing dynasty. First, it attaches importance to the use of historical materials from the Manchu, Mongolian and other ethnic minorities. The rules of past studies of Sino-Japanese Qing history. However, the study of the history of Inner Asia is different. It emphasizes that the history of Qing Dynasty is viewed from the perspective of Inner Asia and grasps the whole view of Inner Asia in the Qing Dynasty. The focus of traditional history has always been at the ends of Eurasia, namely Europe and East Asia, and the history of Inner Asia in the middle zone seems to be in a subordinate, modified and marginal position. The study of the history of Inner Asia is centered on Inner Asia. It believes that the region of Inner Asia has its own unique historical development dynamics. It has had historical periods of complete marginalization and peripheral positions, but also historical periods that played important roles, such as During the Yuan and Qing dynasties, Nea 's influence on the national center of gravity of the Yuan and Qing dynasties, the formulation of national policies, and the direction of national development have had important influences.

The specific manifestations are as follows. First of all, the traditional Qing history

overemphasizes the Chinese view of the ethnic group, the view of the Central Plains Dynasty, and the Man-Han fusion view. Therefore, it is inevitably caught in the quagmire of historical grand narrative and cannot be extricated. It has become the target of attack by others. Its one-sided research approach has also led to the study of the history of the Qing dynasty. Not only is it impossible to grasp the clues of the development of Manchu history from the perspective of Asian, even Eurasian and global history, but it is also impossible to grasp the specific clues and details of the development of the Qing dynasty from the interweaving of many contradictions such as Manhan, Manmeng and Manman. On the surface, there is no real chapter.

Secondly, although the Xinqing School of History claims that their postgraduate methods or perspectives are different from the traditional studies of Qing history, in essence, nothing comes. One, the New Qing School of History represented by Ke Jiaoyan, Ou Lide, etc., helped the study of Qing history to get rid of the traditional "Sinification" model which was too restrictive. Then develop the ability of the younger generation of Qing historians to use documents in languages other than Chinese. The vision of young American scholars was thus opened, and they were exposed to richer literature, which broadened their academic horizons and conceived more academic topics, such as the history of the Manchu society, as well as the military history of the Qing Dynasty and the history of frontiers. Research materials are abundant in non-Chinese literature. From this perspective, American scholars and Chinese scholars will cooperate more closely and frequently, because Manchu and Mongolian archives are being published in batches, and Chinese scholars have begun to use these documents. However, it does not match the name "New Qing History". It emphasizes that its innovation lies in: one is "emphasizing the perspective of globalization"; the other is "emphasizing the importance of Manchurian factors"; the third is "emphasizing the use of Manchu language and other ethnic minorities" The importance of language. "And we must see that these are not invented or advocated by the New Qing History, so this is not a new research path or theoretical orientation of the Qing History. In fact, rather than what new historical research methods were proposed by the history of the New Qing Dynasty, it is better to say that it embodies a more inclusive and academically sensitive research horizon.

Once again, the study of the history of Inner Asia emphasizes the use of multiple Central and Western languages, with Inner Asia as the main body, emphasizes that Inner Asia is the center, East Asia is the edge, Yuan and Qing dynasties developed from the edge to the center, and moved from a small and small country like a small one across East and West. Empire development. It seems that it seems to stand in the perspective of intercontinental history, but it actually does not conform to the actual situation of China's Yuan and Qing Dynasties. "Inland Asia" is a core concept in the study of Chinese history in the Qing Dynasty by western historians since the mid-1990s. It constitutes the theoretical basis of "New Qing history". And cultural aspects are full of the characteristics of the "inland Asia" nations; the Qing Dynasty they established maintains a distinct "inland Asia" feature, not a Chinese character; this makes it easier for Manchus to obtain Identification and support, and based on this, established a powerful dynasty and realized the rule of China. Therefore, how to look at the "inland Asia" factor has become the key to analyzing the "new Qing history". It also considers that the system of the Li Fanfan adopted by the Qing Dynasty is a key measure to resolve political identity with the "inland Asia" nations; the acceptance and respect of the Han culture by the rulers of the Qing Dynasty, and the policy of enveloping the Han people were a strategy The above considerations and means are intended to serve political rule, not to willingly "sinify". In fact, its disadvantages are obvious. A more important factor was ignored, namely the role of the Han nationality in the Qing Dynasty. The Han nationality accounted for more than 95% of the Qing Dynasty population and had economic and cultural advantages. In any case, it should not be ignored in the construction of the Qing Dynasty history. Throughout the 18th century, the Qing Dynasty received funds from the Mainland, and donated only one item to no less than 10 million silver. Without such strong economic support, the Qing Dynasty's success in "Inland Asia" would be difficult to achieve. The alliance between the Manchus and the Hans, and the support of the Mainland, is the main reason for their success in "Inland Asia".

The connection between traditional Qing history research and new Qing history and Inner history research

From the above discussion, the difference between the traditional study of Qing history and the study of the history of New Qing and Inner Asia can be clarified. This is mainly manifested in the following four aspects.

First, they emphasize the Manchu factor. Traditional history is self-evident. Institutions such as the Manchu Society and Manchu Research are generally established in Northern provinces and autonomous regions, while non-governmental organizations such as the "Manchu Liaison Association" are located in various provinces across the country. The history of the New Qing Dynasty explores the Manchu factor as the main factor. It emphasized that the "Manchurian special group" is independent of the Han nationality and has not been "Sinicized". Manchuria played a "very important role" in establishing the Qing rule. The importance of Manchurian factors in the history of the New Qing cannot be added. The history of Inner Asia attaches equal importance to the factors of Manchuria. It emphasizes the Inner Asian ethnicity and the focus of Inner Asia of the Manchus. It believes that the Manchus are full of the characteristics of the "inland Asia" nations in terms of religion and culture.

Second, they both emphasize the "importance" of using Manchu and other minority languages. Traditional Qing history has always insisted on this. As early as the 1930s and 1940s, scholars began to translate Manchu texts. At the same time, more scholars in the Japanese academic community are engaged in the translation of "Manchu Old Stories", which is used as an important historical material for the study of Manchu and Qing history. A Manchu dictionary and a Manchu-Chinese dictionary were published, demonstrating the importance China attaches to Manchu characters. Since the 1960s, Manchu classes have been set up at the Central University for Nationalities. Over the past half century, a large number of Manchu language talents have been trained! In some northern provinces, such as Liaoning, Jilin, Heilongjiang, etc., long-term and short-term Manchu language classes are held, and Manchu studies and Manchu language institutes are set up. As for other ethnic minorities, all languages and characters are set up in some ethnic colleges. Learning minority languages such as Manchuria and other languages that have become "dead languages" are only used to read Manchu literature and are convenient for research. The history of Xinqing claimed that one of its innovations was to emphasize the importance of using Manchu language and other minority languages, so the use of Manchu language is self-evident. The history of Inner Asia emphasizes the comprehensive use of multiple languages, including Manchu and Mongolian.

Third, from the perspective of research methods, the three are interrelated, and they all emphasize the study from the development track of the Manchu. Although traditional history studies the history of Manchu and Qing Dynasty from Huaxia, it still has not separated from the development track and course of Manchu history itself, only focusing on the differences. On the basis of traditional historiography, the history of the New Qing Dynasty increased the composition of the Manchu factors in the study of the history of the Manchu dynasty, focusing on the investigation of the Manchus themselves, the so-called Manchu factors. The history of Inner Asia sublimates the Manchu factor fundamentally. It regards the history of Manchu as the spiral of Manchu's own development, and believes that it has its own trajectory and law. Therefore, from this perspective, the three have a high degree of consistency, but they have different proportions of Manchu factors.

Fourth, from the perspective of research purposes, the three are also interconnected and indivisible. Whether it is the history of the New Qing Dynasty, the history of the Inner Asia, or the traditional Qing history, it is undoubtedly to emphasize the restoration of historical truth and the reshaping of history. So whether it is the traditional Huayi perspective, the Manchu factor perspective of the New Qing history, or the Inner perspective of the history of Inner Asia, it is just a different perspective. The main purpose is the same, all academic purposes, not political blame. From this point of view, we should be tolerant and inclusive with regard to scholarship, just

as "a hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought contend."

Conclusion

Whether it is the history of the traditional Qing, the history of the New Qing, or the history of Inner Asia, it reflects the struggle between the two major schools of scholarship today. The traditional Qing history has multiple textual researches, emphasizing historical data as the basis and speaking with historical data; the latter two clearly focus on the theory and despise the textbooks, and are good at explaining from the perspective of reason. This looks more like a dispute between textual research and doctrine, and the connection behind the argument is: how to balance textual research and doctrine, how to rationally use textual research and doctrine in historical research, and how to build the foundation of traditional history Real innovation. As the successor, how to be good at grasping the identity of contradiction from the contradiction of history is a question worthy of our careful consideration.

References

- [1] Huang Xingtao, *Reshaping China* [M]. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press, 2017.
- [2] Liu Fengyun, *National Identity of the Qing Dynasty* [M]. Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2010.
- [3] Ikeda Yuichi, *settlements and local administration in ancient China* [M]. Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 2017.
- [4] Ge Zhaoguang, *Shu Fangweiyuan* [M]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 2016.
- [5] (US) Owen Lattimore, *China's Inland Asia Frontiers* [M]. Jiangsu: Jiangsu People's Publishing House, 2005.
- [6] Wang Lizhen. Professor Ke Jiaoyan, a well-known American Manchu scholar and Qing history expert, talks about Manchu studies and Qing history [J]. *Manchu Studies*. 2010 (03).
- [7] Zhang Yongjiang, Zhang Xinyu. Summary of Qing History Studies in 2018 [J]. *Qing History Research*. 2019 (04).
- [8] Yao Dali. "Local Local Historical Data First Doctrine" and Historical Writing [J]. *Academic Monthly*. 2017 (02).
- [9] Yao Dali. Lattimore's "Inner Asia Perspective" [J]. *Reading*. 2015 (08).
- [10] William William, Lin Zhan. Writing Qing History in the United States [J]. *Studies in Qing History*. 2015 (02).
- [11] Yuan Jian. Lattimore and Shi Jianya: Differences and Interconnections in the Inner-Asia Paradigm of Borderland Studies and Southwestern Traditions [J]. *Journal of Southwest University for Nationalities (Humanities and Social Sciences)*. 2014 (12).
- [12] Yuan Jian. Inner Asia Studies and Geopolitics in the First Half of the 20th Century: Taking the Introduction and Evaluation of Lattimore and His Doctrine in the Republic of China as an Example [J]. *Northwest Ethnic Studies*. 2013 (04).
- [13] Yao Dali. "Borderland Paradigm" in Western China Studies: A Bibliographic Review [N]. *Wenhui Bao*. 2007 (006).