

Final Report

Research Project "Eastern Tibet: Language, Ethnohistory and Ethnic Identity"

(โครงการวิจัยเรื่องทิเบตตะวันออก: ภาษา ประวัติศาสตร์ชาติพันธุ์ และอัตลักษณ์ชาติพันธุ์)

Principal Investigator

Associate Professor Dr. Krisadawan Hongladarom

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University

B.E. 2548-2551

Supported by Thailand Research Fund

(Opinions expressed in this report are the researcher's sole responsibility. The Thailand Research Fund does not need to agree with everything expressed herewith.)

Abstract

The three-year project on “Eastern Tibet: Language, Ethnohistory and Ethnic Identity” aims at surveying the linguistic and ethnic varieties in eastern Tibet, studying the ethnohistory of the area, analyzing the role of Kham Tibetan as a *lingua franca*, and at analyzing the linguistic ideologies that underly the practices in the region. Methodology includes literature review, field research in Tibet consisting of four short trips ranging from 10-15 days and two longer trips of 30-45 days, analysis of data, and working with informants both in Tibet and Thailand.

The project has two dimensions. The linguistic dimension aims at describing Kham Tibetan dialects and investigating similarities and differences between these dialects and Lhasa Tibetan, the standard dialect. The cultural dimension is an attempt to understand the linguistic and cultural practices of Tibetan speakers in eastern Tibet, particularly the Khampas. It also seeks to understand the interplay among language, identity and ethnohistory that pertain to the speakers.

The main finding of the project is that there is a wide linguistic variety in eastern Tibet due to geographical difficulties. This necessitates the use of Kham language as *lingua franca*, as there is a privilege attached to the language since it is spoken by the majority of the population. Other smaller minorities thus adopted Kham as the language used in communicating with the other ethnic groups in the area. More specifically, it is the Kham nomadic dialect that eventually became the *lingua franca* because the nomads are always moving around so their language has become widely intelligible. This results in the speakers of other minority languages like Tawu considering themselves speaking so-called “abnormal languages”. It is found that these varieties are due to the contingencies in the complex histories and social, political and geographical conditions of the area.

This emphasized diversity within the Kham speaking area has resulted in the Kham people being conscious of their identities vis-à-vis the other major regions of Tibet, such as the central one. This identity politics has a complex interplay with the linguistic situation, showing that linguistic phenomena are intertwined with geographical, cultural and political concerns.

บทคัดย่อ

โครงการวิจัยเรื่อง "ทิเบตตะวันออก: ภาษา ประวัติศาสตร์ชาติพันธุ์ และอัตลักษณ์ชาติพันธุ์" เป็นโครงการสามปี มีจุดมุ่งหมายเพื่อที่จะสำรวจภาษาและชาติพันธุ์ต่างๆในทิเบตตะวันออก ศึกษาประวัติศาสตร์ชาติพันธุ์ของชาวทิเบต วิเคราะห์บทบาทของภาษาทิเบตถิ่นคามในฐานะที่เป็นภาษากลางของชาติพันธุ์ต่างๆ และวิเคราะห์อุดมการณ์ทางภาษาในบริเวณนี้ วิธีวิจัยได้แก่ การทบทวนวรรณกรรม การทำวิจัยภาคสนามในทิเบตประกอบด้วยการทำวิจัยช่วงสั้นๆ ครั้งละ 10-15 วันและการทำวิจัยช่วงยาวๆ ครั้งละ 30-45 วัน การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล การทำงานกับผู้ออกภาษาทั้งในทิเบตและในไทย และการสังเกตและมีส่วนร่วมในวิถีชีวิตพื้นบ้านของชาวทิเบต

โครงการวิจัยนี้มีสองมิติ มิติทางภาษาเป็นการพรรณนาภาษาทิเบตถิ่นคามและการวิเคราะห์ความเหมือนและความต่างระหว่างภาษาถิ่นต่างๆของทิเบตและภาษาลาซาซึ่งเป็นภาษามาตรฐานของทิเบตภาคกลาง มิติทางวัฒนธรรมเป็นความพยายามที่จะเข้าใจวิถีปฏิบัติทางภาษาและวัฒนธรรมของชาวทิเบตในทิเบตตะวันออกโดยเฉพาะชาวคาม และการทำความเข้าใจปฏิสัมพันธ์ระหว่างภาษา อัตลักษณ์ และประวัติศาสตร์ชาติพันธุ์ที่มีความหมายต่อเจ้าของภาษาเหล่านี้

ผลการวิจัยหลักพบที่มีความหลากหลายทางภาษาในทิเบตตะวันออกเป็นอย่างมากอันเนื่องมาจากภูมิทัศน์ซึ่งทำให้มีความยากลำบากในการติดต่อสื่อสาร สถานการณ์นี้ทำให้ภาษาทิเบตถิ่นคามได้กลายเป็นภาษากลางและเป็นภาษาที่มีศักดิ์ศรีเพราะพูดโดยคนกลุ่มใหญ่ของบริเวณ ชนกลุ่มน้อยอื่นๆใช้ภาษาคามเป็นสื่อกลางในการติดต่อสื่อสารระหว่างกัน ในหมู่ภาษาย่อยของภาษาคามเอง ภาษาของชนเผ่าเร่ร่อนได้ชื่อว่าเป็นภาษาที่มีศักดิ์ศรีที่สุดเนื่องจากเป็นภาษาที่ใช้กันแพร่หลายและเข้าใจได้ทั่วไปแม้ในหมู่ชนเผ่าเร่ร่อนต่างถิ่น ผู้พูดภาษาอื่นที่ไม่ใช่ภาษาทิเบต เช่น ภาษาต้าอู มองตัวเองว่าเป็นผู้พูดภาษาลกเก หรือภาษาผิปกติ ผลการวิจัยเน้นว่าความหลากหลายทางภาษาเป็นผลจากรูปแบบทางประวัติศาสตร์ที่ซับซ้อนซึ่งมีผลต่อสถานการณ์ทางสังคมและการเมืองด้วย

อัตลักษณ์ที่ปรากฏในคามมีผลให้ชาวคามมีความรู้สึกว่าพวกเขาเป็นกลุ่มที่แตกต่างจากกลุ่มอื่นของทิเบต เช่น กลุ่มทิเบตภาคกลาง ซึ่งพวกเขาเรียกว่า "เผอปะ" การเมืองชาติพันธุ์นี้มีความสัมพันธ์กับสถานการณ์ทางภาษาและแสดงให้เห็นว่าปรากฏการณ์ทางภาษาไม่สามารถแบ่งแยกจากประเด็นทางภูมิศาสตร์ วัฒนธรรมหรือการเมืองได้

Executive Summary

Between the highlands of Tibet and the lowlands of China lies an area called Mdo-khams or Eastern Tibet. This area has seen long contact between Tibetans, Han, and other ethnic groups like the various Turco-Mongols of the North and the Qiangic and Tibeto-Burman groups of the South, who have co-inhabited the region for centuries. This has also been an important area historically, as it comprises a large number of principalities, kingdoms and tribes. Presently, the area corresponds to several administrative units, so-called Tibetan autonomous prefectures in three western provinces of China, namely Sichuan, Qinghai and Yunnan.

Eastern Tibet is one of the world's most complex ethno-linguistic and cultural areas and serves as a region that links Tibetan culture and Chinese culture. Nevertheless, little knowledge is available about this locality. There is no single work, as far as I know, that highlights the inter-relations of the peoples in the region, aims at documenting its linguistic and cultural diversity, or touches upon contemporary issues from historical, linguistic and cultural angles.

Based on an interdisciplinary approach, this project seeks to investigate this little known zone of Asia. Specific issues to examine include: languages spoken in eastern Tibet, development and use of *lingua franca*, attitudes of peoples in eastern Tibet toward language and ethnicity, history of the Tibetans and other ethnic groups who reside in this area, and inter-relations among the Tibetans and other ethnic groups including Han Chinese.

Given rapid changes that are taking place in eastern Tibet as a result of globalization and economic development in China, the project strives to do the basic research that will document in a timely manner the linguistic and cultural diversity of eastern Tibet and thus preserve the cultural vitality of Asia. The project is an important step in "crossing borders" among disciplines. It is based on an assumption that the study of language cannot be separated from the study of history and culture.

Objectives

1. To investigate linguistic and ethnic diversity in eastern Tibet,
2. To study ethnohistory, the knowledge of which is instrumental for the understanding of linguistic and ethnic issues in eastern Tibet,

3. To examine patterns of interactions among the Tibetans and other ethnic groups who reside in eastern Tibet,
4. To investigate the role of Kham Tibetan as *lingua franca* among various ethnic groups in eastern Tibet, activities which promote and preserve the use of these linguistic varieties, interaction between these varieties and Mandarin Chinese and other related varieties such as Lhasa Tibetan,
5. To examine ethnic identities and linguistic ideologies of the peoples in eastern Tibet,
6. To create new knowledge on eastern Tibet by providing answers on language situation, ways of living and relationship between language, ethnohistory and ethnic identity.

Methodology

The project employed the following research methods such as working closely with language consultants and informants; interviewing native speakers on oral history, attitudes on language and ethnicity, and other contemporary issues; participant observation and analyzing linguistic, cultural and historical materials.

Fieldsites

Tibetan autonomous prefectures in Sichuan, Qinghai and Yunnan Provinces, People's Republic of China

Duration

3 years (March 2004 - March 2007)

Keywords

Language and ethnicity; ethno-history; ethnic identity; development of lingua franca; language contact; linguistic ideologies; Kham Tibetan; Amdo Tibetan; eastern Tibet

Disciplines of Research

Anthropological Linguistics; Sociolinguistics; Tibetan Studies; Asian Studies

Output

1. Two research papers presented in international conferences, and
2. Two research papers published in international journals and one or two papers published in edited volumes which are peer reviewed and published by recognized international publishers.

Research Content and Results

Eastern Tibet

Eastern Tibet is on the fringe of Tibetan mainstream culture if one takes Lhasa as a center of the Tibetan world. It has been labeled by such terms as “Sino-Tibetan Borderlands,” “Tibetan Marches,” “Greater Tibet” and “Ethnic Tibet”. Tibetan historians call it “Do-kham” referring to two traditional provinces: Amdo (Tibet's northeastern area) and Kham (Tibet's southeastern area) respectively. Most of Amdo is now in Qinghai Province, whereas the heart of Kham lies in Sichuan Province.

Eastern Tibet became known to the outside world when western explorers and missionaries entered it for the first time in the early twentieth century. Their accounts not only revealed the mystery and enchantment of the land but make references to the Tibetans (i.e., Amdowas and Khampas) and other ethnic groups who inhabit the area. Most notable of these accounts is Teichman (1922), which pointed out a variety of languages spoken and local political systems in this lesser-known part of Tibet.

Kham

Kham (Ch. Kang) is the name for a traditional province in eastern Tibet. Presently, it covers Tibet-dominated territories in the mountainous parts of China's three western provinces, namely Yunnan, Sichuan and Qinghai. It is also part of the eastern portions of Tibet Autonomous Region. Kham is an interesting area of study because of its linguistic and ethnic diversity which has only until recently been explored. Kham's history and culture is distinct from that of central Tibet, or Tibet proper, rendering its special characteristics and high degree of regionalism.

This report presents an investigation of Kham's history, its ethnolinguistic situation, current problems related to language, ethnicity and identity and changes that are taking place in this part of Tibet. Changing situations ranging from globalization to modernization efforts have resulted in widespread changes in the ethnolinguistic situation in the area. The report is based on a three-year ethnolin-

guistic fieldwork and surveys in eastern Tibet conducted by the author during the grant period 2004-2007.

Ethnohistory

Although there are a good number of books on Tibetan history written by both native and non-native historians (Goldstein 1989; Richardson 1984; Shakabpa 1967; Smith 1996), quite a few paid considerable attention to Kham. Tibetan historiography is based mainly on Ü-tsang or central Tibet.

What we know about the Khampas and Tibetans of other regions is comparatively little. And since there is no such thing as Kham history taught in schools, most Khampa students cannot explain the history of their region or even those of their hometowns. What we know about Kham remains largely fragmentary and is drawn mainly from the above-mentioned travelers' and missionaries' accounts.

Throughout its history, Kham underwent several drastic changes. It was first loosely controlled by the Yarlung kings during the 7th-9th centuries.

During the reign of King Srongsan Gampo in the 7th century, garrisons were sent to several parts of eastern Tibet, including Gyalthang (present-day Shangri-la County in Yunnan) in southern Kham, where people consider themselves speaking a unique dialect similar to Old Tibetan.

In the wake of the demise of the Yarlung dynasty in 842 A.D., Kham was not governed by any unified state but was divided into small kingdoms and principalities, pastoralist tribes and self-governed villages.

During this stateless period, what happened in Kham was obscure. Knowledge about Kham history resumed after an intervention from central Tibet in the 17th century.

Under the Fifth Dalai Lama's rule with the support of the Mongols religious wars broke out in Kham. His Gelugpa sect sacked several Bonpo, Nyingma, Kakyu and Sakya monasteries and transformed them into Gelugpa centers.

The 19th – 20th centuries were a period of turmoil full of strifes and conflict inside Kham itself.

After Kham became part of China in the first half of the 20th century, it constituted a new, but short-lived province called "Xikang". The new province lasted

only until the end of the Republican Government. This was the first time that most areas of Kham were governed under a single administrative unit.

Parts of Kham had also been subjugated by other ethnic rules. Southern Kham fell under the Naxi's rule for several years. As Spengen (2002: 24) writes, "The Nakhi Mu kings felt strong enough to make incursions into Tibetan territory, and as a result there was recurrent fighting on the southern Kham cultural-ecological frontier. It made the Tibetans build watch and defense towers all along a line crossing southern Kham from east to west, separating the Tibetans from Tibeto-Burmans."

Another foreign influence was felt in northern Kham. During the Fifth Dalai Lama's reign, several Kham areas that are today incorporated into Ganzi Prefecture fell under the rule of a Mongol tribe. The localities occupied by these Mongols were later known as "Hor". The term is prefixed to some counties, for example, Hor Trango or Trihor referring to Luhuo County, Hor Kandze Ganzi County and Hor Nyagrong Xinlong County.

These historical facts suggest certain interesting characteristics of Kham. There were various leadership and political patterns in this region. The Khampas have maintained their independence from central Tibet for a long time. This can be one of the reasons why they do not usually identify themselves with people from central Tibet.

Apart from history, Kham's population is also varied. At one extreme are the settled village and urban populations. At the other extreme are nomadic tribes and 'wild' populations such as the people of Changtreng in the south, whom Teichman describes as "turbulent," "unruly" and "notorious" (1922: 203 n.1, 207).

Ethnolinguistic Situation

Contrary to popular belief, China is an ethnically homogenous country (Barnett 1993). After the Communist victory in 1949, the country adopted the Russian-style classification scheme whence peoples were categorized into different minzu "nationalities". Yet, the Han form approximately 92 per cent of the total population. They are clustered in big cities and lowland agricultural areas, whereas minority nationalities occupy most of the country's remaining territories including rugged terrains, deserts, steppes, grassland and border areas.

Out of the recognized nationalities, the “Tibetan nationality” number 4.8 million; one-third of this being the Khampas. This number also includes other non-Tibetan groups, particularly Qiangic speakers such as the Pumi or Prmi and the Minyag or Muya. These peoples are officially classified as *zangzu* (Tibetan nationality), or more specifically Khampa, despite the fact that they speak non-Tibetan languages as their mother tongues, wear different kinds of clothes and build different styles of houses. They also have their own identities and do not usually identify themselves as Tibetans.

Greater Tibet where Kham is located can be claimed to be the most ethnically diverse area in Tibet. To the south is the land of the Naxi, who used to rule southern Kham. Other than the Naxi, there are ethnic minorities such as the Bai, Lisu, Pumi and Yi in Diqin Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture. To the north and northeast is the land of the Monguors. To the west of the Ganzi Prefecture are homes of the Prmi and the Yi.

In summary, eastern Tibet is not only home to Tibetans but also to speakers of various linguistic families: Tibeto-Burman groups (e.g., Tibetan, rGyalrong, Naxi, Lisu, and Yi), Qiangic groups (e.g. Qiang, nDraba, Minyag and Pumi) and Sinitic groups (e.g., Han, Bai, Hui). These ethnic groups, whose population varies from a few thousands to one or two millions, have populated the area for centuries and interacted with one another in terms of intermarriage and trade. They also shared a large number of cultural attributes and religious beliefs; their languages demonstrate traces of language contact and exhibit a strong case of multilingualism.

Current Issues Related to Language, Ethnicity and Identity

In this section the report addresses certain contemporary issues related to language, ethnicity and identity in Kham. The understanding of these issues reveal insights into continuity and change in this part of Tibet.

Role of Kham Tibetan as a Lingua Franca among Various Ethnic Groups

On a superficial level, one may say that Mandarin Chinese serves as a standard language in Kham and other parts of Tibet. Mandarin Chinese is the national language and a medium of upward mobility highly promoted by the state. It also serves as a means of national unity and this is emphasized in ethnic areas.

Minority children, particularly in county towns, are urged from an early age to master Chinese. Command of Chinese is also promoted by the accessibility of televisions, radios and public transportations even in remote areas. As a result, an increasing number of Tibetans and ethnic minorities can understand Chinese.

In some areas such as Markhang (Bakham) County, seat of Aba Prefecture, ethnic groups have a good command of Chinese to the extent that they are more fluent in it than in their native tongues.

Nonetheless, the above statement does not cover the whole truth because Mandarin Chinese or its related dialect like Sichuan Chinese does not serve as the only *lingua franca* for ethnic minorities who live in Tibetan areas. Tibetan varieties, specifically Kham Tibetan nomad dialect have served as a traditional *lingua franca* in this part of Tibet.

For example, in Daofu (Tawu) County where many indigenous languages are spoken, the nomad dialect has become a prestigious code. It functions both a medium for trade and a tool to disseminate cultural knowledge and religion among these ethnic groups who share Tibetan culture and religion. Even the Han residents in the area felt propelled to speak it.

Lack of Standard Common Language

Although Kham Tibetan plays a role as a traditional *lingua franca* among ethnic groups, there is a paradox in this situation. There is no standard common language throughout Tibet and people from various regions need to resort to Chinese in order to communicate with each other. For example, in a Tibetan history class at the Southwest Institute for Nationalities in Chengdu a Khampa teacher delivered a lecture in Chinese to the audience who were all Tibetans.

Contemporary Tibetan scholars and students are not satisfied with the fact that there is no standard common language in Tibet. They have been debating over pros and cons of the establishment of a common code. But the issue is not easy to solve, because they do not agree on which linguistic variety to choose. Several scholars suggest that Lhasa Tibetan should be promoted to be the standard language and should be the medium for instruction in all schools. But people in eastern Tibet object to this idea. To them, the major dialects spoken in their regions should be promoted to serve this function.

To illustrate, Amdo speakers argue that the best common language is Amdo Tibetan nomad dialect which contains archaic features and is comprehended by a wide range of speakers. However, this is disagreed by the Khampas who think that Kham Tibetan would be a better code because it contains features of both Lhasa Tibetan and Amdo Tibetan, hence making it easily understood by people from all regions.

The debates have been going on for years and progress has been made little, apart from the fact that Amdo Tibetan has regularly been broadcast and is now the basis for local newspapers.

The increasing role of English is not to be underestimated either. The Khampas whom the researcher met and interacted with — no matter whether they are monks, teachers, or students all agreed that they need to get ahead by mastering not only Chinese but English. They give a reason that the former is the language of the nation and the latter the language of the world. They often talk about the poor land of Tibet, the land without culture and economic prosperity. There is a strong need for them to get ahead so that they can develop their homeland, and to do so, they need to master English.

Other than the above-mentioned linguistic issues, Kham also faces problems related to the fuzzy notions of “ethnic identity”, which includes the dichotomies between “major ethnic identity” vs. “minor ethnic identity” and “minority nationality identity” vs. “regional identity”.

Identity Politics in Kham

Major Ethnic Identity vs. Minor Ethnic Identity

The Khampas benefited from becoming the *zangzu*, the largest population in the area, hence, rendering their status as major ethnic group who has expanded to include other smaller groups such as the Jiarong (Gyalrong) and the Monguor both of whom have been reported to be greatly Tibetanized.

The fact that major ethnic identity is valued can be illustrated by the following scenario. A Tibetan nationality student at the Kangding Tibetan school is a native of Tawu (Daofu). Although he speaks Tawu as a mother tongue, he denied the assertion that he could speak the language. When asked what language he was using to communicate with the interviewer and his peers during that time, he

said that it was the Rangakha or Xinduqiao dialect, a major Kham Tibetan dialect in that area. As an ethnic language, Tawu is subject to contempt. It has a limited range of use, mainly in family and local settings.

This attitude toward ethnic language is also common in Tawu villages where villagers view that their language was a *loke* “abnormal language”. When asked why they felt that way, they said that it was because outsiders did not understand their language. They often compared it with the more useful nomad dialect which can be used in a larger area. Similarly, in a remote village in Xinduqiao County, Minyag Tibetan villagers refused to speak their own vernacular emphasizing, in Chinese, that their mother tongue was not of value and not worth studying.

Although local people seem to look down upon their minor ethnic identities, it is important to note that certain of these identities have been given more value in recent years by the native speakers who have received higher education and have experienced modern ways of thinking.

A case in point is a group of Minyag speakers who have formed a local NGO called “Minyag Environment and Culture Preservation Group”. This group stressed that Minyag identity was no less important than Tibetan identity. It was traced back to the ancient time of Tibet and has served as the basis of Tibetan culture. To them, the word “Minyag” is more ancient than the word “Kham”. It would be interesting to see how Minyag development unfolds in the near future.

Minority Nationality Identity vs. Regional Identity

Another complication deals with the distinction between minority nationality identity and regional identity. For Tibetans, what is evident is that the distinction does not deal only with Han and them but among themselves, namely Tibetans vs. Khampas or Amdowas.

There is an ambivalent relationship between the easterners and the Tibetans. As Sperling (1976: 10) notes: “Whatever problems arose between Kham and the central government at Lhasa, could not negate the ties of language, culture, and a common heritage that bound all parts of Tibet. The most important tie, however, was that of religion.” Furthermore, the belief that their ancestors came from central Tibet, that is, in fact they are exactly the same group as central Tibet; at the same time, they reject the label “Tibetan” to apply to themselves and they express

negative feelings toward Lhasans. They even despite the use of honorifics, an important trait of Lhasa speech and regard them as insincere, if not hypocrite. This might explain why easterners do not accept the use of Lhasa Tibetan as the standard language.

Although the Khampas share, with central Tibet as well as Amdo, the writing system, religious beliefs, cultural values and “ethnic markers,” to use Keyes's (1995) term, such as food, songs and dances, they prefer to be referred to primarily as the Khampas and secondarily as *phörik* “Tibetan nationality”.

The Khampas hardly call themselves *phöpa* “Tibetan”. This term refers specifically to the people of central Tibet. And in the same way, the latter did not consider them *phöpa* either and were even intimidated by them.

As Shakya (2001: 174) describes: “For many people in U-tsang (central Tibet), the Khampas were considered to be bandits (jag-pa) and were more of problem than the Chinese...”

When the Khampas revolted against the People's Liberation Army and escaped to Lhasa, they were not welcomed by the people there. “Once in central Tibet, the Khampas were faced with enormous hardship, besides the loss of family and friends back home. And at first they were met with, at best, indifference and, at worst, hostility from the people in central Tibet” (Shakya 2001: 163).

That Kham is a land of banditry is not only among the attitudes of central Tibetans; western scholars and travelers since the 19th century presented a similar picture. Barnett (1993: 411) writes: “When I visited this region in 1948, Xikang Province was a wild, primitive, cops-and-robbers frontier region. It was the private domain of one of China's most notorious warlords, Liu Wenhui.” Similarly, Samuel (1993) emphasizes the fact that the southern Kham areas of Changtreng and Kongkaling were wild and bandit-ridden.

Not only people from central Tibet look down upon the Khampas, other ethnic groups such as the Naxi also do. In her interesting account of the history and identity of the Naxi, White (1998: 21) recounts the stereotypes that the Naxi hold of other nationalities living in and around the Lijiang basin. Regarding the Tibetans, specifically referring to the Khampas in Shangri-la County, “(They) typify as wild (literally, barbarian, or yeman), and usually as backward and dirty” (White 1998: 27). The fact that the Naxi have this look-down-upon attitude is hardly surprising, because they used to gain power in this area, including the high-

land plains of three areas in southern Kham which correspond to present-day Shangri-la County, Batang County and Litang County.

Eastern Tibet and Consequences of Modernity

Way of Life

We have to keep in mind that the Khampas are no longer frontier people, though prejudices and stereotypes about them (e.g., they are violent, aggressive, wild and uncivilized; they are barbarians.) still remain.

The Khampas we are dealing with are subject to changes that take place in the post-Mao era, which include changes as a result of globalization as well as the so-called “western development” in China. Satellite dishes, computer games and Internet cafes have become common sights in these areas, where public transportations were no longer a problem.

Language

Many young Khampas want to get ahead. The cost of this is high, as they no longer value their own native tongues. Several Kham dialects and ethnic languages are spoken much less and young people find it more important to master first the language of the nation and second the language of the world . This attitude is clearly seen in a Khampa nun’s remark: “We need to master many modern languages; otherwise, we are no different from ལོ (collective term for yaks and yak-like animals).”

Perhaps one of the major policy matters in the region would be preservation of the local Tibetan languages. According to Mey (2001), efforts to study endangered languages are laudable. But concerned parties must protect not only the languages but also the users by providing them with living conditions that allow them to continue using their languages.

Loss of language, Tibetan and non-Tibetan languages being replaced by Mandarin Chinese and English, is among the clearest changes that are occurring in the region. As Mey states, an effective way to prevent this is to improve the living conditions so that they are allowed to use their languages in such a way that they do not feel hindered in their daily lives if they continue to use the language.

Education

In this era we also see major developments in education. Tibetan children have more opportunities to go to school. Many private schools run by Buddhist monks and local and international NGOs have been established. These schools stress the use of bilingual education placing value to both Tibetan and Chinese. However, education is often provided only at a primary or at best secondary level. Like other minority nationalities, Tibetans need to compete at a national level if they want to receive higher education.

In northern Kham several Khampa students are good at writing in Tibetan. But the language they write has a unique character because they combine Written Tibetan with Kham colloquialism. This situation is also true for Amdo, where a new written Amdo Tibetan has developed containing features of both Written Tibetan and Amdo spoken dialects. The fact that people are proud of their regional identities could explain why Tibetans cannot come to a conclusion which variety to choose when it comes to a common language.

The majority of Khampa students, however, are better at Chinese than Tibetan. This is not surprising, given the fact that there are more schools that use Chinese as a medium of instruction and the feeling that if one wants to get ahead, one should master the nation's language. Barnett (1993) made an interesting observation that the Tibetans in the Ganzi region obviously feel strong cultural and religious links with that area, yet politically and economically they are much more closely linked to areas of China to the east – that is, to Han China.

Conclusion

To conclude, there is both continuity and change in eastern Tibet. On the one hand, the people continue, despite all the hardships, to be very steadfast in their faith in Buddhism. They still continue to speak their own dialects. On the other hand, there are many incidents of change and the effect of globalization is being increasingly felt even in this remote part of the world. It remains to be seen how continuity and change will continue to play out and how the dynamism between the two is expressed and realized in the years to come.

One thing we should keep in mind the Khampa are no longer frontier people, though prejudices and stereotypes about them (e.g., they are violent, aggressive, wild and uncivilized; they are barbarians.) still remain. The Khampas we are dealing with are sub-

ject to changes that took place in the post-Mao era, which include changes as a result of globalization.

The researcher wants to end the report with remarks by Epstein (2002: 5) which brought our attention to a new methodology to step out of the confines of traditional disciplines in studying such a complex frontier area like Kham. "Kham is conceived here not only as a geopolitical and historical terrain of contacts and conflicts, but also as a contact zone in the conceptual sense, where new ideas can be spawned, tested and negotiated."

Cited References

- Barnett, A. Doak, *China's Far West: Four Decades of Change* (Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview Press, 1993).
- Epstein, Lawrence, 'Introduction', in Lawrence Epstein (ed.), *Khams pa Histories: Visions of People, Place and Authority*, (Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill, 1-6).
- Goldstein, Melvyn C., 'A History of Modern Tibet, 1913-1951', *The Demise of the Lamaist State*, (University of California Press, 1989).
- Harrell, Stevan, 'Languages defining ethnicity in Southwest China', in Romanucci-Ross, Lola and George DeVos (eds.), *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict, and Accommodation*, (Walnut Creek, London, New Delhi: Altamira Press, 1995, 97-114).
- Hongladarom, Krisadawan, 'Linguistic and ethnic diversity in Kham: Change and continuity', in Shen Hongfang (ed.), *The Future of Asia: Development, Diversity and Sustainability*, (Beijing: Asian Scholarship Foundation, in press).
- Mackerras, Colin, 'Han-Muslim and intra-Muslim social relations in northwestern China', in W. Safran (ed.), Pp. 28-46.
- Makley, Charlene, Dede, Keith, Hua Kan, and Wang Qingshan, 'The Amdo dialect of Labrang', *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 22.1: 97-127 (1999).
- Mey, Jacob. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*, (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001).
- Richardson, Hugh. *Tibet and Its History*, (Boulder: Shambhala, 1984)
- Samuel, Geoffrey. *Civilized Shamans: Buddhism in Tibetan Societies*, (Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993).

- Shakabpa, W.D. Tibet: A Political History, (Yale University Press, 1967).
- Shakya, Tsering. The Dragon in the Land of Snows. A History of Modern Tibet Since 1947, (London: Pimlico).
- Smith, Warren. Tibetan nation, A History of Tibetan Nationalism and Sino-Tibetan Relations, (Westview Press, 1996).
- Spengen, W. Van, 'Frontier history of southern Kham: Banditry and war in the multi-ethnic fringe lands of Chatring, Mili, and Gyethang, 1890-1940,' in Epstein, ed., 7-30.
- Teichman, Eric, Travels of a Consular Officer in Eastern Tibet, (Cambridge: University Press, 1922).
- White, Sydney D., 'State discourses, minority policies, and the politics of identity in the Lijiang Naxi people's Autonomous County,' in W. Safran, ed., Pp. 9-27.

Research Output

I. Publications

Papers

1. Published in International Refereed Journals

1. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. Submitted (2007). Indexicality in Thai and Tibetan: Implications for a Buddhism-grounded Approach. **Journal of Pragmatics**, Special Issue on “Exploring Emanticipatory Pragmatics”.
2. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2007. “Because mother isn’t at home: Evidentiality and meta-pragmatic knowledge. **Manusya** 13: 48-60.
3. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2007. Development of evidentials in Kham Tibetan dialects. **Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area** 30.2.
4. Stuart, Kevin, Hongladarom, Krisadawan, and Palden Choying, 2006. Nangchen Tibetan texts: Culture and Language. **Orientalia Suecana** LV: 165-184.
5. McCargo, Duncan and Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2004. Contesting isan-ness: Discourses of politics and identity in northeast Thailand. **Asian Ethnicity** 5.2: 219-234.

2. Published in International Research Monographs

1. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2007. “Don’t blame me for criticizing you”: A study of meta-pragmatic utterances in Thai. In Wofram Bublitz and Axel Hubler, eds., **Metapragmatics in Use**, 29-48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

2. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2007. Grammatical peculiarities of two dialects of southern Kham Tibetan. In Biemeier, Roland and Haller, Felix, eds., **Linguistics of the Himalayas and Beyond**, 119-152. Berlin Mouton de Gruyter. (This paper is an output of the previous related project Grammar of Southern Kham Tibetan, 1999-2003 supported by the TRF. The author submitted a revision of the paper during the grant period of the present project.)

3. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2006. Linguistic and ethnic diversity in Kham: Continuity and change. In Shen, ed., **The Future of Asia: Development, Diversity and Sustainability**, 77-84. Bangkok: Asian Scholarship Foundation.

3. Presented in International Conferences

1. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2007. Indexicality in Tibetan and Thai: Implication for a Buddhism Grounded Theory. Paper presented at the 10th International Pragmatic Conference, 8-13 July 2007, Göteborg, Sweden.

2. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2007. Indexicality in Tibetan and Thai: Implication for a Buddhism Grounded Theory. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Emancipatory Pragmatics, Japan Women's University, Tokyo, Japan, 28-30 March 2007.

3. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2006. Evidentiality and metapragmatic knowledge. Paper presented at the Lund-Chulalongkorn International Symposium, Chulalongkorn University, 1-2 November 2006,

4. Hongladarom, Krisadawan, Palden Choying and Stuart, Kevin. 2005. Marking time in Nangchen Tibetan. Paper presented at the 11th Himalayan Languages Symposium, Chulalongkorn University, 6-9 December 2005.

5. Hongladarom, Krisadawan, Palden Choying, Stuart, Kevin. 2005. A preliminary analysis of Nangchen Tibetan texts. Paper presented at the 38th Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistic Conference, Fujian University, 28-31 October 2005.

6. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2005. Linguistic and ethnic diversity in Kham: Continuity and change. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Future of Asia: Development, Diversity and Sustainability, Beijing, 13-14 November 2005.

7. Hongladarom, Krisadawan. 2004. Development of evidentials in Kham Tibetan dialects. Paper presented at the Workshop on Evidentiality in the Sino-Tibetan Linguistic Area, in concurrent with the 37th Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistic Conference, Lund University, 30 September-3 October 2004.

II. Conference

Organizing an international conference “The 11th Himalayan Languages Symposium” (HLS11) in honor of Her Royal Highness Princess Sirindhorn’s 50th Birthday, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, 6-8 December 2005.

III. International Recognitions

*Serving as a grantee in the Project “Linguistic Substratum in Tibet” led by Professor Yasuhiko Nagano, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, Japan (2006-2007).

*Serving as a member in the International Workshop on Emancipatory Pragmatics led by Professor Sachiko Ide, Japan Women’s University, Tokyo, Japan (March 2006, March 2007).

*Serving as an external examiner of Ellen Bartee’s Ph.D dissertation on a Tibetan dialect, University of Santa Barbara, USA (2006-2007).

*Elected as a member of the International Consultation Board of the International Pragmatic Association, the Netherlands (2006-2012).

*Serving as a consultant for the Tibetan language and a reviewer for the journal *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, LaTrobe University, Australia.

IV. Work for Society

Establishing the Thousand Stars Foundation (มูลนิธิพันดารา), an NGO in Thailand to promote knowledge of language, culture and religion in Tibet and to develop education of nomad children and women in remote areas in eastern Tibet. The foundation was registered in Nonthaburi, Feb-

ruary 2005. It has achieved international recognitions by being awarded a three-year grant from the Metanexus Institute in the US (2005-2008), and a supplemental grant award for outstanding work by the same Institute (2006). In addition, it has received two grants from the Bridge Fund (USA), and the Global Women Fund (USA). It has organized many high-impact conferences in Thailand, such as the International Conference on “Body and Mind: Science and Spirituality Perspectives.” The foundation’s website: www.thousand-stars.org.

Appendices

Published in Journals

1. Indexicality in Thai and Tibetan: Implications for a Buddhism-grounded Approach (Submitted to Journal of Pragmatics)
2. “Because mother isn’t at home: Evidentiality and metapragmatic knowledge (Published in Manusya)
3. Development of evidentials in Kham Tibetan dialects (Published in Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area)*
4. Nangchen Tibetan texts: Culture and Language (Published in Orientalia Suecana)
5. Contesting isan-ness: Discourses of politics and identity in northeast Thailand (Published in Asian Ethnicity)

Published in Research Monographs

6. “Don’t blame me for criticizing you”: A study of metapragmatic utterances in Thai (Published in Metapragmatics in Use)
7. Linguistic and ethnic diversity in Kham: Continuity and change (Published in The Future of Asia: Development, Diversity and Sustainability).
8. Grammatical peculiarities of two dialects of southern Kham Tibetan (Published in Linguistics of the Himalayas and Beyond).

Note: The pre-publication of Item 3 is attached. An offprint of this article will be sent to the TRF as soon as the researcher receives it.