Sharing Archaeology: But with Whom?

Li Ling

To cite this article: Li Ling (2010) Sharing Archaeology: But with Whom?, Contemporary Chinese Thought, 42:1-2, 97-112

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/CSP1097-1467420104

Published online: 08 Dec 2014.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 3

View related articles
Li Ling

Sharing Archaeology: But with Whom?

Reflections on Reading Report of the 2000 Excavation of Hezhang-Kele

Sharing Archaeology

On September 30, 2008, I received a circular from the Peking University Centre of Public Archaeology and Art informing me that Peking University’s School of Archaeology and Museology was holding an international conference on “public archaeology” on November 3–4, 2008, addressing the theme “Reading the Meaning of Human Heritage: Sharing and Transmission.”

“Sharing archaeology”! I felt the theme was marvelous—big on both ideals and vitality. This is the way I think about archaeology—as open knowledge, open to other disciplines and to other readers, and not some closed, refined, and navel-gazing discipline. The topic of the conference seemed particularly apt.

In July 2008, I had a visit from Liang Taihe, former head of the Guizhou Provincial Cultural Relics and Archaeology Institute and now with the Guizhou Provincial Museum, who was on a working

On October 27–28, I went to Changsha, where I examined the paintings on silk in the Hunan Provincial Museum, and also paid a visit to the Zidanku Chu tomb excavation site. On the 29th and 30th, I went on to Guiyang to see the exhibition at the Guizhou Provincial Museum, with the express intention of having a close look at the material excavated at the Hezhang-Kele site, availing myself of the opportunity to have it explained to me by Mr. Liang and comrades from the Guizhou Provincial Cultural Relics and Archaeology Institute. To be honest, I had never previously been to Guizhou and knew nothing about the topography and archaeological work in that province, so this visit had something of the feeling of a set of first impressions, and the “covered head burials” (*taotou-zang*) of that region made quite an impact on me.

A few days after returning to Beijing, I took part in the conference on “Sharing Archaeology.” Most of the papers presented at the conference revolved around the themes of site conservation, the popularization of archaeological knowledge, and the applications of computer technology. My paper was not so much along those lines, being more in the nature of “discussing archaeology by getting away from archaeology”; my focus was on “how to read archaeology,” as well as archaeology’s relationship with other disciplines.

I explained how I was a “reader” of archaeology, and I spoke as a reader from a reader’s perspective.

The time allotted for papers at the conference was limited and there was no room for amplifying my theme, so I would like to discuss my ideas here in detail.


Where do I begin? In front of me is the excavation report presented to me by Mr. Liang. The report is excellent and it directly touches
on the themes of the conference. After reading the report, I feel I can discuss the meaning of “sharing archaeology.” Of course, these are only the feelings of an amateur.

Hezhang-Kele is the name of a flatland enclosed by mountains at a place called Kele in Hezhang county, located in the northwestern part of Guizhou province, and the site was part of Hanyang county during the Western Han dynasty. Valuable tile ends unearthed at the site provided a date from the “Jianshi” period, one of the regnal names adopted by Emperor Han Chengdi and roughly equivalent to 32–29 B.C.E. In the year 2000, the Guizhou Provincial Cultural Relics and Archaeology Institute excavated 111 tombs in Kele, and these ranged in date from the early period of the Warring States until the reign of Emperor Wudi of the Western Han. The discoveries at the site had great significance for research on the “southwestern barbarians” (xinan yi) of the Yelang period, and the excavation was deservedly named as one of the Ten Major National Archaeological Discoveries of 2001.

The excavation report comprises six sections:

1. The main part of the report is found in the first half of the volume: section one, general description; section two, overall description of type A tombs; and, section three, overall description of type B tombs. These three sections are “statements by the excavators.”

2. The fourth section of the excavation report presents the testing and analysis of the unearthed artifacts. This testing and analysis of all the various types of artifact is wide ranging, running to seventeen different categories, but this section is not an appendix to the report but rather the core text of the report.

3. The fifth section of the report details the burial materials and, on the basis of the original tomb findings, presents a preliminary classification of the tombs, as well as an inventory of each tomb for reference purposes.

4. The sixth section presents the conclusions of the report, touching on eight aspects, including the historical administrative geography (diwang) and ethnicity of the site,
aspects that again can be categorized as “statements by the excavators.”

In conclusion, the volume contains two postscripts and an addendum. The addendum comprises “Report on the Hezhang-Kele Excavation,” originally published in the September 1989 issue of the quarterly Acta Archaeologica Sinica (Kaogu xuebao) and in which three batches of materials unearthed at Kele in 1976 and 1978 are presented.

**The Two Distinguishing Features of the Report**

The excavation report, with its detailed materials and rich content, is easily recognizable as conforming to the norms for writing field archaeology reports; the total reliance on scientific testing methods is also in the mainstream fashion. Yet apart from the rigorous writing that this volume exemplifies, it has two noteworthy features that distinguish it from the usual archaeological excavation reports and that have attracted attention.

The first is the addition of “statements by the excavators,” which is touched on in the assessment of the report in Liu Qingzhu’s preface:

The materials obtained by field archaeology are the scientific fruits of archaeology; at the same time, these materials form the “data” and “resources” for the scientific research constantly being developed by the modern human sciences, social sciences, and natural sciences. Such “data” and “resources” are available for scientific research by all disciplines, and it is the expectation of the academic community and the demand presented to archaeological researchers by scientific development that enable scholars from other disciplines to understand the fundamentals of field archaeology excavation reports so that the presented findings can be used in other intellectual fields and field archaeology materials can fully play their role in scientific research. Archaeology is a “comprehensive” science that addresses the objective material world of “the past” of relevance to humanity, and obviously it must serve the “comprehensive” sweep of the present-day objective world. The “statements by the excavators” in the Report of the 2000 Excavation of Hezhang-Kele represent an innovative attempt to do this,
by directing the “data” and “resources” of field archaeology not only to the archaeological world, but to scientific workers in the broader fields of science and in many other disciplines, so that the acquisition of these “new data” and “new resources” will lead to further “new knowledge” and “new fruits” that will enable all related scientific disciplines to develop to a greater extent and more rapidly! By genuinely enabling its data to enjoy “the exhaustive use of the artifact,” field archaeology will fully realize the scientific value of archaeology itself.

The second distinguishing feature of this excavation report is the authors’ addition of an inventory of the “oversights and omissions” in their fieldwork, as Liu Qingzhu explains elsewhere in his preface:

Its rigorous scientific conscience must be greatly admired and respected! We are only too well aware that archaeology, like so many other disciplines, is a science “with much to regret,” and we can confidently say that there is no complete and perfect archaeological fieldwork. Even when we feel that the fieldwork is going smoothly, when we are sorting the materials and compiling the reports, we inevitably discover “shortcomings,” often feel that the work falls short of the ideals we had intended, and constantly have to swallow the bitter pill of regret. The compilation of an excavation report basically signals the summation of the scientific research about the archaeological fieldwork, and this summation should encompass both successes and inadequacies (or what we might call “slipups”), so that in future scientific research work, we can build on past successes and overcome past failures. For scientific workers, or rather for scientific research activities, such summaries are an even more valuable “treasure.” Only when science is pursued in such a spirit can it develop in a healthy and rapid fashion. Yet it is regrettable that in the past we paid little attention to this. In writing up several field archaeology excavation reports, I discovered in the course of sorting through and editing field data that there were technical and other problems in the original field work that basically should not have been there, but all of which I would note down for use in later scientific research. We never wrote up these “omissions” and “errors” in our excavation reports, however, and simply regarded them as the “price” we paid for our scientific research work. Their inclusion in the Report of the 2000 Excavation of Hezhang-Kele as a “shared wealth” of which we can all partake establishes, to my way of thinking, an exemplary model for the archaeological world, providing us with unbounded strength!

I fully concur with Mr. Liu’s appraisal.
How Do We Write? How Do We Read?

How are archaeology reports written, and read? Answering these questions is not so simple. I would like to talk a little about my own ideas on this subject.

On the First Distinguishing Feature of Hezhang-Kele: “Statements by the Excavators”

As I see it, the use in the report of “statements by the excavators” is a bold experiment: the writing is absolutely lucid and the language is popular and simple, readily comprehensible by the ordinary reader, and accessible for use by other disciplines.

At the present time, archaeological reports have become increasingly lengthy and weighty tomes; what once would have constituted a simple report now extends to many volumes. Even the insider in the field—forget about the general reader—finds himself flipping and checking through these volumes that are very hard to digest and grasp. It would be a distinct advantage if such excavation reports were to come with a guide, a well-organized presentation, and a summation of arguments, as well as some readily comprehensible exposition and explanations.

Another aspect of excavation reports that must be considered is that they are archival in nature, and so should be scrupulously objective, honest, accurate, and thorough. How this is achieved is a question that warrants attention.

In the past, to stress the objectivity of archaeology reports, Xia Nai stressed that it was best to separate the research from the report, so that the research was research and the report was simply a report. In writing the report, he considered it best to make no inferences or elaborations, and if one had any ideas, one should write a separate monograph. Such an attitude was very cautious. But there were also scholars who pointed out that any written report must contain the subjective ideas of its authors, and can only reflect the level of knowledge and understanding at a definite point in time; it can only offer conjecture on the basis of existing categories, and can never be totally objective. It can present readers with the ideas of
the authors, or serve as a reference to help readers understand the relationships between materials and the cataloguing rationale.

In archaeology, handling the relationship between the field report and the research, the relationship between archaeology and other disciplines, and that between specialized scholars and ordinary readers are three issues that require discussion. It is possible that the archaeology report cannot take on so many tasks—and some of this work lies outside the scope of the report—but I believe that archaeological work should extend to ongoing research on materials and address other disciplines and the general public.

The question of whether an archaeological report can embark on discussion beyond simple conclusions about the excavation treated in the volume and go on to look at temporal and cultural relationships of this particular excavation warrants further discussion. Whether the report’s authors can also guide readers, provide introductions, and make conclusions also warrants discussion. As an experiment, I feel that the approach in *Hezhang-Kele* is of positive significance.

**On the Second Distinguishing Feature of Hezhang-Kele: Admitting “Oversights and Omissions”**

As I see it, the section of the report covering “oversights and omissions” is only slightly more than one page (pp. 137–138 in the fifth chapter of the third section), yet the author is extremely frank, and in discussing “archaeological mistakes,” which is a taboo among fellow professionals, covers up nothing in presenting the problems and “coming clean.” I feel that in this, the author is braver than any of his predecessors.

This question is not simply a matter of what might or might not have been done; I feel it is more important than this. Four years ago, I touched on this issue, in an article titled “The Hopes of an Archaeology Reader” (Yige kaogu duzhe de xiwang), which was published in *Reading* (Dushu, no. 6 [2004]: 152–59). I have always believed that archaeology is a process of understanding and the archaeology report should reveal this process, through its summary and analysis of errors and by presenting the entire picture, and certainly not by dwelling on what might or might not have been done.
If we insist that an archaeological report must be completely honest, reliable, objective, and thorough, then we cannot obfuscate and conceal, kicking the ladder out from under the reader and misdirecting his or her understanding and imagination.

Of course, I do acknowledge that doing this is not easy; what sounds easy is not easily put into practice. Theoretically, anyone can uphold the principle that frankly acknowledging errors is a virtue, but in practice, most people do not think along these lines and feel that such a course of action is foolish. Such honesty impinges on the reputation and advantages of the individual and the unit, and people do need to be able to hold their head up high in interpersonal relations, so few people have the courage to be so honest.

Yet the question goes beyond scholarship and entails the issue of intellectual ethics. Confucius said that acknowledging shame is akin to bravery. I feel that the authors of this field report are truly brave; I suspect that few will emulate them.

Returning to an Earlier Debate

In the spirit of persistence, the authors in the second afterword of the report refer to a debate that was conducted some twelve years previously in the pages of the journal *Reading*. The journal had organized and published (no. 12 [1996]: 1–31) a polemic comprising contributions by a number of people, including Chen Pingyuan, Ge Zhaoguang, Chen Xingcan, and myself. My arguments were merely the comments of an onlooker and I made no major points, so I was quite surprised to find that they had attracted the attention of the authors of *Hezhang-Kele*.

In the 1996 debate, Yang Hong criticized me several times for misinterpreting archaeological site reports (and in fact only recently at a seminar, he again criticized me for this). He maintained that the site report was a reference tool—something provided for people to check, not to read; such a “besieged” theory (siege mentality) is patently false, as it assumes those trapped within the city walls never want to leave and those beyond the city walls must never enter.

I regret that he never understood my point of view. I never understood archaeology reports to be pulp reading matter, so here I
would like to reiterate my ideas, in the hope that this time, everyone will be able to understand them:

Archaeology is a vast branch of knowledge. As I understand it, archaeology not only belongs to archaeologists, but to the humanities in the broadest sense. It does not merely encompass field excavation, sorting, and reporting, but research in many other peripheral disciplines, as well as cross-disciplinary research spanning vast periods of time (far exceeding that of historiography in the narrow sense) and a vast scope. It is something in which everyone is involved.

I long ago pointed out that Sun Ji’s research of antique objects and the verification of the history of material objects (mingwu kaozheng), as well as Yang Hong’s research on weaponry and the archaeology of art, are in fact studies in peripheral disciplines or cross-disciplinary investigations. And I argued that this research is very useful.

Archaeology, as I see it, proceeds by three steps: the first step is excavation; the second is the excavation report; and the third is the research. The research is also multitiered, specialist research being the first step and research outside these specializations forming the second step. This second step inevitably also requires interaction and cooperation with other disciplines.

What do I mean by “siege mentality”? I am referring to the defenses that each discipline throws up around itself. We should not strengthen the boundaries such people demarcate; instead, we should regard archaeological knowledge as the shared knowledge of all of humanity, inviting others in while venturing outside ourselves, relying on all our efforts to popularize such knowledge and elevate it a step at a time by cooperating with other disciplines and communicating with the general public—no more and no less. Put simply, this is the “archaeological sharing” we are discussing today.

Defining the Issues

In speaking of “sharing archaeology,” I need to explain myself.

First, I need to explain that what archaeology addresses is “human heritage.” Although archaeology discovers “artifacts,” behind these artifacts were “people.” The authors of Hezhang-Kele correctly point out that we “cannot see artifacts without seeing people.” As I see it,
“human heritage” comprises the things that people leave behind and that we preserve and study, admittedly using the technical means provided by various natural sciences, but what we are ultimately focused on is still people. To research archaeology, we must embrace the concerns of the humanities, and this in turn requires that our perspective is that of scholarship in the humanities.

Second, what is the significance of our “explanations” (chanshi) of “human heritage”? Do we regard it as signaling a fortuitous event if we are able to write up the things we have unearthed in the format of a report, or do we attempt to “explain” or “elucidate” these things? I can only see the report as a beginning and not as the conclusion of archaeological work; neither the excavation nor the record of the excavation is equivalent to an explanation. Providing an explanation is a further step in the digestion of archaeological materials, being not merely a discussion of stratigraphy, typology, pit sequencing, cultural relationships, and dating sequences; rather, it is the demand to investigate the background historical and cultural content. Such an investigation cannot proceed either without archaeologists or with only archaeologists; it requires multidisciplinary participation.

Third, should archaeological knowledge be the concern of people outside the profession? If we want laymen to care about archaeology, what means should we use to establish the conversation? As I see it, popularizing archaeology so that ordinary people can understand archaeological work is only one aspect of what we should be doing. More important, we need to deepen and augment our own archaeological knowledge and add more dimensions to our knowledge, something that cannot be achieved in a simple step but requires incremental progress. I believe that only when archaeological knowledge is integrated with a broader background of scholarship in the humanities and when the disciplines of others are involved in this process, do we return the stuff of human life that is archaeological material back to the lives of humans. In this way, articles and books written in the spirit of the Hezhang-Kele excavation report can be used by other disciplines and accepted and understood by the general population.

Put simply, archaeology is a body of knowledge that studies
man, and only when people’s voices can be heard will archaeology be understood by the general population. If we remain closed and shut ourselves off from other disciplines and from readers and the public beyond archaeology, then I feel we would not need to be having this conference along these lines.

Sharing Archaeology with the Natural Sciences

Today, it is generally acknowledged and certainly not disputed that the “sharing” in which archaeology engages is with the natural sciences.

To sort, classify, and analyze archaeological materials (data), archaeology already relies on: research in geography and palaeoenvironmental studies, as well as palaeo-zoology, palaeo-botany, and palaeo-ethnology; the testing and analysis of ceramic, bronze, iron, and jade; the use of various dating technologies including carbon-14 dating and photo-luminescence; and such analytical tools as computer technologies and databases. These studies are no longer outside of archaeology, but are an integral part of archaeology.

In the 1980s, we began to read some of the writings of the new archaeology. Some people asked the question that went to the heart of the matter: What sort of intellectual discipline is archaeology? They suggested that archaeology’s orthodoxy is prehistory, and its primary relationships are with geology, paleontology, and physical anthropology, as is the case with the Institute of Vertebrate Palaeontology and Palaeo-anthropology under Academia Sinica. The use of stratigraphy in archaeology is directly borrowed from geology. Nowadays, the scientific testing of unearthed relics is occupying an increasingly larger space in archaeological reports, and such results have been moving from the addenda into the body of these texts. This trend was noted several years previously by Yuan Jing (“High Technology and Hand Shovels” [Gaokeji yu shouchan], Reading, no. 6 [2004]: 160–66), who dated the phenomenon back to 1999. Today the trend is even more pronounced.

Butcher Ding, in the anecdote in Zhuangzi, dismembered the ox to be eaten, but the ox did not exist to be eaten. Science ultimately targets the whole phenomenon, the natural world being a
whole, human life being a whole, and the relationship between the natural world and man being a whole. The division of labor in the production of knowledge requires that we dismember the targets of our research and allocate them to different scientific fields. This simply serves the convenience of scientific research, and this is not the same thing as saying that these objects of science are of themselves discrete entities. The situation is like that of a hospital. The hospital is divided into different departments, but the patient cannot be similarly dismembered, except in the pathology labs! Treating an illness requires many different types of knowledge and treatment procedures, all of which necessitate diagnosis by different specialists. Obviously, it is not a simple matter of treating the head to treat headaches, or treating a foot to cure a pain in the foot!

Some of our disciplines are synthetic of themselves. Military studies, for example, include both natural sciences and social sciences. The modern equivalent of a member of the ancient Militarist School of philosophy (bingjia) has already been transformed into a weapons expert, as armaments and technology have turned everything upside down, and weaponry is now only half the story for military studies. The other half of the story derives from the simple fact that it is people who invent and use weapons. The ancients had a saying, “The way of man precedes weapons,” meaning that military studies were ultimately a study of man. Modern military studies have seen a similar shift back toward the issues addressed by the traditions of the humanities.

Zhang Guangzhi (K.C. Chang) once said, “in the Three Dynasties [i.e., Xia, Shang, and Zhou] there were no separate disciplines.” However, while a division of labor may have taken place in intellectual work, no division has occurred in the issues addressed—these are frequently interconnected and no lines of demarcation can be drawn between them. Interdisciplinary research is the basic nature of intellectual work and the future trend in all academic work.

The integration of archaeology and natural sciences is a done deed, and that is not subject to debate. The question we need to ask is whether archaeology can extend its sharing beyond the natural sciences to the human sciences.
Sharing Archaeology with the Human Sciences

Is it that easy to share archaeology? Often the most desirable goals are the most difficult to achieve, such as sharing archaeology with the humanities: with the Chinese Language Department, with the History Department, with the Philosophy Department, with the Art Department, and with the general public.

During the earlier debate about the “siege mentality” of archaeology, the emphasis was on this very question: How do we restore the spirit of the humanities to archaeology?

Thirty years ago I was a student of archaeology and I remember a teacher telling us how, in order to maintain the “purity” of archaeology, we needed to draw a clear line between it and other disciplines, especially “the brother disciplines” such as epigraphy, palaeo-linguistics, ancient manuscript studies, historiography, ethnology (or anthropology), art history research, and research on antiquities.

Yet this task is simply impossible to achieve. In prehistoric archaeology research, especially that examining the neolithic era, can we exclude the assistance of ethnology or anthropology (not simply its ethnic classifications, but also its theories and methodologies)? Obviously we cannot.

In researching the archaeology of the Shang, Zhou, Qin, and Han periods, given the large quantity of inscribed oracle bones, bronze inscriptions, and inscribed slips that are unearthed, as well as the large quantity of above-ground historical documents that can be referred to, can we exclude historiography, palaeo-linguistics, and ancient philology? Obviously we cannot.

In researching the archaeology of the Wei-Jin, Southern and Northern dynasties, Sui-Tang, Song-Yuan, and Ming-Qing periods, can we exclude the assistance of research in the fields of art history and antiquities? Obviously we cannot. Nor can we if we are researching Buddhist cave temples and Buddhist or Taoist statuary, architecture since the Tang-Song period, murals in cave temples and tombs, jades, gold and silver objects, porcelain, or countless other questions.

Archaeology originated in the West, although it is not so cut and dried as this bald statement might suggest.
In the West, prehistory and archaeology of historical periods are quite separate matters. However, Western prehistoric archaeology draws on anthropological research (for example, in American archaeology the study of Native American cultures is often undertaken in anthropology departments when it is a university discipline), and archaeology of the historical periods is widely connected (for example, Greek and Roman archaeology is engaged with art history and the classics, while medieval research is engaged with art history and divinity studies), with many universities integrating art history and archaeology.

In Chinese archaeology, that of the historical period is the most prominent, and from the beginning it was located on university campuses in history departments, which stressed the use of ancient documents and texts, as well as research in social history. After it was made an independent discipline, it still tended to be a part of historiography, where it formed a second-tier discipline.

The blending of archaeology and history is traditional in China; originally they formed “one family”; it has only been during the last twenty years that they were separated.

The integration of archaeology and art history research is also becoming a major trend. Although it has its opponents, these two disciplines find their names in the full title of the Arthur Sackler Museum at Peking University. It is becoming very fashionable in Chinese art colleges to use archaeological materials to discuss art history.

Archaeology is one of the humanities, and everyone holds out great hopes for archaeology, so why is archaeology by contrast so keen to exclude other disciplines? Surely we should take delight in the fact that archaeology helps others and others help archaeology. This would seem to be a good thing.

Sharing with the Public

The archaeology site report forms the basis of our research, and it is something to which we constantly refer. I have never regarded it as an entertaining diversion through which we can leaf. In fact, no one reads such reports in that way. I understand archaeology to be a basic discipline that provides data (materials) for others to
use, indirectly rather than directly. Its role is indirect in that it is an intermediary, and practitioners who play this role shoulder a great responsibility. Yet such people are few, although they do exist, and so “sharing archaeology with the public” is no easy matter.

In the 1996 debate in the pages of Reading, Chen Xingcan contributed a paper titled “What Type of Archaeology Does the General Public Require” (Gongzhong xuyao shenmeyang de kaoguxue, Reading, no. 12 [1996]: 26–31) in which he addressed this very question, and his reply was “sorry, but because of the limited nature of archaeological materials and archaeologists, we need to make far greater efforts if the general public is not to be disappointed.” In comparison with prehistoric archaeology, there are only two possible “intermediaries”—experimental archaeology and ethnic archaeology. These two “intermediaries” are not necessarily capable of delivering what people want to read.

In the field of prehistoric archaeology, there are few books that can be read and little history that can be drawn upon, so its role as an “intermediary” is negligible. As previously mentioned, archaeology needs help from many quarters. Here the question is not one of whether or not “intermediaries” are up to the task, but whether or not archaeology is capable of achieving any sharing without “intermediaries.”

Archaeology examining historical periods cannot be conducted in the same way as prehistoric archaeology. Yet people have great expectations of archaeology, which rebounds to the glory of archaeology. Perhaps they have hopes that are too extravagant or too infantile, but what they most need is understanding and interaction, not exclusivity and rejection.

In utter contrast with Chen Xingcan’s modesty, many scholars divorce themselves from others even though they want to be appreciated, an exaggeration often found in basic disciplines such as ancient linguistics and archaeology.

Such a view is narrow. Outside archaeology, in the “superstructure” of the various humanities, we find that people in history, philosophy, and art departments cannot talk in this way. Self-sufficient archaeologists need to realize that if others need them and they do need other people, then this is the archaeologists’ loss. They might
have forgotten that their “materials” and “resources” require a great
deal of “processing” before they become a “product.”

Archaeological knowledge is the result of a complex process: we move from basic materials to those digested and understood within a specialization, to those used and transmitted outside the specialization, eventually reaching the general public. This is not a simple step; if it were that simple, there would be vulgarization and distortion. “Popularization” is not “vulgarization,” but a way of emerging from deep water and coming up into shallower water. Only by having plunged into deeper waters, can we come up in shallower waters. “Popularization” is in fact very difficult; it is not a first step in scholarship, but the final step, or one could even say it is a higher realm of scholarship. For scholars, this is very difficult.

What is the basis for interaction and communication in the humanities? The answer is simple: scholars are people, as are the general public. Scholars and the general public alike should believe that people can communicate.

There is no remarkable difference between scholars and the general public. Scholars are scholars by virtue of the fact that they are skilled at deconstructing seemingly simple things and reassembling them using academic language, technical terminology, conceptualization, particularization, abstraction, and rendering simplification as something complex.

In fact, scholarship has an even higher realm, which is restoring simplicity to that which has been rendered complex. Yet very few scholars take this further step. This being the case, we should seek to move in this direction, even if we can never fully attain this worthy goal.

January 10, 2009
Lanqiying Staff Quarters, Beijing