

政治人类学评论

Political Anthropology Review
2018·1

总第7辑

陶庆 ◆ 主编



陶庆

安徽宁国人，上海师范大学哲学与法政学院政治（人类）学专业教授，上海师范大学第七届校学位评定委员会委员，兼任任复旦大学社会科学高等研究院驻院研究员；北京大学政府管理学院政治学专业博士后，北京大学社会学系人类学专业博士后，获得“北京大学优秀博士后奖”；入选教育部“新世纪优秀人才支持计划”；荣获“第五届全国教育改革创新‘先锋教师奖’”；主编创刊《政治人类学评论》并已出版6辑；作为第一作者发表、出版论著近50篇（部），其中15篇论文分别被《新华文摘》杂志和《政治学》《社会学》等中国人民大学复印报刊资料杂志全文转载。

担任上海师范大学公共管理一级学科（学术型）硕士学位授权点负责人，主创的“本科生大创协同教学—硕士生创刊反哺教学：培育文化自信的共享型模式”荣获上海市教学成果奖二等奖（2017年），主讲的本科生“公共管理学前沿”（双语）课程入选上海市级“精品课程”（2018年）。



教师主页二维码



超星慕课二维码



集人文社科之思 刊专业学术之声

刊 名：政治人类学评论
主办单位：上海师范大学哲学与法政学院
上海师范大学政治人类学研究所(筹)
主 编：陶 庆

POLITICAL ANTHROPOLOGY REVIEW 2018•1

编辑委员会（以姓氏笔画为序）

马 骏 王浦劬 朱光磊 刘建军 阮云星 李俊清 何国强 佟德志
张应强 纳日·碧力戈 范 可 林尚立 罗红光 和少英 竺乾威
金太军 周 平 周大鸣 赵旭东 胡 伟 徐 勇 徐杰舜 高丙中
郭苏建 桑玉成 常保国 董建辉 Baca George Eric Wittersheim

编委会主任（以姓氏笔画为序）

徐 勇 高丙中

编辑部成员（以姓氏笔画为序）

牛潇蒙 刘娜娜 吴采萱 宋 明 常国富 蒋姗姗

总第7辑

集刊序列号：PIJ-2018-307

中国集刊网：<http://www.jikan.com.cn/>

集刊投约稿平台：<http://iedol.ssap.com.cn/>

政治人类学评论

Political Anthropology Review
2018·1

总第7辑

陶庆 ◆ 主编



社会科学文献出版社
SOCIAL SCIENCES ACADEMIC PRESS (CHINA)

上海师范大学应用文科振兴计划“学术刊物”类建设项目

“《政治人类学评论》（培育）”

资助成果（A-7031-18-005530）

国家哲学社会科学基金一般项目

“新政治人类学在‘中国特色政治学三个体系’中的地位与作用”

资助阶段性成果（18BZZ010）

作者简介

(按照论文编辑顺序排列)



秦海燕

女，1982-，安徽无为，吉林大学政治学理论专业博士，现任安徽大学社会与政治学院讲师；电子邮箱：haiyan609@163.com。



骆建建

男，1978-，江苏淮安人，上海大学社会学专业博士，现任常州信息职业技术学院人事处处长，副教授；电子邮箱：46135651@qq.com



郭亮

男，1982-，重庆璧山人，西南政法大学法律史博士，重庆大学博士后，重庆邮电大学法学院讲师；电子邮箱：guoliang@cqupt.edu.cn。



吴晓燕

女，1969-，四川达州大竹人，华中师范大学法学博士，重庆师范大学公民道德与社会建设研究中心研究人员，教授；电子邮箱：wxy_9502@qq.com。



谢建社

男，1959-，江西九江人，上海大学社会学专业博士，现任广州大学公共管理学院副院长、教授；电子邮箱：18922168916@126.com。



张雨龙

男，1984-，云南西双版纳州景洪市人，云南大学民族学专业博士研究生毕业，获法学博士学位，现任云南大学讲师；电子邮箱：yulongzhang10@163.com。

学科开放与学术共享

——《政治人类学评论》代总序

《政治人类学评论》及其所阐发“新政治人类学”暨“政策人类学”等学科范式,迫切呼唤学科开放与学术共享的“春天”!迄今,它刚满四周岁,仍是学术界很不显眼甚至有些“扎眼”的“丑小鸭”,但期待它有朝一日凌空翱翔。《政治人类学评论》是目前国内第一份政治人类学专业集刊——即便英语文献的全球范围内也仅存二三——涵盖政治学、公共管理学、马克思主义人类学、社会人类学、文化社会学等多个学科与交叉领域,具有交叉跨学科的潜质与特征。

“一切有为法,皆悉归无常”。《政治人类学评论》所阐发的“新政治人类学”范式,表现为“政治学科学化”“政策学真理化”“‘群众路线’学术化”等内在逻辑,旨在发掘具有范式“象征”“符号”的“学科基质”(disciplinary matrix)与“有序元素”(ordered elements);具体体现在“五四”学术框架,即“学科基质”的“五化”过程(政治学科学化、人类学政治化、民族志写文化、管理学人性化、政策学真理化),与“有序元素”的“四要素”组合(权力要

素、田野要素、民族志要素、扎根理论要素)等辩证统一上;并围绕着“权力-权利”博弈的逻辑主轴,演绎出田野研究、民族志文本和扎根理论等“三位一体”的扎根理论方法论。

“新政治人类学”在政治与行政实践中必然演化出“政策人类学”等知识新语境——传承政策科学与领导科学的全部精髓与核心内涵——秉承马克思主义经典作家关于人的自由发展的精髓要义和沿袭拉斯韦尔(H. Lasswell)关于科学服务于民主的思维初衷。一方面,马克思主义人类学是“政策人类学”“活的化石”,回归“民族志”与重塑马克思主义人类学是“政策人类学”范式创新的不二选择;“政策人类学”学术内涵“五性统一”,具体表现为“内在问题导向性”是研究动机,“参与观察性”是研究方法,“互为他者性”是研究态度,“利益公共性”是研究目的,“政策科学性”是研究检验,并内嵌着互为一体、良性循环、螺旋上升、永无止境的内在整体性逻辑。另一方面,中国共产党“群众路线”是“政策人类学”“活的灵魂”,学术化“群众路线”将以一党法宝擎天领导科学、由中国话语泽被普世学术。一言以蔽之,“群众路线”是意识形态化的“政策人类学”,“政策人类学”是学术化的“群众路线”!

正因为此,《政治人类学评论》同仁将有志于学科开放的“超度”和学术共享的“涅槃”!

学科开放的“超度”。“超度”在这是指“超越”学科的高度、广度、幅度、速度等种种限度。人类知识根据某种共性特征进行分类而形成不同体系即学科(discipline),但同时也无中生有地树立起种种“知识壁垒”,形成众多“知识关税”,产生惊人“交易成本”。学科开放,并不是简单地“公开”学科知识与开放知识体系,而是破除“知识壁垒”,实现知识“零关税”,把“交易成本”减少到最低甚至是“零”。

学术共享的“涅槃”。“涅槃”是指浴火重生的复活境界。人类对存在物及其规律的学科化论证即为学术(academia),但同时也衍生出种种“学术圈子”,形成众多“学术山头”,滋生惊人“学术腐败”。学术,本身是思想自由的载体;而今,反沦为限制自由、禁锢思想的藩篱!学术共享,并不是简单

地“让与”“赠与”等施舍,而应是人类探索真理过程中,从自封到自律、从自发到自觉、从自为到自在、从自闭到自由的精神升华。

学科开放与学术共享,这正是《政治人类学评论》及其同仁的“中国梦”。



2018年10月18日

Discipline Openness and Academic Sharing

—Preface to the *Political Anthropology Review*

Political Anthropology Review and paradigms it elucidates, such as Neo-Political Anthropology [NPA] and Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP], urgently call for the “spring” of discipline openness and academic sharing! So far, it has just turned four years old, and it is still an unobtrusive or even inconsiderable “ugly duckling” in the academic world, but it is expected to soar in the sky someday. *Political Anthropology Review* is the first professional journal of political anthropology in China; there is only several English literatures like this in the whole world. It covers many disciplines and cross-disciplinary fields, for instance, political science, public administration, Marxist anthropology, social anthropology, cultural sociology, thus making it have the characteristics of cross-disciplinary.

It was said in *Mahayana Mahaparinirvana Sutra* that everything has its laws, but they all are of impermanence. The paradigm of “Neo-Political

Anthropology [NPA]” elaborated in *Political Anthropology Review* is presented in the internal logic of “Scientizing Politics”, “Scientizing Policy-making” and “Refining the ‘mass line’ academically etc. , and aims to discover “disciplinary matrix” and “ordered elements”. Specifically, it is embodied in the “five processes-four elements” academic framework, which is the dialectical unity of the “five processes” (Scientizing Politics Politicizing Anthropology, Ethnographic Writing Culture, Humanizing Management and Scientizing Policy-making) of “disciplinary matrix”, and the “four elements” (power element, fieldwork element, ethnography element, earth-bounded theory element) of “ordered elements”. In addition, based on the main logic of the “power-right” game, it also deduces the “three-in-one” grounded theory methodology, including fieldwork, ethnography and earth-bounded theory etc.

“Neo-Political Anthropology [NPA]” is bound to evolve in political and administrative practice, then develops into a new context of knowledge, for example, “Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP]”, passing on all the essence and core connotation of policy science and leadership science, adhering to the substance of free development of human beings put forward by classic Marxist writers, and following the H. Lasswell’s thoughts about science serving for democracy. On the one hand, Marxist Anthropology is “living fossil” of “Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP]” and reentry “ethnography” and remolding Marxism Anthropology is the only choice for the innovation paradigm of “Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP]”; “the unification of five characters”, academic connotation of “Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP]”, is embodied in such factors; “inner problem-oriented research” is the research motivation; “participation-observation for others” is the research method;

“otherness for both interviewer and interviewee” is the research attitude; “publicity of interests” is the research purpose; “Scientificity of policy-making” is a research examination. Besides, it is embedded with intrinsic and holistic logic with features of mutual integration, virtuous circle, spiral rising, which never ends. On the other hand, the “mass line” of the Communist Party of China is “living soul” of “Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP]”; refining “mass line” academically will be magic tool on leadership science for the Party and will be universally taught by Chinese discourse. In a nutshell, the “mass line” is the ideology of “Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP]”, and “Anthropology for Public Administration on Policy-making [APAP]” is the academic result of “mass line”!

Therefore, *Political Anthropology Review* colleagues will be interested in the “Beyond Limits” of discipline openness and the “Nirvana” of academic sharing!

“Beyond Limits” of discipline openness. “Beyond Limits” here refers to transcending such limits as height, breadth, amplitude, speed etc. Human knowledge is classified according to certain common characteristics and then form different systems, which are disciplines, but simultaneously, various “knowledge barriers” are erected indiscriminately, and many “knowledge tariffs” are generated, resulting in great amount of “transaction costs.” The openness of disciplines is not simply to open subject knowledge and its systems, but to break “knowledge barriers”, realize “zero tariffs” on knowledge, and reduce “transaction costs” to a minimum or even “zero”.

“Nirvana” of academic sharing. “Nirvana”. “Nirvana” refers to the rebirth from fire. The disciplinary argumentation of existence and its laws are academia, but at the same time it has also spawned a variety of “academic circles”, conducting many “academic hills” and bred astonishing “academic

corruption.” Academic itself is carrier of freedom of thought, which nowadays, however, becomes hedge restricting freedom and imprisoning minds. Academic sharing is not simply a matter of “transferring” and “gifting”, but should be the spiritual sublimation from self-proclaimed to self-discipline, from spontaneous to self-conscious, from being-for-itself to being-in-itself, from self-closing to freedom in the process of exploring the truth.

Disciplinary openness and academic sharing are the “Chinese Dreams” of the *Political Anthropology Review* and its colleagues.

Jao Qing

October 18, 2018

目 录

- 1 村寨社会国家化进程的人类学视角
——以中、老、缅交界地区哈尼/阿卡人为例
/ 张雨龙 1
- 2 乡村权力多元与乡土秩序重构
——以赣西村宗族权力与政府权力冲突互动为例
/ 谢建社 53
- 3 村委会权力运作嬗变下的村庄治理
——以皖中 DG 村“老板”村干部为例
/ 秦海燕 101
- 4 村寨治理与法秩序变迁
——以“中国村民自治第一村”合寨村为例
/ 郭 亮 157
- 5 乡村集市中的权力整合
——以川东圆通场的废兴个案为例
/ 吴晓燕 222