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Abstract

The Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism exerted an important influence on the ideology of the Dzungar Empire and the Qing Empire. At the end of the 16th century, the rise of the Romanov and the Qing squeezed the living space of nomads. The Mongols, including the Dzungars, chose to convert to Tibetan Buddhism to regulate the increasing internal and external tensions. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the power structure of Central Eurasia continuously changed with the expansion of the Yellow Hat Sect’s cross-regional religious, political and economic systems and religious wars. By the 1740s, the Qing Empire established a new order in Tibet and its surrounding areas, as well as Mongolia, in other words, in most Tibetan Buddhist areas except Dzungaria. Due to the special relationship between the Dzungar and Tibet, the Dzungar constantly challenged the new ideological order constructed by the Qing with the “irrational” request of inviting Tibetan lamas. In response, the Qing constantly adjusted its strategy, which is the main problem discussed in this thesis. The ideological conflict between the two eventually led to a war that eliminated the Dzungar and the attempt to ontologically homogenize the Qing Empire in the post-Dzungar era.
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Introduction: the Dzungar, A “maverick” steppe empire

In Central Eurasia in the second half of the 17th century and the first half of the 18th century, the nomadic imperial confederacy of the Dzungar, as the “last steppe wolf”, was the final climax of the history of nomadic Central Asian empires. Historians usually regard the Dzungar Empire as a continuation of the Mongol Empire, which is partly due to the Qing’s incorporation of the Dzungars into the category of “Mongols” after conquering the Dzungar. However, in light of new historical materials about the Dzungar, I think the Dzungars can be considered mavericks that bore considerable differences from their Mongolian cousins at that time, making unique choices that had a profound impact on the power structure and historical process of Central Eurasia. Most significantly, the choice of the Dzungars to continue to fight the Qing Empire tenaciously for nearly a hundred years was anamolous. Other Mongols at that time followed the traditional practice of choosing alliances flexibly based on the balance of power. I think one of the important driving forces behind this unorthodox approach was their Tibetan Buddhist ideology. Previous research has not taken the Dzungar’s “uncompromising” stance as a research problem, nor has it paid much attention to the Dzungar’s ideological issues but has generally been more focused on war narratives. Using newly-available documents, this thesis will try to interpret the Dzungar’s “uncompromising” attitude towards the Qing from an ideological perspective, whether in relation to violent or peaceful negotiation. I will take the Dzungar’s continuous challenge to the new ideological order built after the Qing’s control of Tibet and the Qing’s response on the issue of inviting lamas from 1740s to 1750s as an empirical case with which to interpret the ideological basis behind the behavior of both parties.

3 Ibid., p. 317.

The “Mongols” discussed in this thesis refer to the Mongols in Inner Asia or in the Qing scope that was defined by its maximum territory in the mid-18th century. Whether the Dzungars can be classified as “Mongols” depends on the perspective and time, which Crossley has discussed. In this thesis, I define the Dzungars as “non-Golden Family Mongols.”
Research Design

Theory and Method: A Non-Qing Perspective on the Ideological History of the Qing Empire

Since the Dzungars converted to the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism and began the process of centralization in the mid-17th century, they had become powerful challengers to the Qing frontier. The end result of the long-term ideologically driven competition between the two was that the Qing defeated and incorporated the Dzungar in the mid-18th century. Therefore, the Qing’s historical records and narratives about the Dzungar not only record the Dzungar’s ideology, but also provide an approach to understanding how the Qing integrated the Tibetan Buddhist world into the Qing ideological universe and constructed its “universal rulership” from the perspective of the Dzungar-Qing interaction. How, then, did the Qing record and interpret the Dzungar? The Qing’s ideology and strategy of rule intervened in the imperial historical narrative, which made the identity and history of the Dzungars marginalized and dispelled in the historical narrative, as a part of the overall historical reconstruction of the empire. Since the 1990s, in North America’s Chinese studies departments, the New Qing History School proposed to study Qing history from the “Inner Asian perspective” emphasizing the historical connection between the Qing bloc and the nomads on the northwestern frontier of the empire. (In this thesis, the Inner Asia refers to the part of Central Eurasia that located in the Qing Empire.) As a result, the history of the frontier entered the center of the academic stage. The Dzungar deserves such a focus, because in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Dzungar was indeed a historical engine and source of shaping the international power form and structure in Central Eurasia. Compared with previous studies on the geopolitical importance of the Dzungar, I pay more attention to its geo-ideological influence on the eastern part of Eurasia, which is the foundation of modern China. Although the Dzungar was geographically located on the edge of the Qing Empire, it was one of the core forces to promote the key development of the Qing’s ideology and dominance. The existence and disappearance of the stimulus from the Dzungar played a significant role in shaping the transformation of the expression of the Qing emperor system and the discourse system of “universal domination”.

For the study of Qing ideology, Pamela Kyle Crossley is an enlightening historian who is usually considered a member of the New Qing History School. Her 1999 work *A Translucent Mirror: History* has been influential.

---

5 Zhong 2018.
6 Cheng 2016.
and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology inspired this thesis in topic selection, theories, and methods.9 Based on the historical texts produced by the Qing Imperial Historiographical Office (国史馆, guoshiguan), Crossley deconstructed the historicist narrative of the empire to restore the historicity of the Qing rule.10 She tried to understand the construction of state power and ethnic groups in early modern China by figuring out the ideological change of Qing rulers’ identity. To do that, one of her methods is to trace long-term development and to pay attention to and compare diachronic changes, which helps uncover the phased ideology and paradigms of rule behind the imperial narrative serving the construction of state entities in different periods from the reigns of Nurhachi (努尔哈赤, nuerhachi, 1559-1626), to Huang Taiji (皇太极, huangtaiji, 1592-1643), and then to Qianlong (乾隆, qianlong, 1711-1799).11 In addition to focusing on temporality including both synchronic expressions and diachronic comparisons, Crossley also makes spatial comparisons from a global perspective. She compares the Qing Empire with other early modern empires such as Russia and Ottoman Turkey, which aids in understanding the technologies of ruling a diversified empire and the historical consequences of the choice of different technologies.12 She compares the Qing with the outside world as a whole, and the outstanding feature of the Qing was simultaneous emperorship, that is, the emperor used different cultural expressions when facing different groups.13 This thesis attempts to turn the comparative perspective back to the inside of geographical scope of Qing Empire, comparing the ruling ideology of the Dzungar-Tibet alliance and the Qing bloc in the middle of the 18th century. I will employ a long-term retrospective method to explore the reasons why Mongolian nomadic society, including the Dzungar, accepted the ideology of Tibetan Buddhism in the 13th and 17th centuries. For a research object that had a long-time span, a wide geographical scope, and had both synchronic and diachronic complex expressions, “conceptualization” is a method used by Crossley to conduct in-depth research. I think “conceptualization” is a method that can combine synchronicity and diachronicity.14 This thesis is inspired by these concepts or terms and puts forward different views on some of them, such as the “Wheel-Turning King” and the “Great Emperor Manjushri”.15 (Buddhist conceptions of kingship)

---

9 Crossley 1999.
11 Ibid., p. 2.
12 Ibid., p. 360.
13 Ibid., p. 11.
The transformation of the paradigms of rule discussed by Crossley was adapted to the Qing’s conquest process starting from Northeast Asia in the 16th century and reaching its peak after conquering the Dzungar in 1750s. This interpretation is from the perspective of the Qing bloc, regarding them as the active force of conquest. The conquered were viewed as passive, their identities were reshaped by the conqueror, and their ideologies became the trophies of the simultaneous imperial expressions of the conqueror. It assumes that the desire to expand and consolidate the regime was the historical force for the development of the ideology that promoted and served conquest. All in all, “a conquering empire” is the basic concept of Qing history. However, I think it is not enough to explain some phenomena related to the Dzungar-Qing interaction. First, what was the source of the desire to conquer? If it was only out of the endless desires of larger territory, why did Qing expansion end after conquering the Dzungar? At the same time, the Qing ideology of conquest also began to transform again as the conquest stopped. Crossley was aware of these contradictions, but she did not answer these questions. Another problem with the theory of conquering empire is that following the clues of the process of conquering, no matter how scholars recognize and emphasize the importance of frontier and the “Inner Asian perspective”, frontier cannot be the center of interpretation. I argue that the two concepts of “frontier” and “Inner Asia” themselves were essentially Qing-centered. Because “center” and “frontier” are a pair of contrasting concepts, the premise of emphasizing “frontier” is that the Qing bloc has been placed at the center. According to Perdue’s definition, “Inner Asia” refers to the part of Central Eurasia that is located in present-day China, which means that China (the Qing) is used as the scale to separate the continuity and relevance of Central Eurasia. So, there is a potential conflict between the theory of conquering empire and the pursuit of interpreting history from the perspective of the nomads from Central Eurasia. Furthermore, the Dzungar’s sphere of influence once involved Southern Siberia, Western Siberia, Central Asia and Xinjiang, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Western Tibet, and Qinghai. The Dzungar should be regarded as a Central Eurasian power rather than an Inner Asian power. I think that it is more accurate to say the Dzungar once existed and exerted influence in certain areas than (a modern

---

16 Crossley 1999, p. 28.
17 Ibid., p. 31.
18 Ibid., pp. 44, 56, 58, 91, 103, 109, 208, 138 – 139.
19 Zilatejin 2013, p. 359.
Perdue defined “Central Asia” as the part of Central Eurasian steppes that was under the control of the Soviet Republic (also including Outer Mongolia).
concept) “territory” because their domain had changed greatly over time and was influenced by the nomadic federation structure and the nomadic concept of land ownership.\(^\text{24}\)

If we abandon the one-directional theoretical framework of “conquering empire”, we can introduce the theoretical framework that Thomas J. Barfield advocated in his 1989 work *The Perilous Frontier: Nomadic Empires and China* to establish interactive models based on anthropology.\(^\text{25}\) Different from Qing-centralism, Barfield emphasizes the interaction between the three cultural ecologies had shaped the course of Chinese history.\(^\text{26}\) In the 13th and 18th centuries, the nomadic and sedentary hybrid Northeast Asian (where the “Manchus” originated in) power “forest tiger” twice interfered with the nomadic “steppe wolves” and the sedentary Chinese states’ long-term interaction model, which led to the Mongols turning to the West in the 13th century, and the Dzungar’s integration with the East Asian system in the 18th century.\(^\text{27}\) He proposed that the three cultural ecologies had different perceptions of the world order, which inspired me to view the Dzungar-Tibet Tibetan Buddhist alliance and the Qing as two ideologically separated world centers.\(^\text{28}\) In addition, Barfield also inspired me to examine the transformation of ideology, discourse system and ruling paradigm of each bloc from the tension and operation of the interaction model. In this thesis, it is the interaction tension between the Dzungar, Tibet, and the Qing. The historical driving force of this interactive tension makes me think that it is feasible to apply the “challenge-response” theoretical framework within the scope of the Qing Empire to get an analysis different from the theory of conquest.\(^\text{29}\)

My empirical focus is the dispute between the Dzungar and the Qing over inviting Tibetan lamas, which was the Dzungar’s challenge to the new ideological order built by the Qing after incorporating Tibet and the Qing’s response. It needs to be emphasized that the “challenge-response” model I use does not imply the active and passive relationship or advantages and disadvantages of the parties. In Barfield’s model, sedentary China was largely at a disadvantage of being passive and intervened, for example, nomads intervened in China’s civil strife to ensure that China could serve as a stable “treasury”, which I do not agree with.\(^\text{30}\) On the contrary, I believe that Chinese states actively built their own cultural, political

---

24 Zilatejin 2013, p. 121. In addition to the frequent territorial changes caused by nomadic internal struggle and conquest, the Dzungars maintained connection with the tribe who migrated to the lower Volga River, thus exerting influence in Europe.


26 Ibid., p. 15.

27 Crossley 1999, p. 73; Barfield 1989, p. 15. Crossley describes the economic form of the Manchus in Northeast Asia: “hunting, fishing, gathering, farming, mining, pearl curing, or ginseng reduction”, which showed that the Manchus lived a mixed economic life and should not be defined as nomads.


“Challenge-response” is originally a theoretical paradigm proposed by “Harvard School” scholar John King Fairbank in the 1960s to study the 19th century Chinese history. The main point is that the challenges of the West promoted the historical development of the “long stagnant” China. In this thesis, I use this theory to demonstrate that the Dzungar’s challenge to the Qing promoted the Qing’s expansion of territory and transformation of ideology.

system and their world order to deal with various internal and external challenges, such as the Qing’s continuous attempts to build a universal ideological order. In addition, he described Qing rule as a dual system of the steppe and China, overlooking other elements of the Qing Empire such as Tibet, and did not pay attention to the Qing’s pluralistic ruling ideology.31

Sources and Textuality

It is difficult to trace the history of nomads like the Dzungars, because the nomadic politics and ideology in Central Eurasia were complex, changeable, and sometimes disappear in historical records. Some historians, including Barfield, believe that they can rely on the rich and clear records of China of its neighbors.32 It is true that Chinese national historical data are precious sources, but we must realize the textuality of these historical narratives. Chinese national historical materials, like any historical narrative text, are an active performance or explanatory process. China’s historical records are not always comprehensive, but are typically carefully selected.33 The Dzungar is an example that was erased to some extent in the historical record after its defeat by the Qing.34 In order to change the long-term dependence of academia on Chinese historical materials, in addition to deconstructing Chinese historical materials from a textual perspective, another way is to use non-Chinese historical materials including the various languages involved in the interaction in Central Eurasia, as well as the various languages within the Qing Empire, such as Manchu, Mongolian, and Tibetan. At the same time, as Crossley suggests, these languages themselves are textual; they are part of identity construction and reconstruction.

History of the Dzungar Khanate by Yi Ya Zilatejin (伊•亚•兹拉特金) originally published in Russian in 1964, was the groundbreaking, being the first general history work to systematically study the Dzungar.35 The author used Russian archives, Todo (托忒蒙古文, tuotei mengguwen, Clear Script, a Mongolian script used by the Dzungars) documents and other languages such as Tibetan, Turkic, Mongolian and English to produce this monograph on the general history of the Dzungar from the 15th to the 18th century.36 He was committed to reconstructing the political and economic structure of the Dzungar.37 Due to the lack of historical materials directly recording Dzungar society, he used the Turgute (土尔扈特, tuerhute) tribe who migrated to the Volga River.

---

34 Ibid., pp. 320, 328.
To do that, the name of the Dzungar was not allowed to be used. They were portrayed as “standard Mongols”, so their history might be concealed by Mongolian history to a certain extent. In addition, the Qing created Uigur constituency in Xinjiang to cover up the history of the Dzungar rule there.
36 Crossley 1999, p. 317; Wulan 2011; Zilatejin 2013, pp. 4, 24 – 44.
37 Zilatejin 2013, pp. 42, 294.
in the 17th century as a reference, which inspired me to use the historical background of the conversion of Mongolian tribes other than the Dzungar to Tibetan Buddhism in order to understand the motives of the Dzungar.\(^{38}\) Zilatejin emphasized the decisive role of economic factors, especially the shortage of pasture and trading rights, on the Dzungar’s internal affairs and diplomatic policies. He discussed the struggle for power in the Dzungar and the trade and wars between the Dzungar, the Qing, Russia, and other Central Eurasian countries. However, when describing the Dzungar-Qing relationships, due to the limited historical materials he had access to at the time, he continued the academic practice that he himself criticized for relying on the national historical works produced by the Qing.\(^{39}\) Almost all of the sources he used came from “\textit{Shengzu Qinzheng Pingding Shuomo Fanglve}” (圣祖亲征平定朔漠方略). He misunderstood it as an original archive, so he was convinced of its authenticity without realizing that it was extensively deleted and modified.\(^{40}\) But for him, it was the only available (uncorroborated) evidence. If uncorroborated evidence is used, it is particularly difficult but necessary to criticize it because of the risks brought by the lack of comparative evidence.

If we interpret this “uncorroborated evidence” according to Crossley’s theory, this historical work produced by the Qing Imperial Historiographical Office is a typical “translucent mirror”, reflecting the ideology of Qing rule, which is historicism.\(^{41}\) The mirror of historicism is translucent and bidirectional, in which the history guides the present and the present guides the history. The title of this work means that the sage ancestor personally went on an expedition to put down the rebellion of the Dzungar. The “\textit{Fanglve}” was actually a strategic reference for the successors to handle similar situations. By doing so, they could inherit the achievements and wisdom of their ancestors. But, the mirror (historical works) and ancestors in the mirror were the works of the later emperor’s Historiographical Office instead of the archives at the time of ancestors. According to what kind of image the present successor wanted to show himself, he must portray his ancestors into that kind of image. With this process repeated, the history of ancestors was constantly reconstructed.\(^{42}\) Furthermore, considering the long-lasting and in-depth exchanges between the Qing and the Dzungar, “\textit{Fanglve}” should not and cannot have been a “uncorroborated evidence”. So, it can only be the result of deliberate intervention, which reflected the historicism ideology of the Qing rule. For a long time, a large number of government archives had not been sorted, published, or translated but were deliberately or unintentionally ignored because they were not or should not be the history of ancestors.

Zilatejin’s dependence on “uncorroborated evidence” is not only due to Qing historicism’s control of a single historical narrative or Zilatejin’s inadequate awareness of this point, but also the

\(^{38}\) Zilatejin 2013, pp. 294 – 295.
\(^{39}\) Ibid., pp. 24 – 25.
\(^{40}\) Ibid., p. 44.
\(^{41}\) Crossley 1999, p. 17.
\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 291.
inaccessibility of other historical materials. In addition to the thematic history “Fanglve”, the records about the Dzungar are also distributed in “Qing shilu” (清实录) that is a compilation of more than 4,400 volumes of officially edited chronicles of the Qing Dynasty.\(^{43}\) Zilatejin hardly tried to extract the Dzungar-related parts from it. The Full Text Database of Historical Archives search system released in October 2020 makes “Shilu” more usable.\(^{44}\) The meaning of “Shilu” is “real examples”, and a similar historicism interpretation can be made for it.

Influenced by this view of The New Qing History School emphasizing the importance of non-Chinese historical materials, especially Manchu court archives, local Mongolian and Tibetan archives, many archives have been recently translated and used.\(^{45}\) Among these primary sources, I attempt to use the Chinese translation of two Manchu archives that have been published in the past ten years, which are the *Qingdai Junjichu Manwen Aochadang* (《清代军机处满文熬茶档》, The Grand Council Archive of the Dzungar pilgrimage to Tibet) and *Junjichu Manwen Zhungaer Shizhedang* (《军机处满文准噶尔使者档》, The Grand Council Archive of the Dzungar Missions).\(^{46}\) The former is referred to as *Aocha* Archive for short, the latter is referred to as the Mission Archive.

*Aocha* ("brewing tea") refers to a religious ritual in which believers distribute alms in Tibetan Buddhist temples. From 1740 to 1748, with the permission and under the surveillance of the Qing, Dzungar *Aocha* missions entered Tibet to perform this religious ritual. The *Aocha* Archive records the events in detail, including personnel, routes, time, alms, and trade goods. It also includes correspondence between Tibetan Buddhist leaders and the Dzungar rulers. Organized and translated by the First Historical Archives of China, in 2010, a Manchu-Chinese version was published, including more than 300 documents. Since then, some historians have restored the basic historical facts of the series of religious and diplomatic events that took place in peacetime beyond the previous war narrative.\(^{47}\) A representative work is Peter C. Perdue’s 2015 article *Tea, Cloth, Gold, and Religion: Manchu Sources on Trade Missions from Mongolia to Tibet*.\(^{48}\) He appreciates the value of this newly-available source, because neither the local border archives nor the central court’s records had any extensive record of the *Aocha* events. He believes that this source has not been fully

---

\(^{43}\) Wu, Xu 2017.  
\(^{44}\) *Qingshilu*.  
\(^{45}\) Guo 2012; Perdue 2015.  
\(^{46}\) For example, *qingdai elunchun manbanwendang huibian* (《清代鄂伦春满文档案汇编》 2001; *qingdai xiaqiangzijianghaabaoermenggu manwendangan quanyi* (清代西迁新疆察哈尔蒙古文档案全译) 2004; *qing neimenggenzhangdang* (《清内蒙古宗室档》 2006; *qing neimishuyuan mengguwendangan huibian* 《清内阁蒙古文档案汇编》 2007; *qianlongchao manwenjixindang yibian* 《乾隆朝满文寄信档译编》 2011; *qinghui xiyangzhuanjiaoshi manwenjihun* (《清朝西洋传教士满文档案译本》 2015).  
\(^{47}\) Guo 2012, p. 65.  
\(^{48}\) Perdue 2015.
studied.\textsuperscript{49} His own research pointed out the diplomatic competition and trade relations in peacetime that have enriched our understanding of the form of communication between both parties beside open conflicts. He interpreted \textit{Aocha} events from the perspective of border trade, which reflected the interdependence between the Qing and the Dzungar and their competition for control over Tibet. The two sides continued to negotiate and adjust strategies, which exposed the irregularity of the so-called tributary system. On the basis of his concern about the communication strategy regarding trade between the Qing and the Dzungar, I analyze the ideological significance of Tibetan Buddhism to the Qing-Dzungar interaction through the \textit{Aocha} events.

Regarding diplomatic competition and strategy about the ideology of Tibetan Buddhism, the Mission Archive also provides detailed information, containing 14 volumes and 608 pieces, and recording the negotiations and other activities of 17 Dzungar missions sent to Beijing between 1734 and 1754 during the time of peace. These official documents were produced naturally during diplomatic activities, without being historically re-processed by the Imperial Historiographical Office.\textsuperscript{50} Translated and compiled by the First Historical Archives of China and the History and Geography Research Center of the Frontier Areas of Minorities, the Mission Archive in Manchu and Chinese was published in 2009.

For the study of these two archives, the contributions of most scholars are to restore this previously unknown history of the peace period. Generally speaking, theoretical analysis is lacking. A few scholars try to conduct some theoretical analysis based on historical facts, such as Perdue and Lv Wenli, whose theoretical framework focuses on economic and political relations.\textsuperscript{51} Compared with the previous standard war narratives, it is already a valuable academic development. My aim is to use different theoretical frameworks of analysis based on these sources and literature, comparing and tracing the ideology and paradigm of rule of the Dzungar and the Qing. I believe that although the two had some similar performances, for example, they both supported the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism, the ideological essence of their rule was different, which has not been analyzed very much before. However, the prevailing view is to confuse the two, for example thinking they were both nomadic conquerors, or the Qing was a “follower of Genghis”, which I think is debatable.\textsuperscript{52} The Manchus should not be considered nomads, and their relationship with the Mongolian legacy should also be re-examined.

Language and translation are issues that should be considered when using source materials. As government reports on the northwest border affairs of the empire, the producers and audiences of these two archives were the Manchus in the government, which means they might be closer to the essence of Qing ideology.\textsuperscript{53} However, the problem is that I cannot read Manchu and must rely on

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} Guo 2012, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{51} Lv 2017.
\textsuperscript{52} Crossley 1999, p. 312.
\textsuperscript{53} Guo 2012, p. 7.
the Chinese translation, of which the translation technology is recognized in the academia. Nevertheless, any translation process causes loss and distortion of information. For historians, it may be a problem they try to avoid by learning Manchu language and using textual linguistics methods to interpret the history beyond the text. For example, Crossley used Manchu grammar to speculate on the early Manchu social conditions.

For the Qing emperors, however, manipulating language barriers was a technique of rule, of which the translation of this term Aocha was an example. The term in Manchu is “manja fuifume”. The meaning of “manja” is mandala, which is a cosmic model of Buddhism and also a model of the relationship between Buddhist gods, which showed that Qing rulers understood Aocha was not only a religious practice, but also a recognition of the cosmic order of Tibetan Buddhism and an establishment of interactive relationship. By contrast, the Chinese term is熬茶 (Aocha, brewing tea), from which it is impossible to see the worldview, theory or practice of Tibetan Buddhism. For Chinese audience, Tibetan Buddhism was less visible in imperial archives and historical narratives. Contrary to the Qing emperor’s claim that he was the preacher of Tibetan Buddhism, I think that he did not wish to expand the sphere of influence of Tibetan Buddhism, because Tibetan Buddhism’s cosmology and power relationship network were a threat to the integrity of the Qing Empire and the emperor’s “universal rule,” as will be described in more detail below.

**The Background of Tibet-Dzungar Ideological Alliance: The Exchange of Political, Economic, Military and Ideological Capital**

Tibetans have the tradition of consuming “brewed tea” made from ghee and strong tea water. The lamas in monasteries drink a lot of this refreshing tea due to long sitting meditation and chanting sutras. An important practice of Tibetan Buddhism is to worship the “Three Treasures of Buddha, Dharma, Sangha” to have good karma through oblation. Tea has become an important part of the worship and oblation, and Aocha (“brewing tea”) has also become a part of the religious rituals and a pronoun for the believers to establish relations with lamas. Believers who go to monasteries to worship and pray for blessings must first brew tea for the lamas to show respect, and then give alms while the lamas drinking tea. At the end of the 16th century, with the spread of the Dalai Lama worship of the Yellow Hat Sect among the Mongols including the Dzungars, going to Tibet to Aocha (“brew tea”) became a method and symbol for the establishment and consolidation of alliances between the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism and the Dzungars as well as other Mongols.

---

56 Ibid., pp. 263, 269, 299, 312, 335.
57 Wuyunbilige, Kong 2016.
58 Huang 2007; Neimacairang 2020.
The Establishment of the Alliance between the Sakya Sect of Tibetan Buddhism and the Direct Line of Golden Family in the 13th Century and the Construction of the Roles of “Preceptor” and “Student”

Before the conversion to Tibetan Buddhism, the Mongols practiced shamanism. With the vast conquest of Genghis Khan (成吉思, chengjisi, 1162-1227), the Mongolian polytheistic shaman system developed the concept of the supreme god “Mongke Tengri” (蒙克騰格里, mengke tenggeli) meaning “eternal heaven” or “longevity sky”. This shamanistic concept of the supreme god was of great significance to Genghis’s rule, and became the root of subsequent beliefs in a religious supreme participating in the construction of rulership, such as the Dalai Lama. In 1206, after unifying the Mongolian tribes, Genghis officially became the Mongolian emperor and the Great Khan (of all Mongols) through his coronation by a shaman. The supreme god Mongke Tengri was the source of the legitimacy of integrating various powers and establishing a unified centralized regime. According to this belief, the secular ruler himself did not possess sacred power, but relied on the agent shaman who might interfere with the independence and supremacy of secular power. Later, the role of shaman was replaced by Living Buddhas whose authority was even higher because the shaman was only a vessel that could be abandoned, while the Living Buddha was the incarnation of god himself, whose authority should be eternal.

Mongolian shamanism not only worshiped heaven, but also ancestors. After the death of Genghis, the Mongols deified him as the most revered ancestral god, which gave legitimacy to his direct descendants, known as the “Golden Family”. By doing so, in Mongolia’s rule, a chain-like ideology was formed to confirm the legitimacy: the religious supreme being-the historical ancestor god-the current Golden Family. Different from shaman, obtaining legitimacy from the ancestral god Genghis did not rely on any external force, but naturally through blood. And this legitimacy was not transferable. I think the idea of obtaining legitimacy through blood lineage in shamanism was similar to the idea of reincarnation in Tibetan Buddhism, which might have facilitated the conversion of the Mongols. One difference was that reincarnation did not require proof of blood relationship, which made it possible for non-Golden Family Mongols to gain legitimacy. For this reason, shamanism was abandoned by indirect lines within the Golden Family and non-Golden Family Mongols who turned to the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism in 17th century. Although the direct line of Golden Family also accepted the Yellow Hat Sect, they did not give up the shamanism’s theory of blood legitimacy.
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Therefore, when discussing Mongolian ideology, generalizations should not be made, since the various tribes in Mongolia may have variable ideologies. Factors influencing the choice of ideology of different tribes, beside the conflict for legitimacy, geopolitical location was another one. For example, the ideology in southern and eastern Mongolia flexibly included elements of different sects of Tibetan Buddhism, shamanism, and Confucianism. On the contrary, the Dzungar, located in the west, near Tibet, completely abandoned shamanism and was dedicated to the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism, eventually becoming its protective armed force.

In the late 13th century, Genghis’s Mongol Empire disintegrated. In eastern Asia, Kublai (忽必烈, hubilie, 1215-1294) won the throne, establishing the Mongol Yuan Empire in 1271 and conquering China in 1279. Kublai became the only legal Great Khan who had the right to control sedentary China’s wealth (instead of land). Broadly speaking, all descendants of Genghis can be called the Golden Family. In a narrow sense, the “Golden Family” referred to Kublai’s descendants, of which the direct line was the orthodoxy of all Mongols. (In this thesis, the Golden Family refers to the descendants of Kublai. Among the descendants of Kublai, the successor to the throne (the Great Khan of all Mongols) was the direct line, and the others were the indirect line. The Dzungars were considered non-Golden Family.) Prepared with shamanism’s polytheistic flexibility, the concepts of supreme god and ancestor god as the ideological basis, the newly established Mongolian Yuan empire needed to consolidate the rule of diverse people in a vast territory, which led to the first formal acceptance of Tibetan Buddhism. The Mongolian system of succession and inheritance system was chaotic. In Mongolia, livestock and dependent herders were private property, and each son had the right to inherit. The systems of private property and divided inheritance made it difficult to centralize power. Even if it was achieved, it was often due to the personal charisma of a “hero”. Heroic centralization was difficult to maintain with this inheritance system. Another principle of inheritance in Mongolia tradition was that the eldest son inherited the father’s office and the youngest son inherited the property, which led to confusion and struggle. I think the analysis of the inheritance system is an entry point for understanding Mongolian and later Qing ideology. An important difference between the two was that exclusive land ownership in Mongolia had little intrinsic value, which makes me think that the two might have different understandings of “sovereignty”, and it inspires me to suspect that the competition between the Dzungar and the Qing might not be based on territory. I think the hypothesis that the Qing and
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the Dzungar competed to inherit the territory of the Yuan Empire is anachronistically based on the concept of modern territorial sovereignty.

Continuous internal and external tension and ecological uncertainty made it difficult for Mongolia to obtain stability; instead existed in a fluid state of conquering and being conquered. For example, after the Oirads, the ancestors of the Dzungars, were conquered by the Mongols in the 13th century, they joined the Mongol alliance and became a new conqueror. They lost their original territories, but they occupied new territories during the joint westward march.\(^{73}\) However, since the conversion to the Yellow Hat Sect in the 17th century, the Dzungar’s behavior deviated from the common practice of nomads. At that time, other Mongols joined the Qing to fight against the Dzungar due to the power balance, while the Dzungar fought the Qing continuously for a hundred years even when at a disadvantage. Barfield argues that in Inner Asia the survival of nomads depended on the resources of the outside world, especially the neighboring agricultural areas.\(^{74}\) Whether through trade or plunder, the access to resources was based on the balance of power between the nomads and the outside world. In the 17th century, in Central Eurasia, the rise of the Romanov and the Qing squeezed the living space of nomads and reduced the possibility of their extracting resources from the outside world. Therefore, facing both internal and external tension, I think Mongolian society required a new ideology to play a regulatory role and the new ideology from Tibet may explain the Dzungar’s persistent and unyielding confrontation with the Qing. The economic form of Tibet was similar to that of Mongolia, which was mainly nomadic economy supplemented by a small amount of agriculture.\(^{75}\) Based on the same economic situation, the Tibetan Yellow Hat Sect and the Dzungar formed an alliance controlled by the Dalai Lama.

In the 13th century, as a complement to shamanism, the upper Mongols introduced Tibetan Buddhism into their ideological system. In 1240, the Mongolian army entered Tibet and began to realize the appeal of Tibetan Buddhism in Tibet. Therefore, in order to completely control Tibet, Mongolia needed to make the leaders of Tibetan Buddhism succumb to them to demonstrate the legitimacy of Mongolia’s rule over Tibet. In addition to religious legitimacy, through Tibetan Buddhist leaders, Mongolia and local powers in Tibet reached political and economic cooperation. In 1244, Köden (阔端, kuoduan, 1206-1251), the son of the Great Khan Ögedei (窝阔台, wokuotai, 1186-1241), wrote a letter to Sakya Panditath (萨迦班智达, sajiabanzhida, 1182-1251), the fourth of the Five Sakya Patriarchs.\(^{76}\) The letter began with a tribute to heaven and Genghis, which showed the dominance of the shamanist ideology during the reign of Ögedei. Simultaneously, the upper Mongolian understood the theory of “The Three Treasures of Buddha, Dharma and Sangha”. And they realized that the situation in Tibet was largely influenced by the attitude of the
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lamos of popular sects. The most important was that the Mongolian ruler expressed the willingness to reconstruct the ruling ideology by introducing the Sakya Sect of Tibetan Buddhism. At last, from the initial contact between Mongols and Tibetan Buddhism leaders, there had been the practice of giving gifts to build relationships. These gifts were made of silver and fine silks might be from China. Chinese products would continue to be an important part of alms in future Aoba.

As “Sangha” (lama) of the Three Treasures, Sakya Pandita chose to cooperate with Mongolia and persuaded believers and local powers in Tibet to submit to Mongolia due to their military strength. After Sakya Pandita, his nephew Drogön Chogyal Phagpa (八思巴, basiba, 1235-1280) continued to develop relations with Mongolian rulers. In 1270, he was awarded the titles of “emperor’s preceptor”. The Yuan Empire established the General Institution to manage Buddhist and Tibetan affairs since 1264, of which the leaders were the successive “emperor’s preceptor” from Sakya Sect. Among various sects of Tibetan Buddhism, the Mongolian ruler selected the Sakya Sect. In addition to its popularity, I believe the more important reason was that the teachings of the Sakya Sect met the needs of the (Kublai’s) direct line of Golden Family to consolidate their rule. The succession of the Sakya leader was passed down within the Khon family (昆氏家族, kunshijiazu). Sakya Sect’s blood inheritance system for sacredness and legitimacy was the prerequisite basis for Yuan Empire and Sakya Sect to form an ideological alliance. During the Yuan Dynasty, the Sakya Sect was always an integral part of the ideological expression of the Mongol Yuan Empire. In 1269, Drogön Chogyal Phagpa created the “Phags-pa script” (八思巴文, basibawen), which was at Kublai’s request for an “imperial script” that “translates all languages”. The Sakya Sect not only consolidated the legitimacy of the direct line of Golden Family, but also brought a Tibetan Buddhism worldview or cosmology into the ruling ideology of the Yuan Empire. The emperor of the Yuan Empire, the Great Khan of all Mongols, was the ruler of Jambudvipa (南瞻部洲, nanshanbuzhou), the continent inhabited by humans in the Buddhist universe model. He had the ability to understand all human languages and knowledge in the world.

According to the teachings of Tibetan Buddhism, the relationship established between Tibet and Mongolia was the “preceptor-student” relationship. On the one hand, Sakya Sect strengthened the emperor’s centralization. On the other hand, the “preceptor-student” relationship became a potential threat to weaken the supremacy of the Mongol emperor, because the roles of “preceptor” and “student” implied a power relationship. The performances of the Tibet “preceptor” and the Dzungar “student” in the 17th and 18th centuries expressed this power relationship to the
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extreme. Mongolia’s choice to build such a power relationship with Tibet seems irrational for the emperor pursuing absolute status. For the emperor, as a natural person, it was a common practice to establish religious preceptor-student relations. But when emperor performed as a state system, the “emperor’s preceptor” had the potential to be a separate power center. (The “emperor’s preceptor” was indeed also named “the country’s preceptor” in the Yuan Dynasty.) The inheritance of blood also spurred the accumulation of the power of the Sakya Sect’s “emperor’s preceptor” in the Yuan Dynasty. Why did the Mongolian ruler approve this approach? From the perspective of religious practice, lamas were necessary to guide the believers. If the emperor personally believed in Tibetan Buddhism, he would need a “superb preceptor”. Meanwhile, the need of emperor as an institutional political leadership for guidance from preceptor can be traced back to traditional shamanism. The Mongols consulted shamans for any major decisions through divination. The lamas replaced the guiding role of the shaman. This can partly explain the strong demand of the Dzungar for lamas in the 18th century, which is the research question of this thesis.

In order to understand the ideological disputes between the Dzungar and the Qing regarding Tibetan Buddhism, I reviewed the Mongolian ideological transformation in the 13th century. One risk of the long-term retrospective approach is to ignore the synchronic historical phenomena that disappeared in later history. For example, the thoughts of the Yuan Empire were diverse, including shamanism, Taoism, Confucianism, and Christianity. The Yuan emperors needed to use multicultural expressions to universalize their legitimacy of blood. However, this diversity declined with the decline of the Yuan Empire. In the post-Yuan period, the indirect line of Golden Family and the non-Golden Family rose up, whose demand for disruptive sources of legitimacy led to another transformation of the Mongolian ideological paradigm. Theories supporting the legitimacy of blood had been abandoned, including shamanism and Sakya Sect, which were replaced by the non-blood “reincarnations” legitimacy theory of Yellow Hat Sect.

The Yellow Hat Sect, the Indirect Line of Golden Family, and the Non-Golden Family

During the Yuan Dynasty, Tibetan Buddhism was only spread among the ruling class instead of being the belief of the whole people. After the Ming Empire replaced the Yuan Empire in the late 14th century, the Mongolian regime withdrew from China and became ideologically dominated by shamanism again. Although the Yuan Empire’s multiple ideologies, including Tibetan Buddhism, declined, they had become resources for the re-transformation of Mongolian ideology since the
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16th century. The first Mongolian leader to seek ideological transformation was Altan Khan (俺答汗, andahan, 1508-1582) who came from an indirect line of the Golden Family, but who was more powerful than the orthodox direct line (the Great Khan of all Mongols) at the time. The legitimacy of Altan’s rule of his own tribe came from the title granted by the Great Khan of all Mongols, which was not in line with the actual power structure. To correct this deviation, Altan needed to ideologically break the monopoly on the legitimacy of blood kinship, finding alternative sources of legitimacy, and constructing his own legitimacy discourse system. His first option was to gain the legitimacy by joining China’s East Asian tributary system. For the nomads around China, the title given by China had a centralized appeal because it was a license or even monopoly privilege for trade with China. However, Altan’s attempt failed, because the tributary trade between Mongolia and Ming China did not go smoothly, which I think to a certain extent was due to the traumatic memory of Yuan Mongol’s conquest of China. In addition to trade, the East Asian tributary system was an ideological order centered on China, of which the Mongols did not approve.

In religion, Altan eliminated shamanism and tried to introduce Bailianism (白蓮教, bailianjiao), a hybrid of Buddhism and Confucianism that had existed during the Yuan Dynasty. Bailianist leaders encouraged Altan to be the “emperor” to restore the “Yuan Empire”. However, the Mongols in the post-Yuan period did not have the desire to revive the Yuan Empire and reconquer China, but wanted to follow the tradition of exploiting China from a distance to obtain resources that had existed for more than a thousand years before the Yuan Dynasty. In the end, the reincarnation theory of the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism, in which I believe that the possibility of non-blood inheritance was the decisive factor, satisfied Altan’s pursuit of ideological reconstruction. Since 1578, when Altan met Sonam Gyatso, the third Dalai Lama (索南嘉措, suonanjiacuo, 1543-1588), the Yellow Hat Sect has been the dominant religion of the Mongolian people. After the meeting, Altan gave Sonam Gyatso a large amount of alms including silver mandala and five-color silk symbolizing the universe model of Tibetan Buddhism, and ten white horses symbolizing Mongolian affiliation, which means that the Mongols accepted the world order and power order of Tibetan Buddhism. This alms-giving practice imitating the 14th century ritual was to metaphorically indicate that Sonam Gyatso was the reincarnation of Drogön Chögyal
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Phagpa, the first “emperor’s preceptor” of the Yuan Empire, and that Altan was the reincarnation of Kublai.

Compared with how it was in the 13th century, the 16th century Tibet-Mongolia relationship was twofold. The first was still the “preceptor-student” relationship but more exclusive since shamanism was completely banned. The Yellow Hat Sect not only exerted an influence on religion, but also played a role of preceptor in all aspects of Mongolian society, including internal affairs and diplomacy. “In short, everything should follow the example of Tibet.” The second was the “benefactor-blessed field” relationship. In Yuan Empire, the wealth flowed from Tibet to Mongolia in the form of tribute and taxation. But in the 17th and 18th centuries, the wealth flowed from Mongolia and the Dzungar to Tibet through Aocha. According to the teachings of Tibetan Buddhism, the wealth of the benefactor was like a seed, and the lama was the field. Through alms-giving, the benefactor could improve their practice and get blessings.

In the meeting, the Mongols’ identity of the Yellow Hat Sect’s protector was also created. Sonam Gyatso gave Altan the title of “Brahma Vigorous Chakravarti Nomen Khan” (梵天大力察克喇瓦尔第诺们汗, fantiandalichakelawaerdinuomenhan). Brahma came from Hinduism and was an important protector god in Tibetan Buddhism, whose image of the four-faced Creation Buddha also symbolized a cosmic order. Chakravarti or the Wheel-Turning Kings, also came from Hinduism, who were the rulers of unified continent(s). Therefore, the legitimacy of Alatan’s rule was based on the cosmic order of Tibetan Buddhism. Furthermore, the identity of the Wheel-Turning King allowed Altan to inherit leadership abilities across blood and even across ethnicities. In history, Ashoka of India, Songtsen Gampo of Tibet, and Kublai of Mongolia were all regarded as Wheel-Turning Kings. I must emphasize that my point of view is that what was inherited through this identity was “leadership ability” (that was usually inherited by blood among the nomadic elites) rather than “governance or ownership of a specific territory” (based on modern territorial sovereignty), which will be discussed more in the following sections.

The theory of reincarnation was not flawless for Altan. Since the “reincarnation” was not through blood relationship and was not unique at the same time, the Dalai Lama could grant this title to any “student”. This legitimacy was therefore only temporary, and tied to individuals rather
than blood, which was similar to the image of the traditional Mongolian leader “hero”. Moreover, the acquisition of the title relied on the authorization of the Dalai Lama. Therefore, the power relationship between the Yellow Hat Sect and Mongolia was increasingly centered on the Dalai Lama. An indication of the changes in the Tibet-Mongolia power relationship was how the two sides conferred titles to each other. In the 13th century, only the Mongolian emperors awarded titles to Tibetan Buddhist leaders, not the other way around. In contrast, in the 16th century, Altan and Sonam Gyatso awarded each other titles, which shows at that time the religious power side and political power side of the alliance were relatively separated and balanced. Altan gave the title of “Dalai Lama” to Sonam Gyatso. In the 17th century, only the Dalai Lama conferred the titles of Mongolian and Dzungar leaders, not the other way around.

Religious Wars and the Dzungars as Defenders of the Faith

With the rise of the Qing in the 17th century, the Qing and Tibet became two confrontational ideological centers, between which the Mongols could ally with either side due to struggles within Mongolia. In general, southern and eastern Mongolia tended to support the Qing bloc, while western Mongolia, the Dzungar, was the most powerful defender of the Dalai Lama's authority. At the beginning of the 17th century, the Yellow Hat Sect spread from eastern Mongolia to Dzungaria. In 1640, the “Mongolia-Oirad Code” stipulated that the Yellow Hat Sect was the state religion of the Dzungar. (From this name, subtle differences may be perceived in the identities of the Mongols and the Dzungars.) The code started with salute to the leaders of the Yellow Hat Sect. The practice of the children of the Dzungar nobles going to Tibet to study Buddhism was gradually institutionalized, which deepened the Tibet-Dzungar “preceptor-student” relationship. I think the alliance between the Dzungar and the Yellow Hat Sect was therefore more intimate and emotional than that of other Mongols who lacked such a close and institutionalized relationship. In addition, from a geopolitical point of view, the Dzungar was adjacent to Tibet, so exchanges between them were more frequent, while southern and eastern Mongolia might be more influenced by the Qing. The Dzungars geographically had more access to external resources from Central Asia, which made them less dependent on the Qing. However, the Dzungar’s distance from the Qing’s pluralistic ideological order led to the Dzungar’s dependence on Tibet, the sole source of their ideological legitimacy, and therefore they were more reliable and manipulable for the Yellow Hat Sect. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the Yellow Hat Sect attached great importance to the Dzungar’s function of “defenders of the faith”, (which is my
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definition of the Dzungars’ ideological role), because of the struggle between Tibetan religious sects. Since the initial contact between Mongolia and Tibetan Buddhism in the 13th century, the sectarian struggle in Tibet and the power struggle between the Mongolian tribes were intertwined. For example, Kublai sponsored the Sakya Sect and his opponent sponsored the Kagyu Sect.113

The Yellow Hat Sect was a fast-growing new reformist sect.114 In the late 16th century and early 17th century, The Yellow Hat Sect was at a disadvantage due to the suppression by Karma Kagyu Sect (噶玛噶举派, gamagajvpai) and other sects supported by the ruler of Tibet Tsangpa (藏巴汗, zangbahan, 1565-1642). As a result, the Yellow Hat Sect actively sought secular support inside and outside Tibet. Altan, who extended his power to the periphery of Tibet, was the first protector of the Yellow Hat Sect. Sonam Gyatso, the third Dalai Lama, did not return to Tibet but stayed in Mongolia to preach for ten years. After his death, according to his instructions, Altan’s grandson Yonten Gyatso (云丹嘉措, yundanjiacuo, 1589 – 1617) became the fourth Dalai Lama, the only Mongol among all the generations of Dalai Lamas. The Mongolian identity of the fourth Dalai Lama consolidated the Tibet-Mongolia alliance and accelerated the acceptance of the Yellow Hat Sect in Mongolia and Dzungaria.115 After Altan’s death, the support for the Yellow Hat Sect declined rapidly. In 1603, the fourth Dalai Lama arrived in Lhasa under the escort of the Mongolian nobles, but he died suddenly in 1617 at the age of 28.116 The Yellow Hat Sect lost their source of support and urgently sought a new one.

Military operations of the Dzungar are rarely viewed from a religious perspective. I have selected three wars with important ideological significance and defined them as religious wars. In the 1630s, in Tibet and surrounding areas, an anti-Yellow Hat Sect political-religious alliance was established. The fifth Dalai Lama asked for help from the Dzungars and their allies. They organized a coalition army to march into Tibet in 1636. Under the military and political guidance of the Dalai Lama, in 1642, the coalition destroyed the opposition forces, and the Yellow Hat Sect established a new regime ruling Tibet.117 Furthermore, the geographic route of direct communication between Tibet and Dzungaria was taken over by the allies of Dzungar, the Khoshut tribe, which allowed the Dzungars to enter Tibet more freely to Aocha.118

The Yellow Hat Sect espoused a hierarchical polytheism across tribes and regions, of which the Dalai Lama was paramount and doctrinally controlled Tibet, as well as having local lower-level living Buddha reincarnation systems forming a pyramid-shaped central local power relation. Due to the spontaneous and legally regulated support systems of various localities, the local living
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Tibetans could also travel freely between Tibet and Dzungaria.
Buddhas formed religious, political and economic entities centered on their temples, which usually sent resources to Tibet through Aocha.\(^{119}\) At the same time, this living Buddha system was an information network through which the Dalai Lama conveyed his will to various places to exert influence. However, as with any central-local relationship, there might be power competition between the Dalai Lama and the local living Buddha systems. Facing possible local challenges, the central leadership of the Yellow Hat Sect needed support from power entities, especially military support. With the rise of the Dzungar, the fifth Dalai Lama highly valued his student, prince Galdan (噶尔丹, gaerdan, 1644-1697) of the Dzungar. Galdan was considered the reincarnation of the Living Buddha Dben Sa (温萨活佛, wensahuofo) who was one of the envoys sent by the fifth Dalai Lama to Dzungaria asking for help in 1635.\(^{120}\) It was the same as the reincarnation of the fourth Dalai Lama as the grandson of Altan, which was a strategy to consolidate alliances in times of crisis as well as for proselytizing. The Dalai Lama and Galdan established a close “preceptor-student” relationship.\(^{121}\) He received religious and military education in Tibet. He was dedicated to the Dalai Lama’s political and religious career that was the expansion of the Yellow Hat Sect.\(^{122}\) In 1662, Galdan went back to Dzungaria, before which the Dalai Lama taught him in detail the plans to serve the political and religious interests of the Yellow Hat Sect.\(^{123}\) The “preceptor-student” relationship between the fifth Dalai Lama and Galdan was a typical example of the relationship between the Yellow Hat Sect and the Dzungars, which was religious, military, political, and economic alliance.

In the early days of returning to the Dzungar, Galdan acted as a living Buddha and exerted influence in state affairs.\(^{124}\) In 1670, the Dzungars were embroiled in an inheritance struggle, which provided a better opportunity for Galdan to perform the Dalai Lama’s will, as communicated to him when he studied in Tibet.\(^{125}\) The reason why he won the throne was related to his status as a unity of politics and religion. He was regarded as a “god” in the Dzungar both by his followers and enemies.\(^{126}\) In addition to living Buddha, Galdan’s military and martial skills gave him the image of the Mongolian god of war. Crossley discussed the relationship between the image of the god of war in Tibet, Mongolia, and the Qing and the centralization of power. Furthermore, the Mongolian god of war also became a protector of the Yellow Hat Sect.\(^{127}\) Besides, Dalai Lama provided him with actual military resources.\(^{128}\) After winning the throne in 1672, Galdan returned to laity and
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began a campaign for unification and external expansion to serve the expansion plan of the Yellow Hat Sect. In 1678, Galdan received the title Danjinboshuoketu Khan (丹津博硕克图汗) from Dalai Lama through Aocha as a recognition of his rule of the conquered areas. So far, the imperial confederacy of the Dzungar was established. Through the regime of integration of politics and religion, the centralization of power in the Dzungar was strengthened, and the power of the Dalai Lama further broke through the boundaries of geography and sovereignty.

According to the plan of the Dalai Lama, Galdan began to expand his domain to the Islamic regions in southern Xinjiang, agricultural areas supplying resource for Tibet and Dzungaria (northern Xinjiang). The Dalai Lama fostered agents in the local Islamist sect struggle and instructed Gardan to march into the area in 1679. Galdan ruled indirectly over the area, imprisoning local nobles as hostages to force them to pay taxes to the Dzungar and Tibet. Galdan also gave the right to the tax revenues from several conquered cities as Aocha alms to the Dalai Lama. In addition to lack of strength, I think ideology was another important reason why Galdan ruled indirectly. I assume Galdan could not replace the Golden Family’s legitimacy through the “reincarnation” theory of Tibetan Buddhism in Islamic areas (Yarkent Khanate), which was a difficulty faced by non-Islamic ideological regimes (including the Qing Empire) in governing Islamic regions, whose ideology was difficult to integrate. Although this war of conquest took place between two religions, I think there was no evidence to characterize it as a religious war. Due to the increase in the population and livestock of the Dzungar before the war, it is reasonable to believe that it was a “periodical” expansion of the nomads, at the same time, serving the economic interests of the Dalai Lama.

In contrast, I regard the war between the Dzungar and the Qing to fight for control of Khalkha (喀尔喀, kaerka) Mongols as the second religious war. In 1655, Khalkha nominally surrendered to the Qing for economic benefits and trade privileges, but in fact they were independent. In the second half of the 17th century, Khalkha fell into civil strife. The Dalai Lama tried to mediate but his envoys were ignored by Tüsheet Khan (土谢图汗, tuxietuhan, 1699). Since the Dalai Lama’s authority was scorned, the Dzungar and the Qing were invited for mediation. Galdan accused Khalkha of causing the civil strife by disobeying the Dalai Lama. Therefore, Galdan’s strategy was to contain local power and restore the supreme authority of the Dalai Lama. However,
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during the mediation process in 1686, the local Living Buddha of Khalkha Jebsundamba (哲布尊丹巴, zhebuzundanba, 1635-1723) continued to challenge the authority of the Dalai Lama and Galdan, which eventually led to Galdan’s religious crusade against Tüsheet and Jebsundamba in 1688 on the charge of “apostasy”.

At first, the Qing remained neutral on Galdan’s military operations, with the aim of Khalkha formally joining the Qing under the pressure of the Dzungar. After this goal was achieved in 1691, the Qing sheltered Tüsheet and Jebsundamba and the war between the Dzungar and the Khalkha became a war between the Dzungar and the Qing. This confirms my point that the power that shaped the Qing’s territory did not only emanate from the Qing’s one-way conquest, but was multi-directional, and the ideology of Tibetan Buddhism played an important role. In this religious war, the behaviors of the Dzungars and the Mongols were obviously different. The Eastern Mongols chose their camp based on flexibility to adapt to different political circumstances. Galdan stated in the negotiations with the Qing that his purpose was only to hand over the two “apostates” to the Dalai Lama, and he was willing to maintain peaceful exchanges with the Qing.

The Dalai Lama publicly supported Galdan, which was quite unusual, showing that he regarded the two “apostates” as a threat to his authority. Even as his position deteriorated, at the last moment of Galdan’s life, he still refused to surrender and did not give up asking for “apostates”. In order to spiritually destroy Galdan’s fighting will, the Qing announced that the fifth Dalai Lama had in fact been dead for 15 years. It was the minister of the Dalai Lama who gave orders under the guise. But the Qing’s psychological offensive was wasted effort, because at this time Galdan had passed away from illness in 1697 without hearing the news.

The revelation of the secret of the death of the fifth Dalai Lama in 1682 caused chaos in Tibet where three the “sixth Dalai Lamas” appeared from 1697 to 1720. In fact, the ministers of the Yellow Hat Sect concealed the news of the Dalai Lama’s death because Dalai was worried that the Yellow Hat Sect would be at a disadvantage in the power struggle in Tibet after his death. The Khoshut Lha-bzang Khan (拉蔵汗, lazanghan, ?-1717) opposed the sixth Dalai Lama recognized by the ministers of the Yellow Hat Sect but supported another one, and killed the prime minister in 1705. The disadvantaged Yellow Hat Sect followed the example of the fifth Dalai Lama to turn to the Dzungars for external military support. Lha-bzang Khan was the descendant of the protector of the Yellow Hat Sect during the first religious war. In order to destroy the legitimacy of Lha-bzang Khan’s rule, the Yellow Hat Sect accused him of converting to the Red Hat Sect. The Yellow

140 Hei 2005, p. 64.
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Hat Sect sent a distress letter to the Dzungars in the name of their guardian god, the General Protector of the Dharma whose call of duty provided the religious legitimacy for the Dzungar’s dispatch to Tibet. With the help of the Yellow Hat Sect, Dzungar expeditionary forces eradicated Lha-bzang Khan’s regime in 1717.\footnote{Wang, Yang 2018.}

In addition to destroying secular hostile forces, The Dzungar expeditionary army persecuted rival sects and conducted a purge within the Yellow Hat Sect, which showed the exclusive religious fanaticism of the Dzungars. The main target of the persecution was the Red Hat Sect. The Yellow Hat Sect as a reformist emphasizing the precepts was different with the old Red Hat Sect in doctrines and rituals. The Dzungars also eliminated the “filthy” old doctrines and ritual elements within the Yellow Hat Sect by, for example, demoting monks who violated the precepts.\footnote{Ibid.} One reason behind the religious persecution and pursuit of religious purity among the various sects of Tibetan Buddhism was the change in the power structure of Central Eurasia with the expansion of the Qing. After Galdan’s defeat, his Khoshut allies in Tibet and surrounding areas formally joined the Qing in 1701, which allowed the Qing to begin a blockade of Tibet.\footnote{Wulanbagen, 2017.} Tibet’s income from Aocha was restricted, which intensified the competition for resources among sects.\footnote{Cai 2011; Lv 2015; Yang 2018, p. 110.} For example, the Dzungars gave monastery properties of the Red Hat Sect to the Yellow Hat Sect. The leader of the army was praised as the reincarnation of the protectors in history for serving the interest of the Yellow Hat Sect.\footnote{Wang, Yang 2018.} Moreover, the Qing controlled the cross-regional religious and political exchange institutions of the Yellow Hat Sect.
Empirical Analysis

“Inviting Lama” Disputes and the Construction and Resistance to the New Ideological Order

In the Tibet-Dzungar ideological alliance, in addition to the Dzungars entering Tibet to Aocha, inviting Tibetan lamas to the Dzungar to preach was an important way for the two sides to communicate. These lamas were not only engaged in religious activities, but also often acted as the Dalai Lama’s messengers and played a guiding role in Dzungar society. However, after the Qing expeditionary army defeated the Dzungar expeditionary army in Tibet in 1720, the Qing began to station troops in Tibet to further strengthen their control over Tibet, the communication channel between Tibet and the Dzungar was blocked.\(^{152}\) Whether it was feasible to invite lamas from Tibet depended on the Qing’s attitude. From 1734 to 1754 (the time period covered by the two archives used in this thesis), the Qing and the Dzungar resumed peaceful exchanges. The Dzungar missions went to Tibet three times to Aocha and visited Beijing seventeen times. Whether it was going to Tibet or Beijing, one of the purposes of the Dzungar missions was to conduct trade-related activities and negotiations. Because of the Dzungars’ pursuit of trade, the Qing once regarded trade as the most important bargaining chip for coordinating Qing-Dzungar relations.\(^{153}\) The Qing believed that the fundamental motivation and purpose of the Dzungars’ Aocha in Tibet and visiting Beijing was trade, so the Qing tried to build a “permanent trade model” to incorporate the Dzungar into the “East Asian tributary trade-political system”.\(^{154}\) During the first Aocha in 1741, the Dzungar mission gave up on entering Tibet and returned halfway due to trade divergence, which only reinforced the Qing emperor’s assumption.\(^{155}\) Due to the prominence of trade, historians such as Perdue and Lv Wenli pay more attention to economic and trade factors in the peaceful interaction between the Qing and the Dzungar in the 1840s and 50s, and defined these exchanges as “Aocha trade” and “mission trade”.\(^{156}\) However, what was beyond the expectations of the Qing was that no matter how much importance the Dzungars attached to trade, due to the Dzungar’s adherence to the “purity” of the Yellow Hat Sect’s ideological order, the Qing’s attempt to use peaceful means to construct a new order of Qing-Dzungar relations would ultimately fail.\(^{157}\)

\(^{152}\) Deng 2000.
\(^{153}\) Perdue 2015.
\(^{154}\) Junjichu manwen zhungaershizhedang yiban 2009, qianlongsinianshieryuershiquiri “shangshuhaiwangdengzoubaoyushichenhaludengyilunmaoyishiyipian”.
\(^{155}\) Qingdai junjichu manwen aochedang 2010, qianlongliunianbayuechusiri “liangzhoujiangjunwuhetudengzoubaozhunguarentrendengyiuyuichengfanhuiquiyomuzhe”.

“Mission trade” means that every time the Dzungar missions went to Beijing, they conducted trade, and the trade volume of this kind of trade accounted for almost half of the total Qing-Dzungar trade.\(^{157}\) Qingdai junjichu manwen aochedang 2010, qianlongshisanzhengyueshibari “liangzhoujiangjunwuhetudengzoubaozhunguarentrendengxianwanshobushiyinshumuzhe”, qianlongshisanzhengyueshibari “xiningbanzhidachenzhongtobaouzoubaozhunguarentrendengxianwanqinghaigesimiaoaochaqingxingzhe”.

\(^{157}\) Qingdai junjichu manwen aochedang 2010, qianlongshisanzhengyueshibari “liangzhoujiangjunwuhetudengzoubaozhunguarentrendengxianwanshobushiyinshumuzhe”, qianlongshisanzhengyueshibari “xiningbanzhidachenzhongtobaouzoubaozhunguarentrendengxianwanqinghaigesimiaoaochaqingxingzhe”.
The Dzungar’s “maverick” choices compared to their Mongolian cousins attracted my interest to the ideological factors affecting the Dzungars’ behavior beyond economic factors. Unlike the Chinese, who believed that the East Asian system was centered on China, Mongols traditionally believed that the center of the Mongolia-China interaction model was Mongolia.\textsuperscript{158} My opinion is that the Tibet-Dzungar system was unique because it was centered on the Dalai Lama in Tibet instead of the Dzungar itself. The reason for that was that the Dzungar did not have its own local living Buddha system like other Mongols and the Qing did.\textsuperscript{159} It was a manifestation of the Tibet-Dzungar interdependence that was self-reinforcing. The degree of interdependence was so deep that the political legitimacy brought about by trade privileges with the Qing could not replace Tibet as the source of the Dzungar’s legitimacy. Therefore, I believe what behind the confrontation between the Dzungar and the Qing was the competition between Tibet and the Qing as two separate ideological centers. As a result of the Dalai Lama’s submissive performance under the Qing’s fortified rule at the time, this subtle ideological competition might be less visible until the two new archival collections are investigated.

According to the Aocha Archive and Mission Archive, among the issues under negotiation, such as Aocha, border dispute, trading regulations, the issue of inviting lamas was the only irreconcilable dispute between the two parties, and it made the Qing finally realize that they could not integrate the Dzungar into the Qing-centered East Asian system due to their ideological separatism (that is my definition of the potential characteristics of Tibetan Buddhism for the Qing empire), thus finally resorting to force. The inviting lama dispute also profoundly affected the Qing’s attempt to downplay Tibetan Buddhism, integrate and homogenize the empire that had “completed” its conquest and expansion in the post-Dzungar era.\textsuperscript{160}

The mobility of lamas was a key to the Yellow Hat Sect’s cross-regional political influence. To weaken it, the Qing made regulations that prohibited lamas from different regions to communicate without permission, which caused trouble for the Dzungars who did not have their own living Buddha system.\textsuperscript{161} Lack of local living Buddha system also meant that the higher education system of the lamas in the Dzungar was incomplete.\textsuperscript{162} As mentioned earlier, lamas were essential to the

\begin{flushleft}
For example, in the letter from the Dzungar ruler to the Dalai Lama, it was mentioned: “there is no other belief except the Yellow Hat Sect”. In some other letters from the Dzungar ruler to the lamas in Tibetan monasteries, it was repeatedly emphasized that “to strengthen the foundations of the two sacred masters of the Yellow Hat Sect [Dalai Lama and Panchen Lama] and the lamas... to gather lamas’ hearts, to purify the morality and the behavior, to strengthen the faith of the Dzungars as the foundation of the sect.”
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{158} Barfield 1989, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{159} Xing 2007; Zilatejin 2013, p. 110; Li 2016.
\textsuperscript{160} Crossley 1999, p. 233.
\textsuperscript{161} Li 2016; Yang 2018, p. 118.
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religious practice of Tibetan Buddhism. The resources of senior lamas and technical lamas in the Dzungar, such as doctor lamas, largely depended on Tibet. For example, during the third religious war, the Dzungar army brought many Tibetan lamas back home. Therefore, the Dzungars were compelled to find ways to break through the Qing’s blockade and get in touch with the Yellow Hat Sect in Tibet. Aocha was an opportunity for that, and in some cases, it was difficult for the Qing to refuse the Dzungar’s request for it. Firstly, from a diplomatic point of view, in the negotiations on delimitation in 1738, one of the conditions was Aocha. Secondly, from a religious point of view, the reason for requesting to the first and second Aocha in 1741 and 1743 was to hold ceremonies for the death of the fifth Panchen Lama (1663-1737). Thirdly, the Dzungar’s reason for requesting to the third Aocha in 1747 was that the newly succeeded ruler, in accordance with the teachings of Tibetan Buddhism, needed to hold a Aocha ceremony in Tibet to pray for his father, the deceased former ruler. They were in line with the teachings of the Yellow Hat Sect and the requirements of Confucian “loyalty” and “filial piety”. The Qing emperor, who was claimed to be the “great benefactor of the Yellow Hat Sect” and the “sage master of Confucianism,” was therefore obliged to approve the requests.

Although the Qing emperor had no excuse to refuse such a request for Aocha, he wanted to reduce its effectiveness as much as possible. He anticipated that the Dzungar Aocha mission would use the opportunity of Aocha to propose to invite Tibetan lamas to the Dzungar, so he had already prepared excuses for refusal for local officials and agents in Tibet in advance: “Because they do not have the emperor’s decree, they cannot decide without authorization”, which was obviously inconsistent with the actual situation. I think that being vague in name while clear in operation was actually a flexible governance strategy that helped maintain the emperor’s “immaculate and sacred” moral image. The “authoritative and innocent” image of the Qing emperor also made it possible to show Tibet’s ostensibly voluntary affiliation with the Qing and to weaken the relationship between Tibet and the Dzungar without worsening the relationship between the Qing and the Dzungar. However, the Dzungar mission returned halfway during the first Aocha because the benefits of trade were less than expected.

During the second Aocha, in 1744, after the religious ceremonies where the mission and the lamas were able to come into contact, the mission said to the local agent of Tibet, Polhané Sõnam

163 Junjichu manwen zbungaerbizhedang yibian 2009, qianlongjiunianzhengyueshibari “lifanyuanshuliangyubaozoubozhuanyangshixiuquxiaoyuanqipinglamapojuaiyuynzhe”.
164 Ibid., qianlongsanniansanyueyuchuli “junjichuweituosongzhungaershichenjinzangshimizijiangjunwuhetudengwen”.
165 Ibid., qianlongshiyiniansanyueyuchuli “yuzhungaertaijicewangduoerjenamuzhaleweiqifufuzangaochaxuweyici”.
166 Crossley 1999, p. 221, 226.
Topgyé (颇罗鼐, poluonai, 1689-1747), that they were instructed to invite a lecturer lama and a doctor lama to the Dzungar. The officials of the Imperial Colonial Office (理藩院, lifanyuan) who escorted the Dzungar mission and the minister in Tibet immediately reported it to the Qing emperor.\(^{170}\) The Qing officials who surveilled the Dzungar mission could not enter the temples to learn about the details of the meeting between the mission and the lamas, so it was difficult to say whether the inviting lama request was instructed by the Dalai Lama. Polhané was a Tibetan power figure who was once an official and son-in-law of the Khoshut Lha-bzang Khan killed by the Dzungar expeditionary army. He was chosen by the Qing as an agent rather than an official directly sent by the Qing court. The Dzungar might hope to reach a consensus with the local power in Tibet and ignore the new order of the Qing. The result was, his reply was in accordance with the previous instructions of the Qing emperor. His attitude of affirming the supremacy of Qing imperial power to rule Tibet was approved by the Qing emperor.\(^{171}\)

The Dzungars realized the extent to which Tibet was controlled by the Qing. In this case, the Dzungar could only make a request to the Qing emperor through the diplomatic missions sent to Beijing. Before the Qing blockade of Tibet, inviting lamas was an internal affair of the Tibet-Dzungar alliance. Now, the affairs between Tibet and the Dzungar had become an international affair between the Qing and the Dzungar, which meant that the autonomy of the Dalai Lama, both domestically and internationally, was largely replaced by the Qing emperor’s authority. Tibet had begun to be emptied into a symbolic power of ideology.\(^{172}\) The Yellow Hat Sect in Tibet, once a religious, political, military, and economic entity, had begun to be dismantled while Beijing was building an alternative new center. The economic and military resources of the Dzungar to supply the entity were cut off, and Tibet became more dependent on the resources of the Qing, so the Tibet-Dzungar alliance was weakened. The Dzungar’s purpose of Aocha was to re-establish the connection between Tibet’s symbolic capital and the Dzungar’s political, economic and military capital. The process of dismantling the center of Tibet was accompanied by the transfer of the center to Beijing and the construction of a new order. In providing alternative resources for Tibet, the Qing was not only trying to replace the position of the Dzungar in the Tibet-Dzungar alliance, but ultimately also Tibet’s position throughout the Tibetan Buddhism world. One of the reasons I made such a hypothesis is the expression and practice of the Qing emperor’s identity that will be discussed more later. The Qing emperor did not Aocha in Tibet himself. He was not to be the benefactor (as he claimed) or student of the Dalai Lama, but the controller of the power network

The Lifanyuan was a central institution in the Qing Empire to manage the affairs of ethnic minorities in the border. I take the English translation Crossley used.  
\(^{171}\) Junjichu manwen zhongguoershizhedang 2009, qianlongjiunianzhengyueshibari “lifanyuanzuoshilangyubaozoubaozhuanjianxiangchiyugeibanchalinebingfandiqianzangzhe”, “fudutongsuobaiwenzhengaershichengqixiumiaoyanqingtulamapoluonaiweiyunzhe”.  
\(^{172}\) Crossley 1999, p. 328.
of the Yellow Hat Sect. The emptiness of Tibet’s power and the Qing emperor’s attempt to transfer the center of secular entities and religious symbols can be seen from the Tibet and the Qing’s response to the Dzungar’s request to invite lamas.

In 1745, the Dzungar mission visited Beijing and made a written request to invite lamas:

> At present, most of the lamas invited from Tibet are dead or old, so we hope to select good lamas from Tibet. If the lamas can be presented to us, the Yellow Hat Sect can continue in our place [Dzungaria] forever, and we will always thank the emperor for his mercifulness.\(^{173}\)

The written request expressed the Dzungar’s religious needs and implied that it was the emperor’s moral obligation to provide support for the promotion of the Yellow Hat Sect in the Dzungar. This cross-border religious moral obligation was part of the cross-regional hierarchical power and obligation network established by the Yellow Hat Sect. In the verbal statements of the mission, the implication of Qing emperor’s obligation to the Dalai Lama was more obvious by accusing the Qing’s local agent in Tibet:

> When our Aocha mission was returning from Tibet, Polhané did not support us well and refused to allow us to invite lamas, which was different from convention. He was originally a clerk of Lha-bzang Khan, and he did so probably because of the old hatred.\(^ {174}\)

The Dzungars implied that they approved the old order centered on the Dalai Lama represented by “convention” and believed that the Qing emperor and officials should still follow it. In the Dzungars’ perception, Dalai Lama’s competitor Lha-bzang Khan and the Yellow Hat Sect were distinct enemies. By expressing their dissatisfaction with the Tibetan agent, they implied dissatisfaction with the new order established by the Qing in Tibet to empty the Dalai Lama’s power. In contrast, in Qing’s narrative, this distinction between the identity of the Yellow Hat Sect and the other sects was eliminated.\(^ {175}\) The legitimacy of the third religious war waged by Yellow Hat Sect-Dzungar alliance was therefore questioned or even considered immoral. The Qing emperor made a conceptual replacement of the subject of religious persecution, and thereby rejected the Dzungar’s request, at the same time granting legitimacy to his own actions and those of his agent: “In the past, the Dzungars disturbed Tibet, demolished temples, and had a vendetta against Tibet, so they [the lamas] do not want to go.”\(^ {176}\) The only restrictive term in this expression was the broad concept of “Tibet”. The Qing implied that the “Tibet” or “Tibetans” as a whole were persecuted by the Dzungars. The identity of the Dzungars changed from a defender of the Yellow Hat Sect to a persecutor, and the Yellow Hat Sect changed from a victor in religious struggle to a victim. The Qing nominally restructure the alliance between Tibet and the Dzungar as a hostile

\(^{173}\) Qingshilu, qianlongshinianzhengyuejihaitiao.
\(^{174}\) Ibid.
\(^{175}\) Wang, Yang 2018.
\(^{176}\) Qingshilu, qianlongshinianzhengyuegengzitiao.
relationship. The Qing had become a higher authority that brought “justice” to the “Tibetans” including the Yellow Hat Sect. The subtext of the Qing’s message was that firstly, the lamas of the Yellow Hat Sect were unwilling to go to Dzungaria because they had been persecuted by the Dzungars in the past instead of the Qing’s prevention. Secondly, it was the Yellow Hat Sect lamas that violated the religious obligations instead of the Qing emperor. The Dzungar was the party responsible for the failure of “convention” of inviting lamas. “I am the great emperor; regardless of home and abroad, I regard all beings as equal who I compassionate and love.”¹⁷⁷ The Qing emperor combined Buddhism theory with the ideal of a universal monarchy and portrayed himself as a higher authority over “all beings”, including Tibetans and Dzungars. The Qing emperor also might obtain potential arbitration power by “regarding the two opponents equally and neutrally”.

The Qing’s rhetoric was not flawless but suffered from contradictions. Firstly, as the “great benefactor of the Yellow Hat Sect”, the Qing emperor was supposed to promote the Yellow Hat Sect, and therefore should sent lamas to Dzungaria to preach. Secondly, the Qing emperor’s claim that Tibetans could not be forced to go to Dzungaria because of his neutrality was in contradiction with his higher authority that should transcend his subjects’ “private enmity”. As a consequence of these loopholes, the Dzungar missions continued to negotiate with the Qing on inviting lamas to prevent the transferring the religious and secular authority center of the Yellow Hat Sect from Tibet to Beijing, which hindered the expansion of the Qing’s universal rulership. In 1745, Dzungar ruler Galdan Tseren (噶尔丹策零, gaerdanceling, 1695-1745) died. After his second son, Tsewang Dorji Namjal (策妄多尔济那木扎勒, cewangduoerjinamuzhale, 1732-1750), took over the throne, a mission was sent to Beijing to asked to go to Tibet to Aocha for Galdan Tseren, which was approved.¹⁷⁸ In addition, the mission again verbally requested to invite Tibetan lamas:

The Dharma of our place [Dzungaria] came from Tibet, and the lamas from Tibet are dead or too old now. The emperor promotes the Yellow Hat Sects everywhere to comfort all living beings. So, please allow us to invite lamas.¹⁷⁹

The Dzungar’s statement showed a pursuit of the purity of the origin of lamas and the legitimacy “Tibetan origin” brought. From the perspective of historicism, this legitimacy came from the assumption that “Buddhism in Dzungaria came from Tibet” and the religious historical theory of the same origin of India, Tibet and Mongolia.¹⁸⁰ From the perspective of cosmology, this legitimacy came from a world model order centered on Tibet. The Dzungars suggested that only lamas from Tibet, the birthplace of the Yellow Hat Sect and the center of the universe, had the legitimacy to

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., qianlongshinianeryuejiayintiao.
¹⁷⁸ Junjichu manwen zhungaershizhedang yiban 2009, qianlongshiyiniansanyuechujiuri “zhungaertaijicewangduoerjinamuzhaleweiqingzhunfuzangaochashizoushu”, qianlongshiyiniansanyueshibari “yuzhungaertaijicewangduoerjinamuzhaleweiqifuuzangaochaxuweiyici”.
¹⁷⁹ Junjichu manwen zhungaershizhedang yiban 2009, qianlongshiyiniansanyuechujiuri “hubushangshuhawangdengzoubaohaluzhuanqinglyanqinglamabingjiujinyusuzhoumaoyipian”.
¹⁸⁰ Xidurigu 2001; Li 2012.
preach in Dzungaria. The new ruler continued to use the issue of inviting lamas as a breakthrough
to challenge the Qing’s ideological center construction to defend the authority of the Dalai Lama.

Even if the Aocha mission in Tibet used a smallpox epidemic as an excuse to make Qing officials
relax their surveillance, Aocha was after all a temporary contact under the supervision of the Qing,
which the Qing could tolerate.181 Except for this, the Qing made effort to diminish contacts
between the Dzungar missions and Qing’s subjects at the border with Dzungaria and in Tibet, not
to mention the uncontrollable long-term contact of inviting lamas.182 The Qing once again denied
the request, presenting their reasons as “the same as in your father’s time.”183 In the spring of 1748,
a Dzungar mission went to Beijing. The Dzungar missions usually visited Beijing in the winter half
of the year when it was safer for the Dzungars, who lacked smallpox immunity. Therefore, their
eagerness to invite lamas was obvious. Due to the previous rejections, the Dzungars slightly
adjusted the strategy of re-establishing contact with Tibet through the lamas.

Most of the lamas from Tibet have died, and the remaining old lamas want to return to their
homeland. We want to send a small number of people to escort these lamas back to Tibet, so
please instruct us what route to take to return to Tibet. We look forward to promoting Yellow Hat
Sect and comforting beings by doing so. We beg the emperor to make a wise decision.184

The Qing emperor responded:

These old lamas have lived in your place [Dzungaria] for a long time and are more proficient in
Buddhist scriptures. They are monks, and there is no difference where they are. Even the Tibetan
lamas who come to Beijing do not return, so this request cannot be approved. The promotion of
the Yellow Hat Sect lies in the sincerity of everyone, and the Dharma spreads all over the world.
The important thing is the sutra itself rather than the person who chants it. I am the emperor of
the world, and do everything rationally. I cannot support your unreasonable behavior.185

As a multicultural empire, the Qing’s ideology was a diverse collection. As a universal emperor, the
Qing emperor chose to display the corresponding cultural face when dealing with people with
different cultural backgrounds. Crossley argues that the Qing emperor used “simultaneous
expression” of his collection of ideologies.186 The Chinese for “simultaneous expression” is “合璧”
(hebi) meaning that two matching jade pieces are combined into one piece. In contrast to her
emphasis on “cultural matching” expressed by the Qing emperor, I believe that the collection of

181 Qingdai junjichu manwen aochadang 2010, qianlongshanniansanyuecuierri
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the Qing’s ideology was not a mechanical combination of the ideological parts of various cultures in the empire, but can be seen as an organically and flexibly integrated rhetoric.\textsuperscript{187} In other words, I think the Qing’s multifaceted ideological expressions were not simply aligned with various cultural groups, but rather used the collections of imperial ideology to construct various complexes of imperial expressions respectively suitable for the groups. In the process of the expansion and consolidation of the empire, the Qing constantly adjusted composition of each compound expression to build a holistic discourse order dominated by the Qing emperor.

The Yellow Hat Sect was an important component of the expression complex constructed by the Qing emperor to cope with the Dzungars, which corroborates the theory of simultaneity. However, compared with the obvious Tibetan Buddhism factors, I pay more attention to the subtle references to other cultures in the emperor’s reply, which may support my hypothesis of a holistic discourse system in which various ideological parts interacted. In the archival material that forms the basis for this thesis, the Qing emperor elaborately replaced the rhetoric of Tibetan Buddhism with the rhetoric of Chinese Buddhism to argue with the Dzungars.\textsuperscript{188} Compared with Tibetan Buddhism, Chinese Buddhism emphasized personal temperament and sudden enlightenment, rather than the relationship of “preceptor-student” or “benefactor-blessed field.” The supreme discourse power of Tibetan Buddhism was in the hands of the Dalai Lama. I believe the Qing emperor might have attempted to dismantle it through vagueness and substitution, thereby shifting the center of discourse power from Tibet to Beijing. The term “Dharma” used by the Qing emperor was a broad concept that were shared by Tibetan Buddhism and Chinese Buddhism. Practice depending on “respective sincerity” was also the doctrine of Chinese Buddhism. If so, the rhetoric of Chinese Buddhism not only might help dismantle the special status of the Dalai Lama, but also might dismantle the “preceptor-student” relationship and the “benefactor-blessed field” relationship between Tibet and the Dzungar. If the new hybrid Buddhistic discourse system was constructed, according to the doctrine carefully selected by the Qing emperor in his collection of options, inviting lamas and Aocha would be unnecessary for the Dzungars. Because the practice relied on “respective sincerity”, there would be no need for communication between lamas in different places, so the prohibition on private exchanges between lamas could gain religious legitimacy. Therefore, the power network of the Yellow Hat Sect would be divided and weakened. In addition to Buddhist rhetoric, this expression of the Qing emperor also included Rationalistic School of Confucianism (理学, lixue), such as using “rationality” (理, li) as the guide for all actions and the source of the legitimacy of decision-making.\textsuperscript{189} In short, I argue that the Qing not only used
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Tibetan Buddhism to deal with the Dzungar, but even deliberately weakened the importance and uniqueness of Tibetan Buddhism by referencing other cultures.

In addition to the emperor’s written reply, a Qing minister told the Dzungar mission:

You Dzungars and Tibetans had conflicts in history, [...] and Tibetan lamas are unwilling to go to [Dzungaria]. Even if the emperor decrees Polhané to send lamas, he may send mediocre lamas. You will not be satisfied. You repeatedly submit this request that you know cannot be approved, which is not in line with the way of peace.190

This rhetoric once again reshaped the conflict in history between the Dzungars and Tibet’s anti-Yellow Hat Sect forces into a conflict between the Dzungars and all Tibetans. Furthermore, there was a loophole in the previous statement, that is, since inviting lamas could promote the Yellow Hat Sect, even if the Tibetans were unwilling, it was reasonable for the emperor to order to send lamas. The new rhetoric deliberately blurred the relatively clear standard of the levels of lamas to shirk the Qing emperor’s responsibility for promoting the Yellow Hat Sect.191 More importantly, the Qing considered that the Dzungar’s repeated requests to invite lamas was a provocative act. The Qing realized that the Dzungar did not agree with the new order in the peace period in Central Eurasia after the third religious war. And the Qing threatened the Dzungar to accept this new order of force.

Rather than succumbing to the Qing’s veiled threat, the Dzungars continued to adhere to the old order of the Tibetan Buddhist world. In 1750, due to the two previous successful experiences in Aocha in Tibet, a Dzungar mission went to Beijing to propose sending small missions with only a few people to Aocha each year, which meant it should be normalized as it was before the Qing intervened.192 The previous two Aocha were for the Panchen Lama and Dzungar ruler who had passed away. Therefore, the specifications were very high, and the number of personnel and items was large. Although that reasons ensured the approval of the Qing emperor, for the purpose of resuming the alliance relationship with Tibet, the frequency of Aocha of this specification might be too low and the cost might be too high. I assume that the normalized small-scale Aocha could reduce the costs and increase the frequency of communication, as well as help to avoid the close attention of the Qing. However, after the Aocha ended in 1748, the Qing emperor told the Tibetan agent and the Dalai Lama that no more Aocha would be allowed except for “major events” such as the death of the ruler.193 It was not clear whether the Dzungars knew about this ban, but it should have been clear to the Dzungars that the Qing’s attitude was to cut off contact between the Dzungar and Tibet. They could have expected that this proposal would be rejected. As for why they still made this request, I think the reason may be to constantly put pressure on the Qing
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emperor with the religious obligation of the Yellow Hat Sect. Ao cha was necessary for the practice of believers and the interests of Tibetan temples and lamas. The prohibition of it would incur widespread dissatisfaction with the emperor. The Dzungar mission might use this pressure as a negotiation strategy to make another proposal accepted by the Qing emperor to maintain his religious reputation. Another proposal was that the Dzungars should be allowed to study in Tibet, which also an old convention in the Tibet-Dzungar alliance. One reason was that Buddhist higher education in Dzungaria was underdeveloped, and the other was that noble children could obtain property through it. The Qing emperor refused both request on the grounds that the Tibetans were harmed by the Dzungars during the third religious war and were unwilling to see them enter Tibet.194

Judging from the Dzungar’s request, it seems clear that the Chinese Buddhist rhetoric of the Qing emperor was not convincing to them. Since Tibetan Buddhism practice cannot be emptied into “personal sincerity” in a short period of time but required concrete objects of worship, the Qing’s response was to construct Beijing as an alternative concrete object of worship. Such concrete worship objects could be various ideological symbols that imitate Tibet, including landscapes such as palaces that mimicked the Potala Palace, Beijing’s living Buddha system, Buddhist educational institution, scripture translation and printing institutions.195 According to the Mission Archive, the Dzungar missions’ important activities in Beijing were arranged to visit Tibetan Buddhist temples, living Buddhas and lamas, religious ceremonies, and Buddha statues in the royal garden. The attitude and response of the Dzungars were recorded and reported to the Qing emperor in detail.196 I believe that Beijing wanted to replace Tibet as the ideological source of Tibetan Buddhism, at least, starting with the elimination of the uniqueness of Tibet as the only source.

In light of these strategies, the Qing emperor responded to the Dzungar’s request:
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It is true that most Tibetan lamas in your place [Dzungaria] have died, and the Yellow Hat Sect may decline. [...] Our temples here [in Beijing] have famous living Buddhas and lamas from Tibet and other places. Lamas in your place can come to Beijing to study and promote Yellow Hat Sect when returning to nomadic [Dzungaria], which is the same as going to Tibet.197

The emperor emphasized that “this is the way of peace” and hoped that the Dzungars would accept the “emperor’s grace”.198 “Peace” became the negotiating discourse used by the Qing to replace the discourse of the Yellow Hat Sect, because it seemed that the discourses of trade, Chinese Buddhism and Confucianism were ideologically ineffective in dealing with the Dzungars. I think the Qing emperor’s proposal was to test openly whether the Dzungar could accept the new Tibetan Buddhist world order built by the Qing with Beijing as the center (or at least one of the centers). If the Dzungars accepted this order, then the state of peace could be maintained. If not, The Qing emperor would assume that the Tibet-Dzungar alliance posed a military threat to the Qing that could not be eliminated by peaceful means. Now that the Yellow Hat Sect was under the control of the Qing, the emperor suspected that the Dzungar might wage a religious war again to restore the independence of the Yellow Hat Sect and the supremacy of the Dalai Lama as before. As for the Dalai Lama, backed by the powerful foreign armed force, the Dzungar, as a separate ideological center, he might potentially have the will and ability to wage a war to separate Tibet from the Qing empire in order to restore his former state. (The three previous religious wars may be regarded as the “mirror of history” referenced by the Qing emperor. I surmise that these wars might not only constitute negotiating discourse, but also historical traumatic memories for the Qing.) If religious wars happened again, not only Tibet, but other border areas of the Qing, including Mongolia, might follow Tibet’s separatist action because of the appeal of the Dalai Lama. Therefore, I would argue that the question of whether the Dzungar accepted the new order built by the Qing was not only an international issue for the Qing, but also a question of domestic stability. Maybe because of this, the Qing emperor’s envisioned design for Dzungar young lamas studying in Beijing was not a temporary policy but can be seen as a long-term institutional policy.

Study for three to four years, and preach for thirty to forty years. After they get old, send young lamas to Beijing to study again, and I [the Qing emperor] will provide support for their studies for peace between the two sides.199

Before the Qing received the Dzungars’ reply, in the same year (1750), the Dzungar was in civil strife again due to the succession to the throne, and the eldest son of Galdan Tseren, Lama Darja (喇嘛达尔扎, lama daerzha, ?-1753), killed his brother Tsewang Dorji Namjal and seized the throne.200 The new ruler immediately dispatched a mission to Beijing to ask for permission to Aocha
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for Galdan Tseren. Unlike previous rulers of the Dzungar who gave up their religious identity while acquiring secular power, such as Galdan, at this time, it can be inferred from the title of the new ruler that the unity of politics and religion in the Dzungar had developed to another level where the ruler could have both secular and religious identities. Before 1672, in Tibetan records, Galdan was called Living Buddha, but after that, he was called only by secular titles, which showed that he returned to laity. After winning the throne, Darja called himself “Lama Erdeni Baturu” (喇嘛额尔德尼巴图鲁, lama eerdeni batulu), and the Qing emperor always referred to him as “Lama Darja”. The Qing did not recognize his legitimacy because he was an illegitimate child. I think another reason might be that the Qing wanted to restrict him from combining political power with religious power to consolidate his rule. This request for Aocha should be mainly for political purposes, because the previous ruler had already made Aocha for the death of Galdan Tseren, and the religious need to pray for the dead should have been met. Then, the “usurper” asking to Aocha for his father Galdan Tseren once again was probably to prove that he was also a legitimate heir from the perspective of religion (the Dalai Lama’s recognition) and blood (the son of Galdan Tseren) at the same time.

Regarding the previous proposal of the Qing emperor that Dzungar lamas could study in Beijing instead of studying in Tibet or inviting Tibetan lamas, the new ruler continued the “uncompromising” attitude of the Dzungars and did not accept it. The Dzungars refused on the grounds that the Dzungars were “raw bodies” (生身, shengshen) without smallpox immunity and therefore could not go to Beijing, while still insisting on inviting lamas to teach in Dzungaria. This was a medical discourse used politically by the Dzungar in negotiations. The fact that some Dzungar envoys died of smallpox in Beijing might give the Dzungar the moral high ground in the negotiations. The Qing emperor ignored this fact and replied: “If you sincerely want to send someone to study, of course you will choose lamas who have already had smallpox. Why do you say that deliberately using smallpox as an excuse?”

In the Dzungar’s written request, they asked to “invite lamas” without specifying from where, while the verbal request indicated that the lamas should still be invited from Tibet. This subtle difference might show that the Dzungars realized that the Qing and Tibet were competing for the
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center of Tibetan Buddhism. In order not to provoke the Qing too much, the written official statement was vague. I think the less formal verbal request showed the resistance of the Dzungars to the new Beijing-centered order constructed by the Qing. Even after several negotiations, the Dzungar did not compromise on the lama issue for reestablishing long-term contacts with Tibet. In contrast, in order to maintain his reputation as a proponent of the Yellow Hat Sect, and to strive for the Dzungar’s recognition of the new ideological order of the Qing, the Qing emperor made a compromise. In my opinion, the Qing emperor tried to make Beijing a transit point, thus achieving the shift of center by reshaping the operation process of inviting lamas. The Qing emperor proposed that the Qing could select eminent lamas from Tibet and bring them to Beijing. When the Dzungar mission would come to Beijing next time, these lamas can be invited to Dzungaria. This transformed the direct Tibet-Dzungar exchange into an indirect one realized through the Qing-Dzungar relationship. The Qing stopped short of completely cutting off long-term contact between Tibet and the Dzungar, compromising by allowing them to have limited contact under Qing’s intervention and control. At the same time, Beijing was highlighted as the symbol of imperial expression and the center of the universe. The Qing once again used Aocha as a bargaining chip to persuade the Dzungars to accept the new order implied by the new process and accept the Qing as the controller and regulator of the Yellow Hat Sect. Because the “usurper” Lama Darja desperately needed the Dalai Lama’s recognition of his legitimacy by Aocha to consolidate his rule in the Dzungar, the Qing emperor threatened him by stating that if he did not accept the new process of Beijing as a pivot transit station, Aocha would no longer be approved in the future.

The Qing emperor seemed to be confident that this new process would perfectly balance the Tibet-Qing-Dzungar relationship, because before receiving a reply, he had already started the operation. Under the order of the Qing emperor, the Dalai Lama selected ten famous lamas and sent them to Beijing. However, the Dzungar mission to Beijing in 1752 conveyed the attitude of the Dzungar ruler that he did not approve of even a compromised new order. In his reply, not only ignoring Qing’s arrangement, he put forward a more exaggerated request to invite senior living Buddhas from Beijing and Tibet instead of lamas. The Dzungar’s request had become divorced from actual religious needs but might have been an ideological attack on the Qing, because it was unacceptable for Qing emperor and the failure of his arrangement would shake his religious authority. Senior Living Buddhas (驻京呼图克图, zhujing hutuketu) were a scarce resource for ideological construction. There were only three in Beijing at that time, so the emperor was unwilling to send one to Dzungaria and thereby weaken the religious appeal of the Qing. The Qing emperor did not allow the Dzungar to invite lamas from Tibet on their own, let alone send
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the Tibetan living Buddha designated by the Dzungar. The Dzungar’s provocative attitude towards
the Qing was so obvious that it even aroused the Qing’s alert for the Dzungar’s imminent march
into Tibet.211

The Qing’s procedural transformation of the old power structure of the Tibet-Dzungar alliance
was ignored by the Dzungar, which was a heavy blow to the Qing’s authority within the Yellow
Hat Sect and threatened the stability of Qing’s rule over the border areas of the empire that believed
in the Yellow Hat Sect. I think that the Dzungar’s maintenance of Tibet as the sole center of
ideology had transgressed the bottom line of the Qing’s ideology of rule, which was to incorporate
the Tibetan Buddhist world into a cosmic order centered on the Qing. So far, both the Qing and
the Dzungar had clearly realized that they could not reach a consensus on the ideological basis of
peaceful coexistence after the ideological conflict of inviting lamas. As we have seen, in this conflict,
both sides had deployed diverse discursive strategies in fields as various as religion, philosophy,
international relations and medicine. For the Qing, as long as the Dzungar existed as an
independent neighbor of the Qing, the Qing could not completely integrate the Tibetan Buddhist
world, and the cosmic order that Qing wanted to build would never be complete. Even the existing
order of the Qing empire would risk being torn apart. The imperial territory behind this cosmic
order was also at risk of being split. Therefore, the seeds of war were planted by repeated
negotiations on the issue of inviting lamas during peacetime. From the perspective of the Qing,
the upcoming war would be a war of conquest. When receiving this mission, the Qing stopped
activities and negotiations on trade, and banned Aocha by the Dzungars, which can be regarded as
the Qing severing diplomatic relations with the Dzungar and removing it from the East Asian
tributary system.212

The dispute of inviting lamas was not only symbolic, but also practical. Compared with the
pursuit of “emptiness” in the practice of Chinese Buddhism, lamas were important mediums and
concrete objects of worship in Tibetan Buddhism. Therefore, the lamas were also a system that
constituted the power network of the Yellow Hat Sect. As figures in power, some lamas played an
anti-Qing role in the history of the confrontation between the Qing and the Dzungar.213 For
example, there were anti-Qing factions in the Dalai Lama’s clique. They once secretly supported
the revolt of the Three Feudatories in the Qing Empire in 1673-1681. The very influential lama
Zaya Pandita (咱雅班第达, 1599-1662) who preached in the Dzungar also held an anti-Qing
stance, which might affected the attitude of the Dzungars towards the Qing. The Qing might have
realized that the lamas of the Yellow Hat Sect tended to have strong political and military stances
which might be a threat. The political and military nature of the lama system can also help explain
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Qing’s prohibition of direct contact between Tibetan lamas and the Dzungar, as well as the Dzungar’s persistent pursuit of the direct contact.

During the previous religious wars, powerful Tibetan lamas had confronted the Qing. They “recited the scriptures for Galdan, chose the battle date, and negotiated with the Qing army.”214 A Tibetan lama who was originally serving the Qing and was dispatched to negotiate with the Dzungars betrayed the Qing and defected to the Dzungar and conducted espionage work on its behalf.215 This demonstrated that the value orientation of some lamas in Beijing at that time might be still centered on Tibet. The Qing publicly torture this “treacherous lama” to death in 1697 to warn the separatist lamas who believed that the Dalai Lama took precedence over the Qing emperor’ interests.216 Even if the Qing reshaped the historical narrative and portrayed the Dzungar and the Yellow Hat Sects as enemies, after the third religious war, because of dissatisfaction with the efforts of the Qing to strengthen control over Tibet, thousands of lamas joined the rebel army.217

After the Qing garrisoned troops and reorganized the government in Tibet, the seventh Dalai Lama, fostered by the Qing, seemed to be controlled by and recognized the supreme rule of the Qing emperor, at least under the Qing’s surveillance. But from some details in the newly discovered Aucha Archive, it might be seen that the Dalai Lama did not want to give up the pious support of the Dzungar. When the Dzungar Aucha mission arrived in Tibet in 1743, the Dalai Lama sent people to cater the mission without discussing with the Qing officials in advance. He later defended this flattering behavior as “convention”.218 Such “convention” between Tibet and the Dzungar was what the Qing wanted to break, but considering the Dalai Lama’s influence, the Qing agreed to his behavior. In contrast, the Qing rejected the Tibetan agent’s attempt to entertain the Dzungar mission.219 The Qing officials could not enter the temple when the Dalai Lama and the Dzungar mission were holding rituals, which made the Qing worry about the content of their exchanges. Therefore, the Qing censored the correspondence between the Dalai Lama and the Dzungars.220 By accepting this censorship, The Dalai Lama showed his loyal attitude. But the subtle rhetoric in his letter to the Dzungars seemed to be a vague appeal for help by saying that all his actions
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including reciting what kind of sutras were in accordance with the requirements of “the Great Emperor Manjushri.” The Dalai Lama seemed to imply that he lost his religious and secular autonomy under the intervention of the Qing emperor. According to historical experience, the Dzungars often responded to the Dalai Lama’s requests for help with military actions. The Qing was alert to this and had prepared a confidential plan to put the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama in protective custody at any time in response to possible military actions by the Dzungar.

The incident of the “war instigator lama” (罗布藏丹怎, luobuzangdanzen) during the Aocha in 1743 aggravated the Qing’s unease about the lama community. During the third religious war, this Tibetan lama followed the Dzungar army to Dzungaria. After 26 years, he returned to Tibet with the Aocha mission. At first, the Qing officials did not pay special attention to him. However, he reported to the Qing officials that according to the intelligence of the first Aocha mission, the Dzungar ruler once prepared to attack the Qing and to occupy Tibet but finally gave up. The Qing doubted whether the Dzungar had the intention of launching a war to occupy Tibet, or whether the lama was using lies to instigate a war. The emperor worried that he would conduct intelligence work in Tibet or sour the relationship between Tibet and the Qing, and so ordered him to be sent to Beijing. Unexpectedly, the lama escaped midway, which might increase the Qing’s distrust of the lama community and the Dzungars. The Qing mobilized huge manpower from several provinces to capture him, which showed that the Qing emperor attached great importance to the problem of lamas and their possible influence. It can be seen that some lamas of the Yellow Hat Sects possibly want to provoke a war to overthrow the new order of the Qing, which made even more understandable why the eight-year inviting lama dispute that began in 1745 was a sensitive issue that the Qing and the Dzungar could not reconcile. I think the lamas of the Yellow Hat Sect can be regarded as a military link between Tibet and the Dzungar. If this link could not be cut off, the Qing might continue to feel threatened militarily. The way to eliminate this sense of threat was ultimately to completely incorporate the Dzungar into Qing’s territory.

Regarding distrust, Perdue believes that in the 17th and 18th centuries in Central Eurasia, the development of borders and maps restricted mobility, and the states did not trust movable people. In this case, the Qing distrusted the lama community and nomadic Dzungars and Mongols who had joined the Qing empire. “The Dzungar people are cunning and untrustworthy. Even my Khalkha and other Mongolian people, I cannot trust them.” As a countermeasure, the
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Qing used technology to restrict mobility, such as the lama identity registration system and the Aocha licensing system.\textsuperscript{228}

**The Comparison of Ideology of Rule between the Qing and the Dzungar**

One research trend of Qing history represented by the New Qing History School emphasized the connection of the Qing’s “Manchu” and “Inner Asia” characteristics to achieve a successful rule that distinguished it from Chinese empires.\textsuperscript{229} Members of this school emphasize the importance of the Manchu-Mongol connection to the Qing rule, which was the critical part of the “Inner Asian” perspective of Qing history.\textsuperscript{230} According to this perspective, the Qing chose the expression of Tibetan Buddhism to fit into Mongolia’s narrative of legitimacy. This theory assumes that Tibetan Buddhism was unique to “Inner Asia”. The ideological alignment between the Qing bloc and the Tibetan Buddhist cultural areas was assumed to enable the Qing to achieve a universal rule that surpassed the Chinese empires. The Qing gained the legitimacy to rule Tibetan Buddhism areas of Inner Asia by acquiring the ideological symbols of Tibetan Buddhism that were “unique” there, which implies that Qing’s Tibetan Buddhist ideological expression neither contained Chinese ideological elements nor was used to rule China. This connection was not only parallel to the “Manchu-Chinese” ideological system, but also took precedence over it. The Qing’s inheritance of Mongolian Yuan heritage through this “Inner Asia” system is considered to be the foundation of the legitimacy of the Qing’s rule over China.\textsuperscript{231}

Although the emphasis on the “non-Chinese” factors of Qing imperial rule is necessary to understand Qing’s multiple ideologies, it may have the risk of overemphasizing the inheritance and similarity of Mongolia and the Qing. At its worst, this can lead to reductionism and oversimplification of the various parts of the Qing empire, whether the Manchuria, Dzungaria, Mongolia, Tibet or China. In contrast, as demonstrated by my above analysis based on newly discovered primary sources, the negotiation discourse about the issue of inviting lamas showed that Qing ideology was an organic and flexible pluralistic complex distinguishing it from the dominance of the Tibetan Yellow Hat Sect in Dzungaria. For example, the Qing emperor sometimes used Chinese Buddhism and Confucian rhetoric to deal with the Dzungar. In addition, I believe the inviting lama dispute revealed that behind the eye-catching Dzungar-Qing confrontation was the Qing’s weakening and absorption of the importance and uniqueness of Tibetan Buddhist ideology in Inner Asia. It can be seen that the Qing, the Dzungar, and Mongolia treated Tibet as a source of ideology in different ways. From the perspective of Tibetan Buddhism ideology, I think the
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confrontation between the Qing and the Dzungar was essentially different from the confrontation between Mongolian tribes at that time. In the struggle of the Mongolian tribes, the theory of Tibetan Buddhism’s reincarnation was intertwined with the Mongolia’s inheritance system. In this case, in order to explore the difference between the Qing-Dzungar confrontation and the confrontation between Mongolian tribes, we should re-examine the issue of the legacy of the Mongol Yuan Empire, which may help avoid conflating the “Manchu” characteristics with Mongolian factors.

Crossley uses the concept of the “Wheel-Turning King” to argue that the Qing regarded Tibetan Buddhism as the ideolog and legitimacy of ruling Mongolia and even realized the universal rulership ideologically through it. Based on the source material analyzed above, I believe that the effect of this concept of Tibetan Buddhism may be exaggerated, and the sources of the legitimacy of Qing’s rule over Mongolia (including the Dzungar) were culturally diverse. When analyzing the Qing rulership, I would argue that any kind of imperial behavior should not be understood by only in reference to a single culture. Examining the use of this and other identity concepts in the Qing archives may give different interpretations of the Qing emperor’s cultural and political identity. The Wheel-Turning King was what Buddhism originated in ancient India called an ideal secular monarch who ruled certain “continent(s)” and protected Buddhism. For enlightenment, Bodhisattvas might reincarnate as Wheel-Turning Kings or their family members. A secular ruler can be a Wheel-Turning King and an incarnation of a bodhisattva at the same time, which enabled Buddhism to combine political and religious powers. In this theory and practice of the unity of politics and religion, the order in which secular power and religious authority were acquired is worth noting. The bodhisattva might reincarnate as the Wheel-Turning King or his family members, which meant that when a person had met the prerequisite of being a powerful secular ruler, he could be recognized as a Wheel-Turning King and then might have the chance further to be recognized as a reincarnate of a bodhisattva.

From the perspective of the legitimacy of inheritance, I think this reincarnation system recognized the existing power structure, and did not support the claimed ownership or dominion over territories that had not been actually occupied. This was a significant difference between the reincarnation legitimacy system that emphasized present conditions and the blood heritage inheritance system and the imperial inheritance system that emphasized historical ties. Therefore, in my opinion, the reincarnation inheritance system was more suitable for “illegal” real power to break the legitimacy of inheritance brought about by blood orthodoxy or other cultural orthodoxy such as Confucianism. (This may explain why Tibetan Buddhism almost disappeared from the Mongolian ideology when the Mongols retreated from China to the steppe in the late 14th century.) In other words, the reincarnation inheritance system was more oriented towards the short-term
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than systems based on family inheritance because the “reincarnation status” was based on the temporary power of the ruler and depended on the approval of temporary religious authority. Moreover, the title of the Wheel-Turning King was not exclusive, and there might be multiple at the same time, which also determined that the identity of the Wheel-Turning King could only authenticate the existing ruling pattern. But it did not mean that it was committed to maintaining the current pattern. On the contrary, I think this reality-based legitimacy authentication system also provided potential legitimacy for external expansion and conquest. The ruler did not inherit the right to rule a certain territory because it was ruled by his ancestors in history, but when he conquered a new territory, he had the legal right to rule over it because of his status as the Wheel-Turning King. So, this ideology might be an incentive for challengers but a threat to the existing order. (I think this was one of the reasons why the Qing tried to play down Tibetan Buddhism after conquering the Dzungar, which is the homogenization that will be discussed later.)

Since the 1st century, both in China and Tibet, there had been rulers regarded themselves as Wheel-Turning Kings and bodhisattvas. Therefore, both places had the tradition of treating (Tibetan) Buddhism as part of their ideology. The structure of Tibetan Buddhism was hierarchical and geographical. The three Guardians of Dharma Guanyin Bodhisattva (观音菩萨, guanyinpusa), Manjushri Bodhisattva (文殊菩萨, wenshupusa), and Vajra Bodhisattva (金刚手菩萨, jingangshoupusa) were the three most important bodhisattvas worshiped by Tibetan Buddhism. As the various sects of Tibetan Buddhism sought the external support of secular rulers in their struggles, these three highest Bodhisattvas formed their respective relatively fixed geographical ranges of enlightenment. Tibet was believed to be enlightened by Guanyin Bodhisattva. Since the 9th century, due to the rise of Tibetan Buddhism power and the decline of secular power, religious leaders rather than secular rulers were considered the incarnation of Guanyin Bodhisattva. Since the 15th century, all the generations of Dalai Lamas were considered the incarnation of Guanyin Bodhisattva, implying that they were both religious and secular rulers.

For the external conquest of the Mongol empire, the theory of the Wheel-Turning King and the incarnation of Bodhisattva might help the Mongolian rulers gain legitimacy. Comparing the two titles, the Wheel-Turning King had no geographical restrictions and was easier to obtain. Many Mongolian powerful figures were Wheel-Turning Kings. However, the recognition of the three Guardian Bodhisattvas of Dharma incarnation was stricter and more exclusive. For example, the identity of Manjushri’s incarnation was monopolized by the ruler of China. The political rule of
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Mongol lands can be divided into the pre-Yuan period, the Yuan empire, and the Post-Yuan period. The mark of distinction was that only the Yuan empire included China. In the 13th century, Kublai, the founder of the Yuan Empire, was considered to be the incarnation of Manjushri, possibly due to Manjushri’s residence in Mount Wutai, China. Since then, the rulers of China, regardless of ethnicity and nationality, had been regarded as the incarnation of Manjushri, which could be compatible with the title of Wheel-Turning King. Zhu Di (朱棣, 1360-1424), the third emperor of the Ming empire, was known both as the Wheel-Turning King and the incarnation of Manjushri.

Therefore, there were two conditions for obtaining Tibet’s recognition of Manjushri’s incarnation status: one was to respect Tibetan Buddhism, and the second was to actually rule China. So, this identity should not be considered as a Mongolian Yuan legacy. Furthermore, from the perspective of Tibetan Buddhism, sovereignty over China was not the legacy of the Mongolian Yuan Empire. In addition, Tibetan Buddhism had been discontinued for a long time in Mongolian society. In the 14-16th century, the post-Yuan period, Tibetan Buddhism faded from Mongolia’s ideology. The Qing’s acceptance of Tibetan Buddhism might be influenced by Mongolia’s re-acceptance of Tibetan Buddhism in the 16th century, but the acquisition of Manjushri’s identity and the religious and political legitimacy it brought was due to the conquest of China, which was a continuation of the Ming Empire.

Through the changes in how the Dzungars and their allies called the Qing rulers at the different stages of the Qing’s conquer, it can be seen that the identity of Manjushri came from China rather than Mongolia. In 1641, Khoshut Gūshì Khan (固始汗, gushihan, 1582-1654) called the last Ming emperor the “incarnation of Manjushri”. In 1635, the Qing had obtained the legitimacy of inheriting the Yuan empire’s heritage from the surrender of the “Great Khan of All Mongols” and established the Qing empire in 1636. The legacy of the Yuan empire was only the legitimacy of ruling the Mongolian people rather than the former territory of the Mongol Yuan Empire, (which was related to the Mongolian concept of sovereignty.) Before conquering China, the Qing ruler Huang Taiji (皇太极, 1592-1643), did not show much enthusiasm for the title of Wheel-Turning King, because this title held by Genghis and Kublai did not help him to include China as part of the legacy of the Yuan Empire he had inherited. He could not and did not use the title of Wheel-Turning King to declare the right to inherit the territory of the Mongol Yuan Empire as a legal basis for conquering China. Contrary to Crossley’s hypothesis that Huang Taiji attached
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importance to his identity of Wheel-Turning King but keep it secret, it might actually have no such great value to the Qing at that time.\textsuperscript{248}

Shunzhi (顺治, 1638-1661), the first Qing emperor who conquered China, was the first one of the Qing emperors to be Manjushri recognized by the Dalai Lama in 1646.\textsuperscript{249} In 1647, Güshi Khan also recognized the change in the Qing emperor’s religious status as a result of actual conquest. He wrote a letter to Shunzhi:

\begin{quote}
The most victorious incarnation of Manjushri seized the power of the Ming and you occupied China, while the great merciful and compassionate Guanyin Bodhisattva incarnated into the Wheel-Turning King enlightening Tibet, which is occupied by our khan.\textsuperscript{250}
\end{quote}

The secular ruler of Tibet at that time claimed to be the incarnation of Guanyin Bodhisattva who coexisted with the Dalai Lama, reflecting the competition between the two for the rule of Tibet, which eventually led to the outbreak of the third religious war.

During the rule of Qing emperor Kangxi (康熙, 1654-1722), the Qing further strengthened control over China. In the beginning, the Dzungar ruler Galdan sometimes referred to Kangxi as Wheel-Turning King or Khan. After Kangxi resolved the rebellion of the Three Federations in southern China in 1681 and regained Taiwan in 1683, Galdan seemed more willingly to called him Emperor Manjushri.\textsuperscript{251} Judging from the title of Emperor Manjushri, Tibet and the Dzungar both recognized the legitimacy of the Qing’s rule over China. So, I think the argument that the Dzungar and the Qing competed for the inheritance of the Mongol Yuan Empire using reincarnation theory may be questionable from this perspective. However, the status of the Wheel-Turning King might nevertheless prompt the two sides to fight for new territory. For example, in 1681, the Dalai Lama praised Galdan for his “Wheel-Turning enterprise” in conquering Islamic regions.\textsuperscript{252}

To a certain extent, it might be said that the identity of “Emperor Manjushri” did not depend on the will of the Dalai Lama. As the “incarnation of Guanyin Bodhisattva”, the Dalai Lama was on the same level as the Qing Emperor Manjushri in the theologically hierarchical structure of Tibetan Buddhism. On the contrary, for the title of Wheel-Turning Kings, the Dzungar rulers relied on the Dalai Lama’s award. According to the Tibetan Buddhist cosmology, the Dalai Lama and the Qing emperor should enlighten two separate worlds.\textsuperscript{253} Therefore, I think the Qing emperor could not prove his identity as the “universal emperor” by using the identity of the “Manjushri” or the “Wheel-Turning King”, which may be contrary to Crossley’s view. The reason why the Qing emperor accepted this title was possibly related to the process of conquest. In the early period of
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the Qing conquest of China, the Qing’s rule was not stable. This title helped Qing gain recognition from the powers of the Tibetan Buddhist discourse system around China for Qing’s rule of China. At the same time, within China, since Manjushri Bodhisattva was also a very influential image of Chinese Buddhism, it could enhance Chinese recognition of the Qing’s rule. Therefore, the expression “Manjushri incarnation” can be regarded as a phased ideological paradigm during the period of consolidation of control over China.

The Dzungar’s ideological paradigm seemingly had become unitary and stable since accepting the Yellow Hat Sect in the mid-17th century, and was committed to maintaining the Tibet-Dzungar alliance. Because Dzungar leaders were non-Golden Family, the Yellow Hat Sect might be required as a source of legitimacy for the independence of the Dzungar. Barfield believes that Mongolian tribes, including the Dzungar, wanted to trade with China independently to maximize their interests, and therefore opposed the direct line of the Golden Family. From the 15th century, the ancestors of Dzungars began to pursue independence from Mongolia, because they could not rely on Mongolia to trade with China.

I think that the Dzungar rulers were designated Wheel-Turning Kings by the Dali Lama who “ruled continent(s)” meant that Dzungaria was equivalent to an independent “continent” rather than part of Mongolia in the Tibetan Buddhist world order. (All Mongols were nominally under the rule of the direct line of Golden Family, the Great Khan of All Mongols, and later the Qing from the perspective of Mongolian legitimacy.) The shamanism that proved the legitimacy of the direct line of the Golden Family must be eradicated by Mongolian tribes and Dzungars seeking independence, which was showed in the 1640 Mongolia-Oirad Code. Other cultures that might support the Qing’s legitimacy, such as Confucianism, had not been accepted by the Dzungars either, judging from the inviting lama negotiation.) Through this title, the Dzungar ruler was certified as the highest ruler in Dzungaria, instead of being a nominal subordinate of the direct line of the Golden Family. In my opinion, this satisfied the needs of the Dzungars to strengthen the centralization of their realm in response to the international situation in Central Eurasia in the 17th and 18th centuries. The Dzungar’s path-dependence on the Yellow Hat Sect alone might make its ideology tend to be rigid, and even develop violent tendencies towards “religious purity” and “religious fanaticism”, for example their behavior in the third religious war.
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261 The Renat maps in the Carolina Rediviva library reflected the centralization and state-building process of the Dzungar due to the change of international power structure from the perspective of cartography. From the 16th to the 18th century, all nomads in Central Eurasia experienced tensions of land resources. Russian intelligence in 1623 stated: “No matter where the nomads go, they all maintain close contact and participate in the affairs of the Oirad Federation (the ancestors of the Dzungars)”, which might demonstrate the strengthening of centralization.
On the contrary, Manchu shamanism (of which the content was different from Mongolian shamanism) was the original religious source of legitimacy of the Qing. In the process of conquering Mongolia, due to the political surrender of the direct line of the Golden Family in 1635, the Qing took over their legitimacy and did not need to resort to Tibetan Buddhism to break the legitimacy of the direct line of the Golden Family backed by shamanism. (As I argued earlier, any behavior of the Qing should not be interpreted through the lens of only one culture; political surrender, the blood relationship between the Qing rulers and the Golden Family, the Manchu ancestor’s Jin (金, Gold) Empire’s rule over Mongolia in the early 12th century, and Tibetan Buddhism symbols should all be considered.) Therefore, shamanism could be kept as the background color of the Qing ideology from beginning to end. The New Qing History School uses a long-term retrospective method, paying attention to the early founding process of the Qing Empire before entering China, and discussing the nature of the Qing from this perspective. For example, in terms of ethnicity, the Qing bloc was multi-ethnic from the beginning and there might be no such thing as “pure Manchu” culture. Regarding ideology, I think its budding state was likely to have a vital influence on the development direction of the Qing ideology. I believe it was the diverse, inclusive and flexible characteristics of shamanism as polytheism itself that made the Qing’s ideological expression diverse and flexible.

After consolidating the control of China, the Qing turned its attention to the western and northern frontiers, and the Qing-Dzungar war, the second religious war, broke out. In order to achieve control over Tibet, Dzungaria and Mongolia, I think the Qing’s ideological paradigm was transformed again and entered the stage of “reconstructing Tibetan Buddhism”, trying to place the Qing emperor at the only highest position in the hierarchy. The Qing emperorship used its multi-faceted characteristic to the extreme in an attempt to integrate the Tibetan Buddhist system and the East Asian system to achieve “universal rulership”. Cartography might reflect this ideological pursuit of the Qing and help realize it. In 1709, the Qing began to send officials to Tibet to manage affairs and to conduct surveying and mapping of Tibet. Beijing’s Jesuit cartographers were not satisfied with the officials’ mapping work, so between 1715 and 1717, two lamas trained in geometry and arithmetic led another large-scale surveying and mapping in Tibet, which eventually became part of the empire’s map.
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Barfield believes that Manchuria itself can be divided into four cultural ecological regions.


Perdue, 1998; Baoyintegusi 2009, pp. 49 – 50; Guo 2012. In the 18th century, based on the changes in the power structure of Central Eurasia where powers encountered, the rulers required more “accurate” maps to determine the boundaries and resources within the domain. However, this did not imply that the development of the Qing cartography was influenced by the West and experienced a simple
In addition to ideological flexibility, such as the several concessions made by the Qing emperor during the inviting lama negotiations, the design of Tibet’s new political structure also reflected the flexibility of Qing rule. Since 1728, sending officials was institutionalized as the “system of ministers stationed in Tibet.” The power struggle between the local agent, the Dalai Lama, and the Qing minister led to a rebellion in 1750, after which the Qing reformed Tibet’s political system again. The Qing probably realized that the religious power of the Yellow Hat Sect could not be completely excluded from the political system. Excessive restrictions on the political power of the Dalai Lama might provoke religious and secular opposition, by for example the Dzungars and lamas. In 1751, the Qing established a state-religious government in Tibet composed of three secular leaders and a religious leader. The Qing made concessions based on the local reality giving up the separation of government and religion in Tibet. Ignoring the Qing’s concessions, the Dzungar insisted on resisting and challenging this new order, prompting the Qing finally eliminate the Dzungar in order to maintain the new order.

In terms of religion, the Qing emperor also tried to reconstruct the power structure of Tibetan Buddhism. In the chaos caused by the death of the fifth Dalai Lama in Tibet, in 1705, the Qing emperor requested that the controversial sixth Dalai Lama be sent to Beijing because: “The name of the Dalai Lama has a great influence on the Mongols, so the sixth Dalai Lama Cangyang Gyaltsen (仓央嘉措, cangyangjiacuo, 1683-1706) must not stay in Tibet.” I hypothesize that the Qing emperor wanted to move the Dalai Lama, the supreme power symbol of Tibetan Buddhism, from Tibet to Beijing. Although local powers in Tibet had objections to this order, it had to be implemented under pressure from the emperor. But unexpectedly, the sixth Dalai Lama died (or escaped) on the way to Beijing, so the Qing had to change strategy. The sixth Dalai Lama Cangyang Gyaltsen was identified as a “false reincarnation”, and Qing fostered a new reincarnation candidate in Tibet. In 1713, the Qing emperor officially designated the Panchen Lama as “Panchen Erdeni” (班禅额尔德尼, banchan eerdeni), intending to foster another religious leader to divide the power of the Dalai Lama. This title was a combination of Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Manchu, meaning “wisdom, great, treasure,” and the Mongolian component of his old title was removed. The expansion of living Buddha systems in Tibet and other places such as Beijing was one of the development from inexact to exact, or emphasizing the division of “cultural (religious or rhetorical) maps” and “scientific cartography”. In fact, the new mapping technology adapted to the needs of the Qing Empire and strengthened the single-centered cultural world of the Qing through maps, which was confirmed by more precise measurements. In other words, I think these imperial maps might be a flexible mixture in line with the characteristics of Qing ideology.

269 Baoyintegusi 2009, p. 58.
270 Qingshibu, kangxisishuwnianshieryuedinghaitiao.
strategies to divide the power of the Dalai Lama. Due to the restriction of Aocha by the Qing, the temples and lama systems in various places might be more dependent on the Qing economically.274

Affected by the policies of Qing, the development of religion in the Dzungar was hindered and the source of legitimacy was cut off. So, the Dzungars might want to develop an alternative local living Buddha system. In 1743, the Aocha mission brought the Dalai Lama a letter from the Dzungar ruler, seeking permission from the Dalai Lama to establish a high-level living Buddha system in Dzungaria to deal with the Qing blockade.275 However, the Dalai Lama did not respond, maybe because it would weaken the Dzungar’s dependence on the Dalai Lama. By that time, the Dzungar was the last independent force outside the Qing Empire that the Dalai Lama could rely on and manipulate.276 Therefore, there was a tension in the Qing-Tibet-Dzungar interaction. Tibet had been subdued by the Qing, but the Dalai Lama was unwilling to cut off the connection with the Dzungar. The Qing’s attempt to cut off the connection between Tibet and the Dzungar failed at the ideological level. The Qing’s attempt to peacefully incorporate the Dzungar into the East Asian system also failed. I argue that the double failure eventually developed into a war of conquest in 1757.

From the degree of dependence on the Dalai Lama, we can see the difference between the Dzungar ruler as Wheel-Turning King and the Qing emperor as Manjushri, which was not only because the incarnation of Manjushri Bodhisattva was parallel to the Dalai Lama as incarnation of Guanyin Bodhisattva, but also because the essence behind “Emperor Manjushri” was the diverse and flexible “emperor expression system” of the Qing. In the Qing emperor system, the emperor could act as an individual or a state institution. (Barfield believes that the difference between Manchus and Mongols was that the Qing was an institutional power and Mongolian power depended on tribal elites.)277 In my opinion, religious elements and secular elements of the emperor could be combined flexibly according to actual needs, which might lead to the complexity and variability of the Qing imperial ideological expression. At the same time, the Qing imperial ideology had multiple forms of expression, such as literatures, images, landscapes.278 Different forms of symbols might convey different information, might face different audiences, and might create different spaces for interpretation. For the expression of the identity of the Emperor Manjushri, historians pay attention to portraits of Emperor Qianlong (乾隆, 1711-1799) in the style of Tibetan Buddhism.279 In these portraits, he was sitting on a lotus throne with a yellow hat on his head,
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holding a Dharma wheel that symbolized the identity of the Wheel-Turning King, and on his shoulders are Prajna (般若, bore) sutras and a wisdom sword that symbolized Manjushri. In my opinion, compared with literatures, the information of these portraits could be more subtle, leaving more space for interpretation. Historians have disputed whether these portraits reflect the imperial ideology or only reflect the emperor’s personal religious beliefs. I believe this controversial ambiguity itself might be exactly an intentional performance of the flexibility of the imperial ideology. (From the negotiation of inviting lamas, it can be seen that “ambiguity” was one discourse strategy of the Qing.) These portraits were hung in the Royal Tibetan Buddhist landscapes in Beijing. Their audience were lamas, royal family, and upper-class from Tibet, Mongolia, and Dzungaria. For non-audiences, such as the Chinese, these expressions of Tibetan Buddhism were hidden and private. For the audience at that time and later historians, I assume the emperor left space for them to interpret without any institutional promise.

Official records in archives might be more explicit than portraits. Therefore, the emperor seemed to use religious elements more carefully in these official expressions. The emperor’s identity can be divided into three aspects: first-person, second- person, and third-person. Among them, I think what he called himself might most sensitively reflect the imperial ideological institution. While, some of the appellations that the emperor acquiesced might not be in line with the emperor’s pursuit of self-image or institutional commitment. The portraits could be seen as a form of self-definition, but due to the limitations of their audience and the ambiguity of interpretation, their accuracy might be less than the literal self-definition. I counted the appellations of the emperor from various parties in the Aocha Archive and the Mission Archive. In Tibet and surrounding areas, lamas and agents called him Great Emperor Manjushri. In most cases, the Dzungars called him the Great Emperor, and occasionally called him the Great Emperor Manjushri in written statements. However, the modifier Manjushri might limit the scope of the Qing emperor’s religious and political realm, that is, China. For example, Gardan once called the Qing emperor the emperor of China. From this perspective, the Qing emperor who ruled Mongolia and Tibet should not officially claim himself to be only Manjushri. Indeed, in these two archives, the Qing emperor never called himself Manjushri or Wheel-Turning King. The Qing emperor seemed clearly to have understood the division between Tibet, Mongolia and China in the worldview of Tibetan Buddhism. For example, during the second religious war, in 1690, Galdan promised the Qing emperor that he would not violate “people of the emperor of China”. But the Qing emperor rewrote the historical narrative as “he promised not invade Khalkha Mongolia since then” to prove that Galdan acknowledged the Qing’s rule of Khalkha Mongolia. Therefore, I think in the process of
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gradually conquering Tibet, Mongolia, and Dzungaria, the Qing’s ideological paradigm could use Manjushri image to enhance religious sacredness and sense of intimacy, but the emperor perhaps would not officially use this identity to rule “Inner Asia” because it did not support the legitimacy of his rule outside China. In the archives, the Qing emperor said he was promoter of the Yellow Hat Sect. His officially-recorded verbal self-definition obviously had no geographical restrictions, which thus I believe was more conducive to construct the identity of “universal emperor”.

The difference between the Qing and the Dzungar also can be seen from whether the rulers entered Tibet to Ao cha in their own name. For the Dzungar rulers, Ao cha was inseparably both private and public. It was a religious obligation a son to his father. It was also a national institutional procedure for the ruler to gain legitimacy. At the same time, the religious and political nature of the Dzungar’s Ao cha were inseparable. I speculate that this might be a continuation of the confusion between Mongolia’s private property and the public state, (which might lead to confusion in inheritance), and the religious-political legitimacy interaction paradigm of shamanism. On the contrary, the Qing emperor did not conduct Ao cha, and Tibet’s financial shortfalls due to the Qing’s blockade of Ao cha were made up by imperial finances instead of the emperor’s personal almsgiving. In my opinion, just as the emperor’s portraits suggest, the emperor’s use of Tibetan Buddhism to rule was not a clear institution like it was among the Dzungar, but a cryptic suggestion. The ritual of Ao cha, as a unity of public and private and a unity of politics and religion, was performed when the Qing emperor’s mother died. This high-status but less politically institutional female image might create a sense of sacredness and intimacy, but avoided any institutional commitments. (Crossley pointed out that there were strong private emotional political discourses in Qing rule.) At the same time, crossing the supposed boundaries between his simultaneous cultural personae, I think it also served to prove the moral quality of “filial piety” necessary for the emperor as the “sage master of Confucianism”.
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The Post-Dzungar Era and New Challenges

Neither Manjusri nor the Wheel-Turning King could provide legitimacy of rule over Mongolia, Dzungaria and Tibet, but just recognitions of legitimacy of the rule of occupied regional territories. These identities could be transferred without restrictions of blood, ethnicity or nationality, which even might encourage potential territorial wars. In other words, I think this ideology might serve the challengers and regional rulers of the existing order, which was a potential threat to the Qing, so the Qing would eventually play down these two concepts. The Qing’s attempt to incorporate the Dzungar into the East Asian system through ideological reconstruction to achieve peaceful coexistence failed. The Dzungar was considered to be a threat to compete with the Qing for Tibet and split Mongolia from the Qing Empire. Under these circumstances, in 1758, the Qing completely conquered the Dzungar and eliminated this threat by force. At this point, the territory of the cross-border ideological alliance had been completely incorporated into the Qing world. From this perspective, the existing Tibetan Buddhist order where Emperor Manjusri and Dalai Lama Guanyin Bodhisattva were still parallel regional centers, seemed to no longer match the actual ruling order. After various attempts, the Qing could only temporarily find a balance between religion and secular, local and central power.

By this time, the Qing emperor felt that his empire was “complete” because the challenge from Central Eurasian Tibet-Dzungar ideological alliance had been brought under the control of the Qing by force. Now, it may be possible to try to answer a question raised before, that is why after the defeat of the Dzungars, the pace of the Qing’s “external conquest” stopped. My answer is that it was possibly because the world of Tibetan Buddhism in Central Eurasia, the world of East Asia and the world of Northeast Asia finally merged completely to form the universe of the Qing Empire. Ideological cross-border issues, such as the Taiwan and the Dzungar had been resolved, so the emperor might believe that there was no longer a source of tearing at the Qing empire from the outside. However, the “complete conquest” of territories perhaps was only the first step towards the realization of a “complete universe”, because the external threats before might turn into internal separatism. Therefore, at the ontological level, I think the Qing needed to and indeed did promote further integration. The Manchu culture from Northeast Asia, in the Qing imperial ideological collection, was weaker in cultural appeal than either East Asian Confucianism or Central Eurasian Tibetan Buddhism, which did not conform to or might even weaken the actual ruling order.290 My hypothesis is that, in the process of conquering, whether facing China or Inner Asia, the Qing’s strategy was to follow the cultural logic of the conquered, constantly adjusting its narrative to fit the conquered culture. On the one hand, this granted the Qing ideological flexibility.
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Barfield believes that after the conquest of northern China in the 12th century, the traditional culture of the Qing ancestors was not enough to adapt to the complexity of the new lifestyle. I think that in the 18th century, faced with a broader and more complex empire, the traditional culture of the Qing was also not enough to support their rule.
On the other hand, I would like to make a point that it might make it difficult for the Qing to construct its own universal discourse that transcended local cultures.

The Qing’s original Manchu shamanism seemed do not have the potential to replace Confucianism or Buddhism. Therefore, in the post-Dzungar era, when the conquest was “completed”, I assume the Qing’s pursuit was to construct a “homogenizing” ideology that transcended locality. Inspired by the “conceptualization” method used by the New Qing History School, I think “homogenization” is a concept that can be used to analyze Chinese ideological history after the conquest of the Dzungar until now. In my opinion, in order to consolidate and maintain the unity of the culturally diverse empire, the Qing’s ideology paradigm must be transformed from multifaceted to homogeneous. Crossley noticed that in the post-Dzungar era, the diversification of the Qing’s ideological expression quickly disappeared, and she seemed to see it as an indication of the decline of the empire. My opinion is contrary to hers. I believe that this change in ideological expression was not passively forced by the “decline of the empire”, but a transformation that was actively carried out to strengthen centralization. Regarding the specific content and direction of this homogenization, I think the Qing emperor chose “emptiness”, a concept mentioned by Crossley. The concept of “emptiness” was shared in Tibetan Buddhism, Chinese Buddhism, Taoism and some Confucian schools. Since the nature of the current world was emptiness, factors that might divide or subvert the empire, including culture, race, religion, and nationality, would be null on the ontological level of philosophy. On the basis of the universal cultural emptiness, the Qing rule might be able to get rid of the dependence on the sources of legitimacy and become an absolute political dominant structure.

However, due to possible cultural resilience, this transformation would not be rapid and smooth. Regarding Tibetan Buddhism, the Qing policy’s after conquering the Dzungar was to further promote institutionalized and legalized management, which probably implied that the Qing emperor took “secularization” as a step in the transformation of the imperial ideology. The Qing emperor pointed out in 1791 that although he protected the Yellow Hat Sect, they must be governed by the emperor’s laws, with no difference with the mainland. Secularization, both at the ideological level and at the political institutional level, was supposed to make room for a stronger Qing government based on a homogeneous “universally cultural emptiness”. However, the Tibetan Buddhist world might still maintain some resistance to the transcendence of Qing imperial power over religious power. For example, using the method of religious anthropology to examine the Qing emperor’s “killing Manjushri” ritual in Mount Wutai and the reaction of the Yellow Hat Sect might help reveal this conflict implicitly. In the royal temple in Mount Wutai, there
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is a unique statue of Manjushri stabbed by an arrow on the shoulder. There was a saying that the arrow appeared on the statue after the Qing emperor shot a monk who was the incarnation of the Manjushri. Some anthropologists believe this meant that the emperor used violence to occupy and surpass the divinity of Manjushri. However, the thirteenth Dalai Lama (1876-1933) drew the arrow out, and the tenth Panchen Lama (1938-1989) took the arrow away because they “could not bear to see the Bodhisattva hurt”. Judging from this, the Yellow Hat sect might have some ideological disagreements with the new order constructed by the Qing for a long time.

As a pre-modern empire, the homogenization of the “emptiness” of the Qing might be ultimately limited. The Qing’s absolute political structure that should transcend regional cultures had not been fully realized in the end. On the contrary, there were nationalist rebellions in the empire in the late Qing period. In addition to the resistance of local powers, as a minority group ruling a huge empire, complete cultural emptiness and homogeneity could be risky for maintaining the dominant position of the Manchus. The Qing seemed always to be in a dilemma between a strong institutional government and the support of tribal elites. My view is that in the 19th century, challenges from the West might exacerbate the Qing bloc’s conflicting situation because the Qing needed a stronger government to mobilize the resources of the entire empire as well as stronger tribal forces to maintain Manchu rule. Moreover, “emptiness” might have helped to weaken the local authoritative cultures’ resistance to the Qing rule, but it could not help in the mobilization of the empire as a whole. If the Qing universe was “complete” as the emperor envisioned with no more external challenges to its integrity, “emptiness” might be a successful ideological choice for the empire. But soon, it turned out that more intense external challenges were coming. The Qing’s limited homogenization could not provide the Qing a government with strong mobilization power to respond to the new challenges.

Facing the challenges of the West, the empire might have two options for the next ideological transformation, which I think was the essence of the late Qing philosophical debate discussed by Crossley. The first was to divide the multicultural empire into many single-cultural (nation) states, so that each state could achieve the greatest degree of homogenization, and the greatest degree of
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mobilization could be created to meet the new challenges. The second option was to further homogenize the multicultural empire on the basis of what the Qing had done. To do that, more radical strategies would be necessary, such as the promotion of a national standard language, the construction of a new identity for all citizens, and the introduction of a homogeneous ideology that transcended local cultures and with stronger mobilization power.\textsuperscript{300} Both of these paths had been tested in early modern China, and they continue to have an impact on China today.

\textsuperscript{300} Zhao 2009.

The Qing designated the Manchu language as the “national language” or the “Qing language” and produced reference books for learning the language, for example, the Manchu-Chinese Hebi Dictionary (满汉合璧字词书, manhanhebizicishu). I suppose this may be one of the inspirations for Crossley’s “simultaneous” (合璧, hebi) theory. However, the popularity of Chinese language made it difficult to promote Manchu language.
Conclusions

The newly-available archive material *Qingdaijunjichumanwenaochadang* (《清代军机处满文熬茶档》, The Grand Council Archive of the Dzungar pilgrimage to Tibet) and *jinjichumanwenzhungaershizhedang* (《军机处满文准噶尔使者档》, The Grand Council Archive of the Dzungar Missions) provide an opportunity for this thesis to review the Qing ideology of rule in the mid-18th century. Through the archives, this thesis attempts to reveal the Qing-Dzungar ideological conflicts about the Central Eurasian Tibetan Buddhist order in peacetime beside the standard war narrative and this ideological conflicts’ influence on the Qing’s ideological transformation. In order to do so, this thesis establishes a new theoretical and methodological framework for analyzing Qing ideology. Firstly, I use long-term retrospective methods and cultural ecological interaction theory to explore the reasons for the establishment of the Tibet-Dzungar ideological alliance. In this process, due to the lack of direct records about the Dzungars, their Mongolian cousins who also belong to the nomadic culture ecology of the steppe were used as reference. Secondly, I try to compare the ruling ideologies of the Qing and the Dzungar to question some academic arguments that emphasized the inheritance relationship and similarity between the Qing and Mongolia (including the Dzungar). At the same time, through comparison, I try to interpretate the tension and strategy in the process of integrating Tibetan Buddhist world into the Qing ideological universe. Whether it is Qing or Dzungar ideology, it was complicated on both the synchronic and diachronic level. For such a macroscopic research topic, I think “conceptualization” is an effective microscopic entry point. Therefore, this thesis analyzes and compares the identity concepts of the “Emperor Manjushri” and the “Promoter of the Yellow Hat Sect” of the Qing rulers and the “Wheel-Turning King” and the “Defender of the Faith” of the Dzungar rulers.

Regarding empirical cases, this thesis conducts a textual analysis of the *Aocha* Archive and the Mission Archive related to the dispute between the Qing and the Dzungar about inviting Tibetan lamas from 1745 to 1752. From an ideological point of view, I try to interpret the discourse strategy of the two parties in the process of negotiation on this sensitive issue. During the negotiation, the Dzungars continued their stand of defending the authority of the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism centered on the Dalai Lama and resisting the Qing's attempts to establish a new ideological order. Facing such challenges, the Qing emperor constantly adjusted his discourse strategy, by for example referring to the diverse cultures in the Qing Empire such as Tibetan Buddhism, Chinese Buddhism, and Confucianism, which might give us a new understanding of the flexibility of Qing ideology to construct “universal rulership”. I think this ideological “challenge-response” model had a profound impact on the Qing Empire and later Chinese history. After the Qing conquered the Dzungar in 1757 and finally integrated the Tibetan Buddhist world by force, the Qing emperor believed that the “Qing ideological universe” was finally “complete”
and there would be no more external threats to the integrity of the empire. In order to maintain the integrity of this imperial universe and strengthen centralization, the Qing started the “homogenization” process on the ontological level. However, contrary to the emperor’s vision, the Qing Empire had faced more intense challenges from the West since the 19th century. Which path to choose to further promote homogenization to establish a stronger government to deal with new challenges would be a choice that affected the course of Chinese history from then to now.
Appendices: Chronological Table

Table 1. Chronology of events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>The establishment of the alliance between the Sakya Sect of Tibetan Buddhism and the Direct line of Golden Family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>The decline of Tibetan Buddhism in Mongolian society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>The establishment of the ideological alliance between the Yellow Hat Sect of Tibetan Buddhism and the Dzungar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>The fifth Dalai Lama awarded Batur the title of “Erdeni Batur Huntaji”; the Dzungar Khanate was founded in Dzungaria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>The Qing Empire was founded in Manchuria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>The first religious war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>The Qing conquered Beijing and North China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>The Qing conquered the whole China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>The fifth Dalai Lama awarded Galdan the title of “Danjinboshuoketu Khan”; the imperial confederacy of the Dzungar was established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>The Qing quelled the rebellion of the Three Federations in southwestern China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>The Qing regained Taiwan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688-1697</td>
<td>The second religious war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717-1720</td>
<td>The third religious war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>The Qing established a new order in Tibet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>The fifth Panchen Lama passed away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>The first Aocha for the death of the Panchen Lama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743-1744</td>
<td>The second Aocha for the death of the Panchen Lama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>The incident of the “war instigator lama”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>The Aocha mission proposed to the Tibetan agent to invite Tibetan lamas to the Dzungar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>The Dzungar mission in Beijing requested to invite Tibetan lamas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Dzungar ruler Galdan Tseren died and his second son, Tsewang Dorji Namjal, took over the throne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>The Dzungar mission in Beijing requested to Aocha for the death of Galdan Tseren and to invite Tibetan lamas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>The third Aocha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>The Dzungar mission in Beijing requested to escort Tibetan lamas in Dzungaria back to Tibet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>The Dzungar mission in Beijing requested to Aocha on a small scale every year and to study in Tibet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Lama Darja “usurped” the throne of the Dzungar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>The Dzungar mission in Beijing requested to Aocha for Galdan Tseren and to invite Tibetan lamas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>The Dzungar mission in Beijing requested to invite senior living Buddhas from Beijing and Tibet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>The Qing conquered the Dzungar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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