

第二期

一九九六年一月十五日

# 華南研究資料中心 通訊

South China Research Resource Station Newsletter

## 政府檔案處華資註冊公司記錄簡介

鍾寶賢

香港浸會大學歷史系

政府檔案處有關香港註冊華資公司的檔案頗豐。其中包括：

1881 萬安保險	1924 Ching Siong Land
1895 全安保險	Investment Co.
1899 宜安保險	1924 青源置業按揭
1899 同安保險	1925 Sang Yuen Land
1899 香港九龍置業按揭	Investment
1901 瑞安輪船	1926 Wai Tak Land
1903 聯益保險	Investment
1906 四邑輪船	1926 Tsang Chung Shan
1908 中國康年人壽	Tong
1908 Po Lam Land	1926 Luk Hok Tung Co.
Investment	Ltd.
1912 Sun Co. 大新百貨	1926 Sincere Perfumery
1914 福華銀行保險	1927 Wing Lai Land
1915 利民興國保險	Investment & Loan
1915 先施保險	1927 Dor Fook Land
1915 上海火水險	Investment & Loan
1915 永安火水險	1927 Luk Hok Tung Life
1916 聯泰聯保	Assurance
1916 南海火水險	1927 Wang Yuen Ltd.
1919 東亞銀行	1928 The Oriental
1921 平安置業	Investment Co.
1921 香港國民商業銀行	Ltd.
1922 康年銀行	1928 Chung Shum Land
1922 先施人壽	Investment
1923 何文田置業公司	1928 Yue Tak Land
1924 Pun Tak Land	Investment & loan
Investment	1929 Tak Wa Land
1924 Hing Fat Land	Investment
Investment	1930 Sam Wo Hing Land
1924 Yin Nin Savings &	Investment
Mortgage	1930 Luk Hok Tung
1924 永安人壽	Dispensary
1924 香安保險	1932 Wing On Bank
1924 均安聯保	1932 上水置業公司

檔案所收者，除公司的“Articles of Association”外，亦附有公司股東的名單。其中如萬安保險等由法院清盤之公司，其清盤之部分記錄亦有收入在檔案中。

歸納檔案資料所載，大家或會有以下的印象：

(一) 最早期註冊的華資公司(19世紀後半期)只有5間——主要是輪船、火險、水險公司。股東多為南北行廣幫、潮幫商人。他們開辦輪運、火險(貨倉)、水險(船運)大概是他們南北行事業的延伸別支。可留意者潮、廣商人並未有把其龐大的南北行事業註冊，反而是把其別支延伸的輪運和保險事業註冊成有限資本公司。

(二) 在清末(新政)及民初時期註冊的公司數目有明顯跳升。其中活躍者當推香山人、四邑人(以美國、澳洲回流者)，以百貨公司、保險公司、地產投資公司為多。從股東名單中所見，這批公司互相控股的情況十分明顯。家族成員、姻親、同鄉族弟關係在股東名單中亦甚為明顯。

(三) 第3批出現的公司在1920年末至30年代初，多為私人註冊的置業公司。股東人數少而且多為同姓氏、同地緣者組合而成，其中亦有由全女性股東所組合者。這些公司記錄展現出的形像甚豐富，其中以上水置業公司甚值細看。

上水置業公司是1932年成立的，以上水廖焯南為骨幹，組織了上水廖氏族譜所載四房中第一、第二房主要成員(包括以祖嘗名義者)成立公司。除廖氏以外，股東名單上有3位陳氏股東——包括著名的四邑商人陳符祥。陳為四邑李煜堂之同鄉世姪，受李氏器重管理廣東銀行、上海聯保及聯泰保險等四邑人擁有的公司。

事緣1930年代，四邑名商人李煜堂淡出粵政財

界後，四邑商人集團出現兩位新一代（又互相競爭）的領袖：一為李氏親姪李星衢、一為李氏世姪陳符祥。30年代，陳氏仍掌聯益保險、廣東銀行部分財權，同時另組一系列新公司：陸海通公司、酒店、藥房、置業、保險及彌敦酒店，並活躍於新界地區的土地投機事業。上水置業就是陳氏在新界土地投機的產物。上水廖氏四房當時分作兩陣營，兩皆着力與陳符祥合作試圖開發上水土地，陳、廖的開會聚集處就是彌敦酒店（至今仍存在）。

陳符祥開發新界土地投資的資金大多來自廣東

銀行及聯益保險公司：30年代末，廣東銀行（在港註冊但在粵運作）面臨經濟危機，行將被宋子文沒收，李煜堂子孫曾與陳符祥、李星衢聯絡挽救。李星衢據說當時拒絕出資挽救銀行，其理由為——銀行與聯泰資金已為陳符祥投壓於「前景不大」的新界土地。廣東銀行結果為民國政府沒收，李氏子孫在四邑商人組織中的地位淡出，陳符祥及其經營的陸海通系列公司則繼續在港經營。其在新界之土地投資，時間證明獲利甚豐。

## 有關清代樟林港貿易的一段記載

陳春聲  
中山大學歷史系

近年在廣東澄海縣樟林鄉調查，得到當地文史學者李紹雄先生協助，印得民國34年當地人陳汰余編撰的《樟林鄉土志略》抄本乙冊。作者稱「本志為專載本鄉往事，俾鄉人得悉桑梓源流」。全書分鄉土之原始、名稱之由來、氣候、鄉民之來源、物產、鄉民生計、鄉土變遷、曆朝顯貴、篤行、裝

服、藝術、災變、建設、廟宇、古跡、怪異、先賢文藝等節目，所錄大多為作者之見聞，體例不甚嚴格，內容生動有趣。其中「鄉民生計」一節，記錄明代至民國數百年間當地經濟狀況的變化，言簡意賅。此書不易獲見，特抄錄一段公諸同好者：

我樟地頻海噬，鄉人昔以漁為業。羈網、牽罾、扣船、掌桁、柵箔、挨緝、放湖、鈎釣，深水淺腳，無不有之。故昔有耕三漁七之諺。及後海濱淤日勦廣，東郊一望，海變良田。農業之家，日見日多。

陸地與各屬交通舟車便利，遂成上北落南通津總匯。各屬出洋者，必來樟林赴船。鄉民亦漸次由農而入工商。至雍乾間，南北洋船，往來益眾，更由鄉村而變成市鎮。鄉人出洋成家者，亦由此始。漁民則營罾網而為大商，蔗寮糖坊林立，農民亦多成巨賈。此時人民殷實，釘洋船而發家者，各社不少其人。大商巨賈，更難枚舉。仙橋一街，皆洋船行。至今里巷有一句趣語，曰：「大船到，豬母生；烏仔豆，帶上棚」，即當時說幸運之人。又有一句掃興語，曰：「無師請著阿晴盲五」，亦當時實事。因洋船欲放行，昔人習俗必延師公船上祭神，頌經禱祝，然後開行。同時開行者常成十艘，或多至十餘艘。師公本無多人，晴盲五非真盲者，乃師公之下者。一時缺乏，雖下必請，故有是語。以此可知當時人民生計之饒裕。當時北社林家有一艘名曰「和春冠」，一聯云：「和之璧，隋之珠，珠合璧聯歌滿載；春自南，夏自北，南來北至慶榮歸」。

咸豐之世，紅頭船（即洋船）改變為甲板船，而變為火輪船。樟林口岸無形中移出沙汕頭。不特發洋事停歇，至同光時東面海成沙田，港內出海不止十餘里路，羈網牽罾事業且讓南澳、柘林、海山。鄉中只有少數貧人只身持罾于海濱而已。

然輪船往來，波濤不惊，航海無阻。鄉人出洋者日眾。發跡于暹域者，各社有人。南洋群島實為我樟林殖民矣。

樟林是清中葉粵東沿海最重要的近海帆船貿易港口。筆者所見有關當時口岸及社區情況的記載，以《樟林鄉土志略》的這段內容最為豐富生動。所述從漁村到農村，再到貿易港口，近代以後又成為僑鄉的變遷，在潮州沿海地區可能不特是樟林一鄉的歷程。值得注意的還有，以往的研究大多強調汕

頭開埠以後樟林的衰落，但從上引記載可以看出，其時樟林已成僑鄉，財富積聚仍在繼續。其他文獻記載和實地調查所得也証明這一點，事實上，清末民初正是樟林社區迅速擴展的時期，20，30年間村落擴大了一倍。此是後話，按下不提。

界後，四邑商人集團出現兩位新一代（又互相競爭）的領袖：一為李氏親姪李星衢、一為李氏世姪陳符祥。30年代，陳氏仍掌聯益保險、廣東銀行部分財權，同時另組一系列新公司：陸海通公司、酒店、藥房、置業、保險及彌敦酒店，並活躍於新界地區的土地投機事業。上水置業就是陳氏在新界土地投機的產物。上水廖氏四房當時分作兩陣營，兩皆着力與陳符祥合作試圖開發上水土地，陳、廖的開會聚集處就是彌敦酒店（至今仍存在）。

陳符祥開發新界土地投資的資金大多來自廣東

銀行及聯益保險公司：30年代末，廣東銀行（在港註冊但在粵運作）面臨經濟危機，行將被宋子文沒收，李煜堂子孫曾與陳符祥、李星衢聯絡挽救。李星衢據說當時拒絕出資挽救銀行，其理由為——銀行與聯泰資金已為陳符祥投壓於「前景不大」的新界土地。廣東銀行結果為民國政府沒收，李氏子孫在四邑商人組織中的地位淡出，陳符祥及其經營的陸海通系列公司則繼續在港經營。其在新界之土地投資，時間證明獲利甚豐。

## 有關清代樟林港貿易的一段記載

陳春聲  
中山大學歷史系

近年在廣東澄海縣樟林鄉調查，得到當地文史學者李紹雄先生協助，印得民國34年當地人陳汰余編撰的《樟林鄉土志略》抄本乙冊。作者稱「本志為專載本鄉往事，俾鄉人得悉桑梓源流」。全書分鄉土之原始、名稱之由來、氣候、鄉民之來源、物產、鄉民生計、鄉土變遷、曆朝顯貴、篤行、裝

服、藝術、災變、建設、廟宇、古跡、怪異、先賢文藝等節目，所錄大多為作者之見聞，體例不甚嚴格，內容生動有趣。其中「鄉民生計」一節，記錄明代至民國數百年間當地經濟狀況的變化，言簡意賅。此書不易獲見，特抄錄一段公諸同好者：

我樟地頻海噬，鄉人昔以漁為業。羈網、牽罾、扣船、掌桁、柵箔、挨緝、放湖、鉤釣，深水淺腳，無不有之。故昔有耕三漁七之諺。及後海濱淤日勦廣，東郊一望，海變良田。農業之家，日見日多。

陸地與各屬交通舟車便利，遂成上北落南通津總匯。各屬出洋者，必來樟林赴船。鄉民亦漸次由農而入工商。至雍乾間，南北洋船，往來益眾，更由鄉村而變成市鎮。鄉人出洋成家者，亦由此始。漁民則營罾網而為大商，蔗寮糖坊林立，農民亦多成巨賈。此時人民殷實，釘洋船而發家者，各社不少其人。大商巨賈，更難枚舉。仙橋一街，皆洋船行。至今里巷有一句趣語，曰：「大船到，豬母生；鳥仔豆，帶上棚」，即當時說幸運之人。又有一句掃興語，曰：「無師請著阿晴盲五」，亦當時實事。因洋船欲放行，昔人習俗必延師公船上祭神，頌經禱祝，然後開行。同時開行者常成十艘，或多至十餘艘。師公本無多人，晴盲五非真盲者，乃師公之下者。一時缺乏，雖下必請，故有是語。以此可知當時鄉民生計之饒裕。當時北社林家有一艘名曰「和春冠」，一聯云：「和之璧，隋之珠，珠合璧聯歌滿載；春自南，夏自北，南來北至慶榮歸」。

咸豐之世，紅頭船（即洋船）改變為甲板船，而變為火輪船。樟林口岸無形中移出沙汕頭。不特發洋事停歇，至同光時東面海成沙田，港內出海不止十餘里路，羈網牽罾事業且讓南澳、柘林、海山。鄉中只有少數貧人只身持罾于海濱而已。

然輪船往來，波濤不惊，航海無阻。鄉人出洋者日眾。發跡于暹域者，各社有人。南洋群島實為我樟林殖民矣。

樟林是清中葉粵東沿海最重要的近海帆船貿易港口。筆者所見有關當時口岸及社區情況的記載，以《樟林鄉土志略》的這段內容最為豐富生動。所述從漁村到農村，再到貿易港口，近代以後又成為僑鄉的變遷，在潮州沿海地區可能不特是樟林一鄉的歷程。值得注意的還有，以往的研究大多強調汕

頭開埠以後樟林的衰落，但從上引記載可以看出，其時樟林已成僑鄉，財富積聚仍在繼續。其他文獻記載和實地調查所得也証明這一點，事實上，清末民初正是樟林社區迅速擴展的時期，20，30年間村落擴大了一倍。此是後話，按下不提。

## 「經營文化：中國社會單元之組織與營運」

香港科技大學人文學部主辦

1995年10月20日至22日

黃永豪 馬木池

香港科技大學人文學部

對於中國社會在過去漫長的年代為何不能發展出現代化的工商業經營及管理方法，學者有很多不同的見解。有些強調儒家思想不利現代化的工商業發展；有些主張君權過大扼殺了創造性的精神；有些則認為缺乏法律保障才是主要的原因。此次會議的目的就是希望嘗試以個案研究的方法，來探討中國社會中各種社會單元，在各種不同的歷史、地理、文化、政治和經濟環境內，是如何組織與營運，分析其共同之處，從而找出中國社會中各種經營文化的內容，為上述的討論提供一些資料。

由於文化有多方面的範疇，各與會者的研究取向也有多方面；因此，上述問題的答案也可能是多種多樣的，不能單就某些法律條文的規限或某種思想的影響便指為答案之所在。

與會者提醒我們中國傳統社會有其獨特性，種種不同的社會環境和文化因素，塑造了很獨特的文化和經濟表現。陳春聲對乾隆13年的米貴問題提出了新的見解，指出清朝官員把米貴看成與行政運作是否得當有直接關係的問題，因此從政治、社會等許多方面來探求降低米價的辦法，而根本的目的只是防止社會動亂。因此我們不能僅從經濟學的角度來理解傳統中國的經濟。張瑞威研究18世紀的常平倉，認為地方官員建立常平倉只是為了營利，而最大的得益者絕不是貧民而是地方上的大米商。黃永豪研究清末洞庭湖區的農田墾殖，指出開墾土地是一投機的商業活動。

對於家族制度與商業活動的關係，與會者從不同方向進行探討。王振忠研究徽商的家族制度與清代兩淮鹽商組織「務本堂」的關係時，指出徽商的家族制度一方面着重謀求社會地位和政治特權，局限了徽商商業運作的模式；另一方面強調周恤族人，使徽商缺乏持久的冒險精神。傳統中國商業組織的一個特徵，就是社會性往往重於經濟性。邵鴻

則持相反的意見，他探討明清江西農村社區中「會」的發展與宗族的關係。他主張「會社」是宗族和社區成員為了特定事務而建立的一種契約型組織，主要的作用是作為宗族的輔助性功能組織，是適應當時商業化和世俗化的社會變遷，鞏固和發展宗族組織的一個重要途徑和體現。

很多與會者對上述中國傳統文化中的各種社會及經濟組織有很大的可塑性和適應性的說法持相同的意見。曾玲研究新加坡的一個華人村落潘家村與其村內橫山廟近年來的演變，說明此廟從福建移植到新加坡的過程中，由潘氏族人的神廟變成具有宗祠與神廟的雙重功能，正是華南鄉村以血緣、地緣為紐帶的社會和經濟結構以及文化傳統，隨着時空的變更而調整的一個例子。

對於中國傳統文化和社會體系在不同的社區環境下的作用，與會者強調着不同的中介組織。如Carl Smith強調傳統自治組織的重要性。他陳述在16至18世紀時期，在澳門的華人，面對中澳兩方面的各種限制下，正是以建立各種獨立或半獨立的傳統自治組織，來保障華人的生活。Liu Ching-mui認為中國文化在移民的社區固然重要，但當地的教會組織作為推動中國文化的機構的角色絕對不能忽視。她分析近年香港鴨州島的移民在蘇格蘭的一個小鎮的社區生活，由於當地教會不單對這些移民提供了信仰和社區生活上的需要，也強化和整固了他們傳統的中國家庭觀念，於是這些移民在維護傳統文化之餘，同時成為當地的定居者。上述兩位學者的文章雖強調不同的地方組織，但皆暗示中國傳統文化中的社會體系具有適應當地社區的特質。

傳統文化下的各種經濟及社會體制與國家政權的關係，也是與會者所關注的重心所在。郭潤濤着重論述清代「紹興幫」的組織形態、就業方式、職業收入及其支出諸問題，認為「紹興幫」是基於師

徒關係為聯結紐帶的生產經營組織。這種師徒關係的特質就是父與子的關係。換句話說，傳統的家族特點塑造了政治活動的方式。梁洪生與邵鴻同是對明清江西樂安縣農村社區作出研究。但梁洪生則專注國家和鄉紳之間在控制地方社會的關係。他認為鄉紳以王學為指導理論來整合其家族，加強了家族的自治程度和基層控制權，有助國家對地方的控制。Joseph McDermott 以蘇州的端午節為例，說明在沒有家族和國家的架構下，城市階層中的惡霸、會黨、歹徒和打手成為領導地方節日慶典的主要力量。上述的文章陳述了地方的經濟和社會組織成為地方社區的主導力量。

反過來，國家政權如何塑造文化和社會體制也沒有被與會者忽略。在這方面，與會者的意見比較一致，皆同意國家政權對於文化的經營具有很大的塑造力。謝世忠討論近年台灣政府利用經濟手段，

操控着原住民的文化示範，把其局限在一定的官定傳統下。他認為國家正以一種「象徵性的暴力」來指揮着原住文化。Henrietta Harrison 的研究有力地說明了在各種政治力量角力下，通過孫中山的喪禮與及葬禮，新的國民政治文化被塑造了，而孫中山也被塑造成民族主義的象徵，最後成為黨國領袖的象徵。

有部分與會者主張文化認同是個人自我經營的一種表現，也是個人如何理解其所屬的文化體系的表現。Nicole Constable 透過一位居於新界的張姓客家基督徒的生平，分析其如何經營其「中國文化和社會體系」。她認為社會體系是與個人認同和社會認同緊緊地結合在一起的，個人與社群作為一個自主的機構，根據其主觀的意願來註釋文化。

(二之一，下期待續)

「經營文化：中國社會單元之組織與營運」學術研討會論文，依期在會議期間發展的先後次序編列如下：

Myron, L. Cohen	Management in Chinese Culture
謝世忠	Munipulating and Managing "Traditional Culture": Taiwanese Indigenous Culture in Regime's Recognition
Lisa Fischler	Women and Representation: Constructing Gender Identities in Hong Kong
Nicole Constable	The Negotiation of Culture in the Life History of a Hakka Christian Man
Joseph McDermott	Festival Organization
譚棣華	廣東神廟與當地社會經濟
郭淨	民間祭祀表演組織的構成與運作：以西南農村的「壇」為例
丁荷生	Economics of Ritual in the There in One Tradition
鄭振滿	從大興祠看仙游三一教的演變——解讀兩篇教徒自傳
張小軍	文化的經營與經營的文化：一個宗祠重建的個案研究
James Hayes	Headmen and Representatives: Traditional Village Management in the Hong Kong Region
Patrick Hugh Hase	Eastern Peace: The Foundation and Management of Sha Tau Kok Market
劉志偉	清末珠江三角洲鄉村家庭的企業經營：以順德沙滘鄉陳遠枝堂為例
馬木池	二十世紀初期的小商業經營：南中國的個案研究
Stephanie P.Y. Chung	The Siyi Group Of Merchant in Hong Kong and their Investments in Canton Politics
帆刈浩之	東華醫院與華人網絡
Graham E. Johnson	Managing Revolutionary Transformation: Action and Reaction the Pearl River Delta Region
Mak Hung-fai	Organization of Village Group after Decollectivization: A Case Study in the Pearl River Delta

邵鴻	明清以來江西農村社區中的「會」：以樂安懸流坑村為例
梁洪生	社區建設實驗：江右王門學者與流坑村
黃永豪	地方精英與墾土經營：以「保安湖田志」一書為例
Carl S. Smith	Effort to Create Ghetto in a European City on Chinese Soil — Macau
曾玲	橫山廟與潘家村：新加坡一個華人移植性宗族的運作
Garland Liu	Managing Cultural Distinctiveness: An Ethnography of the Hong Kong Ap Chau Islanders in Scotland
Cheung Sui-wai	Management of Evernormal Granary in Eighteenth Century China
陳春聲	「經濟」不是 Economy：乾隆十三年米貴問題
王振忠	徽商與清代兩淮鹽務：「務本堂」研究
郭潤濤	清代幕業中「紹興幫」的組織形態與經營方式
Elisabeth Hsu	A Government-run Medical College in Action: The Technology Transfer of Acumoxa from Shanghai to Yunnan
Henrietta Harrison	Ceremony, Protest of Riot? The Official Funerals of Sun Yatsen and the Making of History
Chan Kai-yiu	Making Business Empires in Nationalist China: A Case of the “King of Matches” Liu Hongsheng, 1927-1937
Ichiro Numazaki	Partnership as a Chinese Managing Culture: Historical and Contemporary Cases from Taiwan
Lai Chi-kong	Beyond Lineage Trusts and Partnerships: The Emergence of the Modern Company in China
Naoto Kagotani	The Role of Chinese Merchants in the Development of the Japanese Cotton Industry, c. 1890-1932
Wong Heung-wah	Chinese Employees in a Japanese Supermarket in Hong Kong

---

## 「十六世紀的嶺南」 學術研討會在廣州舉行

程美寶  
中山大學歷史系

華南研究會聯同中山大學歷史系及廣東中國社會經濟史研究會，於1995年12月16日在廣州中山大學舉辦了一次以「十六世紀的嶺南」為主題的學術研討會。與會者分別來自日本東京大學、英國牛津大學、美國俄亥俄州立大學、瑞典隆德大學、台灣中央研究院、香港科技大學、香港浸會大學、廣東省社會科學院、中山大學以及廣州其他大學和研究機構。是次會議把16世紀視作嶺南地域社會發展史上一個頗為關鍵的轉型時期。論者在會上的發

言，除了繼續強調過去許多有關16世紀嶺南社會的商業經濟發展的討論成果外，更力圖進一步闡明這段時期嶺南地區在更廣泛的層面上的轉變，特別是16世紀前後當地經歷長時間社會動亂的背後，實際上是一個社會秩序的重建以及文化的再創造的過程。論者將這些地方性的發展放進國家政治和文化的脈絡中理解，說明地方社會的變動，如何在宗教和宗族制度的變遷中具體呈現，以及如何在蠻夷與漢人、地方與國家之間的攙雜互動的過程中展開。

邵鴻	明清以來江西農村社區中的「會」：以樂安懸流坑村為例
梁洪生	社區建設實驗：江右王門學者與流坑村
黃永豪	地方精英與墾土經營：以「保安湖田志」一書為例
Carl S. Smith	Effort to Create Ghetto in a European City on Chinese Soil — Macau
曾玲	橫山廟與潘家村：新加坡一個華人移植性宗族的運作
Garland Liu	Managing Cultural Distinctiveness: An Ethnography of the Hong Kong Ap Chau Islanders in Scotland
Cheung Sui-wai	Management of Evernormal Granary in Eighteenth Century China
陳春聲	「經濟」不是 Economy：乾隆十三年米貴問題
王振忠	徽商與清代兩淮鹽務：「務本堂」研究
郭潤濤	清代幕業中「紹興幫」的組織形態與經營方式
Elisabeth Hsu	A Government-run Medical College in Action: The Technology Transfer of Acumoxa from Shanghai to Yunnan
Henrietta Harrison	Ceremony, Protest of Riot? The Official Funerals of Sun Yatsen and the Making of History
Chan Kai-yiu	Making Business Empires in Nationalist China: A Case of the “King of Matches” Liu Hongsheng, 1927-1937
Ichiro Numazaki	Partnership as a Chinese Managing Culture: Historical and Contemporary Cases from Taiwan
Lai Chi-kong	Beyond Lineage Trusts and Partnerships: The Emergence of the Modern Company in China
Naoto Kagotani	The Role of Chinese Merchants in the Development of the Japanese Cotton Industry, c. 1890-1932
Wong Heung-wah	Chinese Employees in a Japanese Supermarket in Hong Kong

---

## 「十六世紀的嶺南」 學術研討會在廣州舉行

程美寶  
中山大學歷史系

華南研究會聯同中山大學歷史系及廣東中國社會經濟史研究會，於1995年12月16日在廣州中山大學舉辦了一次以「十六世紀的嶺南」為主題的學術研討會。與會者分別來自日本東京大學、英國牛津大學、美國俄亥俄州立大學、瑞典隆德大學、台灣中央研究院、香港科技大學、香港浸會大學、廣東省社會科學院、中山大學以及廣州其他大學和研究機構。是次會議把16世紀視作嶺南地域社會發展史上一個頗為關鍵的轉型時期。論者在會上的發

言，除了繼續強調過去許多有關16世紀嶺南社會的商業經濟發展的討論成果外，更力圖進一步闡明這段時期嶺南地區在更廣泛的層面上的轉變，特別是16世紀前後當地經歷長時間社會動亂的背後，實際上是一個社會秩序的重建以及文化的再創造的過程。論者將這些地方性的發展放進國家政治和文化的脈絡中理解，說明地方社會的變動，如何在宗教和宗族制度的變遷中具體呈現，以及如何在蠻夷與漢人、地方與國家之間的攙雜互動的過程中展開。

## THE KNAW COLLOQUIUM ON SOUTH CHINA: STATE, CULTURE AND SOCIAL CHANGE DURING THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, 22-24 MAY 1995

The Colloquium on *South China: State, Culture and Social Change during the Twentieth Century* was held in an exceptionally creative and comfortable atmosphere. It was organized by the undersigned on behalf of the Royal Netherlands Academy of the Arts and the Sciences (KNAW), under the indispensable intellectual guidance by Heather Sutherland (CASA, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam). Its purpose was to improve the study in the Netherlands of internationalization processes in East and Southeast Asia going on since the 1980s, with an emphasis on South China and the role of ethnic Chinese living in Southeast Asia. To this end the organizers had invited an ample thirty scholars and Ph.D. students from North America, Western Europe, Australia, and the regions more narrowly concerned, representing a wide variety of social science disciplines. There were twenty-two paper givers and eight invited discussants. This made it possible to look broadly, also from a historical perspective, at issues arising from economic growth that affect the social and political constellations in the region. The evaporation of socialism in Chinese everyday life and its replacement, during the 1980s, by an unprecedented permissiveness of free enterprise has articulated questions concerning unequal regional development and economic exploitation; it has resulted in the re-emergence of ethnic issues and the revival of traditional ideologies and cultural expressions; and it has drawn the ethnic Chinese overseas back into the increasingly powerful Chinese political orbit centered in Beijing.

One of the corollaries of the process of economic growth going on in the region is the emergence of a new discourse on “Chineseness” and “Chinese Capitalism”, fashionable since the emergence of the NICs from the 1970s onwards but particularly acute since the new wave of opening-up going on in China since late 1991. The explanatory value of these categories for the economic successes achieved in South China and Southeast Asia has been doubted since their first inception, but their resilience in contemporary academic discussions had a profound impact on the colloquium. The most articulate protagonist of their use at the colloquium was *Wong Siu-lun* (*University of Hong Kong*), who argued that the dynamic combination of entrepreneurship styles from Mainland China and Chinese overseas has resulted in China’s economic miracle. Familism, pragmatism, autonomy and personal trust were marked by him as the crucial values conducive to successful entrepreneurial

behavior. The most articulate antagonist of this argument, *Arif Dirlik* (*Duke University, Durham NC, USA*) in his wide-ranging paper admitted that the discourse on Chinese Capitalism understandably reflects the new assertiveness in China, and the rest of Asia, in overcoming colonial hegemony. Rather than an explanation of economic success, however, this new emphasis on allegedly Chinese values and behaviour is, according to Dirlik a consequence of the renewed subservience of the Chinese economic sphere to Western and Japanese economic interests: Chinese economic institutions by their informal character and family-orientation in his view are uniquely fit for subcontracting labour-intensive productions from multinational corporations. *Rajeswary Brown* (*SOAS, London*) joined this argument by raising the question whether Chinese business networks, however successful they are in accumulating capital and monitoring markets, could ever engender the transition to capital-intensive production. Her paper, by concentrating on the Chinese multinationals Kwek and Yeo Hiap Sing, operating from Singapore, emphasized the importance of regional state power and the Japanese and USA economic interest in determining the fate of Chinese business enterprise. Other papers supported the argument in a more indirect manner. *Liao Shaolian* (*Xiamen University, China*) eulogized the economic performance of Township Enterprises in Fujian Province (South China), which are often foreign invested; but at the same time his paper offered no data to contradict the impression that their production remains largely dependent upon cheap labour. The paper by *Wellington Chan* (*Occidental College, California, USA*) perhaps best illustrated the limits and possibilities of cultural explanations: his detailed comparison of the Wing On and Sincere Companies, both Overseas Chinese storehouses in metropolitan South China, during 1900-1941, suggests that only under largely equal circumstances, managerial culture could be considered as the crucial factor in determining their relative success.

The new discourse on “Chineseness” is narrowly related to discussions going on nowadays on a “Greater China”, claiming the existence of a coherent cultural and economic Chinese world that stretches over the PRC, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and the Chinese ethnic communities in Southeast Asia and even further away. The dangers of this line of thought are clear since it intentionally involves anyone who descends from the territory which is now the PRC’s political domain. One

of Prof. Dirlik's strongest criticisms of the discourse on "Chineseness" was its purposeful ignorance of ethnic differences among Chinese communities in the so-called Chinese Diaspora, alongside its ignorance of differences in class and gender interests. *Michael Godley* (*Monash University, Clayton, Australia*) supplemented this argument by stating that the "Nanyang connection" conception of the world has of old determined Beijing's look on the outside world. His study shows, that the big broker of the Overseas Chinese interest, Beijing-appointed Zhang Bishi, at the beginning of this century also fostered ideas on pan-Chinese nationalism. Dr. Godley's justified fears for the political consequences of the recent revival of such ideas made him argue that one had better confine the uses of Chinese ethnicity for the promotion of economic progress, and obstruct its political (ab) uses. *Charles Coppel* (*University of Melbourne, Australia*) in his paper emphasized the historicity of ethnic identity, and the factors internal to Indonesian politics that have contributed to its construction and its changes over time. His scrutiny of the evolution, during the period 1880-1930, of marriage and funeral rituals among *peranakan* Chinese in Java proves that a resinification of those rituals occurred at a time, when growing tensions arose between Muslim and Chinese trader communities, which factor, among others, put an end to the existing tendency of cultural assimilation. *Mary Somers Heidhues* (*University of Heidelberg, Germany*) similarly assured us that the resilience of the ethnic articulation of West Kalimantan's Chinese communities, which persists until today, had to do with factors internal to their position in Southeast Asia, like their original isolated position within the Indonesian colonial polity, and their multi-faceted orientation towards Singapore.

One could view the existing social structures and political practices existing in South China today as transitory. The large role of informal linkages (like trade and business networks), the importance of the family, authoritarian rule, the ignorance of subethnicity, class and gender, and the incapacity at creating a society ruled-by-law, could all be considered as "problems" that must once be overcome, or should be overcome, in order to achieve a rational, modern world order. This trend of thought could be traced in the papers that emphasized the broad international context of developments in China (or East Asia, or Asia), particularly those by Dirlik and Brown. A number of papers, however, took what might be labelled an "internalist" position, representing developments in China, or East Asia, as autonomous processes; in doing so they occupied an intermediary position between Wong's culturalism and Dirlik's

marxism. *Chuang Ying-chang* (*Academia Sinica, Taipei*) provided a detailed description of rotating credit associations on Taiwan; those function as providers of credit in situations where formal banking institutions cannot be relied upon for loans, as is the case in many underdeveloped countries. In Taiwan, these associations belong strictly to society; much of the social mechanism that organizes them dates far back into history, and is nowadays wrapped in institutes that are traditional in form, like temple cults. The detailed paper by *David Faure* (*University of Oxford; in collaboration with Anthony Pang, lawyer in Hong Kong, not present at the colloquium*) discussed the uses of written contracts in China up to the early twentieth century: they expanded vastly in number since the spurt in commercialization from the sixteenth century onwards, and were part of a resilient Chinese culture that prefers informal social arrangements above the enforcement of law from above, as is usual in the Western experience. *Leo Douw* (*Universiteit van Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*) in his paper compared the Chinese and the Western experiences over a similar time space as Faure did, in order to elucidate their persistent differences in state-society relations and the construction of ethnic identities; he surmised that Chinese cultural patterns stretch over much of East Asia nowadays and might prove to offer more of an alternative to Western cultural patterns than is implied by more unilinear approaches. Similarly, *Peter Post* (*KNAW/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*) confirmed the power of Asian cultural patterns that persisted despite colonial domination. On the basis of a study of the Hokchia/Henghua business networks during the first half of this century, which stretch from Indonesia over much of East Asia (and further), he concluded that Japan's emergence as Asia's economic motor from 1928 onwards, and its dependence on ethnic Chinese entrepreneurship definitively supplanted the always superficial economic potential of the colonial powers in the region. The paper by *Takeshi Hamashita* (*Tokyo University*), by focusing on the voluminous intra-Asian rice trade provided another example of how in the Asian cultural domain, centering around South China, commodity chains developed which were neither touched by Western capital nor supplanted by supposedly superior Western business organisations.

The process of internationalization that currently takes place in East Asia, and which once again affects the balance of power between China (Asia) and the West, is obviously multifaceted with many actors involved. The power of Western and Japanese MNC's is not absolute, and subject to change, as are the chances of survival of Chinese institutions, often based on centuries old

practice. Historical study alone can make out how the balance is at any concrete juncture of time. The near total opening-up of China that supposedly sold out its inhabitants to the vagaries of free market capitalism went hand in hand with efforts to increase control by Beijing. In her paper on the stock markets of Shenzhen and Shanghai *Ellen Hertz* (*Université de Lausanne, Switzerland*) described how in 1992 Shanghai took over Shenzhen's leading position as China's financial center, replacing the wilder and more corrupt Southern Chinese capitalist culture by a more stable, Beijing-oriented environment. Neither stock markets, however, could be described as fully capitalist, according to *Hertz Leo Suryadinata* (*National University of Singapore*) stated straightforwardly that Beijing still emphatically appeals to the ethnicity of investors of Chinese descent in Southeast Asia, despite the fact that now they are fully acknowledged as nationals of the countries where they live; this, according to Prof. Suryadinata, is a potentially destabilizing factor in the East Asian power balance, as it has been since the late nineteenth century. The paper by *Arthur Wolf* (*Stanford University, USA; adstruced by his wife Hill Gates, of the same university, in his unfortunate absence*), made one aware that diverging social practices cannot lightheartedly be subsumed under one broad cultural nomer: the recent emergence in South China of "New Feudalism" as a label for child-brides, expensive funerals, refurbished temples, and rebuilt lineage halls need not of necessity signal a return to a once coherent feudal culture, but may quite be the expression of new social developments. *Hill Gates* (*Stanford University, USA*) herself presented a fascinating paper on the rise and decline of footbinding in China in Late Imperial and Republican times, based on a tantalizingly vast data, mainly from interviewing. She argued contrary to established opinion, that the unbinding of feet during the twentieth century was not a consequence of a changed morality, engendered by Chinese enlightened elites and Western reformers, but of the spread of industrial capitalism; this made outdoor work of little girls more profitable for their families.

The study of *qiaoxiang* (hometown) ties, or links between ethnic Chinese abroad and their native places in China, is of particular importance in researching how economic internationalization affects socio-political structures. Ethnic Chinese communities in Southeast Asia and elsewhere have organized along *qiaoxiang* lines for centuries, and *qiaoxiang* ties are part and parcel of Beijing's presentday appeal to ethnic Chinese abroad. The papers by *Isabel Thireau* (*CNRS, Paris, Chinese University of Hong Kong; in collaborating with Mak Kong, not present at the colloquium*) and *Woon Yuen-*

*fong* (*University of Victoria, Canada*) on two widely divergent *qiaoxiang* in the Pearl River Delta, and the one by *Zhuang Guotu* (*Xiamen University, China*) on the big hometown Jinjiang in South Fujian offered a vast array of materials enabling a comparison of the patterns of international interaction that are developed nowadays. *Song Ping* (*Xiamen University, China*) offered another contrast by describing the transition, in the early 1990s, towards profit-oriented management of education in Jinjiang. *Dai Yifeng* (*Xiamen University, China*) pictured Xiamen city in the first half of this century as a thoroughfare town linking South China's trade and labour with Southeast Asia without being integrated otherwise with its Chinese hinterland. Here the theme of unequal regional development came to the fore, which makes one wonder once again at the pretension that one homogeneous Chinese culture and economy would exist.

It seems clear that this KNAW Colloquium was a fortunate start for the renewal of overseas Chinese studies in the Netherlands, within the broader framework of contemporary East Asia and China studies. A host of new questions has already been stirred up by the discussants that can unfortunately not be treated here: *Cyril Lin* (*University of Oxford*), *Ruth McVey*, *Sun Fusheng* (*University of Xiamen*), *Thee Kian Wie* (*Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Jakarta*), *Wang Yeu-farn* (*CPAS, Stockholm*), *Leonard Blussé*, *Ngo Tak-wing*, *Frank Pieke* and *Kurt Radtke* (*all Leiden University*); as by the other participants: *Ray Yep* (*University of Oxford*), *Faye Chan*, *Tineke Jansen* (*both University of Amsterdam*), *Li Minghuan*, *Sicco Visscher* and *Wu Xiao'an* (*all CASA*). The possibilities to follow up the themes treated at the colloquium are amply present now in Dutch academic life. The University of Amsterdam and the Center for Asian Studies Amsterdam (CASA) have abundantly sponsored the colloquium, and by their program of cooperation with Xiamen University in China have a solid basis for research in the area concerned. It is expected that the third research program of the IIAS, initiated last year, on *International Social Organization in East and Southeast Asia: Qiaoxiang Ties during the Twentieth Century*, will also offer major contribution to this field of study.

Leo Douw and Peter Post  
Amsterdam/Jakarta, August 1995

\*\*\*\*\*This report is reprinted from the *ILAS Newsletter*, no.6, pp.45-6. The editors are grateful to the authors, Professors Leo Douw and Peter Post and the International Institute for Asian Studies, Netherlands.



編案：

王教授在港期間，致力推動本地研究。一方面，在中大人類學系設立「香港文庫」(Hong Kong Collection)，收集與香港有關的人類學研究的文章。他並且嘗試建立香港新界的地區檔案。第一個也是唯一一個的地區檔案，就是與當時(1983-85)在港進行田野調查的，現日本東北大學教授瀨川昌久博士合作的「八鄉地區檔案」。在兩位教授的指導下，當時的中大人類學學生在八鄉地區的每一條村落進行調查。檔案內容包括了口述歷史，調查筆記，各村落的文獻如族譜等。王教授又致力港日研究的交流。其中之一是協助上智大學的白鳥芳郎教授領導下的「競渡文化圈」研究計劃香港部分的研究。此外，王教授與當時在中大社會學系任教的故華德英(B.E.Ward)教授是華南研究會的前身，「高流灣研究計劃」的顧問。「高流灣研究計劃」是中大人類學系成立伊始(1980)，一群主修和副修人類學的同學，在香港新界西北部的漁村高流灣，進行的長期的田野調查實習。王教授是華南研究會長期的良師益友。王教授遽登仙域，本會同寅深表哀慟。

讀者來函

關於華南研究資料中心《通訊》科大衛「從一封談起」，提及信中「又叫吉堂夫人，明年加多應堯一個蘇蝦仔，應全一個蘇蝦女，要來拜斗」一段，詢問讀者意見。

余以為這個「吉堂夫人」，可能是該信件家人中的一位寡婦，應堯、應全可能是家中已逝去的兩兄弟，那「一個蘇蝦仔、一個蘇蝦女」，是指每年家祭中用來祭祀的紙扎公仔。「要來拜斗」是「用以祭祀燒奠」的意思。

未知台端以為然否？方便時請順告科教授悉。

《通訊》辦得不錯，有空再談。祝

編安！

劉敏儀

27. 10. 95

《福建宗教碑銘匯編·興化府分冊》

現已出版

徵訂單

《福建宗教碑銘匯編：興化分冊》，由鄭振滿博士與Kenneth Dean博士合作編纂，福建人民出版社1995年初版，書號ISBN7-211-02529-8。

此書為大型資料叢刊《福建宗教碑銘匯編》的第一分冊，其餘各分冊即將陸續出版。本分冊共收錄唐至民國時期的寺廟碑銘442件，內容涉及儒、道、釋三教及三一教、摩尼教、龍華教、祖先崇拜、地方神崇拜等，並附有碑銘說明、寺廟索引及英文提要。

本分冊為精裝16開本，繁體字豎排，新式標點，彩色圖版16頁，內文570頁。每冊售價USD50.00，由福建人民出版社委托興化民俗文化研究中心專售，欲購者請直接與本中心聯系。收到購書款後，收據隨書寄出。

聯系人：廈門大學白城一號樓503室鄭愛華女士

Tel:592-2082995

Fax:592-2082995

華南研究會

South China Research Circle

華南研究會1996至97年度幹事會及編輯委員會已順利產生，名單如下：

幹事會

會長：廖迪生

副會長：蔡寶瓊、張展鴻

秘書：何傑堯、程美寶

財政：黃永豪

總務：盧淑櫻

出版委員會

主席：蔡志祥

委員：陳春聲、劉志偉、張兆和、廖迪生、馬木池

活動通告

教育與國家民族認同

Education & National Identity

主辦機構：香港中文大學教育行政與政策系  
香港教育研究所 合辦

日期：1996年6月1日

時間：上午9時至下午5時30分

地點：香港中文大學祖堯堂

講者：Prof. Edward Friedman (Dept. of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison)

張茂桂教授（中央研究院民族學研究所）

陸鴻基教授（加拿大約克大學歷史系）

聯絡人：香港中文大學教育行政與政策系

蔡寶瓊博士 Tel:2609-6931 Fax:2603-6129