

教/育/部/人/文/社/会/科/学/重/点/研/究/基/地/项/目

政治经济学博士点建设丛书



资源约束与 产业结构 演进

袁易明 等◎著

RESOURCES CONSTRAINT AND
EVOLUTING OF INDUSTRIAL
STRUCTURE



中国经济出版社

CHINA ECONOMIC PUBLISHING HOUSE

教/育/部/人/文/社/会/科/学/重/点/研/究/基/地/项/目

政治经济学博士点建设丛书

F121.3

6

2007

资源约束与 产业结构 演进

袁易明 等◎著

RESOURCES CONSTRAINT AND
EVOLUTING OF INDUSTRIAL



中国经济出版社

CHINA ECONOMIC PUBLISHING HOUSE

北京

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

资源约束与产业结构演进/袁易明等著.—北京: 中国经济出版社, 2007.2

ISBN 978-7-5017-7916-1

I. 资… II. 袁… III. 产业结构—研究—中国 IV. F121.3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2007)第 004868 号

出版发行: 中国经济出版社 (100037·北京市西城区百万庄北街 3 号)

网 址: www.economyph.com

责任编辑: 张淑玲 (电话: 13910084005)

E-mail: zsl8838@sina.com

责任印制: 石星岳

封面设计: 白长江

经 销: 各地新华书店

承 印: 北京人民文学印刷厂

开 本: 787mm×980mm 1/16 印 张: 32 字 数: 524 千字

版 次: 2007 年 3 月第 1 版 印 次: 2007 年 3 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-5017-7916-1/F·6918 定 价: 56.00 元

版权所有 盗版必究

举报电话: 68359418 68319282

总序：卷起千堆雪

——“丛书”总序

苏东斌

这一套“政治经济学博士点建设”系列丛书是深圳大学政治经济学学科组为了学科建设而创作的学术专著。它直接的目的是为了开阔博士研究生的文化视野。

对于中国今天的改革开放大业来讲，根本目的更在于为推进现代化建设提供理论支持。

在如何对待现代化的问题上，丛书在引证中强调：

其一，早在1874年，清末有识之士，曾经担任清廷驻外使节的郭嵩焘就提出了他的疑惑：“西洋立国，有本有末，其本在朝廷政教，其末在商贾。造船制器，相辅以益其强，又末中一节也……舍富强之本图，而怀欲速之心以责于海上，将造船制器，用其一旦之功，遂可转弱为强，其余皆可不问，恐无此理。”^①

而另一位薛福成在《出使四国日记》中在引证了新加坡、香港开辟商埠后经济繁荣的事实后，发表了一段十分精彩的议论：“夫商为中国四民之殿，而西人则恃商为创国造家、开物成务之命脉，迭著神奇之效者，何也？盖有商则士可行其学，而学益精；农可通其植，而植益胜；工可售其所作，而作益勤。是握四民之纲者，商也，此其理为从前四海之内所未知，六经之内所未讲。而外洋创此规模，实有可操之券，不能执中国崇本抑末之旧说以难之。……盖在太古民物未繁，原可闭关独治，老死不相往来；若居今日地球万国相通之世，虽圣人复生，岂能不以讲求商务为汲汲哉！”薛福成在这里为资本主义在中国鸣锣，要求让商人从“四民之殿”的地位上升到“握四民之纲”的地位，这确实是“从前四海之内所未知，六经之内所未讲”的新

^① 郭嵩焘：《条议海防事宜》，载《郭嵩焘奏稿》，长沙：岳麓书社1983年版，第341页。

道理。

他更深刻地论述：“今之议者，或惊骇他人之强盛而推之过当；或以堂堂中国何至效法西人，意在摈绝而贬之过严；余以为皆所见之不广也。”他说：西方的科学、文化、技术和经验，是人类文明的积累，“乃天地间公共之道，非西人所得而私也”。既然欧洲在历史上接受过东方文明的影响，“中国又何尝不可因之”？讳疾忌医和因噎废食都是不对的。他说：只要中国人善于学习、敢于竞争，“又安知数千年后，华人不因西人之学，再辟造化之灵机，俾西人色然而惊、墨然而企也”^①！

其二，1965年日本前首相吉田茂在他的《激荡百年史》中更加精辟地分析了科学技术与制度因素的深层关系。他指出：外国文明的输入很容易破坏本土社会、文化和精神上的统一。在德川末期，一些思想家们曾预想用“西方的艺术、东方的道德”或者是用“西方的学识、日本的精神”作为对付这种破坏的公式。

但是，这样的公式与实行近代化是相背离的。

为什么这么说呢？受倡导的文明原本是一个统一体，很难只单单采用它的科学文明技术。如果要采用西方先进的军舰和武器，就必须修建配合它的造船厂和兵工厂，为了进一步地使造船厂和兵工厂的机能得到有效的发挥，就必须让构成它基础的经济活动能够得到顺利的开展。

过去的儒教伦理将追求利润视为不道德的行为，这就产生了矛盾，因此，想要拥有军舰就必须影响到该国的文化。

然而，就算业已输入西方国家的科学文明技术，要吸纳其政治观点、思想方法等形成其文明基础的东西，仍然不是一件简单的事情。就是这样一些所谓的价值体系，如果没有经过漫长的历史过程，用自己的力量努力地创造它，那么，努力改革的东西就不能够成为人们一种真实的道德基础。

因此，在一种不得已的情况下，采用外国文明的国家便会面临一种困境，这种困境是深刻且令人进退维谷的。

在那个时代，有个学者曾经说：“孔孟的道德已经衰落了，西方的理论还未进入，这就像太阳已经落山，而月亮犹未升起时的情况。”

在第二次世界大战后驻军日本的占领军，在历史上也是罕见的占领军。美军不仅占据着胜利者的地位，而且还以改革者的身份推进日本的“非军事化”改革。

^① 钟叔河：《中国本身拥有力量》，江苏教育出版社2005年版，第162~163页。

美国将“二战”爆发的原因归结为日本和德国的军国主义，因此他们认为，只有对日本进行改革，瓦解日本军国主义存在的社会结构，削弱日本的军事能力，才能构建世界和平。抱着这样的目的，他们在进驻日本之前就制定了详细的措施，当军队进驻日本后，就开始按照计划在日本推进非军事化和民主化。

美国的占领军在1945年8月末驻军日本后，就开始实施了以下的措施：在非军事化方面，首先在9月11日逮捕了东条英机等数名主要战犯，接下来解除了日本军队的武装，废除了日本的军事机构，一些国家主义的团体也被解散（1946年1月）；在民主化方面，进一步整肃了一些不受欢迎的公职人员，思想警察和政治警察也被废除了（1945年10月），赋予妇女参政权（1945年12月），组织工会（1945年12月）；等等。

在战后一两年之内占领军又采取了土地改革、教育改革、解散财阀和制定宪法等措施。这些巨大的变化简直可以称为“不流血的革命”^①。

这两段话表达了制度是何等重要！

但是，制度经济学一再提醒人们：不仅制度规则是由人来制定的，而制度执行更要依赖于人来完成。而作为经济人，又都是在追求实现自身利益最大化的。所以，任何意义上的人性假定，都离不开具体人的具体行为。

而在浸透着儒家礼仪和缺乏公民意识的国度里，是一个长期“以父家长为中心的家族制和宗法组织”的国家，用王亚南先生的话说，这种情况“在专制——官僚的政体实现以后更加强化了，但在这以前，却显然存在着这样一个可供官僚政治利用的传统。国与家是相通的，君权与父权是相互为用的”^②。“家不可一日无主，国不可一日无君”，在人们的意识深处两者是相提并论的。遵循这样的传统，国人对家庭的忠诚很自然地就转化为对国家的认同。“在家庭生活中灌输的孝道和顺从，是培养一个人以后忠于统治者并顺从国家现政权的训练基地。”^③“皇权主义最深厚的根基，正是这种家长制。”^④

在这种环境下，国家一旦放弃了对人权的尊重和对产权的保护，大众也就自己丧失了自主意识。于是从上层的人治社会到下层的无法无天，便使制度因素更加虚拟化。

于是，我们评价历史，也就不能仅仅依据个人的主观动机，甚至也不能仅仅依据他的动机所实现的程度，而只能依据大众的基本实践结果。对于所

① [日] 吉田茂：《激荡百年史》，陕西师范大学出版社2005年版。

② 王亚南：《中国官僚政治研究》，中国社会科学出版社1981年版，第41页。

③ [美] 费正清：《美国与中国》，世界知识出版社1999年版，第22页。

④ 王亚南：《中国官僚政治研究》，中国社会科学出版社1981年版，第130页。

谓的“好人好事”是如此，对于所谓的“坏人坏事”亦是如此。

正如前苏联的改革，对政治人物来讲，是失败了，因为作为改革的领袖戈尔巴乔夫几乎丧失了一切特权（无论别人如何分析，也无论戈尔巴乔夫本人如何解释，这一后果决不是他本人所希望出现的）；而对政治事件来讲，却有另外的结果。因为它开启了前苏联从计划经济向市场经济，从集权政治向民主政治，从一元帝国向多元联合的全面转型的新时代。若按着马克思主义经典作家的核心价值观念——自由来判断，“无论如何，俄罗斯人民要比在苏联时代获得的自由要多得多”（普京语）。而“这个结论恰恰仅仅来自于社会实践，来自于人民的选择”（著名的马克思主义者俄罗斯经济学家阿巴尔金教授语）。这就是今天的俄罗斯。

也只能在这个意义上，人们才常说：作品的主题远远大于作家的思想。于是，如果我们再追问，人和制度到底是一种什么关系？答案便一目了然了，那就是，制度绝对是人制造的，而人又绝对不能随心所欲。

当我们赞同任何动物、生物乃至物品的本质都是预先被设计好了的，而人却只能通过自我选择来创造自己的本质；当我们确信人生不是别的，乃是自我设计和自我实现的过程，放弃了选择，也就是放弃了自由；当我们承认“上帝死了”的时候，自己才有了称得上“人”的尊严感。可以说，作为哲学家、思想家的萨特，至今还在影响着我們。

当年，马克思主义者的佩里·安德森在研究哈耶克和弗里德曼的学说时，特别着重“历史可能性”时刻。因为在人的行为面前，他能够得出这样的结论：无论多么神圣或者多么为人所熟知的体制，都不是原则上不可触动的：“制度的格局比人们认为的要更柔弱和可塑”。这不禁叫人记起波普尔的反历史决定论的坚定主张。因为他的全部出发点都是历史、是人创造的，社会的发展不会如同物理学那样，存在一种任何时间、任何地点，既没有时代制约，又没有国情限制的一般规律性。

当然，人也决不会永远专横而自负下去。因为正如哈耶克所说：“人们享有公民自由的资格与他们对自己的禀性施以道德约束的愿望成正比，与他们把热爱正义置于个人贪婪之上成正比。”^①这也就是：大江东去，浪淘尽，千古风流人物。……卷起千堆雪。

2006年6月

① 哈耶克：《致命的自负》第二章开头引语，中国社会科学出版社2000年版。

Preface

Turbulent Decades

Su Dongbin

"The Most Recent Research For Building PhD Base In Political Economy", the monograph series, were written for the discipline building by the group members of the political economy section, Shenzhen University. The direct objective is to broaden the cultural vision of PhD candidate students.

However, the ultimate objective is to provide theoretical support for China's modernization, which is a great enterprise for today's China.

As regards modernization, the series stress:

Firstly, as early as 1874, Guo Songtao, a very insightful diplomat in the Qing Dynasty, puts forward his doubts: "the western nations are powerful because they differentiate between essential issues and nonessential issues. Essential issues include political institutions; nonessential issues include business. Business and political institutions reinforce each other. If we disregard essential issues, focus our efforts on nonessential issues like building ships, and expect that we can become powerful this way. This viewpoint is utterly wrong."

After citing the facts of prosperity from the experiences of Singapore, Hong Kong after opening, Xue Fucheng makes an excellent comment in his book "Travel Notes on the Journey to the Four Countries": "the business people have the lowest status in China's society. The West nations think that business people play a vital role in both the state's affairs and family's business. Then magic happens. Why? The reasons are those: with business people, academics can apply their knowledge, thus knowledge can be improved. Peasants can sell produce to business people, thus crop can be increased. Workers can sell manufactures to business people, thus more manufactures can be produced. Business actually is a medium connecting all walks of life. However, the importance of business is not

well recognized in China. It is not mentioned in Chinese classic works either. The reasons the West nations are so developed are operational skills. Those reasons cannot be explained by old Chinese doctrines... The doors of the nation states could close in ancient times. People did not have any needs to interact. Nowadays people in different countries have very close connections, even with the Saints we could not make our country advanced without business! ” Xue encouraged developing capitalism in China. He hoped that the status of business people could be increased from the lowest to the one connecting all walks of life. Of course the statement had never been known in China, and never mentioned in Chinese classic works.

“There are basically two points of view about the West; some think that the West is too powerful that we cannot catch up with them; others think that we Chinese people are so great that we should not emulate the West. I consider these two points narrow minded,” Xue said. Xue also said, science , culture, technology, and experience in the West were the accumulations of the human civilization, “they belong to all the world rather than only the West. ”It is not the right choice we don’t admit the facts or dare not to solve our own problems. Xue said, as long as Chinese people were good at learning, rose to the challenge, “in thousands of years China is likely to shock the West and makes the West jealous! ”^①

Secondly, Yoshida Shigeru, the former prime minister of Japan analyzes the deep relationship between science and institutional factors in the book "Kaiso Junen (Turbulent Decade), translated into English as The Yoshida Memoirs: The Story of Japan in Crisis." He points out that, the import of foreign civilizations is likely to break harmonious relations among society, culture, and spirits in the homeland. In the late years of Edo period, a few Japanese thinkers proposed the formula, “the western art, the East morals” or “the western knowledge, the Japanese spirits”, to counteract the western influence.

However, such formula deviates from the track of modernization.

Why? Because the proposed civilization is a whole, and it is impossible just to adopt its advanced science and technology. If the advanced western war-

① Zhong Shuhe: *China Itself Has the Power*. Jiangshu Education Press, 2005. Page 162-163.

ships and arms are used, then the warship factories and the arms factories have to be built to support the adoption. Further more, the basic economic activities constituting the operational base have to be developed in order for the factories to run smoothly.

The Confucian doctrines regard the pursuit of profits as immoral, then contradiction occurs: having warships affects the culture of the importing country.

However, even with the importing of the western science and technology it is still difficult to assimilate the West's political perspectives, the ways of thinking, which are the foundations of the western civilizations. These so-called value systems can only be built with our own great efforts in the long process. Otherwise they cannot become the peoples' real moral base.

Therefore under the unavoidable circumstances the country adopting the imported civilization is stuck in a dilemma. This situation is really difficult and confining.

"The Confucian ethics has been in decay, the western theories have not come in. The situation is like the sun setting but the moon has not risen," a scholar of that time once said.

In the meantime the American occupation forces were promoting non-military and democratic reforms in Japan. The Japanese people not only cared about their daily lives, they were conceiving of the direction Japan would go as well. The occupation forces began to instruct the Japanese government to implement complete reform. But what would the result be?

The occupation forces in Japan after the World War II were rarely seen in history: the U.S. forces were not the winner of the war, they were promoting "non-military" reform in the name of the reformer.

The U.S. attributed the burst of the World War II to the German and Japanese militarism. They argued that, only by carrying out the reform in Japan, destroying the social structure of the Japanese militarism, and weakening the Japanese military power, could the world peace be built. With such an aim the U.S. forces had made a very detailed plan before they stationed in Japan. After stationing they immediately carried out non-military and democratic reform as scheduled.

The U.S. forces implemented the following measures after stationing at the

end of Aug., 1945: on the non-military front, the main war criminals including Hideki Tojo were arrested, then the Japanese arm forces were disbanded, and the Japanese military institutions were abolished. So were the other national organizations (Jan., 1946). On the democratic reform front, some unwelcome public servants were laid off. The ideology police and political police were also dismissed in Oct., 1945. Women were allowed to participate in politics in Dec., 1945, labor unions were organized in Dec., 1945, and so forth.

Within a couple of years the occupation forces implemented the land reform, education reform, abolishing zaibatsu, drafting the constitution, and so forth. Such huge changes can be called "the bloodless revolution."^①

The aforesaid paragraphs simply demonstrate how important the institutions are!

However, the institutional economics keeps reminding us that: not only are the institutional rules made by people, the implementation of the rules depends on the people even more. As an economic man he pursues the maximization of his own welfare. Therefore any human assumptions cannot be separated from the specific actions of a specific person.

China is such a country, where "the patriarch and the clan system have dominated for quite long." The Confucian rituals have pervaded, and there has been no sense of the citizenship. In the words of Wang Yanan, this situation "had been reinforced since despotism – the bureaucratic regime was in place. But before that the system, which could be used by the bureaucratic politics, had existed. The nation state and the family were interconnected. The rights of a king and the rights of a father could be used interchangeably."^② "The family must have the master everyday, the nation state must have its king everyday." Obviously in the deep of the Chinese peoples' minds the two are mentioned together. Observing such traditions, the Chinese people turn their loyalty to the family into the identification with the country. "The family, where the fealty and obedience are in-

^① Yoshida Shigeru: *The Yoshida Memoirs: The Story of Japan in Crisis*. Chinese version translated Li Du, Shanxi Normal University, 2005.

^② Wang Yanan: *The Study on Chinese Bureaucratic Politics*, The China Social Sciences Press. 1981. p.41.

doctrinated, is actually a training base for obeying the ruler and the regime. ”^①
“The patriarch system is the most solid foundation for despotism.”^②

Under such circumstances once the nation state gives up the protection for human rights and properties, then the people lose their own consciousness. The chaotic society, from the rein by the powerful at the top to the unruliness at the bottom, occurs exactly because of the institutional factors.

When making comments on history, we should come to the conclusions based on the practical results of the masses rather than the motives of the individuals or the degrees to which their motives are finalized. This criteria applies to both “the so-called good guys and good things” and “the so-called bad guys and bad things.”

Just like the reform in the former Soviet Union, it was a failure for political figures, because Mikhail Gorbachev, the leader of the reform, lost almost all his privileges. (However others analyzed this incident, and whatever reasons Gorbachev himself gave, the result was definitely not what he had anticipated.) However, for political development, it yielded something else, because it ushered in the new times, the transformation from the planned economy to the market economy, from despotism to democracy, from unilateral dominance to multi-lateral union. If freedom, the core concept of the classic Marxist writers, is adopted to judge the event, “from whatever perspectives, the Russian people enjoy much more freedom than they did in the Soviet times.” (quoted from Putin, the Russia president) This judgment “exactly comes from the social practice, and the people’s selection” (quoted from Абалкин, Л.И., the Russian renowned Marxist and economist). That is today’s Russia.

Only in this sense do people say that, the themes of the works are much more meaningful the writers’ ideas. But if we pursue further: what sort of relationship is this between the individuals and the institutions? The answer is quite obvious now: **the institutions are built by the people, but the people cannot do at will.**

① John King Fairbank: The United States and China. Chinese version translated by Zhang Lijing, The World Knowledge Press, 1999, p.42.

② Wang Yanan: The Study on Chinese Bureaucratic Politics, The China Social Sciences Press. 1981. p.130.

When we agree that, all animals, plants, and even physical materials are predetermined, but human beings can only form their own nature by self-selection; when we believe that, human lives are nothing else but the process of self-designing and self-realization, then we will believe that giving up selection equates giving up freedom; when we admit that “the God is dead,” then we will have a sense of dignity as “human beings.” We can say for sure that, Jean-Paul Sartre is influencing us even today.

When studying the doctrines of Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, Perry Anderson, the U.S. Marxist, stressed the importance of “the historic possibility.” That is because, he argued, he could come to the conclusion in the face of the individuals’ actions; however sacred or however familiar the institutions were, they were not untouchable in principle. “The institutions are more fragile, and more flexible than people expect them.” This argument reminds us the anti-historic determinated theory, the assertion made by Karl Popper. All the starting points of Popper’s theories are those: history is made by human beings; unlike physics, social development doesn’t have universal governing laws, free of the limitation of time, place, and the characteristics of a particular nation state.

Of course, it is unlikely that people have been so arrogant and conceited forever. As John Locke says: “the qualifications of freedom that people have as citizens are proportionate with the desires that they have to constrain their natures with moral bindings, and they are also proportionate with how they place justice over greed.”^① A poem written by Su Shi, a Chinese poet in the Song Dynasty can sum this up: with the passage of time many heroic figures have faded into the historic dust... however they caused huge changes.

June, 2006

① Friedrich Hayek: *The Fatal Conceit*. Introductory words in Chapter 2, Chinese version published by The China Social Sciences Press, 2000.

自序：寻找产业结构演进背后的原因

袁易明

300多年前的1691年，著名的古典经济学家威廉·配第就对产业发展进行了极具开拓性的研究，经过以英国为对象的仔细分析，威廉·配第得出了一个奠基性的结论：即，在经济发展的进程中，由于工业利润往往比农业的利润要多得多，而商业的利润又较工业的利润多得多，产业发展必然会出现从农业到工业，然后又从工业到商业的演进。进而，威廉·配第进一步得出，随着经济的不断发展，产业中心将逐渐由有形财物的生产转向无形的服务性生产的一般性结论。在配第的研究之后，产业发展及其演进规律在经济学家们的视野里开始变得越来越重要起来。其中，对于产业结构的分类及其界定、探索推进产业结构演进的理论原因，成为直到19世纪这一相当长时期里产业理论研究的重点。19世纪之后，特别是20世纪以来，经济学家们的研究视角发生了重大的改变，主要在于两个方面：其一，研究的出发点和目的不同。古典经济学家从现象切入，得出基于经验研究的一般性结论，注重从经验研究中揭示产业发展的内在规律，其兴趣与魅力在于对内在一一般性规律的发现。20世纪以来的现代产业理论的着眼点则是研究规律和应用规律推动产业结构的升级，以提升自身竞争力，发展中国家和后起发达国家更是对通过产业的演替升级实现其后发优势大感兴趣。

另外一个显著的不同是，古典经济学以生产供给（厂商利润视角）和需求的结合来研究产业演替的原因，而现代产业理论则主要以供给作为产业发展的研究视角，转制国家则从产业政策在产业结构演替中的地位和作用进行研究。显然，古典经济学注重产业发展的理论发现，而现代理论则更倾向于寻找产业演进的推进力，富于功利色彩。

虽然古典经济学已经奠定了产业结构演进规律的理论基础，但直到20世纪30年代，一个完备而系统的产业发展研究方法并没有建立起来，因为，

对于产业的结构层次划分标准及其具体的界定尚未完成。20世纪30年代英国经济学家费希尔(A.G.D.Fisher)的成果终结了产业结构的研究困境。费希尔不仅提出了第一、第二和第三产业的清晰概念,还对各自的外延进行了开创性的界定,不仅如此,经过对世界经济历史的研究,费希尔还提出了关于产业层次的理论,他将人类生产活动分为初级生产阶段、工业发展阶段和服务业发展阶段。初级阶段的产业主体是农业和畜牧业;第二阶段是工业发展阶段,以工业的规模化发展作为标志,纺织、钢铁和其他制造业大量吸引生产要素,生产规模的迅速扩张;在第二阶段基础上出现服务业的发展,以商业、旅游、娱乐、文化艺术、保健、教育科学、政府等各种公共服务行业的迅速发展为标志。服务业成为吸引经济活动要素的新领域。

费希尔创造性的产业分类法为产业结构理论的发展奠定了基础。20世纪40年代,英国经济学家克拉克深入地研究了经济发展水平与产业结构变动之间的内在关系,以劳动力作为测量指标,揭示不同发展水平产业就业人口在第一、第二和第三次产业间的变动规律,使经济发展与产业结构演进的关系研究得到极大的发展,由此创立了著名的配第—克拉克定理。

威廉·配第的奠基性结论、克拉克对产业结构变动规律的总结和费希尔的产业结构分类贡献,为经济学家们探索产业结构的成因提供了关键性的前提与研究基础,寻找结构演进的本质原因及其理论解释显然才是经济学家们的最终使命,而这又使得产业结构理论在经验研究的层次上向前迈进。

当威廉·配第的产业发展理论诞生后,我们似乎可以认为,配第将产业结构由农业到工业,再到商业的原因归结于利润因素,即不同发展阶段产业利润水平的变化,产业间相对利润的出现引起产业的此消彼长,后来的产业经济学家们几乎可从中看到产业利润和产业结构演进间的因果关系。

克拉克在得出产业结构与经济发展水平之间的关系之后,对为什么出现产业结构的变动做了研究,克拉克的结论是,需求和效率是推动产业发展的两大因素,克拉克的解释是,随着人均收入的增加,对农产品的相对需求一直在下降,对于制造业而言,随着人均收入增加,相对需求出现先上升然后下降时,对服务业的相对需求则开始上升。^①克拉克将随收入增加出现的对 product 需求的变化趋势与产业间的效率差异结合起来,寻找产业结构变化的内

^① 杨公朴、干春晖主编:《产业经济学》,复旦大学出版社,2005年6月,第306页。

在原因。在克拉克看来，由于制造业的人时实际产品差不多总是同一经济中其他部门的人时实际产品以更大速度增长，因此，制造品的一个相对静止的相对需求将会导致该部门就业劳动力比例的下降，甚至当制造品相对需求增加时，我们仍然可以一般地预期，在长期，该部门的就业劳动力比例是下降的。^①这里克拉克以行业的需求和该行业效率的相对变化速度作为判断产业结构变动的基本依据，即当需求的增长高于效率的增长时，产业处于扩张状态，相反，则产业处于下降时期。在克拉克看来，从过去的整个发展历史来看，农业部门的劳动效率呈不断上升的趋势（原始社会除外），但是与制造业比较，农业部门的劳动力效率显然要低，而市场对农产品的相对需求却是随着收入水平的提升而下降的，上升的劳动力效率和下降的产品相对需求，使得农业产业在经济结构中的比重下降。不言而喻，在工业化的时期相对于不断上升的工业劳动力效率，有增长得更快的对工业产品的相对需求。需求与效率给出了一个符合历史发展进程的解释。

当代社会，一个经济体的产业结构演变的情形较半个世纪前要复杂得多，更难与 300 多年前威廉·配第的时代相比。有两个因素在产业结构的演进中起着不可忽视的作用——经济开放与资源约束。经济开放使一国内的区域之间和国际间的生产力分工高度深化，生产过程的跨地域布局使得一地的产业结构可能不决定于国内市场的相对需求与生产效率的相对变化（比如一个高度外向的经济体就是如此），而决定于国际市场的需求变动与生产地的资源优势，这是为何在处于收入水平相近的转型国家里的两个城市，其产业结构却是大相径庭的原因。

另一个重要的因素是资源约束，如果考察一个国度里的两个城市经济体，它们面临着对某一特定（如工业）产品相同的相对需求，也完全合理地假定它们的生产效率相近，满足此条件下的这两个城市的产业结构可能明显不同。

对于一个需要研究的经济体来说，在其发展过程中，资源的供求关系必定会发生变化，如果已经找出资源约束与产业结构间关系的规律，那么研究这个在某一发展阶段的经济体的产业结构就变得容易。但至今，关于开放和要素约束两因素与产业结构变动间的关系依然需要探索，这正是本书的兴趣

^① 金元满：三次产业结构发展演变的规律与趋势及其对文化发展的意义，2006 年 1 月 19 日，<http://www.culindustries.com/news/displaynews1.asp>。

与出发点。

几年前，我组织了一个近 20 人的团队，以深圳为对象进行产业发展与结构演进的研究，基本意图在于通过一个特定经济体的产业演进过程的客观分析，揭示在开放条件下，转制经济体产业结构的演变规律，力图通过产业结构演进轨迹的分析，探索引起结构变动的主要原因，特别是资源约束与产业结构的关系和政府的选择与作用。

以深圳作为研究对象，主要源于以下理由：第一，在过去的 25 年里，由农业社会到工业社会，再到服务经济的快速发展。这个过程均是在经济转型时期进行的，研究产业发展具有相当一致的制度状态；第二，在快速结构演进过程中，资源的供求关系出现了明显改变，土地由充裕供给到严重短缺，劳动力的稀缺出现，而资本和技术要素的供给能力却大为增强，产业结构的变迁是伴随要素供求条件的变化而进行的；第三，产业结构的演变不仅在于一、二、三次产业间的变动，还在于各次产业内部，尤其是工业内部的结构演变；第四，由于在整个发展过程中，产业结构的演变均是在一个全开放的条件下进行的，期间发生了产业分工合作方式的改变、产业组织的发展和产业发展模式的变化，这为多视角研究产业结构演进提供了可能。

我带领的研究组生产了本书的部分内容，其后，围绕产业结构演进又连续地主持了几个课题的研究，我的研究组里拥有思想相当活跃的青年学者或是研究生。在研究过程中我的基本要求是客观地分析现实，着力去探索、去揭示客观现象间的内在联系，让智慧的读者在这现实分析上得出自己的结论，希望我们的研究努力距所确定的目标又近了一步。

2006 年 12 月 17 日夜