# 海外華族研究論集

## 第一卷

## 移民、華商與經貿

# *Essays on Ethnic Chinese Abroad*

## *Vol.1*

## *Migration, Entrepreneurs and Commerce*

# 前　　言

　　本集所收文章，均爲世界海外華人研究學會（The International Society for the Studies of Chinese Overseas-ISSCO）第四屆世界海外華人國際學術研討會（The 4th International Chinese Overseas Conference）中宣讀過的論文。該研討會是 ISSCO 與代表中央研究院的中山人文社會科學研究所共同於 2001 年 4 月 26 日至 28 日在台北南港該院舉辦的。

　　由於全球經濟繁榮，美澳歐各國容接中國移民，而中國大陸於 1970 年代末改革開放，允許人民出國外移，使得海外華族人數量大增，在經濟、社會方面之力量也提陞，於是研究海華的學術界人士覺得應該策進、聯繫海外華人的研究。風勢所趨，有志一同。中國大陸成立了中國華僑歷史學會，台灣有中華民國海外華人研究學會的設立，而美國加州大學柏克萊校區在民族學系教授王靈智（L. Ling-chi Wang）努力下，於 1992 年 11 月召開了中國海外移民史研究空前的國際盛會，出席者有全世界知名的海華研究學者、組織領導人、重要的海華領袖。其主題是「落地生根：海外華人的法律、政治及經濟現狀」。在這一基礎上，世華學會（ISSCO）於 1993 年 8 月在香港組成，其臨時負責人至 1995 年 1 月經會員會議正式選出。會長爲名海華史學家，時任香港大學校長王賡武（Wang Gungwu），副會長爲菲律賓華裔青年聯合會會長洪玉華（Teresita Ang See），秘書兼司庫爲王靈智教授，並分別先在東北亞、東南亞、澳洲、北美、拉美、歐洲等地各聘 Professor Shiba Yoshinobu（斯波義信）、Teresita Ang See（洪玉華）、Professor Yen Ching-hwang（顏淸湟）、Professor L. Ling-chi Wang（王靈智）、Professor Ramon Mon、Professor Emmanuel Ma Mung 等爲聯絡員，台灣、香港、大陸爲特別區（Special Area），也各聘張存武教授、Professor Elizabeth Sinn（冼玉儀）以及莊國土教授爲聯絡員。限於經費，學會在初期只從事舉辦學術研討會議，每三年一次國際大會，1995 年由香港大學召開，1998 年由馬尼拉華裔青年聯合會及 Eteneo 大學合辦，2000 年澳洲有關方面本欲配合奧林匹克世運會舉辦，台灣聯絡人以爲台灣的海華研究亟待促進，且世紀之交、千年分際的會議意義非常，蒙王賡武會長之協調及中央研究院院長李遠哲之協助，乃得在該院召開，惟因故延至 2001 年。

　　國際海華研究會的視野關注全球。二十世紀下半葉海外華族處境最大的變動是由於中國教育、經濟的振興，自由世界經濟的繁榮，美、加、澳、紐排拒華人移民的白色長城（White Great Wall）之撤廢，接納中國移民的東南亞關起了大門，一向對外移民的歐洲轉爲接納包括華人在內的外國移民，以致中國海外移民人數大量增加，素質提高，經濟實力膨脹。ISSCO 以往所開數次國際學術研討會均訂一研討主題（theme）。考慮到台灣的海華研究還不夠強，如再將研究範圍限制在某一範疇，則與會提論文者將更少，而且我們也期盼研究各種問題的學者前來，以增加中外交流的幅度。這個目的是達到了，與會學者所提論文可說都在上述大變動幅度內立論發揮。例如 1980 年以來中國大陸官方將大量外移人口名之曰新移民，成爲熱門研究問題，而台灣從事者絕少，此次會議中不獨有史事及理論的討論，透過王賡武教授的主題演講（keynote speech）我們更瞭解目前「新移民」研究存在的缺失。海華出

版的報刊，是重要的研究資料，而以往的討論均專注於漢文報刊。事實上，如菲律賓、印尼等處華僑華人也出版非漢文報刊，此種刊物也代表他們的事業發展及言論立場，同樣值得注意，本次會議我們就照顧到了這一點。而對有關刊物史的系統整理，言論的演變，諸文均有重要的參考價值，對民進黨刊物的報導研究，對台灣而言更具時代意義。台灣婦女地位的上陞，社會責任負擔的加重，及對婦女研究的日受重視，使我們想到，也達致有關海華婦女在論文中佔有適當比重。總之，有關華僑華人的定義、認同、政府政策、文化教育、經貿發展、對移出移入地區的貢獻，及北美、澳紐、歐洲、日本、東南亞等地區海華的分論比較，多有可觀。如海華定義及認同趨向的持續與轉變、台海兩岸之海華政策、各地華文教育的適應變化、歐美國家政情對新移民形成的影響等，均予人時新感覺。以地區論，加拿大、日本、歐洲方面的論文令人察覺到研究風氣之進展，這也是移民數量增加的反應。不完全站在中國立場，照顧海華的利益，自屬與時俱進的新思維。

第四屆世界海外華人國際學術研討會之得以在中央研究院召開，王賡武會長之協調屬分內事，應感謝者為遠從海外前來的外國學者、海峽對岸的同好、中央研究院李遠哲院長、時任副院長楊國樞，及近代史研究所研究員暨院長特別助理謝國興、中山人文社會科學研究所所長梁其姿與該所全體工作人員、近史所、民族所、東南亞區域研究計畫、東北亞區域研究計畫，以及湯熙勇及黃詩婷。在經費無著，論文無由出版之際，成立於抗戰時期陪都重慶的華僑協會總會及時贊助，並組成論文集編輯委員會，研商編輯方針及出版事宜，由李志賢任編輯助理。我們感謝梅培德理事長、常務理事兼會務發展委員會召集委員陳三井教授。本年六月適逢該會六十壽辰，我們謹以此論文集之出版為壽，並表感激之忱。


張 存 武
湯 熙 勇 　謹識
民國九十一年四月廿五日

# 第 一 卷 ： 移 民 、 華 商 與 經 貿

# 目 錄

# 三、 華商與經貿

# 釋　義　與　研　究

# Chinese Overseas as a Minority in Majority Settings[*]

## Peter S. Li[*]

Two logical approaches may be adopted to study the Chinese overseas, or global settlement of ethnic Chinese outside of China. The first one is to examine the cultural origin of Chinese migrants, in terms of such common features as linguistic pattern, lineal descent, and home locality, as keys to understanding how networks are cultivated and how diasporic communities are maintained. The second approach is to focus on the structure and nature of the destination countries to see how changing local conditions, especially those pertaining to economics and politics, shape the way Chinese communities evolve and differ. There are compelling reasons for both approaches.

Historically Chinese migrants venturing outside of China had a tendency to follow the footpaths of their predecessors from the same home locality, and migrate overseas to enter into similar lines of work others before them had started.[1] This is the same logic that other international migrants have adopted in chain migration (see for example, MacDonald and MacDonald, 1964). Thus, kinship-based migration explained why 80 per cent of the Chinese in four provinces of the Philippines in the 19th century came from four counties in Fujian (Wickberg, 1965: 172), and why early Chinese settlements in Malaya were clearly marked by distinguishable speech groups of Hookien, Hakka, Cantonese, Teochiu and Hainanese (Heng, 1998: 173). Given the history of kinship-based migration, cultural heritage, in terms of home dialect, common surname, kinship network, and religious practice, provides a useful basis for understanding the features of early Chinese settlements, especially in Southeast Asia (see e.g. Coughlin, 1960; Freedman, 1958; Willmott, 1960; Yen, 1986).

Two features make the exclusive focus on cultural origin incomplete. First, Chinese diasporic communities evolve and change, interacting with the local population and the economy and politics of the adopted countries. Over time, the influence of primordial culture, albeit still relevant in many aspects of life, increasingly plays a minor role in shaping the structure and direction of Chinese settlements. The case of *Peranakans* (Suryadinata, 1981, 1986, 1997) in Indonesia is a good example of how second and subsequent generations of Chinese migrants adopted the Malay language and many aspects of the local lifestyle, and yet developed a niche in Indonesian society distinctively different from the *totoks*, or first generation Chinese immigrants, and from the indigenous population. It is more than a case of assimilation, as Chinese immigrants developed a community within the constraints of the receiving society and at the same time, taking advantage of the local opportunities.

Second, Chinese emigration in the 18th and 19th century are different from that of more recent times. While the former process tends to be rather homogeneous in terms of migrants' origin, the latter pattern becomes more diverse in home locality, language, occupation, education, and cultural milieu. Thus, common cultural heritage becomes a much weaker feature in being able to explain the diversity and differences of more contemporary Chinese international migrants, whose opportunities of international immigration are often determined more by the changing conditions of the receiving countries than the cultural linkages new migrants are able to maintain with their overseas counterparts.

These two factors, adaptations of Chinese settlements to the local conditions as well as the changing complexity of contemporary Chinese migrants, suggest that the rigid insistence on cultural origin as a key factor in explaining the development of Chinese diasporic communities is unwarranted. They further suggest that a typology of Chinese settlements in the Diaspora has to take into account local features and evolving conditions of receiving societies in understanding how Chinese diasporic communities change and differ.

## The Chinese Diaspora

Despite a long history of the Chinese diaspora that dates back to the 16th century and even earlier, when China expanded its trade relations in Southeast Asia (Reid, 1998: 51; FitzGerald, 1972; Wang, 1991: 3-21), the migration of Chinese to different parts of the world took place under specific historical and social contexts. Whereas Chinese emigration to Southeast Asia was originally prompted by China's imperial aggrandizement and its people's unofficial trade relations with regions outside of China (Reid, 1998; FitzGerald, 1972), the migration of Chinese to North American, Australia and European countries in the latter half of the 19th century and early 20th century was largely triggered by industrialization of the West and the subsequent demand for Oriental labourers during times of labour shortage (Benton and Pieke, 1998; Li, 1998; Pan, 1998). Thus, the different history of Chinese settlements, the subsequent local policies towards the Chinese and economic opportunities available to them are important considerations for understanding the variations within what may be called "the Chinese diaspora".

The term "Chinese diaspora" has been used metaphorically to refer to the dispersion of Chinese around the world outside of China --- a process that began in the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) with the movement of Chinese merchants, continued in the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) with the emigration of Chinese labourers and workers in the coastal provinces of Guangdong and Fujian, and expanded in the 20th century in the form of global migration of Chinese of diverse cultural and occupational backgrounds from Hong Kong, Taiwan, mainland China and other countries to different parts of the world.

The Chinese diaspora does not have a political or national boundary, and its Chinese membership can only be loosely defined based on a lax interpretation of descent, origin, or other imprecise cultural features. However, the Chinese diaspora is intricately connected to China,

from where ancestral roots and cultural heritage are linked or claimed. Politically too, China as a nation has historically presumed its jurisdiction over all Chinese outside of China proper, based on a loose interpretation of Chinese descent. From this standpoint, the plight of overseas Chinese was linked to the idea of protecting Chinese subjects abroad. This mentality explains why the term *huaqiao*, which means Chinese nationals sojourning overseas (Zhuang, 1989), was used in Chinese diplomatic documents after the Opium War (1839-42), and later widely adopted in the Chinese language to refer to all Chinese outside of China, with the implicit assumption that overseas Chinese would eventually return to their China homeland. By 1911, the term *huaqiao* had become an all-encompassing term for all Chinese overseas (Wang, 1981: 125). The term *huaqiao* is typically translated as "overseas Chinese", that is, people who migrated from China as sojourners to foreign countries with the desire to return home eventually (Purcell, 1965: 30; Siu, 1953). Some scholars now advocate using a more neutral term "Chinese overseas" to refer to ethnic Chinese outside China, in recognition of the fact that many Chinese immigrants and their descendants have acquired the citizenship of the adopted country where they also settle permanently (see Wang, 1991).[2] Putting aside the question of whether the Chinese sojourned or permanently settled in their adopted countries, the Chinese diaspora may be simply referred to as the global settlement of ethnic Chinese outside of China.

If the Chinese diaspora is conceptualized to include those ethnic Chinese outside of Mainland China and Taiwan, then based on a loose interpretation of descent or ethnic origin, the Chinese diaspora is estimated to cover roughly 33.3 million ethnic Chinese in 151 countries in 1998 (Table 1). Earlier, Poston and Yu (1990, 1992) calculated the world's overseas Chinese population to be around 26 million people in 1980, when Hong Kong is excluded from the calculation.[3] If these rough estimates can be legitimately compared over time, then the population of the Chinese diaspora would have sustained an average annual growth rate of about 2.4 per cent between 1980 and 1998.

**Table 1**
**Estimates of Chinese Diaspora Population By Region, 1998**

| Region | Number of Country | Number of Chinese | Chinese As Per Cent of Global Chinese Dispora Population |
|---|---|---|---|
| Europe | 25 | 945,171 | 2.8 |
| North America | 2 | 3,859,000 | 11.6 |
| South America | 14 | 870,588 | 2.6 |
| Central America | 23 | 290,725 | 0.9 |
| Southeast Asia | 9 | 24,806,000 | 74.5 |
| Northeast Asia | 2 | 273,970 | 0.8 |
| Other Asia | 23 | 1,566,209 | 4.7 |
| Oceania | 17 | 563,901 | 1.7 |
| Africa | 36 | 125,650 | 0.4 |
| Total (All Regions) | 151 | 33,301,214 | 100.0 |

Source:
Compiled from a 1998 data base developed and supplied by *Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission*, Taipei.

Note:
The Chinese in Macao are included in the original data file as belonging to Southeast Asia; however, they are excluded in the above table.

About three-quarters of the Chinese diaspora population, roughly 25 million people, are located in 9 countries in Southeast Asia (Table 1). In comparison, North America accounts for only about 12 per cent of the total ethnic Chinese population outside of China. These two regions, Southeast Asia and North America, cover about 86 per cent of the population in the Chinese diaspora. However, the type of Chinese communities developed in the two regions is very different.

**Types of Chinese Diasporic Community**

Although the Chinese Diaspora is distributed in 151 countries throughout the world (Table

1),[4] the ethnic Chinese are in fact concentrated in a handful of countries, mainly in Southeast Asia and to a much lesser degree, North America. Three countries in Southeast Asia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia, are home to roughly 19 million ethnic Chinese, or 57 per cent of the 33 million ethnic Chinese in the diaspora (Table 2). In contrast, ethnic Chinese are slightly less than 1 million in Canada, and about 2.9 million in the U.S.

Table 2
Population Estimates of Chinese Diasporic Communities By Country,
For Southeast Asia and North America, 1998

| Country | Number | Chinese Population | | |
| | | Per Cent of Region's Total Chinese Population | Per Cent of Country's Population | Per Cent of Global Chinese Dispora Population |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Southeast Asia | | | | |
| Brunei | 53,000 | 0.2 | 16.83 | |
| Burma | 1,000,000 | 4.0 | 2.11 | |
| Indonesia | 7,115,000 | 28.7 | 3.34 | |
| Laos | 160,000 | 0.6 | 3.04 | |
| Malaysia | 5,515,400 | 22.2 | 26.35 | |
| Philippines | 1,030,000 | 4.2 | 1.33 | |
| Singapore | 2,435,600 | 9.8 | 69.79 | |
| Thailand | 6,497,000 | 26.2 | 10.82 | |
| Vietnam | 1,000,000 | 4.0 | 1.31 | |
| Subtotal | 24,806,000 | 100.0 | 4.92 | 74.5 |
| | | | | |
| North America: | | | | |
| Canada | 960,000 | 24.9 | 3.13 | |
| U.S.A. | 2,899,000 | 75.1 | 1.07 | |
| Subtotal | 3,859,000 | 100.0 | 1.28 | 11.6 |
| | | | | |
| All Regions | | | | |
| Total Global Chinese Diaspora Population | 33,301,214 | | | 100.0 |

Source:
Chinese diaspora population estimates are compiled from a 1998 data base developed and supplied by Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission, Taipei.   Population figures for individual countries are based on U.S. Bureau of Census, Report WP/98, World Population Profile: 1998, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1999

Note:
The Chinese in Macao are included in the original data file as part of the overseas Chinese population, but they are not inlcuded in the above table.

There are many differences between the Chinese communities in North America and those in Southeast Asia. Demographically, the ethnic Chinese made up a small numeric minority in North America, about 3 per cent in Canada, and 1 per cent in the U.S. However, in Southeast Asia, the proportion of Chinese in the country of residence tends to vary widely, ranging from the special case of Singapore in which the Chinese made up about 70 per cent of its population, to a diverse nation such as Malaysia where the 5.5 million ethnic Chinese constitute 26 per cent of its

population, and to populous countries like Indonesia where the 7 million or so ethnic Chinese account for only 3 per cent of the country's population. The Chinese communities in North America and Southeast Asia differ not just in absolute number and relative concentration. They represent different types of Chinese community being constituted, which in turn, reflect a difference in the history of Chinese migration and settlement, and a variation in the way the host society has incorporated the Chinese racially, economically and politically.

At least two broad types of Chinese diasporic community can be distinguished. The first type encompasses Chinese communities in what may be characterized as multiracial societies in which racial features were accentuated or produced by a history of colonization, such that distinctions between races were the bases of class formation and social control, and that such distinctions remain socially significant in post-colonial developments. Suryadinata (1997: 3) has referred to these societies as "indigenous nations", in that they use "the native ethnic groups as their frame of reference", as opposed to "immigrant nations" which use "the model of the immigrants groups themselves".

Suryadinata's formulation is insightful, except the idea of immigrant nations using immigrant groups as the frame of reference can be misleading in the context of immigrant societies of the west, where the European immigrant groups, as charter settlers, often claim dominance and legitimacy over other groups, including the aboriginal peoples and other racial origins, and where the privileged position of Europeans enabled them to set the terms and conditions under which other groups were to be admitted and incorporated. In short, the "model of immigrant groups" can be lopsided with the interests of some immigrant groups dominating over that of others.

Similarly, the idea of "indigenous nations" is also revealing, but it is probably the fact that many of such societies have gone through a history of colonization by Europeans that the notions of indigenous rights and claims become salient in both colonial and post-colonial times. In short, the creation of multiracial societies, the social hierarchy of races within these societies, and the articulation of indigenous claims as the frame of reference can be seen as societal features which are intimately connected to the history of colonization. The Chinese communities in multiracial societies often have the image of an outside group which has over-claimed their economic and political entitlement by taking advantage of their middleman position during colonial times, and by maintaining their secured financial and entrepreneurial position in post-colonial periods. The type of Chinese community in multiracial societies is characterized by the precarious status the Chinese have occupied in relation to other racial groups, one that has been politically marginal albeit economically secured.

The second type includes Chinese communities in polyethnic societies, that is, societies which were racially homogeneous but ethnically diverse, and which were constituted largely through controlled migration and settlement. Historically, the interest of these nations was framed from a Euro-centric vantage point, since European settlers and descendants tended to predominate in these countries and hold the majority power. Consequently, racial differences in

these societies were defined by deviations from the European stock, and non-European or non-white were seen as marginal to the mainstream, if not inferior to the dominant group. Even today, racial diversity in these societies remains a contested feature despite recent increases in racial differentiations largely due to international migration. What distinguishes the Chinese communities in these societies is the way the Chinese race has been socially and normatively constructed as a questionable minority, and the marginal social and economic status to which they historically had been confined. In recent times, these Chinese communities have been upwardly mobile, in part due to political and economic changes of the host societies, and in part due to increases in the movements of Chinese immigration in the latter part of the 20th century.

The distinction between these two types of society has less to do with differences between race and ethnicity as primordial features, and more to do with the social construction of race, and to a lesser extent ethnicity, in historical contexts. In other words, race becomes socially significant in so far as it allows the state to safeguard the interest of the dominant group, but the form of racial difference varies depending on the type of society in question. Thus, in colonial and post-colonial societies, the Chinese became a mediating element which advanced the interests of the colonizing class, and in doing so, placed itself in a privileged and distinguishable racial position vis-à-vis the indigenous population. However, in polyethnic societies which were dominated by European settlers, the Chinese became the labouring class and their superficial racial differences were used as convenient grounds for social marginalization and economic exploitation.

## Chinese in Multiracial Societies: The Case of Indonesia

Many countries in Southeast Asia would fit well in the model of multiracial societies, although there are noted exceptions such as the case of Singapore. Indonesia, in particular, serves as a good illustration of how the colonial rule and subsequent emphasis on indigenous rights greatly affect the structure and nature of the Chinese community.

Suryadinata (1997: 9) has noted that the mass migration of Chinese to Southeast Asia only followed the European colonization of the region, in part because of the expanded economic activities and subsequent demand of labour. Before the arrival of Europeans in the Indies in the 16th century, the presence of Chinese was relatively small in number.

The founding of the Dutch East India Company in 1602, and its establishment in Batavia, now Jakarta, in 1619 opened up new economy opportunities of trade. Initially considered hostile competitors in the pepper trade, the Chinese was quickly seen by the Dutch as helpful intermediaries in commerce and trade as well as useful labour source in the development of the colony's economy (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Purcell, 1965). The Dutch colonial government encouraged Chinese immigration, and the Dutch East India Company regarded the Chinese as the protégé of the Dutch rulers (Fernando and Bulbeck, 1992: 9). Under the Dutch, Chinese labour,

as artisans, agriculturalists, shopkeepers and unskilled labourers, played a major role in the development of Batavia (Heidhues, 1998: 156).

The Dutch East Indian Company saw its interest in controlling the export trade, while leaving the indigenous population to manage itself as long as productive activities were not interrupted. However, the system of export trade required much more labour power than what the Dutch could provide themselves, and the Chinese became necessary collaborators in intermediate and retail trade. But the Dutch would also develop policies to control the social and economic place of the Chinese in the Indies, and to ensure their marginal status.

Several policies under the Dutch advanced the economic opportunities of the Chinese as well as limited their political future. Politically, the Chinese, usually *peranakans,* were allowed to be appointed as Kapitans or officers with the duties to collect taxes for the colonial government. The appointments were often hereditary and the system created a political elite. The officers maintained their financial interests as tax collectors, holders of monopolies and revenue farms, and owners of private land (Heidhues, 1998: 155).

The system of revenue farms, by which individuals in designated regions were given the monopoly concession for selling certain kinds of goods, was another colonial institution closely linked to the Chinese. The system was first applied to the Chinese, and later to natives of Java, and eventually extended to the countryside (Heidhues, 1998: 156). The system provided an important source of financing for the colonial government even after the Dutch East India Company was abolished in 1799 (Heidhues, 1998: 156). Before the revenue farm system was abolished in the 1870s, the Chinese dominated the tax farms, and served as useful agents for the Dutch colonial government while profiting from the system themselves.

Although the Chinese played an important role as middlemen between the Dutch and the indigenous peoples in the Indies, the Dutch colonial government maintained policies to separate the Chinese from the native population. Officially classified as "foreign Orientals", the Chinese were kept as a distinct group, especially under the pass system and the quarter system developed in the 19th century (Heidhues, 1998: 157). The former system stipulated that Chinese traveling to the countryside had to apply for a travel pass, while latter system required all foreign Orientals to reside in special quarters designated for the Chinese. Exceptions were granted to the Chinese who were associated with revenue farms because of their need to travel. After 1870, the Chinese were further prohibited from further owning agricultural lands, although existing ownership remained legal (Heidhues, 1998: 157).

It has been pointed out that in the late colonial period in the Dutch Indies, the Chinese, mostly in trade and commodity collection, clearly occupied the intermediate position, one that was subordinate to the Dutch but above the indigenous population (Mackie, 1988, 1990). However, the expansion of the Dutch plantations and mining operations in the Indies in the late 19th century created a surge of labour demand, and the arrival of large number of Chinese labourers filled the labour shortage in the Indies but also altered the structure of the Chinese community. Between 1860 and 1930, the Chinese population in the Dutch Indies increased