



CHINA'S INTERACTIONS WITH THE WORLD
Internationalization, Internalization, Externalization

中国与世界的互动： 国际化、内化与外化

柯伟林 牛大勇 主编

河南人民出版社

CHINA'S INTERACTIONS WITH THE WORLD
Internationalization, Internalization, Externalization

中国与世界的互动： 国际化、内化与外化

柯伟林 牛大勇 主编

河南人民出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

中国与世界的互动:国际化、内化与外化/柯伟林,牛大勇主编.
- 郑州:河南人民出版社,2007.5
ISBN 978-7-215-05676-3

I. 中… II. ①柯… ②牛… III. 中外关系-国际关系史-研究-近代~ IV. D829

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2005)第 035351 号

河南人民出版社出版发行

(地址:郑州市经五路 66 号 邮政编码:450002 电话:65723341)

新华书店经销 河南省瑞光印务股份有限公司印刷

开本 680 毫米×960 毫米 1/16 印张 35.5

字数 540 千字 插页 1

2007 年 5 月第 1 版 2007 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

定价:52.00 元



2004年6月下旬,哈佛大学、柏林自由大学、北京大学联合召开了“中国与世界的互动:国际化、内化与外化”学术研讨会。哈佛大学文理学院院长柯伟林教授、柏林自由大学汉学系主任罗梅君 (Mechthild Leutner) 教授、美国加州伯克利大学叶文心教授分别率团参加。图为部分专家、学者在会议举办地北大历史学系留影。

名校名师的思想荟萃

中外关联的主题凝结

传统与现代的多重诠释

文化与社会深刻剖析

序 言

柯伟林(哈佛大学历史学教授)

本论文集是2004年6月美国、德国和中国学者在北京大学举行的关于中国国际化进程专题研讨会的成果结晶。这个研讨会是我们正在进行的系列研究的第三轮会议。我们把中国融入世界体系看做现代中国的特点。在整个20世纪的历史中,无论是就知识、政治、经济还是文化的发展趋势而论,中国都始终是一个不断地卷入国际化大潮的大国。尽管当代政治学家对中国最近的“崛起”所形成的挑战有相当多研究,但是对中国长期以来的国际化进程却很少有学术性评价。

可以肯定,国际化是一个比这些论文所论及的“现代时期”还要长的进程。在西方学术界,研究长时段历史的学者如石约翰(John Schrecker)著有《历史大视野中的中国革命》,根据中国史学范式对中国史加以充满朝气的重新阐释,而王国斌(R. Bin Wong)在《转变的中国》(*China Transformed*)一书中则另辟蹊径。他们向占中国学支配地位的分析框架提出了挑战,这种框架认为中国是在18世纪末19世纪初才开始大规模接触西方的。而他们(如王国斌)则或是摆脱这种框架来看待中国历史,或是补充这种框架^①。

最近,研究早期中国史的学者已开始努力从国际(更精确地讲是从全球)角度探讨中国历史,揭破西方和中国的孤立主义神话。乔安娜·韦利-科恩(Joanna Waley-Cohen)的著作《北京的六分仪:中国历

^① See John E. Schrecker, *The Chinese Revolution in Historical Perspective* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991); R. Bin Wong, *China Transformed: Historical Change and the Limits of European Experience* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

史上的全球化潮流》就是这方面的出色成果。她在书中揭示:中国积极参与了国际交流网络,这个网络“自西方的叙利亚延伸到东方的日本、从北方的朝鲜连接着南方的印度尼西亚,而且,至16世纪,甚至将欧洲和新大陆都包括在内”。她透过宗教(如佛教)的迁播和全球贸易模式(例如与拉丁美洲的白银贸易)来探索中国在这个过程中的变迁^①。早在这一波新的学术潮流之前,罗萨比(Morris Rossabi)和其他学者已经在中国与邻国传统关系的研究方面做了大量工作,以完善那永恒的经典观念“中国中心论”。

尽管如此,我们这里所关心的主要是现代。长期以来,历史学家们一直讨论外部和内部力量在中国现代史形成中的相对作用。这些争论与几十年前在德国发生的讨论几无不同。当时人们争论:一个国家的历史发展动力究竟是对国际政治特权(*Primat der Außenpolitik*)的追求,还是主要出于国内政治的推动?甚至连对外政策也取决于国内政治吗^②?但是对现代中国的研究并没有像德国史研究那样局限于外交政策及外交精英的行动而排斥其他因素。费正清(John Fairbank)提出了中国“回应”西方的问题,但是并没写一部通俗外交史,也没把构成“西方”的一系列复杂矛盾因素简单化^③。的确,对研究现代中国任何历史阶段的学者来说,关于外交政策和国与国正式关系的考察,从没有取得在撰述19世纪末20世纪初欧洲历史时所享有的那般重要地位。

在费正清的学术全盛期,无论在西方还是在中国,现代中外关系的研究都处于现代中国史研究的中心地位,而他的老师蒋廷黻教授为撰写现代国际关系史树立了典范^④。外交史尤为中国历史编纂学的最好

① Joanna Waley-Cohen, *The Sextants of Beijing: Global Currents in Chinese History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1999).

② See Eckart Kehr, *Der Primat Der Innenpolitik. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Preussisch-Deutschen Sozialgeschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited and with an introduction by Hans-Ulrich Wehler (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965).

③ John K. Fairbank, *Trade and Diplomacy on the China Coast* (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1954).

④ 蒋廷黻:《中国近代史》,长沙:商务印书馆1938年版;蒋廷黻:《近代中国外交史资料辑要》,上海:商务印书馆1931年版。

范例^①，这个传统很好地保持了下来^②。但是这里却成为 20 世纪 60 年代以来西方的中国学研究停滞不前的一个领域。近几十年来，对中国国际关系的研究，无论在数量和质量方面，同对中国社会史和文化史的研究相比，都显得黯然失色。与那些领域的代表作不同的是，大多数关于中外关系的权威论著都写作于中国大陆和台湾的民国档案开放之前。因此，对于外交史这个最依赖档案的史学领域而言，西方不存在广泛利用中外外交档案写就的关于 20 世纪中国国际政治关系的经典著作。在经济和文化关系领域同样缺乏综合的研究^③。当今关于中国对外关系的西方论著非常偏重于当代中华人民共和国政府的外交政策，即便这个领域也没有几本著作提供综合性的论述^④。从各方面来看，有关历史和当代中外关系的最好著作应推居根·奥斯特哈梅尔(Jürgen Osterhammel)的 *China und die Weltgesellschaft*。可惜这本书没有英文版，其读者也就有限了^⑤。此外，很多人在研究中国对外政治关系中明显存在各种冲突，但很少人去关注那些至少已被证明是同样重要的互动、互渗和跨国合作等模式^⑥。余凯思(Klaus Mühlhahn)和罗梅君(Mechthild Leutner)最近发表了一项关于 19 世纪中德关系的研究，以传教士和经济活动为中心，试图把微观和宏观的历史考察方法相结合，阐发四种互动模式^⑦。

我们已开过的几场关于中国国际化问题的讨论会肯定会受到我们

① 可参见张忠绂：《中华民国外交史》，国立北京大学出版组 1936 年版，正中书局 1943 年版。

② 吴东之主编：《中国外交史：中华民国时期，1911—1949》，河南人民出版社 1990 年版。尤其是石源华：《中华民国外交史》，上海人民出版社 1994 年版。

③ For an extended review of these issues and the literature see William Kirby, "The Internationalization of China," *The China Quarterly*, no. 150 (June 1997), 433-458.

④ See Thomas W. Robinson and David Shambaugh, eds., *Chinese Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); and John W. Garver, *Foreign Relations of the People's Republic of China* (Engelwood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1993).

⑤ Jürgen Osterhammel, *China und die Weltgesellschaft. Vom 18. Jahrhundert bis in unsere Zeit* (Munich: C. H. Becks, 1989).

⑥ One unpublished exception can be found in the papers of the ACLS/SSRC Conference on Patterns of Cooperation in Modern China's Foreign Relations, Wintergreen, Virginia, 1987.

⑦ Mechthild Leutner, Klaus Mühlhahn (eds.), *Deutsch-chinesische Beziehungen im 19. Jahrhundert. Mission und Wirtschaft in interkultureller Perspektive* (Münster: LIT, 2001).

所承袭的知识的影响^①,例如费正清的“冲击—反应”论或保罗·柯文(Paul Cohen)的“从内部”研究近代中国论^②,他们基本的假设是,在20世纪很多领域中,简直无法划清以国际的、或全球的、或外部的的事物为一方,而以“中国的”事物为另一方的界线。因此,目标不是将内部事物同外部的划分开,而是综合考察国内外的国际化进程。

第一个目标就是研究诸如政治活动、商业活动、法律和监狱系统,或者无论其他什么可称为国际文化实践之类的事情在中国的內化,研究时至少应把中国角色的作用看得同国际影响一样大。例如,怎样才能理解某些西方政治思想的流脉在中国的持久性?其中包括并非无要紧要的列宁主义,这个主义至今仍是人民共和国领导体制的核心。怎样才能像我们研究当代中国经济那样从研究近代中国的资本主义中学到什么?这种资本主义在共产革命之前的国际交往中已经成熟,并随后在中国的东亚周边地区发展起来。在20世纪的三次法律改革浪潮中,中国在何种程度上将国际法律标准“內化”了?中国高等教育国际化对中国和世界各国已经并将继续产生什么影响?中国的物质环境是怎样再配置的?又怎样在一个世纪之久的农业、工业和工程领域的大规模国际合作中影响了全球环境?

第二个主要目标是从世界及区域的范围来观察中国,中国在这个范围内的国际成员资格已经一如既往地重塑了全球社会与风气。例如,中国在共产国际、国际红十字会、国际联盟和联合国等如此不同的机构中,成为起领导作用的参与者后,究竟造成了什么变化?这些国际机构与个体中国人所拥有成员资格的许多非政府国际组织可大不相同。尤其民国时期,在国内知识界似乎盛行一时的文化国际主义也对中外合作及对抗的性质起了界定作用^③。

第三个目标是从微观或宏观的历史视角考察不同角色在中国互动

① The first two have been held at Harvard University and at the Free University of Berlin in 2000 and 2001, respectively; the third, which has resulted in this volume, took place at Peking University in June 2004.

② Paul A. Cohen, *Discovering History in China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 153.

③ See for example, Akira Iriye, *China and Japan in the Global Setting* (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1992); and idem., *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

的具体模式,试图更加系统地辨析中国和世界的关系。

虽然中外关系的内外诸方面都有跨国际跨文化的互动问题,包括文化、经济或政治的互动,但我们出于一个很简单的原因,还是更倾向于用“国际化”而不是诸如“全球化”这样的词。关键问题是,在 20 世纪的中外关系即跨越公认(虽然有时有争议)的国界而发生的事务中,国家与政府的角色远比个人和公众更重要。并且,国家与政府在很大程度上调节了非国家角色的活动。当今中华人民共和国的“政府办的非政府组织”并不是全新的概念。

在哈佛大学和柏林自由大学举行的前两次专题研讨会上,发表了许多试图从这些新视角运用新方法来考察中国和中外关系的论文。我们在北美和欧洲各聚会一次后,在中国本地举行第三次中国国际化专题研讨会是最合适不过的了。呈献给读者们的这本论文集就是由牛大勇教授和北京大学历史学系主办的这次最鼓舞人心的专题研讨会的成果。

(张静、牛大勇译)

目 录

序 言

.....	柯伟林	1
Interaction as Hierarchy or Equality? Patterns of Working		
Relationships between German and Chinese Scholars, 1887-2004		
.....	Mechthild Leutner(罗梅君)	1
帝国主义在中国:条约体系的文化认知		
.....	罗志田	34
救时的偏方:戊戌变法期间司员士民上书中军事外交论		
.....	茅海建	56
A Question of Independence: Rhetoric and Crisis in a Chinese City,		
1911-1917		
.....	Joshua Benjamin Hill	97
Honorable Pursuits: <i>Shangxue</i> , <i>Guoxue</i> , and the Republican		
Chinese Academy		
.....	Wen-hsin Yeh(叶文心)	157
Internationalization, Identity, and Social Organizations in Pre-war		
Colonial Jilong		
.....	Evan Dawley	204
Sino-Japanese Fishing Disputes in the Zhoushan Archipelago,		
1924-1932: An International Perspective on Chinese		
Environmental History		
.....	Micah Muscolino	248

蒋介石、张学良与中东路事件之交涉	
..... 杨奎松	275
一九五六年十月危机:中国的角色和影响	
——“波匈事件与中国”研究之一	
..... 沈志华	316
中美关系进程中一次错失的机遇	
..... 牛大勇	368
冷战与 20 世纪 80 年代的中国外交	
..... 牛 军	384
Changing Periods of Internationalization: 100 Years of Record Production in China, 1903-2003	
..... Andreas Steen(史通文)	404
A Continuous Stream? Huai River Management in the First Decade of the People's Republic	
..... David Pietz	439
殖民主义、本土国家与东南亚华人移民:中国跨国化的一些 历史含义	
..... 吴小安	461
识宝传说:一个关于本土与异域的华北民间历史隐喻	
..... 赵世瑜	475
Internationalizing the Developmental State: The Role of Foreign Advisors in Scientific Planning in Taiwan	
..... J. Megan Greene	487
Rethinking Modern Chinese History: Transnational and Global Perspectives	
..... Klaus Mühlhahn(余凯思)	520
跨进中西教育之门	
——清末京师大学堂国际交流的探索	
..... 徐中煜 岳庆平	544

Interaction as Hierarchy or Equality? Patterns of Working Relationships between German and Chinese Scholars, 1887-2004

Mechthild Leutner (罗梅君, Free University of Berlin)

Introduction

This paper is about the complex working relationships between German and/or other Western scholars and their Chinese colleagues in a period that spans more than a century. With very few exceptions,^① these working relationships have not been investigated in the field of sinology or in other disciplines. I will also address the methodological importance of this subject and its role in the production of knowledge about China as well as in the conceptualization of China. If we generally accept that an “interplay of foreign and native elements in shaping Chinese national culture, national and cultural identity” (Wang 2001:6) has been the case and is the case all the more today, then on the micro-level of knowledge production it is the structure of working relationships as power relationships that has largely shaped the findings to date. This analysis proceeds from several suppositions. Firstly, that the working relationships of scholars are a form of cross-cultural relation, i. e. a specific form of relationship between

① The exceptions are brought up for discussion below. This topic was discussed in the past years only from the ethnological perspective and from the perspective of gender studies.

outside researcher and native informant^① in which the sinologists serve as mediators in a transnational cultural transfer. Secondly, the working relationships are organized according to the political, economic and cultural relations of a given period at both the institutional and the individual level and are correspondingly either hierarchical or equal. These are complex relationships of knowledge and power. Methodologically, a generational approach is useful, but on the other hand individual personalities, i. e. specific biographical components that often run counter to the mainstream, have an effect. Thirdly, the conceptualizations of China are running parallel to these working relationships. They tend more toward a Eurocentric or universalistic approach or toward a cultural relativist approach depending on both the period in question and the subjects involved. This plays a role both in the great narratives as well as the individual *topoi* and stereotypes of the knowledge produced both through and in the course of these working relationships.

In general, these working relationships show a complex pattern of power relations that have undergone the following developments:

- a) In the colonial period, hierarchical relations of subordination were prevalent. These relations were part of a Eurocentric approach that was shaped by the paradigm of civilizing as a specific form of the modernization approach. The civilization narrative also implied that the natives were to be put to work as well as to be “educated” and “instructed” in the working relationships, which meant de facto the exploitation of their insider knowledge according to the institutional and individual goals defined by others. One example of this is the work of Chinese instructors at the Seminar for Oriental Languages

① The classic ethnographic binary of inside (China) and outside (West/Germany), the centre (West) and the margin (China), the universal (West) and the particular (China) can be transferred generally speaking also for the “text science” Sinology, although the German Sinologists presented themselves as experts and therefore as “inside.”

(SOS) at Berlin University.

- b) In the postcolonial phase, a gradual transition from hierarchical relations to a relation of presumed equality can be observed. In this phase, the Germans contributed theoretical and analytic competencies and the Chinese were responsible for knowledge of the language and insider knowledge. This new cultural relativist approach was accompanied by a conceptualization of China and the Chinese as having different cultural and — in terms of the working relationships — specific native knowledge. These differences were accepted as a necessary complementary form of knowledge within the overall process of knowledge production. The idea of hierarchy of knowledge that has been observed recently had not yet been developed during this time. Exemplary for this transitional period are the different working relationships and academic networks set up by Richard Wilhelm in the period from 1900-1930.
- c) In the most recent phase of globalization, a neoliberal mainstream position can be distinguished from an emancipatory minorities position. The emancipatory approach, which issues from a cultural relativist approach, is characterized by a deliberate acceptance of equality as a fruitful integration of different academic competencies, both analytic and empirical. The mainstream approach, on the other hand, is now again characterized by hierarchical structures in which the West and its scholars are those who impart theory and their Chinese colleagues deliver the empirical facts as native insiders. Here the relationship between empiricism and theory is clearly hierarchical. In this mainstream approach, which is influenced by theories of modernization, China is again conceptualized as politically, legally and academically “lagging behind.” This means that according to the explicit and implicit approaches of these mainstream representatives, China is regarded as needing “development aid” not only on the whole but specifically in relation to academic theory.

Beyond the national and institutional conditions bearing on the working relationships, other important factors in these cross-cultural relations are the individual world views and academic self-understanding of the scholars. These factors can anticipate the patterns of working relationships that will later develop, or delay changes in them. The structure of the working relationships also undergoes change during the period in question. During the beginning of this period the working relationships were mostly between individual scholars, but during the course of the 20th century this individual basis of knowledge production gradually shifted to become a collective process dominated by intensive networking via institutionalized collective research projects and conferences.

1. Subordination of Chinese Teachers in Hierarchical Working Relationships of the Colonial Period: The Case of the Seminar of Oriental Languages (SOS) in Berlin

In 1887 the SOS was founded at the Berlin University. It was the first institution for applied study in Germany that took as its object a contemporary foreign country. The SOS fulfilled all the tasks of a “colonial institute,”^① which meant that beyond educating future diplomats in the language and culture of the Orient, it was responsible above all for educating civil servants for colonial service and, around 1900, for training officers of the “Expedition Corps to Defeat the Boxer Movement.” Until 1945 the SOS was the most important state-related educational institution in Germany dealing with modern China. The publication *Mitteilungen des*

① The majority of the students trained there worked there after in the colonial service. See Sachau on the occasion of the 25th anniversary in 1912, in: GSTPK, I. HA, Rep. 208 A, Nr. 181, Bl. 208. More than 100 officers were trained alone in Chinese and Japanese. See the statement of the Director of the War Academy, v. Manteuffel, in: *ibid.*, Bl. 222.

Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen also made it one of the most important publishers in this field. Into the 1920s it was also the center-point of the most influential network of German sinologists and German diplomats working in China, and thus it served as the hub of knowledge production on China in general. With its directorial administration and its focus on contemporary affairs, the organization and the range of issues covered by the SOS made it a counter-model to the reigning university model, which was based on ordinaries and a collegiate administration as well as a philological orientation toward texts and classical antiquity — also for Oriental studies. But the SOS was not understood as a counter-model on an equal level; its status was considered inferior. With its independent professors engaging in instruction and research, universities were seen to embody prestigious theoretical scholarship, while the SOS was considered less prestigious because it imparted practical knowledge. Further, the structure of the SOS was considered inferior, having a director overseeing poorly paid German lecturers, who only had a nominal status as professors, and even more poorly paid native speakers. These factors — the unequal political relations between Germany and China and the perception that practical instruction of the Chinese language was inferior to the classical, text-oriented, academic sinology, as well as the corresponding disregard for the SOS and its instructors — ran parallel to the hierarchical structures between the German professors and the Chinese instructors within the SOS itself.

The concept of instruction at the SOS was based on imparting basic knowledge of the language, i. e. what was considered theoretical language instruction, by German lecturers and practical exercises led by native speakers. This necessitated the hiring of Chinese instructors at German educational institutions, which was a first. Up until the end of the German Empire, this was organized via government agreements and the candidates were selected by German diplomatic representatives in China. Starting in 1903, Chinese students studying in Berlin were hired by the SOS on a temporary basis to lead practical exercises and to serve as assistants. By the