

上海市社会科学博士文库

# 清末民初铁路外债观研究

马陵合 著

復旦大學 出版社

# 序 言

马陵合副教授的博士学位论文《清末民初铁路外债观研究》作为上海市社会科学博士文库的一种，即将正式出版了。这是一部从专门史的角度和方法来研究中国近代史重大领域的文稿。

众所周知，铁路和外债均为治中国近代史者必须谈及的重大问题，而铁路外债在整个外债中又有其特殊性。据统计，晚清中国举借实业外债共 85 笔，债务额达 374 560 965.7 库平两，其中铁路外债就有 37 笔，债务额更达 318 147 297 库平两（许毅等：《清代外债史论》，中国财政经济出版社 1996 年版，第 677 页）。近代第一笔铁路外债，始于 19 世纪 80 年代末的津沽铁路借款。而在民元之后，达成善后借款、西原借款这样的政治性外债并不多，但在整个北洋时期，除 1917 年之外，各年均均有铁路外债。至于近代中国的铁路外债观，有着不同于单纯的经济思想和外交思想的相对独立的内涵，它不仅包括对铁路外债的举借、抵押担保、使用、偿还等诸多外债要件的认识，还包括时人从经济发展、国内政局和中外关系演变等方面对铁路外债功用的判断，是以铁路外债为核心的涉及经济、政治、外交观念的综合反映。

对清末民初铁路外债观进行专门的研究，这是一个学术含量与难度都很高的博士学位论文选题，至少要从 19 世纪 70 年代的马建忠、郑观应等早期维新派知识分子的有关主张开始进行梳理和分析。研究者除了必须具备历史学的一般知识和方法之外，还

需要在近代中国经济史、铁路史、外债史、社会史和思想史诸专门史领域有相当的功力,分别进行过专题研究,然后才能够整合汇聚于这一主题。马陵合副教授本科毕业于厦门大学历史系,接着在南开大学历史系用三年时间攻读硕士学位,嗣后在安徽师范大学历史系执教中国近现代史数年,对近代经济史、社会史和外债史研究已经花过不少功夫,受到过宓汝成等学术界前辈的点拨,发表了多篇论文。2000年他进入复旦大学历史系攻读博士学位,又较系统而深入地研修了晚清史、民国史、外债史、社会经济史等课程,从而为论文稿的撰写奠定了厚实的专业基础。

在该书稿的撰写和补充修改过程中,马陵合围绕论文选题较全面地梳理了相关的参考文献。他尽可能地搜寻自清末以来有关近代中国铁路史、外债史和经济思想史方面的论著,如曾鲲化的《中国铁路现势通论》、《中国铁路史》,孙荫培的《中国铁路全志》,陈宪章的《中国国有铁路外债问题》,谢彬的《中国铁道史》,陈晖的《中国铁路问题》,关赓麟的《中国铁路史》,张嘉璈的《中国铁道建设》,宓汝成的《帝国主义与中国铁路》,许毅主编的《清代外债史论》、《北洋时期封建复辟与外债》;专题的资料集如国民政府交通部编《交通史路政编》、徐义生编《近代中国外债史统计资料》、宓汝成编《近代中国铁路史资料》,以及20世纪90年代后出版的专题资料《中国清代外债史资料》、《民国外债档案史料》、《中华民国铁路史资料》等。他还对国外和港台学者的研究成果有较全面的了解掌握,对大陆和台湾档案及学术机构整理编辑的清代和民国相关专题的档案史料集以及台湾地区所藏清总理衙门、外务部和民国外交部的未刊档案,都下了较大的功夫,进行了仔细的爬梳。另外,对于相关历史人物的文集、传记等资料中大量涉及近代铁路外

债观的部分,他更是作为基本史料详加研读。

在厚实的学科知识与方法、大量专业文献和翔实史料的基础上,作者构建起了自己的研究体系。该书稿的主体部分(第一至五章)以时间为序,以铁路外债观的演进为主线,即选取晚清和民国初年主要的铁路外债,对相应的外债观进行个案考察,着重从铁路借款模式的变迁、债权人的选择、对铁路外交和内政延伸功能的评断等几个视点出发,把近代铁路外债观划分为几个发展阶段:一、甲午战争前朝野对借债筑路从排斥到初步认可;二、甲午战争后形成了“以路作抵”的铁路外债观;三、以赎回粤汉铁路为起点的以“文明排外”为特征的拒债高潮;四、重新倡导借债筑路,争取改善借款条件和宣扬“借债救国”;五、民初对新银行团利弊的讨论,体现了对列强在华共同投资铁路的回应。这部书稿注重以社会舆论为基础,仔细考察了各时期朝野关于借款筑路的基本主张,剖析其动机及所体现的取值取向。书稿还注意结合国内政局、中外关系的变迁,探究近代铁路外债观具有的超经济内涵,在这方面重点讨论了中央与地方关系对于铁路外债观的影响,同时分析了铁路外债观在晚清宪政进程中的特殊作用。作者还用较多的篇幅探究了“路亡国亡”、“借债救国”这两个均曾有过极大社会回响的相反观念发生、发展及对峙的历程,力图揭示近代民族主义对铁路外债观的影响。

近代铁路外债数量多,持续时间长,有着庞杂的内容,关注铁路外债的群体远多于其他种类的外债,留存下来的思想资料卷帙浩繁,要在篇幅有限的文稿中予以穷尽当然是不可能的。作为研究铁路外债观的博士学位论文,不在于面面俱到,而在于理解上的全面、准确与深刻。这部文稿最后一章,分两节分别谈“铁路外债

要件认识上的偏差”和“铁路外债观的多重指向与悖论”，可视为作者对自己的“铁路外债观”的阐释。前一节虽然直接评议的只是有关赎票和包工的认识，但表现出作者在近代中国铁路外债史研究方面的功力。铁路外债史包括有经济、政治乃至外交领域的内容，以往的研究较侧重于时政，对特定的经济方面内容较少论及，从而使铁路外债史应有的特点被淡化了。同样的道理，在铁路外债观的研究中，也易于偏重一般外债观的共性，忽略其特性。当然，该书各章中，对铁路外债观中涉及特定经济甚至技术层面的内容也发掘不多，这既受到留存下来的资料性质所限，但也有待作者对资料文献的发掘和解读有更全面的取向。至于后一节，作者努力对铁路外债观中凸现的经济民族主义以及所谓悖论，作出超越特定本位的深刻的评判。但在我看来，固然可用经济民族主义来概括近代中国铁路外债观中的特定倾向，但它不能包含铁路外债观所涉及的中外关系的全部内容；如同对于各个时期各个领域的民族主义都需要进行客观的历史评价一样，研究近代中国铁路外债观中体现的民族主义，也有待于在充分梳理有关个案的基础上，揭示每一特定认识与观点的具体历史内容。这将有助于我们更好地理解 and 把握整体意义上的近代中国民族主义。我和其他读者一样，期待着马陵合博士在已有研究的基础上，在学术求索的过程中取得更丰硕的成果。

吴景平

2004年11月于复旦大学

# 本书摘要

本书主要选取晚清和民国初年为考察时段,探讨近代中国社会各界对铁路外债的反应,并给予这种反应以准确定位;同时具体说明社会各界关于铁路外债问题的讨论所形成的舆论力量与政府的铁路外债政策之间的互动关系。

近代中国的铁路外债始终具有超经济的特质,其意义远不是单纯的举债和偿本付息问题。近代中国在处理借用外资与维护利权之间关系时处于一种两难的困境。受半殖民地国际地位的刺激,倡导利用外资的言论与实践往往招致非议,对外债的排拒往往成为舆论的主流,伴随着近代民族主义的兴起,其声势更大。然而,这种排拒并不足以改变近代中国对铁路外债的倚重,中国铁路资金来源主要是外债则是不争的事实。近代中国社会各界对铁路外债的认识具有多样性和多变性,呈现出变动不居的特征。解读与评判这种现象,需要用一种更能接近共同心理特征的概念去总结,因此本研究试图运用具有高度概括性的外债观这一概念去统领研究主题。

铁路外债观是关于铁路外债的基本认识,它既包括对铁路外债的举借、抵押担保和外债用途、偿还等诸多外债要件的认识,也包括从经济发展、国内政局和中外关系等方面对铁路外债功用的判断。它的内涵不同于单纯的经济思想和外交思想,是以铁路外债为核心的经济、政治、外交观念的综合反映。本研究拟以外债观

的内涵与外延为论述重心,勾勒出外债观演进的基本线索,并结合个案探究其所蕴含的丰富历史信息,进而准确地对铁路外债观所具有的内在缺陷与制约因素作出总结,解释清末民初在借用外资、接受西方经济观念与维护利权、处理中外关系的两难抉择之间的内在关联,丰富对清末民初经济、政治、外交诸多领域的认知。通过对铁路外债观这一富有社会影响力的课题进行研究,揭示近代中国低下的国际地位对利用外资思想的影响,并重新建立一种对落后国家近代化道路进行更为合理解释的理论框架和思维方式。

本文具体学术目标在于:

第一,通过对主要的铁路外债进行个案考察,揭示近代中国对借款筑路模式探讨及运用的历程。

第二,以社会舆论为基础,考察朝野关于借款筑路的基本主张以及在具体个案上当事人和社会各界的反应。在对这些言论进行解读的基础上,探讨其背后的真正动机及所体现的价值取向。

第三,结合国内政局、中外关系的变迁,审视近代铁路外债观所具有的超经济内涵。

本书主要以时间为序,并结合各个不同阶段的不同特点,重点阐述了下列几个问题。

第一,近代铁路外债观的早期形态。近代早期关于铁路外债问题的讨论,在近代中国关于铁路外债的认识和外债政策的变迁历程中具有导向性的影响。这种导向性主要在于对铁路外债应急性的运用,并开始显现出明显的依赖性。因缺乏平等的国际关系和合理的官商关系,使得利用外资不可避免地成为一种依赖。芦汉铁路外债是19世纪末借债筑路的起点;“以路作抵”的借款模式是甲午战后列强以外债为诱饵扩充势力的蓝本。这一时期铁路外

债观的核心是在依赖心理驱动下生成路权与债权交换的主导思想；在体现外资合理性的同时，也暴露出排斥商股、模糊抵押权限、利用外资形式偏执等诸多偏差，表现出近代国人在利用外资上排拒与依赖并存的矛盾心态。

第二，对铁路外债的排拒及其困境。20世纪初年，铁路及铁路外债成为社会各层面共同关注的重大问题。以1905年粤汉铁路的赎回为起点，在全国范围内爆发了一场“挽回利权”运动。这场运动的一个主要目标就是排拒铁路外债。无论是粤汉铁路和京汉铁路的赎回，还是沪宁铁路、广九铁路、津浦铁路和沪杭甬铁路借款合同的修订，均表现出强烈的拒债倾向。文明排外是拒债倾向的外在表现，它较集中地体现了近代国人的赎路情结。这种情结虽然使政府和民间一度呈现出激进的排拒外债姿态，然而，文明排外并未形成对铁路外债全面的抵制，只是通过一些“合法”的手段并付出高昂代价收回部分路权。这种言行之间的差异导致清季的收回利权必然渐失其光芒，文明排外不能解决近代中国所面临的维持国权与引进外资的两难抉择。

第三，“浦口条件”与对铁路外债有限认可。“浦口条件”是西方人对清季津浦铁路借款筑路模式的称谓。它不同于以芦汉铁路借款为蓝本的“以路作抵”模式，而是以地方税捐为借款担保，中方可以获得对铁路修筑和管理更多的控制权。这一模式不仅被清政府所认同，而且以之为收回利权的工具。“浦口条件”是特定历史背景下的产物，虽较以前的借款模式有所改善，但对于削弱列强对华铁路控制而言并不是一种具有实质意义的借款模式，而且它的存在是短暂的，没有改变清末民初“以路作抵”的基本定式。但是，它引发了对铁路外债的重新估价，从经济学理角度就债论债，肯定

借款筑路的积极作用，逐渐为人注意。虽然它的声音是微弱的，难以得到社会更多的认同，但是它的出现反映了当时一部人对铁路外债的理性思考，表达了对国际间资金融通的认同。

第四，“借债救国”论的倡导与转向。在东北实行均势外交，打破日俄垄断地位，是清政府的基本方针。东三省改制前后，在首任东三省总督徐世昌的努力下，均势外交策略经历了由全面引进外资的“开门通商”之策，到将精力全部集中到以铁路外债为核心的“厚集洋债、以均势力”的转变。锡良任东三省总督后，在郑孝胥的鼓动下，明确提出了借款救国论。在清末宪政运动中，它又延伸到内政方面，成为国会请愿的舆论推动力量，并构成了干线国有政策的促动因素。郑孝胥在其间发挥了独特作用。近代铁路外债观的功能异化、内涵的多质化及其政治化倾向在其身上达到了极致。他的经历与思想充分展现了近代中国在利用外资与维持民族利益之间的两难选择，也显示了立宪派的政治性格。

第五，“共同投资”与对国际银行团的回应。第一次世界大战以后，美国倡议组成新银行团，期望实现对华铁路的共同投资。在新银行团组建前后，关于它的利弊，中国朝野纷争不断，希望与失望并存，对新银行团持一种欲拒还迎的矛盾态度。中国朝野希望通过共同投资让债权方互相制约以达到削弱列强对华控制的目的，并借此振兴民族经济。事实最终证明这只是一厢情愿的弱国外交理念。这种努力的终结，使中国民族主义的目标更加集中于政治层面，废除不平等的条约制度成为民族主义者努力的主要方向，晚清以来以挽回利权为核心并突出铁路外债的外交功用的经济民族主义开始褪去其耀眼的光芒。

第六，结论部分。主要从中国朝野路权意识的角度对赎票和

包工等铁路外债的要件进行评述,并从近代经济民族主义的特质出发评析近代铁路外债观的多重指向及其悖论。在近代中国,内政与外交、外交与外债联为一体,互联互通,使策略性、功利性运用民族主义成为可能,经济民族主义因此发生了功能的异化,进而形成内涵上的多质性。挽回利权是近代经济民族主义的起点;均势外交是近代中国经济民族主义工具性特性的延展;将经济民族主义的旗帜指向国内政治,曲折表现了近代中国政治革新的举步维艰。抽象地评判其政治意义,则是近代中国排拒或依赖铁路外债理念中的共同缺陷。正是由于这种缺陷,也就决定了铁路外债观不可能将经济民族主义这种在落后国家至可宝贵的思想发展到一种具有操作性的层次,而只是在借与不借之间,作出一种选择。这种简单的判断是经济民族主义在近代民族主义思潮中一个不成熟部分的主要标志。

清末民初铁路外债观所展现的理论的幼稚,内涵上的变幻不定,深刻地展现了近代中国所面临的困境。它所具有的一些悖论,却更为直接地触及了近代中国社会的现实层面。由于它自身无法解决这些悖论,就会产生两种后果:一是放弃这种没有实际意义的争论;二是超越经济层面,从不平等的中外关系、落后腐败的政治制度入手,以期找到根本解决的路径。从这个意义来讲,近代铁路外债观是近代中国民族主义整体趋于成熟的源泉之一。

# ABSTRACT

Focusing on the period from the late Qing Dynasty to the early Republic of China, this book discusses the responses of all circles in modern China to foreign railway loan, and tries to determine its nature veraciously. At the same time, I will explain specifically the mutual relations between public opinions on the issue of foreign railway loan and the policies of the government on it.

Foreign railway loan in modern China always had a super-economic characteristic, its meaning beyond the problem of loaning and repayment of the capital and interests. Modern China was in a difficult dilemma when dealing with the relation between borrowing foreign loan and protecting native interests and rights. Stimulated by the semi-colonial status of China in the world, the opinions and practices of using foreign capitals often begot blames, and the idea of refusal to foreign loan generally was the main trend of public opinion and became more and more popular with the rising of modern nationalism. But this refusal was not enough to change the reliance of modern China on foreign railway loan, and it was definitely true that foreign loan was the main source of Chinese capital for building railways. In modern China,

public opinions on foreign railway loan were diversiform and changeful. So, I need a concept that was much closer to the characteristic of common mentality to explain and judge this phenomenon, and “Views on Foreign Railway Loan” is a right one.

Views on Foreign Railway Loan is the basic understanding of foreign railway loan, concluding opinions of the functions of foreign railway loan from aspects of economic development, native political situation, and relationship between China and foreign countries, as well as money borrowing, mortgages and guaranties, purposes and repayment, and some other essentials of foreign loan. Its meaning is beyond any simple economic and diplomatic thoughts, but the integrative reflection of economic, political and diplomatic conceptions. With the meanings and extensions of Views on Foreign Railway Loan as the main discussing point, this research tries to outline the basic developing process of Views on Foreign Railway Loan, and explore the rich history information of some cases. Thus I can make a precise summary of the inherent limitations and conditional factors of Views on Foreign Railway Loan, and explain why the nation at that time was in a dilemma between borrowing foreign loan, accepting occidental economic ideas and protecting rights, dealing with relations home and abroad. From this point, this book will enrich the understandings of economy, politics and diplomacy, and some other research realms of the

---

nation from the late Qing Dynasty to the early Republic of China. By studying this influential task of Views on Foreign Railway Loan, I want to reveal the impact of lowly international status of modern China on the ideas of utilizing foreign capital, and to remake a more reasonable theoretical framework and thinking pattern of explanation for the way of modernization of undeveloped countries.

This book consists of three main objectives:

Firstly, by examining some concrete cases of foreign railway loans, it reveals how the modes of loaning for railway building are searched and applied in modern China.

Secondly, based on the public opinions, this book studies reviews various responses from those concerned in the cases and all circles, as well as the basic standpoints of the government and the public on foreign loan for railway building. Thus it reveals the true motivation and value tendency hidden behind.

Thirdly, combining the domestic situation with the changing relationship between China and foreign countries, this book examines the super-economy meaning of Views on Foreign Railway Loan for in modern China.

With temporal dimension and according to the characteristics of different periods, my research mainly discusses several problems as follows:

1. The Early Form of Views on Foreign Railway Loan in Modern China. The discusses about the issue of foreign railway

loan in the early time had an oriented effect on the process of people's attitudes to foreign railway loan and the transition of foreign loan policy in modern China. This effect was that China began to utilize foreign loan as an emergence and show an obvious dependence on it. For lack of equal international relations and reasonable relations between officials and merchants, this dependence is inevitable. Lugou Bridge-Hankow railway foreign loan was the beginning of loaning for building railways in the late 19th century. And "railway mortgage loan" was the original example of the big powers to expand their orbits with the loans as bait. At this period, the key points of Views on Foreign Railway Loan was that the dominant ideas of bartering railway rights for creditor's rights was formed droved by the dependent mind, and many errors in using foreign capitals such as refusing merchant shares, blurring the mortgage purview, and the extreme patterns, were exposed at the same of showing its reasonability. And at some extent, it manifested the ambivalent mind of modern Chinese that the emotion of refusal and dependence in using foreign loans coexisted.

2. The Refusal of Foreign Railway Loan and Its Predicament. In the early years of the 20th century, railway and foreign railway loan became important issues drawing attention of all society. With redeeming Guangzhou-Hankow line in 1905 as the beginning, a countrywide "rights recovery movement" broke out. A main purpose of this movement was refusing foreign

railway loan. And whether the redeem of Guangzhou-Hankow and Tientsin-Hankou lines or the modification of the loaning treaties of Shanghai-Nanking, Guangzhou-Jiulong, and Tientsin-Pukow and Shanghai-Hangchow-Ningpo railway equally showed a strong tendency of refusing foreign loans. Nonviolent xenophobia was the exterior expression of the tendency of refusing foreign loans, and focally reflected the complex of modern Chinese to redeem the railroads. Although this complex made the government and the public once take a radical stance towards refusing foreign loans, nonviolent xenophobia did not engender a all-around resistance to any foreign railway loans, but just recovered part railway rights by some “legal” measures and high price. The gap between words and deeds inevitably led this movement to lose its force bit by bit. And nonviolent xenophobia could not resolve the dilemma of modern China between protecting national rights and introducing foreign capitals.

3. The Tientsin Pukow (T-P) Terms and the Limited Identification with Foreign Railway Loan. The T-P Terms is a name for the pattern of loaning for building Tientsin-Pukow railway in the late Qing Dynasty called by the occidental. It was different from the pattern of with Lugou Bridge-Hankow railway as the original example, but loaning on local tax and tallage, and China could acquire more control rights of railway building and management. This pattern not only was identified by the Qing

Dynasty, but also became a tool for rights recovery. As a result of special history situation, the T-P Terms was improved than former loaning patterns, but it was not a practical pattern which could weaken the control of the big powers to Chinese railways. What's more it just existed for a brief time and did not change the basic pattern of "railway mortgage loan". But it gave rise to the reassessment of foreign railway loan, and the attitude of affirming the positive effects of loaning for building railways from the perspective of economy was paid attention gradually. Although this voice was faint and was difficult to be accepted by more people, it reflected that partial Chinese began to rationally think of foreign railway loan and international financing was accepted by some of them.

4. The Advocacy and its Changeover of the Idea of "Borrowing Money to Save the Nation". At the last stage of Qing Dynasty, the government's essential strategy in northeastern China was carrying out the foreign policy of balance of power to break the situation that Japan and Russian monopolized this area. Originally, the first viceroy for northeastern three provinces, Xu Shichang pushed the policy of "open and trading" to introduce foreign capitals form many other countries. Subsequently this policy was changed to loaning for building railways from western countries. His successor Xiliang put forward the theory of "borrowing money to save the nation" encouraged by Zheng Xiaoxu. At the movement of constitution

government in late Qing Dynasty, this theory was also used in interior and became the driving force in the petition for holding congress and in the adoption of the policy of “the main railways belong to the nation”. Zheng Xiaoxu played a particular role meantime and his experiences and thoughts showed best that modern China was in a dilemma between utilizing foreign capitals and protecting national rights.

5. “Pooling” and Responses to the New Chinese Consortium. After the word war one, the U. S. proposed to make up of the New Chinese Consortium to invest in Chinese railroads together. Before and after the makeup of the Consortium, Chinese government and the public was in a controversy for its advantages and disadvantages. They had a conflict attitude to the Consortium. In the beginning, they hoped that the creditor nations would restricted each other by pooling so that the desire of the big powers to control China could be weaken and national economy could be developed. But ultimately, facts showed that this was only their own wishful thinking and was an ideal of diplomacy for weak countries. The failure of this endeavor made Chinese nationalist concentrate on the aspect of politics and abolishing the system of unequal treaties became their main aim. At the same time the economic nationalism that tried to recover the rights and emphasized the diplomatic function of foreign railway loan began to fade away.

6. The Conclusion. At this part, I will mainly review the