

宏觀視野

- 1 Comparative Intellectual History of Chinese Studies: Micro-identity and Macro-civilization
Chih-yu Shih
- 17 European Humanities and Global Challenges — A View Towards 2060
Poul Holm
- 25 Inventory and Invention: How Can a Classical Education Foster Creativity?
Alan T. Wood

多元觀點

- 29 美國牛肉與自由貿易：臺灣民眾的態度調查
江淳芳、劉錦添、王慈雅
- 33 「從思想史思考東亞」國際學術研討會紀要
徐興慶
- 39 Report on the 10th International Conference on the New Significance of Chinese Civilization
in the 21st Century
John Tucker
- 41 日本近代文學的根本要素——江戶文學與西洋文化的交融
真銅正宏
- 43 另一種近代日本圖像——共和政治與幕末的東北
大川真
- 45 《東アジア思想交流史：中國・日本・臺灣を中心として》中文自序
黃俊傑

計畫近況

- 47 東亞儒學研究計畫
- 51 東亞民主研究計畫
- 53 東亞華人自我的心理學研究計畫
- 57 東亞法院與法律繼受研究計畫
- 59 東亞國家的貿易、勞動、金融與生產力研究計畫
- 61 東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫
- 67 數位人文研究整合平臺
- 69 東亞崛起中的日本與韓國研究整合平臺
- 71 歐盟研究整合平臺

院務新訊

- 73 新近出版品介紹
- 77 院務短波
- 81 院內大事紀

【宏觀視野】

Comparative Intellectual History of Chinese Studies: Micro-identity and Macro-civilization

Chih-yu Shih^{*}

The following discussion will introduce a transnational project, entitled Comparative Epistemology of China studies, the project's rationale, stage of development, and methodology. The project is a response to the postmodern call for reflexive scholarship and rides upon a resurgent interest in civilizational politics. However, its focus is on individual adaptation to and agency for change. The approach to intellectual history is anthropological. The project treats the production of knowledge as a human phenomenon, evolving between one's choices of identity strategy and one's encounter with various larger forces, contexts, and relationships, discursively as well as socially. The project conceives of an individualized intellectual history critical of mechanisms of civilizational evolution and exchange.

The project, which includes an oral-history component and a curriculum component leading to the writing of MA and Ph.D dissertations, encompasses the study of intellectual history embedded in civilizational and international politics. The hosts of the project are the Research and Educational Center for China Studies and Cross-Taiwan Strait Relations in the Department of Political Science at National Taiwan University. Funded with a grant from the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation in 2004, it rose out of a pilot project in Japan under the leadership of Professor Hirano Ken'ichirō with the support of his colleagues Nakamura Yūjirō and Tsuchida Akio. Now Funded by the National Science Council of Taiwan, the College of Social Science at National Taiwan University and the Graduate Institute of Political Science at National Sun Yatsen

* Chair Professor, Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University; Director, Program for Contemporary China's Development and the Transformation in the Subjectivity of China Studies under the Rise of East Asia.

University, along with a number of other smaller grants, the project has continued through 2012 and will remain ongoing thereafter.

The project has generated over 100 interviews with institutional and individual participants all over the world (including 7 American, 3 Australian, 9 Czech, 4 German, 4 Hong Kong/Macau, 19 Indian, 18 Japanese, 16 Korean, 3 Mongolian, 16 Russian, 5 Singaporean, 18 Taiwanese, and 10 Vietnamese scholars), over 50 monographs, and a number of periodical articles. In addition to the interviews conducted by members of the Japanese pilot project, individual coordinators in Korea, Australia, China, Germany, Hong Kong, Mongolia, Taiwan, and Singapore and Chinese scholars dwelling in a few national communities, more interviews on intellectual history of national and international Sinology are being jointly conducted via partnerships with the Association for Asia Scholars in New Delhi, the Institute of China Studies at the Vietnamese Academy of Sciences, Ho Chi-minh City University of Social Sciences and Humanities, the Institutes of Oriental Studies and Far Eastern Studies at the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Center of East Asian Studies at Charles University, and the Department of Chinese Studies at Warsaw University. The Center for Foreign China Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences has provided a wide range of technical support throughout. An expanded agenda has begun in Russia, Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Poland, Belgium, and sporadically in Germany in 2012, and hopefully in Italy in 2013.

We should also express here the grief we felt

at the loss during the project's first 8 years of Mizoguchi Yūzō from Tokyo, Lidia Ivanovna Golovatcheva, Oleg Borisovich Rakhmanin, Nadezhda Vinogradova and Yury M. Garushyantz from Moscow, Buu Cam and Nguyen Ton Nhan from Ho Chi Minh City, and Mira Sinha Bhattacharjea and V. P. Dutt from New Delhi, all interviewees, and Vladimir Ganshin from Moscow, a coordinator and interviewer in the Russian project.

Several workshops explore various possibilities of comparative agendas, one appropriately dealing with a comparison of China studies in Japan and Korea. Contrasts among the "border scholarship" of Korea, Mongolia, Taiwan, and Hong Kong are also under scrutiny. Transitional scholarship in post-socialist communities such as Russia, the Czech Republic, Poland, Vietnam, and Mongolia promises to be fascinating. Nascent democracies of Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Mongolia, the Czech Republic, Taiwan, and Korea could be compared on how narratives on China have changed in the process of political change there. The combination and recombination of ideological and civilizational sources and the historical, institutional and social practices of these possible agendas provide a rich repertoire of how the mutual constitution of Sinology, Sinologists, and their Sinic world has proceeded through individual career paths. This project thus contributes to the development of an anthropological interpretation of social knowledge as well as a humanities-based foundation for understanding international relations regarding views on China. Three books are or will be published from the Japanese, Indian, and Russian oral history projects during 2011-2012.¹

1 Hirano Ken'ichirō 平野健一郎, Tsuchida Akio 土田哲夫, Murata Yūjirō 村田雄二郎, and Shih Chih-yu 石之瑜 (eds.), *Intabyū sengo nihon no Chūgoku kenkyū* インタビュー戦後日本の中国研究 [Interviews on China studies in Post-WII Japan] (Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 2011); Chih-yu Shih, Swaran Singh, and Reena Marwah, *From Civilization to Nation State: The China Studies in India* (New York: Cambria, 2012 forthcoming); Valentin Golovachev and Chih-yu Shih, "Writing the Oral History of China Studies and the New Era of 'Global Sinology': Russian Perception." Paper presented at the conference "Chinese Studies in the International Perspective: Past and Present" (Beijing, October 30-November 1, 2011).

Significance of the Project

The return of the topic of civilization to the field of international relations has been forceful. The phenomenon of Sinicization that affects China and the rest of the world in multiple directions requires a deeper understanding of the historical and cultural trajectories characterizing the intellectual history of Sinology, in order to avoid a one-sided reaction to Chinese developments. The image of "China rising" dominates headlines everywhere; however, China as objective reality becomes increasingly obscure due to the fact that exchange and interaction across territorial China are so intensive that no China watcher (journalist, businessman, scholar, and politician alike) can afford to be outside of China, physically or socially. China watching constitutes self-interrogation. In retrospect, the objectivistic pretension that China watchers observe China from an external, value-free position is untenable. Any scholar's study of China can never be kept independent from his or her own historical and political, even social, conditions. This is why the project considers how China studies contributes to the reproduction and representation of self-understanding everywhere in one way or another, at the micro as well as the macro level.

The project is an intellectual exercise that may effectively deconstruct any fixed images of China embedded in the legacy of the Cold War and the faddism of globalization. With China increasingly becoming a moving identity and Sinicization appearing to prevail in the current century, the world needs a self-reflective mode of understanding it, in order to avoid overly investing in specific perspectives with specific dispositions that usually lead to self-alienation.

Epistemological issues do not usually attract much discussion in the China Studies community. Sporadic reflections in this regard, nonetheless, have raised a few challenges that are worth

serious examination. Earlier challenges were primarily concerned with the relationship between area studies and social science. Recently, debates have arisen over the relationship between scholars and their objects of study, vaguely considered to represent China. Suggesting an inevitable connection between scholarship and politics, this latter type of debate questions the legitimacy of the *problematique* of mainstream social science as well as area studies agendas. While the academic community has yet to systematically respond to any of these epistemological critiques, pressure for such a response continues to mount for those who endeavor to promote social science in area studies.

First of all, there is the cultural studies perspective that rocks the Cartesian certainty upon which scientific knowledge is thought to be based. Interpreted meaning is substituted for universal theory, becoming the new focus of scholarship in cultural studies. Despite its various and diverse analytical interests and approaches, the field of cultural studies has developed a minimal consensus that almost all share; specifically, a common focus on identity. Cultural studies research whose epistemology seeks to deconstruct knowledge conceives its agenda as no more than another text to reproduce or invent identities desired by the concerned scholars. Secondly, it happens that, at the same time, cultural studies accuses the social sciences of being essentially political constructions, while the national identity composition of China scholars is witnessing drastic changes, with more overseas Chinese social scientists joining the Anglophone China studies community. This development makes the discussion on the ethical relationship among China scholars, China scholarship, and China itself increasingly pressing. Finally, globalization, which is bringing scholars and those carrying the China identity in and out of China more and more frequently, further obscures the border of China

that scientists used to assume to be "just out there." Once China as an object of research is opened up, the mutual constitution of related scholars and scholarship cannot be easily hidden any longer.

Interaction among the identities of China, China scholars, and China scholarship together casts doubt on the validity of knowledge in scientific communities. In brief, the challenge is that if knowledge is at the same time an identity statement of those who produce the knowledge, does this not mean that past research, which presumes the objectivity of China knowledge, should all be disposed as sheer product of identity politics? Or, is it that knowledge is still knowledge, except that it is not universal, law-driven, or time-neutral? This is not the first time a challenge of this sort has appeared in China studies. Earlier denunciations of area studies as counter-productive from the social science community once threatened to discredit the kind of research on China that was not oriented toward universal theory building. However, that earlier challenge was largely methodological and did not touch upon the identity issue that intrinsically links scholars to the scholarship. This ontological reconceptualization has prompted some responses from the social science community, but has not yet led to similar reflection in either Sinology or China studies.

The challenge is also about research design. How could scholars, after recognizing their subjective intervention into the production of knowledge through the *problématique* that motivates their research, feel comfortable about the result that to some extent responds to their own identity needs, consciously felt or not? This recognition means that one's scholarship represents at best truth relative to that of another. Scholarship is therefore more than a representation of truth. It is at the same time text which reveals the scholars'

own inner world. Scholars end up examining China, while readers end up examining the scholarship.

Indeed, the social science community has responded to the cultural studies challenges in various ways. The result is by no means encouraging, in the sense that the two epistemologies find no ready platform to engage in dialogue. Similar challenges appear in China studies indirectly, mostly not presented in epistemological terms. As these epistemological and ontological challenges question the moral foundation for research in the China studies community, the need for a framework that can deal with knowledge of a completely different nature seems present and urgent. Without such a framework, possible mutual estrangement among scholars of different identities will no doubt negatively affect the process of learning, as well as the quality of intellectual exercise. A framework that is epistemologically tolerant enough to bring together scholarship based upon different philosophies of knowledge can provide an ethical relationship among different varieties of knowledge. The oral history approach that contextualizes and individualizes scholarship provides a base for the participants to engage reflexively in an anthropology of knowledge that can lead to such a framework.

Theoretical Reflections

The purpose of the intellectual history of Chinese studies is to deconstruct the possibility of looking at China in its entirety. China rising has attracted an enormous amount of scholarly attention in the twenty-first century. However, influenced by their own historical and philosophical backgrounds, and the mundane political and economic conditions in which they live and work, writers actually treat China in a variety of ways. How one reads meanings out of the image of China rising intrinsically reflects one's own encountering and choice. The resulting

vast epistemological and civilizational difference between Asian, European, and American approaches to China is no longer a secret.² Even those seemingly sharing overlapping research agendas in any particular community nevertheless contrive to make contrasting strategic choices of theoretical and ideological perspectives. That said, most China scholars decide not to tackle or even acknowledge the embarrassing reality that different scholars study different notions of what China is. Adding to the textbook list of theoretical positions, one could present a geographically impressive array of views on China rising, coming out of South and Southeast Asia, Russia, Tibet, Australia, postsocialist Europe, and so on. In all these national and civilizational communities, political considerations and memories of historical relationships with premodern China intertwine with each other to produce distinctive opinions about the way China rising should be studied today. In a nutshell, no writing on China rising can avoid the self-involvement of either the writers or their readers.

Studying China in a global age involves almost immediately interactions between two sets of identities—the observers' and their China's identities. Each set comprises at least choices at three levels: civilizational, national, and (sub)ethnic. Take, for instance, Mongolia. Mongolia is representative of nomadic and prairie civilization as opposed to maritime, agricultural, or industrial civilizations. Mongolia is simultaneously a sovereign nation in quest of potential alliance with Japan or the United States in order to balance its two powerful neighbors, namely, China and Russia. Furthermore, Mongolia denotes an ethnic group in the Chinese autonomous region of Inner Mongolia, with a population larger than that of the

Republic of Mongolia. Needless to say, reference to China evokes similar images of civilizations, nations, and ethnic groups. When a self-regarding Mongolian scholar does research on China, or inversely a self-regarding Chinese scholar does research on Mongolia, the scholar (subject) should know from which and on which identity he or she writes. Accordingly, the intellectual choice of identity becomes intrinsic to international relations scholarship. Any choice or change of choice designates an institutional identity that bears upon the distribution of rights and duties, public as well as private. In addition, the choice affects the balance of social relationships. Thus, the scholarship treating such choices is by necessity multi-sited, political and global.

Due to widespread perceptions that China is on the rise, designating China's identity has become essentially a political matter. It could be a coagulatory decision that reinforces a specific identity and relationship for China. Or, alternatively, it could be a transformational decision that ushers in a new, different identity for China. However, the meaning of such decision or choice is rarely unilaterally determined by the scholar, nor is it invariable over time. The possibility of what such choice signifies constitutes a discursive site of constant contestation. Such contestation centers on whether or not China should be viewed as a threat and to whom this threat is posed. Moreover, the contestation implies how one should treat those agents who carry the identity of China, willingly or reluctantly. This is why studying China is a political as well as personal engagement, not to mention studying international relations of China. This political engagement speaks to both China's identity and the researcher's self-identity and could therefore be

² One notable comparison is presented in David Shambaugh, Robert F. Ash, and Seiichirō Takagi (eds.), *China Watching: Perspectives from Europe, Japan and the United States* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

highly controversial and volatile over time.

Between any civilizational and individual identities, there could be an unlimited number of cultural sites where one can acquire perspectives through learning, practicing, or simulating particular identity strategies that make sense to the sites, which home the available alternatives for the time being. Not only is the choice of identity at a particular site could be unstable over time, but the choice of site in itself is unstable, reducing the choice of identity to no more than an act of role-taking except that the latter usually requires a conscious, context-specific, and immediate decision. Globalization obscures the distinction of identity from role due to the increasingly destabilizing effects of globalization on self-other relations. Intellectual paths that come through the transformation—overthrowing, lingering-on, disappearing, reproducing, fading, or backfiring—of the party-state leadership in China as well as its foreign relations are compelled to encounter such dislocation of self-other relations, which generate frustration, hope, emptiness, fear, opportunity and other types of anxiety. Sites are accordingly as much intellectual, psychological, and social as physical.

Reflections on one's choice of site from which one has written different things on or about China could begin easier from recalling one's travelling experiences—as an immigrant, a student abroad, a conference participant, a visiting scholar, a field researcher, a tourist or those other noted as well as unnoted on one's curriculum vitae—whereby encountering that incurs constant making of choice is pervasive. Similar pressures to make a different choice likewise take place when hosting, willingly or not, arriving travelers in various forms—when surrendering to their colonial governing, hiring their service, reading

their writings, subscribing to their religion, consuming their products, marrying their members, and so on. Travel is intrinsically a method of China studies and also methodology of Sinicization.

The oral history respects the authors and readers of all the distinctive academic traditions as well travelling experiences, but it bypasses them to a certain extent. On the one hand, each of them deserves an entire book just to touch on the intellectual background that has prepared them to approach China rising in their own particular way. Their national and civilizational distinctiveness is typical and normal in their own context. On the other hand, and in comparison, there are others who write from a less noticeable or established national distinctiveness in terms of epistemological disposition toward China. These are subaltern writers who can demonstrate an even more powerful agency for the deconstruction of China, intended or otherwise, because they are more flexible in combining and recombining cultural resources at the individual level. In fact, the borders of China, within as well as without, including Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korea, Mongolia, and Tibet, are probably the least noted sites of original and yet silenced thinking on China and China rising. A forthcoming volume on Tibetan studies will be published by Routledge.³ Those contesting the meanings of China rising brought forth by globalization, together with the phenomenon of China rising itself, should also include at least two additional groups, namely, diasporic Chinese and Asian scholars writing on China from outside the land of their birth, and migrant and indigenous residents reflecting upon their association and identification with national China from within its territories. A further group could be composed of a particular kind of diasporic Western male scholars who have married

3 Chih-yu Shih and Yu-wen Chen (eds.), *Tibetan Studies in Comparative Perspective* (London: Routledge, forthcoming).

Chinese wives and established their careers in China.

In other words, the individualized intellectual tracks of scholars and the Chinese people they study show empirically how a normally understood China in social science literature is both possible and impossible. This multisited approach to China rising at the individual level is, in itself, a response to the popular belief in China rising, albeit constantly reinterpreted.⁴ China rising, as it has been written, read, and practiced everywhere, compels individuals who, frequently as well as sporadically, have to cope with the symbols and narratives of China in their daily activities to apply different meanings to it for different occasions. Chinese leaders usually react negatively toward any politicization of such multisited possibilities and are used to connecting it with what they see as a Western conspiracy to divide China. They could be right to some extent. Accordingly, national epistemological traditions and international relations, where Chinese leaders hope to secure China's national identity, collude in reproducing the entirety of the Chinese nationality. This is why multisited reflections on how the symbols of China are appropriated and reappropriated in various individualized conditions are so different, full of surprises, and worthy of recording.

Analytical Framework

Underpinning our oral history project is the conviction that individual intellectual trajectories necessarily reflect choices, conscious as well as

subconscious, over epistemological possibilities allowed by social conditions over which individuals have no immediate choice. Two mechanisms that facilitate intellectual growth are first, an encounter with the existing epistemological perspectives beyond one's own volition, and second, the choice that strategically selects, recombines, and renovates perceived (im)possibilities. The mechanism of encountering constrains the range of intellectual puzzles;⁵ the mechanism of choice reflects the strength of volition.⁶ Whereas encountering is largely socially prepared and yet unavoidably mediated by coincidence, choice is indicated by the existence of alternatives which the differing decisions and narratives of others are either preserved or created. Between one's choice and encountering, which is beyond one's own choice, there is the second-ordered mechanism of traveling, both conceived in terms of physical movement and career path. Traveling always involves choices that facilitate the encountering that ensues; hence, it is a second-ordered mechanism that breeds individual intellectual growth.

The present project invites reflections on various trajectories of intellectual history pertaining specifically to how China is accessed through knowledge of China in different communities and life biographies. Given the world's multiple identities, one's self-understanding is essential to one's understanding of China. Decisions made upon ever evolving individual biography challenges the objectivity of knowledge.⁷ The knowledge of China and the practices associated

4 Peter Katzenstein (ed.), *Sinicization and the Rise of China: Civilizational Processes beyond East and West* (London: Routledge, 2012).

5 Sandra Harding, *Is Science Multicultural?: Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998); Paul Diesing, *Science and Ideology in the Policy Sciences*, with a new introd. by Richard Hartwig (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2005); Nico Stehr and Volker Meja (eds.), *Society and Knowledge: Contemporary Perspectives in the Sociology of Knowledge and Science* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2005, 2nd rev. ed.).

6 Gary D. Phye, *Handbook of Academic Learning: Construction of Knowledge* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1997), pp. 52 & 110; Jason Stanley, *Knowledge and Practical Interests* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Robert C. Stalnaker, *Our Knowledge of the Internal World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

with the name of China complement one another in China as well as elsewhere.⁸ The evolution of China knowledge proceeds through trajectories of intellectual growth, each embedded in its own social practices. This is particularly pertinent in the age of globalization and amidst the arguable "age of China rising." As symbols of China fill in one's life practices, the China scholar's approach to its study increasingly interferes with his or her self-understanding.

The study of individualized intellectual history regarding China is therefore at the same time an anthropological study of knowledge. China involves the process of the self-becoming of its scholars and their communities, and is thus composed intrinsically of a phenomenon of human evolution. Historical bearings of one's social and cultural background comprise the epistemological foundation of one's writings on China. They incorporate various biographies that have given rise to unusually rich but often mutually incompatible intellectual resources and inspirations, including, at the very least, the collective memory of all those groups with which one has sequentially identified oneself throughout one's life. In my own birthplace, Taiwan, for example, these historical bearings refer particularly to political and social movements launched and wars fought in the name of, or targeted at, China and the associated political upheavals that caused social cleavages, political disarrays, ideological confusion, and, at times, anti-foreign, anti-colonial or anti-Chinese nationalism.

China scholarship in Taiwan, for example,

involves choices by scholars with respect to encountered and constantly reinterpreted imaginations of how China's names, identities, and images are incurred. Due to its colonial history, Civil and Cold War legacies, and internal cleavages, China scholarship in Taiwan consists of strategic shifting among the Japanese, American, and Chinese approaches to the subject, as well as their combination and recombination. The mechanism of choice, including the traveling that can orient, reorient and disorient existing views on China, produces conjunctive scholarship. The rich repertoire of views on China challenge, together with the politics of identity, the objectivistic stance of the social sciences to the extent that no view of China could be exempt from political implications and politicized social scrutiny.⁹ Concerns over exigent propriety in a social setting are internal to knowledge production. Therefore, understanding the process by which all the historically derived approaches inform China scholarship in Taiwan through the mechanism of encountering reveals both the uncertain nature of knowledge, in general, and the uncertain meanings associated with China worldwide, in particular.

Specifically, the present project encourages readers of the oral history results to track the identities and associated practices of academics. Their careers and intellectual evolution and the simplifications and complexifications in their work offer latecomers a window into the existing understanding of identities and practices in the Sinic world. Careers are not representative in any way, but they do illustrate well the possibilities

7 Paul Diesing, *How Does Social Science Work?: Reflections on Practice* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991); Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and 'nation building' in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

8 Baogang He 何包剛, "The Dilemmas of China's Political Science in the Context of the Rise of China," *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 16, 3 (Sep., 2011), pp. 257-277; Guoguang Wu 吳國光, "Politics Against Science: Reflections on the Study of Chinese Politics in Contemporary China," *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 16, 3 (Sep., 2011), pp. 279-297.

9 Chih-yu Shih, "China Studies That Defend Chineseness: The Im/Possibility of China-centrism in the Divided Sino-phone World," in Devare, Sudhir T., Reena Marwah, and Swaran Singh (eds.), *Emerging China: Prospects of Partnership in Asia* (New Delhi: Routledge, 2011).

that structures provide for self-reflexive agents to make meaningful choices and thus to shape, at least to some extent, their environments, without ever fully determining them. These academics illustrate with particular clarity the liminal positions they occupy between China and their own continents of Asia, Europe, America, Africa, or Australia, and between East and West. Their lives and work thus illustrate Sinicization as a set of multi-directional, multi-sited, discursive processes, including variants of de-, re-, and self-Sinicization. In short, Sinology presupposes agency and the appropriation and re-appropriation of Chinese phenomena by Chinese and non-Chinese academics for their self- and group-interested use at multiple sites.

These academics illustrate in their lives a variety of geographical, linguistic, and temporal possibilities. They were born into different national communities, they lived and worked in different countries, and their occasional reliance on languages other than their professional languages teaches their readers that Sinicization does not have to proceed in either Chinese or English. Rather, the use of third languages can be a statement of who one is, from where one comes and where one is heading. In brief, Sinicization reveals in one individual the existence of multiple cultural-geographical selves. Later in their careers, many experienced a rising concern over their home countries, often reflected in a shift happening, consciously and rationally, in their academic and political agendas and frequency of visits. This fact is a healthy antidote to the common preconception that structures are all-determining. As these individual

lives show, nothing could be further from the truth.

Even far-reaching views that seek to associate China with very specific images, such as "rise," "all under heaven," or "Chinese characteristics," represent choices, not inevitabilities; however, the lives and work of these academics contradict any such notion. If one insists on the nation-state as the only viable civilizational actor in world politics, Huntingtonian clashes of civilizations may have some plausibility. Academics living and working in transnational careers, however, have been free to choose practices unrelated, even resistant to, the constraints and opportunities that nation-states impose and provide. Promotion or denial of Chinese distinctiveness always involves choices. Thus, no view on China can be politically neutral. Sinicization is unavoidably shaped and impacted by conceptions of identity and political practice.

This does not mean that actors have full control over their scholarly work on China or over the self-identifications that implicitly or explicitly inform their perspectives. No academic could have controlled either the larger forces that prompted his or her civilizational encounters, or the liminal positions they have held.¹⁰ Their choice of language, for example, would not go unnoticed by one community or the other. Home and host countries posed structural constraints simply because they differed from one another. Any narrative strategy about China could not help but activate those differences. Yet, meaningful choices persisted, including both the choosing of sides and avoiding the choosing of sides. Structural determinacy thus fails to remove the capacity for

10 One version of the mix of these larger forces includes realism, idealism, Confucianism, and Islamism. See Wang Yu-ching 王玉青, *Tongshi, buguo fenkai': Dangdai 'xifang pubianzhuyi' xushu xia de rujia yu yisilan* [*Simultaneous and yet Separate: Modern Discursive Strategies toward Confucianism and Islam in Western Universalism*] 「同時，不過分開」——當代「西方普遍主義」敘述下的儒家與伊斯蘭 (Taipei: The Research and Educational Center for China Studies and Cross Taiwan-Strait Relations, Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University, 2008). Another version is Korea between China and Japan, socialism and capitalism, and East and West. See Myongsob Kim and Horace Jeffery Hodges, "Korea as a Clashpoint of Civilizations," *Korea Observer*, 37, 3 (Autumn 2006), pp. 513-545.

strategic indeterminacy. Adaptation, and even self-revocation, is the norm of biography.

Discursive analysis shows that these academics consciously manage their liminal positions through scholarship. In their work on China, we see at least two common puzzles that call for answers. How do they place themselves in the Sinic world? That is, does China belong to an identical or a different ontological order? How do they want China to be evaluated? That is, should China conform to a Western standard expressed in values that are claimed to be universal?

Encounter and choice are the mechanisms that define agency. Sinicization is premised upon encounters between Chinese and other civilizations. Encounters push agents to adapt, as they must choose between resistance, teaching, learning or a combination of all three. Consciously or not, each agent is constantly involved in choosing different strategies of adaptation. If encounters can generate fresh possibilities for innovation and re-combination, Sinicization is endlessly multi-sited. In processes of cross-civilizational encounters, no two agents will adapt their practices in exactly the same way. And although such encounters are occurring all over the world because of the size of China's population and its peaceful rise, Sinicization is gaining increasing significance.

Reworlding China and the Multi-sitedness of Sinicization

The phrase "China rising" gives the impression of an expanding Chinese sphere of influence or Sinicization. The meaning of Sinicization is complicated, multidimensional and contested. It refers to conceptions of self and other that are typically deeply intertwined. The practices it represents, discursive and otherwise, can signify either

the broadening or the narrowing of social and cultural distances. Many of the developments that are currently shaping the contemporary world, such as globalization, capitalism, nationalism and multiculturalism, provide the context in which China encounters and engages both East and West. The information on the lives and scholarship of individuals collected by the present project clearly reflects the complexity of these processes.

The intellectual reconstruction of China in its various guises, involving self and other, is about influence and interaction among people as much as states;¹¹ viz., the Chinese and their self-understanding as much as China and its sphere of influence, and China and its diaspora conceived of beyond the category of territorial China. Moreover, Sinicization focuses our attention on those mediating between China and the world. Consumers of goods made in China, Taiwanese pro-independence advocates, Chinese villagers fighting for socio-economic and human rights, and indigenous Chinese loyal to Southeast Asian states can all act as cultural brokers involved in processes of encounter, engagement, and clash between different civilizational complexes. Sinicization is a concept that summarizes important processes leading to self-discovery and self-interpretation. Without it, the economic, security, and political dimensions of Sinology are devoid of meaning.

Individualized intellectual history describes processes of civilizational evolution. These processes adapt both internal needs and external contacts with various agents who substantially, though not fully, share worldviews, values, self-understanding, and life practices. Appropriating knowledgeable practices across civilizational boundaries encourages adaptation. The contemporary study of China thus rests on the readiness of its students to conceptualize

11 William A. Callahan, *Contingent States: Greater China and Transnational Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).

and practice new ways of self-understanding.

Specifically, the oral history phase of the present project presents multiple sites of China studies that de/reconstruct the Sinic world order through the worlding and reworlding of historical subjectivities in various sites so that China rising in the 21st century contains no fixed destiny for post-Socialist, Asianist, religious (Christian, Islamic, Tibetan, or Indian) civilizational politics and international relations. By showing multiple possibilities of remapping the past or the present Sinic world order, the contending formulations of what China is appearing in the mainstream English, Japanese, Russian, and Chinese research literature can each find their own place in specific historical contexts, enabling students of Sinology to appreciate how China studies and China scholars are mutually constituted, as are the Sinic world order and China scholarship.

For contemporary social scientists outside of North America or Western Europe, pretending that an objective China exists may be a departure from imperialist history, its associated civilizing burden and its unwarranted sense of superiority. Presumably, a social scientist no longer has to be obsessed with the backward identity of China or feel responsible for its remedy. However, the seemingly natural, normal objectivism in European and North American social science is neither natural nor neutral once the nascent Asian intellectual reflections on politics of knowledge, especially knowledge regarding China studies as area studies, is put in perspective. The civilizational embedding of scientism actually inspires the American and West European elite to take the objectivist approach, rendering their own civilizational past ostensibly irrelevant. This explains why a return to civilizational consciousness becomes an epistemological prescription to the compulsive obsessive drive for objectivism that, incidentally, exposes the political nature of social science.

China's many colonized neighbors can no longer appreciate the objectivists' discourse. Their otherwise insignificant choices, meaningless to the mainstream research literature, nevertheless compose a variety of creative worlding possibilities. Under their quest for subjectivities from within the Sinic world order, what used to define the Sinic world order—for example, the tribute system, Daoist philosophy, ethnic kinship, political territorial sovereignty, and so on—no longer holds true or is no longer practical. However, this finding does not mean that these neighbors coordinate in these deconstructive exercises or that deconstruction is incompatible with nascent Sinicization. For the majority of Korean thinkers, for example, a Korean historical trajectory exists outside the Sinic world order, which bore the burden of the tribute system through its various vicissitudes. In turn, for the majority of Mongolian thinkers, a Mongolian historical trajectory exists independently over a vast territory, which the Yuan dynasty at best turned into a sub-empire, foreshadowing the eventual reunification of a great Mongolian nationality. On the other hand, a small group of Vietnamese Sinological veterans hold tightly to their Sinic identity to support a distinctive national position, while deterritorialized Chinese Southeast Asian scholars greatly undermine any attempt at a centered arbitration of Chineseness.

Multi-sited reinterpretations of the Sinic order challenge the singular text of "China rising" as well as the "Chinese threat" and points to a different intellectual history and, ultimately, a different view of global international relations. China rising has already generated multi-sited understandings both inside and outside China's territorial borders. Chongqing, the leading municipal region in Central China that has been consciously developing a China model in contrast to the Western model, parallels, in a manner of speaking, Canton, which deliberately combines

liberalization and one-party rule. Both are under capable leaders with both confidence and vision, and an eye on each other. One not need mention the age-old competition between Shanghai and Beijing or any other smaller, allegedly "unique" sites attempting to approach socialist reform in their own ways. Further challenges come from other sites, such as Tibet, Xinjiang, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, where the borders of China's turn increasingly obscure not only territorially, but socially and politically, as well. A transition from one Chinese territorial site to another usually demands a distinctive understanding of what China is. How China is continuously becoming another China is therefore contingent upon how each site, as low as individual households and as high as national regimes, acts upon its own historical trajectory. Neighboring nations certainly join in this constant process of becoming part of "China rising" and China becoming part of their own becoming. Borders and sites multiplying in this complicated manner almost certainly undermine high politics in the imagery produced by the conventional international relations research literature. Among possible sites are, however, the long ignored Socialist sites and their presocialist trajectories.

Sites are where identity strategies emerge. The multiple Sinic orders arising from various sites, which appear to belong to overriding Sinic order, reflect different identity strategies that meet within their interaction. These strategies derived from different historical trajectories construct their own China out of the mechanism of encountering and choice. Through encountering, each site is constrained by the physical and discursive contexts from which its strategies emerge; through choice, each site combines and recombines cultural resources to give meaning. This is how no site can monopolize the meaning of the Sinic order. All sites are able to come up with new or recycle old meanings. The Sinic order ironically

survives in name or imagination, if not in substance, as all strategies interact and adapt continuously.

Sinicization has enhanced the vitality and resonance of the intellectual history of Sinology. It has facilitated the spread of American market capitalist practices within China's economy, nationalism and rights rhetoric within Chinese politics, the idea of "balance of power" within China's foreign policy, and multi-culturalism within China's global diasporic communities. Conceptual and institutional adaptations to Sinicization and the different forms of resistance, re-appropriation, and feedback they engender have made Sinicization more important. All responses push agents to be cognizant of the positions they occupy between different civilizations, and all require knowledge of both the Euro-American and Chinese forms of civilization. Invariably, academics as agents of Sinicization cannot do without the use of English, which has unavoidable ideological, practical, and institutional consequences. Sinicization, as well as Sinology, often implies not only China as a nation-state, but also the Chinese residing in Indochina and Taiwan who mediate between the Chinese and their own various forms of identity. They act as both producers and consumers of civilization who maneuver among collective, familial, and individual centers of allegiance. Self-knowledge is the foundation of Sinology. Becoming a Sinologist involves multi-sited processes that deconstruct stereotypical notions of China's rise in the twenty-first century. Our interviewees have actively participated in Sinicization. Their strategic choices are shaped by their specific historical contexts, and their adaptations thus vary widely. Since they are positioned at different sites, these agents do not respond in a similar manner to China's rise.

Japan

The Japanese oral history we collected yields the earliest results of the project. How to be a nation-state has remained a constant puzzle for the Chinese as well as Japanese civilizations since the arrival of modernity in East Asia. The solution used to be one of learning, understanding and self-transformation. Only when the mission of transformation evolves into one of assertion do the two civilizations realize that the ultimate challenge still lies ahead. This is the first global moment at which the two nation-states appear on the world stage as global powers. For Japan, the global moment occurred at the turn of the century, emerging victoriously from the 1895 war on China and the 1905 war with Russia. China's moment transpired almost a century later after the dramatic year of 1997, which witnessed the demise of its last revolutionary leader Deng Xiaoping, the vindication of colonial shame through the transfer of Hong Kong to PRC sovereignty, the final completion of socialist thought revision and a triumphant survival of the Asian financial crisis. It is at their global moments that these two states, together with other actors on the world stage that had to engage their rise, were forced to decide on the ultimate challenge, if their final entry into world politics were to represent a different ontological configuration for international relations dominated by major power politics.

The ultimate challenge is inevitable at the global moment for psychological and political reasons. Psychologically, the past civilizations of East Asia, considered backward during their grand self-transformation, were able to regain their exterior attraction along with the rise of national power. First, there exists the drive to redeem lost self-respect by constructing a positive self-image embedded in the glorious civilizational past. There is conviction that current success of the nation-state to achieve the benefits of world status was enabled by the strength provided by the great

civilizational past. Accordingly, there is the urge to demonstrate that the newly acquired status should not be achieved at the sacrifice of extant civilizational traits. However, identity politics that asserts civilizational difference to meet these psychological necessities unavoidably challenges the very meaning of being a nation-state. Both Japan at the beginning of the 20th century and China in the 21st have appeared as threats to international relations due to their civilizational estrangement.

Unlike the historical rise of a national actor that will alter the balance of power in world politics, both Japan and China have avoided such a challenging position by claiming that their entry transcends the balance of power. While nation-states are territorial configurations, many students of China in Japan, as well as in China by the way, have painstakingly resorted to assuming a pervasive identity in an undivided space. Thus, becoming powerful among the East Asian states proceeds through civilizational expansion rather than territorial. Furthermore, this civilizational expansion should continue on the premise of incorporating, rather than replacing, existing civilizations. It is the new humanist ethic through which Japan or China contributes to world politics, not a new balance of power. Nevertheless, other students of these nations believe that the real task in practical terms is to request the fair share due for the rising status of their nations in accordance with the existing rules of the game or, alternatively, to faithfully follow the code of conduct set by earlier major powers. For these latter pundits, civilizations are national resources; they redefine neither the nature of the nation-state nor international relations.

Despite the similar variety in their civilizational approaches to a common challenge, Japan at the beginning of the 20th century and China in the 21st century categorically differ in the actual strategies

they employed, discursively as well as physically. On the one hand, for those who regard the two nations as civilizations, their treatment of Asia and Asianism stands out specifically in the difference. Japanese scholars are conscious of their place in the civilizational divide. They eagerly devise an Asia that enables Japan to group Asia and Europe together in its philosophical space of existence. Asia preserves Japan to the extent that the latter can become both Europe and China freely by becoming Asian, so that Asia becomes more universal than any other identity. In contrast, the Chinese imagination of space is an open-ended accommodation of anyone who intends to share Chinese civilization. In short, Japanese civilization ideally transcends world politics and survives civilizational divides through its enhanced intellectual capacity to become both. Asia is its conceptual vehicle. By contrast, Chinese civilization accomplishes the same thing by claiming everyone else as being Chinese. Asia is epistemologically redundant for Chinese thinkers.

On the other hand, for those who view their nation no more than an entity joining in an existing system and civilizations as being essentially territorial rather than transcendental, the challenge is slightly more physical than discursive. In this vein, for the Japanese nation to acquire its fair share and win respect, it must dominate Asia in order to become an equal participant in world politics. The scope of Asia arguably could be as limited as including no more than China and Korea. It could be as extensive as additionally including Southeast and South Asia. In the same vein, Chinese realists and liberals who subscribe to the system of nation-state are not perplexed by the scope of Asia, as they are concerned only about achieving equality for China's own sovereign domain. How China should prepare for acceptance by the rest of the world is the point of departure in this particular debate.

From the vantage point of the Japanese and Chinese scholars we have surveyed, knowledge of international relations conveys meanings considerably richer than the literature of power politics would allow. The quest for entry by Japan and China is self-defeating in two aspects. On the one hand, entry initially requires self-denial to allow civilizational aliens to evolve into a Eurocentric model of nation-state. However, the point of success at the global moment presents the ultimate challenge to the Eurocentric model, in order to compensate for the loss of self-respect in the process of becoming European. Our Japanese oral history project is intended to reflect on the various ways in which self-understanding is expressed in modern Japan and China. It will continue to elaborate on how knowledge of world politics and international relations, on the one hand, and civilizational self-understanding, on the other, are mutually constituted. It will discuss how theoreticians have discursively devised identity strategies for their group/nation/civilization to survive the ultimate challenges as they have understood them. It will tackle the question of how in specific contexts different scholars re-appropriate civilizational discourses for the sake of their own identity and survival, to the extent that world politics cannot escape from individualized aspiration for meaning and agency for being and/or becoming.

As it currently stands now, the project has completed 14 interviews, among which 10 were gathered in a book published by Heibonsha in June 2011. The first volume of the Chinese version, which came out in October 2011, also contains 10 interviews, 9 of which are translations from the Japanese version. A few other interviews are still being conducted at the time of the writing of this article, and the second Chinese version is expected in 2013. The interviews give the impression that individualized encountering and choice together frame the development of

intellectual history at the micro level. Experiences from the defeat in WWII vividly remain in the memories of many interviewees; however, those experiences do not seem to have impacted their later entry into the field of China studies. Similarly, the Chinese socialist revolution of 1949 does not appear to have been an influential component to their lives as teenagers. The decision to study Chinese in college was idiosyncratic, but also functional to their eventual careers in Sinology. In comparison, the Cultural Revolution attracted the attention of a good many who had already chosen Sinology as their research specialty. At which point each individual began to feel alienated from the Cultural Revolution was a matter of personal judgment and view of Japan. Some did remain sympathetic to some extent, though. In addition, how to regard China studies in the United States required conscious deliberation at times.

Methodologically, a vague division between social science and area studies appears to parallel the familiar division found in US academics. However, exploring the meaning of Asia among Japanese Sinologists finds at best a weak echo of their American or European counterparts. A political thought foundation that supports one's scholarly inquiry of China, while hardly motivating for American China experts, is not unusual among our Japanese interviewees. In Japan, this political thought foundation can carry with it a positive attitude toward China, from which the social science approach often exempts its practitioners. In either case, investigation is considered essential to a proper understanding of China among all interviewees. Friendship and social connections in China are mentioned across the board, while a cynical view of the Chinese Communist government can be detected in some interviews. Reliance on theoretical abstraction is partial, and there are proclivities to both sensitize details and dabble in long-term speculation.

【宏觀視野】

European Humanities and Global Challenges — A View Towards 2060⁺

Poul Holm^{*}



May I first say a warm thank you to the organisers of this important conference for inviting me and thereby offering me the opportunity to learn how the humanities are developing in East Asia.

I have the year 2060 in the title because I want to talk about some of the challenges for the next generation of humanists whom we are training now and who will make their biggest impact on society in 30 to 50 years time. It will be a world much different from the one we know. Many of the changes we cannot predict but three main changes in demography, climate, and information are inevitable. I would hold therefore that teaching and research in the humanities today anywhere in the world need to somehow reflect these grand challenges of the 21st century. I shall

be offering a distinctly European perspective in the hope of promoting a global dialogue.

Demographic Change

Let me take as point of departure how current undergraduates may experience change in the course of their career. From a European perspective, demographic changes will see Europe's share of the global population change from being a fifth of the world's population in 1960 to about 7% by 2060. At the same time Europe's population will be rapidly aging. These changes present huge challenges to European self-perception and innovation, which will become an important part of the humanities agenda. This is bad news for Europe's global influence—it gets smaller. It is also good news because it means that our congestion problems will be relatively small—we

⁺ Delivered at the 2012 International Conference on New Perspectives in East Asian Studies held between June 1-2, 2012, sponsored by the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, NTU.

^{*} Trinity Long Room Hub Professor of Humanities, Trinity College Dublin.

may preserve the rural and urban qualities that will be under tremendous pressure in many other regions of the world. Europeans will be old people. Wonderful as long as the old ones take care of themselves, difficult when we are poor and need help. With a declining population, we need robots or immigrants to do the job. In universities and the global world of learning, the legacy of European humanities will be questioned for its relevance to a world, which is 93% non-European. In sum then, Europe may become smaller and older, protect some qualities of life that will come under threat elsewhere, and Europe will be needing immigrants.

In view of these prospects, I would argue that European humanities need to globalise—we must embrace these predictions of the future in terms of the questions we deal with and the training we provide for our undergraduates who will inherit the planet as the next generation of leaders, experts and teachers. My sense is that we do not do a good job at present. These predictions are known and yet they are not reflected in the way we teach history, literature and philosophy or other humanities disciplines. There are many reasons but one is certainly that European humanities are still in a cocoon of European or Anglo-American thought. We need to step up the dialogue with other continents dramatically. We need to welcome hundreds of scholars from Asia, Africa, Latin America to learn from and exchange pathways of the humanities.

Climate

Climate next: Environmental change will change the world we live in over the next few decades. While climate change may be denied by sceptics today, there is no doubt that forces of demographics and economics alone will put the planet under severe stress in coming decades. We live in

a time when we need to come to terms with perhaps the biggest challenge of the humanities and indeed the human race ever.

I am talking therefore about the need for a new Environmental or indeed Anthropocene Humanities: which steps up to the challenge that the future of the planet is determined by ourselves, by our actions, by our behaviour as consumers and as citizens, taking up the particular suggestion recently advanced by Paul Crutzen, and other environmental scientists, that we have now entered a new planetary geological age, that of the "Anthropocene".¹ All the individual choices we make sum up to a behavioural aggregate, which is bad for the planet and for ourselves. Global changes are known—we can measure and discuss differences of degree, but the big challenges are known. What we do not know is how we should be able to change direction. Enlightenment is not enough. It is extremely difficult for humans to change behaviour, even though we know the negative consequences of unchanged behavior, just think of tobacco smoking, HIV, or CO² load. How can research help us survive as a species? Anthropocene humanities must therefore soon be a core part of a humanities curriculum.

Anthropocene Humanities must help us understand how and why we choose and act like we do. Research in environmental history is obviously relevant in this regard, but many other humanities disciplines can make important contributions. There is a need for research on how we model and narrate environmental change, how different languages and cultures perceive challenges, there is a need for studies of climate representations, a need to rethink philosophical and ethical questions about the commitment of living generations to future generations, etc.

¹ Paul J. Crutzen and Eugene F. Stoermer, "The 'Anthropocene,'" *IGBP Newsletter*, 41 (May, 2000), pp. 17-18.

The agenda for Anthropocene Humanities must investigate how we may enhance and intensify work on how directionality could be articulated, democratically pursued and implemented by new technologies, medical knowledge, economic paradigms, and forms of social organization.

The agenda must also embrace the fact that Western thought is repeatedly confronted with internal limits defined by institutional and philosophical constraints, while non-Western traditions remain embedded within national or cultural confines that often do not offer universalistic responses to environmental action.

Common to us all, Eastern and Western humanities, is that many of the problems we are confronted with are variants of the Prisoners' Dilemma: we would all benefit from collaborating towards the common good, but in an era of weak global politics, cultural distrust and imbalanced communication the defector is likely to get away with cheating. We know that the only solution to overcome the PD game problem is mutual trust. In a world of a vast, distributed PD game, the good guys will limit emissions etc, the poor guys will ask for acceptance that they pollute for a time, and the bad guys will pay lip service and get away with not changing their ways (and of course it is not always clear who are the good/bad/poor guys). Anthropocene Humanities should help us understand how and why we choose and act like we do. The humanities must play a key role in communication, translation and building trust.

The Constructive Role of Humanities

Colleagues in the sciences often look to the humanities—and the arts disciplines especially—for help with communicating science findings. While arts certainly may help communicate science findings, and humanities disciplines such as media studies certainly may help us understand how and why communication works, I believe that

the humanities have an independent role for understanding, adapting to and mitigating climate change.

The humanities may inform us when and how environmental problems have been mitigated or solved by individual and common action and what have been the interpretive grammars of purpose, significance, and meaning. We know that intellectual and cultural enlightenment is not enough to change human behavior and that it is extremely difficult for humans to change repetitive actions or preferences even when we know the negative consequences of unchanged behavior. The challenge to the humanities would, therefore, be: can the interpretive investments, research paradigms, disciplinary histories, and aesthetic traditions of the humanities help us effect fundamental orders of social and cultural change in a moment of climate crisis? We need to understand human behaviour, management, motivation, intention and desire, and this understanding needs to inform society. Research questions must be addressed at the individual, institutional, and social levels: How do individuals take on board and respond to calls for change in individual behaviour? How may social innovation help redress institutionally ingrained patterns? How do societies cope with and develop resilient responses to threats of crisis and collapse?

Some colleagues argue that the role of the humanities is not to contribute to the construction of the world, but rather that our role is to be a critical voice against the established. They will leave it to natural and engineering sciences to describe and construct the world, and will instead take the position as critics: while the natural science's role is to lay brick upon brick of the scientific building, it is the humanistic role to demolish the building. The postmodern historian Ankersmit says squarely that the historian is not committed to the truth, but solely to narrative

power.²

It's a radical position, which I reject. We cannot renounce the reference to reality and truth without giving up our academic position. But I do recognize that post-modern thinkers have played a positive role by demolishing positivist innocence and naivety. The last twenty years of rapid development of narrative style and experience universes would be unthinkable without post-modern thought and its influence on everyday thinking.

In the 21st century our thinking is characterized by design rather than tradition, we are no longer so much preoccupied with how the world is, but with how we can create something entirely new and unbound. The linguistic turn was therefore one of the humanistic world's most important discoveries in the last generation. The problem is that the humanities in the postmodernist interpretation may turn entirely self-reflecting. When a researcher looks at surroundings, the researcher may look really only at his or her reflection. Research may be a question only of how I choose to look at the world, how the world is reflected in me, or how I can look deeper into myself.

Instead of just being critical of this development of the humanities and harking back to positivist epistemology, we must recognize that there is no turning back. We all acknowledge that we humans have no other tool than language to comprehend the reality that is around us. The only thing we have as researchers are sensations and perceptions, empirical data and models, whether we are researching nanoparticle or dance. In this way both science and the humanities have taken the linguistic turn.

Can the Humanities Change the World?

If we agree that research should inform action, and that humanities findings may have a role to play, some sceptics may still ask: But have the humanities ever changed anything? Yes, I would maintain that the humanities have been central to articulating and determining long-term human behaviour certainly since Socrates and Confucius. Consider this one example of the role of the humanities during the Cold War. The world of the 1950s and 1960s was dominated by a belief in social engineering both in democratic and communist systems. The Cold War period was convinced of the possibilities of social planning as a result of the cognitive breakthrough for the quantitative social sciences such as sociology and economics. Still, it was beyond comparison a humanities thought product that helped to define and defend the western world during this time, the philosopher Karl Popper's 1945 study of the Open Society and his uncompromising defence of democracy at a time when totalitarian thinking was in sharp focus.³ Popper's philosophy had a take-up the extent of which we can hardly fathom today because it so radically came to define Western thought and behaviour during the Cold War. In a sense it is still with us today, perhaps most clearly evidenced by the United Nations COP-17 on Climate Change in Durban, South Africa, last year. The clash between the liberal thinking of western countries and the perspective of the newly affluent BRIC countries was evidence that we need a new kind of thinking.

I would call this new way of thinking Anthropocene Humanities, to overcome the differences and create a new consensus for living with environmental change. My suggestion is not to make all humanities a servant of one particular

2 F. R. Ankersmit, *History and Topology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphor* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1994).

3 Karl R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (London: Routledge, 1945).

agenda but rather to encourage humanities researchers to grasp the real need for a better understanding of the human in the age of the Anthropocene.

The Second Scientific Revolution

From demographics and climate let me turn to the third big challenge to the humanities, the way in which we do what we do, information and how we handle it. The second scientific revolution caused by the Internet is only now working its way into how we practice the humanities. The use of digital technologies is rapidly changing methods and indeed research questions, yet we are still training most humanities graduates for an analogue world. Do we need a step change in the humanities curriculum?

IT and especially the Internet has accelerated and fundamentally changed the way in which cognition takes place and these changes will only accelerate. The Canadian physicist Michael Nielsen argues in his book from last year *Reinventing Discovery* that the Internet means that we are facing the second scientific revolution: "We are living at the dawn of the most dramatic change in science in more than 300 years. The internet is transforming the nature of our collective intelligence and how we understand the world."⁴

Nielsen does not discuss the web's impact on the humanities, but its significance is, in my opinion at least as large and perhaps in an epistemological sense, much larger. Humanities are still overwhelmingly conceived and practiced as analogue sciences and the full benefits of the digital revolution are still ahead of us. Archives hold an ocean of human knowledge, which is still locked in paper format.

In the 1960s IBM tried to reach a closer understanding of how humanities disciplines contribute to human cognition, especially as concerns the humanities affinity for IBM's engineering world. Therefore, it suggested a ranking by how rigorous the humanist discoveries could be said to be.⁵ It was a ranking that reflected the needs of the computer industry to machine code precise information for limited resources of hard disks and bandwidth. Today the IT industry has happily overcome these restrictions to accommodate large text masses. It offers vastly improved opportunities to develop IT-based humanist technologies, and we are certainly only at the threshold of a leap from analogue to digital research methods.

Instead of thinking in two cultures—technology and culture badly set up for each other—we should consider that no culture today comes to us without being digitally disseminated. The last twenty years of IT revolution is being felt everywhere in all disciplines be they Assyriology, numismatics, dramaturgy, literature or language studies.

Humanities research provides content in the form of texts, images, objects to an online world that is ever more hungry for content. Therefore the first step in digital humanities anywhere has been to translate this analogue world onto a digital platform. We now have access to millions of books that no one can ever have time to read or get an overview by reading from cover to cover. Therefore the task is no longer just for the individual researcher to read as much as possible and remember as much as possible using index cards, notes and dog ears. Future humanities research is ex ante digital humanities, and the task is to develop and master as many digital technologies

4 Michael Nielsen, *Reinventing Discovery* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2011).

5 Edmund A. Bowles (ed.), *Computers in Humanistic Research* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967).

and search strategies as possible.

The digital revolution is already challenging the school system from the first to last stages. Students are increasingly unable to read long, sustained texts, and when they write, their products are often samples, pieced together by texts from the Internet, instead of original expressions. We may regret this development, but must also take it seriously. The question is how the school system should look after the digital revolution. Until now much of the teaching and examination methods continues in an analogue tradition. The problem is that when students' world is digital there is a mismatch, which leads to declining motivation and poorer outcomes. The current school generation in Europe is perhaps the first of several generations who have worse formal results than the previous one. There is an urgent need for humanities research into how we adjust to a reality that has already occurred.

The humanistic university programmes are also still predominantly in an analogue world. We do not prepare the next generation of born-digital humanists, who with naturalness exploit the digital opportunities. Instead, the humanistic study is often a schism between young people's digital-social networks and the analogue study chamber. It is no wonder if this schism is experienced by students as anything but a preparation for the work that awaits after graduation.

Translational Humanities

In a world where natural resources are final, and where smart solutions are about overcoming cultural barriers and improve access to digital resources, it is essential that we think of the university in a new way. The university operates

today as a framework for specialized knowledge sharing, with a library and administration as the only common facilities. But the centrifugal motion, the creation of ever more specialised disciplines, which was the engine of the first scientific revolution, leaves little space for knowledge sharing. During the second scientific revolution, there is a need for a reconfiguration of science, including the humanities. There is a need to promote radical-interdisciplinary collaboration across traditional faculties.⁶

Radical interdisciplinarity that exceeds faculty boundaries is often praised but rarely practised—and suffers from lack of support. There is little incitement from university managers or politicians to break with traditional patterns and hence we are left in the disciplinary siloes and thought patterns developed with the university of the 19th century.

In sum, these grand challenges to the humanities may be taken to indicate the need to rethink humanities. I suggest that we may learn from the practice of translational medicine to overcome difficulties of disciplinary boundaries and obstacles to application of humanities insights, and that a way forward may be to support what I would call translational humanities.

Translational medicine is the term for the important transformation of health research that occurred around 2000 by an emphasis on shortening the turnover time and reduce transaction costs in the research value chain. There are delays and obstacles at every level from laboratory to hospital bed, from biomedicine and psychology to the patient. This is why translational medicine is about ensuring that basic research and knowledge at each specialized level is translated

⁶ Poul Holm, Michael Goodsite, Sierd Cloetingh, Bernard Vanheusden, Kathryn Yusoff, Mauro Agnoletti, Moldan Bedřich, Daniel Lang, Rik Leemans, Joergen Oerstroem Moeller, Mercedes Pardo Buendia, Walter Pohl, Andrew Sors and Ruben Zondervan, "Collaboration between the Natural, Social and Human Sciences in Global Change Studies," *Environmental Science and Policy* 2012 (in press).

to the next, and about developing relationships from research labs to hospitals, GPs and ultimately to the patients.⁷

Such a translation dimension is not typical in the humanities. We do not have the financial overheads that can pay the transaction costs. As a humanities scholar you must be both basic scientist and entrepreneur, translator and communicator, activist and lobbyist. If you are not able to play all parts, it is unlikely that your research will have impact.

The challenge for us on the one hand is to defend disciplinary diversity, so we avoid being one-dimensional in our concept of the human—biologists have been good at defending biodiversity, we must be better to speak on behalf of the diversity of human existence. On the other hand, we must become better at articulating our findings, and we must bring our findings into play. We must come up with answers to how we can bring heritage with us into the future, how our research may benefit social cohesion, how we can share knowledge with companies and institutions, and how it helps us live with the challenges of climate and globalization.

Universities and research councils therefore need to think in ways of enhancing both the ability of the humanities to research the Anthropocene and to translate our findings. And we need to increase our ability to put this knowledge at stake in society.

7 Duke Institute for Translational Medicine defines translational research practices in this way: "It is an integrated support structure that provides resources and training and facilitates collaborative research in clinical and translational research. DTMI's mission is to catalyze translation across the continuum of scientific discovery, clinical research, care delivery, and global health. DTMI facilitates team science by joining multidisciplinary investigators and industrial-model project management, while providing investigators easy access to emerging technologies and methodologies." <http://www.dukemedicine.org/Initiatives/ClinicalAndTranslationalScience> (accessed Jan. 3rd, 2012).

【宏觀視野】

Inventory and Invention: How Can a Classical Education Foster Creativity?⁺

Alan T. Wood*



In February, 2012, I directed a week-long series of conversations and presentations on our campus on the overall subject of innovation and creativity. As part of that forum, I invited J. Rogers Hollingsworth, a historian at the University of Wisconsin, to present a lecture on how universities around the world have encouraged—and discouraged—breakthrough innovation in the sciences. He has spent decades studying that issue, and has interviewed 500 of the leading scientists in the world. Many of his insights are reflected in the remarks below on stimulating creativity in the sciences.

The subject is of great interest to me, because I am in the process of writing a history of the rise and fall of human civilizations around the world. It turns out that one of the hallmarks of successful civilizations is the ability to foster innovation. By

the same token, one of the hallmarks of a civilization in decline is a failure to foster innovation.

So in this paper I would like to reflect on this question as it relates both to classical education in Chinese history and then to world history. I will first mention a few reasons why a classical education discourages innovation, followed by some reflections on how a classical education is absolutely necessary for innovation. That paradox—that the study of classics both discourages and encourages innovation—is captured in the title. In English the two terms "inventory" and "invention" share the same root, though they seem very different. Inventory implies the past; invention implies the future.

How does a classical education discourage creativity?

+ Delivered at the International Conference on "The Importance of Classics Education: *Contemporary Issues, Classical Insights, East and West*," sponsored by the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, NTU, October 25, 2012.

* Professor of History, University of Washington, Bothell, WA.

- (1) Past knowledge not always relevant to future problems. The past is a very useful repository of human experience, and is a guide to the future—but not always. The fact is that history never repeats itself in exactly the same way. Similar, yes; the same, no.
- (2) A classical education typically focuses on successes. We tend to study what worked, what led to beneficial outcomes, and what the previous generations have told us was worth remembering. Let me give an example. I've always thought that Xunzi 荀子 had a much more interesting and profound understanding of human nature than Mengzi 孟子. But the classical tradition, because of the neo-Confucian heritage, focuses almost exclusively on Mengzi. So Xunzi's insights are not given much weight.
- (3) All civilizations require bureaucracy in order to accomplish complex goals. But bureaucracy actively discourages innovation because innovation requires risk, and risk invites a certain degree of failure, which bureaucracy has no tolerance for. When, as in traditional China, access to the bureaucracy is by exam, then innovative thinking is going to be discouraged even more. I remember reading Northern Song scholars who constantly criticized students for studying only for the exams and not for the sake of real learning.
- (4) A classical education reinforces conventional standards of thought and behavior. More on that later.
- (5) Creativity occurs on the margins, but classical education is the center. New thinking, because it is likely to be wrong (because it is risky) is not going to have prestige and reputation, by definition. But

that is where the innovation is. Confucius was creative, but he was not at the center.

If that is the case, then how does a classical education promote creativity? The answer lies in another question: How do you know something is new if you don't know what is old? Invention thus requires a knowledge of inventory, of what came before. Creativity, on the other hand, means something new, something previously unknown, something resulting from breaking previously established rules. But how is it possible to know that you have broken a rule if you don't know what the rules are in the first place? How do you know something is new if you don't know what is old?

Examples:

- (1) Renaissance = re-birth. The European Renaissance was founded as a rebirth of classical studies. Scholars looked to classical antiquity for inspiration. This is one reason why, incidentally, I believe that China and Taiwan are soon about to begin a renaissance of their own, and that this renaissance will be based on a synthesis of Chinese classical education and modern science.
- (2) A very high proportion of scientists in the United States received a liberal arts education at small liberal arts colleges without expensive equipment. There are many potential reasons for that, but one of them is surely that their education was broad and general, and in the process introduced them to the most exciting questions of life and to the joy of learning.

So the real question is how to encourage those aspects of a classical education that foster creativity, and discourage those aspects that don't foster creativity. I will suggest some strategies that have been successful in the past. These strategies are based on research on how to foster break-

through creativity in the sciences:

- (1) Passion. Because creativity takes place on the margins, often at great risk and without the normal rewards of prestige and reputation, there has to be a deep and abiding and passionate interest in pursuing that particular line of inquiry. One has to encourage students and artists to find what it is they are passionate about, and then help them channel that passion into productive directions.
- (2) Curiosity: education should engage students' curiosity by focusing on problems first, then the solutions in the form of knowledge about those problems.
- (3) Cultivate both breadth and depth: our entire higher educational system—all over the world—focuses on depth—we specialize from early on, until at the Ph.D. level we know more about one tiny piece of knowledge than anyone else in the world. But breakthroughs are made by people who also have a much broader breadth of interests that puts them in contact with all kinds of people outside their own specialization. My experience is that out of 100 people who become researchers and professors, only about 1 or 2 have a deep and abiding interest in the really big, visionary issues. Take biology, for example. Most practicing biologists have been trained in very narrow fields of specialization, and they stay in those fields for the duration of their career. Out of that small number, a tiny fraction are fascinated with the really big—and seemingly unsolvable—issues like "what is life?" How can one explain or understand the astonishing transition from a collection of inert chemical elements to something that is alive? It turns out, however, that it is that small minority of scientists who are fascinated with the really

big questions that often end up being the most creative.

- (4) Small size promotes flexibility and adaptability. The experience of most institutions is that the larger and more prestigious the institution, the less likely it is to foster breakthrough thinking. In the United States and Europe, the big, prestigious universities do not usually produce really breakthrough ideas. Smaller places like Cal Tech and Rockefeller University, or places like the Bell Labs and the research PARC, are far more likely to break new ground. Prestige and size are a real impediment to innovation. So is success. No sooner is a company or an organization successful than it often stops being innovative. That's why in the computing industry, companies don't last very long. Success dooms the companies to failure because they become complacent.
- (5) Frequent conversation with people outside one's own area of expertise. The key to innovation is conversation, conversation, and more conversation. There is no better way to get scholars to be innovative than to provide cheap, good food and a wonderful atmosphere conducive to conversation. Combine eating with talking—figure out ways to get people to interact with each other outside their offices. Rockefeller University, I am told, has a great dining facility with tables that seat no more than eight people, so that conversations don't divide up but take place at the table as a whole, bringing together specialists in diverse areas.
- (6) Create an atmosphere that promotes risk. Failure is essential to the creative process. In Silicon Valley in California, failure is not something to be ashamed of—it's almost a badge of honor. The assumption is that one

learns more from failure than from success, so the more you have failed, the more you know! It's no accident that the most successful system for innovative thinking in the Silicon Valley in California is outside the university. Universities are intensely conservative places intellectually—liberal politically, but intellectually extremely conservative. So for Silicon Valley, the universities provide the knowledge base, but not the environment where that knowledge can be put into practice. That requires a completely different atmosphere. Nothing could discourage risk more than the American system of promotion and tenure, which makes it imperative to get grants and publish successful results in a short period of time. It makes people very, very cautious in what they do. It's also another reason why so much innovation in that field is done by very young people. The knowledge base of the modern digital revolution was produced by companies like AT&T's Bell Labs (where Steven Chu 朱棣文 did the work on lasers for which he received the Nobel Prize), IBM's Watson Research Center, and Xerox's PARC (Palo Alto Research Center). Those were called skunk works that were outside the control of mid-level managers (who would never have permitted such freedom), and it was young people like Steve Jobs and Bill Gates who took many of those innovations and made a revolution out of them. And yet Silicon Valley, and Microsoft, rose out of close proximity and collaboration with universities. There is a kind of symbiotic relationship there.

- (7) As someone who has now spent a whole lifetime in the university (my father was a university professor and a dean and academic vice-president, and I have been both a professor and an academic vice-

chancellor), I am always fascinated by the simple paradox that underlies the modern university. The paradox is that we are programmed in our educational system to be competitive. But competitive people are often the least creative, because competition assumes that all the competitors are playing by the same rules. Creative people, on the other hand, don't play by the rules—they invent not just new rules, but entirely new games. But because they are new, they don't have status or prestige, or money for that matter, which is why passion and curiosity are necessary. Without them, people would not persist in spite of being ignored.

- (8) Lastly, intellectual creativity requires diversity. It requires people to do what does not come naturally, which is to associate with people who are different, not with people who are the same. That is how new ideas are formed, not by associating with people who are alike. All that produces is an echo chamber.

So in closing, let me once again return to my central point, which is that a classical education is absolutely necessary for creativity, because it represents the cumulative knowledge and wisdom of the past. But creativity needs more—it flourishes only in an atmosphere of great tolerance for risk and for failure. To balance these conflicting perspectives is our greatest challenge in higher education.

【多元觀點】

美國牛肉與自由貿易：臺灣民眾的態度調查

江淳芳*、劉錦添**、王慈雅***

自 2003 年美國發現首例狂牛症以來，開放美牛與否一直是臺灣與美國貿易角力的重要戰場，也是本國民眾相當關心的議題。2009 年，雙方重新開啟美牛進口談判，簽訂「臺灣美國牛肉議定書」，並於當年 10 月開放 30 月齡以下的美國帶骨牛肉、內臟、絞肉開放進口。此項決定引起醫界、消基會等團體之反彈，認為此舉恐使臺灣遭受狂牛症威脅。在各界的壓力下，立法院於 2010 年 1 月通過食品衛生管理法第 11 條修正案，禁止美國內臟與絞肉等牛肉及製品進口到臺灣，但也引發美國強烈不滿。

今年度總統大選後，美國在牛肉進口議題上再度對我政府施加壓力，希望臺灣放寬標準，讓含瘦肉精之肉品能進口到臺灣，並表達

若美牛案順利解決，將有助於臺美貿易暨投資架構協定（TIFA）之洽談。但俗稱「瘦肉精」的萊克多巴胺具有毒性，可能影響人體健康，因此再度引發環保及衛生等團體之強烈反彈。

為了解臺灣民眾對於進口美國牛肉與經濟貿易全球化等相關議題之看法，本研究計畫分別於 2009 年 11 月與 2012 年 5 月間，委託故鄉市調公司，針對年齡介於 20 到 65 歲間的民眾進行電話訪問，兩次調查的樣本數分別為 1,203 人與 1,306 人。

關於進口美國牛肉相關議題

臺灣目前食用牛肉人口比例約佔 78.1%，略高於 2009 年 11 月調查結果（74.34%）。自 2003 年美國發現首例狂牛症以來，開放美牛與

* 臺灣大學經濟學系助理教授。

** 臺灣大學經濟學系特聘教授。

*** 臺灣大學經濟學系研究助理。

否一直是臺灣與美國貿易角力的重要戰場，同時也是本國民眾相當關注的議題。在今年 5 月 1,306 位受訪者中，有 86.91% 表示曾經在新聞媒體閱讀過美牛新聞，且 26.72% 會特別注意相關報導，而閱讀時，民眾對健康與食品安全的關心（76.8%）遠高於自由貿易協定（7.27%）。另外，大約有 47.32% 的受訪民眾認為新聞媒體本身對美牛進口持反對看法，對於報導公正程度則給了不及格的平均分數：57.91。

上一次調查（2009 年 11 月）中，69.37% 的民眾表示不贊成（或非常不贊成）開放美國牛肉進口；而本次調查在加入瘦肉精議題後，則發現不贊成（或非常不贊成）開放含瘦肉精的美國牛肉進口的民眾佔了 74.5%，與前次調查結果相比較，增加了 5.13%。其中，選擇非常不贊成的比例更由 2009 年的 30.46%，增加了約 9 個百分點，至 39.51%。

若進一步探究受訪民眾採取不同立場的原因，本次調查發現贊同美國牛肉進口的 16.23% 民眾中，大多數（80.19%）認為只要商品上有明確標示，消費者可以選擇是否購買；其次則認為美牛的開放與美國簽訂自由貿易協定息息相關（15.09%）。至於反對美牛進口的民眾主要著墨於健康與食品安全議題，擔心瘦肉精對人體造成危害的比重佔 74.82%，另有 15.52% 受訪者反對的癥結係著眼於對本國畜牧產業之保護。

近幾個月以來的瘦肉精風暴，對於民眾的肉品購買行為確實造成一定影響，其中又以牛肉為甚：問卷中有 15.24% 的民眾因此完全不購買牛肉，14.62% 則大量減少消費，而 34.61% 的民眾則未受影響；相對而言，豬肉市場所受到的衝擊則小得多，大約 61.04% 的受訪者表示他們的豬肉購買量並沒有減少，因瘦肉精風波而完全不購買，或大量減少購買豬肉

的比率則分別為 1.68% 與 8.73%，遠低於前述關於牛肉的調查結果。

行政院於 2012 年 3 月 15 日提出「安全容許、牛豬分離、強制標示、排除內臟」政策方向，對含瘦肉精的美國牛肉「有條件解禁」。根據本次電話訪問，約 31.70% 的受訪者對於政府的食品安全管理政策「非常沒有信心」，較 2009 年微幅增加 1.82%；「沒有信心」的比重則較前次調查降低了 4.7%，為 37.6%。整體而言，對政府政策宣示傾向於有信心的受訪者，只有 24.74%，與前次調查的 24.25% 結果相當接近。

關於自由貿易相關議題

本次電話訪問亦調查一般民眾對於自由貿易的看法。在受訪者中接近六成（58.50%）的民眾較傾向於對外國商品進口進行管制，其中 16.77% 的受訪者認為應該做嚴格的管制。與 2009 年時的調查相比，贊成對外國商品進口進行管制的比率小幅上升近 3 個百分點。

被詢問到是否贊成美國農產品（含稻米、牛肉、豬肉）全面開放進口時，18.91% 的受訪民眾表示「非常不贊成」，若加入「不贊成」的樣本，比例更高達 53.68%；不過另一方面，也有 23.04% 的民眾傾向贊成全面開放。若農產品來自中國，贊成（含非常贊成）開放的民眾僅有 12.79%，較 2009 年調查結果減少 5.34%；此外，更有 35.68% 以及 48.70% 的受訪者表示「非常不贊成」與「不贊成」。

2010 年臺灣與中國簽訂了 ECFA（兩岸經濟合作架構協議）。2009 年的電話訪問中，對馬英九總統在進行 ECFA 談判時是否能夠維護臺灣權益沒有信心（含非常沒有信心）的受訪者佔 54.39%，較有信心者多了約 14%。不過，協議簽訂後近兩年，10.41% 的受訪者認為這近兩年來，這項協議對臺灣的經濟發展很有

幫助，認為稍有幫助的民眾的比例為 40.74%，但也有 34.99%的受訪者認為 ECFA 對我國的經濟發展有某些程度的傷害。

雖然民眾肯定開放貿易帶來的成效，但對於全面開放仍有疑慮。被詢問到是否贊成簽訂完全免關稅，商品可自由進出口的「自由貿易協定」時，持反對意見者（不贊成、非常不贊成）較多；若簽訂協議的對象為中國，反對比例高達 60.1%；若為美國，反對者則為 44.49%。這項數據比 2009 年大幅成長了 10.72%，這是否因近日美國對我國施加壓力而引發民眾不滿，值得關注。

【多元觀點】

「從思想史思考東亞」國際學術研討會紀要⁺

徐興慶^{*}

臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院「東亞崛起中的日本與韓國研究整合平臺」於6月3日舉辦「思想史から東アジアを語る」國際學術研討會。發表學者來自日本、中國、韓國及國內，皆為學術界知名且資深的學者。本次研討會重點集中於東亞近世之議題探討，從思想、歷史的角度切入，提供一個研究時代樣貌、共時性的研究視野。

上午的專題演講，共有四位講者。第一位講者伊東貴之教授以〈東アジアの「近世」と中國の「近代」—中國と日本、思想と社會の異同を中心に—〉（東亞的「近世」與中國的「近代」——以中國與日本、思想與社會的異同為中心）為題，述及中國的「近世」時代劃分，有許多不同的看法。伊東教授認為中國近世為宋元明清，這是一段相當長的時期，其中

又以明清交替為一個分歧點，很多研究集中探究此時期對日韓兩國的影響。此外，相對於中國的近世，日本的近世則是江戶德川時期。伊東教授比較中國與日本的「近世」，以及明清交替對於當時朝鮮和日本的影響。

第二位講者劉岳兵教授於〈1872年「瑪也西」號船事件與近代中日關係〉演講中，以當時的時代背景為出發點，考察相關文獻，進一步探討當時日本的真正意圖，提出新的論點。認為日本當初提供協助，一大部分原因是為了臺灣及琉球，欲藉此讓中國承認這兩地為日本的領地，其說法推翻過去這個事件的論述。

第三位講者松田宏一郎教授以〈日本政治思想史研究についての「近世」・「近代」概念と文脈〉（日本政治思想史研究中的「近

⁺ 本文係2012年6月3日由本院「東亞崛起中的日本與韓國研究整合平臺」主辦「從思想史思考東亞」國際學術研討會之活動紀要。

^{*} 臺灣大學日本語文學系教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

世」、「近代」之概念與文脈)為題,探討「近世」與「近代」的定義。日本先受到儒學影響,明治之後受到西洋影響,「近世」與「近代」並非以東洋或西洋來區分。

第四位講者金錫根教授發表〈19世紀末東アジアと社會進化論—韓國における受容と機能を中心に—〉(19世紀末東亞世界與社會進化論—以韓國為中心討論受容與機能—),述及東亞如何接受進化論「適者生存,弱肉強食」的觀點。認為韓國了解進化論知識的過程可以由日本、中國、韓國三方面來探討。東亞的進化論超越個人到達民族,甚至國家的層次。更以社會進化論來解釋國際的冷漠,以及合理化之帝國主義。

下午進行了三場專題演講及綜合討論。李鍾元教授發表〈韓國の地域外交と東アジア〉(韓國的地域外交與「東亞」)。他以國際外交的視野,提及中日韓各國皆關心東亞共同體,其中又以韓國最重視。並舉出針對亞洲十個國家實施的調查結果,韓國人排名皆在前面。認為東亞各國在政治、經濟方面,都應超越國家、國民,架起一座友好的橋樑。

辻本雅史教授發表的〈教育における日本近世〉(日本近世的教育)中,將重點置於「近世日本的教育如何被看待」,以及「出版媒體對於教育的影響」兩個論點。指出學術界多以近代的觀點看近世教育,他則認為應該反過來站在江戶時代的立場來看近代。提出江戶時代出版大量書籍,增加教育的普及率。先行研究之所以不重視江戶時代的教育,其實與明治之後的近代教育有很深的影響關係。

徐興慶教授發表〈近代日本知識人の臺灣觀——傳統と近現代の葛藤における徳富蘇峰の視點〉(近代日本知識份子的臺灣觀——徳富蘇峰在傳統與近現代糾葛下的觀點)一文,提到日本因三國干涉,被迫放棄遼東半島,這

事件讓徳富蘇峰從平民主義開始轉變其想法。指出徳富蘇峰認為臺灣對日本而言,在擴展南方版圖時,無論是經濟或是政治方面的發展皆勢在必得,且臺灣物產豐富,可以提供日本糧食等後勤補給。因此徳富蘇峰貫徹其「大日本膨脹論」,主張日本應積極佔領臺灣。

最後綜合討論的焦點都集中於「東亞」及「近世」的概念,因此,首要問題便是「近世」一詞該如何去定義。與會者之一的徐勝教授也認為大家雖以「近世」為共通前提,但各自的定義都不盡相同,可以以此為主題再舉辦一場研討會。此外,「東亞」這一概念,其實是從日本開始,建議各位學者下次可從日本方面著手。此次研討會,各位講者都帶來了精闢的演講內容,針對東亞各國歷史背景及各國間互動,各自提出看法,相互交換意見、深入討論。學術研究跨越國界、彼此對話,使得人文與社會科學對話更加活潑、多元且富有深度。

以下為本次大會所發表論文之摘要:

伊東貴之 (ITO Takayuki) :

〈東アジアの「近世」と中國の「近代」—中國と日本、思想と社會の異同を中心に—〉

中國的「近世」這個時代劃分上的時期,儘管在日本的歷史學界有諸多說法,普遍來說,依 11 至 18 世紀的王朝而言,相當於縱貫宋、元、明、清這樣一段極長的時期。相對的,日本的「近世」大體上被認定等同於江戶(徳川)時代。且如日本當時的儒學學派的朱子學及陽明學,乃為更久以前成立於宋、明時代的思想。這樣的差異起源為何呢?此外,中日兩國「近世」的本質及其本質上的差異,往往被認為具有著其後續之「近代」的相異傾向。大致上而言,從該時期,不管從歷史層面還是思想與文化層面,可看出日本從過去全盤接受中國的影響到相對邁向自立的過程。總之,其也可說是現今探討的兩國特性開始相互

突顯的時代。本報告以歷史層面各問題為核心，特以思想與文化的觀點詳加考察，同時，為不落於文化本質論類的獨斷說法及國民性論調的陷阱中，也將提及作為背景之兩國政治與社會的特質。此外，在可能的範圍內，將同時代朝鮮半島的情勢納入考量，並加上比較史層面的檢討。具體而言，將視點放在中國的王朝體制與日本的幕藩體制，也就是奠基於科舉之士大夫官僚政治與以士農工商階級為前提之武家政權之間的差異，以及封建制與郡縣制、中國儒教、朱子學及日本武士道、國學，加上君臣、忠孝、家、禮等觀念與型態的差異，以明示該時期兩國歷史與社會層面、思想與文化層面之異同為主要目的。於此前提下，關於與西歐、日本相異之所謂中國性「近代」的特質應該作何理解，將加上近年日本方面的研究動向與發表者自行的考察，提出意見。

劉岳兵 (LIU Yue-bing) :
〈1872 年「瑪也西」號船事件與近代中日關係〉

1872 年日本在美英各國的敦促與協助之下，積極就秘魯「瑪也西」號船事件展開審判，解救了中國被拐賣的勞工，是近代日本史和中日關係史上具有重大意義的歷史事件。從法制史（領事裁判權）的角度對該事件的研究已經非常詳細，此事件本身的具體過程，也已經揭示得比較清楚了。該事件對近代中日關係的影響，中國大陸學者近年偶有論及。該事件在中日關係史上的意義，既要看到日本方面有對中國講信修睦的友好的一面，但是又不能只是片面強調日本一方的積極作用，且不論日本方面因此而表現出來的「皇國優越」意識的膨脹，無論如何也不能無視日本方面企圖利用此事件而設計的種種「如意算盤」。許多歷史事件，在人道主義的旗幟下常常隱含著偽善的因素。該事件也不例外。這些友善和偽善的因素，可以通過日本方面處理該事件的最高指導

者副島種臣和直接經手人大江卓的言行得到印證。此事件的處理，不僅為日本贏得了「聲譽」，也為其處理臺灣、琉球問題，贏得了謀劃的時間，並得到了美國的「支援」。

松田宏一郎 (MATSUDA Koichiro) :
〈日本政治思想史研究についての「近世」・「近代」概念と文脈〉

歷史研究上的時代區分，一直以來都是學界的論爭要點。本稿試從日本政治思想研究者的立場，來看日本的「近世」和「近代」的概念在今日是如何被看待。在這之前必須先確認此種區分是否能有明確的定義。筆者認為現今對這種概念仍存有疑慮，因此要思考今後將能夠採用何種研究方法。有關馬克思主義或是近代論為代表的單線發展的時代區分論的疑問已被完整提出。我們經常在坊間看到在大眾媒體或是一般歷史書中，提到日本「近世」的特殊優越性或「近代化」的成功故事（亦或挫折故事），但那在學界中都不具說服力。但是，在去國民國家史成為前提之下，全球化的動向或是東亞地區史的具體研究成果，仍存在不少疑問。在本次的報告中，將探討在政治思想史研究方面的「近世」、「近代」的概念。

首先，作為第一條線索，必須提起在國外的日本研究者，特別是在英語圈進行有關近世日本思想方法論論爭的 Yamashita、Bolitho、McMullen、Ooms 等學者。此並非討論近世、近代時代該如何區分的論爭，而是思想史研究方法論的論爭。具體來說，就是將該如何看待 modernity 這問題產生連結。接著是重新審視「近世」、「近代」在全球的歷史動向。在那之中，日本國內發生的事件和東亞地區以及全球動向之間的共鳴或差異，以及藉由 modernity 至 modernities 複數形的觀點，來嘗試說明日本 16 世紀到 19 世紀社會的變動及思想狀況。以 J. Fletcher、M. E. Berry、宮嶋博

史、岸本美緒等的論點為線索，最後採用幾本 2000 年以後的日本政治思想史著作，分別考察他們是以何種程度來回應「近世」、「近代」這個議題。舉例來說，以渡邊浩、宮村治雄、前田勉等老一輩研究者最近的著作，以及真壁仁、大久保健晴、菅原光、河野有理等年輕學者的著作來做比較，進而檢討今後思想史研究的未來，並加上筆者自身的著作來自我反省。

金錫根 (KIM Seog-gun) :
〈19 世紀末東アジアと社會進化論—韓國ける受容と機能を中心に—〉

社會進化論 (Social Darwinism) 在舊韓末，也就是 19 世紀末到 20 世紀初葉，對社會造成巨大的影響。此論延續開化期，特別是愛國啟蒙時期而成為主要的思想變數。在當時，追求富國強兵與自主獨力的知識人，將社會進化論的善與惡交由現實社會評斷，於是此論也扮演著前進未來的重要角色。社會進化論的思想有些從美國傳來，但大多從日本與中國間接傳入。社會進化論的「機能」與「角色」間的細微差別也出現了不同的解釋。

本演講針對思想的「傳播之受容與變形」進行側面剖析，舊韓末的社會是如何接受社會進化論與其機能的傳播，筆者希望在此做個批判性的檢討。檢討方法首先要找出某個並非原形傳入的思想與思維，從此之中探討受容的過程與其「變形」的經過，特別是在限定的條件與狀況之下，這些「受容」的思想是如何演變為適合此國情的型態。從這些觀點來看，在同為東洋圈的日本與中國、舊韓末之間，社會進化論的受容當然有一定程度的相異。我想以此觀點立足，把焦點放在「是誰？用什麼方式？」將社會進化論帶到舊韓末。接著導入並介紹社會進化論在當時形成什麼樣的角色與機能。

講者在檢討中，從各國間的國際定位來看

經由美國、日本與中國間接傳入的社會進化論，在政治、意識型態中的解釋應該有相當程度的差異。因此舊韓末的社會進化論也會同時擁有這些複合的雙重性格。另外，社會進化論所形成的角色與機能也可能有正反兩面的評價。但是 1910 年日韓合併後，這些複合的解釋也被分化，其意圖也確實走向不同的道路。

李鍾元 (LEE Jong-Won) :
〈韓國の地域外交と東アジア〉

在韓國，論及「地域」時，混合著三個地理概念，而這三個概念有時會競相呈現。最廣域的架構為「亞太地區」，而亞洲的鄰近地區則以「東亞」與「東北亞」分別代表著不同的含意來使用。這三個地理概念隨著時代及情勢的變化移轉重心，為集結韓國地域外交各種方向性與選擇的概念。二戰後冷戰時期，韓國最先打出的地域構想為「太平洋」，也就是「亞太地區」。相較於其傳統作為「東洋」一員的認識，雖是個極大的轉變，對以「分斷體制」為起點並與亞洲大陸地區共產主義各國對峙的韓國而言，實為建立對美關係、確立其存立根柢之戰略。李承晚總統與臺灣、菲律賓等，共同摸索「太平洋聯盟」構想，而朴正熙政權在美國方面支援下，主導了「亞洲及太平洋理事會」的創設。

進入 1980 年代，中美冷戰實際上的終止、經濟相互依存的實質化，使亞太地區更趨向整合性地域形態。韓國盧泰愚政權積極參與亞太經濟合作會議 (APEC) 的創設，同時關注北方大陸地區展開「北方外交」。基於這樣的二度轉變，金大中與盧武鉉政權時期，韓國的地域外交大為傾向「東亞」及「東北亞」。金大中總統在 ASEAN+3 的場合推進「東亞共同體」的構想，盧武鉉總統則將「東北亞」的地域合作作為其政策重心。1990 年代以後，活躍韓國的「東亞」論，概可分為 (1) 經濟

共同體、(2) 地域霸權主義、(3) 東亞文化認同、(4) 多極體系理論四個方向。加上經濟及外交與安全保障架構的理論，可看出其中超越近代民權國家之新政治意識與體制方面的縝密摸索。

辻本雅史 (TSUJIMOTO Masashi) :
〈教育における日本近世〉

要如何看待「日本近世的教育（1600-1867）」，我認為要從「知識傳播媒體」的觀點開始重新審視。教育方面的日本近世，在近代教育的形成期中一直被認為是應該被否定的對象。第一次世界大戰後，世人確信日本近代教育是成功的，日本近世教育的「近代性」被「發現」，因此我們不得不說那正說明了「近代的成功」。

我們可以將 17 世紀視為文字普及和商業出版的「媒體革命」時代。知識傳播媒體劇烈的變化帶來了知識和社會狀況的改變。從這點來看近世教育，可以明顯看出它和中世、近代之間的連續性及不可連續性。以兵農分離和「石高制」這種制度為基礎的近世社會，無可避免地產生了「文字社會」。文字的普及促成習字私塾和職業教師的出現，進而形成日本列島上平均的文字文化。商業化帶來的大量出版，造成知識、資訊的商品化，在文化大眾化及民眾間素養的促成帶來貢獻。在那之前只能靠聲音口傳及手抄本流通的物語，也因出版使得多數人得以親近，形成所謂的「古典化」。經由學習古典，逐漸在民眾間建立起基本素養觀念。加上習字本的大量流通，大大地普及了民間教育。學習儒學時不可缺少的漢籍教材和日本複刻本的大量流通，也使得學問普及的可能性大增。幕府與各藩領主從事自行出版業（官版、藩版），也推動了武士官僚教育的普及。

近代社會和教育、思想，以文字和出版業

為基礎。因此我們不得不說，日本近代的教育和思想，正是以文字和出版業為知識的傳播媒體。

徐興慶 (SHYU Shing-Ching)
**〈近代日本知識人の臺灣觀—傳統と近現代
 葛藤における徳富蘇峰の視點—〉**

本報告以思想交流史為視野，以人物交流為主軸，主要探討有「日本梁啟超」之稱的徳富蘇峰（1863-1957）對近代臺灣的思維及其思想主張。

在近代東亞國際秩序變遷之下，徳富蘇峰於 1906（明治三十九）年首次前往中國，並出版《七十八日遊記》（東京：民友社），另於 1918（大正七年），在第二次中國旅行結束時出版《支那漫遊記》（東京：民友社），1929（昭和四年）年時出版《臺灣遊記》（東京：民友社）。上述文獻中都詳細紀錄了他對近代中國與臺灣的看法。

透過對照中日雙方的徳富蘇峰相關史料，探究在傳統與近現代糾葛之時代潮流中，徳富蘇峰對異國文化的接受及臺灣思維的變遷問題。

1894 年，徳富蘇峰在《國民之友》、《國民新聞》中發表的〈大日本膨脹論〉中提到，「其為臺灣土地、南太平洋之門戶」、「吾等於國防上、殖民上、通路上，深信臺灣不可不取」，顯示臺灣在中日甲午戰爭時對日本的重要性。爾後，他持續關注近代日本該如何看待臺灣，在其《臺灣遊記》中，清楚可見「豊臣秀吉與臺灣」、「徳川家康與臺灣」、「日本人進軍海外」、「培理來日與臺灣」、「日本與臺灣的交流」、「臺灣回歸日本領土」、「支那統治中的臺灣」等論述。

在日本近代化的過程中，徳富蘇峰在「臺灣領有論」系統下的思維及行動究竟為何？在

「脫亞」、「興亞」意見糾葛的時代中，其對亞洲的思維（特別是臺灣觀）又是如何？透過本報告，對照、比較筆者研究的東亞人物、思想交流實例，進而深化、補足「近代中日思想交流」中「自他認識」的研究史。

【多元觀點】

Report on the 10th International Conference on the New Significance of Chinese Civilization in the 21st Century⁺

John Tucker*



The 10th International Conference on the New Significance of Chinese Civilization in the 21st Century, held October 26, 2012 at National Taiwan University, was an overwhelming success in terms of exploring and highlighting the abiding relevance of Chinese cultural expressions for the various twists and turns that humanity and global culture present them. Just a century ago, as the world entered the 20th century, many intellectuals within China and throughout the globe were ready to preside over the last rites for Confucian thinking, especially as a system that related meaningfully to the problems facing the world in the new century. Many associated with the May Fourth Movement, ironically enough, believed that the way to the future for China and East Asia had to be found in Western ideas, philosophies,

and ideologies. Western thinking seemed ascendant, as a variety of other new, upstart ways of thinking moved to the fore while Asian patterns of thought seemed obsolete and irrelevant. However, now we look back a century later and see clearly, as the National Taiwan University Conference so ably organized by Professor Huang Chun-chieh and the NTU Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, has illuminated so powerfully, that Confucian and more generally Chinese solutions to human, even global problems, remain as relevant and compelling as ever before, while few if any credibly offer as abiding solutions the ones that a century ago seemed so appealing. What appeared as compelling common sense among intellectuals then now seems exceptionally naive and misguided if not

⁺ The conference was sponsored by the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, NTU, October 26, 2012.

* Professor of History, East Carolina University.

disingenuous.

The NTU Conference brought together a host of first-class scholars from the west to join with some of the best minds of East Asia, who focused their minds and hearts, as well as their scholarly expertise, on addressing these issues in relation to the multifaceted richness of Chinese culture. Whether discussing the problem of change, the challenges of modernity, post-modernity, and the damages done by humanity and nature to the environment, issues related to theoretical ethics, twenty-first century wedding ceremonies, the sciences, technology, art, language, communication, spirituality, capitalism and how it can be contextualized within the East Asian cultural nexus, the relevance of Chinese culture and Confucianism seemed so fully rich and plentiful that time did not permit a full exploration of all that they have to offer in terms of compelling relevance. While this, of course, leaves plenty of room for future conferences to explore similar issues as they evolve in history and global cultural space, the plentitude of China and Confucianism was abundantly evident.

Dean Huang Chun-chieh's and Associate Dean Kirill Thompson's organizational skills and their vast network of scholarly contacts were equally evident at every turn, contributing significantly to the astounding success of the conference from beginning to end. The setting, on the campus of National Taiwan University, in October, as the Republic of China celebrates its founding day with colorful flags flying throughout the city, proved more than adequate as an open-minded, historically meaningful environment for exploration of these issues. Hopefully the future will bring more dialogue and discussion of this sort as we commonly recognize that the problems and challenges facing us are global ones that must be solved with global approaches founded in systems of culture with integrity, as with Chinese

civilization and Confucianism. The hope of humanity and our world depends on it.

【多元觀點】

日本近代文學的根本要素 ——江戶文學與西洋文化的交融⁺

真銅正宏^{*}



關於日本的近代化，一般認為係由於明治維新之後，為了要趕上因為江戶時代長久的鎖國政策，所導致落後於當時先進地區西洋的部份，而急忙進行發展的結果。然而，即使是在鎖國時代，日本的文化也並不能一概而論地說是停止了發展，或許可說在許多的領域範疇裡，甚至有到達了超越近代的發展。

江戶文化如此之成果，即使是在進入明治時期，西洋文化傳入之後，也超越現今我們所想像的，以文學性素養為中心，更為根深蒂固地滲透到一般民眾之間，同時，以各式各樣的形式對日本的近代化產生影響。我特別希望針對日本近代文學的出發期——明治時期，江戶文學是如何發揮影響力之事做考察。

我所使用的題材是：明治時期前往西洋旅

行的日本文學家的旅行記和在海外時所寫的日記等等，此資料可以呈現出在西洋文化傳入之際的翻譯方法。

對當時的日本而言，傳入不為眾人所熟悉的西洋文化實非易事。在當時，有人領悟到利用在文化性上更為先進的江戶文學來做譬喻的效果。以江戶文學來替換西洋文化，或是將西洋文化比做江戶文學等等的方法，開始將西洋文化此一全新之事物，以能夠理解的事物樣態傳入。

我希望藉由追溯此翻譯的過程，清楚釐清江戶文學與西洋文化是如何合而為一，形成日本近代文學出發期的根本要素之詳細內容。

⁺ 本文係 2012 年 7 月 15 日本院人文社會科學討論會的內容。

^{*} 日本同志社大學文學部教授。

【多元觀點】

另一種近代日本圖像 ——共和政治與幕末的東北⁺

大川真^{*}



去年發生大地震的受災地區——東北地方，在 1868 年發生了奧羽越諸藩同盟的歷史事件。此同盟和之後樹立明治政府的薩摩與長州等新政府軍發生了激烈的內戰。奧羽越諸藩同盟會受到注目，是因為同盟最高意志的決定機構是諸藩的「代議」，也就是說必須經過「代議」，政策與方針的正當性才能得以被承認。事實上，並非只有以西南諸藩為中心的新政府才是擁有嶄新的政治理念組織，因為該理念在明治維新的「失敗者」的土地上，也就是東北地方亦能看見。而揭示同盟基礎理念的「盟約書」強調的是，「代議」中公平性的重要性、普遍正義的實現及非人道的殺戮與掠奪的禁止等。

然而回溯到奧羽越諸藩同盟的八年前，也就是 1860 年，江戶幕府為了簽訂日美修好通商條約派出遣美使節團，仙台藩士的玉蟲左太

夫誼茂為其成員，因而得以前往美國。他的渡航日記《航美日錄》記述使節團在美國各都市接受款待的情況及其文物。其中玉蟲最關心的是，美國的政治制度——共和制。玉蟲高度評價共和政治，認為其為政者既不圖私利亦不起私欲，國民之間並沒有任何差別，而且非常團結。受到林復齋的提拔，曾擔任過私塾塾長的儒者，玉蟲在美國所發現的是，重視民情的「仁政」。美國一直以來都被鄙視為夷狄，但他實際在美國所看到的卻是，經書所言的聖賢政治之實現，這給予了玉蟲很大的衝擊。

玉蟲八年後，和其師大槻磐溪不僅都成為奧羽越諸藩同盟的精神領袖，還非常的活躍，然而一年後（1869 年）在氣仙沼被新政府軍捉拿，最後在獄中切腹自殺。

⁺ 本文係 2012 年 7 月 15 日本院人文社會科學討論會的內容。

^{*} 吉野作造記念館副館長。

【多元觀點】

《東アジア思想交流史：中國・日本・臺灣 を中心として》中文自序⁺

黃俊傑^{*}



本書所收集的是我近年來所發表的有關東亞文化交流的 8 篇論文，共分成「理論篇」、「中日交流篇」以及「臺日交流篇」等三個部分，承蒙臺灣師範大學東亞學系藤井倫明教授與日本立教大學水口幹記教授的好意譯為日文，集結成書，我衷心感謝！我想趁本書出版的機會，就東亞文化交流研究略申管見，以就教於本書讀者。

人類歷史進入第三個千年紀元之後，全球化的發展與亞洲的崛起是兩大明顯的趨勢。在這兩大趨勢的影響之下，人文社會科學研究逐漸從傳統的以單一國家為視野的研究格局，走向跨界的、跨國的、多音的、多重主體的新研究方向。東亞文化交流研究正是在這種新趨勢之下，一個值得注意的新興研究領域。

但是，首先必須思考的是「什麼是東亞？」這個問題。用山室信一的話來說，「東亞」不只是地理學意義下的「被賦予的亞洲」（「與えられるアジア」），實際上更是文化史意義下的「被創造的亞洲」（「創られるアジア」）（參看山室信一：《思想課題としてのアジア：基軸・連鎖・投企》〔東京：岩波書店，2001 年〕，頁 1-7）。在悠久的歷史之流中，東亞各國的人民、知識分子、官員、商人等穿梭往來於各國之間，進行跨越國界的互動與交流。所謂「東亞」這個名詞的定義與內涵，就在頻繁的互動與交流之中被重新定義並創造新的內涵。

正因為所謂「東亞」恆處於被創造的過程之中，所以，「東亞」不應被視為在中、日、

⁺ 本文係本院黃俊傑院長《東アジア思想交流史：中國・日本・臺灣を中心として》之中文自序，是書將於 2013 年 1 月 28 日由日本岩波書店出版，譯者為臺灣師範大學東亞學系藤井倫明教授及日本立教大學文學部水口幹記教授。

^{*} 臺灣大學特聘教授、中央研究院中國文哲研究所合聘研究員、本院院長。

韓、越等各國之上的抽象的概念，而應被視為在東亞各國具體而特殊的互動過程之中，與時俱進的存在。我們對「東亞」的視野從「之上」翻轉成「之中」之後，「東亞」就不是一個僵固而一成不變的意識形態，而是在具體的各國人物往來與文化交流活動中，被形塑、被創造（つくられた）而隨時變遷中的文化圈。在這個作為區域史研究領域的東亞文化交流圈裡，各國的人物往來、政治互動與思想文化交流，常常是感性遠大於理性的成分。舉例言之，公元 1644 年大明帝國灰飛煙滅，大清帝國在東亞歷史的地平線上升起，這項歷史巨變不僅對黃宗羲（1610-1695）而言是「天崩地解」，對顧炎武（1619-1692）而言是「亡天下」，對於中國周邊國家的知識分子也帶來巨大的心理撞擊，使得山崎闇齋（1618-1682）對學生提出假設性的問題：如果中國攻打日本而以孔子與孟子為大將及副將「牽數萬騎來攻我邦，則吾黨學孔孟之道者為之如何？」山崎闇齋的問題所觸及的東亞各國互動中的「文化認同」與「政治認同」的問題，也在朝鮮知識分子之中以鮮明的方式表現出來。大明帝國滅亡之後，許多朝鮮知識分子仍繼續使用「崇禎」年號，就透露出東亞交流史是一段有血有淚、有愛有恨的活生生而具體的歷史經驗。

在充滿了血淚與情感的東亞文化交流史中，文化認同居於最關鍵的地位。18 或 19 世紀越南的官僚或知識分子進入中國國境之後，與中國士大夫賦詩酬詩，他們共同分享的是漢字文化圈中的文化認同及其情感。17 世紀出身浙江餘姚的朱舜水（1600-1682）亡命日本，從他答安東省庵（1622-1701）的書信中，可以看出他淹留日本時生活之艱辛，但他在流離困頓中之所以堅持「天日再明，沉州復陸」（《朱舜水集》〔北京：中華書局，1980 年〕，第 2 卷，頁 14），正是由於對中華文化的認同與情感。1985 年日本佔領臺灣之後，當

時臺灣首富李春生（1838-1924）應日本當局之邀赴日本參訪，在淺草觀看甲午海戰戲劇，見清朝慘敗一幕，以衣袖掩目不忍觀賞，自嘆「新恩雖厚，舊義難忘」，這種民族情感正是建立在文化認同的基礎之上。朝鮮時代的燕行使在中國與中國知識分子進行筆談，爭辯陽明學到底是正統或異端，也是一種文化認同的表現。朝鮮朱子學大師丁若鏞（茶山，1762-1836）讀了荻生徂徠（1666-1728）與太宰春台（1680-1747）論著以後，就認為日本是禮義之邦，必不會侵略朝鮮。丁茶山對日韓關係的樂觀判斷，也是從「文化認同」而不是從「政治認同」或經濟利益的思考。

21 世紀的日本與臺灣的關係至為密切，2011 年來訪臺灣的日本人總數是 130 萬人，比 2010 年成長 20%，2012 年 1 月至 3 月赴日本的臺灣人總數達到 32 萬人次，比 2011 年同期成長 96%。2010 年日本東北地方大地震，臺灣人的捐款總數更居世界各國之首位。在新時代東亞各國頻繁交流互動，各國人民之間建立起日本語所謂的「絆」的情感之中，我們更可以從重溫作為區域史的東亞交流史之中，汲取歷史的智慧的靈感！

【計畫近況】

東亞儒學研究計畫⁺

計畫總主持人：
黃俊傑^{*}

總計畫

本計畫延續 1998 年以來各階段的研究，以東亞為研究之視野，以儒家經典為研究之核心，以文化為研究之脈絡，聚焦東亞各地文化之互動，並在上述脈絡中探討儒家經典與儒家價值理念之變遷及其展望。

本計畫首要之研究目標在於建構本校成為國際及漢語學術界「東亞儒學」研究之重鎮，並致力於在二十一世紀文明對話新時代中，深入發掘東亞文化的核心價值，在東亞儒學研究上推陳出新，開創新局，使本校成為「東亞儒學」研究之重鎮。

分項計畫

東亞儒學史中孔子形像與解釋之變遷及其思想史的涵義

孔子形象之建構與變遷，係東亞各國思想與文化變遷之溫度計，既顯示東亞各國歷史之轉捩點，又體顯東亞各國儒家「道統」與「治統」之不可分割性、互為緊張性及其不穩定之平衡性。本研究以「孔子形象」之變遷作為研究主軸，可以深入分析東亞各國思想之升沉與世運之興衰。

李退溪與東亞儒學

本研究擬以五年為期，研究韓國大儒李退溪（名滉）的儒學思想及其思想與東亞儒學的關係，除探討李退溪對朱子思想的繼承與發展、

⁺ 本計畫係本校執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之校內拔尖研究計畫之一。

^{*} 臺灣大學特聘教授、中央研究院中國文哲研究所合聘研究員、本院院長。

對陽明學的批判，並探討退溪學在東亞儒學史的意義和地位。

東亞儒學視域中韓國朱子學與陽明學之交涉

在朝鮮儒學的發展史中，朱子學享有權威地位，陽明學則始終受到排斥。即使朝鮮的朱子學者不接受王陽明的觀點，他們仍須面對王陽明所提出的問題，故在朝鮮儒學的實際發展中，陽明學的觀點仍然不斷滲透於各種論辯之中。本研究即透過對若干人物與問題的研究，來探討朱子學與陽明學在韓國儒學中的交涉，以期有助於深入了解韓國儒學的問題與發展。

東亞儒學視域中的身體與工夫：以變化氣質說為線索

本研究主要探討東亞儒學中的變化氣質說。先以宋明理學為核心，探討伊川、朱子、陽明、蕺山等人變化氣質說的內涵，後以日、韓儒學為中心，探討中江藤樹、山崎闇齋、李退溪、鄭齊斗等人在變化氣質說上的特殊之處。最後則分析東亞儒學中有關身體論與工夫論的幾種主要類型，並探討東亞儒學之身體論與工夫論的內涵。

東亞儒學視域中朝鮮儒者丁若鏞與越南儒者黎貴惇的經世學思想

本研究擬由探究朝鮮儒者丁若鏞與越南儒者黎貴惇的經世學思想，企圖呈顯東亞儒學的同質性與地域的異質性，一方面也想藉由這樣的討論，探究儒學在面對西學時，如何產生具有現代性的思考，而可有其有別於西方現代性的發展。

近代日本新學問的形成與傳統儒學思想的轉化

本研究探討阪谷朗廬、中村敬宇、岡倉天心、津田左右吉、和辻哲郎等五位跨越德川幕末及明治時代的知識人之思想體系，以及他們對傳統儒學思想價值的認知，論述東西文化融和的重要性。

計畫執行近況

本計畫於本季共辦理六場學術活動：

「東亞視域中的韓國儒學研究」學術研討會

時間：2012年9月28日

地點：臺灣大學法律學院霖澤館7樓會議室

主辦：臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

「東亞儒學」研究計畫

International Conference on Historical Studies and Humanism: An Intercultural Perspective

時間：2012年10月11日至12日

地點：臺灣大學農化新館5F第四會議室

主辦：臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

「東亞儒學」研究計畫

International Conference on "The Importance of Classics Education: Contemporary Issues, Classical Insights, East and West"

時間：2012年10月25日

地點：臺灣大學法律學院霖澤館7樓會議室

主辦：臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

「東亞儒學」研究計畫

The 10th International Conference on New Significance of Chinese Civilization in the 21st Century: Interactions and Confluences in East Asian Thought

時間：2012年10月26日至27日

地點：臺灣大學法律學院霖澤館7樓會議室

主辦：臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

「東亞儒學」研究計畫

《思與言》五十週年社慶研討會

時間：2012年11月24日

地點：臺灣大學農化新館5F第四會議室

主辦：《思與言》雜誌社

臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

「東亞儒學」研究計畫

「東亞歷史文化交流中的共性與殊性」研討會

時 間：2012 年 12 月 14 日至 15 日

地 點：臺灣大學應用力學研究所 4 樓會議室

主 辦：臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

「東亞儒學」研究計畫

【計畫近況】

東亞民主研究計畫⁺

計畫總主持人：
胡佛^{*}、朱雲漢^{**}

總計畫

本計畫為人文社會高等研究院 2005 年創立時四大核心研究計畫之一，由國內績優研究團隊結合東亞十三個國家與地區的研究團隊以及國際頂尖學者組成，針對東亞地區威權政體轉型與民主化的機制與過程，進行長期性追蹤研究，累積具豐富理論意義且系統化的實證資料，與其他地區民主轉型進行比較研究，並推動全球民主化研究理論的演進。

本計畫以「亞洲民主動態調查」（Asian Barometer Survey）為骨幹，協同東亞各國團隊發展有效解釋本地區政治價值變遷，政治正當性來源、政體轉型經驗的理論架構，並定期針對東亞各國公民的政治價值、政治支持、政

體表現與治理品質評價，及政治參與進行同步調查。本計畫為「全球民主動態調查」（Global Barometer Surveys）的核心成員，承擔相當比例的全球營運總部功能，全面開展全球範圍的民主化比較研究，並與相關重要國際組織進行長期性合作。

分項計畫

亞洲民主動態調查區域調查計畫

本計畫承擔「亞洲民主動態調查」區域總部的功能，負責東亞十三個國家與南亞五個國家調查的整合。對亞洲的民主轉型、鞏固與運作的經驗進行系統性研究，研究架構同時納入比較政治理論的四個典範：「現代化 / 後現代

⁺ 本計畫係本校執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之校內拔尖研究計畫之一。

^{*} 臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員、中央研究院院士、臺灣大學政治學系名譽教授。

^{**} 中央研究院政治學研究所籌備處特聘研究員、中央研究院院士、臺灣大學政治學系合聘教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

化理論」、「新制度論」、「政治文化理論」，以及「理性選擇理論」。第四波調查並將深入探討「東亞例外」的理論爭論，並分析傳統文化、國家機構治理能力、經濟社會現代化，以及國際環境等因素對東亞政體轉型的影響。

亞洲民主動態調查臺灣地區調查計畫

本計畫配合東亞區域調查計畫的共同研究架構，並針對臺灣、香港、新加坡與中國大陸等華人社會比較研究架構，以及臺灣特殊歷史情境與政治發展軌跡進行規劃。臺灣調查配合東亞區域調查的時程，定於2013年執行。

亞洲民主動態調查大陸地區調查計畫

本研究是全球唯一長期追蹤大陸地區公民價值變遷與政體評價的調查計畫。在理論發展及研究設計部分，除了配合東亞區域計畫的共同研究架構外，並將針對兩岸三地的比較研究架構，以及中國大陸特殊的政治發展經驗進行規劃。大陸調查配合東亞區域調查的時程，定於2013年起執行。

全球民主動態調查計畫

本研究整合全世界五個大型區域調查計畫，成為一個涵蓋超過七十個國家的全球性民主化調查研究組織。在此架構下，開展與世界銀行、聯合國開發總署、「國際民主與選舉支援機構」及其他重要國際組織的長期合作關係，定期收集與建構全球範圍的民主發展與治理品質指標，並合作發表權威性的調查研究報告。

政治體制、族群關係與政體評價

本研究結合亞洲民主動態調查的跨國資料，以及晚近有關族群關係的理論議題，並於全球民主動態調查的合作平臺上，深入而系統性地探究不同族群團體與制度設計間的關係。

自由貿易、政治體制與治理品質

本研究結合亞洲民主動態調查的跨國資料以及晚近有自由貿易與治理品質關係的理論議題，發展完整的測量指標，並對照各國實質的貿易數量和主要進出口產業，發展出自由貿易對於民主政治影響的基礎性資料庫，並以此延伸為分析自由貿易協定和治理品質的先驅性跨國比較研究。

計畫執行近況

1. 9月20日至21日與中央研究院政治學研究所、聯合國開發計畫署（UNDP）合辦 "Democratic Citizenship and Voices of Asia's Youth" 國際學術研討會，會中針對亞洲青年人對民主的認知進行相關討論，並開啟後續與 UNDP 的合作及出版計畫。

2. 10月22日至23日與上海交通大學人文藝術院合辦 "How East Asians View the Rise of China" 國際學術研討會，會中針對中國在亞洲的崛起進行相關討論。

3. 11月3日至4日與臺灣民主基金會、中央研究院政治學研究所、臺灣選舉與民主化調查（TEDS）、政治大學選舉研究中心合辦 "The Maturing of Taiwan Democracy: Findings and Insights from the 2012 TEDS Survey" 國際學術研討會，為期兩天的會議，安排了近40篇論文，詳盡的針對臺灣的民主發展與選舉制度進行研究討論。

4. 11月4日至5日於臺北召開2012年度的全球民主動態調查規劃會議，各區域計畫針對執行的現況進行討論並完成相關合作備忘錄的簽署。

5. 12月11日本計畫邀請國際級重要學者 Ronald Inglehart 來校進行演講，對於本校師生來說為一難得寶貴的經驗，可與大師進行面對面的交流。

【計畫近況】

東亞華人自我的心理學研究計畫⁺

計畫總主持人：
黃光國^{*}

總計畫

本計畫係針對西方心理學研究之偏頗而發，規劃以東亞華人的「自我」為研究焦點，以「關係主義」作為預設，建構一系列的理論，取代西方「怪異的」心理學理論，來解決本土社會的問題。本計畫將以東亞華人的「自我」之研究作為基礎，一面推展華人本土心理的理論建構及實徵研究工作，一面擴大對國際本土心理學社群的影響力，希望能為非西方國家的本土心理學開闢出一片新的研究領域。

分項計畫

華人的倫理自我

本研究企圖探討華人的倫理價值，如何透過家庭教化影響華人自我發展的歷程，包括儒

家倫理價值的現代性、自我修養觀與人際寬恕、價值衝突與矛盾接受性等相關議題，用以闡明黃光國所提出之自我曼陀羅模型（Mandela model of self）中，文化價值與個人行動智慧之間的相互衍生關係。

讓孩子成為一個真誠的自我能動者：個體化與關係自主性發展的影響來源

過去雖有探討如何培養青少年「個體化」與「關係」這兩種自主能力發展的零星研究，但仍欠缺在整合個人性格特質、家庭與學校等脈絡因素之理論架構，有系統地探討影響青少年自主性發展的來源因素。本研究目的即欲採取縱貫式研究設計及多元層次統計分析策略，細緻地探討有利於青少年這兩種自主性發展歷程中的重要影響來源。

⁺ 本計畫係本校執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之校內拔尖研究計畫之一。

^{*} 臺灣大學心理學系講座教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

華人組織中的個體我與集體我：組織認同的構念、形成及效果

本研究探討華人關係主義下，華人組織內的個體我與集體我間究竟具有何種錯綜複雜的關係。針對此一目的延伸出來的問題，包括：集體我的形成歷程、個體我融入組織或集體我的歷程，以及個體我與集體我間的契合效果等。

自我、人我、天人：華人文化脈絡下大學生生涯建構歷程研究

本研究為深具發展潛力的原創性研究，一方面可以建構具本土意涵的生涯發展理論，深化對華人文化脈絡生涯發展的認識；另一方面亦期能與現有之西方生涯發展理論對話，並補足西方生涯理論之不足，為生涯研究開創新的研究視域。

計畫執行近況

總計畫（主持人：黃光國）

本計畫於 12 月 8 日在臺大心理學系視聽教室舉行「余德慧教授紀念學術研討會」，由余安邦、蔡怡佳主講〈人文臨床與宗教療癒〉；龔卓軍、王心運主講〈身體情緒與身體現象〉；葉啟政、瞿海源、顧瑜君（余德慧遺孀）主講〈余德慧教授生平回顧〉；汪文聖、李維倫主講〈詮釋現象心理學的迂迴〉；林耀盛、石世明主講〈臨終關懷與柔適照顧〉；宋文里、王浩威、彭榮邦主講〈文化心理學的轉折〉。最後由黃光國、吳英璋共同主持圓桌論壇「本土心理學的基礎探問」。本次學術研討會出席人數 300 餘人，以視訊連線的方式，在三個教室同步進行。論壇現場互動熱烈，主講者與參與者針對本土心理的發展提出了許多尖銳的問題。會場上發展的論文經修改後，將納入這些問題的討論，由《本土心理學研究》出版專刊。

子計畫一：華人的倫理自我（主持人：黃光國、黃曬莉）

1. 本子計畫協同主持人黃曬莉教授於 11 月 20 日應「科學人文跨科技人才培育計畫——A 類論壇平臺——臺大論壇」之邀請，參加在中研院原分所浦大邦講堂（臺大總校區內）舉行的〈《我們是誰？臺灣人是什麼？》——談文化認同與主體性的建構〉論壇，並擔任與談人。

2. 本子計畫主持人黃光國教授與協同主持人黃曬莉教授等人共同發表 TSSCI 論文一篇：江俊宏、黃曬莉、黃光國：〈要不要聽父母的話？——科系選擇的後悔及其影響因素〉，《教育與心理研究》，第 35 卷第 4 期（2012 年 12 月），頁 77-101。

子計畫二：讓孩子成為一個真誠的自我能動者：個體化與關係自主性發展的影響來源（主持人：葉光輝）

1. 本子計畫主持人於 10 月 13 日至 14 日參加第 51 屆臺灣心理學年會，自組一專題研討會「正向心理學：親子衝突的建設性轉化歷程」，發表 5 篇相關論文，分別為：〈兩種觀點，親子衝突歷程大不同：功能性與防衛性評估對衝突消解策略與生活適應的作用效果〉（與吳志文、莊詩怡共同發表）、〈親子衝突情境下青少年的情緒調控策略對個人身心適應的效果〉（與呂婕、何文澤共同發表）、〈華人親子信任內涵及其在親子衝突中的功能〉（與莊詩怡、吳志文共同發表）、〈父母支持性溝通模式對子女衝突評估與生活適應的作用效果〉（與吳志文共同發表）及〈親子衝突頻率與青少年的理智性——情緒性歸因〉（與吳志文、何文澤、呂婕共同發表），專題研討會中引發熱烈的迴響及討論。

2. 於 11 月 29 日獲邀擔任司法院「101 年家事人員專業講座」，講題為〈溝通與衝突處理〉。

3. 發表論文 2 篇：(1) Y. L. Wang, Y. C. Lin, C. L. Huang & K. H. Yeh, "Benefit from a Different Angle: The Effect of Complementary Matching of Psychological Distance on Emotion Regulation," *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 3 (Sep., 2012), pp. 198-207, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-839X.2012.01372.x (SSCI)；(2) 邱獻輝、葉光輝：〈從傳統華人貞節觀念探討男性殺妻者〉，《本土心理學研究》，第 38 期（2012 年 12 月）（TSSCI）。

子計畫三：華人組織中的個體我與集體我：組織認同的構念、形成及效果（主持人：鄭伯璫）

本子計畫主持人於 11 月 3 日至 4 日舉辦為期兩天的「組織行為研究在臺灣：深化與展望」學術研討會，並發表會議論文 4 篇，分別為〈威權領導：回顧、現況及前瞻〉、〈家長式領導：回顧與前瞻〉、〈組織中的時間與時間觀：回顧與展望〉及〈領導者與部屬上下關係認定〉，與會者近百人。最後亦擔任綜合座談的對談人之一，激發多元思考，並帶出臺灣組織行為研究議題的未來展望。

子計畫四：自我、人我、天人：華人文化脈絡下大學生生涯建構歷程研究（主持人：王秀槐）

本子計畫下第二年的研究計畫案，進行臺灣高中生「生涯」字詞概念研究，於 11 月與三所高中老師合作，收集高中學生與生涯相關字詞聯想，初步獲得一千多相關字詞，將於 12 月進行分析整理。

【計畫近況】

東亞法院與法律繼受研究計畫⁺

計畫總主持人：
葉俊榮*

總計畫

東亞法院之間如何互動與相互影響，對於東亞民主理念與法治主義的發展，具有學理上的重要意義。本計畫希望結合多位不同法學領域的學者，以法院功能的演變與發展為經，以法律的繼受與發展為緯，以法院的功能為核心，共同探討東亞的司法實踐與理論發展，並進一步掌握臺灣法院與法文化在東亞的網絡定位。

本計畫的範疇除了臺灣以外，包括韓國、日本、中國（包括香港）、新加坡、泰國、馬來西亞與越南等，涵蓋具有代表性的法律繼受背景、政治社會結構、發展型態的國家，在議題內涵上則以法院與法律的社會承擔、民間信賴、正義實現效能，以及國際化為重點。

分項計畫

東亞憲法法院角色的演變與社會對話

本研究延伸東亞憲政主義的討論，探討憲法法院所反映的歷史及社會脈絡，包括過去歷史遺留、社會現實以及社會需求等。

東亞經濟法的繼受與發展： 以經濟法制發展為核心

本研究從法院的組織與程序、法院的經濟管制功能與法院的國際化等面向對東亞的經濟法制發展進行探討

東亞法院的民事紛爭解決： 東亞民事程序法制的繼受與變革

本研究以東亞民事程序法制之繼受、變革及發展為主軸，分別探討民事程序制度之四大

⁺ 本計畫係本校執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之校內拔尖研究計畫之一。

* 臺灣大學法律學院特聘教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

領域，涵蓋民事訴訟程序、法院對於裁判外紛爭處理程序之支持與監督、家事事件程序及債務清理程序（以消費者債務清理事件為中心）。

東亞法院的治理功能：
從發展型國家到管制型國家

東亞國家已遠離「發展型國家」的脈絡，但以經濟為主軸的發展方向並未改變，面對全球化的激烈競爭，國家發展經濟的壓力不減反增。本研究將在此背景下探討東亞各國法院的治理功能，包括東亞法院初步展露的管制型國家特色是否為真、東亞法院的表現與其他管制型國家是否有所不同等。

東亞民法的理論繼受與法院實踐

本研究希望探尋東亞各國對於歐陸民法的理論繼受在法院的實踐過程，甚至東亞各國彼此間民法理論之繼受與實踐過程中，出現的「去時間化的意義變遷」。特別著重在觀察東亞各國繼受之民法理論與固有法制間的異同，以及東亞法院如何進行融合與續造，承擔法律的社會規制責任，進而發展出屬於該國本土特色的繼受成果，藉以探求東亞區域民法的差異及整合或統合的可能性。

計畫執行近況

本計畫之執行近況可至本計畫部落查詢
<http://eacourt.blog.ntu.edu.tw>。

計畫實地考評

本計畫於 10 月 12 日下午 1 時半至 3 時半進行計畫於 2011 年 8 月 1 日至 2012 年 9 月 20 日期間執行成果的實地考評。五位計畫主持人共同出席，報告計畫執行成果。本計畫在這段時間的執行成果包括九場東亞法院論壇、兩場國際學術研討會、一場國內學術研討會、簽訂中文出版計畫、國際出版計畫、課程開設等。

審查委員對計畫執行成果表示肯認，並給予進一步的研究建議。

東亞法院論壇系列（十）
菲律賓與泰國法院的制度與運作

日期：2012 年 10 月 19 日

主持人：葉俊榮（臺灣大學法律學院）

主講人：Raul C. Pangalanga（菲律賓大學教授）
Nattaporn Nakornin（泰國朱拉隆宮大學講師）

與談人：張文貞（臺灣大學法律學院副教授）
李立如（中原大學法學院副教授）
蘇彥圖（中研院法律所研究員）

【計畫近況】

東亞國家的貿易、勞動、金融 與生產力研究計畫⁺

計畫總主持人：
劉錦添^{*}

總計畫

延續第一期「全球化研究計畫」，本計畫將繼續探討全球化對臺灣的影響。不過本次重點將聚焦至東亞各國，將臺灣與東亞區域的互動作為全球化下的一個重要面向加以討論，此一研究上的聚焦原因有二：首先是希望藉由與人文社會高等研究院其他東亞相關研究在地理區位上的重疊，能在不同學門間產生跨領域的對話。再者，雖然全球化在概念上並未有疆域的限制，但是由於交易成本的影響，每個國家與相鄰區域的互動，顯然占了全球化活動中相當高的比例。而臺灣與東亞各國的互動，正是屬於此一範圍。

分項計畫

1. 東亞國際婚姻移民對臺灣的衝擊
2. 臺商在中國投資的區位選擇（劉錦添）

本研究第一部分係利用臺灣的個體資料庫，探討外籍新娘引進對臺灣婦女的結婚、離婚、生育行為與就業市場的衝擊。第二部分則利用臺灣經濟部對外投資登記的原始檔案，探討 1991 至 2006 年，臺商至中國各省投資的區域選擇。

全球化下的貿易型態（陳虹如）

本研究利用一個具有外國直接投資、國際委外代工和技術累積特性的南北國產品週期的模型，來探討全球化生產模式對產品研發、技術累積、所得不均和生產模式的影響。

⁺ 本計畫係本校執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之校內拔尖研究計畫之一。

^{*} 臺灣大學經濟學系特聘教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

全球化對個人幸福感、工資與所得不均與生育率的影響：從亞洲與臺灣的切入（林明仁）

本研究利用 AsiaBaromete 計畫資料，分析全球化時代影響個人幸福感的幾項原因，並討論東南亞外籍勞工的引進，對臺灣的勞動市場與所得分配的衝擊。

全球化對臺灣民眾政治經貿態度與媒體產業的影響（江淳芳）

本研究將延續第一階段全球化的問卷調查，調查臺灣民眾對自由貿易與外來勞工的態度，並檢驗民眾的國家認同與經貿態度之間的關係。

全球化對經濟發展的影響：一個人口外移的實驗（王道一）

本研究利用經濟學這幾年最新發展的實驗經濟學的方法——「最不努力賽局」（或稱「最弱環節賽局」）的實驗來研究不同移民政策的效果，針對人才的國際移動進行實驗。

東亞各國的經濟成長與收斂：固定效果混合隨機邊界模型的估計與檢定（王泓仁）

本研究以一個具固定效果之長期追蹤資料混合隨機邊際模型（mixture panel stochastic frontier model with fixed effects）估計東亞各國的成長收斂情形及檢驗收斂的集團特性，以此作為探討區域整合的基礎。

1. 政治關係與公司信用評等：中國、臺灣及東亞各國比較
2. 企業社會責任和廠商績效：亞洲四國五區域的比較（沈中華）

本研究前三年在探討政治關聯性是否會影響信用評等，樣本來源為中國、臺灣及東亞等國的公司。後二年則設定兩項研究目標：一是利用亞洲五個區域，包括中國，日本，韓國，香港和新加坡在銀行、保險和非銀行機構的數據來探究企業社會責任的決定因素；二是檢視

企業社會責任和財務績效對在東亞五區的公司之間的關聯。

計畫執行近況

本計畫於今年 7 月開始籌辦「東亞國家的經濟與生產力研究」研習營，旨在培養並激發國內年輕學者與研究生針對本計畫主題相關領域之研究潛能，並且促進國內外學界之交流，尤其是亞太地區學者間之聯繫。研習營每月一場，至 12 月止已舉辦 4 次，舉辦地點在本校社會科學院公共經濟研究中心，邀請校內外學者及研究生參與討論者超過 20 人。

總計畫主持人劉錦添教授，於今年秋季分別邀請新加坡國立大學經濟學系 Jessica Pan 助理教授、美國史丹佛大學 Institute for Economic Policy Research Shuang Zhang 博士後研究員、北京大學經濟學系林浣娟副教授、美國 Tufts University 經濟學系 Heiwai Tang 助理教授、美國 University of Houston 經濟學系 Elaine Liu 助理教授等學者前來本校經濟學系訪問交流。

子計畫三計畫主持人林明仁教授由教育部頂尖大學交換計畫選派至 MIT 經濟學系訪問，並於 11 月 4 日在 Dartmouth College 舉辦之東北大學發展聯盟年會會議（The Northeast Universities Development Consortium [NEUDC] Conference）發表論文，亦於 12 月 4 日在 MIT 經濟學系勞動經濟學專題討論中發表論文。

【計畫近況】

東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷 與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫⁺

計畫總主持人：
石之瑜^{*}

總計畫

本計畫為期五年，以本校社會科學院中國大陸研究中心作為執行單位，由趙永茂院長偕同中國大陸研究中心執行長徐斯勤共同規畫。

本計畫包括五個子計畫，整合了本校社會科學院的政治學、經濟學、社會學、社會工作四項不同的學門專長，以各子計畫主持人既有的關於中國大陸之研究取向為基礎，而與高研院的東亞文明總體計畫旨趣相互銜接配合。主要目的，在於同時強調當代中國大陸的實存客觀發展與變遷，以及研究社群在主觀上如何去理解研究中國時所顯現出的特質乃至問題，如何去影響了研究中國大陸實存發展的科學性或貢獻和價值。

分項計畫

公共治理中國家與社會的合作與競爭：
海峽兩岸的當代比較分析

本研究以五年為期，每年選取臺灣與中國大陸各一個地方公共治理的案例，來比較兩岸之間的「國家」部門與「社會」部門當面對不同的「結構」層面條件及「行為者」層面條件時，彼此之間如何產生不同的合作和競爭關係，以及這些呈現多樣性的互動關係，如何在不同的治理議題之間，以及在海峽兩岸之間，呈現出治理結果與影響上的「共同性」與「差異性」。

中國研究的知識策略及其文明構成：
在地學術世界的多點追蹤

本研究藉由各種具備世界在地性的文本所

⁺ 本計畫係本校執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之校內拔尖研究計畫之一。

^{*} 臺灣大學政治學系講座教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

體現的差異，蒐羅中國研究的知識史中關於文明過程的困境與機緣，整理其中的限制和可能性，以及因此所醞釀出尚不為人知的諸多全球意象。

臺灣企業與中國企業生產力與創新能力及其比較分析之研究

本研究探討臺灣與中國加入 WTO 後，影響中國大陸製造業廠商勞動生產力與總要素生產力及創新活動的因素，以及影響臺灣廠商生產力與創新活動的影響因素。

東亞福利體制中的兩岸三地福利改革比較

本研究以五年為期，比較研究兩岸三地的社會福利改革經驗，並探討其在東亞福利體制與中國福利研究兩個研究傳統中的理論與經驗意涵。

宗教搭臺，政治經濟唱戲？——中國大陸「宗教觀光旅游」的社會學考察

本研究透過理論探討與經驗研究雙重策略，五年內針對宗教旅游現象逐一探究，並與大陸方興未艾的「紅色旅游」、「黑色旅游」與「綠色旅游」作一比較，立基在韋伯（Max Weber）學派的多元因果觀，深入分析宗教旅游所體現的「宗教力」與「文化力」，在中共「政治力」與「經濟力」雙重控制下，是否有突圍發展，確立自己的「固合法則性」與主體性的可能性。

計畫執行近況

分項計畫執行近況暨主持人學術活動近況

（一）趙永茂教授

分項計畫主持人趙永茂教授於本季學術活動如下：

1. 發表論文

- (1) 〈從烏坎事件談中國大陸的地方政治改革〉，《亞太和平月刊》，第 4 卷第 9 期（2012 年），頁 2-3。
- (2) "The Restructuring of Local Politics and Political Parties in East Asia: From Establishments of Money-Politics to the Emergence of Active Civic Engagement," *Panorama: Insights into Asian and European Affairs* (Forthcoming).
- (3) 〈中國大陸基層自治改革的幾個思路〉，發表於「政治改革與經濟改革協調發展」學術論壇（上海：上海復旦大學社會科學高等研究院，2012 年 12 月 22 日至 23 日）。

2. 學術活動

「第二屆建構公民社會治理的公共價值」國際學術研討會

時 間：2012 年 10 月 15 日

主 辦：空中大學公共行政學系
（主持圓桌論壇）

「從成長到分配：對首爾市的都市政策轉向的一些觀察」學術演講

時 間：2012 年 11 月 24 日

主 辦：臺灣大學政治學系
臺灣大學中國大陸研究中心
主講人：黃麗玲（臺灣大學城鄉研究所所長）

"e-Financial and Performance Management Reform: Korean Cases" 學術演講

時 間：2012 年 12 月 1 日

主 辦：臺灣大學政治學系
臺灣大學中國大陸研究中心
主講人：崔興碩（韓國高麗大學公共行政系教授）

「全球化時代的中國大陸變遷：東亞崛起與兩岸關係」國際學術研討會

時間：2012年12月6日

主辦：臺灣大學中國大陸研究中心
(擔任開幕致詞)

「縣市改制直轄市2週年回顧與展望」研討會

時間：2012年12月8日

主辦：行政院內政部
(開幕致詞並主持)

(二) 徐斯勤教授

「中國大陸公共治理中的國家與社會關係」學術研討會

時間：2012年10月12日至13日

地點：中央研究院人文社會科學館三樓第一會議室及遠距會議室

主辦：中央研究院政治學研究所
臺灣大學中國大陸研究中心
臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

發表主題："Pathways of Sustainable Local Governance Reforms in China: The Cases of Wenling and Yiwu in Zhejiang"

「兩岸三地勞動關係」學術研討會

時間：2012年10月25日至26日

地點：香港浸會大學逸夫樓五樓會議室

主辦：香港浸會大學
臺灣大學中國大陸研究中心
臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

(致詞並主持)

「全球化時代的中國大陸變遷：東亞崛起與兩岸關係」國際學術研討會

時間：2012年12月6日至7日

地點：臺灣大學法律學院霖澤館

主辦：臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院
臺灣大學社會科學院

臺灣大學中國大陸研究中心
臺灣大學國家發展研究所

「海峽兩岸農村社會保險理論與實踐」學術研討會

時間：2012年12月13日至14日

地點：東華大學

主辦：臺灣大學中國大陸研究中心
中國社會保險學會農村社會保險委員會
浙江大學公共管理學院
臺灣社會福利學會
臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院

(三) 石之瑜教授

1. 專書

- (1) *Tibetan Studies in Comparative Perspective*
(與陳玉文合撰)
- (2) *Sinicizing International Relations*

2. 期刊論文

- (1) 〈在臺灣研究中國／大陸：知識政治與政治知識〉，《展望與探索》，第10卷第10期(2012年10月)，頁34-55。

3. 學術活動

跨校中國學知識社群團隊會議

時間：2012年11月30日

地點：臺灣大學社會科學院言論廣場

主辦：中國大陸暨兩岸關係教學研究中心

"Participation, Contestation and Legitimation in Chinese Politics"國際學術研討會

時間：2012年12月3日至5日

地點：印度清奈

主辦：China Studies Centre, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
蔣經國國際學術交流基金會

(擔任兩場主持人，一場發表人、一場討論人)

(四) 林惠玲教授與楊志海教授

林惠玲教授於 10 月 13 日至 14 日赴南韓首爾國立大學參加為期兩日的 3rd Asia-Pacific Innovation conference，會中發表與楊志海及傅浚映教授共同撰寫之"Ownership, Innovation, and Productivity: Evidence from Chinese Electronics Firms"論文。同一時間由林教授之合作學生經濟學系博四蘇鈺雯赴泰國帕堯參加 10 月 12 日至 14 日舉行之 13th International Joint World Cultural Tourism conference，代為發表"Analysis of International Tourist Arrivals Worldwide: The Role of World Heritage Sites"論文。

林惠玲教授與林世昌教授及呂雅萍合作撰寫中之中國大陸與臺灣生產力追趕論文 ("Firm's R&D Investment, Ownerships, and China's Catch-up to Taiwan in Labor Productivity—The Case in Electronic Industry")，該文主要分析 2001 至 2007 年間，中國電子業廠商對臺灣電子業廠商的生產力追趕的速度，並進一步探究中國電子業廠商勞動生產力快速成長的原因。目前進度為中國大陸資料已處理完成，尚待整理投入臺灣資料計算。

(五) 古允文教授、施世駿副教授、傅從喜助理教授

古允文教授於 12 月 1 日至 12 月 2 日受邀參與香港教育學院與南華理工大學合辦之 "International Conference on Social Policy and Governance Innovation: Towards Social Equity and Cohesion in Asia"，並以 "Towards an Inclusive Society: Challenges for the Developmental Welfare Regime in Taiwan" 發表主題演講。古教授同時與美國 Rutgers University 社會工作學院黃建忠副教授合組 "Effects of Social Welfare Programs on Income Distribution and Poverty in Asia" 的專

題討論，邀請美、日、臺學者與會發表論文。

施世駿副教授於 10 月份邀請中國社會科學院社會政策研究室王春光主任與王晶研究員參與第四屆發展年會，並於年會中發表論文及擔任評論人。兩位學者來訪期間，除了與臺大國發所與社工系老師及同學進行學術交流，亦前往政治大學社會系訪問，並於臺大國發所舉行了〈普惠時代在艱難地行進——對大陸社會福利發展的反思和展望〉的演講。

施世駿副教授也於 12 月在《社會政策與社會工作學刊》發表了〈變遷中的歐洲社會模式：考察歐盟年金政策的發展〉一文。

傅從喜助理教授邀請英國 Buchingham New University 的 Rhidian Hughes 教授來訪，訪談期間：11 月 17 日至 24 日。其訪臺期間，與研究團隊就「高齡化下的社會政策發展」舉行座談。Hughes 教授並於 11 月 21 日發表專題演講，主題分別為：

1. Why Planning the Care and Health Workforce for Older People Matters: Local Issues, International Challenges
2. Integrating the Health and Social Care Workforce: Perspectives from England

以下為本次活動之留影：





(六) 林端教授

1. 專題演講：

(1) 林端教授於 10 月 19 日至 21 日赴上海各高校交流訪問，除就大陸儒學復興與孔子歸聖現象訪談上海相關學者之外，並在 10 月 20 日應邀在上海華東政法大學社會發展學院舉行的「法律社會學年會」中，以〈法律社會學理論的發展：從古典到當代〉發表專題演講。

林教授在演講中強調，鴉片戰爭以來，中華文化遭遇了前所未有的挑戰，如何學習西方的典章制度，讓儒家主導的傳統華人社會向現代法治社會過渡，變成當代知識分子憂患意識念茲在茲的歷史使命。當代華人法律社會學家，一旦以法律社會學為其志業，就必須共同面對眼前的三座大山：傳統法律 / 現代法律的矛盾（古 / 今之爭）；中華法律 / 外國法律的矛盾（中 / 外之爭）；國家法律 / 民間法律的矛盾（國法 / 活法之爭）。當前華人社會很幸運地共同擁有兩岸四地、有同有異的法律實驗，法律社會學的蓬勃發展，應該會對建立現代華人的法治社會，提出其卓越的貢獻。

本次演講獲致在場師生熱烈的回應，並與大陸「法律社會學學會」會長、人民大學社會系主任郭星華等人，為日後多方的合作達成共識。

(2) 林端教授於 11 月 16 日應邀出席高雄師範大學舉辦「2012 年臺灣音樂學論壇」年會，擔任開幕的 keynote speaker，以社會學家的角度，發表〈音樂家的創造力：社會學家的看法〉專題演講。演講內容主要強調，在人類歷史發展的過程裡，音樂家等的藝術家常常被看成是文化的創新者，他們是具有特定創造力與天才的傑出人物。社會學家則傾向把音樂家等的藝術家的創造力，擺在社會文化脈絡下來加以探究：「沒有社會中人，哪來音樂家？」。演講以德國社會學家韋伯（Max Weber, 1864-1920）、伊里亞斯（Norbert Elias, 1897-1990）以及法國社會學家布迪厄（Pierre Bourdieu, 1930-2002）等人的藝術家的創造力理論，以音樂家為代表，分析比較其異同。獲得在場近兩百名師生的熱烈迴響，會後並與臺灣音樂界先進、甫獲臺大榮譽博士的馬水龍教授等人廣泛交換意見。

2. 主辦會議

11 月 8 日邀請英國倫敦經濟學院中國比較網聯席主任常向群教授，在臺大社會學系 401 室舉行演講，講題為〈關係中國、還是人情中國——「禮尚往來」概念解析〉，林教授擔任主持人。常教授以「中國是一個關係社會，還是一個人情社會？」的問題出發，透過她在中國農村長期的經驗研究，並以《論語》中的「禮尚往來」的說法，把這個根植於中國社會文化土壤，並廣為中國人所使用的概念錘煉成一個分析工具。本次演講結合了相關研究的實例，以「禮尚往來」對中國社會的基本構成及其運作機理加以勾勒，並分析華人企業家與西方企業家交往中的幾個誤區，為中國人與非中國人之間的溝通提供一套可操作的工具，使參與同學獲益良多。會後林教授與常教授相互贈書，雙方並與南京大學社會學系翟學偉教授就相關內容做進一步交流，為日後的合作研究

奠定基礎。

11月22日至29日協助中央通訊社，安排大陸宗教志業參訪團之參訪活動。本次宗教志業參訪團成員，係大陸各省重要報系和電視媒體記者組成，如南方周末、上海壹周、湖南電視臺、北京青年報等記者，前來臺灣了解宗教志業的發展情況。

志業參訪團於11月22日抵臺，並聆聽林端教授的演講：〈臺灣宗教現況簡介〉。演講介紹了宗教之社會功能，並向大陸記者介紹臺灣宗教現況與歷史發展、宗教人口概況、宗教自由官方層面現況、以及內政部獎勵宗教促進社會福利的團體等等。林教授特別提到，「臺灣宗教過去幾百年來，發展出諸多具有全球化下的典範意義的成果：性別平等、和平共存、傳統與創新融合、多元認同與社會參與。這是華人世界的典範，也是全球其他社會效法的對象。」他還引陳紹馨教授所說的「臺灣是中華文化的實驗室」，來說明臺灣為何可以各種宮廟、教堂林立，卻相安無事、相互合作的原因。在場記者聽完後發言踴躍，並對接下來的宗教參訪充滿期待。

本次參訪團的相關宗教參訪，多由林教授與臺灣宗教學會負責聯繫，參訪團於11月23日前往中臺禪寺，11月24日至高雄六龜參訪一貫道天臺山，11月25日則參訪高雄佛光山與佛陀紀念館，11月26日至花蓮慈濟園區參訪，11月27日則返回臺北與星雲大師會晤，林教授受邀列席參與。11月28日則前往金山法鼓園區參觀。

參訪團離臺前夕，林教授主持了「臺灣宗教志業發展與法制輔導」座談會，會中邀請內政部民政司黃麗馨司長、臺灣宗教學會副理事長張家麟、臺灣宗教學會理事劉國威、臺灣宗教學會監事吳永猛，與參訪團進行座談與交流。會中專家就其專業部分做簡短報告，並與

來訪記者互動熱烈，而林教授對大陸宗教發展素有研究，透過簡單地說明與對比，讓大陸記者能更準確地掌握到，臺灣在華人世界中「宗教奇蹟」的深層因素。

【計畫近況】

數位人文研究整合平臺⁺

平臺執行長： 項潔*

總計畫

近年來，隨著資訊科技的迅速發展與網際網路普及，數位資源的建置與應用已成為知識再現與傳播的重要形式。國際間許多學術組織不僅積極投入發展各具特色的數位資源，推動數位資源應用於人文社會科學的研究及教學中，更將數位人文研究（Digital Humanities）列為學術發展之重點項目之一。

所謂的數位人文研究即是利用資訊科技，協助人文社會科學研究者，在大量且紛雜之數位資源中，重新分析建構資料間之可能意義關聯與脈絡，進而從中發掘出新的研究方向與研究議題。換言之，數位人文研究不僅能夠提升人文社會科學研究的效率與品質，更可透過資訊科技技術的協助，拓展人文研究的視野。

本計畫之目的為協助人文社會高等研究院打造一個資源整合的數位人文研究環境，並探究人文社會科學研究的影響力與能見度的擴散，促進研究人才向下扎根與拓展國際交流合作。本計畫訂定四大目標如下：

一、建構人文社會科學數位知識中心：持續推動本校數位資源之累積與永續經營外，更將積極與校外單位進行數位化合作及技術交流，期藉此增進臺灣研究數位資源之深度及廣度，並使本校成為臺灣研究資料中心。

二、建立符合人文社會學科的學術影響力之量化指標及質化學術傳播模式：為探究人文學科研究的影響力與能見度的擴散，特別規劃以高研院項下計畫為研究分析對象，並期以「資訊傳播觀點探究學術研究影響力」及「探

⁺ 本平臺係本院執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之研究整合平臺。

* 臺灣大學資訊工程學系特聘教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

究數位媒介在臺灣人文學科研究的影響力與能見度的角色」二項研究方法，建立符合人文社會學科的學術影響力之量化指標及質化學術傳播模式。

三、培育跨領域與數位人文研究人才：本計畫將每年透過舉辦工作坊、專題研討會及國際研討會等學術交流活動，及推動訪問學人計畫及研究生獎助計畫，培育新世代之跨領域與數位人文研究人才。

四、開拓國際交流合作關係：為學習數位人文研究相關之最新知識技術，推廣本校數位人文研究成果，本計畫將每年定期參與國外具有指標性的學術研討會，以及國際數位人文研究專業社群及其所屬機構成員所舉辦之相關會議與各類委員會，並積極與國際知名數位人文研究機構互動交流。

計畫執行近況

2012 數位典藏與數位人文國際研討會

日期：2012 年 11 月 29 日至 30 日

地點：臺灣大學法律學院霖澤館國際會議廳

主辦：臺灣大學數位典藏研究發展中心

【計畫近況】

東亞崛起中的日本與韓國研究整合平臺⁺

平臺執行長：
徐興慶^{*}

總計畫

臺灣與日本、韓國地理位置相近，經貿往來頻繁，在東亞區域安全問題上更是命運共同體。1972年迄今臺灣與日本斷交已近四十年，在沒有正式國交關係的情況下，日本政府在兩岸之間推行「一個中國+對臺實質關係」的外交模式，與臺灣維持了諸多領域的雙邊實質交流。又，臺灣雖然在1992年與南韓終止了國交，但近二十年來，雙方依然維繫著文教經貿往來的實質關係。據官方進出口貿易統計資料顯示，目前臺灣最大的貿易往來國依序為中國、日本、美國、韓國，顯見日、韓是臺灣在東亞國際社會的重要夥伴。在此國際化急速進展的時代，以東亞為視域，重新思考傳統日本、韓國文化與現代政經發展實有其必要性。

二十一世紀「全球化」的浪潮與亞洲崛起之新發展蔚為趨勢，推動跨國學術交流已是刻不容緩的課題。

本平臺的目標，即是從東亞學術交流的角度切入，從區域層面到整體發展，建構人文、社會科學領域之對話機制，發掘知識社群之多元問題意識，探索傳統與現代日、韓兩國的歷史縱身、文化形態；並從比較的視域，瞭解其之於現代西方文化的意義。為達到整合與服務之目標，促使六大計畫的日本、韓國研究更具國際競爭力，在方法與步驟上將：一、舉辦專題研究系列講論會；二、舉辦年輕學者暨研究生研習營；三、聚焦六大計畫主題，逐年擬定專一領域舉辦日本與韓國研究論壇或雙邊學術研討會；四、蒐集日本、韓國研究相關資料，

⁺ 本平臺係本院執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之研究整合平臺。

^{*} 臺灣大學日本語文學系教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

建置數位資料庫及研究網絡，並公開發表研究成果，以達到學術無國界的卓越目標。

計畫執行近況

一、本季所舉辦之學術活動及成果如下：

「台湾において今何が問題か—日本韓国研究の現状と課題—（臺灣目前問題為何——日本韓國研究的現狀與課題）」國際學術研討會

日期：2012年10月6日至7日

地點：福華文教會館14樓貴賓廳

主辦：本院「東亞崛起中的日本與韓國研究整合平臺」

二、徐興慶教授近期學術活動及成果如下：

（一）研究成果：

1. 專題演講

- （1）〈日語教育與日本研究如何結合——從教學與人材培育談起〉，臺灣：文化大學外語學院主辦，「精進教學品質活動」講座，2012年10月24日。
- （2）〈明清文化人的東渡與中日文化交流〉，臺灣：屏東教育大學中文系主辦，專題演講，2012年11月12日。
- （3）〈近代中日思想交流與自他認識——兼談研究方法論〉，臺灣：政治大學日本研究碩士學位學程主辦，專題演講，2012年12月13日。

2. 專書

- （1）《朱舜水與近世日本儒學的發展》東亞儒學研究叢書16（編著）（臺北：臺大出版中心，2012年10月），469頁。

【計畫近況】

歐盟研究整合平臺

歐盟科研架構計畫——社會經濟與人文主題國家聯絡據點⁺

平臺執行長：
沈冬^{*}

總計畫

國科會近年來積極推動與歐洲的學術研究合作，與歐盟科研架構計畫簽訂合作協議，於2008年成立「歐盟科研架構計畫——社會經濟與人文主題國家聯絡據點」（Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities Thematic National Contact Point, SSH-NCP），由中山大學廖達琪教授以及臺灣大學沈冬教授共同負責，而北部辦公室即將設置於國立臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院，即為「歐盟研究整合平臺」。

本計畫的研究重點方向及趨勢，主要根據目前歐洲面臨的各種問題，試圖透過各式的研究來尋求解決方案，相當問題導向及應用導向。而在 SSH 領域目前擬定的八大研究主軸如下：

（一）歐洲知識社會裡的經濟成長、就業力及競爭力：創新、競爭力及勞動市場的相關政策、教育及終身學習、經濟結構與生產力。

（二）歐洲視野下經濟、社會及環境目標的整合——邁向永續發展的路徑：跨區域的經濟與社會連結、社會與經濟面向的環境政策。

（三）歐洲社會主要趨勢及影響：例如人口結構的改變、家庭與工作的協調、健康與優質的生活、青年政策、社會排除及種族歧視等等。

（四）世界的歐洲：全球化下歐洲與世界的互動及互賴關係，例如貿易、移民、貧窮、犯罪、衝突及其解決之道之相關研究等。

（五）歐盟的公民：如何跨越人民的差異以達到有效的公民參與，目前面臨的挑戰有政

⁺ 本平臺係本院執行第二期邁向頂尖大學計畫之研究整合平臺。

^{*} 臺灣大學音樂學研究所教授、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院特約研究員。

治參與、公民的權利與義務、民主及課責性、文化差異性及價值觀等。

(六) 社會經濟及科學指標：微觀與宏觀層次政策制定之指標使用及其效果評估之相關研究。

(七) 前瞻研究：關於全球知識、移民、老化、風險及其他具有前瞻性領域之科學研究。

(八) 橫向行動：推動橫向聯繫、協助參與、與國際合作等策略行動。

計畫執行近況

11月7日歐盟 Net4Society 主持人 Angela Schindler Daniels 來訪

歐盟科研架構計畫 (EU-FP) 之社會經濟人文領域國家聯絡據點 (Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities Thematic National Contact Point, SSH-NCP) 為使國內學者更加了解歐盟最新之研究機會與研發策略, SSH-NCP Taiwan 於 11 月 7 日至 8 日分別在臺灣大學與中山大學舉辦兩場說明會。講者為歐盟 Net4Society 主持人 Angela Schindler Daniels, 主題是 "The Making of Horizon 2020 - the Role of SSH and International Cooperation"。

11 月 7 日在臺大的說明會由本平臺執行長兼該計畫共同主持人沈冬教授主持, 由臺灣歐盟中心蘇宏達主任致詞, 亦邀請國際事務處李心予副國際長為在場貴賓介紹臺大的國際合作與發展。當日來賓除了校內各系所之老師及辦公處室同仁, 亦有來自東吳大學、淡江大學、中央大學對歐盟計畫感興趣之專家學者。會中 Angela Schindler Daniels 女士首先介紹歐盟科研架構計畫之現況, 指出現正逢前後兩屆計畫交接期, 歐盟本身也正針對各領域計畫提出檢討與展望。接著介紹 Horizon 2020 之內容, 鼓勵臺灣學者多多了解與參與, SSH NCP Taiwan

也補充若老師們需要協助查詢計畫或是尋找歐洲夥伴, 皆可與我們聯繫。

寶島回想曲——周藍萍與四海唱片贈藏展

本平臺執行長沈冬教授策劃《寶島回想曲——周藍萍與四海唱片贈藏展》, 12 月 14 日在臺大總圖一樓多功能展覽廳舉行開幕儀式, 為期三個月。

周藍萍先生 (1926-1971) 是戰後臺灣最重要的國語流行歌曲作曲家。作品有膾炙人口的〈綠島小夜曲〉、賺人熱淚的黃梅調〈梁山伯與祝英台〉等。四海唱片公司由廖乾元先生 (1926-) 創立, 是民國 50 年代最具規模的唱片公司。周藍萍與廖乾元合作, 開啟了臺灣自行灌錄國語流行歌曲的濫觴。

臺大總圖書館有幸同時獲得廖乾元先生捐贈四海出版唱片、書籍文件, 周藍萍長女周揚明女士捐贈其父文物照片。為了感念二人的無私奉獻, 闡發前輩的輝煌事功, 臺大總圖書館由沈冬教授主持策畫這次展覽, 期待觀眾由此理解臺灣音樂文化的豐厚蘊含。

三個月展覽期間安排了音樂會、電影欣賞會等活動, 有興趣者請參考活動網站: http://www.lib.ntu.edu.tw/events/2012_formosamusical/info.html。

新近出版品介紹

《臺灣東亞文明研究學刊》

本院出版之《臺灣東亞文明研究學刊》第9卷第2期（總第18期）於2012年12月出刊。本期學刊的專號主題為「全球化視野下的日本哲學」（Japanese Philosophy in the Global Perspective），內容涵蓋「專題論文」三篇，「研究論著」兩篇，「研究討論」兩篇，「譯著」一篇，以及「書評」兩篇。

「專題論文」部分，陳瑋芬的〈「哲學」之創譯與演繹——兼論「哲學」與「理學」之辨〉探討"philosophy"的漢譯成立過程。"philosophy"一般被譯作「哲學」，由日本哲學家西周所確立。西周曾思考過許多種譯語的可能性，最後決定用「哲學」一詞，從而確立了一門學術領域。

廖欽彬的〈近代日本宗教哲學的開展——清澤滿之、西田幾多郎到田邊元〉分析了現代日本的宗教哲學，特別是日本淨土真宗的思想發展。清澤、西田與田邊各自展開了其宗教哲學，三者對「自力」與「他力」的立場引起了不同的宗教哲學進路。

林永強的〈西田幾多郎與牟宗三——跨文化倫理學說的可能性〉從比較中日兩位現代哲學家對倫理學的想法，而提出了一個根本的問題：什麼是「跨文化」哲學？他指出「跨文化」是否定文化的本質主義，而重視一種「文化混血的動態交錯」。日本文化從一開始便是

混雜的。

在「研究論著」部分，蔡振豐的〈黎文敵《周易究原》與其儒學解釋〉討論19世紀末至20世紀初越南儒者黎文敵《周易究原》一書對中國《周易》的解釋特色。探討的主題有三：（1）18世紀後越南儒學的發展與朱子學的關係，（2）《周易究原》中的宇宙生成論（cosmogony）的特色及其思想根源，（3）黎文敵以宇宙生成論解釋《論語》、《大學》、《中庸》所形成對儒學的見解。

張崑將的〈修養與行動之間：近代東亞陽明學解釋的辯證關係〉從近代東亞陽明學發展史的角度，論證陽明學在日、韓兩國的特殊詮釋。作者指出，近代中國知識分子所詮釋的陽明學，仍沿著陽明學中的良知學的理路，強調「修養」的重要性；而日本近代知識分子詮釋陽明學，卻逐漸與「修養」脫鉤，甚至最後變成只問「行動」的純粹性，而不問「良知」或「修養」之有無。這其中的變化，本文做了詳盡的解讀。

在「研究討論」部分，黃俊傑的〈東亞儒學中的茶山學：21世紀的視野〉首先說明朝鮮儒學在東亞儒學史中的特質有二：一為朝鮮時代儒學影響巨大，近於國家宗教之地位，二為朝鮮儒學是中國儒學與日本儒學發展的中介平臺，發揮重要的橋樑的作用。其次論述茶山學如何在東亞儒學史上扮演融舊鑄新、承先啟後

的角色。最後指出茶山思想世界中的實學精神及其對「文化認同」的重視，在 21 世紀全球化時代的國際新秩序的形成與互動，具有嶄新的啟示。

馬場公彥的〈日本人思想中的中國革命傳統——論其再生與消逝〉（廖欽彬翻譯）以日本的論壇與學術界的言論動向為線索，探究長達一世紀日本人對近代中國認識之軌跡。本文以「中國革命」的日本人思想言論為焦點，指出「革命中國」圖像就如同即使在其以外的中國事情理解上也發揮給予人一些印象的作用那樣，長期強烈地規定著日本人的中國認知框架。本文即以此「中國革命」的相關言論為線索，探尋近代日本人中國圖像的形成與變化之過程。

本期學刊收錄了一篇與專號主題密切相關的翻譯稿，即黃文宏譯西田幾多郎的〈叡智的世界〉。〈叡智的世界〉於 1928 年出版。當時西田哲學的主要立場是「場所」，有別於《善的研究》（1911 年）的「純粹經驗」或《自覺中的直觀與反省》的「自覺」立場。〈叡智的世界〉闡述了西田的「場所」立場，並延伸至其後期的一些重要概念，如「行為」、「身體」及「歷史」等。

學刊最後收錄了兩篇書評，分別是林純瑜的〈評《苯——神奇的字，西藏本土宗教》〉與龔韻蘅的〈評《揚雄與漢代經學》〉。林純瑜著重評介中文學界較少接觸的西藏本土宗教「苯」教的研究內涵，指出該書中大致囊括目前西方學界從事苯教研究的主要學者，通讀該書之後，讀者大致能了解近年對於此領域的研究成果與進展。龔韻蘅指出，歷來對揚雄經學的評價或褒或貶，多半注意其模仿行為的功過，探討揚雄是否僭越了聖凡之間的界線，而《揚雄與漢代經學》一書作者解麗霞則大膽的從儒家經典詮釋傳統的角度出發，重新審視揚雄經學

在漢代經學史上及在漢魏玄學發展上的意義，值得重視。

《東亞儒學研究叢書》

本院「東亞儒學研究計畫」所出版的《東亞儒學研究叢書》書系，本季出版了二冊新書：

叢書 14，黃麗生教授（編）：《東亞客家文化圈中的儒學與教育》。本書各文以東亞為視域，從不同的面向，探討不同時期、不同地區客家族系與儒家和教育的關聯。就研究面向而言，包含了書院、廟學、科舉、禮制空間、宅第建築、民間興學、儒紳儒學、華教孔教、教育轉向、儒家政府和宗族文化。就研究時期而言，從宋元起始，下迄當代，跨越千年。就研究區域而言，從贛南、閩西、粵東山區的客家原鄉，到臨近海洋的香港、臺灣，甚至遠渡重洋的東南亞和東北亞。本書的論文豐富多元，呼應了客家族系從孕育、形成到開枝散葉之長期播遷歷程；亦反映客家文化與儒學教育的研究課題。本書呈現了客家族系在生活世界中所體現的儒家影響，除了印證客家文化確屬漢文化支脈的事實，也呈顯了儒學超越殊異的普遍價值觀，曾鼓舞著遠離國境的客家族人。除上述之外，本書也論及海外客家在教育轉向和文化調適過程中的弔詭處境，及其難以迴避之後裔逐漸異化的問題。

叢書 16，徐興慶教授（編）：《朱舜水與近世日本儒學的發展》。2010 年適逢朱熹誕辰 880 週年暨朱舜水誕生 410 週年紀念，世界朱氏聯合會於海內外舉辦一系列紀念活動。為促進對「舜水學」的認識，臺灣大學日文學系暨研究所、臺灣大學人文社會高等研究院、臺灣朱子學研究協會、臺灣朱氏宗親文教基金會、世界朱氏聯合會結合海峽兩岸的學界以及東海兩岸的中、日學界，聯合舉辦「朱舜水與東亞文明發展」國際學術研討會。日本水戶彰考館

德川真木館長在會中提供該館典藏三百餘年的朱舜水貴重文物資訊，並建構出今後世界「舜水學」的學術、文化交流平臺，引發國際學界關注與迴響。本書的出版，即是此次研討會議的寶貴成果，收錄來自中國大陸、美國、日本及國內學者的 15 篇精闢論文。

《身體與自然叢書》

本院「東亞儒學研究計畫」所出版的《身體與自然叢書》書系，本季出版了一冊新書：

叢書 03，楊儒賓教授（著）：《異議的意義——近世東亞的反理學思潮》。本書探討近世東亞反理學思潮的思想史意義。東亞的反理學與理學幾乎同時成立，同步發展，只是勢頭大小與理論成就高低頗有不同。惟重要的反理學哲人，從葉適、戴震、阮元以至丁若鏞、伊藤仁齋、貝原益軒、荻生徂徠等人，皆具有深刻的哲思。作者將反理學的思潮分成相偶論與禮論兩種類型，相偶論在深層的意義上可含攝禮論，它與體用論恰可作為反理學與理學兩者典型的思考模式。

【院務新訊】

院務短波

「東亞國家的經濟與生產力研究」研習營

本院「東亞國家的貿易、勞動、金融與生產力研究計畫」從今年 7 月開始籌辦「東亞國家的經濟與生產力研究」研習營，旨在培養並激發國內年輕學者與研究生針對本計畫主題相關領域之研究潛能，並且促進國內外學界之交流，尤其是亞太地區學者間之聯繫。研習營每月一場，至 12 月止已舉辦 4 次，舉辦地點在本校社會科學院公共經濟研究中心，邀請校內外學者及研究生參與討論者超過 20 人。

唐格理副院長於法國狄德羅大學人文學中心發表演講

本院唐副院長於 9 月至 10 月訪問法國狄德羅大學（Diderot University）人文學中心期間，分別發表兩場演講：9 月 21 日發表演講："Humanism in Classical Chinese Thought: Challenges for Western Humanism"及 9 月 24 日發表演講："Mozi's Teaching of Impartial Regard: A Lesson for the New Millennium?"。

項潔教授出席"International Conference on New Media, Memories and Histories"

本院「數位人文研究整合平臺」執行長項潔教授於 10 月 5 日至 6 日應邀出席在新加坡南洋理工大學舉辦之"International Conference on New Media, Memories and Histories"，並於"Digital Archives and Digital Cultural Heritage"

專題場次發表論文，題目為："Re-indexing the Chinese Recorder Index"。

「臺灣目前問題為何——日本韓國研究的現狀與課題」國際學術研討會

本院「東亞崛起中的日本與韓國研究整合平臺」於 10 月 6 日至 7 日舉辦「臺灣において今何が問題か—日本韓國研究の現狀と課題—」國際學術研討會。本次會議邀請了 7 位來自中國、韓國、日本、加拿大及法國等，橫跨歐亞美三大洲的日韓研究專家，分別就文學、文化、歷史等各領域發表演講，吸引了數十位國內學者與研究生熱情參與。在 7 場專題演講之間，也分別安排了兩場綜合討論時間。演講題目如下：王金林（天津社會科學院教授）：〈六十年來中國（大陸地區）日本史研究的回顧〉、堀内アニック（巴黎狄德羅第七大學教授）：〈近世日本思想史における翻譯の役割〉、Mark Cody Poulton（加拿大維多利亞大學教授）：〈北米に於ける日本研究〉、中川成美（立命館大學教授）：〈世界のなかの日本文學研究——日本語と日本文學〉、稻賀繁美（國際日本文化研究中心研究員）：〈交易の海賊史觀にむけて：美術品交易を例に〉、韓龍震（高麗大學校教授）：〈グローバル化時代の教育と教育學〉、崔在穆（嶺南大學校教授）：〈韓國の近現代期における日本學・日本研究について—現況と課題と展望—〉。

黃俊傑院長赴南京進行學術訪問並發表演講

本院黃院長於 10 月 17 日至 18 日應邀赴南京進行學術參訪並演講。17 日在東南大學演講〈挺立立志攀登生命的高峰〉；18 日赴南京大學人文社會科學高級研究院，洽談兩院未來可能合作之方向，並就兩院資深教授互訪演講、兩院國外客座訪問學者行程延伸至對方、兩院出版品交換、會議消息互動、兩院聯合編書、會議合作、相互選送博士生或博士後、本院派講師支援南大與哥廷根大學合作課程等事宜達成共識。

東亞法院論壇系列（十）：菲律賓與泰國法院的制度與運作

本院「東亞法院與法律繼受」研究計畫於 10 月 19 日上午 10 時至 12 時，在本校法律學院 1703 室舉辦「東亞法院論壇系列」第十場，本次主題為「菲律賓與泰國法院的制度與運作」，邀請菲律賓大學 Raul C. Pangalangan 教授與泰國朱拉隆宮大學 Nattaporn Nakornin 講師主講。由本計畫總主持人葉俊榮教授主持，計畫成員張文貞副教授、中原大學法學院李立如副教授與中研院法律所蘇彥圖助研究員共同與談。

黃俊傑院長出席第 8 屆生命教育學術研討會並發表主題演講

本院黃院長於 10 月 21 日應邀出席由臺灣大學生命教育研發育成中心主辦之第 8 屆「生命教育」學術研討會，會中發表專題演講，講題為：〈21 世紀大學通識教育的新方向：生命教育的融入〉。

唐格理副院長出席 International Conference on Classics Education: Current Issues, Classical Inspirations 並發表論文

本院唐副院長於 10 月 25 日出席本院主辦之 International Conference on Classics Education:

Current Issues, Classical Inspirations，發表論文題目為"The Trial of Socrates and the Temptation of the Grand Inquisitor"。

本院與美國人文學研究中心簽署學術合作備忘錄

本院於 11 月 5 日與美國人文學研究中心簽署學術合作備忘錄，闡明該中心對臺灣大學提供獎學金之共同認識。雙方同意每年補助臺灣大學優良學者數名至該中心進行為期 9 個月的研究工作。該中心是美國唯一專注於人文方面所有領域之獨立機構，座立於北卡羅來納州三角研究園。

朱雲漢教授出席「從中共十八大展望未來」論壇並發表演講

本院「東亞民主研究計畫」總主持人朱雲漢教授於 11 月 19 日出席由本校中國大陸暨兩岸關係教學研究中心及中共研究雜誌社主辦之「從中共十八大展望未來」論壇，演講主題為：〈十八大後的中國大陸發展前景〉。

朱雲漢教授出席 2012 年中國政治學會年會暨學術研討會並發表主題演講

本院「東亞民主研究計畫」總主持人朱雲漢教授於 11 月 17 日出席由中國政治學會主辦之「劇變中的危機與轉機：全球治理的發展與困境」學術研討會，演講主題為：〈中國興起與世界秩序重組〉。

「從中共十八大展望未來」論壇

本院「東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與『中國研究』主體性的轉換」研究計畫、中國大陸暨兩岸關係教學研究中心與中共研究雜誌社共同舉辦「從中共十八大展望未來」論壇，於 11 月 19 日假本校社會科學院國際會議廳舉行，會中邀請管中閔院士、朱雲漢院士等學者評論中共十八大前後之政治、經濟、社會多面向議題。

林建甫副院長出席「第二屆兩岸產業合作論壇」並發表論文

本院林副院長於 11 月 21 日應邀出席由兩岸經濟合作委員會產業合作工作小組主辦之「第二屆兩岸產業合作論壇」，會中發表論文，題目為〈深化產業合作與促進雙向投資〉。林副院長指出：大陸市場結合臺灣軟實力的思維，共同搶進全球市場大餅，可以形成兩岸新經濟合作模式，建議盡速進行 ECFA 後續協商包括商品貿易、服務貿易等協議。

葉俊榮教授出席德國東南亞公共政策與良善治理卓越中心第三屆國際年會並發表論文

本院「東亞法院與法律繼受研究計畫」總主持人葉俊榮教授應德國東南亞公共政策與良善治理卓越中心（German-Southeast Asian Center of Excellence for Public Policy and Good Governance）之邀請，出席於 11 月 23 日至 25 日在曼谷舉行之第三屆國際年會。本次會議主題為「憲法學的功能、影響與挑戰」。葉教授在「憲法法院角色的功能：理論反思（二）」場次發表論文，論文題目：〈亞洲憲法法院的政治化：制度特徵、脈絡與正當性〉。

朱雲漢教授出席「臺大四系所跨領域」論壇並發表演講

本院「東亞民主研究計畫」總主持人朱雲漢教授於 11 月 28 日出席由本校政治學系、經濟學系、工業工程研究所及土木學系主辦之「臺大四系所跨領域」論壇，演講主題為：〈大陸崛起與全球秩序重組：臺灣的挑戰與對策〉。

黃俊傑院長出席第一屆聯合國文明聯盟上海會議並發言

本院黃院長於 11 月 28 日至 30 日赴上海出席由聯合國文明聯盟（UNAOC）與中國聯合國協會（UNA-China）共同主辦的第一屆聯

合國文明聯盟上海會議。該項會議的主題是「跨文化對話與地區和諧：亞洲——南太視角（Harmony through Dialogue and Diversity: Rooting the Alliance of Civilizations in Asia-South Pacific Region）」。

石之瑜教授主持「跨校中國學知識社群團隊會議」

本院「東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與『中國研究』主體性的轉換研究計畫」總主持人石之瑜教授於 11 月 30 日主持「跨校中國學知識社群團隊會議」，在臺灣大學社會科學院言論廣場舉行，會中知識社群團隊成員交換意見，與會成員包括中山大學、臺灣大學、政治大學等校碩、博士生、博士後研究。

石之瑜教授出席印度清奈國際研討會

本院「東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與『中國研究』主體性的轉換研究計畫」總主持人石之瑜教授於 12 月 3 日至 5 日赴印度清奈參加由中國大陸研究中心主辦、蔣經國國際學術交流基金會協辦之 "Participation, Contestation and Legitimation in Chinese Politics" 國際學術研討會，石教授於本次會議擔任兩場主持人，一場發表人與一場討論人。

林建甫副院長出席「2012 年東亞區域發展」國際學術研討會並發表主題演講

本院林副院長於 12 月 6 日出席臺灣師範大學主辦之「2012 年東亞區域發展」國際學術研討會，應邀發表主題演講，講題為：〈東亞的經濟現狀與發展分析〉。

項潔教授出席 "Pacific Neighborhood Consortium (PNC) 2012 Annual Conference and Joint Meetings"

本院「數位人文研究整合平臺」執行長項潔教授於 12 月 7 日至 9 日應邀出席在加州大學柏克萊分校舉辦之 "Pacific Neighborhood

Consortium (PNC) 2012 Annual Conference and Joint Meetings"，並於 "Infrastructure and Development of Reference Resources" 專題場次發表論文，題目為："Context Discovery with SHY"。

余德慧教授紀念學術研討會

本院「東亞華人自我的心理學研究計畫」於 12 月 8 日假臺大心理系視聽教室舉行「余德慧教授紀念學術研討會」，由余安邦、蔡怡佳主講「人文臨床與宗教療癒」；龔卓軍、王心運主講「身體情緒與身體現象」；葉啟政、瞿海源、顧瑜君（余德慧遺孀）主講「余德慧教授生平回顧」；汪文聖、李維倫主講「詮釋現象心理學的迂迴」；林耀盛、石世明主講「臨終關懷與柔適照顧」；宋文里、王浩威、彭榮邦主講「文化心理學的轉折」。最後由黃光國、吳英璋共同主持圓桌論壇「本土心理學的基礎探問」。本次學術研討會出席人數 300 餘人，以視訊連線的方式，在三個教室同步進行。論壇現場互動熱烈，主講者與參與者針對本土心理的發展提出了許多尖銳的問題。會場上發展的論文經修改後，將納入這些問題的討論，由《本土心理學研究》出版專刊。

林建甫副院長赴越南河內出席「臺灣金融改造經驗研討會」並發表主題演講

本院林副院長於 12 月 14 日出席由中華民國駐越南臺北經濟文化辦事處、中國信託商業銀行與越南中央銀行共同主辦，在越南河內舉行之「臺灣金融改造經驗研討會」，會中發表主題演講，講題為："The Trend of Merge and Acquisition in the Banking Industry"。

院內大事紀

2012年09月16日~2012年12月15日

日期	紀要
09月20日~ 09月21日	東亞民主研究計畫與中研院政研所、聯合國開發計畫署（UNDP）合辦 "Democratic Citizenship and Voices of Asia's Youth"國際學術研討會
09月28日	東亞儒學研究計畫主辦 「東亞視域中的韓國儒學研究」學術研討會
10月06日~ 10月07日	東亞崛起中的日本與韓國研究整合平臺主辦 「臺灣において今何が問題か—日本韓國研究の現状と課題—」國際學術研討會
10月12日~ 10月13日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫協辦 「中國大陸公共治理中的國家與社會關係」學術研討會
10月18日	黃俊傑院長赴南京大學人文社會科學高級研究院洽談兩院未來學術合作事宜
10月19日	東亞法院論壇系列（十） Raul C. Pangalanga 教授、Nattaporn Nakornin 講師主講： 「菲律賓與泰國法院的制度與運作」
10月22日~ 10月23日	東亞民主研究計畫與上海交通大學人文藝術院合辦 "How East Asians View the Rise of China"國際學術研討會
10月25日	International Conference on "The Importance of Classics Education: Contemporary Issues, Classical Insights, East and West"
10月25日~ 10月26日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫協辦 「兩岸三地勞動關係」學術研討會

日期	紀要
10月26日~ 10月27日	The 10 th International Conference on New Significance of Chinese Civilization in the 21 th Century: Interactions and Confluences in East Asian Thought
11月04日~ 11月05日	東亞民主研究計畫與臺灣民主基金會、中研院政研所、臺灣選舉與民主化調查 (TEDS)、政治大學選舉研究中心合辦"The Maturing of Taiwan Democracy: Findings and Insights from the 2012 TEDS Survey"國際學術研討會
11月08日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫 常向群教授主講： 「關係中國、還是人情中國——『禮尚往來』」概念解析
11月19日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫協辦 「從中共十八大展望未來」論壇
11月24日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫協辦 「從成長到分配：對首爾市的都市政策轉向的一些觀察」學術演講會
11月24日	與《思與言》雜誌社合辦 《思與言》五十週年社慶研討會
11月29日~ 11月30日	數位人文研究整合平臺協辦 「2012 數位典藏與數位人文」國際學術研討會
12月01日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫協辦 "e-Financial and Performance Management Reform: Korean Cases"學術演講會
12月06日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫協辦 「全球化時代的中國大陸變遷：東亞崛起與兩岸關係」國際學術研討會
12月08日	東亞華人自我的心理學研究計畫主辦 「余德慧教授紀念學術研討會」
12月11日	東亞民主研究計畫 Ronald Inglehart 教授主講： "Cultural Change, Democracy and the Democratic Peace Thesis"

日期	紀要
12月12日~ 12月13日	東亞崛起中當代中國大陸的發展變遷與「中國研究」主體性的轉換研究計畫協辦 「海峽兩岸農村社會保險理論與實踐」學術研討會
12月14日~ 12月15日	「東亞歷史文化交流中的共性與殊性」國際學術研討會