

历史视野中的中国国家治理

周雪光 邓小南 罗祎楠

编者按：当今中国的国家治理正经历着深刻的变革。当代中国历史社会学作为探寻国家治理的中国意义的进程中一个方兴未艾、充满活力的领域，在扩展中国国家治理研究的学理深度方面可以作出重要努力。这种扩展体现为研究问题意识的创新，历史研究发现的推进，以及研究方法论与理论意识的批判性自觉。通过这组专题论文，我们期待在拓展历史社会学学科视野的同时，将“中国国家治理”这一实践性课题推向深入，为思考当代中国治理道路的历史源流和发展方式提供启示。美国斯坦福大学社会学系教授周雪光指出，要寻找国家治理的历史脉络，必须努力超越正式制度和官方文本，搜寻有关非正式运作的历史资料，以便解读正式与非正式之间的相互作用，以及象征性权力与实质性权力之间的转化，这正是向史学家和史学研究学习的起点。社会科学和史学研究应该保持一个良性的张力关系，通过由差异引起的紧张和互补来推动思想的碰撞、知识的深化。北京大学历史系教授邓小南基于对作为重要信息渠道的宋代“言路”建设及其活动与滞碍的呈现，进一步讨论指出，信息渠道的路向、制度的针对性及运作形式，受到具体历史情势的影响。信息的通达与否，并不仅仅在于是否有相应的输送呈递渠道，造成通塞的是其中发挥作用的“人事”。制度文化是一种弥漫性的政治生态环境，渗透于制度之中、影响着制度的生成及其活动方式。真正有意义的问题，不在于当时是否制订过相关的制度，而是被称作“制度”的那套规则和程序，在现实中如何实践并且发挥作用；当时的官僚体系如何执行（或对待）这套制度，当时的社会人群如何感知这套“制度”。清华大学公共管理学院助理教授罗祎楠基于对宋元明历史的分析，认为以往对传统中国国家治理的讨论，深受“个体性权力”视角的影响，将国家治理化约为个体参与者争夺、占有资源的过程，研究者往往利用历史资料印证根据异国经验得出的理论模式，却无法科学解释植根于中国历史中的治理发展道路。与之不同，“制度性权力”视角关注传统中国国家治理的“内生性演化”进程，重视对制度及其运行实践扭结而成的历史机制进行研究，注意在学理上解释这一机制对治理参与者的行为与相互关系的型塑。因此，可以考虑从这一视角出发，对传统中国国家治理中的“内生性演化”进行切实探讨。

main field for the construction of a society with rule of law. We should confront grassroots constraints, focus on the main business of grassroots society, and make full use of the function of grassroots social organizations. At the same time, we should effectively integrate the important roles of government, social organizations, enterprises, lawyers and other players in the construction a society with rule of law.

(5) A Historical Perspective on the Governance of the Chinese State

Zhou Xueguang, Deng Xiaonan and Luo Yinan • 89 •

The governance of the contemporary Chinese state is undergoing a profound reform. As a vigorous rising field in the exploration of the Chinese significance of state governance, the efforts of historical sociology of contemporary China can make an important contribution to expanding the depth of research on the governance of the Chinese state. Such expansion embodies innovative research problem consciousness, the advancement of historical research findings, and critical consciousness of research methodology and theory. Through this special issue, we hope to advance the practice-based subject of “Chinese state governance” and at the same time expand the perspective of historical sociology, thus providing a stimulus to thinking about the historical origin and developmental modes of China’s governance path. Professor Zhou Xueguang of the Sociology Department of Stanford University points out that in seeking the historical evolution of state governance, we should try to transcend the official institutions and official texts, and look for unofficial historical materials to interpret the interplay of the official and unofficial and the transition from symbolic power to real power. This is the very starting point of learning of sociologists from the historian and history. The social sciences and historical research should keep a benign tension through differences and complementation, to promote collision of ideas and knowledge deepening. Professor Deng Xiaonan of the History Department of Peking University argues that, based on his study of the construction of the “*Yanlu* (channel for airing criticism and opinions)” and its operation and stagnancy, an important information media of the Song dynasty, the direction of information media, the pertinence of system and its operation will be influenced by specific political situation. The communication of information lies not only in the relative transmitting media, but also the “human factor” that affects the information blocking or not. Institutional culture is a divergent political ecological environment, which infiltrates the institutions, and influences the origin of the institutions and its operational methods. The issue really matters does not lie in that it is not important whether we set up relative institutions or, but how the so-called institutions and procedures practice and play roles; how the authorities carry out or treat the

• 206 •

institutions; how the people feel under such institutions. Basing on the analysis of the history of Song, Yuan, and Ming dynasties, Luo Yinan, Assistant Professor of the Public Management College of Tsinghua University, holds that the previous discussions on the state governance of China are influenced by the perspective of “individual power” and regard the state governance as the process of competition and grabs for resources among different interests groups, researchers verify their theoretical patterns by using historical materials of foreign experiences, which often fail to explain the governance path in Chinese history. Different from these patterns, the perspective of “institutional power” concerns on the process of “endogenous evolution,” attaches importance to the institutions and the historical mechanism in its operational practice, and notices the formation of the mechanism to the participants and their relationships. Therefore, further exploration from this perspective should be advocated.

(6) Chinese Modern Knowledge Transition from the Perspective of Media Reform

Huang Dan • 137 •

Knowledge and journals are of great importance of understanding Modern Chinese transition. Books and journals are different media and stand for different knowledge systems. Traditionally, there was a pattern of knowledge production and order structure focusing on “book” in China. Since the modern time, journals, representing the external culture, changed the existing order of knowledge system and influenced China’s reform in modern time. The communicating practice of book and journal reminded us that the process of systematization of a new media and the new structure of institutional media, are an important driving force of knowledge and social transition, and are regarded as a new perspective to understand “great changes unseen in 3000 years.”

(7) The Congruity of Poem, *Ci*, and *Qu* and the Reconstruction of Their Historical Theories

Li Feiyue • 159 •

The standards for differentiating the *gelv* (格律), singing and *qudia* (曲调) of poem, *ci*, and *qu*, reflect the factors, features and concepts of songs and poems in different historical periods. The belief in the transition from art to literature and from vulgarity to elegance of “*qu-ci-poem*,” and in the evolution from literature to art, and from simplicity to complexity of “poem, *ci-qu*,” veils a richer artistic landscape. The historical fact is that poem, *ci*, and *qu* are of the same origin. We should, starting from the point, break the genre differentiation, reflect the history of text origin,

• 207 •