學術對談

中國、傳播與網路社會*

曼威・卡斯特 (Manuel Castells)

「社會運動在人類歷史上是社會變遷的主要源泉。在中國也是如此，過去是如此，現在也是如此。但它們的形態往往千變萬化，因為並不是所有的社會運動都具有進步意義和民主性。社會變遷也可能是倒退式的變化。」

「我生活中的主要樂趣是能夠對我的學生有幫助，能夠一起創造知識，幫助人們更好地理解他們的世界，以及在此基礎上，根據他們自己的價值觀和決定而改造這個世界。」

---

* 卡斯特學術對談小組：陳韜文、邱林川、馬傑偉、潘忠黨、馮應謙、黃煜

卡斯特生平簡介

曼威‧卡斯特 (Manuel Castells) 1942年生於西班牙一公務員家庭。年僅20歲便因參加工運、反對佛朗哥而被迫流亡法國。在巴黎，他師從阿蘭‧圖海納 (Alain Touraine)，24歲獲得社會學博士，開始任教巴黎大學，不久卻又因介入1968年左派學運而遭放逐。整個六、七十年代，他輾轉西歐、拉美、北美，直到1979年於加州大學伯克利分校擔任社會學、城市與區域規劃學雙聘教授。80年代以降，他以北加州為基地，潛心研究傳播科技與全球化對人類的影響，並周遊列國進行講學和研究，足跡遍及前蘇聯、包括香港、新加坡、中國大陸、台灣及其他亞太地區。[1] 2001年他受聘於巴塞羅納公開大學，2003年起又在南加州大學安南堡傳播學院任教，專注於培養傳播與社會研究的新一代學人。

卡斯特厭惡空談、重視實證，尤其重視跨國、跨文化社會體系的比較研究。他著述頗豐，出版專著及合著書籍20餘部，其中最有影響力的包括1972年的《城市問題》、1983年的《城市與草根》以及1989年的《資訊城市》。[2] 而影響最為深遠的莫過於1996-1998年間出版的「資訊時代」三部曲：《網路社會之崛起》、《認同的力量》、《千年終結》。[3] 這是他戰勝腎癌期間的作品，更是他多年研究資訊科技與全球化的集大成之作。今日社會科學、人文研究、公共政策、乃至法學、商學諸多領域，舉凡涉及網路與個體、媒體與社會的研討均不同程度地受到該三部曲的影響。該書英文版在短短5年多的時間內加印15次，並已被譯成包括中文在內的19種語言。[4]

除學術研究外，卡斯特也為聯合國、歐盟等國際組織提供有關傳播科技、全球化及公民社會等方面的政策諮詢。他多次榮獲社會學、城市研究、政治學等領域的最高榮譽獎項，並獲頒十多所大學的榮譽博士學位。在2006年6月的國際傳播年會 (ICA) 上，他亦以「傳播研究網路化 (Networking Communication Research)」為題進行了主題演講。

每年，卡斯特收到數以百計的採訪邀約，但因時間、精力所限，他只能參與其中的一小部分。以下他與本刊的對話表達出他對中華傳播與社會研究的關注和期待。

傳播與網路社會

CS： 傳播與社會學刊

MC：曼威‧卡斯特

CS： 作為一位社會理論家和研究都市的學者，您經過了什麼學術歷程
而進入了傳播研究？主要是因為您對資訊技術的興趣，還是有其
他原因？綜合而言，我們如何在網路社會的理論中為傳媒定位？

MC：在我的學術歷程中有一個貫穿始終的核心命題：對構成社會基石
的權力關係的研究。在我研究都市化時，都市問題對於新的政府
政策和新的社會運動如何形成至關重要。如今，傳播領域 ── 包
括新技術環境中的新媒體和傳播的橫向網路 ── 是權力關係得以
展開的場域。傳播是我們這個世界政治運作的中心，因此，在過
去10年，我決定進入這個領域。這個決定反映了我一以貫之的思
路。

CS： 網路社會的理論在中國的適用程度究竟如何？許多接觸過您的三
部曲的中國讀者認為，建立在互聯網和移動通訊網的新社會網
路，是對中國傳統關係網絡的補充。還有些人認為新的資訊技術
網路只是對曠日持久的社會問題所開的臨時藥方，是對社會基礎
建設低度發展的補償。你怎麼看這些觀點？

MC：網路社會建立於資訊和傳播技術與社會整體之間的互動。網路社
會是全球的。但是，如我在三部曲中詳細論述的，網路社會的建
立，是基於網路與自我之間的對立、以及具有工具性的全球網路
與身份認同的文化建構之間的相互對立。因此，中國是個網路社
會，因為她處於全球性的相互依賴之中，同時，中國又建立在自
己獨特的文化認同之上。互聯網與移動傳播網路在中國是新型社
會關係和組織形態形成的基礎設施。但是，我的理論是個具有一
般意義的理論，在中國的適用程度如何，只能有待中國的學者
們，通過在中國的現實中予以應用和修正。我將吸收、採納他們

的發現，修正我的理論。

理論與方法的取向

CS： 如今，大家都在談論跨學科研究。本刊亦希望推動跨學科的傳播研究。您本人的研究就跨越了社會理論、都市研究、政治學、文化研究、經濟學和傳播。您認為將傳播看作一門獨立的學科有意義嗎？您是否可從您自己的研究出發，談談跨學科研究的真正潛力？從事跨學科研究的障礙何在？如何克服它們？

MC： 傳播是個跨學科的領域，就如城市規劃和商務研究。這話的意思是，一方面，傳播有自己具體的研究對象(傳播)，另一方面，它又依賴其他學科的傳統，並要將它們與自己的研究對象聯繫起來。

我認為，學術創新發生於跨學科的領域，就如生物科學和電腦科學。為何這個現實難被接受？真正障礙來自傳統學科和專業對自己既得利益的維護。要克服這些障礙，你只有從事自己的研究，做出傑出學術成績，不必在無謂的邊界糾紛和官僚機構爭鬥中浪費時間。

CS： 您早年的學術研究中有馬克思主義的影響。在多大程度上這種影響仍然存在於您對網路社會和中國的研究當中？馬克思主義強調辯證法，道家哲學亦如此。為什麼您在研究中極少運用「辯證法」這個概念？這是有意的選擇嗎？

MC： 我已不再運用馬克思主義，因為我覺得它對我理解自己的研究對象不再有幫助。我對待理論持有一個工具主義的觀點，即選擇你認為有用的，拋棄你認為無用的。這種選擇隨著研究和社會的變化而發生。我仍然認為馬克思主義理論中有些很有意義的概念和觀點，比如生產方式、階級分析，以及國家作為支配社會的工具等。但總體來說，理解今天的中國和世界，我們需要更開闊的理論，馬克思主義只是其中之一部分。辯證法是個哲學理論，我不

是哲學家，我是個實證研究者，在我的研究中，這種哲學的爭辯沒有什麼用處。

CS： 您曾在不同時期參與過社會運動。在一定條件下，社會運動起到了改變權力關係和文化價值的重要作用。六、七十年代的學生和社會運動在美國和西歐社會留下了深刻烙印。任何社會運動的生成和產生影響，都離不開傳播。2003年7月1日，50多萬香港市民走上街頭，抗議國家安全條例及施政失誤頻仍的政府。如果沒有傳播，這種廣泛的社會動員不可能實現，其影響也難以抵達北京和世界的其他地方。作為一個學者和個人，社會運動對您來說有何意義？您如何看待當今傳播與社會運動之間的關係？比如，在如今的中國，我們看到有些社會運動依賴互動傳播技術，有些則不是。如何看待被排除在數碼網路之外的人？他們的運動會有效嗎？

MC： 首先，我總是將個人對社會運動的參與和我的科學研究，包括對社會運動的研究，區別開來。如果你將這二者混雜於同一個過程，你的研究不會好，你也不會成為一個好的社會活動家。社會運動在人類歷史上是社會變遷的主要源泉。在中國也是如此，過去是如此，現在也是如此。但它們的形態往往千變萬化，因為並不是所有的社會運動都具有進步意義和民主性。社會變遷也可能是倒退式的變化。

傳播在社會運動中具有核心作用，為促進大規模的社會動員，社會個體需要與社會溝通。新傳播技術有助社會運動繞開大眾傳媒或利用大眾傳媒而自主傳播。隨著我稱之為「大眾自我傳播」(互聯網、無線網絡)的出現，社會運動的歷史場域發生了深刻變化，你們所列出的中國例子就是很好的說明。

CS： 您的生活和研究跨越了不同的文化、國家和社區，貫穿了多個大陸，您的研究多數帶有比較的視角。很多學者都在談論比較研究的重要性，但較少有人付諸實踐。能否請您談談比較方法在您的認識論中的重要性？您為什麼要比較？如何才能在全球化的今天從事關於傳播與社會的比較研究，並從事理論的建構？

MC：比較研究的根本在於避免民族自我中心偏見。科學研究的基礎是能夠區別獨特場景的影響和由社會結構與動態所決定的社會過程，這對於研究諸如傳播的文化等過程，尤其重要，因為它們特別依賴於具體的場景。比如，對於移動傳播和互聯網的研究就需要理解形成傳播的橫向電子網路與它們所處的社會和體制場景之間的動態，個中分析的概念包括個人主義與社群主義，強勢的大家庭與弱化的核心家庭，政治集權與政治開放等。

中國與世界

CS：作為在香港和中國工作的學者，我們對您長期關注中國並在此展開重要研究項目而感到親切。您的學生對於我們理解中國社會，包括大陸和台灣，作出了頗大貢獻。能否請您講講您個人的中國之旅？您如何處理地方特殊性與理論普遍性之間的張力？中國是否代表了有別於矽谷和芬蘭的新型網路社會模式？或者説中國代表了有別於日本和亞洲經濟小虎的資訊經濟模式？

MC：當然，中國的實踐代表了建設網路社會的一個獨特模式，我們對這個建設實踐仍然所知不多，但是有些研究已取得進展。我們知道中國既具全球性，又具民族性和地方性。她是一個網路社會，因為她已經完全融入在了全球化的過程當中，因此而正在經歷社會結構深刻轉化。她的傳播產業，尤其是電視產業，正在日益全球化，使得中國文化，尤其是在年輕一代人當中，正在日益與全球文化相交匯。中國擁有比世界上其他任何國家都多的互聯網用戶，而儘管有官方的內容審查，互聯網是對全球開放的傳播視窗。中國的獨特之處在於，她是個網路社會，同時也是個國家主義的社會，資本主義的社會，和農業社會。她是個網路社會因為她與全球的網路化經濟以及全球傳播系統相連接；在體制上而言，她是個國家主義的社會；她又是個農業社會，因為人口的大多數仍住在鄉村，而且在很多情況下他們仍然依賴於非市場的關係。理解中國模式的關鍵是看國家 —— 中央和地方政權 —— 如何

能夠(或不能夠)將國家主義的體制與正在從全球地方聯繫中形成的新型階級結構相勾聯。加州伯克萊大學的邢幼田教授將這個興起中的新階級稱為官僚企業階級。

CS： 中國是全球各地學者中的一個熱門課題。您看這個正在興起的中國研究中有哪些不足？根據您自己研究日本或前蘇聯的經驗，有哪些陷阱您希望提醒我們？目前，哪些關於中國的問題最令您感興趣？

MC： 中國非常重要，因此，對她感興趣是完全有道理的。但絕大多數研究往往將中國聯繫到全球資本主義的拯救，完全忽略了這麼一個基本道理，即社會的動態，包括社會政治動態，最終決定一個社會的發展過程。中國是「發展中國家」的一個新形態。我的主要興趣是社會運動如何可能干預這個發展的過程，或者如後共產主義的俄國，國家和新興資產階級如何能夠聯手，通過孤立和壓制地方的抗拒而引導發展的過程。我認為傳播在促成另類社會組織設計中扮演核心的角色。

個人與社會

CS： 《南方週末》是一份在中國很有影響的週報，曾刊載了一期關於當代中國公共知識分子之興起的文章。但這期報紙遭到禁制。您自從學生時代就活躍於社會與政治運動。您是否自視為公共知識分子？在網絡社會中，公共知識分子的角色是什麼？您如何看待學術追求、實際的政策研究以及社會參與行動？

MC： 不，我不是公共知識分子，我從來不是，也從來不希望是。我是個研究者，我的角色和使命是生產知識。但是，我是個有良知的社會成員，我在自己力所能及的範圍，試圖完善這個世界，這是個狀況非常糟糕的世界。我的公共生活是使自己成為一個我所能企及的好學者和研究者。我生活中的主要樂趣是能夠對我的學生有幫助，能夠一起創造知識，幫助人們更好地理解他們的世界，以及在此基礎

上，根據他們自己的價值觀和決定而改造這個世界。至於說其他人希望整合各項活動，我覺得這是非常個人的決定。我唯一能說的是，避免混淆不同的角色至關重要。當你在做研究時，你不應當擔心政策後果；與此相對應，當你在制定政策時，最重要的問題應在於政策會否產生正面的效果，而不在於它是否有研究的基礎。同樣的邏輯適用於從事政治和社會變革。為改變社會而戰不是科學領域的決定，而是個道義領域的決定。如果你不是個好的研究者，儘管你滿懷高尚價值，你仍然是個糟糕的研究者。意識形態必須與科學相區別，儘管它們混雜於我們日常生活當中。

註 釋

1. 他在大中華地區的研究成果包括Castells, M., Goh, L., & Kwok, R.Y.W. (1990). *The Shek Kip Mei Syndrome: Economic development and public housing in Hong Kong and Singapore*. London: Pion Ltd. 以及 Bianchi, P., Carnoy, M., & Castells, M. (1988). *Economic modernization and technology transfer in the People's Republic of China*. Stanford: CERAS, School of Education.

2. 法文版 *La question urbaine* 出版於1972年，1977年譯成英文：Castells, M. (1977). *The urban question: A Marxist approach*. London: Edward Arnold. 另兩本分別為Castells, M. (1983). *The city and the grassroots: A cross-cultural theory of urban social movements*. London: Edward Arnold. 和 Castells, M. (1989). *The informational city: Information technology, economic restructuring, and the urban-regional process*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

3. Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell; Castells, M. (1997). *The power of identity*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell; Castells, M. (1998). *The end of millennium*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

4. 中文版由夏鑄九等人翻譯，台北唐山出版社印行版本書名為《網絡社會之崛起》(1998)、《認同的力量》(2002) 及《千禧年之終結》(2001)；大陸社會科學文獻出版社印行版本書名為《網絡社會的崛起》(2003)、《認同的力量》(2003) 及《千年終結》(2003)。

China, Communication and Network Society

CS: Chinese Journal of Communication and Society
MC: Manuel Castells

CS: As a leading social theorist and urban scholar, how did you find your personal journey into the studies of communication? Is your interest in information technology the main cause? Any other reasons? Overall, what is the theoretical location of media in the conception of network society?

MC: Throughout my intellectual trajectory there is a recurrent, central theme: the study of power relationships, as they are the foundation of society. When I studied urbanization, urban issues were critical for the formation of new state policies and new social movements. Nowadays the communication realm, including the new media and the horizontal networks of communication in the new technological environment, is the field in which power relationships are played out. Communication is the center of politics in our world, thus my interest in the last decade, and my decision to move entirely to this field, in coherence with my thinking.

CS: How applicable is the theory of network society in China? Many Chinese readers of your trilogy regard new social networks based on the Internet and mobile phone as supplementary to China's traditional guanxi networks. Others even see IT networks as a temporary remedy for age-old social problems and as a compensation for the underdevelopment of social infrastructures. What is your take on such views?

MC: The network society is based on the interaction between information and communication technologies and society as a whole. The network society is global. But the network society also is built on the opposition between the net and the self, between global networks of instrumentality and cultural constructions of identity, as I explained in detail in my trilogy. Thus, China is a network society because it is

globally interdependent, and at the same time is also based on specific cultural identity. And Internet and mobile communication networks are a fundamental infrastructure of new forms of organization and social relationships in China. However, how applicable my theory (which is a general theory) is to China can only be established by Chinese researchers, applying it, and modifying it, to the Chinese reality. I will incorporate their findings to my theory and change it accordingly.

Theoretical and Methodological Orientations

CS: Everyone is talking about interdisciplinary research these days. Indeed, this journal aspires to contribute to the interdisciplinary study of communication. Your studies appear to have straddled social theory, urban studies, politics, culture, economics, and communications. Do you think that it makes sense to treat communication as a discipline by itself? Can you draw on your research experience to shed light on the real promise of interdisciplinary research? What are the main obstacles to interdisciplinary research? How to overcome them?

MC: Communication is an interdisciplinary discipline, as planning is or business is. Meaning, on the one hand it has the specificity of the object (communication), on the other hand it needs to rely on very different disciplinary traditions and relate them to its specific object. I am convinced that intellectual innovation happens in interdisciplinary fields. This is the same for biological sciences or computer sciences. Main obstacles to accept this reality are the vested interests of established disciplines and professions. You overcome the obstacles by just doing your work and achieving excellence without wasting time in sterile border disputes and bureaucratic quarrels.

CS: Given the influence of Marxism on your earlier scholarship, to what extent do you find Marxism still relevant to the analysis of the network society in general and China in particular, if at all? Marxism emphasizes dialectics, as does Daoism. How come you seldom use the term "dialectics"? Is that a deliberate choice?

MC: I stopped using Marxism because I did not find it useful to understand what I was studying. I have an instrumental view of theory. You use what is useful and you discard what is not, and this evolves with research and with society. I still think there are some interesting concepts and perspectives in Marxism, such as mode of production, class analysis, the concept of the state as an apparatus of social domination. But overall, most of what we need to understand today, in China and in the world, requires a much broader theoretical approach, of which Marxism is a small part. Dialectics is a philosophical theory. I am not a philosopher. I am an empirical researcher, and I have no use for this kind of philosophical debates in my work.

CS: You engaged yourself in social movements at various times. In some cases, social movements appear to have played significant roles in transforming power relationships and cultural values. The student and cultural movements in the sixties and seventies have left their imprints in both the United States and Western Europe. For any social movement to happen and to be effective, it seems that communication is indispensable. On July 1 2003, more than half a million people in Hong Kong took to the streets to protest against a national security legislation. Without communications, it is difficult to imagine how such massive mobilization could be achieved and how its impact could be felt in Beijing and other parts of the world. What do social movements mean to you as a scholar and as an individual? How do you see the relationship between social movements and communication nowadays? In China today, for example, we see some movements that are based on ICT as well as others that are not. How about these people being excluded from digital networks? How do their movements matter, if at all?

MC: First, I always tried to separate my personal participation in social movements from my scientific work, including the work on social movements. If you mix both in the same process you do bad research and you are not able to be a good social actor. Social movements, throughout history, are the main source of social change. So they are in China, then and now. But they could come in unexpected formats,

because social movements are not always progressive and democratic. Social change can also be regressive social change. Communication is central in social movements, because for social actors to induce mobilization on a large scale, they need to communicate with society. New communication technologies increase the capacity of social actors to communicate autonomously bypassing the mass media or acting on the mass media. The emergence of what I call mass self-communication (Internet, wireless networks) is a new factor that is transforming the historical landscape of social movements, as you point out very well in your examples of China.

CS: You have got involved in various cultures, polities, and communities. The sites of your studies span different continents. Most of your studies are informed by a comparative perspective. Many scholars talk about the importance of comparative studies, but few seem to have actually practiced them. Could you tell us the importance of the comparative method in your epistemology? Why you want to compare in the first place, and what is the best way to do comparisons and theorize about communication and society in this global age?

MC: Comparative studies are essential to avoid ethnocentrism. It is scientifically fundamental to separate what is determined by the context from what is a social process that can be understood in its structure and dynamics. This is particularly important for the study of cultural processes, such as communication, because they are very much dependent on context. For instance, the study of mobile communication or of the Internet requires to understand the dynamics of horizontal electronic networks of communication in relationship to the cultural and institutional context where they operate, eg, invidualism vs. communitarism, strong extended family vs. weakened nuclear family, political authoritarianism vs. political openness, and the like.

China and the World

CS: As scholars working in Hong Kong and China, we felt at heart to learn that you have held long-term interests and conducted major studies in

this part of the world; and that your students have made great contributions to the understanding of Chinese societies including both the mainland and Taiwan. Could you tell us more about your personal journey into China? How do you resolve the tension between local specificity and theoretical generalizability? Does China represent a new model of network society vis-a-vis Silicon Valley and Finland, or maybe another model of informationalism vis-a-vis Japan and the Asian Tiger Economies?

MC: Of course China is constructing in practice a specific model of network society. We do not know enough about it, but some research is making progress into that direction. We know that China is global, national, and local at the same time. It is a network society because it is fully immersed in the process of globalization, this is the basis of Chinese economic growth, and therefore of the profound transformation of the social structure. The communication industry, particularly television, is increasingly globalized, making Chinese culture increasingly mixed with global culture, particularly among the younger generation. And Internet has more users in China than in any other country in the world. And Internet is a window of communication open to the entire planet, regardless of limited censorship in some instances. The specificity of China is that it is at the same time a network society, a statist society, a capitalist society, and an agrarian society at the same time. It is a network society in its global connection to the global networked economy and to the global communication system. It is a statist society institutionally. It is a capitalist society because market relations dominate social dynamics. And it is an agrarian society because the majority of the population still live in rurality and in many cases depending on non market relations. The key to the understanding of the Chinese model is the way in which the state, centrally and locally, is able, or not, to articulate the institutions of statism to new class structure emerging from the global/local connection, what Professor You-tien Hsing of Berkeley has conceptualized as the class of bureaucratic entrepreneurs.

CS: China is a hot topic among scholars worldwide. What do you see are the

inadequacies of this recent boom of research on China? Any pitfalls you would like to alert us of, drawing from your earlier experiences in studying, for instance, Japan or even the Soviet Union? At this moment, what questions interest you the most about China?

MC: China is important in itself, so the interest is justified. But most analyses are related to China as the savior of global capitalism, forgetting that ultimately the dynamics of society, including the socio-political dynamics, is what determines the process of development. China is a new form of Developmental State. My main interest is precisely in trying to understand how social movements will be able to intervene in this process of development, or, as in the case of postcommunist Russia, the state and the new capitalist class will be able to steer the process by isolating and repressing the instances of local resistance. And I think that communication is central in the emergence of alternative projects of social organization.

Individual and Society

CS: The *Southern Weekend*, an influential weekly in China, published an issue on the emergence of public intellectuals in contemporary China. But the issue was cracked down. You have been socially and politically active since your student days. Do you consider yourself a public intellectual? Where do public intellectuals fit in the configuration of a network society? How do you see the balance between academic pursuits and practical, policy-oriented research, and activism?

MC: No, I am not a public intellectual. I never was, and I never wanted to be. I am a researcher, I produce knowledge — this is my role and my project. On the other hand, of course, I am a concerned citizen, and I do whatever I can to improve the world, that is in very bad shape. But this is my private life. My public life is to be as good an academic and a researcher as I can be. My main joy in life is to be helpful to my students, and, together, produce new knowledge on relevant matters that can help people to understand better their world, and then to change it according to their own values and decisions. As for other persons

trying to combine different dimensions of activity, this is a very individual decision. The only thing I would say is that it is essential not to confuse the roles: when you are doing research you cannot think about policy consequences, and vice versa, when you are designing policy, the important matter is that it has a positive impact, not that it is founded on research. Same thing with politics and social change. To fight for social change is not a scientific decision, but an ethical one. And if you are full of good values but you do lousy research you are still a lousy researcher. Ideology has to be clearly distinguished from science, even if they both mix in our everyday life.