

## 參加「宗哲系互動論壇暨自助晚餐：本土意識左中右」有感 Opinion-Commentary: Reflections on Participating in the Department of Religion and Philosophy Interactive Forum “Local Consciousness – Left, Neutral, or Right?”

中文版作者：豐桂貞（宗教及哲學系） 譯者：余承恩（翻譯學課程）

Writer (Chinese version): Jenny FUNG (Department of Religion and Philosophy)

Translator: YU Shing Yan (Translation Programme)



1

去年，浸大宗教及哲學系舉行「宗哲系互動論壇暨自助晚餐：本土意識左中右」論壇。著名時事評論員及資深傳媒人李怡先生、宗教及哲學系高級講師陳士齊博士，聯同宗教及哲學系二年級湯偉圓同學擔任是次互動論壇講者，由宗教及哲學系副教授吳有能博士主持。豐桂貞同學透過這篇文章，談談是次論壇的一些重點，並用自己的立場，表達論壇如何影響香港的未來。

*Last year, the HKBU Department of Religion and Philosophy held an illuminating forum on the timely theme of “Local Consciousness – Left, Neutral, or Right.” The interactive forum was hosted by Dr. Ng Yau Nang, Associate Professor of the Department of Religion and Philosophy, and joined by three guest speakers: Mr. Lee Yee, the well-known commentator and veteran journalist; Dr. Chan Sze Chi, senior lecturer of Department of Religion and Philosophy; and Miss Thong Wai Yuen, Year 2 student from the Department of Religion and Philosophy. Student Jenny Fung reflects on some of the highlights of the forum and offers her own perspective for Hong Kong’s ongoing dialogue.*

由李怡先生、陳士齊老師（齋 sir）及湯偉圓同學同台座談，配搭非常新鮮，囊括老中青三代的代表——他們在 2015 年 11 月 19 日的「本土意識左中右」座談會中各抒己見，分享對本土的看法。由於意見精彩，不禁讓參與座談會的同學反思很多根本問題，譬如到底甚麼是「本土」和本土派？何謂香港？到底這片土地有甚麼元素使其變成今天的香港地？

On 19 November 2015, Mr. Lee Yee, Dr. Chan Sze Chi and student Miss Thong Wai Yuen – offering a fresh combination of representatives from different generations – shared the stage to express their different views on the issue of localism. Their insights provoked a number of fundamental questions from the attendees: What is “local” and what constitutes the localism camp? What do we mean by “Hong Kong?” And what elements have contributed to today’s Hong Kong?

偉圓直言，很多朋友都認為她是本土派，但她只算是 pro- 本土，所以不能完全代表本土派的立場。她引用李怡先生的觀察，說明她認為本土派其實是現實的政治環境所產生的：政府公信力下跌，而泛民作為反對派支持度沒有上升，意味著泛民已不能代表一眾不滿政府的港人，本土派於是應運而生，排解這些不滿。本土派之所以利用激進的方式捍衛本土利益，乃是出於生死存亡的意識。她明白並非所有人都能接受激進的方式，但即使不為大眾接受，本土派亦不應取悅群眾，放棄底線，秉持革命精神。但何謂本土？甚麼是本土利益？

其實，何謂本土的問題，關乎身份認同，更直接影響到香港的政治前途，所以有必要詳細理解。但齋 sir 提到「本土」其實是很難辨明的概念，正所謂「一方水土養一方人」，各地條件不同，對當地人士產生不同影響；故此各自有其本土意識。他認為香港本地的特色正是建基於吸收了外來文化，包括歐美日韓新等地，再轉化成為獨特的混合文化。譬如香港的廣州話在浸染後變成港式廣州話，磨去抑揚頓挫，加快了對話速度，並混合各種外來字（如「便當」等字詞）。

香港文化也正因來者不拒的混合特性，容易包含差異，所以本地也有左中右不同派別，而當代也有反霸權、新社會主義等各種思潮。在政治取態上，香港有人擔心貪污腐敗，不能說真話，無法伸張正義，甚至害怕被資本主義控制；有人擔心借社會之名行專制之實，讓資本先走；也有人因自古以來血濃於水的民族感情，強調香港與中華文化一脈相承，因此選擇從參與國家建設之中尋找香港的位置。這些又算不算是本土派呢？

若從買辦文化來解釋香港一直以來的地位，可以追溯到《南京條約》割讓香港的歷史。從那時候開始，香港其實一直是處於中西夾縫之間的對話窗。從當時流行文化就得知香港人的身份並非獨立自存，由「阿燦」到《表姐，你好嘢！》，港人最初的身份就是從與他者的對比中掌握。不過，居民身處的地理環境、當地歷史就是定義香港人自我身份認同的必然前提。或許只要勾勒出香港的特色，再比較其他相異城市就能簡單地得出何謂香港。但其背後與深圳河以北千絲萬縷的關係，就令一些人嘗試將兩者看成對立，讓身份在敵我矛盾的危機感中

Miss Thong claimed herself to be just a “pro-localist,” so she could not totally represent the stance of localism, even though many of her friends do think that she completely belongs to that camp. Citing Mr. Lee’s observation, Miss Thong believed that current political circumstances had contributed to the formation of localism. The pan-democratic camp, as the opposition party, has failed to gain citizens’ support when the government falls in credibility. To her, this implies that the pan-democrats cannot represent those Hong Kong people who feel discontent towards the government. In order to express this dissatisfaction, the localism camp has emerged. In addition, localists’ use of radical means to uphold local interests is due to their sense that this is an important matter of life-and-death. This approach may not be welcomed by the general public, Miss Thong admitted. Even so, localism should not sacrifice its revolutionary spirit and bottom line simply to gain wider support. However, how is “local” to be defined? And what is the meaning of “local interests?”

There is a need to clarify those questions related to localism and identity recognition as they directly affect Hong Kong’s political future. However, Dr. Chan stated that “local” is a rather difficult concept to explain. As a proverb says literally, “the soil in a place gives birth to the people of that place,” meaning that different environmental factors exert different influences upon the inhabitants, leading to different understandings of local consciousness. Dr. Chan believed the absorption of foreign cultures, including European, American, Japanese, and Korean, was the basis for Hong Kong local characteristics, which then converted into a uniquely mixed culture. For example, as compared to Guangzhou Cantonese, Cantonese in Hong Kong has fewer cadences, faster conversation speed, and has fused with various languages (e.g. in words such as “humour” and “bento”).

Hong Kong culture is an inclusive melting pot, and for this reason it contains discrepancies that have nurtured different political stances: left, neutral, and right. In contemporary society, there are also schools of thought like anti-hegemonism, neosocialism, etc. When choosing their political attitudes, some Hongkongers may fear corruption, the loss of freedom of speech, and a lack of justice; or they may even fear being controlled by capitalism. Some may worry that politicians borrow the name “socialism” to disguise capitalism and authoritarianism. Some may emphasise the close blood ties and cultural linkages between Chinese and Hongkongers, and participate in Mainland development to identify Hong Kong’s position. Can these people to be labelled “localists?”

If we use comprador culture to explain the position of Hong Kong, we can trace back in history to the time when Hong Kong was ceded under the “Nanjing Treaties.” Hong Kong has been a bridge between the Mainland and the West since then. References in popular culture at that time, from the slang term “Ah Chank” (a derogatory label for new immigrants from the Mainland) to movies such as *Her Fatal Ways* show that Hongkongers’ identity was not independent, but initially moulded through comparison with others. However, inhabitants’ geographical environment and local history are two intertwined elements that are crucial to Hongkongers’ identity. Maybe we can simply know “what is Hong Kong” by outlining her characteristics and then comparing them with other similar cities. Yet, some people may try to isolate themselves from and

建立。對於本土的定義，會左右我們的身份認同，產生不同的政治立場。這似乎是一些很相對、主觀的想法，但每個人都應堅持理性，面對真理，並堅守正確的立場。這樣就可以在理性的基礎上，持續對話，爭取更大的認同。面對惡勢力，我們還是要有勇氣，堅持原則，不去苟同。

偉圓認為左派和本土派在理論上並非不可調和。兩派不合，乃是由於現今的「左翼」政治領袖或社運人士，實踐和理論不一。她引用《城大月報》的文章，說明「左膠」們「只講階級、不見帝國、拒用暴力、消費革命」。在爭取新移民權益時，只見到貧窮階級的弱勢和受中共壓迫的慘情，卻看不見大中華帝國的殖民政策。該篇文章亦提到，香港的左派沒有革命精神：

「將雨傘革命降格為運動；口中唱着『舊世界打個落花流水』的國際歌，卻譴責打爛立法會玻璃的抗爭者」。偉圓更直言左派的本質就是要團結低下階層推翻另一個階級的激進派。「左膠」之「膠」名，亦並非空穴來風。李怡先生就從「道」與「勢」的對揚，期許知識分子在面對政治勢力之時，堅持大道，維護原則，希望大家認清香港的核心價值，保護香港。

對本土的理解，雖然各說各法，但其實也可以愈「辯」愈明。正如當晚大家在西洋菜街看中國對香港的賽事時，並非單純的忽然球迷，乃是出於對香港的身份認同感。而這種本土意識並非空穴來風，無中生有。回顧香港歷史，可知「香港」早在開埠時，就發現不需要強權統治？香港已經在這些年間建立自己獨特的身份認同、文化價值和生活方式。我們不強求大家認許，但謙卑的期待應得到尊重；我們既不強加價值觀於人，也不同意消滅自身的特徵，來認同中國。為甚麼歷史可以任意竄改？為甚麼必須隱藏香港的文化底蘊，去迎合中國？這些都不只是政治問題。身為獨立自存的個體，我們必須捍衛自身文化。在別人說服我成為「愛乜愛物」的人之前，我必須澄清：香港從來都不是一言堂。面對香港的前景，只能再引李怡先生的話：我悲觀，但我積極。

stay hostile to the Mainland, even after knowing Hong Kong has so much in common with the place beyond the Shenzhen River. The definition of localism alters our sense of identity, creating different political stances. This seems to be a relative and subjective idea, but everyone should stay rational, face the truth, and uphold the correct position, so that we can have continuous conversation on a rational basis in order to reach a broader consensus. This view is qualified, however, by the observation that, in the face of vicious pressure, we should also have the courage to stand up and adhere to our principles.

Miss Thong believed that left-wing politics and localism are not theoretically incompatible; the opposition between the two camps is due to leftist leaders or social activists nowadays acting differently toward their respective ideologies. She quoted a passage from *CityU Monthly* to illustrate that a “leftard” is someone who “talks class without imperialism, and consumes revolution without violence.” While fighting for the rights of new immigrants, they see only the deprivation of the poorer classes and the suppression from the Communist Party of China, but turn a blind eye to the colonial policy of the “Greater Chinese Empire.” The opinion that the Hong Kong left-wing has no revolutionary spirit was also written in that passage: “(Leftists) degraded the Umbrella Revolution as a ‘Movement,’ and with ideological duplicity, condemned protestors breaking the glass of LegCo.” Miss Thong added that the original nature of the left is to unite grassroots power and fight radically against an upper class. Thus, there are reasons for calling leftists “leftards.” From the perspective of attitude and power, Mr. Lee expected intellectuals to persevere with their own beliefs and principles when facing any political pressure. He also hoped that we can understand the core values of Hong Kong and protect this city.

Although there are different interpretations of the word “localism,” its spirit is identifiable. On that night when crowds of people gathered at Sai Yeung Choi Street South to watch the China versus Hong Kong football match, it wasn't simply because they had suddenly become football fans; it was due to the recognition of their Hong Kong identity. Such a sense of localism was not born from nothing. If we review our history, we shall know that since the early stage of Hong Kong's development, authoritarian rule was unnecessary. In these years, Hongkongers have been developing their own identity, cultural values, and lifestyle. We are not asking others to accept our attitude, but humbly begging for some respect. We are not forcing our values on people, but we disagree to giving away our unique characteristics to flatter Mainland China. Why can history be tampered with recklessly? Why must Hong Kong hide her cultural grounding to pander to China? As an independent individual, we must defend our own culture. I must clarify that Hong Kong is always open for any opinion, before someone asks me to change my political stance. I can only cite Mr. Lee's idea when foreseeing Hong Kong's future: “I feel pessimistic but I am enthusiastic about it”.

2



1 著名時事評論員及資深傳媒人李怡先生、宗教及哲學系高級講師陳士齊博士，聯同宗教及哲學系二年級湯偉圓同學擔任是次互動論壇講者，由宗教及哲學系副教授吳有能博士主持。Forum host Dr. Ng Yau Nang and guest speakers Mr. Lee Yee, Dr. Chan Sze Chi, and Miss Thong Wai Yuen

2 眾文學院一年級同學及宗教及哲學系同學與各講者分享對當今時局和香港未來的看法，思潮起伏，度過了充實快樂的一晚。Year 1 Faculty of Arts students and students from Department of Religion and Philosophy exchanging their opinions about Hong Kong's present situation and future predictions with guest speakers