

Please scroll down for English

開場白

游靜

多謝大家來參加《新自由主義下的新道德》研討會。

首先，這會能順利開幕，有賴站在我前面的這義工團隊，由 Ms. Grace Yee 統籌，請大家俾 D 掌聲，同認住他們的顏色牌，這兩天有任何問題請抓住他們。

由美國右翼智囊機構傳統基金會和《華爾街日報》聯合發佈“經濟自由度指數”報告，2014年香港連續第20年被評為全球最自由經濟體系。香港今年獲得的總評分為90.1分，較去年提高，並遠高於全球平均分60.3分。第二位是新加坡。港府對獲此“榮譽”表示歡迎，三年前曾說「政府一直擔當市場促進者的角色」，緊遵「大市場、小政府」的原則；自由經濟是「香港持續經濟穩定、增長及繁榮的基石」。並不偶然，香港是在所謂「已發展地區」中堅尼系數最高的，顯示貧富懸殊也最嚴重。第二位也是新加坡。

在殖民統治下，香港一直都是被當成一盤生意般經營，即政府以確保自己及商界盈餘最大、稅制最低、承擔最低限度的公共服務作為管治原則；一切以經濟活動、經濟價值為先，把社會關係市場化。當在八十年代英美戴卓爾夫人及列根政府開始聯手打造全球的新自由主義趨勢，借自由主義修辭來收編基進左派政治文化資源時，香港早十幾年前已與中國／華人 1930-50s 的左派包袱割裂，香港變身成新自由主義天堂(或地獄)的速度與程度，比發明新自由主義的地方都有過之而無不及。也由於香港的新自由主義並不是來自本土自由主義的激進化及借屍還魂，並不需要與傳統協商，我們的新自由主義可以說是最「新」的，也可說無「新」可言。

過去十多二十年，不少學者描述及分析過香港的新自由主義化，但大多著眼於經濟、民生尤其是房屋問題，較少談論文化面向。2013年3月，卡梅倫在保守黨大會上發言，說要「把英國打造成一個有志氣的國家，一個不計較你認識誰或你的出身，最重要的是你找到自己，及想立志做什麼」。聽著這番話我有點時光倒流的感覺。這種「秀異管治」的語言曾經籠罩著我們的七十至九十年代。我們曾經相信香港是一個以法制保障公平競爭、營商自由、多勞多得的社會，同時我們內化了跟以上看來矛盾而其實互為表裡的一系列價值觀：競爭式個人主義、撈世界要醒目、執輸行頭慘過敗家、怕蝕底、搶錢的自由比一切(尤其是性)自由重要、如果你少得／吾得那就必定是因為你少勞、「偷懶」／吞卜、衰左等等。如Raymond Williams (1963)的名言，社會階梯這種想象只能讓一個個孤單的個體攀爬上去。容許我補充說：向下流動的那條滑梯永遠也是一個人滑下去，這樣才能令群體的抗爭無法出現。

這種資本主義的發展看似一個去道德的過程，但同時也必須在我們身上製造一系列全新的道德價值觀念來合理化它自己，尤其是要合理化當所有人都被鼓吹要爭逐向上流動時必然產生的大量向下流動。向下流動固然跟每個人的性別、性傾向、種族、語言、高矮肥瘦都很有關係，但在香港，我們傾向把身份政治

妖魔化成「技不如人的借口」。身份政治是被自由主義整理出來的社會關係，本身已鞏固及和諧化了一些不平等的權力關係。相當偶然又不太偶然地，在過去兩星期，香港三大基督教會在報紙買下三版全版廣告，刊登了題為《宣明婚姻立場，維護家庭價值》的聯署。維護家庭基金（前身為維護家庭聯盟）在上週末舉辦「家庭快樂巡遊」，主辦方說有三萬人出席，及超過九十間社福機構、媒體、幼稚園、小學、企業及教會支持。香港基督右派，近年多利用身份政治及平權話語來運作，像他們聲稱要維護兒童權利，又向僱傭(修訂)條例提出倡議，甚至向扶貧委員會成功申請資源來討好基層家庭及兒童（向他們派發賀歲盃足球賽事免費入場門票），從而要建設公義的社會等等。他們的動員展現了社會大眾面對新自由主義的不公義容易墮入的道德恐慌，也同時暴露了新自由主義本身的道德矛盾：高舉「維護家庭」的旗幟，但故意漠視正是「一男一女、一夫一妻、一生一世及生兒育女」這種建制與國家的共謀（像交稅、住屋、醫療福利等），其實在製造更多的向下流動及壓迫各種弱勢，不單是因為性傾向，也因為在家庭建制中被視為不合格的人種才是多數，包括單親離婚失婚不婚有外遇不育等等，別忘記我們還有更多數來自不合格的階級、種族、族群、性別、語言。

新自由主義繼承自由主義，遮蔽了各種不合格身份之間的關係，要我們每個人體內的階級、種族、族群、性別、語言也像格仔店的格格互不相干，使我們作為「人」的這個抗爭主體更難以出現。Professor Lisa Duggan 是紐約大學社會與文化分析教授。她的學術成果對我們最富啟發性及令我們鼓舞的，正在於她對於社會運動鏗而不捨的投注及分析，並且一一釐清性/別及政治經濟結構之間緊緊扣連、互相成全的各種關係。在香港，我自己就被告訴了幾十年，研究政治經濟學是那幾百人，做性/別研究是另外孤伶伶的可有可無的那幾個人。Professor Lisa Duggan 卻跟我們說，如果我們還不斷複製這種虛假的知識分類，我們對兩方面的理解與介入都只會繼續隔靴抓癢，講不到重心。她的著作《平等的晨昏？：新自由主義、文化政治及對民主的攻擊》中說：「新自由主義把我們的物質及政治生活用種族、性別及性向、經濟階層、國籍，及宗教這些定義來重新組織，但又透過自由主義來把這些分類之間的關係模糊化」；「文化、身份議題如果仍然在分析與組織上被視為跟它們原來相嵌其中的政經結構互不相干，我們將永遠無法建立一種新的社會運動，會夠強、夠有創意、夠多元，為新世紀的全球政治創造新的可能」。

她的另一本書《莎芙狂刀：性、暴力與美國現代性》曾獲美國歷史學會的 John Boswell 獎。這本書非常重要地指出在美國社會歷史中，某些階級及族群的尋求法律保障經常是透過壓迫其他更邊緣族群以達致的，從十九世紀白人婦女至二十一世紀爭取婚權的同志皆如是。這些在今天香港也非常值得我們深思。今年 Professor Duggan 是美國研究學會的候任主席。我們很榮幸可以邀請到 Professor Duggan 來當主題講者，她來前我聽到她剛接到一些恐嚇，叫她收聲，如果不是就會危害她的人身安全。我們今天很慶幸她龍精虎猛、安然無恙地站在我們面前。Lisa.

OPENING REMARKS

Yau Ching

Thank you for joining us at the Neolib Neomorals Conference. Welcome.

The successful opening of this conference today depends heavily on the volunteer team standing in front of me, headed by our conference Manager Ms Grace Yee. Please look carefully at their colorful badges; for any problems or questions in these 2 days, please feel free to grab one of them.

This year Hong Kong has been ranked the world's freest economy for the 20th consecutive year by the right-wing US think tank The Heritage Foundation, in partnership with The Wall Street Journal. Hong Kong's score is 90.1, higher than last year, and much higher than the global average of 60.3. No. 2 is Singapore. The Hong Kong Government has always welcomed this "honor". Government spokesman has said that "The Government have played a market facilitator role by upholding the "large market, small government" principle, and that economic freedom "is the cornerstone of sustained economic stability, growth and prosperity of Hong Kong." Not coincidentally, the Gini coefficient (measure of income inequality) of Hong Kong is also the highest in the "developed" world. No. 2 is also Singapore.

From its first colonial days, Hong Kong has always been run like a business, ie. assuring the government and its business partners the largest profit, with the lowest taxation and providing the minimal amount of public services, thus serving to marketize all social relations. When the British-American Neoliberalism was trumpeted by Reagan and Thatcher in the 1980s to become a global trend, Hong Kong, having gotten rid of its Leftist heritage from the 1930s-50s, was most readily turned into a neoliberal paradise (or hell), in a speed and at a degree that far exceeded its inventors. And because Hong Kong's neoliberalism was not a radicalization and second coming of Classical Liberalism from its own tradition, *our* "neo"liberalism is indeed the *newest*, without anything renewed.

In the past 2 decades, Hong Kong scholars have produced a collection of literature on our neoliberalized development, but almost of them have focused on its economic implications especially on the housing problem in Hong Kong. Few looked at its cultural aspects. UK Prime Minister David Cameron addressed the Conservative Party Spring Conference in 2013 by saying: "We are building an Aspiration Nation. A country where it's not who you know, or where you're from; but who you are and where you're determined to go." Listening to this was a *deja vu* experience for me. Once upon a time we were dominated by a similar language of meritocracy, at least from 1970s all the way to 1990s, if not longer. We were brought up to believe in Hong Kong as a society with comprehensive legal protections, fair competition for opportunities, the "more effort yields more crops" mentality while internalizing apparently contradictory but in fact complementary values including competitive individualism, be smart to survive, "not earning enough is the worst loser", the constant fear of being ripped off, of poverty/not having much as a morally inferior trait, and the only freedom that matters is the one to grab cash and run, overshadowing and/or replacing all other freedoms especially sexual ones. As Raymond Williams had reminded us in 1963, the ladder, as a symbol for bourgeois society, no doubt offers the opportunity to climb but it can only be used

individually: “you go up the ladder alone.” Allow me to add here, the process of moving down—also alone—is usually much faster; sliding would be a more realistic imagery, rendering collective action impossible.

While this form of capitalist development looks like a demoralizing process, it has installed in us a whole new set of values and moral imperatives to justify itself, in particular to justify the massive downward mobility caused by the collective struggle for upward mobility. Social mobility is of course dependent on factors including gender, sexuality, race, language, body size and shape but in Hong Kong, we are accustomed to demonizing identity politics as the excuse for “not making it”. Identity politics, as social relations reorganized by liberalism, in itself perpetuates some existing unequal power relations. Coincidentally or maybe not quite, in the past week, three Christian megachurches in Hong Kong bought three full page ads to print their petitions of reinstating “family values”. Just this past Sunday (when the organizing team of this conference was having its meeting), a Christian organization known for its anti-gay agenda, Family Value Foundation organized a “Happy Family Parade”, claiming that there were 30,000 participants and receiving endorsement of more than 90 NGOs, schools, companies and churches. The HK Christian Right have been employing tactics and rhetorics borrowed from identity politics and the rights movement in recent years; Family Value, for example, claims to be concerned with issues of “social justice” and “children’s rights”, advocates legislative revisions for domestic helpers, and even applies to HKSAR Commission on Poverty for “free tickets” to soccer games to be handed out to grassroots families in order to gain constituencies. Their power to gain constituencies not only reveals the moral fears and anxieties faced by many people under the unjust neoliberal regime but also exposes some of the moral contradictions of neoliberalism itself: hailing “family values” on the one hand but refusing to address the oppression of many families and their downward mobility caused by the collaborative efforts from institutions such as “One man one woman, one wife one husband, one partner for life, and pro-procreation” and the nation-state. Institutions as such define and exile the majority of people from families in terms of our sexual orientation as well as in terms of our single parenthood, divorces, death of partners, singlehood, adulteries, inabilities to procreate etc., on top of our already being disqualified in terms of class, race, ethnicity, gender, language and so on.

Neoliberalism has inherited liberalism in its tendency to obscure the relationships between the (disqualifying) identities, compelling each of us to consume and sell each compartment separately in its project of disowning us as human subjects capable of resistance. Lisa Duggan is Professor of Social and Cultural Analysis at New York University. Her intellectual work is most inspiring and encouraging for me in her persistent and hopeful investment and analysis in activist social movement, and her refusal to be segregated comfortably in either the “field” of political economy or gender/sexuality. In HK, I myself have been told for about 2 decades, those who do political economy are hundreds of people, and in gender/sexuality are those few, and they do not talk to each other. However, according to Professor Duggan, if we continue to replicate this kind of false categorization of knowledge production, our understanding and intervention in both would always be very limited and irrelevant. In *The Twilight of Equality?: Neoliberalism, cultural politics, and the attack on democracy*, she analyzes succinctly: “Neoliberalism, a late twentieth-century incarnation of Liberalism, organizes material and political life *in terms of* race, gender, and sexuality

as well as economic class and nationality, or ethnicity and religion. But the categories through which Liberalism (and thus also neoliberalism) classifies human activity and relationships *actively obscure* the connections among these organizing terms”; “Nor will it be possible to build a new social movement that might be strong, creative, and diverse enough to engage the work of reinventing global politics for the new millennium as long as cultural and identity issues are separated, analytically and organizationally, from the political economy in which they are embedded.”

Her book *Sapphic Slashers: Sex, Violence and American Modernity* won the John Boswell Prize of the American Historical Association. This work poignantly reveals how in US history, the demands for “rights protection” for certain classes of people are often done in the expense of oppressing other more marginalized population, true for 19th century white women as well as 21st pro-marriage LBGTs. This is essential food for thought for us in HK today. Professor Duggan is also the President-Elect of the American Studies Association this year. We are very honored to have her as our keynote. After she has accepted our invitation, I was told that she received some death threats—which I’m sure are not related to this invitation. We are—needless to say---more than grateful to be able to receive Professor Duggan here in her fully alive, safe and rigorous mode. Lisa.