打造香港道德

The (Re)Making of the Hong Kong Ethic

游靜 YAU Ching

提綱

過去關於港人價值觀的論述一般認為華人難民社群有「功利家庭主義」的非政治化取向(Lau) 、殖民政治強化「固有的保守和怯懦心理」(曾 31)、「港人(主要是年青一代)普遍都表現了十分內向與退卻的心理..... 極端的物慾主義、享樂主義或消極意念」(曾 35)。雖然貧富懸殊嚴重，但直至本世紀初以前，「多數居民都相信有能力肯苦幹就有機會出頭」；「法律觀念深入民心」，所以「個人和家庭利益放在集體利益的前面」(李 41)；八十年代後是「利益團體政治」及伴隨而來的「公民權利」及「社區意識」興起，「歸屬感政治」轉變至「權益政治」(黃偉邦 184)。戰後出生的一代因為並未經歷中國內戰所以較為「理想主義」(張炳良 58)，大多「出身低下家庭」，「故對社會公義問題特別敏感」(張炳良 59)，普遍認同「民主自由、公義平等」原則；不是「福利派」，「要求其本階級利益獲得一定的注重」(張炳良 61)，「重視自我奮鬥，強調獨立」(張炳良 63)；要求機會平等而不是均等主義 (Lau and Khan 66；呂 1998b：203)。「競爭性資本主義」環境提供的「雙軌發展」社會流動機能鼓勵沒受過專上教育的透過「搏殺」來晉升中產階級 (呂 1998a: 98) 。即使看到資本主義「有不平等」，但仍然接受「競爭性的制度」; 九七後的焦慮是害怕失去「一個個人自由得到尊重、個人高度的自由活動空間和依法行事的制度」，導致「自身利益受損」，「毋須因政治理由而委屈、妥協」，面對「強權的、家長式的環境」(呂 1998b：203-206)。

以上大概描述了上世紀八十年代及以後的港人主流價值觀，經常被統稱為「獅子山下精神」的。過去學者一般傾向把香港本土意識的崛起，「獅子山下精神」(《獅子山下》為 1974-1994 年間，香港電台製作的一套電視劇)的形塑追溯至七十年代。六十年代末至七十年代是香港經濟結構急劇轉型期(如 1969-1972 年間就有三家證券交易所成立：1969 年遠東交易所、1971 年金銀證券交易所及 1972 年九龍證券交易所)，而五十至六十年代中則通常被指為南來人口無法或企圖適應香港、心懷祖國的過渡期。本文借爬梳五十年代的流行電影文化來闡述當時社會—我認為同樣是「紮根」香港，以香港作為想像共同體—深入民心的的價值觀跟「獅子山下精神」的不盡相同甚至矛盾，從而企圖重新想像香港文化中的一些被歷史斷裂化了、地下化了的聲音，如何被有系統地排除在「香港本土」的界定以外。我追溯這過程作為在香港被「競爭性資本主義」全盤洗禮之前，經歷了的一項去（舊）道德，同時也是去政治化工程。而把「香港本土意識」定性於在七十年代才出現這種說法，是把香港人對殖民資本主義的認同作為香港成為想像共同體的條件，這也是香港最新自由主義化的「本土性」。

Abstract

Present discourse on Hongkongers' value systems considers this community of Chinese refugees as having an apolitical "utilitarian familism" (Lau); that colonial politics reinforced "an existing psychology of conservatism and timidity" (Tsang 31); that "Hongkongers (mainly its younger generations) express generally a very inward-looking and regressive mentality… an extreme

materialism, hedonism and negativity." (Tsang, 35) Despite a severe gap between the rich and poor, until the 21st century "most residents believed that the opportunity would be theirs if they were capable and if they worked hard." "Concepts of the law were deeply embedded in the population"; "the interests of the individual and his family were placed before those of the collective." (Li 41) After the 1980s, the emergence of "civil rights" and "community consciousness" accompanied the rise of "interest-group politics"; a shift took place between "the politics of belongingness" to "the politics of rights". (Wong Wai-pong 184) According to Cheung Ping-leung, the post-war generation, mostly "from lower-class families", is relatively "idealist" for not having experienced the Chinese civil war (58), "and are thus particularly sensitive to the problems of social justice." (59) While they are "welfarists", they generally identify with values of "democracy, freedom, justice and equality" and "demand certain regard to the rights of their proper classes." (61) "Autonomy and hard work is valued high." (63) They demand equal opportunity, and not egalitarianism. (Lau and Khan 66; Lui 1998b : 203) Lui Tai-lok (1998b: 98) believes that the "double-track development" mechanism of social ascension provided by a "competitive capitalist" environment has encouraged those who have not received higher education to elevate themselves to middle class status by "engaging in the combat of life", so much so that even though Hongkong people could see that capitalism "has its inequalities", they still accepted "a competitive system". Major anxiety raised by the Chinese handover was/is that they would lose "a system where personal liberty is respected, and where the rule of law ensures a high degree of autonomy of individual activity", resulting in "a loss of one's interests", and fear that their days of "not having to compromise for political reasons" in the face of an "authoritarian, paternalistic environment" would soon be over. (Lui 1998b : 203-206)

The above should have approximately outlined the mainstream value system of Hong Kong people since the 1980s, commonly known as the "Under the Lion Rock spirit"[19]. Hong Kong witnessed rapid economic shifts at the end of 1960s to early 1970s (three stock exchanges were founded: Far East Exchange 1969; Kam Ngan 1971; Kowloon 1972), and the 1950s were usually sidelined as the transitional period where the newcomers from China were unable or struggling to adapt themselves to the colony with their hearts still in the Mainland. This paper seeks to map some of the values as represented in the 1950s popular Hong Kong cinema and their distinctiveness from those of the "Under the Lion Rock spirit," while I would argue that these are no less "rooted" in a social identification with Hong Kong and having it as an imagined community. Rather, the discourse of Hongkongness as a 1970s invention has redefined the Hong Kong ethnic identity in such a way that it, more often than not, assumes a collective identification with the colonial capitalist project—a moral and affectual development that did not become dominant until post-1967—as a *required* condition for such identity. This alone, I would say, is one of the most neoliberalized conditions of Hong Kong. Through uncovering a systemic project of ostracizing/demonizing some long repressed moral tales and of replacing them with success narratives on "upward class mobility" under a "competitive capitalist" system, I hope to examine the beginning of remaking/reengineering the Hong Kong ethic via a process of colonial depoliticization as well as to further problematize the historical construction of Hong Kong ethnicity.

[19] *Under the Lion Rock* was a TV drama series produced by Radio Television Hong Kong in 1974-1994, Hong Kong's public television.

打造香港道德

游靜

很少知識份子討論香港人的道德觀及其歷史建構。但在不少政治話語及運動中，道德(感情)又經常被挪用（像「平反六四」、「反對第二十三條立法」[20]、「捍衛新聞自由」等一般被統稱為「大是大非」的議題，常被指有「良心」的人都應該支持，或最近的「做人不要太李梓敬」事件[21]）。民粹政治或維護特權階級利益出發的社會運動與論述，也主要是倚仗道德話語及感情的操作（如綜緩養懶人、反對性傾向歧視立法、反對修訂家暴法保障同性伴侶、反對修訂婚姻條例草案等[22]），甚至過去幾年中港矛盾加劇所造成的一些爆炸點或表癥，如自由行陸客都被港人冠以「缺乏公德心」、「不正義」、「行為不檢」等道德罪名。我希望借今次這機會初步整理香港文化政治中道德價值演變的一些軌跡。

香港「左派」電影

從《香港影人口述歷史叢書(1)南來香港》（2000）開始，香港電影資料館在過去十多年做了大量電影文化歷史資料搜集及整理工作，稍稍彌補了研究香港文化歷史一直面對的資料散佚、言人人殊的問題。這篇文章中的想法也主要是在資料館工作的基礎上開展的。

> 「我揣測 1967 年之前，左派在香港有相當完善的機構，但六七暴動使香港左派機構自己成為最大的受害者。第一，他們失掉了香港民心。第二，因為中國內地鬧文革，香港的左派機構自己都不清楚有沒有正統性，變成左派機構本身也很難運作。第三，香港政府到了 1967、68 年，便慢慢搞清楚了原來香港左派機構並非由北京支持，香港政府就敢去對付他們了…… 」(科 16)

> 「一九五一年，粵語片空前熱鬧，產量驚人。以我所知，這一年共拍了二百多三百部粵語片，而我也演了廿一部。」(黃曼梨 181)

日佔時期，中共與英軍聯手在香港抗日，戰後英女皇授予中共東江縱隊駐港辦事處主任黃作梅勳章。1945 年中共廣東區委與港英政府同意九項條款，包括同意中共在港建立半公開

[20] 《國家安全(立法條文)條例》為香港基本法第 23 條，包括叛國罪、分裂國家行為、煽動叛亂罪、顛覆國家罪及竊取國家機密等。2002 年中央政府要求香港特區政府為廿三條立法。2003 年 7 月 1 日五十萬人遊行，反對草案。其後政府擱置草案（原定於 7 月 9 日提交立法會），保安局局長葉劉淑儀辭職。

[21] 2014 年 4 月 29 日，立法會辯論全民退休保障，自由黨青年團主席被指「涼薄」、「一個無家教既二世祖」。http://www.inmediahk.net/node/1022604

[22] 香港終審法院 2013 年裁定婚姻條例違憲，變性人 W 享有婚姻權，2014 年立法會提出修訂婚姻條例草案，容許跨性別人士在完成變性手術後以新性別結婚。反對修訂條例的基督教論述跟以前反對性傾向歧視立法與反對修訂家暴法相似，認為立法與修訂是挑戰主流「道德觀」；「一夫一妻制現今仍然是香港人的共識亦是社會繁榮的基礎，國家是由無數的家組成，家庭受到衝擊會造成嚴重的社會問題」等。http://christiantimes.org.hk/Common/Reader/News/ShowNews.jsp?Nid=51385&Pid=6&Version=0&Cid=150 ； http://www.hkatv.com/zh-hk/atvnews/24405/2014-04-23/爭取跨性別人士權利團體反對婚姻條例草案

工作機構，中共可在港辦報、設電台，港九人民有武裝自己和維持社會治安的權利等。(周承人 2011b：54-55) 雖然自 1947 年起美蘇冷戰表面化，但 1950 年 1 月 6 日，英國率先承認中共政權[23]。在五十年代香港的文藝陣地，「左派」 (下面我會討論這裡「左」的意涵)佔據優越位置(容 128)；左派電影是五十年代華南電影 的主流。『長鳳新』(長城 、鳳凰、新聯三間電影公司)是香港主要「文藝據點，在香港電影史上擔任重要的角色。當中的新聯影業公司，1952 年創辦，主要拍攝粵語片，宣揚提高粵語片水準，以通俗電影及倫理戲劇詮釋革新的價值觀，不乏左翼意識型態的影響。新聯為文藝和政治使命，奮鬥三十年，製作電影百部……」(何，內封) 五十年代製作粵語片有四大公司：中聯、新聯、光藝、華僑；最早成立的新聯是「國家直接投資」 (郭 130)：「本來有需要時國家會出資，按新聯當時的情況，應該不必」（黃憶 168)，口號是：「背靠祖國，面向海外」。廖承志在 1964 年北京召開的「香港電影工作會議」上曾定性香港電影「和內地不同，應有區別」；「我以為香港的電影，要面向華僑，面向亞洲、非洲的人民」，「藝術思想應該是屬於資產階級性質的革命的電影」，反帝國 、反封建主義，也就是「新民主主義革命」的電影，「那就自然成為祖國社會主義革命、無產階級革命電影的側翼」。(廖承志 190)

這四間公司的人脈很多重疊。中聯及華僑是由新聯發展出來，創辦光藝（由南洋何氏家族投資）的秦劍也是中聯的股東之一，光藝繼承了中聯的傳統並將之更現代化（「摩登」）及都市化（黃愛玲 2006)。中聯的四大導演即李晨風、吳回、秦劍、李鐵常幫新聯拍片(包括 1952-1954 年新聯頭四部創業作)；「中聯為新聯拍片，九折支薪」(黃憶 168)。秦劍也為新聯導演過《家家戶戶》 (1954)、《新婚夫婦》(1956)。為了擺脫「剝削階層」，中聯是一間「合作制」公司，由 21 位導演及演員合資作為股東，不受片商約束，並認為演員(明星)片酬過高，影響製作質素，集體減薪。薪酬也集體議定，製片、導演議定演員的，演員議定編導製的薪金(周 2011a:31)。「長鳳新的資金不充裕，職工薪水很低，但大家不計較。因為大家有個認識，要為華人社會拍一些有益世道人心的戲。」(廖一原 154)中聯仿效長鳳新的集體創作方式，成立編導委員會，劇本要經過委員會討論方能開拍。

香港影人的「左派」背景是甚麼意思呢？最想知道的是港英政府：「新聯及長城都有港英政府的臥底。」(黃憶 169) 1956 年起先後出任新聯、鳳凰、長城等公司董事長的廖一原說：「我們不自認是左派」，「不反共不反華便是（我們的）朋友，因此團結面很廣」(周承人 2009: 28)；「我們甚麼黨都不是，只是愛國派，抗日派」（廖一原 150)；他稱「左派電影」為「愛國進步電影」。廖一原在香港出生，1939 年赴粵北抗日前線任戰地記者，1940 年代國共矛盾加劇，國民黨到處掃蕩共產黨。1946 年在昆明《掃蕩報》工作期間，經歷友人李公樸及聞一多被暗殺，於是回港。1951 年任香港《文滙報》編輯主任。1967 年 5 月，廖一原當選「港九各界同胞反對港英迫害鬥爭委員會」常務委員，同年 11 月被港英政治部逮捕，關進集中營。至翌年 12 月獲釋。他被港英政府通緝期間，就是躲在中聯董事長吳楚帆的家。

[23] 但同時期港英政府對中共在港的活動採取半打壓政策，如 1946-49 年間，中共在港建立的大專學府、位於屯門的香港達德學院，曾於國共內戰期間滙集大量左翼知識份子，包括千家駒、鄧初民、鍾敬文、夏衍等；茅盾、曹禺、葉聖陶、歐陽予倩、郭沫若等也曾到校演講。四九年港府以「訓練學生搗亂治安」及「政黨集會之所」為由關閉該校，後來校舍由倫敦傳道會購得，以紀念香港首位華人牧師命名為何福堂會所，達德主樓改稱為馬禮遜樓。（陳智德 2013：171-177）

吳楚帆深受三十年代末上海左翼影人如蔡楚生、司徒楚敏的價值觀影響，「為時代與社會拍片」；「電影不單是一種新興企業，而且是一種教育工具、一種對社會人生影響極大的藝術。因此從事電影工作的人，都會感到自己責任不輕……」(吳 172)。1937 年他在自傳中寫：「反帝的怒潮到底堵塞不住，全國都在動員」，演完抗日電影《最後關頭》(1938)，看見「四座掌聲震動，影片振奮人心……分享了至高無上的光榮，禁不住激動得流淚。」(周承人 2011a：26-27) 中聯名作《危樓春曉》(1953，李鐵) （下文會闡述）兩位編劇之一，也是新聯的編劇、導演及製片盧敦（郭 121）憶述他青少年時代(二十年代)深受廣州作為革命發源地的思潮影響。在「火紅的年代」省港大罷工(1925-1926)廣州遊行示威期間，英軍一見黃埔學生就開槍：「學生即時打橫一字排開，保護人民，叫我們走」。「中學有不少傾向革命、共產思想的青年學生」，中學宿舍也會被搜，凡是搜得共產書籍，就被拉走。幸好搜到他時，天色已晚，軍隊放棄，「我也因此大難不死」。「其實我有什麼黨派呀？不過以前在廣州受到革命思想的影響，總覺得文藝應為政治服務，文人不能離開政治。」(周承人 2009: 29) 盧敦又回顧，1948-1952 年間，南來文人挪用及重新詮釋五四(香港親中報紙在 1949 後嚮應批判胡適、傅斯年、陳獨秀等)，在香港推動「新民主主義思想啟蒙運動」，這運動「給予傾向進步」，「給香港影壇很重大的影響，反對外來殖民地意識」(盧 116)。這運動包括奉行「四不主張」：「不請客、不送禮、不狂飲、不賭錢」；「生活運動公約」：不應酬、不做不正當娛樂、不拍無聊有毒素的電影、不做反人民的工作、守時間守信用、實行簡單樸素的生活、建立批評討論制度及發揚團結互助精神 (林 165-166)。這些主張跟長鳳新甚至中聯員工自述的風氣很接近; 夏夢(127)：「好像我簽的第一個合約就說明不用參加任何宴會。」。49 年前後，香港影人成立「國語片」及「粵語片」兩大學習組／讀書會，讀馬列毛著作。粵語片組成員包括吳楚帆、盧敦、李清、容小意、張活游、秦劍、高魯泉等 (顧 104)，都是中聯的班底。

甚麼是恥？

中聯頭炮《家》(1953) (改編巴金 Ba Jin) 「獲各方好評，票房熱賣」，《苦海明燈》 (秦劍，1953)及《千萬人家》 (珠璣，1953)也轟動，第四部《危樓春曉》，口碑與票房皆成為里程碑。「中聯精神」秉乘五四及新民主主義的反封建腐化、提倡情感自由、主張獨立自強(如《家》(1953)、《春》(1953)、《秋》(1954)、《紫薇園的秋天》 (1958)、《人倫》(1959))，批判貧富不均、基層勞工受壓迫(《危樓春曉》、《金蘭姊妹》(1954)、《父母心》、《兒女債》(1955)、《孤星血淚》(1955))，反帝反殖反貪官(《血染黃金》、《水滸傳：智取生辰綱》 (1957))，歌頌團結愛國抗日（《路》(1959) 、《海》*Sea* (1963)），反迷信(《金蘭姊妹》、《豔屍還魂記》(1956) 、《鬼屋疑魂》(1963))。《危樓春曉》也如中聯作品一貫強調集體創作，抗拒個人主義，肯定自建社區的互助人倫關係(廣為人知至成為中聯招牌的「人人為我、我為人人」對白[24])，批判封建家庭階序(如大班黃強姦姨仔新移民阿芳後

[24]出自大仲馬（Alexandre Dumas）小說 *Les Trois Mousquetaires* 中的「Un pour tous! Tous pour un! 」，由林紓翻譯成「人人為我、我為人人」。林紓（1852-1924）是中國最早翻譯西方文學作品的人，被認為對五四新文化運動有正面作用。這句話在二十世紀中國經常被社會及政治運動挪用，以致中國作家韓少功在描述文革「全民聖徒化」與「全民警察化」等社會關係的轉向時也有「人人盯我、我盯人人」的說法（2014: 100）。

迫她做侍妾、黃太作下馬威用針插她的頭，以凸顯元配的管治權)。它不但批判以資本邏輯來丈量及工具化人際關係的價值觀念，更把殖民地官商合謀的階級特權壟斷一針見血地顯露。第一場大班黃的對白：「You know, it's criminal」，恃着向包租婆三姑放高利貸的特權身份及在洋行打過工的買辦優勢，挪用特權語言及殖民地法律「用得久就有權處置」[25]來合理化自己霸佔床位，並指三姑租給二叔是「侵權行為」。片末四叔迫羅明三天內收齊「危樓」住客租金，因為政府十天後便會將之清拆，還叫羅明切勿告訴租客。「權利」、「刑法」，這些與西方現代主體共榮共生的制度與信念，及地產商勾結政府、黑廂操作式的「土地發展」、「舊樓拆建」，在片中都被呈現成用來壓迫生活得「愈來愈艱難」(二叔語)市民的技藝。

> 「二十世紀的五、六十年代，難民湧入香港，舉目無親，只能依靠鄉里、工友及鄰居。……農民靠的是田地和親族，田地是祖傳的，可靠穩妥，親族是世代血親，都有互相照顧的義務。因逃避戰亂和共黨統治而離棄鄉土，遽然進入半新不舊的戰後香港社會，只能以傳統的道義和人情來互相扶持，將鄉下親族之間的感情轉移到新相識和陌生人身上……要簡單分析這些現象，不須什麼大道理，只須借助社會學的綜合資本概念：經濟資本、社會資本和文化資本」。(陳雲 156)

陳雲以《危樓春曉》中同住在一座危樓的板間房住客之間雖無血緣關係，但都以「二叔」、「大家姐」、「三姑」等互稱，來說明貧民由於缺乏經濟資本(祖傳田地、親族家產)，只好把親情轉移至近鄰，依靠從「舊社會」學來「張羅應付的」「社會資本」，「即使近鄰只是給予心理和感情上的支援」(159)。陳雲的跨時代翻譯（用今天的語言讀六十年前的文本）是為了要批判九七後特區政府要港人忍受「財閥」宰制，欠缺「經濟資本」仍被迫要同舟共濟，硬啃「香港精神」。他把《危》中鄰里關係讀成為情感支援只是欠缺經濟支援時的勉強補償，其實是故意漠視電影的中心情節：近鄰的情感及心理支援是透過經濟上的互相支援來表達及維繫的。片首二叔一家因欠租被迫遷，就是做的士司機的威哥(吳楚帆飾)及當舞女的「大家姐」白瑩(紫羅蓮飾)來幫他付租金讓他們可留下來。片中租房吃飯開生日會以至買棺材進醫院生小孩都是鄰里之間一起掏腰包互相支援的。片末威嫂失血過多，瀕臨難產，也是中聯股東張瑛飾的羅明不惜冒着「對健康造成很大的影響」(醫生語)的危險，也要主動捐血給她，在血可以賣錢的年代(二叔就是因為兩度賣血虛弱至死)，這是最後的經濟資本了。更重要的是，當醫生知道他捐血是為了幫朋友，醫生一點都沒感到意外，反而說「這就是朋友最可貴的地方」，就是「患難見真情」。反而電影中呈現的大部份血緣親族關係，如黃太太對她從鄉下來的表妹阿芳(梅綺飾) 刻薄至近乎虐待，或認錢不認親、迫羅明在大風雨中收租的置業公司(地產商？)老闆(親)四叔。片中呈現的羅明這窮教員本來就看不起四叔的經濟資本(要托大腳)，給收租佬阿歐陽踢爆他原來是業主的侄，他才不好意思地說「我都很少見他的」。

「文化資本」又如何？羅明雖然有足以當教員的文化條件，但這社會不重視教育，「不窮不教學」(羅明語)。白瑩雖然高中畢業，但那時的香港剛從轉口港貿易模式轉型至工業生產又遇上國內大量移民湧入導致失業嚴重，她除了當舞女也沒其它工作選擇。大班不讓她挑

[25]參香港法例《逆權管有》（Adverse Possession）條文，《時效條例》第 347 章：收回土地財產的訴訟，不得在訴訟權產生的日期起計滿 12 年後提出。http://www.hkreform.gov.hk/tc/publications/adversepossession.htm

客，生日想預支薪水也被罵。白瑩及羅明同樣有一定的文化資本，但在這只講求經濟效益(「什麼也是錢」)的社會，只能本著「習慣吃苦」的(白瑩語)。儒家價值在這社會中只能在談情求偶時派點用場，而且還成為理解階級壓迫的障礙。羅明想跟白瑩一起慶生，但收了鄰里的賀禮後突然失業，沒錢設宴，基於「讀書人的面子」，感到「失禮」。威哥仗義張羅，但只能把乳豬鮑翅換成魚蛋粉麵。羅明又認為這樣叫他蒙羞。白瑩靠夜總會同事介紹的報刊編輯為了巴結白瑩，騙羅明讓他寫專欄，羅明徹夜不眠等第一篇稿面世，希望落空，反怪白瑩讓他丟盡「男人大丈夫的面子」。儒家文人陽剛性被呈現成前現代、鞏固性別／階級不平等的封建構築。《危樓春曉》寫一個知識份子「異化」後再接受改造（陳智德 2012: 108)，呈現了在重商輕文的殖民社會中知識份子的道德鬥爭和恥感；文人賣身給資本家欺壓工人然後發現自己錯了(文人對工人：「希望大家原諒我」)，顯現儒家及五四文人主導救國的傳統在香港的失落及崩潰[26]。

相反，性工作者的角色，作為香港當時婦女的最普遍職業，雖然「搵錢好淒涼」，但「又摩登又靚」，多才多藝(羅明形容白瑩：「入水能游出水能跳」)，仗義敢言，「力求向上」（道德向上向善），敢於與基層工人同進退，反而是電影中最可欲的「現代性」體現(對立面是「欺貧重富」的法制、資本家等)。同在《危》、《牆》 (1956，王鏗)及《金蘭姊妹》（1954，吳回）當女主角的紫羅蓮，演的角色都是能言善辯、敢愛敢恨、理智敢言、富正義感及行動力，儼然是現代華南女性的典範(而白燕 Pak Yin 就是總糾纏在前現代人倫關係中不能自拔)。她的職業，不論是教師、舞女、歌女或者家傭，都被呈現成一種求生策略、際遇與個人選擇的交錯，而不是一項道德議題。抗拒個人主義、批判資本家，甚至中間的買辦階層與法制的合謀，不以貧窮(包括基層婦女如性工作者，只要不「貪慕虛榮」)為恥，反而認為損人利己的囤積資本行為才是值得羞恥的，這是在香港五十年代流行文化文本中常見的道德觀，跟七十年代後新自由主義化的大部份香港敘述很不一樣。

理想主義

1950 年 4 月比 1949 年 5 月香港人口多了接近一百萬人，流亡人口佔總人口百份之四十。五十年代的香港，港英政府壟斷土地供應，以最小支出換取最大利益，以低稅籠絡英國商人及買辦階層，透過買辦集團壟斷經濟，迴避保障勞工的政策，不提供公共房屋與足夠普及的公共醫療設施[27] 。突然大量南來的難民，在一個階級資源分佈本來就極其懸殊的地方，必然產生你死我活、互相踐踏的道德危機。這些左派電影都口徑一致的要「提倡健康，導人向善」(郭 132)，是要直接回應當時香港現實的社會問題。《危樓春曉》的「人人為我、我為人人」在片中被呈現為威哥引以為傲、掛在牆上、反覆強調的座右銘，更顯示自私自利行為在當時大概相當普遍，這些受歡迎的電影滿足了觀眾的一些道德想像與需求。這一代文人不但承傳與轉化五四的救國、讓文化貼近群眾的思想，自身也經歷八年抗戰／日，習慣為愛國主義賦予高度的道德意涵，加上儒家賦予文人的道德責任和優越感，他們參

[26] 然而，寄望文人主導、文人救國的精神在中聯電影中還是經常冒現，如在《金蘭姊妹》中，最後救眾人出困境的就是唯一識字的阿英（紫羅蓮飾），片末更有邀請觀眾判斷家傭們行事對錯的畫外音。

[27] 在五十年代的電影中經常有角色缺錢看病至無法活下去的情節，即使有罕見的公立醫療服務的出現，如在《金蘭姊妹》（1954）中，也被再現為不是片中角色容易接觸到的資源。

予電影創作是為了「文以載道」，動之以情。電影在香港資本主義制度下作為一種新興行業，必須面向大眾才能生存，寫實、抒寫人情(味)，是讓這些電影能持續普及、發揮影響力的主因。寫實又流行、緊貼這難民社會的文化產品如電影，與這些文人的抱負及使命感一拍即合。掌管中聯編導委員會的李晨風在筆記〈人情味是什麼？〉一文中：「人到底是自私的，先為自己，後及親疏，這是人性。但是到了利己損人之後，慢慢的覺得不安而良心發現，寧願犧牲自己，成全他人，這叫人情。反方面的，被損害的人一旦覺得損害者良心發現，而甘願吃虧，也叫人情。」「孝悌忠信，禮義廉恥，是人類的八德，為着了奉行八德，而自我犧牲的，才是人情。」(黃愛玲 2004：123-124) 而在德行與私欲之間產生的矛盾，就是戲劇。觀乎中聯的作品，也不光是擁抱八德的，片中有違「八德」的也不一定是壞人。《春殘夢斷》(1955, 李晨風)(改編自托爾斯泰的 *Anna Karenina*)寫上層社會的婚外情，由當時最紅的白燕 Pak Yin 飾有夫之婦(潘安娜)與張活游飾小三(王基樹)，票房慘敗。李晨風在〈筆記〉（133）中也說「固然，《春殘夢斷》之基樹對哭安娜之愛有違舊道德之處，強作同情，觀眾不能接受，因而種種痛苦，觀眾不同意，此外無別了。」言下之意，是他雖然不認同這種「舊」道德觀，但可以理解觀眾的感受。中聯的股東導演，不在中聯旗下出品的，就更加百花齊放，描寫各種情愛模式，如《往事知多少》(1953，珠璣)中，有婦之夫（也是張活游）愛上有夫之婦（也是白燕） 後來又與其妹（梅綺飾）結合，最後張活游還是由白燕打救。雖然這些粵語片主打家庭倫理，但基層疾苦、朋友間的互信（義氣）、婆媳糾紛、兩、三代親情及矛盾、仁義忠孝，才是道德母題；核心家庭與所謂「性倫理」從來不是電影的中心關注。如《牆》*The Wall* 寫一對夫妻因為老公不贊成老婆出外工作而要鬧離婚，不論老婆當的是歌女抑或教師，老公一概反對，以顯示男權的保守，男女的不平等。紫羅蓮飾演的角色，時而是歌女、孤兒院教師，時而是盡責的母親，電影並沒特別把她妖魔化或悲情化。中聯電影企圖形塑人情世界的理想關係，追求「里仁為美」(徐85)；反封建禮教，宣揚對「幸福」的追求，而「幸福」是自願和反佔有的。婚外情都被賦予相當同情的目光，但不讓老婆外出的老公卻應受責難。《金蘭姊妹》中，壞人是對打住家工的勞工婦女諸多挑剔的醫生太太，及誘騙阿彩上床的雜貨店太子爺。中產及資本階層是壓迫者；愛情、婚姻不是兩人的事，而是由金蘭姊妹們互相監察、互相扶持來成就或破壞的。這種理想主義，並不旨在想象烏托邦，而是本着行「仁」「義」的原則，以身化人，透過勇於批判不公、自主互助來成就理想的人際及社區關係。

香港的冷戰經驗遠比已有論述傾向把五十年代文化簡約為左右爭逐對壘的形勢 來得複雜與曖昧，這些都仍然需要更多的研究與解讀。「右派」的主要資源來自「美元文化」：如美國亞洲基金會贊助、1991 年創辦的友聯研究所及出版社，美國自由亞洲協會贊助的亞洲出版社、亞洲通訊社、亞洲影業公司(1953-1958)，及國民黨開辦的如《國民日報》(1939-1941，1945-1949)等。當時在香港即使反共立場鮮明的「右派」電影，如改編趙滋蕃同名小說的《半下流社會》(小說跟電影均為亞洲出品)，也跟當時「左派」電影的道德觀不無相似，也同樣反資反殖：「《半》片對集體、團結意識的強調，對香港資本主義生活方式的抗拒，乍看之下，與「左傾」影片並無二致。所謂「反共」，只在言辭語教之中透露，我們看不到有任何宣揚個性價值或民主、自由觀念的地方」(羅卡 35)。卡叔這裡所指的

「民主」，是從個人主義出發，包括財產私有化的歐美民主觀念，並非前述廖承志提出的，將來會過渡至社會主義革命的「新民主主義」，而「自由」是（親美）「自由中國」[28]。

一方面左右陣營都自我期許／述說成「五四」繼承者來取得話語權；另方面「左派」提倡的價值觀及寫實手法，對「右派」的邵氏、電懋也影響不少[29]；他們不但成立粵語片組，向中聯學習，邵氏與電懋院線也買及發行長城 、鳳凰的電影到東南亞。長鳳新(長 1948，新 1952，鳳 1953)成立至 1966 年 6 月文革前共拍了 226 部電影，除少數外，「幾乎沒直接去表現階級剝削或階級鬥爭」，「代之以在道德層面上對資本主義社會、生活的批判，批判為富不仁、欺騙榨取的行為，批判愛慕虛榮、貪圖享受的生活方式」，「提倡(尤其是女性)自強自立、奮鬥求存的獨立人格」(周承人 2009：31)。張徹說：「實際上，它們並無什麼意識型態之『左』『右』可分，基本上都拍商業電影」(23)。左右派不但共用資源，演員、導演、編劇都時左時右，如在《危》、《羊城恨史》(1951, 盧敦) 中「覺悟」反資的知識份子，跟《半下流社會》(1957，屠光啟）中的反共文人都是由張瑛飾。

香港本土性

五十年代香港「左派」電影意識主要宣揚(向下流動的)基層應透過團結互助，同甘共苦來建立一個理想環境，而在這些五十年代文本中對這切身環境的刻劃及打拼，不是在大陸或台灣，而是在香港，這也跟《半下流社會》（等「右派」電影）甚為相似，雖然有的「右派」電影傾向把這「精神堡壘」侷限於調景嶺。(梁 55)。《危》中特別強調大班黃的英文及(前)買辦身份，及文人羅明的英文及國際想象，又把業主與政府塑造成基層的共同敵人; 五十年代粵語片片首工作人員字幕背景常出現香港街景及霓虹招牌等，也表現出製作團隊對自身生活環境的凝視、構築及尋找認同的需要—這些都是對香港本土特色的體會與反思，最明顯的莫如在《火樹銀花相映紅》（1953，吳回、珠璣、程剛）片首，一方面紀錄了大量英女皇伊利沙伯二世加冕的慶祝活動場面，但同時在這些歌舞昇平的場面前後都插入作為珠寶行小職員的主角張立民（又是張瑛飾）不滿現狀，盤算如何「撈偏門」（後來盜取珠寶），又對彌敦道上的花車匯演現出一派不耐煩的樣子，成為對香港官方標榜的都會繁華（「火樹銀花」）相當大的反諷[30]。我認

---

[28]台灣的自由工會「等於台灣新聞局的前哨站」（黃仁 75），香港影人申請赴台、影片運台，都要向該會申請。1957 年自由工會正名為「港九電影戲劇事業自由總會」，積極爭取「左派」影人入會。第一回合是爭奪蕭芳芳，她本來是長城旗下童星，以部頭合約式演了邵氏《梅姑》 (1956)，根據台灣規定，由於演員的背景，《梅姑》不能在台上映。1957 年，其母帶蕭芳芳到台灣，被高調報導為「投奔自由」，然後跟長城毀約，台灣的國風影業以高薪邀她拍《苦兒流浪記》(1960, 卜萬蒼)，當時為自由總會的一大成就。後來由左投右以換取台灣市場的「自由藝人」有：嚴俊、林黛、李麗華、樂蒂等。（李培德）

[29] 「右派」片場一般指永華、國泰／電懋、邵氏(http://iics.ust.edu.tw/twhk/outline2.htm) 。「"長城"和"鳳凰"的迅速興起, 對"永華"造成極大威脅。...1953年,"永華"老闆李祖永遭到公司內部左派影人的組織批鬥, 被港督政府插手干預, 之後採取行動將司馬文森、劉瓊等20餘位左派電影人驅逐出境」
http://big5.southcn.com/gate/big5/read.southcn.com/bbs/dnovelread.php?tid=84&page=9。國泰是電懋的前身，1956年接收了永華的片廠。

[30]**亦舒**(2000) 《如果牆會說話》小說中也寫過這段歷史來諷刺殖民地：「如果牆會說話，它會這樣講，車忻簡三戶人家，難得有緣共住一個屋檐下，應守望相助。才安頓下來，一日，車先生興奮地說："安真安真，帶你出去看熱鬧。"安真問："什麼事？""學校不是放假一天嗎，英女皇伊利沙伯二世加冕慶祝游行。"車太太問："英國女皇關我們什麼事？"車先生頓足，"你真胡塗，這城叫殖民地，是英屬領土你可知道。""什麼，亦是租界？"」

為仔細看這些文本足以推翻過去三十年一般會把香港文化本土意識的崛起追溯至六十年代末至七十年代的社運：兩次中文運動(1968, 1978)、保釣運動（1970－1971）、「反貪污捉葛柏運動」(1973)、抗議英女皇訪港(1975)、金禧事件(1978)等，又或七十年代一系列政策的「成功」實施，如 Hugh D. R. Baker 在〈生活在城市中：香港人的誕生〉就以 70-80 年的興建公屋、1971 年免費小學教育、1978 年免費中學教育等，來描述「香港人的誕生」：「勇於行動、極具競爭力、適應力強，反應敏銳，隨機應變。他們穿的是洋裝，講英文。不會講的也期待自己的孩子會講英文」(1983: 478)。這些今天變得非常普遍的說法，問題不單是沒足夠認真對待香港文化歷史的傳承，更重要的是，它們鞏固了對香港文化本土性的某種詮釋，有系統地忽視與埋沒香港文化中的一些元素，並將之排除在被（重新）界定的「香港本土」以外。

早於五十年代，香港電影就對那些「勇於行動、極具競爭力.....不會講的也期待自己的孩子會講英文」的「香港人」批判得相當仔細與給力。《父與子》（1954, 吳回）寫小職員父親（張活游飾）千方百計（勇於行動）要把從「鄉下」來到城市的兒子催迫教化成有競爭力的「香港人」：穿西裝吃西餅、「洗底」（蝦仔改名「貴生」）、念貴族學校、結交上流社會等等，最後受盡白眼與委屈，兩面不討好。片中那所不斷強迫學生必須穿校服（還指定獨市的特貴校服店：這些在今天看來都如此「合理」）的名校，被呈現成行政官僚，道德虛偽，與（大部份草根）家庭條件完全脫節（瞧不起蝦仔家的環境但又要求他們辦生日會）。蝦仔把自己替學校以幫助失學兒童為名賣花募得的錢，直接替他所認得的失學兒童朋友交學費，卻被指偷用「公款」。電影藉著對一個小人物在香港渴望向上流動遇到的困境（「大人想發達」）及要付出的龐大身心代價，來暴露殖民資本主義企圖打造的「香港性」中潛藏的，對馴化身體、階級認同與自我想像的規訓暴力，及對公與私的重新組織，還批判到精英教育與慈善工業對善／道德的合謀壟斷這「香港特色」，今天看來依然勇敢精準。1954 年中聯為成立一周年推出紀念特輯，就是把這部《父與子》及一部關於當年石硤尾火災的新聞紀錄片同場放映，可見這些影人對於他們拍攝的劇情片寫實性的自信及期待觀眾接收時對香港在地的互文思考。

那時關注香港的社會民生狀態與獲中共中央的肯定兩者之間並無衝突。1957 年，中聯出品的《家》獲中華人民共和國文化部頒發優秀影片榮譽獎。正是由於這些電影被北京定位為「屬於資產階級性質的」，「為祖國社會主義革命、無產階級革命電影的側翼」，給予它們相當大的肯定與自主空間，不需要跟著國內的階級鬥爭路線走，反而能以寫實作為分析階級矛盾的工具，對當時香港的社會現實作深刻細緻的呈現及反思。《父與子》中蝦仔開生日會一場，一眾富家少爺同學每名都挾著白衣黑褲媽姐、黑色咔咔車來訪，貧民窟街童鄰居一排站在木橋上與之對望，猶如兩個世界即使相遇也無法溝通，把階級矛盾異常尖銳地視像化。從今天看來，更諷刺的是，那所在片中被小白領看扁、指為沒出息的街坊義學，讓孩子不用穿制服、自由玩耍，還在花園學習耕種，這不是跟今日最潮的自然/另類學校頗為相似？

去道德

香港「六七事件」的成因至今有四種講法：貧富／官民差距、反殖反資(「反英抗暴」)、內地文革禍延香港(「左派暴動」)，另外就是現職《南華早報》、曾任《亞洲週刊》政治記者張家偉（2000, 2012）揭露的資料：1966 年 12 月澳門的「一二三事件」讓中共政府嘗到迫澳葡殖民政府認錯及賠償的甜頭，所以想在香港照辦煲碗，「大幹一場」。我有興趣的是，「六七事件」如何把香港「左派」和大陸左派的路線明顯區別開來，使香港的愛國道德情感失去了「國」作為一種想象中的投射對象，面臨危機。電影資料館跟「左派」／進步影人(從董事到編、導、演等)的訪談／口述歷史(沈鑒治、廖一原、朱克、胡小峰、舒適、黃憶、周聰、夏夢等)，加上影人的自傳(如黃曼莉)都口徑一致地指出 1967 年的「反英抗暴」及文革把香港「愛國電影」公司的命也革掉了(沈鑒治 278) ，「弄得天怒人怨」(黃憶 169)。

1967 年，由北京調來的新華社香港分社副總編輯黃光宇及鍾發之迫令左派電影公司人員要公開政治「表態」[31]：「現在這場是民族鬥爭，沒什麼一線二線了？都要出來表態！」（黃憶 169）「長鳳新」的被迫「出櫃」，導致戲院院線杯葛他們的電影，左派電影走向末路。港英政府抓了廖一原後本來還要抓吳楚帆，但顧慮到這會造成人心背向(「後果很大，令人對英國反感」郭 132)，所以拉了傅奇、石慧而已。給港英及右派趕絕，也因為轉民粹化的中共左派不再肯認他們：「我們是愛國的，國家對我們也幫助，一些影片可以拿回去發行。……誰知文革一來，就說我們是反革命修正主義文藝路線，在外面放毒，做了很多壞事。」(廖一原 154-155) 文革前「我們是很民主很自由的，什麼問題都可以寫」，但文革來了，「民間真正需要關注的問題卻不去關注，就靠唱愛國高調」，「那麼多帽子，我們都有點怕」，「我們把感情也打掉了」，「怕出毛病」(胡小峰 153)。「在文化大革命期間，寫什麼，改什麼，你都不敢。反正有薪水拿，為何要自找麻煩。……描寫階級鬥爭、英雄人物、工農兵，完全跟我們有益世道人心、導人向善的宗旨不同。寫不出來，便沒落了。文革十年，我們受到嚴重的破壞，無論業務、人的感情都是。」（廖一原 156）《屋》（1970，胡小峰)寫香港「工人階級」，「造房子的人沒房子住，這是很普遍的現象」:「當時大家認為是好戲，但給國內批判得不得了—香港工人飲酒，國內認為工人形象這樣子太壞」;「他們的文藝政策，認為只有工農兵的劇本才算好。香港只有喱喀兵，農又不多，就是有也不看電影。寫工人嘛，對立面是資本家，但寫資本家不行，因為是統戰對象，不能做反派。」（朱克 179-180)文革「把『長、鳳、新』十六年的工作全否定了。二百二十六部電影中，幾乎全部被認為是執行『文藝黑線』的產物……過去堅持的『導人向上向善』的方針，自然也被否定了。」(廖一原 154)文革加上六七暴動，香港的「進步」文化工作者，一方面頓失愛國的支柱（「感情也打掉」），另方面受港英政府的政治迫害、台灣的冷戰圍堵：「邵氏、電懋、光藝及榮華，台灣給他們起草，聯合發表聲明，不買、不發行、不放映我們三間公司的影片。」(廖一原 155)，變成被道德淘空(demoralized)，政治冷感(apoliticized)。

[31] 當然國內以表態及扣帽子式進行的「左」、「中」、「右」政治資源標籤及分級制，從文革尚沒正式展開就早早以「階級鬥爭」、「階級路線」、國內教育部強化按「政治審查標準」招生等陸續出台，文革可看成是政治等級制及社會組織軍隊化的激化與延伸（韓）。香港影人不少也有談及六十年代初開始就感到的壓力。

步入新自由主義

「有人說，就同一水平的地區來說，香港資本主義制度的純粹性是少有的」(曾 29)，但鼓吹消費主義、個人主義、零和遊戲，重視效率、工具化及技術化知識，秀異管治(meritocracy)、核心家庭等的價值觀[32]，卻是在六十年代後期才在流行文化文本中大量冒現，而基督教——作為一種導人向善、拯救靈魂、撫慰創傷的意象也同時開始出現。六七後「左派」電影退場的空隙讓邵氏等乘虛而入。緊接六七後幾年的電影，開宗明義向建制靠攏，如邵氏的《死角》（1969, 張徹）、《春火》(1970, 羅臻) 都強調以國家暴力圍剿反叛青年的正當性，形塑成維護法紀及治安的必須手段[33]。《春火》片末當警察的父親更親手射殺兒子以示大義滅親；片中多次出現十字架、教堂、「聖瑪莉女子宿舍」等宗教符號。《冬戀》(1968，楚原)整部電影以平安夜開始及結尾，敘述作家回憶自己如何拯救被吸毒的丈夫所操控的舞女咪咪(蕭芳芳飾)逃出火坑，結果咪咪病死的經過。片末醫院窗外傳來佈佳音，以十字架的影像作結。六七十年代拍粵語片與楚原分庭抗禮的導演龍剛的成名作《飛女正傳》(1969)片末有女童院院長(曾江飾)一段對「青少年問題」的總結：「渴求為人所重視，就是人性最深的本質，為人重視的那種欲望，都不知引誘了多少兒童淪為罪犯……」。片中女主角徐玉貞(蕭芳芳飾)成為「飛女」，竟是由於不能接受母親在父親死後有男朋友。龍剛的電影中充滿天主教意象及類似救世主的角色：《英雄本色》（1967）的麥主任、《窗》（1968）的李修女（整片寫兩個信徒的皈依）、《應召女郎》（1973）的殷神父、《珮詩》（1972）的張醫生等，在此不贅。隨着團結互助的基層瓦解，有良心／承擔的父母形象消失，流行文本把道德的想像與需求移置到對治理階層的信任(警察、社工、學校、監獄、宗教)及對在原生核心家庭以外的情色的規訓。只要對比《人海孤鴻》(1960, 李晨風) 與《飛女正傳》 (1969)就可清楚看到「偏差青少年」在流行文化中的再現被建制化與性化的同步。六十年代末七十年代初，由上而下開展的文化介入又得到右派文化工業積極響應的，企圖製造道德轉向的工程當然是一個多方爭持與協商的過程，例子如政府趁著當時文化刊物興盛之勢出資辦《青年世界》 (1969 年創刊)，以為可借此介入打造青少年文化，但負責編輯刊物的青年團隊卻因不滿社署審查文章，結果雙方決裂，一年後被迫停刊。這群青年人之後轉辦了「左傾」刊物 (劉 130)。

過去對「六七事件」後港英政策的轉變如興建公共房屋、醫療、教育及社會服務、「清潔香港運動」(1972)、「撲滅暴力罪行運動」(1973)及在 70 年代中後期開始建立互助委員會、街坊福利會等，一般被論述為(成功或失敗則在乎論者觀點)企圖回應社會問題或收編民心的策略。近年學者研究英國國家檔案及港英時期香港政府檔案中發現，七十年代港督麥利浩（任期為 11/1971-5/1982)想盡辦法抗拒接受來自倫敦(工黨政府 1974-1979)的社會福利政策建議(呂 2012；Yep and Lui 2010)。當時港督施政的最大宗旨是要加強英國面對九七租約期滿時的談判籌碼，「打造香港為一個達國際地位、具備高質素的教育、科技與文化，以及有高水平的工業、商業、財經設備的模範城市」，「盡量發展得繁榮、團結、滿足」，而且必須「步伐急趕」，以至跟中國的條件最不同，中國可以從中得益，就不想收回 (呂 2012：152)。七十年代中期開始，曾經普及但頓感失落的愛國民族主義，反殖反資情緒

[32] 也許值得一提的是，李嘉誠於六七期間大量買入低廉的物業，並於 1971 年成立長江實業，1972 年發行股票上市。

[33] 1969 年香港警隊獲英女皇賜予皇家封號，表楊其在暴動中的忠誠及勇敢表現。

被一步步轉化成對香港殖民資本主義的認同和「自豪」；重視人倫公共化的道德價值被移置到對財產私有化的打拼、法制的維護以及對階級向上流動的認同。香港七十年代中後期的急劇資本主義發展及新自由主義化，早在英國戴卓爾夫人上台前就因為要維持殖民特權的戰略理由而在香港全面開展，香港也成了英國新自由主義的實驗所。港人過去四十多年來被新自由主義化的程度，也遠遠超於英國：

> 「講到身份認同，香港人倒是從上世紀七十年代開始，作為崛起的亞洲四小龍之一，逐漸生長出一種對香港的自豪感、認同感。比較中國大陸，香港更現代化，也富裕得多；比較英國，香港的經濟也強得多，也是這時候，香港人嘲諷英國 『個個揸住個兜』的..... 全港市民就在公平的法律制度下各顯神通。這種法律保護下創造的繁榮，不僅中國幾十年所沒有，而且是曾經實行過度的福利主義的英國所稍為欠缺的。」（李 2013：31）

從今天看來，這工程的其中一項翻天覆地體現在港人身上的「成就」是形塑了瘋靡香港不下二十年，鼓吹大家為資本主義賣命的「獅子山下精神」[34]，即使「賣命」的部份在九七後過去十多年逐漸破產，但投射在「我們的」資本主義上的道德感情卻未被動搖，也成為香港一直難以人心回歸的一大障礙[35]。這「新」道德工程的定位也可說是製造了今天香港社會上不少似乎顯而易見的問題：「這種發展不鼓勵人問『我認為什麼重要』、『我做人的方向為何』，而是問『什麼地方有得走位』、『我要怎樣使自己 fit 入這些位』。所以當制度對他們不再有利、經濟不再增長、專業不再是護身符、世界不再是無限『開位』、大學畢業後沒有一份好工等着他們之時，他們會非常困惑不知所措了。」(劉 131)

香港殖民資本主義現代性是一藍子看似非關道德的道德打造工程，箇中牽涉重新界定國族認同、生命價值、善惡、公私、家庭、性等範疇。這些成果更讓今天的我們幾近無法回答一些(只是數十年前的)歷史問題。如果是在香港土生土長的一代因為未經戰亂所以「比較理想主義」、「對社會公義問題特別敏感」(張炳良)，那為什麼在五十年代的香港粵國語片洋溢理想主義：《危樓春曉》中白瑩唱「在黑暗中求光亮，人生要力求向上」)；反而到了八十年代以後港產片興起，主角卻變得自嘲及犬儒：經典莫如周星馳及劉德華在《整蠱專家》（1991，王晶)中改編《彩色青春》(1966)的插曲：「我要努力向上」成調侃版，然後滾下樓梯？如果香港人的「普遍道德觀」是支持透過個人競爭來贏取向上流動，「相信法治」、「要求階級利益獲得注重」，那為什麼《危》的大班黃引用法律來捍衛自身的階級利益卻成了在片中最受批判的道德位置？羅明為啥不抓緊唯一的出路，靠着他四叔的經濟資本「搏殺」來晉身中產？這些電影中角色從不在職業上積極進取，只要能存活，安份守己、樂於助人才是善。不鼓勵人向上流動，因為那等於同資本家同流合污。我們是如何消滅了在五十年代曾經深刻呈現，對向上認同、向上流動的批判性距離的？

34「許多香港人擁有獅子山下精神，香港人勤奮克苦，大眾自發地造就了香港經濟的發展，而免費教育將香港人的教育水平不斷提升，有利法治精神的發展，但卻不可以說全是殖民地政府的功勞。」吳偉光，〈反思香港的文化身份理論〉http://www.ln.edu.hk/mcsln/35th_issue/feature_03.shtml

35 「香港內部有著一股強烈反對中國社會主義政權的情緒, 這股情緒自然成為香港華人身份認同的一個核心部分。……香港與內地在發展程度與生活水平上的巨大差距, 香港華人因而產生了優越感。」廖國雄,〈應有促進國民身份認同的文化政策〉(嶺南大學文化研究碩士講座論文)
http://www.ln.edu.hk/cultural/materials/MCSsymposium2006/Panel04/Charlie.pdf

六十年代中醞釀文革至四人幫倒台後，香港「左派」被國內的「左」打為「右」，在香港也隨之被妖魔化、邊緣化成少數的「激進」主義，兩邊不是人。在七十年代以後成長的香港人已難以想像成長過程中每天(在電視上)消費著的殘餘文化(「粵語長片」／「粵語殘片」)其實是香港左派歷史中重要的組成部份。而五十年代這些曾經如此主流的流行文化，漸被邊緣化成一種道德濫調：「香港經濟起飛，不斷建高樓。香港繁榮；人的生活亦不同了……現在獨立自主，不看我們這些古老戲了。」 (郭靜寧引盧敦 133)

> 高思雅 (1983：147)：「以道德主義一詞來形容香港大部份電影，特別是六十年代中期以前的製作，相信不會錯。」

參考資料

王瑞祺 (2010)〈龍剛的宗教論述：奄奄一息，神迷與休克〉，《龍剛》，盛安琪、劉嶔編，香港電影資料館, 頁 126-141。

朱克 (訪)（2001）《理想年代：長城鳳凰的日子》，《理想年代：長城鳳凰的日子》，黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館, 頁 172-183。

呂大樂 (2012)《那似曾相識的七十年代》，香港：中華書局。

呂大樂 (1998a)〈香港新中產階級的特色與前路一與張炳良先生商榷〉，《階級分析與香港》，呂大樂、黃偉邦編，香港：青文，頁 87-109。修訂版。

呂大樂（1998b）〈中產階級在想些甚麼？〉，《階級分析與香港》，呂大樂、黃偉邦編，香港：青文，頁 199-206。修訂版。

林年同 (1991)《中國電影美學》，台北：允晨文化。

沈鑒治（2000）〈舊影話〉，《理想年代：長城鳳凰的日子》，黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館, 頁 250-289。

何思穎編（2011）《文藝任務　新聯求索》，香港電影資料館。

容世誠 (2009)〈圍堵頡頏；整合連橫—亞洲出版社／亞洲影業公司初探〉，《冷戰與香港電影》，李培德、黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁 125-144。

周承人 (2011a)〈光榮與粵語片同在——吳楚帆與「中聯」〉，《我為人人：中聯的時代印記》，黃愛玲編，頁 26-35。

周承人（2011b）〈只有粵語片才能在香港生根.....試說新聯成立背景〉，《文藝任務　新聯求索》，何思穎編，香港電影資料館，頁 53-68。

周承人（2009）〈冷戰背景下的香港左派電影〉，《冷戰與香港電影》，李培德、黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁 21-34。

李怡（2013）《香港思潮——本土意識的興起與爭議》，香港：廣宇出版社。

李明堃（1998）〈八十年代香港社會內部衝突的新形勢〉，《階級分析與香港》，呂大樂、黃偉邦編，香港：青文，頁 36-53。修訂版。

李培德（(2009)〈左右可以逢源--冷戰時期的香港電影界〉，《冷戰與香港電影》，李培德、黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁 83-97。*The Cold War and Hong Kong Cinema*. Wong Ain-ling and Lee Pui-tak eds.

高思雅（1983）〈風月場所〉，《戰後國、粵語片比較研究：朱石麟、秦劍等作品回顧-「第七屆香港國際電影節」專題特刊》，香港：市政局。

科大衛 (2009)〈我們在六十年代長大的人〉，《冷戰與香港電影》，李培德、黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館。

胡小峰 (訪) (2001) ，《理想年代：長城鳳凰的日子》，黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁 144-157。

徐昌明（2011），〈為仁與做人—談中聯電 影的人情世界〉，《我為人人：中聯的時代印記》，黃愛玲編，頁 76-85。

吳楚帆 (2011)〈吳楚帆的中聯抱負〉，《我為人人：中聯的時代印記》，黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁 170-175。

張炳良（1998）《新中產階級的冒起與政治影響》，《階級分析與香港》，呂大樂、黃偉邦編，香港：青文，頁 56-74。修訂版。

張家偉(2000)〈充滿困惑的左派電影界元老廖一原〉，《香港六七暴動內情》，香港：太平洋世紀出版社，頁209-225。
張家偉 (2012)《六七暴動：香港戰後歷史的分水嶺》，香港：香港大學出版社。
張德勝 (2000)〈香港社會秩序的基礎：從低度整合到高度自覺？〉，《香港二十一世紀藍圖》，劉兆佳編，香港：中文大學出版社。
張徹（1989）《回顧香港電影三十年》香港：三聯書店。
梁秉鈞（2012）〈電影空間的政治—兩齣五O年代香港**電影**中**的**理想**空間**〉，《香港文學與電影》，梁秉鈞、黃淑嫻、沈海燕、鄭政恆編，香港公開大學及香港大學出版社。
梁秉鈞、黃淑嫻編（2005）《香港文學電影片目》香港：香港嶺南大學。
郭靜寧（2000），〈盧敦: 我那時代的影戲〉，《香港影人口述歷史叢書(1)南來香港》， 香港電影資料館，頁121-133。
陳學然 (2014)《五四在香港——殖民情境、民族主義及本土意識》，香港：中華書局。
陳雲 (2011)〈中聯影業的寫實主義與官方編造的「香港精神」〉，《我為人人：中聯的時代印記》，藍天雲編，香港電影資料館。
陳智德 （2013）〈達德學院的詩人們〉，《地文誌：追憶香港地方與文學》，台北：聯經，頁 171-177。
陳智德(2012)〈新民主主義文藝與戰後香港的文化轉折—從小說《人海淚痕》到電影《危樓春曉》〉，《香港文學與電影》，梁秉鈞等編， 香港公開大學出版社、香港大學出版社，頁 104-121。
黃偉邦（1998），《階級與社會分析》，呂大樂、黃偉邦編，香港：青文，頁150-198。修訂版。
黃愛玲 (2006)，〈從中聯到光藝〉，《現代萬歲：光藝的都市風華》，黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁 90-100。
黃愛玲編 (2004)，《李晨風—評論、導演筆記》，香港電影資料館。
韓少功（2014），《革命後記》，香港：牛津。
曾澍基（1998），〈香港階級分析初探〉，《階級分析與香港》，呂大樂、黃偉邦編，香港：青文，頁 21-35。修訂版。
葉蔭聰 (2009)〈旁觀者的可能：香港電影中的冷戰經驗與「社會主義中國」〉，《文化研究月報》第九十期，3月25日。
黃曼梨口述、占夢筆記 (2011)，〈黃曼梨自傳（節錄）〉，《我為人人：中聯的時代印記》， 黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁176-193。
黃憶（訪）（2011），《文藝任務　新聯求索》，何思穎編，香港電影資料館。2010年訪問，頁167-171。
劉紹麟 （2005），《香港的殖民地幽靈》，香港：守沖社。
盧敦 (1992)，《瘋子生涯半世紀》，香江出版。
廖一原、馮凌雲等(1997)，〈香港愛國進步電影的發展及其影響〉，《當代電影》第 3 期。
廖一原（訪）（2011），《文藝任務　新聯求索》，何思穎編，香港電影資料館。1997年訪問，頁147-157。
廖承志（訪）（2011），〈關於香港的電影工作〉，《文藝任務　新聯求索》，何思穎編，香港電影資料館。1964年8月報告。
夏夢 (訪) (2001) ，《理想年代：長城鳳凰的日子》，黃愛玲編，香港電影資料館，頁 120-143。
羅卡（1990）〈傳統陰影下的左右分家：對「永華」、「亞洲」的一些觀察及其他〉，《香港電影的中國脈絡》，李焯桃編，香港：市政局。
顧巴魯（1989）《藝海滄桑五十年》，上海：學林。

Baker, Hugh, D. R. (1983) "Life in the Cities: The Emergence of Hong Kong Man," *The China Quarterly* 95.
Lau, Siu-kai（1982) *Society and Politics in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
Lau, Siu-kai and Kuan H. C. (1988) *The Ethos of Hong Kong Chinese*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
Yep, Ray and Tai-lok Lui (2010) "Revisiting the golden era of MacLehose and the dynamics of social reforms," *China Information* 24(3).

The (Re)Making of the Hong Kong Ethic

Yau Ching

Translated by Ernest Leung

Rarely have academics discussed Hongkongers' ethics and their historical construction. But moral sentiment has frequently been appropriated in political rhetoric and action. Issues such as condemnation of "the June 4th Incident/Tiananmen Massacre", "opposing the legislation of Article 23 of the Basic Law[36]" have been referred to as the "great rights and wrongs" which deserve support from anyone who still has any "conscience" – this is recently exemplified in the "don't be too much of a Dominic Lee" controversy[37]. Populist activist discourses in defending the interests of specific privileged classes, have also been cashing in on moralist rhetoric and sentiments. Examples include the longstanding rhetoric that "social security breeds lazy people"; the opposition to the legislation on discrimination against sexual orientation; the opposition towards a revision of the law on family violence aimed at protecting same-sex couples; the opposition towards the revision of the marriage bill[38] – and so forth. I want to take this opportunity to draft some preliminary re-tracing of moral values once popular now repressed in the history of Hong Kong cultural politics.

Hong Kong's "Left-wing" cinema

For more than a decade, the Hong Kong Film Archive has been engaging in collecting and publishing a significant amount of data on cinematic cultural history, beginning with *Hong Kong Here I Come: Monographs of Hong Kong Film Veterans* (1) in 2000. This has slightly helped the researcher's predicament in which information for Hong Kong cultural history has been either unavailable or hard to make sense of from prevailing conflicting accounts. This article is written largely based on the groundwork accomplished by the Archive.

> "I suspect that before 1967, the Left-wing had had a relatively intact organisation in Hong Kong, but the 1967 riots rendered the Left-wing organisations their worst victims. Firstly they lost popular support amongst Hongkongers. Secondly, because of the Cultural

[36] The National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill cum Article 23 of Hong Kong's Basic Law makes provisions for treason, secession, sedition, subversion and the stealing of state secrets. In 2002 the Central Government requested the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government to legislate on Article 23. On 1st July 2003, 500,000 people protested against the bill, scheduled to be submitted to the Legislative Council on 9th July. The bill was then abandoned, and Regina Ip, the Security Bureau chief, resigned.

[37] On 29th April 2014, Dominic Lee Tsz King, Chairman of the Youth Wing of the Liberal Party was accused of being "merciless" and a "spoiled spendthrift", during a debate at the Legislative Council on the Old Age Allowance Scheme.

[38] The Hong Kong Court of Final Appeal judged the Marriage Ordinance to be unconstitutional in 2013 and granted W, a transgender individual, the right to be married. The revision of the Marriage Bill was raised at the Legislative Council in 2014 allowing transgender individuals to marry under their new gender after the operation. Christian discourse against the revision of the bill is similar to what was employed against the legislation against sexual orientation discrimination and the revision of the law on family violence. It accuses the legislation and revision as an affront to mainstream "morality": "Monogamy is still the consensus of Hongkongers and the basis of social prosperity. A country is formed of countless families; should the family be under attack, there would arise serious social problems."

> Revolution in China, the Left-wing organisations were no longer sure of their political legitimacy, and therefore found it difficult to carry on operating. Thirdly, by 1967-68, the Hong Kong Government had realised that the Left-wing organisations in Hong Kong were not in fact supported by Beijing. The Government thus had free rein to deal with them." (Faure 16)

> "Cantonese film production was unprecedentedly fervent and productive in 1951. As far as I remember, some two to three hundred Cantonese films were shot that year, and I myself participated in 21." (Wong Man-lei, 181)

During the Japanese Occupation, the Chinese Communist Party had joined forces with the British Army in its resistance against Japan in Hong Kong. After the war, Raymond Wong Chok-mui (1916-1955), the Hong Kong Officer of the East River Guerilla Brigade under the command of the Guangdong (Kwangtung) People's Army, was awarded an Order of Merit by the Queen. In 1945, the Kwangtung Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, or CCP, settled on a nine-clause agreement with the British Hong Kong Government, which allowed the CCP to establish in Hong Kong semi-open working organisations, including newspapers and radio. The people of Hong Kong and Kowloon would have the right to arm themselves and to maintain social order. (Zhou Chengren 2011b：54-55) Although by 1947 the Cold War had come to the surface between the US and the USSR, Britain was the first country to recognize the Communist regime on 6th January 1950.

The "Leftists/Left-wingers" (I shall discuss below the meanings of the "Left" here) occupied a dominant position in the 1950s Hong Kong cultural scene. "Left-wing films," comprised of Putonghua/Mandarin and Cantonese-speaking productions, were the mainstream in Huanan/South Chinese cinema throughout the 1950s. The "G-P-S" triumvirate, composed of three film companies: Great Wall, Feng Huang and Sun Luen, all making Putonghua/Mandarin films, formed Hong Kong's "base camp of leftist filmmaking in the 1950s and 1960s, play[ing] a pivotal role in the history of Hong Kong cinema. The four main Cantonese film production companies during the 1950s were Union Film, Sun Luen, Kong Ngee and Overseas Chinese. Of these, Sun Luen was the first to be founded and was "supported by the state" (Kwok 139). Founded in 1952, Sun Luen specialized in Cantonese productions and, over the course of 30 years, released some 100 titles in a quest to fulfil its artistic and political missions." (Sam Ho, inside cover of *The Mission: Sun Luen Films*). "Originally the state would supply funding if necessary but with Sun Luen's situation [the popularity of its films] at the time, it didn't seem necessary." (Wong Yik, 168) Sun Luen's slogan was to "face the world by relying on the motherland". At the "Hong Kong Film Industry Working Conference" held in Beijing in 1964, Liao Chengzhi[39] officially classified the Hong Kong film industry as "different from that of the mainland, and should be seen as distinct" – "I think that Hong Kong cinema should aim at overseas Chinese, and the peoples of Asia and Africa"; "its artistic ideology should be that of the revolutionary bourgeois cinema", or that of "New Democratic Revolution" – a concept based on Mao Zedong's theory of the "Bloc of Four Classes": workers, peasants, the petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. Liao wanted the bourgeoisie-informed Hong Kong film industry to become "naturally the side

[39] Liao Chengzhi (1908-1983), head of the Overseas Chinese Commission and Minister of the Office of Overseas Chinese Affairs. He was "the Communist Party's specialist on Taiwan and the chief negotiator in talks with Britain on the future of Hong Kong, died of a heart attack today, a week before he was expected to be elected Vice President of China. He was 75 years old."
http://www.nytimes.com/1983/06/11/obituaries/liao-chengzhi-75-a-chinese-leader.html

flank of the socialist-revolutionary and proletarian-revolutionary film industry of the motherland." (Liao Chengzhi 190)

The personnel of the four Cantonese film companies often overlapped. Both Union and Overseas Chinese were borne out of Sun Luen. Chun Kim, a Union Film shareholder, headed Kong Ngee, financed by the Singaporean film magnate brothers Ho Khee-siang and Ho Khee-yong. Kong Ngee, in many ways, inherited the cultural concerns and traditions of Union Film, urbanised and "modernised" it. (Wong Ain-ling, 2006) The four great directors of Union Film, namely Lee Sun-fung, Ng Wui, Chun Kim and Lee Tit, often assisted in the Sun Luen productions, including the company's first four box-office hits from 1952-54. "Union directors volunteered to take a 10% pay cut when directing for Sun Luen." (Wong Yik, 168) Chun Kim also directed *Mutual Understanding* (1954) and *The Newlyweds* (1956) for Sun Luen. Union Film, which strove to rid itself of an "exploiting class", made itself a joint venture between 21 directors and actors. It was not bound by distributors, and decided to make a collective wage-cut, since an overly high salary for the actors (stars) would affect the quality of productions. The salaries were themselves decided collectively. Producers and directors would decide the actors' pay, whilst their own were decided in turn by the actors. The Mandarin and Cantonese leftist camps also share similar ideologies. Union Film emulated the collective creative approach pioneered by the "G-P-S triumvirate" by establishing Production and Direction Committee; film scripts had to be approved by the committee before entering production. "Capital was in short supply for the 'G-P-S triumvirate' and pay was low, but nobody cared, because they understood that they needed to shoot something beneficial to the Chinese social masses and their hearts/conscience." (Liu Yat-yuen, 154)

What did it mean to have a "Left-wing" background for Hong Kong filmmakers? The British Hong Kong Government was the first one who wanted to know precisely that. "There were British Hong Kong undercover agents in Sun Luen and Great Wall." (Wong Yik, 169) Liu Yat-yuen, successively the General Director of the "G-P-S" companies since 1956, said, "We did not belong to any party. We were simply patriots and resistants against Japan" (Liu Yat-yuen, 150); "we did not see ourselves as leftists" – "as long as you were not anti-Communist or anti-Chinese, you were [our] friend, and so, we had a wide appeal." (Zhou Chengen 2009 : 28) Liu and others collectively referred to "Left-wing" films as the "Patriotic Progressive Cinema". Born in Hong Kong, Liu worked as a war journalist in the front against Japan in northern Guangdong province in late 1930s. By the 1940s, the Nationalist-Communist conflict grew as Communists were being mopped up across the country. While working for *Sao T'ang Pao* (aka *Eradication*, a newspaper founded by the KMT/Nationalist military authorities) in Kunming in 1946, he witnessed the assassination by KMT secret agents of his friends, the opposition politician Li K'ung-pu (or Li Gongpu) and poet Wen I-t'uo (or Wen Yiduo). Liu then decided to return to Hong Kong, and in 1951 was appointed editorial director of the Left-wing newspaper *Wen Wei Pao* in Hong Kong. In May 1967 he was elected as standing member of the "Hong Kong and Kowloon Committee for Anti-Hong Kong British Persecution Struggle", otherwise known as the "Anti-British Struggle Committee". He was arrested by the Special (i.e. Political) Branch of the British Hong Kong Police Force in November that year, and was put into the concentration camp. He was not released until December the following year. When wanted by the authorities, he was hiding at the home of the actor Ng Cho-fan, President of Union Film. Just this fact alone says a lot of the relationship between these companies which together made blockbusters of the times.

Ng Cho-fan (1910-1993) was deeply influenced by the Leftist figures of Shanghai cinema in the 1930s, such as Cai Chusheng (1906-1968) and Situ Huimin (1910-1987) in believing that "one has to shoot for his era and his society"; "the film industry is not only a new industry, but also an educational tool, an artistic form which has great impact on society and on life. Those who are in the film industry should therefore take on a serious sense of responsibility." (Ng, 172) In his autobiography, he wrote that in 1937 "The rage against imperialism refused to be damned. The whole country was mobilised to fight the war against Japan", and upon screening an anti-Japanese film *At This Critical Juncture* (1938) in which he acted, he witnessed how "the viewers came from all over, converging at the cinema. They applauded from where they were sitting. The mission to inspire the audience was accomplished. We felt as if we were given the highest glory. We were so touched that we cried." (Zhou 10) Lo Dun, one of the two screenwriters of *In the Face of Demolition* (1953, directed by Lee Tit, Union Film) was also a writer, director and producer for Sun Luen. He remembers that in his youth in the 1920s, during "the blazing red era", he was greatly influenced by the events in Canton (Guangzhou), then capital of revolutionary Nationalist China. During the Canton-Hong Kong strikes of 1925-26, the British army fired whenever they saw cadets of the Whampoa Military Academy; "the cadets spread out in a line protecting the crowds and told us to run." "Many in the secondary schools were inclined towards revolution and Communism." Secondary school dormitories were subject to searches and students were arrested whenever Communist literature was found. Fortunately when it was Lo Dun's turn to be searched, night had fallen and the troops gave up their search, "and my life was thus spared." "Well, what political affiliation could I have possibly had? It was merely that I was influenced by revolutionary ideas when I was in Canton and felt that culture should serve politics and the literati should never be separated from politics." (Zhou Chengren 2009: 29)

In 1948-1952, a group of literary figures who came south promoted in Hong Kong a "New Democratic Enlightenment Movement" by appropriating and reinterpreting the May-Fourth Movement of 1919. Pro-Chinese newspapers in Hong Kong responded to Beijing's appeal to criticize several key May-Fourth figures who had deviated from Communist orthodoxy, such as Hu Shih (1891-1962), Fu Sinian (or Fu Ssu-nian, 1896-1950) and Chen Duxiu (or Chen T'u-hsiu, 1879-1942). The Enlightenment Movement "promoted significant progress" "in Hong Kong cinema, and pitted itself against the foreign, colonialist mentality." (Lo, 116) The Movement imposed four interdictions – on dinner parties, on gifts, on alcoholism and on gambling. There was a "Convention of the Movement of Life" which banned business socialising, indecent entertainment, the making of nonsensical or poisonous films, and any work that is against the people. It advocated the upholding of promises, a simple frugal life, a system of mutual criticism, and the spirit of mutual help. (Lin 165-166) These seemed quite similar to the cultural consensus described by the staff of the "G-P-S triumvirate" and that of United Film. Hsia Moon (alternatively known as Xia Meng or Miranda Yang, 1932-) wrote that "I seem to remember that the first contract I signed already stated that I did not need to attend any banquets." (127) Towards 1949, figures in the film industry organised two major study groups/book clubs, of Mandarin and Cantonese Cinemas, to study the works of Marx, Lenin and Mao. Members of the Cantonese group included Ng Cho-fan, Lo Dun, Lee Ching, Ying Siu-yi, Cheung Wood-yau, Chun Kim, Ko Lo-chuen, mostly the Union Film team. (Gu, 104)

What is shame?

The first Union Film, *Family* (1953), an adaptation of Ba Jin's novel, "was well received in all quarters and was a box-office hit." Those that followed, *A Son is Born* (Chun Kim, 1953) and *A*

Home of a Million Gold (Chu Kei, 1953) were also successes. The fourth, *In the Face of Demolition,* was both a critical and commercial milestone for the company. The "Spirit of Union Film" took over from the May-Fourth and New Democratic ideal of the fight against feudalism and decadence, by advocating free love and independence (e.g. *Family* (1953), *Spring* (1953), *Autumn* (1954), *Autumn Comes to Crape Myrle Garden* (1958) and *Human Relationships* (1959)); criticized the unequal distribution of wealth and the oppression against workers (e.g. *In the Face of Demotion, Sworn Sisters* (1954), *Parents' Hearts*, *The More the Merrier* (1955) and *An Orphan's Tragedy* (1955)); represented anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and anti-corruption struggles (e.g. *Blood Money* (1957), *The Water Margin: Booty Captured* (1957)); eulogised the united patriotic effort against Japan, as in *Road* (1959) and《海》*Sea* (1963); and against religious "superstitions" (as in *Sworn Sisters, A Beautiful Corpse Comes to Life* (1956) and *The House of Murders* (1963)).

As with other Union works, *In the Face of Demolition* emphasized collective creativity and resisted individualism by approving communal self-help and mutual-aid relationships. The line "All for One and One for All"[40], which helped to immortalize the film, was an attack on the feudalist family hierarchy: for example, when "Taipan Wong" (played by Lo Dun) raped his wife's sister, the recent-immigrant Ah Fong, and forced her to be his concubine; his wife then imposed her authority upon Ah Fong by stabbing her on her head with a hairpin. The feudal patriarch and the colonial capitalist are seen as collaborators, practically embodied in one character. In the first scene Taipan Wang, taking advantage of the fact that he has lent money on usury to Third Aunt and that he is a comprador working for a foreign firm, takes up the privileged language of colonial law – "I have the right to dispose of something that I have been using for a long time"[41] – to justify his occupation of the apartment. He tells Third Aunt that it would be an infringement of his rights if she rents it to Second Uncle, and says in English, "You know, it's criminal." Not only does the film criticize the measurement and instrumentalization of human relations by capitalist logic, it exposes without mercy the dominant classes which participate in the collaboration between the colonial government and business.

At the end of the film, Fourth Uncle makes Lo Ming collect all due rent in three days because the apartment block, which is structurally unsound, will be demolished by the government in ten days' time, a fact which Fourth Uncle insists that Lo Ming do not tell the occupants. "Rights", and the "Criminal Code" - institutions and beliefs coupled with western modernity, and the collaboration between developers and the government by engineering "real estate" and "demolition of unsound structures" are depicted in the film as tricks that have, as Second Uncle says, rendered life "increasingly difficult" for the populace.

> In the 1950s and 60s, refugees flooded into Hong Kong. They had no relatives here, and could only rely on the help of others from their native counties, their co-workers and neighbours. […] Peasants have always relied on their land and their kin. Their land was inherited and was thus reliable; their kith and kin were bound by the responsibilities for mutual assistance. Having abandoned their native

[40] Adapted from Alexandre Dumas' « Un pour tous! Tous pour un ! » from *The Three Musketeers* which Lin Shu translated as "All for one and one for all". Lin Shu (1852-1924) was the first to translate western works of literature in China and was regarded as having a positive effect on the May-Fourth Neocultural Movement. This motto has been appropriated by social and political movements in China during the twentieth century, to the extent where the contemporary novelist Han Shaogong describes the Cultural Revolution's effect on "making every man an apostle and a policeman" as "All sees me and I see all". (2014: 100)

[41] Referring to the provisions on adverse possession in Hong Kong law, Chapter 347 of the *Limitation Ordinance* : "An action upon a specialty shall not be brought after the expiration of 12 years from the date on which the cause of action accrued."

> countryside fleeing from war and the Communist rule, they have entered a Hong Kong society that was no longer traditional but only half way modern. Thus they had to support each other with traditional morality and human compassion, and shifted the affection that they had for their rural clan upon new acquaintances and strangers […] A simple analysis of such phenomena does not require any high philosophy; one only needs to rely on the sociological concept of the composite cost of capital: economic capital, social capital and cultural capital. (Chan Wan 156)

Chan Wan (also known as Chin Wan) attempts to demonstrate that the lack of "economic capital" (inherited farm lands and ancestral property) forced the poor to transfer their familial affection to their neighbours, relying on the "social capital" of the spirit of mutual aid learnt from "old society". He uses *In the Face of Demolition* as an example, where although the occupants of the cubicle apartments in a structurally unsafe building had no blood relations, they referred to each other with such names as "Second Uncle", "Big Sister" and "Third Aunt", "even though the neighbours could afford nothing but emotional and psychological support." (159) Here, Chan, who uses contemporary sociological lingo in analysing a sixty-year old text, is proposing an anachronistic interpretation to support his implied criticism of the post-1997 SAR Government, which forces the "Hong Kong Spirit" down people's throats by subjecting them to the exploitation of large capitalist entrepreneurs. Most Hongkongers, lacking in Chan's "economic capital", were forced onto the same boat.

Chan's interpretation of *In the Face of Demolition* sees the emotional support between neighbours a strained effort to compensate for the lack of economic support. He has deliberately ignored the central theme of the film – communal emotional and psychological support were in fact maintained and expressed in *economic* terms. At the beginning of the story, the family of Second Uncle are forced to relocate for having fallen into arrears with their rent. They only manage to stay when their rent is paid by Brother Wai, a taxi driver (played by Ng Cho-fan) and Big Sister, a dancing girl (played by Tsi Lo Lin). In the film, everything from paying for the rent, to having dinner and birthday parties, buying coffins, staying in hospital and even giving birth are paid for collectively by the neighbours. At the end of the film, the wife of Brother Wai suffers from excessive haemorrhage in labour. Lo Ming (played by Cheung Ying, also a shareholder of United Film) volunteers to donate blood to her despite, as the doctor says, "the great risks that it would pose to his health". In an era when blood could be sold (and "Second Uncle" died of ill-health after selling his blood twice), this is the last bit of economic capital they were left with. More importantly, the doctor is not at all surprised when he learns that Lo donates blood in order to help a (non-family-related) friend, and exclaims that "this is the most precious thing about friends", that "true compassion is only seen in times of trouble." In contrast, blood relations are portrayed negatively in the film, for example in the mistreatment by Mrs. Wong of her cousin Ah Fong (played by Mui Yee) who has come from the countryside; or in Lo Ming's Fourth Uncle, the owner of a real estate company who forces him to collect rent during a typhoon. In the first half of the film, Lo Ming, a poor teacher, is not particularly keen in ingratiating himself with his Fourth Uncle and has little respect for the Uncle's economic capital. When Lo Ming is exposed by another rent collector, Au Yeung, for being the landlord's nephew, he defends himself grudgingly by saying that "I rarely see him."

How about "cultural capital"? Lo Ming had the cultural credentials to be a teacher, but this society did not value education. "One does not teach unless he is poor". (Lo Ming) Bak Ying, a high school graduate, has no choice but to be a dancing girl under the severe unemployment that marked Hong Kong's transition from an entrepot to a industrial centre at the height of the mainland refugee crisis. The nightclub manager does not allow her to choose her clients, and she

was told off when she requests some advanced salary on her birthday. Bak Ying and Lo Ming both possesses a certain degree of cultural capital, but in such a society, which pursues economic efficiency and "talks nothing but money", they can only "get accustomed to enduring the hardships of life", as Bak Ying describes it. Confucian values help during dating talks but are represented in the overall narrative as an obstruction to understanding class oppression. Lo Ming wants to celebrate his and Bak Ying's birthdays together but having received the neighbours' gifts he finds himself suddenly unemployed, and no longer has the money to throw a banquet. He feels ashamed, because he is losing "a literati's face". Brother Wai gallantly helps with buying food, but can only change the menu – which normally would include a "suckling pig, abalone and shark's fin", according to the narrative – to fishballs and noodles. Lo Ming finds this humiliating and blames on Brother Wai. A (could-be) newspaper editor introduced to Bak Ying by her nightclub colleague wants to please her by letting Lo Ming be a columnist; Lo Ming works on his first article all night. The hope falls through, and Lo Ming blames his loss of "a man's face" on Bak Ying. The masculinity of the literati is depicted as a feudalist bastion of sexual/class prejudice. These two narrative shifts pave the way to Lo Ming's characterization in the latter part of the film as the sell-out, the one who betrays the entire household of co-inhabiting grassroots folks including his could-be lover Bak Ying. Lo Ming, having witnessed how Second Uncle has been pressured to death by his rent-collecting calls, in the end of the film he regrets over selling himself to the capitalist, and apologizes to the workers, "I hope you will all forgive me." *In the face of Demolition* speaks of the "alienation" of and calls for a turning around/repentance of an intellectual. (Chan 2012: 108) It shows how, in a colonial society placing the dollar above the letter, the intellectual is caught between two systems of ethics and between capitalist and cultural shame(s), serving to depict a self-reflexive disillusionment in the intellectual-led Confucius and May-Fourth traditions[42] in colonial Hong Kong.

On the other hand, the working girl– as part of the wide and diverse spectrum of sex work/entertainment industries, the professionalized and bread-earning sites of most Hong Kong women at the time– although having to "earn her pennies with grievances", is depicted here as "modern, pretty" and multi-talented. Lo Ming calls Bak Ying someone who "is able to swim nicely in water and jump/dance outside it." The working girl is outspoken, "uplifting" towards the common good, puts herself on the same line as the grassroots workers; she is, in the film, an embodiment of a most desirable form of "modernity", in direct opposition to the capitalist and the legal systems, which rob the poor and feed the rich. Tsi Lo-lin, the female lead in *The Wall* (1956, Wong Hang), *Sworn Sisters* (1954, Ng Wui) and *In the Face of Demolition,* plays eloquent and bold characters with a sense of justice and agency, effectively embodies the prototype of a modern, South Chinese woman – whilst the other Union star Bak Yin's personas primarily lie in her struggles in pre-modern relations. The work situation of Tsi Lo-lin's characters – be they teacher, dancing girl, nightclub singer or domestic helper – is portrayed as a practical means of survival, a matter of chance and personal choice, and not as a moral issue. Resistance against individualistic tendencies, critiques of the capitalists and the collaboration between comprador middlemen and the legal system are highlighted while there is no shame assigned to poverty, nor to working class women such as sex workers – unless they succumbed to greed. Rather, shame was to be found in the accumulation of capital at the expense of others. This was the

[42] Yet, what must be emphasized is that the hope in a literati-dominant nationalism has always been second skin in Union Film productions. For example in *Sworn Sisters,* the person who rescued everyone from their predicament was Ah Ying (played by Tsi Lo-lin), the only literate person amongst them. At the end of the film a God-like voiceover also reminds the audience to judge the actions of the domestic workers.

predominant morality seen in the mainstream cultural texts of the 1950s, in sharp contrast with the overruling Hong Kong discourse after the neoliberalization of the 1970s.

Idealism

About a million more people were living in Hong Kong in April 1950 than in May 1949. Refugees comprised of 40% of the total population. In the 1950s, land supply was (still is) monopolized by the British Hong Kong Government, which maximised gain with the minimum expenditure, lured support from British trading interests and the comprador conglomerates via super low taxes, and stayed away from making policies to protect the working class, from providing public housing and adequate public medical facilities[43]. A sudden influx of southward moving refugees must have caused a dog-eat-dog crisis in a place where the interclass distribution of resources was extremely unequal to begin with. Left-wing cinema was unanimous in "advocating healthy morality and guiding people towards the common good" (Guo, 132) as a direct response to social problems that faced Hong Kong at the time. "All for one and one for all," a motto which Brother Wai hangs on the wall, which Wai repeatedly emphasizes and regards as his pride, aimed to speak to a social reality in which selfishness was probably commonplace, and these widely consumed films worked to satisfy a moral imaginary and spectatorial need. This generation of literati saw their participation in filmmaking as a mission to "convey messages through literature," to move people with compassion, having inherited the ideals of the May Fourth Movement with its call to save the nation in popularizing culture, and having collectively experienced an eight-year anti-Japanese war. Patriotism, experienced and practised as a call for self-sacrifice for the collective good under hard times, is for this generation a moral imperative.

As a modern and booming enterprise under Hong Kong capitalism, the film industry was to respond to the needs of the masses. Film with its possibilities in realism was the perfect match to the literati's sense of mission in a society of refugees. Lee Sun-fung, head of the Production and Direction Committee at Union Film, wrote in his directorial note "What is Human Compassion" that "Man is essentially selfish; he fends for himself, and then extends it to his kith and kin. This is human nature. But after he has profited himself at the expense of others, he would suffer from a crisis of conscience, and would rather sacrifice himself for the benefit of others. This would be human compassion. On the other hand, those who have been exploited, upon realising that their exploiters have rediscovered their conscience, would not mind getting the short end of the stick. This would be human compassion too." "Delight, anger, sorrow, happiness, love, hate and desire are emotions. Humans have it; so do beasts. Yet filial piety, fraternal respect, loyalty and faith; courtesy, gallantry, frugality and shame – these are the eight morals unique to man. Sacrificing oneself in fulfilling these eight morals would also be human compassion." (Wong Ai-ling 2004: 123-124) According to the Union artists, the lived and felt contradictions between morality and human desires were where the drama came from. At the same time, for the sake of realist drama and in depicting the complexity of "human compassion", not all works produced by Union Film embraced the eight morals; and not every character who violated the eight morals were necessary malevolent. *Anna* (1955, Lee Sun-fung), adapted from Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina,* tackling the subject of adultery in the upper class, with the star Pak Yin as Anna and Cheung Wood-yau as her lover Kei-shu, turned out to be a box-office catastrophe. In *Essays,* Li Sun-fung wrote that "The love that Kei-shu had for Anna ran counter to

[43] Films from the 1950s frequently featured characters that died because they could not afford medical care. Even when the rare public medical service did appear, as in *Sworn Sisters* (1954), it was reified as a not-easily-accessible resource for the main characters.

traditional morality and failed to be accepted by the audience, who did not sympathise with his sufferings; *there is little else otherwise*" (emphasis mine). What Li implied was that although he did not agree with this pre-modern/ "traditional" morality, he could understand the feelings of his audience, which he had to reconcile with.

Union Film shareholders cum directors granted themselves greater freedom of expression producing films for other companies, with works portraying various forms of romantic relationships and desires. In *Remembrance of Things Past* (1953, Chu Kei), a married man (also played by Cheung Wood-yau) fell in love with a married woman (also Pak Yin), then later coupled with her sister (played by Mui Yee) but eventually rescued by Pak Yin. These Cantonese films, though being themed on familial ethics and social morality, engaged themselves most poignantly with the sufferings of the masses, compassion/kindness (*ren*), the loyalty of friendship/brotherhood/sisterhood (*yi*), disputes between mothers and daughters-in-law, intergenerational love and conflicts, gallantry, and filial piety. The nuclear family and its sexual norms were never the central issue of these films. For example, *The Wall*, a story about a married couple where divorce is on the agenda, for the husband objects to his wife working, no matter as a nightclub singer or as a teacher, is meant to expose (pre-modern) patriarchal conservativeness and gender inequality. The character played by Tsi Lo-lin turns from a nightclub singer to a teacher in an orphanage overnight, and a responsible mother the next. The film never places her in a vilified nor pitiful position. Union Film's overall body of work aimed to shed positive lights on a process of working towards more compassionate human relations by "finding delight in benevolence." (Tsui Cheong-ming 85) It stood up against feudalist teachings and habits and championed the pursuit of happiness as benevolence (*xin-fu*)– a happiness that had to be voluntary and non-possessive. Extramarital affairs are looked upon with much sympathy, whilst a husband who refuses to allow her wife to work outside the household is much condemned. In *Sworn Sisters,* the wife of a doctor who picks on the domestic helpers, and the spoiled son of a storeowner who tricks the domestic worker Ah Choi into sleeping with him via lying are the villains. The "civilized" middle class and the capitalists are depicted as oppressors: love and marriage are not questions of two people but are issues that need to be fostered or monitored through the mutual aid of sisterhood. This form of idealism, which does not see as its aim the creation of a utopia somewhere else but the personification of the ethical principles of "compassion" and "loyalty", seeks to fashion the ideal communal relations through the criticism of unjust social and familial relations, and advocacy of intersubjective transformation through self-sacrifice and empathy, independent will and solidarity among the Hong Kong working population.

Hong Kong's "Cold War experience" has often been described as a battlefield where opposing (right vs. left) ideological forces headed by two contending regimes across the Straits clashed and collided. These would require much more research and interpretation of greater depth. The right-wing resources primarily came from "US Dollar Culture", such as the Union Research Institute and Publisher funded by Asia Foundation (US); the Asia Publishing House, Asia Correspondence Agency and Asia Film (1953-1958) funded by the American Free Asia Society, and the "Kuo Min Jih Pao" ("National Daily", 1939-41, 1945-49) founded by the KMT, and so forth. It is, however, important to note that even for "Rightist" films with a clear anti-Communist stance in Hong Kong at the time, for example *Halfway Down* (1957, Tu Guangqi), which was adapted from the novel by Ch'ao Ts'u-fan (both the film and the novel were productions of the "Asia" Group) were not morally dissimilar from what was being advocated by "Leftist" cinema at the time – 'The emphasis in *Halfway Down* on collective solidarity and its rejection of capitalist life

in Hong Kong was, upon first glance, no different from "Left-leaning" films. The so-called "Anti-Communist" message was only rhetorical, and we do not see anything in the film that advocates individuality, democracy or notions of freedom.' (Law Kar 35) What Law Kar here refers to by "democracy" is the Euro-American concept which goes in hand in hand with desires for individualistic pursuits and the notion of private property ownership. It is not the "New Democracy" which would transition into the socialist revolution that Liao Chengzhi had spoken of. And "freedom" means that of the pro-American "Free China"[44].

On the one hand both the Left and the Right reified themselves as successors to the May-Fourth orthodox in their bid for discursive power; on the other hand the popular ethics and social realism proposed by the "Left-wing" cultural productions were of great influence upon the "Right-wing" industrial camp, including the Shaw Brothers Studios, Cathay/ MP&GI[45], both of which established Cantonese film units modelling on Union. Both Shaw and Cathay/MP&GI had established inter-dependent relations with the "Leftists" by buying and showing Great Wall and Feng Huang films, especially to their South East Asian markets. Until the outbreak of the Cultural Revolution in June 1966, the "G-P-S triumvirate" (with Great Wall founded in 1948, Sun Luen in 1952, and Feng Huang in 1953) shot 226 films, which, with few exceptions, "did not engage overtly in advocating the party line of class struggles" but "replacing it with the criticism on a moral/ethical level of capitalist society and life, of extortion and deceit, of greed and of luxury", "advocating instead an independent character based on autonomy, self-strengthening and the endeavour to fight it out." (Zhou Chengren 2009 : 31) Director Chang Cheh (coined "Rightist") said "that in all practicality there was little to distinguish ideologically between "Left" and "Right", for we/they all shot commercial films." (23) Not only did the Left and the Right pool their resources, but the actors, directors and producers often went from camp to camp, as exemplified by the fact that Cheung Ying plays the intellectuals who are reawakened by conscience to become anti-capitalist in *Old Memories of Canton* (1951, Lo Dun) and *In the Face of Demolition* but let's not forget that he is also the anti-Communist intellectual in *Halfway Down.*

[44] "HK and Kowloon Union of Free Workers in the Film Industry" (aka "Free Union") was "equivalent to a outpost of the Taiwanese News Bureau". (Huang Ren, 75) Any applications from Hong Kong filmmakers to go to Taiwan, or to send their films to Taiwan, must go through this organization. In 1957 the Free Union officially renamed itself as "Hong Kong and Kowloon Cinema & Theatrical Enterprise Free General Association" and actively sought the membership of Left-wing filmmakers. The first round in this battle was getting the child-star Josephine Siao (at the time signed under Great Wall). She signed a standalone contract for Shaw Brothers to star in *The Orphan Girl* (1956). However Taiwanese policy forbade the film from being shown in Taiwan due to the actress' background. In 1957 Josephine Siao's mother took her to Taiwan on a visit, where she received great publicity for her "defection to freedom", followed by her abrogation of the contract with Great Wall. Kuo-Feng Film Company in Taiwan then paid her highly for acting in *Nobody's Child* (1960). This was seen at the time as one of the Free Union's great achievements. Other "free artists" who shifted from Left to Right in exchange for the Taiwan market included Yan Ch'un (1916-1980), Linda Lin Dai (1934-1964), Li Lihua (1924-) and Betty Loh Ti (1937-1968). (Lee Pui Tak)

[45] The "Right-wing" film companies are generally referred to as Yonghua, Cathay / MP&GI and Shaw Brothers. (http://iics.ust.edu.tw/twhk/outline2.htm) " The rapid rise of' Great Wall' and 'Feng Huang' was a great threat to Yonghua […] In 1953, Yonghua's boss, Li Zuyong, was subject to a struggle session by Left-wing filmmakers inside the company. It was intervened by the British authorities, which took action to exile some twenty Left-wing filmmakers including Sima Man-sum and Liu Qiong.
http://big5.southcn.com/gate/big5/read.southcn.com/bbs/dnovelread.php?tid=84&page=9
Cathay was the predecessor to MP&GI, which took over the Yonghua studios in 1956.

Hong Kong Localness

The struggles etched out in the 1950s "Left-wing" Hong Kong cinema were not in mainland China or Taiwan but Hong Kong. The concerns of "Rightist" films like *Halfway Down*, were not unlike those of the "Leftists," although some of the Right-wing productions tended to constrict their focus to the "spiritual redoubt" in the KMT refugee stronghold at Tiu Keng Leng. (Leung Ping-kwan 55) While *In the Face of Demolition* parodies the comprador-wannabe identity of Taipan Wong, the unrealistic translocal/global imaginations of Lo Ming, marked by their English, it also regards the landlord and the (English-)lawspeak government as common enemies. The street views and neon light signage that often appear as background to the cast list at the beginning of many 1950s films were also expressions of the production teams' gaze upon their immediate environment, and their need to engage with, construct mutual recognition and identification with its local audience – all of these constitute a (self-)understanding and active construction of their Hong Kong-marked subjectivity. This is none the more obvious than what is found at the beginning of *Bright Night* (1954, Ng Wui, Chu Kei, Ching Kong), its Chinese title meaning "The Red Mirroring of Blazing Trees and Silver Flowers". On one hand it documents the spectacle of the celebrations in Hong Kong at the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, but on the other, behind and between the glamorous street scenes, it inserts the story of a clerk at a jewellery shop (Cheung Ying again) whose discontent with reality promotes him to "explore some illicit opportunities" (the first line spoken by him in the film, and he eventually steals the jewellery). His annoyance at the decorated float parades on Nathan Road is a mockery of the urban prosperity (blazing trees and silver flowers) brandished by the Hong Kong authorities. A detailed examination of these texts would, I believe, reverse the judgment that the rise of Hong Kong's "native"/local cultural consciousness should only be traced to the social movements of the 1960s and '70s –counting the two Chinese Language Movements of 1967-68, against corruption (1973), against Queen Elizabeth II's visit to Hong Kong (1975) and the Golden Jubilee Secondary School incident (1978) – or the "successes" of a series of policy measures in the 1970s. For example, Hugh D. R. Baker in *Life in the Cities: The Emergence of Hong Kong Man* has attributed the "emergence" of a Hong Kong identity to the construction of public housing in the 1970s-80s, free universal primary education in 1971 and secondary education in 1978. He describes the "Hong Kong man" as "active, competitive, adaptive, responsive and contingent. They wear western attire, speak English, and for those who do not, they wish that their children will speak the language." (1983: 478) Such discourse, now commonplace, needs to be problematized not only for its lack of regard for the continuities and disruptions in Hong Kong's cultural history, but more importantly, for its perpetuation of a certain interpretation of Hong Kong nativity/local identity by systematically suppressing and ignoring some major culture which have been politically ruptured or driven underground, excluded from a redefined "native Hong Kongness".

Back in the 1950s, Hong Kong cinema had already launched a painstaking and meticulous critique of the "Hongkonger" who was "active, competitive" and "wish that their children will speak the language". Another Union production *Father and Son* (1954, Ng Wui) shows how the office-clerk father (Cheung Wood-yau) coerces his son by all means, who has come to the city from the countryside, to become a competitive "Hongkonger": he makes the kid wear western clothes, bury his past (he changes his son's name from "little shrimp" to "born rich", which the kid has a hard time responding to), go to an elite school, make friends in the upper classes and last but not least, eat gateau. Eventually he is subject to contempt and frustration, and finds acceptance on neither side. The elite school that forces its students to wear a uniform (franchised to a monopolising and particularly expensive shop – all very "commonplace" from

today's perspective) is depicted as bureaucratic, hypocritical, and completely out of touch with the actual conditions of the working classes, in the way the school scorns the living conditions of Little Shrimp but requires him to hold birthday parties because "every child in our school does that". Little Shrimp works out his own logic by paying the school fees of his dropout friend with the donations that he has collected on behalf of the school for dropout students ("why would I give to the principal, since she does not know him, i.e. the dropout?"), but he is accused of "embezzlement"/theft. With the story of the frustrations, immense psychological and physical costs of a small figure striving to climb up the class ladder in Hong Kong (line from neighbour: "the fuss created by an adult who wants to get rich"), the film exposes the institutionalized violence against the body, (upper) class identification and self-imagination in the attempt by colonial capitalism to fashion a (new) "Hong Kong identity", involving here the reorganisation of public and private spheres. It criticizes, with great precision and ferocity, a "Hong Kong characteristic" that is the collaborative monopolization of elitist education and the charity industry on ethics and morality. At Union Film's first anniversary, the commemorative screening of *Father and Son* was programmed as a double bill with a newsreel on the Shek Kip Mei fire of that year[46]. This marked the confidence amongst these filmmakers towards their creative realism and their ambitions in inter-textual renderings of the audience with regard to their immediate social reality in Hong Kong.

It is noteworthy that an emphasis on the lived and felt experiences of Hong Kong people and receiving official recognition from the Chinese Communist Party was not considered a contradiction at the time. In 1957, *Family*, a Union Film production, was given an award in film excellence by the Ministry of Culture of the People's Republic. It is precisely because these films were designated by Beijing as "bourgeoisie" and "the side flank of the socialist-revolutionary, proletarian-revolutionary cinema of the motherland", that they were given so much recognition and autonomy and did not have to toe the line of "class struggle" as was the case later. Instead they used realism as a tool to promote class consciousness and analyze class and colonial contradictions. In the birthday party scene in *Father and son* the sons of rich families arrive on their black "broom-brooms" accompanied by their maids in white shirts and black trousers. The street urchins in the ghetto – the neighbours of Little Shrimp – looked at these wealthy counterparts as if the two worlds would never speak to one another. It was a remarkably acute visualisation of class contradiction. Perhaps what is more ironic from today's point of view is that the "good for nothing" communal charity school, which in the film is scoffed at by the small salaried protagonist, allows its students to play freely without wearing uniforms, and has them farming in a garden outside school. Wouldn't this bear some resemblance to the alternative/gaia schools gaining popularity as the "new" educational trend of our times?

De-moralization

The causes of the "Events of 1967" could be deduced to mainly four discursive directions so far: vast inequality between the have and the have-nots, workers and bosses, rulers and the ruled; of its being an anti-colonialist, anti-capitalist struggle (coined "Anti-British and Anti-Persecution" movement); an over-spill of the Chinese Cultural Revolution into Hong Kong ("The Leftist riots"); and lastly, the narrative revealed by political reporter Cheung Ka-wai (2000, 2012) – the Communist government were so pleased by the apology and compensation form the Portuguese

[46] On Christmas Day, 1953, a massive fire swept the Shek Kip Mei squatter area and made 53,000 people homeless overnight.

Macao government during the December-Third Incident (or "Motim 1-2-3" in Portuguese) of 1966 that they wanted to replicate the success in Hong Kong – it would have been "the next big thing". What I am interested in, is how the events of 1967 distinguished the Hong Kong "Left-wing" from the course taken by the Left in mainland China, with the result of having suddenly lost the "nation-state" as an imaginary object for Hong Kong's moral patriotic sentiments to cling onto, therefore creating an affective crisis. The interviews/oral histories conducted by the Film Archive with "Leftist"/progressive filmmakers from directors, writers, producers and actors – including George Shen, Liu Yat-yuen, Chu Hak, Hu Siao-fung, Shu Shi, Wong Yick, Chow Chung, Hsia Moon and so on, in addition to autobiographies by actresses (also a Union shareholder) such as Wong Man-lei– are unanimous in understanding the "Anti-British Anti-Persecution Struggle" of 1967 and the Chinese Cultural Revolution as having destroyed the "Patriotic Film" companies of Hong Kong, (George Shen, 278) much to "universal outrage and popular disgruntlement" (Wong Yik, 169)

In 1967, Huang Guangyu and Zhong Fazhi, chief editors of the Xinhua News Agency Hong Kong Branch recently transferred from Beijing, forced the staff of Left-wing film companies to "declare their political stance" publicly[47]: "This is now a national struggle, and there is no more distinction between the front and the rear! Come out and declare yourselves!" (Wong Yik 169) The forced "coming out" of the "G-P-S" companies caused a boycott of their films by cinema circuits, thus pushed Leftist filmmaking to its end. After arresting Liu Yat-yuen, the British Hong Kong government had planned on getting Ng Cho-fan but after considering the consequences upon public opinion "which would be grave, and would cause great discontentment towards the British" (Kwok quoting Lo Dun 132), only the actor-couple Fu Che and Shek Hwei were arrested and deported. The eradication of the Hong Kong Left by the collaborative move of the British Hong Kong authorities and the Rightists could only come when the increasingly aggressive populist Communists (the "Extreme Left") in the Mainland refused to recognize them – "We were patriotic, and the state helped us; some of our films could be distributed in the Mainland. Nobody expected that once the Cultural Revolution began, we were accused of running anti-revolutionary, revisionist line, committing heinous crimes and spreading poison outside the country." (Liu Yat-yuen 154-155) Before the Cultural Revolution "it was very democratic and liberal; we could write just about anything." Once the Cultural Revolution arrived, "attention was no longer paid to social issues that really demanded attention, and everything was about being high pitched in patriotic rhetoric." "So many 'hats' were donned on people's heads that we are all quite frightened." "That got the best of our passion." "We were afraid of making mistakes." (Hu Siao-fung, 153) "During the cultural revolution you wouldn't dare to write or to revise anything. As long as the salary was paid, why would you bother to make things difficult for yourself? […] the depiction of class fights, of heroes, glorifying worker-peasant soldiers, all ran counter to our objectives of producing films that are beneficial to the masses and to guide people to the morally right. We fell into disarray because we couldn't write anything anymore. The ten years of the Cultural Revolution decimated us, in our work and in our personal emotions." (Liu Yat-yuen, 156)

[47] In PRC, the labeling of political resources and its hierachization had begun with public declarations and the donning of "hats" long before the Cultural Revolution, which can be seen as the radicalization and extension of the political hierarchy and of social militarization that began with earlier movements focusing on "class struggle", "class line" and the reinforcement of "standards of political screening" by the Education Ministry in the selection of students, among others. (Han) Many filmmakers in Hong Kong have spoken of the pressure that they have felt since the beginning of the 1960s.

The Hut on Hilltop (1970, Hu Siao-fung) attempts to depict the predicament of the Hong Kong working class: "it was a very widespread phenomenon for those who built houses to not have proper housing for themselves." "At the time everyone here thought it was a good film, but back in the mainland it was shredded to bits. Hong Kong workers drank alcohol – and in the mainland, they thought it gave the workers too bad an image." "Their cultural policy thought that only scripts with (heroic) worker-peasant soldiers were acceptable. Hong Kong only had Gurkhas; peasants were hard to find. Even if there were, they wouldn't go to the cinema. As for writing about workers – their enemies were capitalists; but you couldn't write about capitalists, you couldn't make them antagonists in a film, because they were targets for co-optation/unification." (Chu Hak 179-180) The Cultural Revolution "negated the past sixteen years of work by the 'G-P-S triumvirate'. Of the 226 films it produced, most were seen as the product of a 'cultural black-line'. […] The principle of 'guiding people upwards to the morally right' was naturally disapproved." The Cultural Revolution, and the 1967 riots that followed, removed the patriotic underpinnings and thereafter moral backbone of the "progressive" cultural workers of Hong Kong ("That got the best of our passion"), while simultaneously they faced Cold War containment from the Taiwan authorities, backed up by a series of colonial anti-Communist makeover campaigns in Hong Kong: "Shaw Brothers, Cathay, Kong Ngee and Wing Wah issued a joint declaration, drafted by Taiwan, refusing to buy, to distribute and to screen the films of our triumvirate." (Liu Yat-yuen 155) Striving to survive, the Hong Kong Left was to be rendered demoralized and apoliticized.

Towards Neoliberalism

"Some may say that, compared to other places on a similar level (of development), Hong Kong capitalism has a rare degree of purity." (Tsang 29) But the advocacy of a system of values that promotes consumerism, individualism, the zero-sum game and the emphasis on efficiency, instrumentalized and technical knowledge, meritocracy and the nuclear family, only began to emerge in abundance in the texts that became mainstream at the end of the 1960s[48], whilst Christianity began appearing in its moralizing, salvaging, comforting image[49]. The vacuum left by the recession of "Left-wing" cinema in the aftermath of 1967 allowed the expansion of Shaw Brothers in its place. The films that appeared during the several years that followed, made an apparent tilt towards the establishment. The lush Shaw productions of *Dead End* (1969, Cheung Cheh) and *My Son* (1970, Luo Ch'en), for example, both of which emphasize the legitimacy of state violence in rounding up youth delinquency, as a necessary means of protecting law and order[50]. At the end of *My Son* the policeman father is depicted as justifiably shooting his own son for the social good, coupled with repetitive employment of religious motifs throughout - crosses, churches, and a St. Mary's Female Dormitory. *The Splendid Love in Winter* (1968, Chor Yuen), begins and ends on Christmas Eve with a writer recounting how he has rescued Mimi (played by Josephine Siao at her prime), a dancing girl manipulated by her drug-addict husband, from prostitution. The film ends by Mimi's deathbed with the gospel heard outside the hospital

[48] It is noteworthy that the Hong Kong tycoon Li Ka-shing—as of April 16, 2014 the richest person in Asia—amassed his fortune by buying properties at rock-bottom prices at the height of the 1967 events. (Yu 1997)

[49] The complex relationship between colonial modernity, capitalism and Christianity needs to be rendered in greater depth with much more research than the scope of this paper would allow.

[50] The Hong Kong Police was much applauded for its behavior during the riots by the British Government so that in 1969, Queen Elizabeth granted the Police Force the privilege of the *Royal* title, which remained in use until the 1997 handover. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hong_Kong_1967_riots

window showing the image of a cross passing. *Teddy Girls* (1969) that marks the fame of Lung Kong, the chief rival of Chor Yuen, ends with the concluding speech given by the director of a Girls' Correctional Facility (played by Kenneth Tsang) on the "youth problem": "the most profound essence of human nature is man's desire to be recognized; and this desire has rendered many a child a criminal." Tsui Yuk-ching (also Josephine Siao) becomes a "teddy girl" simply because she cannot accept her mother having a new boyfriend after the death of her father. Lung Kong's movies are filled to be brim with Catholic imagery and messianic figures: Director Mak in *The Story of a Discharged Prisoner* (1967), Sister Li in *The Window* (1968) (which dealt with the reconversion of two believers), Father Yan in *The Call Girls* (1973) and Dr. Cheung in *Pei Shih* (1972), among others. With the disintegration of the good-willed imagination of a working class solidarity, the positive image of the responsible parent also dissipated. Moral imaginations and ethical needs are displaced onto the trust towards the ruling classes (the police, social workers, schools, prisons, and the church) and onto the disciplining of sexuality within and beyond the nuclear family. A contrasting comparison between *The Orphan* (1960 Li Sun-fung) and *Teddy Girls* (1969) would suffice to demonstrate the synchronized institutionalization and sexualization of the reified "youth delinquent" in popular culture. At the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the '70s, a cultural intervention engineered a moralistic turn in full swing– which itself was of course a process involving multilateral bargaining and stalemate. One example: the Government, riding on the tide of the popularity of cultural publications, sponsored *Young World* (founded in 1969), believing that it could intervene and produce a *different* youth culture; but the young people responsible for editing the journal were dissatisfied with the censorship imposed by the Social Department. In the end there was open conflict, and the magazine ceased publication a year later. These young people then went on to establish a "Left-leaning" journal. (Lau Siu-lun 129-130)

The public housing projects and nine-year public education, the "Clean Hong Kong Campaign" (1972) and the "Fight Violent Crime Campaign" (1973), together with the establishment of mutual-aid associations and community welfare associations in the mid-to-late 1970s, have all been theorized as government responses to 1960s social unrest and plans for appeasement– whether successfully or not varied from writer to writer. Recent research studying British national archival sources and formerly confidential Hong Kong Government documents have discovered that, in the 1970s Hong Kong Governor Maclehose had meticulously resisted pressure from the English Labour Government (1974-79) to introduce social welfare policies to Hong Kong. The objective of the Governor at the time was to increase as much as possible Britain's bargaining chip when it came to negotiations regarding the expiration of the lease in 1997, by "transforming Hong Kong into a model city of international standing, with high quality education, technology and culture, and equipped with high levels of industrial, commercial and financial infrastructure", "to make it as prosperous, as harmonious and as satisfied as possible", and it must be done "at a rapid pace", so that it would become most different from the conditions in China, which would not want to take back the city if she could profit from it. (Lui 2012: 152) As a result of strategic considerations to maintain and prolong its colonial rule, *rapid* capitalist development and neoliberalization began in earnest Hong Kong in the mid-to-late 1970s, long before Thatcher came to power in Britain. Hong Kong became the laboratory for British neoliberalism, to an extent that has far exceeded that of the UK:

> "Speaking of identity recognition, Hongkongers began to develop a sense of pride and recognition in itself beginning in the 1970s with its being one of the four rising Asian dragons. Hong Kong was more modernised and richer than mainland China. Compared to Britain,

> Hong Kong had a much stronger economy; it was at that time when Hongkongers began to mock the British people "for being all beggars (awaiting welfare)". […] Given an equal legal system, Hongkongers began to exhibit their prowess. This prosperity, created under the protection of a legal system, is not only unseen in China during the past few decades, but also somewhat lacking in the once overly-welfarist Britain." (Li 2013 : 31)

How did the common ethic of the 1950s turn into a recognition of, and even "pride" towards colonial capitalism in Hong Kong? From today's perspective, the revolutionizing effect of this (re)engineering process is epitomized by the two-to-three-decade long craze, also known as the "Under the Lion Rock Spirit"[51], which extolled people to sacrifice themselves for capitalism; and even though its deadening work ethic aspect has gradually fallen into bits and pieces after the post-1997 economic crisis, the moral commitment to *our* capitalism has never been shaken, and has become a major affective obstacle standing in the way of the handover of the Hong Kong "hearts"[52]. This re/de-moralizing engineering project could be seen as the cause of many problems apparent in Hong Kong today – "This kind of development discourages people to ask themselves, 'Why am I important?' 'What is the objective of my life?' Instead it makes people ask, "Where are my best chances?" "What must I do to fit myself into these opportunities?" So when the system is no longer advantageous to them, when the economy ceases to grow, when the profession no longer offers any protection, when the world is no longer infinitely "open", when a nice job no longer waits for them at the end of their degrees – they crumble, in utter bewilderment." (Lau Siu-lun, 131)

Hong Kong's colonial capitalist modernity is a basket of seemingly amoral moralizing projects, encompassing a wide range of issues - redefining national/ethnic identities, life values, public and private spheres, families and sexuality. Their achievements have often rendered us unable to answer some historical questions which date only from a few decades ago. If Hong Kong's home-grown generation was "relatively idealistic" and "particularly sensitive when it came to problems of social justice" (Cheung Ping-leung) because it had not experienced civil war, then why were Cantonese and Mandarin films in 1950s Hong Kong so infused with idealism? Bak Ying sings in *In the Face of Demolition* that "one strives upwards in life as she searches for light in darkness". By the time when "Hong Kong cinema" was proudly labelled as "Hong Kong cinema" (no longer Cantonese or South Chinese) in the 1980s, it, in contrast, was populated by self-deprecating and cynical characters: a classic example would be Stephen Chow and Andy Lau in *Tricky Brains* (1991, Wong Jing) holding hands and singing a parody of the theme song to *Colourful Youth* (1966), "one strives upwards in life" – before rolling down the stairs. If the "universal mentality and ethics" of the Hongkonger endorses upward mobility through individualistic competition, "faith in the rule of law" and by "demanding more attention to class interests", why would *In the Face of Demolition* instead place Taipan Wong, who defends his class interests with the law, in such a morally condemnable position? Why doesn't Lo Ming make use of his Fourth Uncle's economic capital to "fight it out" and become a member of the middle

[51] "Many Hongkongers possess the 'Lion Rock Hill Spirit', their hardwork and spontaneity being responsible for the development of Hong Kong's economy. Free universal education has raised the Hongkonger's education level progressively, which is beneficial to the development of the rule of law, but should by no means be regarded as the sole contribution of the colonial government." Ng (2013)

[52] "There is a strong emotion inside Hong Kong against the Chinese socialist regime, and this emotion very naturally becomes a core element of the identity recognition of the Hong Kong Chinese. […] Hong Kong and China have created an immense distance in their developmental levels and living standards, hence creating a sense of superiority amongst the Hong Kong Chinese." Liu (2006)

class? The characters of these films never believe in professional aggressiveness; they see happiness, benevolence and content in maintaining livelihood, upholding their duties and responsibilities, and in being helpful and beneficial to others. These films do not encourage upward mobility, for that would be equal to collaboration with the capitalists. How did we manage to eliminate this once poignantly critical distance towards upward recognition and class mobility?

From the Cultural Revolution in its embryo days of the early-mid-1960s to the downfall of the Gang of Four in 1976, the Hong Kong "Left" was gradually denounced by the mainland "Left" as reactionary and "Right-leaning", while they were also demonized as minoritarian "radicalists" by Hong Kong authorities and US-backed forces. The Hongkonger who grew up after the 1970s could hardly imagine that the "long Cantonese films" / "derelict Cantonese films" that they consumed on a daily basis as ostracized residual culture on television during their upbringing, were once an essential component of Hong Kong progressive culture. What was once mainstream in the 1950s has gradually become a marginalized, moralistic old chestnut:

> "Hong Kong's economy took off, skyscrapers were being built. Hong Kong prospered, and people lived different lives […] the youths today who are so used to being their own selves don't see our films—they consider them old-fashioned" (Kwok Ching-ling quoting Lo Dun 140)
>
> "It wouldn't be too incorrect use the term 'moralist' to describe most Hong Kong cinematic productions, especially those before the mid-1960s." (Garcia 1983 : 147)

Chinese Works Cited

Chan, Chi Tak (2012) "The Cultural Policy of New Democracy and the Post-war Cultural Turn in Hong Kong – from the Novel 'Renhai Leihen' to the Film 'In The Face of Demolition'. Leung Ping-kwan et al eds. *Hong Kong Literature and Cinema.* Hong Kong Open University Press and Hong Kong University Press. 104-121.

Chan, Hok Yin (2014) *The May-Fourth in Hong Kong – The Colonial Situation, Nationalism and Native Consciousness.* Hong Kong: Chung Hwa.

Chan, Wan (2011) "Social *Realism of Union Film and the Governmental Fabricated Myth of "Hong Kong Spirit," One for All : The Union Film Spirit.* Grace Ng, eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 129-140.

Cheung, Ping-leung (1998) "The Rise of the New Middle Class and its Political Effects." *Class Analysis in Hong Kong.* Lui Tai-lok and Wong Wai-pong, eds. Hong Kong : 56-74.

Cheung, Kar-wai (2000) "Liu Yat-yuen, the Baffled Veteran of Left-wing Cinema," *The Inside Story of the 1967 Riots.* Hong Kong: Pacific Century. 209-225.

Cheung, Kar-wai (2012) *The 1967 Riots – The Watershed of Post-war Hong Kong History.* Hong Kong University Press.

Cheung, Tak-sing (2000) "The Basis of Hong Kong Social Order : From Low Level Integration to High Level Self Consciousess?" *The 21st Century Blueprint for Hong Kong.* Lau Siu-kai ed. Hong Kong : Chinese University Press.

Chang, Cheh (1989) "Recollections of 30 Years of Hong Kong Cinema". Hong Kong: Joint Publishing.

Chu, Hak (2001) "Interview," *Oral History Series (2): An Age of Idealism: Great Wall & Feng Huang Days*. Wong Ain-ling ed. Hong Kong Film Archive.

Faure, David. (2009) "We Who Grew Up in the 1960s." *The Cold War and Hong Kong Cinema.* Lee Pui-tak and Wong Ain-ling, eds. Hong Kong Film Archive.

Garcia, Roger (1983) "The Illicit Place," *A Comparative Study of Post-War Mandarin and Cantonese Cinema: the Films of Zhu Shulin, Qin Jian and other Directors*. Hong Kong: Urban Council.

Gu, Balu. (1989) *Fifty Years in the Cultural Scene.* Shanghai: Xuelin.

Han, Shaogong (2014) *Postscript to Revolution.* Hong Kong : Oxford.

Hsia Moon (2001) "Interview," *Oral History Series (2): An Age of Idealism: Great Wall & Feng Huang Days*. Wong Ain-ling ed. Hong Kong Film Archive. 120-143.
Hu, Siao-fung (2001) "Interview, "*Oral History Series (2): An Age of Idealism: Great Wall & Feng Huang Days*. Wong Ain-ling ed. Hong Kong Film Archive. 144-157.
Ip, Yam-chong (2009) "The Possibilities of the Spectactor : The Cold War Experience in Hong Kong Cinema and 'Socialist China'". *Cultural Studies Monthly* 90. 25th March.
Kwok, Ching-ling (2000) "The Films of My Era," *Oral History Series (1): Hong Kong Here I Come*. Hong Kong Film Archive. 119-140.
Lau, Siu-lun (2005) *The Ghost of Colonialism in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Shou Chong.
Law Kar (1990) "The Shadow of Tradition and the Left-Right Struggle," *The China Factor in Hong Kong Cinema*, Li Cheuk-to ed.
Li, Yee. (2013) *The Hong Kong Ideological Current – The Rise and Controversy of Native Consciousness*. Hong Kong: Guangyu.
Li, Mingkun. (1998) "The New Situation of Internal Conflict in 1980s Hong Kong Society". *Class Analysis in Hong Kong*. Lui Tai-lok and Wong Wai-pong, eds. Hong Kong : 36-53. Revised edition.
Lin, Niantong. (1991) *Chinese Film Aesthics*. Taipei : Yuncheng.
Lee, Pui-tak. (2009) "Pleasing the Left and the Right – the Hong Kong Film Industry During the Cold War." *The Cold War and Hong Kong Cinema*. Wong Ain-ling and Lee Pui-tak eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 83-97.
Leung, Ping-kwan (2012) "The Politics of Cinematic Space – The Idealistic Space of Two Hong Kong Films from the 1950s." *Hong Kong Literature and Cinema*. Liang Bingjun, Huang Shuxian, Shen Haiyan, Zheng Zhengheng, eds. Hong Kong Open University Press and Hong Kong University Press.
Leung Ping-kwan and Mary Wong Suk-han eds. (2005) *A Catalogue of Literary Films in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Lingnan University.
Liao, Chengzhi. (Interview) (2011) "On Cinematic Work in Hong Kong." *The Mission: Sun Luen Films*. Sam Ho ed. (2011) Hong Kong Film Archive. Report delivered in August 1964.
Liu, Charlie (2006) "We should promote a cultural policy that promotes national identity awareness," http://www.ln.edu.hk/cultural/materials/MCSsymposium2006/Panel04/Charlie.pdf. Accessed May 1, 2014.
Liu, Yat-yuen, Feng Lingyun et al. (1997) "The Development of Patriotic Progressive Cinema in Hong Kong and its Effects." *Modern Cinema* 3.
Liu, Yat-yuen (2011) "Interview," *The Mission: Sun Luen Films*. Sam Ho ed. Hong Kong Film Archive. Hong Kong Film Archive. Conducted in 1997.
Lo, Dun. (1992) *Half a Century as a Madman*. Hong Kong: Xiangjiang.
Lui, Tai-lok. (2012) *The Deja-vu of 1970s*. Hong Kong : Chung Hwa.
Lui, Tai-lok. (1998a) "The characteristics and future prospects of the development of Hong Kong's middle class – my response to Mr. Cheung Ping-leung." *Class Analysis and Hong Kong*. Lui Tai-lok and Wong Wai-pong, eds. Hong Kong: Literary Bookstore. 87-109.
Lui, Tai-lok. (1998b) "What are the middle classes thinking?" *Class Analysis in Hong Kong*. Lui Tai-lok and Wong Wai-pong, eds. Hong Kong: Literary Bookstore. 199-206.
Ng, Cho-fan (2011) "Ng Cho-fan's United Film Mission." *One for All : The Marks of the United Film Era*. Wong Ain-ling, eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 170-175.
Ng Wai-kwong (2013) "Reflections on the Cultural Identity Theory of Hong Kong," http://www.ln.edu.hk/mcsln/35th_issue/feature_03.shtml. Accessed May 2, 2014.
Rong, Shicheng (2009) "The Containment of a Liftoff : A Preliminary Study of the Strategising of Asia Publishing House/Asia Film Industries". *The Cold War and Hong Kong Cinema*. Lee Pui-tak and Wong Ain-ling, eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 125-144.
Shen, George. (2003) *"Tales of Old Films". Oral History Series (2): An Age of Idealism: Great Wall & Feng Huang Days*. Wong Ain-ling ed. Hong Kong Film Archive. 250-289.
Sam Ho ed. (2011) *The Mission: Sun Luen Films*. Hong Kong Film Archive.
Tsang, Shu-kei (1998) "Some Forays into Class Analysis in Hong Kong." *Class Analysis in Hong Kong*. Lui Tai-lok and Wong Wai-pong, eds. Hong Kong : Literary Bookstore 21-35.

Tsui, Cheong-ming (2011). "Kindness and Life – The World of Human Compassion in the Works of United Film." *One for All : The Marks of the United Film Era.* Wong Ain-ling, eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 76-85.
Wang, Ruiqi. (2010) "The religious discourse of Lung Kang – dying, coma and shock". *Oral History Series (6): Director Lung Kong.* Angel Shing and Lau Yam eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 126-141.
Wong, Ain-ling (2006) "From United Film to Kang Ngee". *The Glorious Modernity of Kong Ngee.* Wong Ain-ling ed. Hong Kong Film Archive. 90-100.
Wong Ain-ling ed. (2004) *The Cinema of Lee Sun-fung.* Hong Kong Film Archive.
Wong, Man-lei, Zhan Meng (2011) "Selections from the Wong Man-lei Autobiograhy". *One for All : The Union Film Spirit.* Grace Ng, eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 176-193.
Wong Wai-pong (1998) *Class Analysis in Hong Kong.* Lui Tai-lok and Wong Wai-pong, eds. Hong Kong : 150-198. Revised edition.
Wong, Yik (Interview) (2011) *The Mission: Sun Luen Films.* Sam Ho ed. Hong Kong Film Archive. 161-171.
Zhou, Chengren. (2011a) "May the Glory be with Cantonese Cinema – Ng Cho-fan and United Film," *One for All: The Union Film Spirit.* Grace Ng ed. 26-35.
Zhou, Chengren. (2011b) "Only Cantonese Film can be Rooted in Hong Kong… On the Origins of the Establishment of Sun Luen." *The Mission: Sun Luen Films.* Sam Ho ed. (2011) Hong Kong Film Archive. 53-68.
Zhou, Chengren. (2009) "Hong Kong Left-wing Cinema Under the Background of the Cold War." *The Cold War and Hong Kong Cinema.* Lee Pui-tak and Wong Ain-ling, eds. Hong Kong Film Archive. 21-34.

English Works Cited

Baker, Hugh, D. R. (1983) "Life in the Cities: The Emergence of Hong Kong Man," *The China Quarterly* 95.
Lau, Siu-kai（1982) *Society and Politics in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
Lau, Siu-kai and Kuan H. C. (1988) *The Ethos of Hong Kong Chinese*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
Yep, Ray and Tai-lok Lui (2010) "Revisiting the golden era of MacLehose and the dynamics of social reforms," *China Information* 24(3).
Yu, Tony Fu-Lai (1997) *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development of Hong Kong*. London and New York: Routledge.