Research Article **Open Access**

Peter van der Veer*

The Bitter Pleasures of Tea and Opium[1]

DOI 10.1515/cdc-2015-0001
Received August 13, 2014; accepted October 20, 2014

When I came to North India in the early 1970s I drank a lot of tea. Tea was available everywhere. It was cooked with milk and sugar and thus pretty nutritious. In fact, in my fieldwork it was the breakfast that my host served me every morning at 6 AM and the only thing I would get till 11 or 12 when the first (of two) meals were served. Alcohol was not available in the Hindu pilgrimage center where I did my fieldwork.[1] More in general, drinking alcohol was a thing for men in secluded booth or at private parties and mostly not social, but to get drunk. It was also seen as a foreign thing. In my first passport I had a license to buy alcohol in the dry (alcohol-free) state of Tamil Nadu, mentioning that I as a foreigner needed alcohol. For the rest, drinking country liquor (and smoking beedi) was for the lowest castes and my Brahman hosts in North India would frown upon it. They would see it as habits that belong to lower natures and reproduce lower natures. So, tea was the drink and it was safe, because it was cooked. Only once in a while sharbat would be served, a sweet rosewater drink, or some fizzy soft drink like Limca (coca cola was banned in the 1970s; and now again in some states). Since it was the only real universal social drink (coffee was only served in elite coffee houses for men in cities). I took it for granted that it had been in India forever. Moreover, I was aware that tea was produced in Assam, Darjeeling and Ceylon, since we drank tea with these names in Holland. I never wondered why Indians mostly used a relatively cheap British tea brand, called Lipton.

These days of naiveté are over. I now realize that the tea with sugar that I drank at home in Holland had only been spread over the population in the 18th century and that the quintessential British ritual of the afternoon tea is of similar recent vintage. Tea plantations in India were started by the East India Company in the 1820s to break the monopoly of the Chinese and to produce for British consumption. Only in postcolonial India tea became the widespread drink that I found in the 1970s and today 70 percent of India's huge tea production is consumed in India itself. It is hard to imagine India without tea, but it is even harder to imagine that that is such a recent phenomenon.

China's tea is a whole other story. Tea is made from the young leaves of what were originally trees that were for production reasons reduced to shrubs. There is all kind of speculation about the origins and development of tea (bitter drink, called tu or ming). The historian Barend ter Haar argues that in the 8th Century it becomes a replacement for alcohol in the context of the rise of Buddhism (propagating bujiu 不酒 next to busha 不杀), and in the context of the emergence of the imperial exams where one needed to keep oneself awake.[2] Its popularity grew to the extent that it became a major part of the tributary system. That tea is a useful alternative to alcohol is clear to anyone who has visited China, but how successful it is seems less clear. I have not participated in a banquet in which tea has replaced alcohol and my recollection of visiting several Yi groups in Sichuan is blurred and soaked in alcohol. Men can hardly refuse to drink alcohol if they want to make guanxi while women have an easier time.

Anyway, this is the baked cha as we know it and obviously besides making social relations smooth it has all kinds of medicinal purpose and effect too (different teas, different effects). Whatever the case may be tea is a Chinese commodity that became highly sought after by Western seafaring nations in the 17th and 18th century and most prominently by the British after they had defeated the Dutch sea power at the end of the 18th century. Before that the Dutch had been the most important tea traders

1 Peter van der Veer, *Gods on Earth. The Management of Religious Experience in a North India Pilgrimage Centre*. LSE Monographs. London: Athlone, 1988.

***Corresponding author: Peter van der Veer:** vanderVeer@mmg.mpg.de

2 Bared ter Haar, ‚Thee en cup-a-soup', Inaugural Address, Leiden University, October 2001.

and tea is still an important drinking item in Holland. After that Britannia ruled the waves and the tea. Tea was the most important item in the China trade and since the Chinese did not need much from Britain in exchange it was paid for in silver. Sidney Mintz observes that tea, coffee, and chocolate were all introduced in the third quarter of the 17th century, but that the British contribution was to add sugar to these bitter substances.[3] He suggests that tea absorbed sugar more readily than coffee and that that was the reason that the sugar planters promoted tea. It is indeed striking how much tea came to define British drinking habits; much more than it did continental drinking habits. The Germans, French, and Italians drink much more coffee. Tea in Britain was first expensive and only drunk by the elite, but gradually in the eighteenth century the working classes also became hooked. The government levied taxes on tea and this became a major source of income. In Britain tea became a major part of the economy (much less so in China). Tea was 80 percent of the British East India Company's turnover. Mintz shows how dramatic sugar and tea changed the drinking and food habits of the British, but also how crucial these imports from the tropics were in the transformation of Britain's economy. At the same time he shows the rise of an entirely new labor regime, built on slavery, to produce sugar. Consumption and production go hand and hand. One powerful quote about the British East India Company:

> *Its early adventures in the Far East brought it to China, whose tea was destined later to furnish the means of governing India. During the heyday of its prosperity John Company maintained a monopoly of the tea trade with China, controlled the supply, limited the quantity imported into England, and thus fixed the price. It constituted not only the world's greatest tea monopoly but also the source of inspiration for the first English propaganda on behalf of a beverage. It was so powerful that it precipitated dietetic revolution in England, changing the British people from a nation of potential coffee drinkers to a nation of tea drinkers, and all within the space of a few years. It was a formidable rival of states and empires, with power to acquire territory, coin money, command fortresses and troops, form alliances, make war and peace, and exercise both civil and criminal jurisdiction.* [4]

The trade imbalance between Britain and China was, obviously, something the British tried to change especially with the exponential growth of the tea trade. The solution was opium that was grown in India after it had become more and more under the control of the British who had defeated the French. The Qing government had forbidden the sale of opium and tried to stop British illegal trade. The 20.283 boxes of opium that the Qing official Lin Zexu had thrown in the ocean in 1839 (the cause of the first opium war) had an estimated value of 9 million dollar. After the opium war you had an increasing import, for example in 1860 60.000 boxes. Already between 1830 and 1860 the value of the opium export to China was larger than the value of the import of tea and silk from China [5] In 1797 the British government took over the opium monopoly from John Company.

Famously the Qing did not think that China needed any imports from outside China, as illustrated in the following quote from a letter sent by Qianlong to George III:

> "Our heavenly Kingdom has everything that it needs in abundance and there is no lack of any products within its boundaries. Therefore there is no need to import goods from Barbarians in exchange for our goods."

It is less clear and a subject of considerable debate among economic historians how much the Qing economy needed silver from Britain. Whatever may have been the case the flow of silver came to an end with the growing exchange of opium for tea.

British trade and imperial expansion went hand in hand. The first opium war was planned by the trader William Jardine of the opium importing firm Jardine, Matheson, and Company. He directly advised Palmerston in 1839-1840 how to conduct the war. On the Chinese side trading guilds (Hong) were active, but less able to influence state policies. While in Britain the tax on tea was a considerable part of the state's income, this was very marginal in China. The Daoguang emperor blocked the use of a harbor in Fujian where most of the tea came from, although that would have made costs ten times lower and everything was shipped via Kanton till the first opium war. That war was therefore also used as a means to force the Chinese to open more harbors close to the places of production. At the same time the British wanted to circumvent the Chinese monopoly on growing tea by starting plantations in Assam. The labor conditions were those of indentured labor under penal sanction which Hugh Tinker has called 'a new system of slavery' and which after the abolition of slavery came to characterize not only plantations in Assam, but plantations all over the British empire. [6]The Indian populations that one finds today in

3 Sidney Minz, *The Power of Sweetness. The Place of Sugar in Modern History.* London: Penguin, 1986.

4 Ukers 1953, All About Tea, cited in Mintz, P. 112

5 Peer de Vries, Zur politische Ekonomie des Tees, 1979, 43-44.

6 Hugh Tinker, A New System of Slavery: The Export of Indian Labour Overseas, 1830-1920, London and New York: Oxford University

Mauritius, Fiji, the Guyana's, Trinidad, Kenya, Uganda, South Africa are largely descendants of these indentured laborers. This was totally different from the small family businesses that grew tea in China. It is therefore the British imperial system that leads to plantation and conditions of slavery, not the cash crop itself (Vries, p. 97). In general small farmers remained dominant in China till the 20th century.

Despite the creation of tea plantations in India and Ceylon the British still needed increasing imports of tea from China and wanted to pay for it with opium from India. Opium was produced in Bengal and Bihar (called Patna Opium) and in West India (called Malwa Opium). Besides raw cotton and later cotton yarn it was the most important export item to China. Since the trade in opium was forbidden by the Qing government both Indian and British private traders played a significant role. The Indian ports were Calcutta and Bombay. The Indian traders were mostly Parsis, Jains and Hindu Marwaris as well as some Baghdadi Jews like David Sassoon and his sons who were to play a significant role in the rise not only of colonial Bombay, but also of Shanghai. The first Bombay traders to go to China were the Jivanjis who adopted the surname Readymoney. Many of the big merchant families of today's Bombay like the Wadias and the Tatas built their fortune in the China trade. In Bombay the Parsi merchant Jamsethjee Jeejeebhoy had a special relation with the aforementioned William Jardine, the architect of the first Opium War. Jamsethjee built a fleet of cargo ships to serve the trade and in 1842 he was knighted for his leadership in business and philanthropy.[7]

As argued before Indians did not know tea but slowly got hooked to it during the 19th century and became the world's largest tea producers. Indians did know opium, but I never read anywhere that opium was a big problem in India. When I did my fieldwork there was opium available in government-run shops as was hashish. Mc Kim Marriott has a hilarious account of the Holi (Spring) festival that is Bakhtinian in nature and in which he was given bhang (milk laced with hashish) and consequently was unable to write any field notes.[8] Despite this widespread use of intocicants I have never encountered a widespread problem with it. The great addiction is alcohol. General consensus has it that it was a problem for Chinese and that it was created by the British to solve their trade imbalance with China. In Frank Dikötter engaging SOAS inaugural lecture he calls China 'Patient Zero' of opium addiction and then goes on to bust the myth of China's opium addiction.[9]

In nineteenth-century England opium and laudanum were used against pain. It was not seen as causing widespread addiction and, in fact, people could use it in regular quantities throughout life without creating addiction. This was also the case in China, as the following quote from Dikötter shows: "Men and women would smoke a pipe or two at festivals and ceremonies several times a year without ever becoming regular users. R.A. Jamieson, a doctor in Shanghai, noted at the end of the nineteenth century that if those who smoked a few pipes on the occasion of a festival such as a marriage were to be counted, few adult males could be excluded, although regular consumers were very rare. A British consul based in Hainan also reported that 'although nearly everyone uses it...one never meets the opium-skeleton so vividly depicted in philanthropic works, rather the reverse-a hardy peasantry, healthy and energetic'." (Dikötter, p. 5).

Dikötter argues that the spread of opium 鸦片 yapian in China from the eighteenth century depended on smoking. Tobacco, found in America, and introduced in China in the late sixteenth century "became the ideal companion of tea, 烟茶, yancha. Opium was initially laced with tobacco, but this combination was dropped later. To smoke pure Patna opium from expensive pipes became a sign of high status and wealth. Smoking was a social experience and opium houses, like tea houses, sites of male sociability. The other reason to use opium was medicinal like in England, against fever and especially diarrhea. If it was so harmless, why did it become the object of narcophobia? For this Dikötter suggests a Foucauldian theory, pointing at the rise of the medical profession which wanted to monopolize opium, and the emergence of anti-imperial nationalism with its discourse of enslavement and physical weakness. In the 1940s, however, the Communist in Yan'an used the opium production and trade to finance its struggle against the Guomindang, but as soon as they gained power in 1949 they stamped it out in three years. Cigarette smoking, however, was stimulated. Not by chance therefore China is now the world's leading tobacco producer and consumer.
What to make of the stories of tea and opium? A political economy narrative seems the most convincing and rather obvious. Sidney Mintz is the pioneer of a narrative that focuses on sugar and word capitalism. The commodity shapes the nature of production and consumption and

Press, 1974.

7 Amar Farooqui, Opium City. The Making of Early Victorian Bombay. Delhi: Three Essays Collective, 2005.

8 McKim Marrott,'Ther Feast of Love' in Milton Singer (ed) *Krishna, Myths, Rites and Attitudes*. Honolulu, East-West Center Press, 1966.

9 Frank Dikötter, ‚Patient Zero': China and the Myth of the ‚Opium Plague'. Inaugural Lecture at SOAS, University of London, 2003.

connects worlds that were hitherto unconnected. The meanings given to such a commodity are secondary to the force of Capital. Whatever disputes about details there may be this is a compelling narrative, but it does not satisfy for it gives us no access to how people shape their understanding of these world historical processes. This is precisely Marshall Sahlins critique of Eric Wolf's 'mode of production' approach in Europe and the People without History. Sahlins examines the indeed quite fascinating refusal of the Qing emperors to be impressed or interested in the products of the British, thus only accepting silver in exchange for tea.[10]

As is typical for Sahlins' approach to intercultural encounters he makes much of the Qing understanding of Lord Macartney's visit to the emperor. According to Sahlins the Chinese emperor indeed had everything in his yuanmingyuan 圆明园, gardens of perfect brightness at the old summer palace that was partly destroyed in 1860 during the second Opium War. This was a huge curiosities cabinet like the ones one had in Europe but much bigger. This was the collection of tributes that signified the sovereign power over the world that was enjoyed by the Emperor. In Sahlins' words "By setting China apart while at the same time making it the central source of world order, this theory of civilization lends itself equally to projects of imperial expansion and cultural withdrawal, to hegemonic inclusions or xenophobic exclusions, according to the contingencies of the situation."(Sahlins 427-428) It was not that the Qing were 'self-sufficient', but that they found the barbarians too far away and thus too difficult to control.

What we have here in Sahlins analysis are different cosmologies that clash. In work done by James Hevia and others, this analysis is complemented by an interpretation of ritual performance, centering on the question whether Lord Macartney had performed the koutou (kowtow). Hevia focuses on the 'guest ritual' (binli 宾礼) which itself is the basis of power, as in Geertz's power serves pomp, not pomp power.[11] Where Sahlins puts the emphasis on cosmology, Hevia puts the emphasis on ritual (li), but, as both authors would probably agree, these two belong to each other. In Lydia Liu's interpretation of the Treaty of Tianjin after the second Opium War in 1858 the emphasis is on the translation of the word yi 夷, which the British insisted referred to Barbarians, while the Chinese insisted that it only referred to non-Han people.[12] This can help us to see that what we have here are not just incommensurable ontologies, but in fact communications, negotiations, and trading commodities and trading insults. It has all to do with notions of hierarchy and precedence, but these notions are not independent of power relations. On both the Qing and the British side 'honor' and hierarchy play an important role, but they are part of political economy, not separate from it. To me it makes little sense to think that the Qing and the British did not understand each other, but they had very different objectives and interests. The Qing did not want to enter into the Age of Commerce on British terms, but that does not mean that they were not interested in trade. Moreover, at many other levels it was of course not the Beijing or the Westminster court that were central to actual trade, but local traders and local officials and, very importantly, illegal traders. In conclusion one might suggest that following the pathways of commodities is a very useful heuristic device, but it is not sufficient if one wants to understand the changes of political economy. These commodities are embedded in social relations and ideas of sociability. The fact that opium is produced in India but does not define international relations or political economy in the way it seems to have done in China shows already that it is not the commodity itself that provides us with a full explanation. That opium cannot have been the sole reason for 'the opium wars' seems clear from the fact that it is really after the successful establishment of tea plantations in India that the British feel impelled to force the Chinese to open their economy and society.

10 Marshall Sahlins, ‚Cosmologies of Capitalism.: The Trans-Pacific Sector of ‚The World-System" in Dirks, Eley, and Ortner (eds) Culture/Power/History. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994.

11 James Hevia, Cherishing Men from Afar: Qing Guest Ritual and the Macartney Embassy of 1793. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.

12 Lydia Liu, The Clash of Empires. The Invention of China in the Modern World. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

范笔德

苦乐情之茶叶与鸦片[1]

20世纪70年代早期，我来到北印时品尝过很多茶，那时茶叶到处都能弄到，泡茶时拌着牛奶和糖很有营养。 在我做田野调查的地方，每天早上6点钟主人会供应早餐，中午11点钟或12点钟会首次供应点心，一天顶多两次，这时我才能品尝到茶。这个地方是印度教朝圣中心，白酒是禁售的[2]。一般说来，在偏僻的隔间或私人派对等非社交场合，男人们饮酒就是买醉的。酒在这里被当做进口商品，第一次出国时我来到了气候干燥的泰米尔纳德邦，在这里能买到酒（没禁酒令），你知道外国人常需要喝点酒。不过，对于印度的低种姓人群来说，他们常喝乡村烈酒（吸比迪烟），这在北印度像东道主一样的贵族人眼里是不入流的，他们认为这是低等可怜虫的习性，反过来又会产生新的低劣品行。茶作为一种饮料，它是安全的，因为它要经过高温杀青。我也只是偶尔才能喝上莎芭，它是一种含玫瑰甜的香茶，偶尔也能喝到一种像清凉汽水的果汁饮料（在20世纪70年代，可口可乐属违禁品，在某些省份又被列为违禁品）。因为茶是社会上唯一流行的饮品（在城市里，咖啡只属于咖啡厅里的精英男士们），我就想当然地认为一直以来印度都有饮茶习惯。更有甚者，由于在荷兰喝茶时常听到阿萨姆茶、大吉岭茶和锡兰茶这些名字，我就以为茶产于这些地方。我也从来没有弄明白为什么大多数印度人喝那种相对便宜的立顿茶，这种茶来自英国。

现在，这些天真的想法改变了。我现在意识到，在荷兰家里喝的糖脂茶叶也只是在18世纪才开始流行的，就连有名的英国礼仪午茶也同样流行不久。为了打破中国人对茶叶的垄断，东印度公司于17世纪20年代开始在印度建立茶园，以满足英国人对茶叶的需求。我注意到也只是在后殖民主义印度时期，即20世纪70年代，饮茶在印度才变得流行起来。今天印度庞大的茶叶生产中的70%是由印度人自身消费的，很难想象印度没有茶叶会是什么样子，更让人不可思议的是茶叶在印度的流行竟然是近年来发生的事情。

中国茶叶的发展史则完全是另外一回事了。起初，茶叶采自茶树上的嫩叶，后来为了增加产量，茶树都被修剪成灌木丛一样大小。关于茶叶（苦茶，又叫荼或茗）的起源和发展有各种各样的说法。历史学家巴伦德·田海认为，在公元8世纪佛教兴起的大环境下（佛教宣扬戒酒、戒杀），饮茶取代了饮酒，科举考试的出现也促使读书人需要饮茶以保持清醒[3]。品茶的流行使得茶叶成为朝贡体系中一个主要的组成部分。对于任何到过中国的人来说，都知道以茶代酒是很不错的，但究竟是否奏效还不很清楚，以茶代酒的宴会我还没有参加过，记得几次参观四川彝族地区都是喝的醉醺醺，如果想拉关系并且让女士们感到轻松自在的话，男人们不喝酒是不行的。

茶就是这样，它除了能促进建立社会关系外，它还有各种各样的药用功能（茶不同，功能亦不同）。无论事情的原委如何，在17至18世纪，作为商品，中国的茶叶备受西方海上强国的青睐，其中最显著的莫过于英国了，特别是在18世纪晚期打败海上强国荷兰后，英国人一直控制着海上霸权和茶叶生意。在这之前，荷兰人一直是最重要的茶叶营销商，并且饮茶在荷兰很流行。茶叶在中国的贸易中十分重要，而且中国并不需要从英国进口很多商品进行交易，茶叶买卖是以银子进行的。悉尼·明茨注意到茶叶、咖啡和巧克力都是在17世纪50至70年代中期被引进英国的，但是英国人的贡献是把糖加入到这些苦茶中去[4]。他还说道，与咖啡相比茶叶更容易吸收糖分，正是从这个意义上讲，蔗糖种植园主促进了茶叶生意。饮茶在很大程度上影响了英国的饮食习惯，这确实值得注意，而德国人、法国人和意大利人则是更多地喜欢喝咖啡。起初，茶叶在英国十分昂贵，只有精英阶层才能喝得起，后来到了18世纪工人阶层也渐渐地对饮茶上了瘾。于是政府对茶叶行业课以重税，这也成了政府收入的一个重要来源。在英国，茶叶贸易成为经济的一个主要部分（当然不能与中国相提并论），英国东印度公司总营业额的80%也都来源于茶叶买卖。明茨指出，不仅糖和茶叶在改变英国人的饮食习惯上的作用是何等地剧烈，而且这些从热带进口的商品对英国经济的转变所起的作用也是相当的大。同时，他也向人们展示了一个完全建立在奴隶制基础上的新型的制糖业劳力帝国，消费和生产一环扣一环。下面是一则引言，有力地说明了英国东印度公司的状况：

> 不列颠东印度公司的早期扩张使它来到了中国，中国的茶叶注定为其日后统治印度提供了便利。在其鼎盛繁华之时，约翰公司保持了对中国茶叶贸易的垄断地位，控制茶叶的供给，限制

1 这是一篇关于奢侈品项目的随想，奢侈品消费是全球化中的重要一部分。我有幸被邀请参加了于2014年5月在中国福建安溪召开的关于茶叶的一次盛会，非常感谢王明明教授的邀请。

2范笔德，《神在地球》Gods On Earth, 北印朝圣中心的宗教经验管理，伦敦政治经济学院， 专著. 伦敦：阿斯隆，1988.

3 田海，《一杯汤与茶》Thee en cup-a-soup，就职发言，荷兰莱顿大学，2001年10月；

4 悉尼•明兹，《甜蜜的力量》The Power of Sweetness. 糖在近代历史上的地位. 伦敦：企鹅出版社，1986

英国进口茶叶的数量，并由此制定价格。它不仅促成了那时世界上最大的茶叶贸易垄断，而且引发了一场首次为一种饮品而进行的宣传。同时它也引发了英国人的饮食革命，把不列颠变成了一个从趋向喝咖啡转向喜欢饮茶的国家，而这一切仅在数年之间就实现了。这使英国成为世界列强的劲敌，它依靠其强大的力量攻城略地并发行货币，控制要塞和军队，构筑同盟开战维和，并在殖民地建立法治[5]。

很显然，英国欲极力改变中英贸易逆差，尤其是随着茶叶贸易的急剧增长,而解决这个问题的办法就是鸦片。法国战败后，种植在印度的鸦片越来越多地受到英国控制。当时清政府已经禁止出售鸦片，并力图停止与英国的非法贸易。1839年清政府官员林则徐将20，283箱鸦片倒入大海（这就是鸦片战争的缘由），据估算，这些鸦片价值在900万美元左右。第一次鸦片战争以后，清政府被迫继续加大鸦片进口的力度，例如，1860年进口鸦片达到60，000箱。在1830年至1860年之间，中国进口鸦片的价值已经超过了出口茶叶和丝绸的价值[6]。1797年，英国政府从约翰公司接管了鸦片的垄断权。清政府自大地认为中国并不需要任何外来商品，这一点可以从乾隆皇帝给乔治三世的一封信中得看出，其内容如下：

“天朝物产丰盈，无所不有，原不借外夷以通有无。”

在经济历史学家中间，大清王朝从英国赚取多少白银是一个富有争议的课题，并且观点十分模糊。无论事实究竟怎样，不断增长的鸦片买卖取代了茶叶贸易，白银内流也就终结了。

英帝国的对外贸易和对外扩张是一环扣一环的。第一次鸦片战争是由鸦片进口公司怡和洋行的商人威廉·渣甸所策划的，从1839年至1840年，他直接给帕尔姆斯顿献言献策，以进行战争。在中国方面，商会（或叫商行）十分活跃，但是无力影响国家政策；在英国，对茶叶的税收占国家收入的一大部分，然而，在中国这部分税收所占的比例是很少的。位于福建的一个港口是大多数茶叶的集散地，尽管这里茶叶买卖比其他地方成本低10倍，道光皇帝还是下令关闭了这个港口，之后直到第一次鸦片战争爆发，所有的商品都是通过广州进行水运的。通过鸦片战争，英国迫使清政府开放了更多的港口，这些港口都接近茶叶生产地。同时，英国人开始策划着在印度阿萨姆邦建立茶园，以打破中国对茶叶种植的垄断。印度茶园的劳力主要是由蹲过牢的契约劳工所构成，休　廷克把这称之为一个“新的奴隶制度”，这也是继废除奴隶制之后的另一个特色，不仅印度阿萨姆邦是这样，整个大英帝国的种植园都是这样。[7]今天在毛里求斯、斐济、圭亚那、特立尼达、肯尼亚、乌干达和南非所发现的印度人大部分是这些契约劳工的后裔。

印度茶叶种植园与中国家庭小作坊式的种茶方式完全不同，因此，可以说正是英帝国的体制导致了茶叶种植园和奴隶制的形成，而不是经济作物本身（弗里斯，P97）。总的来说，在中国小农经济一直到20世纪都占主导地位。

尽管印度和斯里兰卡的众多茶园产茶，英国仍需不断地从中国进口茶叶，并企图用产自印度的鸦片来支付进口茶叶的费用。鸦片主要产自孟加拉、比哈尔邦（又称巴特那鸦片）以及西印度地区（又称白皮土鸦片）。除了原棉和之后的棉纱，鸦片是出口到中国的主要商品，由于清政府严禁鸦片贸易，印度和英国的私营商人在鸦片贸易中发挥了重要的作用。在印度，从事鸦片贸易的港口主要是加尔各答和孟买。那些印度商人主要是帕西人、耆那教徒、信奉印度教的马尔瓦尔人以及一些巴格达犹太人，诸如大卫　沙逊和他的儿子们，他们对殖民地孟买及上海的鸦片贸易的兴起发挥了重要的作用。第一批到达中国的孟买商人是吉凡吉斯人，他们做买卖只认现钱。今天，像孟买的惠迭家族和塔塔家族等众多大富商家庭都是同中国做鸦片生意起家的。印度帕西商人詹姆塞特吉·吉吉博伊与上文提到的第一次鸦片战争的策划者---威廉·渣甸有着特殊的联系。詹姆塞特吉组建了一支船队，专门从事鸦片贸易，后来因其在经商中的领导才能和对慈善事业所作的贡献于1842年被封为爵士[8]。

前文已经提到，在19世纪，起初印度人并不知道茶叶，而后慢慢迷恋上茶叶，并且成为世界上最大的茶叶生产地。不过，印度人对鸦片还是熟悉的，但我也从来没听说鸦片在印度是一大祸患。我在做田野调查时，发现在政府运营的商店就有鸦片和大麻出售。迈克吉姆·马里欧特对过春节有过一段有趣的描述，写到在一次巴赫金式的狂欢中，别人给他抽了大麻（牛奶中含有大麻），后来他就再也不能写田野调查笔记了[9]。尽管这种无毒物质被广泛使用，我从来也没有料想到它会带来如此多的麻烦；其实，最易上瘾的是酒精。很多人一致地认为鸦片对中国人确实祸害不小，并且它是英国人为了扭转与中国贸易的逆差而制造的麻烦。弗兰克·迪克特在伦敦大学亚非学院就职演说中说，中国对鸦片烟实行“零容忍”，并始终如一地打击鸦片活动[10]。

在19世纪的英国，鸦片和鸦片酒已被用来镇痛，这也没有引起大众的烟瘾，而事实上，人们在生活中可以长久地使用它，只要严格限制使用剂量，并不会上瘾。在中国这种情况也是这样的，正如迪克特的文章中所写的，“无论男女在一年的几个节日和仪式期间，吸上一两次烟斗大烟，这并不会引起上瘾”。R.A.杰米逊是上

5 阿克斯，《关于茶的一切》All About Tea,由明兹引用，P112
6 皮尔·弗里斯，《茶的政治经济学》Zur politische Ekonomie des Tees, 1979,P43-44
7 休　廷克，《一种新的奴隶制度—印度劳工的海外出口（1830-1920）》 伦敦&纽约：牛津大学出版社，1974
8 阿马 法鲁琪，《鸦片之城》. 维多利亚早期孟买的形成，德里：论文集三卷本，2005
9 麦克姆·马里奥特，《米尔顿·辛格在‘爱情盛宴’中的奎师那、神话、仪式和态度》 火奴鲁鲁，夏威夷东西文化中心出版社，1966
10 弗兰克·迪克特，《零容忍—中国与鸦片之魔的传奇》 伦敦大学亚非学院的就职演说，2003

海的一名医生，他记录说，在19世纪末，算上结婚这样的喜庆节日，人们吸上几斗鸦片烟，没有人会染上烟瘾的，尽管当时的瘾君子极少。驻扎在海南的一位领事也在报告中说‘虽然几乎每人都会用到鸦片…，我们也不会看到因吸食鸦片而变得骨瘦如柴的人，他们在慈善宣传里会被描绘的栩栩如生，而情况却恰恰相反---我们会看到一个身体强壮、健康并且精力充沛的农民’。”（迪克特，p5）。

迪克特声称，从18世纪开始，鸦片在中国的流行主要是依赖于香烟。烟草发现于美洲，16世纪晚期传入中国，并成为品茶的配搭---叫做烟茶。起初，鸦片只是被掺入烟叶里去，后来这种做法就被放弃了，用烟斗吸食纯度高的巴特那鸦片烟成为地位和财富的标志。于是，吸烟就成为一种社会经历，鸦片烟馆就像茶馆一样，成为男人社交的场所。使用鸦片的另一个原因是基于其医药作用，比如在英国，它被用来治疗发烧，特别是痢疾。既然鸦片的危害没那么大，为什么人们还是谈烟色变呢？对于此，迪克特提出了福柯理论，指出在医学专业兴盛之时，它们需要控制鸦片，于是就出现了反帝爱国主义，伴随着反奴役和图强的呼声。在20世纪40年代，为了同国民党作斗争，延安的共产党人也靠鸦片生产和贸易获取经济来源，不过，在1949年共产党执政后的三年内就铲除了鸦片生产和贸易。遗憾的是，吸食香烟又受到了刺激，中国成为世界上主要的香烟生产国和消费国就不足为奇了。

是什么把茶叶和鸦片联系起来的呢？政治和经济方面的原因似乎是最令人信服的，并且十分明显。悉尼·明茨是最早把研究重心放在制糖和资本主义方面的学者。商品决定生产和消费的模式，并且把不同的世界联系了起来，由此，资本的力量超越了商品的意义。无论对其中的细节争论有多少，这都是一个扣人心弦的故事，然而我们并不释怀，因为它没有告诉我们怎样去理解世界历史的进程。这是马歇尔· 萨林斯对艾瑞克·沃尔夫在《欧洲与没有历史的人》一书中的“生产模式”方法的严厉批评。尽管英国商品给清朝皇帝们留下了深刻的印象并让他们产生了兴趣，但最终还是只接受以银子换茶叶，萨林斯对清朝皇帝们扑朔迷离的拒绝方式进行了研究[11]。

萨林斯对文化冲突的研究方法还是比较典型的，他从马戛尔尼伯爵觐见清朝皇帝的事件中获得了很多启示。根据萨林斯的描述，圆明园里确有中国皇帝所需的一切，在旧颐和园中，富丽堂皇的园林在1860年第二次鸦片战争期间部分被毁。圆明园充满奇珍异宝，其数量和规模比整个欧洲人所拥有的宝藏都要大、都要多，其中收藏的贡品象征着皇帝对世界的最高权力。按照萨林斯的观点，“一方面把中国与世界隔离，另一方面又使其成为世界秩序的核心。根据时局进展，这种文明理论会使中国经历帝国扩张和文化没落，再到霸权兼并或盲目排外。”（萨林斯，P427-428） 这不是清朝的“狂妄自大”，而是发现异邦离中国太远，很难控制。

这里其他人的观点与萨林斯的看法并不一致，甚至产生了冲突。在汉学家何维亚和其他学者的研究中，萨林斯的见解得到了补充，他们认为这与清朝觐见礼仪表现有关，他们围绕马戛尔尼伯爵觐见清朝皇帝时是否行三叩九拜之礼展开讨论。“宾礼”作为清朝皇权的基础，何维亚把研究的焦点放在了“觐见宾礼”上，正像格尔茨的观点“权力完全服务于炫耀，而不是炫耀服务于权力”一样。[12] 萨林斯从宏观上关注的地方，正好是何维亚他们从微观上的关注点—“礼节”，但是，这两方面并不分彼此，这两位学者可能都认同这一点。在莉迪亚·刘对1858年第二次鸦片战争之后签订的《天津条约》的解读中，主要强调如何对“夷”字进行理解。英国人坚持认为它指的是那些野蛮人，而大清朝坚持认为它指的是非汉族的人民[13]。这可以帮助我们认识到，这中间不仅有本体认识方面的不可调和，而且在交流谈判和商品贸易中也尊严不再。所有的这些都与等级制度和优先权这些理念有关，而这些与各种权力关系又密不可分。无论对于清政府还是英国，“尊严”和“等级制度”都起着重要的作用，但它们是政治经济不可分割的一部分。我认为清政府和英国并不是没有沟通好，而是他们有很多不同的目标和利益。清政府不想走进英国的商品贸易圈子，但这并不意味着清政府对贸易往来不感兴趣。另外，在其他许多层面，处在贸易往来核心地位的并非北京和英国政府，而是地方商贩和政府官员，更重要是那些非法商贩。总之，有人可能认为从商品发展道路方面进行研究是可行的，但对于理解政治经济所发生的变化还是不够的，这些商品是植根于社会关系和社会理念之中的。鸦片产于印度，但它没有按照似乎应有的方式来决定中国的国际关系和政治经济，这个事实表明商品本身并不能完全说明这个问题。印度茶园的成功建立，使英国感到要迫使中国开放其经济和社会，这个事实似乎可以清楚地看到，鸦片战争爆发的原因不可能仅仅是因为鸦片。

11 引自德克斯、艾雷、奥特那编的《文化、权力和历史》中马歇尔•萨林斯著的《资本主义概论—跨太平洋地区的世界体系》一书，普林斯顿：普林斯顿大学出版社，1994

12 詹姆斯•何维亚，《怀柔远人:清代宾礼与1793年马戛尔尼使团》 达勒姆：杜克大学出版社，1995

13 莉迪亚•刘， 《帝国冲突》 近代史上对中国的入侵 剑桥： 哈弗大学出版社，2004