

Hong Kong's Chinese History Curriculum from 1945

Politics and Identity

Flora L. F. Kan

香港大學出版社



HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Hong Kong University Press

14/F Hing Wai Centre

7 Tin Wan Praya Road

Aberdeen

Hong Kong

© Hong Kong University Press 2007

Hardback ISBN 978-962-209-836-7

Paperback ISBN 978-962-209-837-4

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Secure On-line Ordering

<http://www.hkupress.org>

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Printed and bound by Liang Yu Printing Factory Ltd., in Hong Kong, China



Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the distinctive nature of our English-language books published in China.

"At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way of rendering English words in the format of a square so they resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able to read Square Word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers, however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when meaning is unexpectedly revealed."

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations	ix
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Forces influencing curriculum change	4
Historical study in China	13
Historical epistemology in China	19
History pedagogy in China	21
The present study	22
Chapter 2 Politics, Society and Education in Hong Kong: A Brief Historical Overview	25
Politics	25
Society	30
Education	31
Conclusion	50
Chapter 3 The Emergence of Chinese History as an Independent Subject (1945–74)	53
The curriculum for F1–5	53
The curriculum for H-Level and A-Level	70
Conclusion	76
Chapter 4 Consolidation of Chinese History as an Independent Subject (1974–97)	79
The curriculum for F1–5	79
The curriculum for H-Level and A-Level/AS-Level	101
Conclusion	110

Chapter 5	A Period of Crisis and Opportunity for Chinese History as an Independent Subject (1997–2005)	113
	The curriculum development process (F1–3)	113
	Introduction of the revised format of CEE questions: 2001–05	129
	The introduction of ‘New History’	133
	The introduction of ‘Key Learning Areas’ (KLAS): ‘Personal, Social and Humanities Education’ (PSHE)	134
	The new CEE (F4–5) Chinese History curriculum: 2004–08	135
	Conclusion	136
Chapter 6	Conclusion	139
	Chinese History from 1945 to 2005: A summary	139
	The academic orientation of Chinese History	141
	The pattern of change in the content of Chinese History	144
	The influences that have shaped Chinese History’s pattern of curriculum development	144
	Notes	155
	Bibliography	165
	Index	179

Introduction

One purpose of teaching Chinese History to Chinese children would be to get rid of this [inferiority] complex by reviving what is good in Chinese culture, thereby instilling fresh confidence into, and restoring the self-respect of her people. This, however, must not be identified with the promotion of vanity and anti-foreignism which is to be strongly deprecated. (Report of the Chinese Studies Committee, Government Education Department, 1953: 18)

We will incorporate the teaching of Chinese values in the school curriculum and provide more opportunities for students to learn about Chinese history and culture. This will foster a stronger sense of Chinese identity in our students As we face the historic change of being reunited with China, for every individual there is a gradual process of getting to know Chinese history and culture, so as to achieve a sense of belonging. (Tung Chee Hwa, Chief Executive, HKSAR, Policy Address, 8 October 1997)

These excerpts illustrate the views of the Hong Kong government on the role of Chinese History in the school curriculum during two distinct periods. The first quotation comes from the colonial era and shows the government-sponsored committee's ambivalent attitude: on the one hand, it agreed that Chinese History was a source of cultural revival and self-respect but, on the other, it cautioned against possible xenophobia and unrest. The second quotation is from shortly after the handover of sovereignty to China and reveals the government's aim of using history to foster students' national identity and sense of belonging to China. In addition to their interest as statements of colonial and post-colonial governments' attitudes to the aims of teaching Chinese History, these extracts are an indication of the important political role that history plays in a society's school curriculum. Of all the school subjects, history may be the most politically sensitive, and the one which most reflects the culture and politics of a society; it is a

legitimizing phenomenon serving to define national identity and ideology, and to contribute to nation-building (Slater, 1989; Jenkins, 1991; Goodson, 1994).

This has been particularly true in colonial and decolonised countries. There are several conflicting theories about the impact that colonialism has on a country's history curriculum, the most extreme and perhaps simplistic being the classic view of scholars such as Altbach and Kelly (1978, 1984) and Said (1994), who tend to assume that colonial curricula invariably devalue and alienate 'native' history. Several commentators have adopted this view in the case of Chinese History in Hong Kong. For example, Pennycook (1998) sees Chinese History as having been distorted and devalued by the colonial authorities, while Luk (1991: 650) refers to the Chinese cultural curriculum, including Chinese History, as fostering '... a sense of being at the periphery of both the Chinese and World worlds — which no doubt assists the consolidation of colonial rule'. However, those holding such negative views on the influence of colonialism on Chinese History in Hong Kong seem to overlook two important points: first, most people came to Hong Kong only after it had become a colony, which is an unusual feature of colonialism; and second, even if there were restrictions on the content and scope of Chinese History, this might not have been due solely to the actions of the colonial government. Moreover, such claims have not been supported by in-depth studies. Therefore, although it may be tempting to draw such stereotypical conclusions, it is important to look at the possible effect of factors other than colonialism on the nature of the local curriculum. There are several indications that the situation may not be as clear-cut an example of cultural imperialism as the above writers suggest. For example, successive colonial governments were willing to allow Chinese History to be used as a source of cultural renewal (as can be seen from the first quotation). Also, Chinese History enjoyed an independent status as a subject during most of the colonial era.

With regard to decolonisation, the tendency is for the political authorities to remove all signs of colonialism and use education to build up a sense of patriotism and belonging in the newly independent state. However, in the case of Hong Kong, the situation is rather different: after 156 years of colonial rule, Hong Kong did not follow the typical pattern of decolonisation by becoming independent, but was 'handed over' to another sovereign state, becoming a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the Peoples' Republic of China (PRC). These unusual aspects of Hong Kong's colonial past and decolonisation make the study of the development of the Chinese History curriculum in Hong Kong of special interest as they allow us to compare it with the practice in more typical colonial and post-colonial countries, in this way perhaps broadening our understanding of colonial and post-colonial education.

There have been very few studies of the history of school subjects in Hong Kong, and this is the first attempt to analyse the development of Chinese History through the colonial and post-colonial eras. Also, whereas previous work on curriculum development has confined itself to the effect on the curriculum of

educational interest groups, or socio-economic-political forces, or colonialism/decolonisation, the present study attempts to analyse all three types of influence, and the way in which they interacted in determining the nature of Chinese History in Hong Kong. In addition to providing contemporary curriculum planners with an understanding of how the subject has evolved over time — including the major issues, problems and influences in its development — this investigation offers an opportunity to look at the social, cultural and political changes that Hong Kong has undergone through the years of colonial rule, and during and after the transition from British to Chinese rule.

The purpose of this book is to examine how the aims, content, teaching, learning and assessment of the Chinese History curriculum have evolved over the past 60 years, and what the major influences involved have been. Some of the questions the study attempts to answer are:

- To what extent, if at all, has its development conformed to the various theories of colonial and post-colonial curricula, especially the ‘classic’ theories of colonial history curricula mentioned above?
- How much has curriculum planning been determined by the government, and how much has it been in the hands of educational interest groups?
- How has the curriculum changed since the return of sovereignty to China?
- What part has the government of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) played?
- What were the motives and actions of the parties who were most closely involved in curriculum development?

This study reveals a rather different situation regarding the development of Chinese History than might be supposed. It does not support theories of colonial cultural imperialism, in which colonial governments dictate the nature of school curricula in order to diminish the culture of the local population, or theories which see curriculum development as a power struggle among local interest groups. Rather, it is argued, the development of Chinese History was largely the result of a collaborative effort on the part of the three key parties involved — the colonial government/SAR government, the local subject community and the government of the PRC — and of attempts to strike a balance between their interests. Also, the development of the curriculum did not follow the traditional pattern of decolonisation; instead of the Chinese History curriculum being strengthened, after the handover its status was actually threatened by the reforms of the SAR government. However, recent developments have forced the local subject community to make drastic changes to the Chinese History curriculum and re-secure its independent status in the school curricula.

This book also reveals three dominant themes which have typified the curriculum: the study of Chinese History as a continuous whole, an orthodox historical perspective, and a Han-centred cultural view. The picture of the Chinese History curriculum that emerges is of a subject that began with a very traditional,

academic emphasis, and over the course of time became ever more entrenched in its academic orientation. This trend differs from the patterns of curriculum change suggested by Goodson (1988) and Kliebard (1992), who tend to see the process of the development of school subjects as a move from either an academic to a utilitarian tradition or vice versa.

The next section discusses briefly the major types of forces that have been influential in curriculum change. In order to explain why a particular pattern of content knowledge has emerged, three levels of influences are taken into account: first, influences arising from micro-level educational interest groups; second, locally driven meso-level socio-political and socio-economic forces; and third, external factors viewed from the macro-level of colonialism/decolonisation. Although these three levels are analysed separately to enhance clarity, it is recognised that they are not mutually exclusive but are intertwined and have combined to bring about changes (or in some cases inertia) in the development of the curriculum for Chinese History. Later chapters (Chapters 2–5) attempt to analyse the complex interactions of these different forces and the varying degrees to which they have affected Chinese History in Hong Kong.

This is followed by a section which gives a brief review of philosophical approaches to the study of history in China, focusing primarily on a discussion of historiography, supplemented with references to epistemology and pedagogy. The discussion of these issues provides a background for the analysis in later chapters of the development of Chinese History in Hong Kong by placing it in a broader historical and philosophical context.

FORCES INFLUENCING CURRICULUM CHANGE

Micro-level Influences: Educational Interest Groups

Micro-level influences refer to the way in which subject communities may affect curriculum change. The term 'subject community' is used here to refer to individuals and groups associated in various ways with the same school subject, who work together to safeguard the status of that subject and their own interests as stakeholders. This community usually consists of government subject officers, academics, teachers and textbook writers who operate either as insiders (e.g. as curriculum developers) or outsiders (e.g. as a pressure group) in influencing policy-making with respect to their subjects. Members of the subject community may either organise themselves collectively to protect or promote their subject or work as individuals voicing their opinions through the media. According to Bucher and Strauss (1976), the interests that a subject community strive to protect typically include curricular 'territory' (in the form of space in school timetables),

resources, recruitment and training. In the United Kingdom, for example, teachers, as a well-organised and professional group with professional codes governing membership, are particularly prominent members of their subject communities and are thus able to exert some influence on defining what is to be taught, and how. There are also members of the community who are accredited with the power to make 'official statements' — for instance, editors of journals, chief examiners and inspectors.

Some researchers, however, point out that subject communities are seldom homogenous groupings, with patterns of curriculum development frequently reflecting power struggles among rival members. For example, Goodson (1987b: 26–27) asserts that:

The subject community [in the UK] should not be viewed as a homogeneous group whose members share similar values and definition of role, common interests and identity. Rather the subject community could be seen as comprising a range of conflicting groups, segments or factions.

Hong Kong

Unlike the situation in the UK, in Hong Kong there is no officially authorised teachers' council; and, worse still, anyone who possesses a university qualification, or an even lower qualification, can become a teacher as long as they register and obtain approval from the Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB, which before restructuring was known as the Education Department [ED]). Because they are not required to have a minimum level of professional preparation, teachers in Hong Kong are not recognised as professionals, nor do they become members of professional bodies, unlike the case with lawyers and doctors. However, a few teacher unions have been established which play an active role in the education sector, including the Professional Teachers' Union (PTU) and the Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers, which are affiliated to different political parties. Also, there are several teacher associations which aim at enhancing the teaching and learning of a specific subject or group of subjects, such as the Science and Mathematics Education Association, the Economics Education Association and the Geography Education Association. For Chinese History, however, it was not until 2000 that two formal teacher associations were set up in response to perceived threats to the subject. Before that, no organised efforts were made to advance the interests of Chinese History, and the only way in which its subject community was able to have any effect on the development of the subject was through various influential individuals, in particular academics and teachers, making their views known through the media.

Meso-level Influences: Socio-political and Socio-economic Forces

'Meso-level' influences are those socio-political and socio-economic forces that influence curriculum change — for instance, they may affect curriculum planning where the school curriculum is seen as an instrument of social control, and as reflecting the values of the dominant classes in a society. Young (1998) exemplifies this by distinguishing between high-status and low-status knowledge with respect to a subject's academic orientation, and argues that over time the school curriculum in the UK has become legitimised as high-status by the dominant groups who have the authority and/or power to determine its nature. He characterises an academic, high-status curriculum as one which emphasises the written word, individualism (that is, an avoidance of group work and cooperative learning) and abstract knowledge; in short, a curriculum which is often unrelated to daily life. A non-academic, low-status curriculum, in contrast, stresses the spoken word, group work and concrete knowledge, and is related to the outside world. Young argues that whether a high-status or low-status curriculum persists does not depend on pedagogical effectiveness, but rather on 'the conscious or unconscious cultural choices which accord with the values, beliefs and interests of dominant groups at a particular time' (*ibid.*: 20). As a result, attempts at curriculum change which could undermine the status quo might be doomed to failure.

A different view of the effect of meso-level influences is taken by Skilbeck (1992) who explains curriculum change in terms of four dimensions of socio-economic forces: economic forces, population shifts, changing socio-cultural values, and nation-building. Skilbeck argues that the curriculum either is, or can be made, directly responsive to forces and trends in the economy, as in the case of a government using the curriculum as part of a wider strategy of economic restructuring and development, a practice he sees as common in developing countries. Population shifts such as ageing, and the movement of ethnic and cultural groups across national boundaries, may also lead to a change of curriculum focus, such as an emphasis on lifelong education, mother-tongue teaching and multiculturalism across the curriculum. Changing socio-cultural values (e.g. the popularity of electronic media and the drive towards vocational, trade and practical skills training) can give rise to an increasing challenge to the dominance of the academic curriculum, and in particular to its relevance for mass education. Finally, Skilbeck notes that it is particularly common in developing countries and former colonies for the curriculum to be reconstructed for the purposes of nation-building.

Yet another way in which meso-level forces may be instrumental in curriculum development can be seen in Fagerlind and Saha's (1989) 'social system', in which the economic, social and political dimensions interact dialectically with one another, and together interact with education. In the process, education is both an agent of change and is itself changed by society. This can be seen, for example,

in the arguments of political leaders in various countries in recent years that an overhaul of the existing education system is needed if the state is to maintain its international competitiveness through economic and social changes.

As well as being subject to social, cultural and political influences, education itself has the power to shape social and political attitudes, in that it can socialise people into accepting or reconstructing the existing socio-political/socio-economic status quo. According to Sweeting (1995: 75) ‘the relationship between the socio-political and socio-economic forces, and the curriculum is symbiotic and mutually supportive, but they are not uni-linear’.

Hong Kong

In Hong Kong, various social, political and economic forces have influenced education. One example of the effect of political forces on the school curriculum was the concern of successive colonial governments to prevent unrest in Hong Kong and to avoid upsetting the PRC government by ensuring that the curriculum was apolitical. Sweeting and Morris (1993: 214), writing during the colonial era, argue that ‘education is highly sensitive to, and influenced by, the changing political realities which have affected Hong Kong. While the overriding motive of the government has been to minimise any threat to its status, this has operated in parallel with the attempt to avoid offending the sensibilities of political leaders in the PRC’. The same authors (1995) identify two periods in which the school curriculum was modified to meet the political needs of a particular time. According to them, from 1945–82 the government was determined to avoid political issues in the curriculum, and no attempt was made to develop a sense of Chinese national identity. In contrast, during the decolonisation period, there was a rapid rehabilitation of politics and school curricula were amended to include political concerns and to develop a sense of Chinese identity in students. However, it has been suggested (e.g. Morris and Chan, 1997) that, in reality, the effect of the government’s attempt at re-politicisation of the school curriculum as a result of the transition of sovereignty had little impact at the school level because schools continued to be more concerned with competing for academically able students than with integrating political issues into the curriculum.

Economic and social forces are also seen to have had an effect on education in Hong Kong, with Sweeting and Morris pointing out that ‘educational change has followed rather than preceded major structural changes in the economy’ (1993: 213). For example, during the 1950s and 1960s, manufacturing was the chief source of employment for most people, and consequently schools were mainly concerned with teaching students basic literacy and numeracy skills. This changed during the 1970s, when the decline of manufacturing and the rise of a service-based economy (e.g. banking and communications) led to revisions in the school curriculum, and schools were required to produce a more sophisticated workforce with ability in English and expertise in areas such as computer studies,

accounting, commerce and business studies. There was also an emphasis on creativity and problem-solving skills.

Regarding the influence of social factors on the curriculum, Morris (1995a) points out that the existence of an ethnically and culturally homogeneous population in Hong Kong has given rise to a curriculum that has minimal emphasis on social efficiency and reconstruction.

As for the impact of socio-political-economic forces on school subjects, two Hong Kong studies have examined the development of Social Studies and History. The emergence of Social Studies was identified by Wong (1992: 318) as 'resulting from the socio-economic changes in Hong Kong in the 1970s which created the need and the condition for its emergence, and the prevailing political culture determined the means and processes by which it emerged'. In the case of History, Vickers (2000) explained that the subject's culture was influenced by social and political changes as well as by overseas curricular models.

These studies have discussed the varying degrees of influence that meso-level forces have had on the school curriculum in general, but none deals specifically with Chinese subjects such as Chinese Language, Chinese Literature and Chinese History. In fact, in contrast to some other subjects, Chinese History has only experienced minor changes over the last 60 years.

Macro-level Influences: Colonialism and Decolonisation

Colonialism and education

Perhaps the most negative view of colonialism is one of economic exploitation and cultural imperialism, as an inevitable consequence of both Western technological and economic dominance, and a product of 'immoral' policies pursued by Western governments or 'dominant classes' (Altbach and Kelly, 1978). According to this view, education is one means by which colonising governments gain and maintain economic and political control:

Western formal education came to most countries as part of imperialist domination. It was consistent with the goals of imperialism: the economic and political control of the people in one country by the dominant class of another. (Carnoy, 1974: 3)

The teaching of history in particular has been singled out as an example of how education has been used to promote the interests of colonisers. Altbach and Kelly (1978), for example, claim that local history covers only the colonial period, and the little pre-colonial history taught shows the history of the colonised in a bad light in order to contrast it with the more favourable way of life under colonial rule. Also, at the same time as devaluing the culture of the indigenous peoples, colonial governments make every effort to promote their own cultures in order

to socialise the colonised into the culture of the colonisers (Said, 1994), in this way preventing the development of local culture. This cultural dependence of the colonised on the coloniser was a way of reinforcing colonial control of the indigenous people, both economically and politically.

Invariably, according to the supporters of this cultural imperialism view of colonialism, the policies and practices of colonial education have been designed to bring about the following outcomes. First, in terms of the provision of education, schooling is unevenly distributed, and aimed at cultivating an elite group to help administer the colony, while mass education is neglected. Second, the curriculum intentionally devalues the indigenous culture, promotes the colonisers' culture, and aims at assimilating the indigenous people into a foreign culture. Third, as a result of colonial rule, problems such as the language of instruction and elitist education are left to be solved after independence because of what 'those who ran the schools wished to have them accomplish — which, put quite simply, was to assist in the consolidation of foreign rule' (Altbach and Kelly, 1984: 1).

However, the belief that colonialism has had a universally negative impact on the colonised is an overgeneralisation about colonial educational policies, and is not supported by extensive studies across a variety of colonies and at different periods in history. For example, Watson (1993: 147) cautions against such simplistic assertions:

In the British context, at least, there was no universal policy. This [colonial education] varied between, and even within, individual colonial territories either according to the educational and social background of individual administrators, who frequently developed their own policy on the spot or according to the racial and ethnic composition of the territory concerned.

This contrasting view of colonial policy as improvisation rather than planned exploitation is held by other commentators such as Whitehead (1988) and Fieldhouse (1983) who cast serious doubts on the idea that cultural imperialism was 'a conscious and deliberate imposition of alien cultural values and beliefs on hapless indigenous peoples', and that 'education was deliberately used as a means of enforcing British cultural hegemony in the colonies' (Whitehead, 1988: 211). In many cases, they contend, educational planning was carried out in response to the specific social, cultural and economic needs of a particular society, and with the interests of the local people in mind, rather than from pure self-interest on the part of the government; and it was often characterised by 'confused goals arising out of benevolent intentions' (Fieldhouse, 1983). Whitehead argues that 'most colonial schooling certainly mirrored schooling in Britain, but there is ample evidence to suggest that this was more a reflection of local demand on the part of indigenous people themselves than an indication of any deliberate British policy to colonise the indigenous intellect' (1988: 215). In view of the complex nature

and purposes of colonial rule, there is a need for a fuller, more sophisticated assessment of colonial education, rather than simply assuming that colonialism is a good or a bad thing. 'Altruism as well as exploitation had a part to play in the westernisation of colonial youth' (Mangan, 1988: 16–17).

A conception of colonialism which contrasts even more with the classic view than the one above, and which is little developed in studies of colonial education, is Robinson's (1986) 'collaborative contract', in which colonial administrations are seen as collaborating with the indigenous people. Robinson argues that for colonialism to be viable, the colonial administration cannot be solely dependent on the coloniser, but must enlist the support of the local people. In this way, colonialism usually proceeds 'by combining with local interests and affiliating with local institutions' (p. 270), so that 'the true metropolis appears neither at the centre nor on the periphery, but in their changing relativities' (p. 271).

One thing is certain: colonialism can take different forms, and caution should be exercised in order to avoid overgeneralising from one or other of the theories discussed above. It should also be recognised that perceptions of colonialism change over time, and colonial policies tend to alter accordingly; for instance, the perception of colonialism in the nineteenth century differed from that after World War II, when Britain was more inclined to allow a greater degree of autonomy in its colonies. Fan (1995: 233) suggests that when analysing the curriculum under British rule, the following aspects should be noted: the view of the sovereign state on colonialism; the international situation that might affect views on colonialism; the ethnic composition of the colonised state; and the consciousness of nationalism amongst the indigenous people.

Hong Kong

There are various interpretations of the effect of colonialism on education in Hong Kong. For instance, it has been seen as an example of cultural imperialism, with the government manipulating and controlling education. Proponents of this argument describe the main aims of colonial education as producing an educated, English-speaking elite to work with the colonial administration, while largely ignoring education for the majority and promoting British culture at the expense of Chinese culture. This rather one-sided view of colonial education in Hong Kong is exemplified in Tse's (1984: 47–51) claim that the colonial government '... suppresses mass education, and develops a group of elites to help with its administration ...' and '... in enforcing the use of English as the medium of instruction in secondary schools aims at separating Chinese students from learning Chinese culture, and instead nourishing them with English culture'. Other writers take a similar position; for example, Wong (1996: 328) asserts that 'All along, Hong Kong's Chinese education existed in a situation where the road was rough, and there was suppression from the (colonial) government'.

A more moderate view of the nature of colonial education in Hong Kong argues that, although the colonial government did influence the school curriculum by causing it to be depoliticised, it was because of the government's concern to minimise threats to its status and to avoid upsetting China, and not because of any desire to devalue Chinese culture: 'As reflected in the History syllabuses, textbooks, and public examinations, cultural imperialism was neither explicit nor strong. It had to do with Hong Kong's peculiar situation; for example, before the 1970s the government was intentionally trying to bring about the political apathy of the people and hence nothing was done to arouse peoples' national sentiments' (Cheung, 1987: 207). The conclusion that concern for the political stability of Hong Kong, rather than cultural imperialism, motivated the colonial government is also held by Morris and Sweeting (1995) who assert that depoliticisation was promoted for explicitly political motives. According to this view, the government did nothing to prevent the teaching of Chinese culture; in fact, '... far from "devaluing indigenous culture", colonial curriculum policy in Hong Kong had the opposite effect of creating a school subject (Chinese History) that presented a totalising, homogenous, quasi-religious vision of the Chinese past ...' (Vickers et al., 2003: 109).

These two interpretations of colonial policy in Hong Kong are inadequate, however, as each limits itself to one motivating factor in determining the curriculum: in the first case, cultural imperialism, and in the second, political considerations. In neither case is the viewpoint backed up by studies which investigate other factors (social and economic) which may have played a part in determining the nature of the Chinese History curriculum.

In complete contrast to the 'cultural imperialism' school of thought is the idea of collaboration between the government and various interest groups in Hong Kong. According to this view, collaboration in education took the form of a tacit agreement between the government and the subject community, made possible by the fact that their interests coincided, particularly in terms of avoiding contemporary political issues. According to Choi (1987: 146), although the government deliberately deleted the politically sensitive issues in school subjects in order to minimise confrontation between the Kuomintang (KMT) and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in Hong Kong, there was little opposition because:

Post-war teachers were genuine Chinese. Since they had suffered from political hardships in China, they tried, as far as possible, to avoid talking about modern Chinese history. Moreover, many considered Hong Kong as a 'temporary shelter' and so were cautious not to get involved in politics. In their teaching they either consciously or unconsciously imparted Chinese culture to students.

Choi describes Chinese teachers at that time as practising 'self discipline', and argues that it was teachers themselves who avoided talking about modern Chinese history, leading to a sort of 'unconscious collaboration'.

Decolonisation and education

Following the universal process of decolonisation during the last century, the priority for most newly independent states was to begin a series of reforms, among the most important of which was a reorientation of the education system to reflect more strongly their specific cultures and social conditions. Although theories of colonialism diverge, commentators generally agree on the usual pattern of events in a decolonised country: first, reform of school curricula so as to portray the emergent nation and its new rulers in a different and better light, and to prepare students for nationhood; second, more prominence given to local languages as the media of instruction; and third, revision of subjects such as History and Geography to include much more local content (Morrisey, 1990; Altbach, 1992; Bray, 1997b).

Hong Kong

During the years leading up to the return of Hong Kong to China there were already signs that post-colonial education would follow the usual practices of decolonised countries. Policies were introduced to allow students to take examinations in Chinese at all levels, without any indication given on the certificates as to the language used, and additional Chinese language teachers were appointed — measures which are seen by Leung (1992) as examples of decolonisation or ‘domestication’ to encourage a smooth integration with the ‘mother culture’. Also, speaking of education generally, Morris (1995b: 131–32) observed that the impending return of Hong Kong to China was having a marked effect on the formal curriculum of secondary schools in ways that appeared to indicate substantial collaboration between the outgoing British administration and the incoming Chinese authority: ‘... it [the impending retrocession to China] has influenced both the content and treatment of topics within the existing secondary school curriculum. The two specific influences identified were a distinct Sino-centrifical and/or politicisation of some subjects [and] an attempt to try and ensure a smooth and trouble free period of transition prior to 1997.’

Similarly, Bray (1997a: 10) argues that: ‘... much of the emphasis of the added content was not so much on the Hong Kong identity as on the ways that Hong Kong students should see themselves as part of the larger country of which they were becoming part’.

The first few measures after the handover were also characteristic of a decolonised country. In the previous 60 years, the number of Anglo-Chinese (English-medium) schools far exceeded that of Chinese middle schools, even though Cantonese had been an official language since 1974, because of the perception that parents favoured English-medium education for their children. However, in 1998, the SAR government introduced a policy whereby all but 114 schools — about 1/4 of schools — were required to use Cantonese as the medium

of instruction. In addition, from 1998, Putonghua, the official language of Beijing, became a core subject in both primary and secondary schools.

However, there are indications that some aspects of the school curriculum are not typical of post-colonial education. For instance, it is frequently the practice in decolonised states to use civic and political education as a means of promoting national identity but, as various commentators have pointed out, this has not been the case in Hong Kong where the curriculum has continued to be depoliticised. For example, Tse (1999) noted that in most schools, political education, in terms of nationalistic and democratic education, was basically absent. Instead, the dominant orientation of civic education was still concerned with developing the moral virtues of good citizens and promoting a cooperative relationship with the government. Moreover, in commenting on post-1997 civic education, Morris et al. (2000: 259) argue that ‘the loyalty being promoted is not to the state per se, but to a sense of national identity based upon a homogeneous and totalising sense of Chinese culture, morality and values’.

HISTORICAL STUDY IN CHINA

Historiography in China

The Imperial Period (Pre-1912): The work and influence of Confucius

In China, as early as about the sixteenth century BC, there were official historians who kept records of state affairs. For instance, in the *Book of Odes*, there was the famous saying ‘lessons from the Shang dynasty were not far off’ (*yin jian bu yuan*), and this kind of record aimed at giving the emperor examples of actions to emulate or avoid. The *Spring and Autumn Annals*,¹ attributed to Confucius (approximately 551–479 BC), are seen by many historians as the founding work of China’s historiographical tradition (Tu, 1998: 84). The purposes of writing history, according to Confucius, were to ‘punish the bad and advise the good’; to ‘unite the Han people and differentiate them from the barbarians’; to ‘enhance the principles established by the emperors of the Xia, Shang and Zhou dynasties’; to ‘examine the principles of personal matters’; and to ‘distinguish between right and wrong deeds’ (ibid.: 90–92). The narratives of Confucius in the *Spring and Autumn Annals* portrayed key historical actors as a gallery of moral exemplars for the instruction of future generations of Chinese rulers and their ministers. Personal deeds and individual events were narrated in great detail, and emphasis was placed on moral judgements about whether the actions of certain people were right or wrong, loyal or disloyal, ethical or unethical.

Another feature of the Confucian doctrine was its specification of the ‘five relationships’, establishing the hierarchical order of relationships between individuals — emperor and minister, father and son, brother and brother,

husband and wife, and friend and friend; thus every individual had a proper position to observe, be it in the family, society or state. The doctrine was based on loyalty (to the emperor) and filial piety (individuals were bound by the patriarchal clan system); and it could serve both the political needs of the state and the social needs of a conservative agrarian economy, the basic unit of which was the patriarchal clan. In other words, the Confucian doctrines helped to maintain a stable social order (Liang, 1999: 80; Zhang, 1993: 92). Confucianism was the official philosophy of imperial China for more than 2,000 years — from the Han dynasty (206 BC) to the end of the Qing dynasty (1911). The Confucian classics formed the core of the traditional curriculum followed by scholars aspiring to official careers, and the influence of Confucian doctrines permeated Chinese society and culture (Liu and Wu, 1992: 218).²

It is worth noting here that Confucius' ideas were elaborated in the context of the socio-political situation in the Spring and Autumn, and Warring States Period (770–221 BC). As a living tradition of scholarship, in which the classic texts and the commentaries on them were constantly reexamined and reinterpreted in a fashion similar to that of Biblical exegesis in the Christian West, Confucianism was intimately bound up with the development of China's society and her political institutions throughout the imperial period. However, over the past century, Chinese societies have developed in ways radically divergent from the Confucian tradition; for example, the development of commerce and industry has given rise to individuals seeking opportunities in cities, rather than binding themselves to the traditional patriarchal clans of an agrarian economy. While some scholars, such as Tu (1989)³ and He et al. (1998)⁴ strive to re-interpret Confucian thought to make it relevant to the problems of modern China, contemporary Chinese politicians of an authoritarian inclination tend to appeal to a stereotyped, homogenised and anachronistic version of Confucianism, sometimes labelled 'Chinese values' or 'Asian values' (in Singapore) (Tu, 1999: 21).⁵

The work of Sima Qian, Liu Zhiji, Sima Guang and Zhang Xuecheng

In ancient China, historians, often working in an official capacity on the various dynastic histories, inherited and enhanced Confucius' ideas when writing history. Their work comprised bald narratives of events, focusing on the deeds of heroes and villains and praising or condemning their good or bad behaviour. History in ancient China was above all a vehicle for promoting the core doctrines of the Confucian orthodoxy, especially the virtue of loyalty to the Chinese state as personified by the emperor. Historical study was geared primarily towards expounding these doctrines rather than critically investigating the causes of events or the roles of individuals. The following examples taken from the work of renowned historians in different periods reveal the characteristics of historiography in China after Confucius.

Sima Qian's (145–87 BC) *Records of History* (*Shi Ji*) was the first orthodox history⁶ in China. He stated explicitly that the aim of his book was 'to find out the reasons for the changes between the past and the present, and to explore what has happened between nature and men' (*tong gu jin zhi bian, jiu tian ren zhi ji*), so that emperors could understand the reasons for success and failure, prosperity and decline. His interpretation of orthodoxy — the imperial authority of the Han race — was later taken as the 'blueprint' when justifying the succession of thrones (Tu, 1998: 286). After Sima Qian, each imperial dynasty sponsored the compilation of the official 'dynastic history' of its predecessor. Hence, when the last dynasty, the Qing, collapsed, there were '24 Dynastic Histories'⁷ which, taken together, constituted the orthodox account of the Chinese past from the Han dynasty to the Ming dynasty. Sima Qian's work was held in high regard in historical study in China and had a very significant impact on the later development of Chinese historiography.

In his famous book *Critique of Historical Work* (*Shi Tong*), Liu Zhiji (661–721) highlighted the three most important qualities for historians: talent, knowledge, and insight. All these qualities were aimed at determining whether people's deeds were good or bad so that the work of historians could put pressure on the emperors and courtiers to correct their improper behaviour.

Sima Guang's (1019–86) book *History as a Mirror* (*Zi Zhi Tong Jian*) reflected his belief that the role of history was to show examples of good and bad behaviour for emperors and courtiers to follow or avoid. In his view, a country's stability depended on the extent to which the emperors and courtiers adhered to the set of behavioural criteria delineated in historical texts.

Finally, in his book *The General Meaning of Literature and History* (*Wen Shi Tong Yi*), Zhang Xuecheng (1738–1801) said that the function of history was to elucidate the 'principle' (*dao*) which was embedded in the Six Classics (*Liu Jing*).⁸ Hence the framework of criteria set by the Six Classics could be employed to scrutinise present behaviour, rites, ethics and systems. In this way, for many traditional Chinese scholars history took on something of the role sometimes fulfilled by Biblical scripture in Christian Europe — that of a resource with which to exhort or admonish rulers or ministers who appeared to be straying from the 'correct' path.

Chinese historiography has thus been characterised by its moralising, exhortatory function, originating with the Confucian classics and later prescribed in 'the 24 Dynastic Histories'. However, it is worth noting that this type of history functions best in a static society, or one where changes are minimal, so that the moral exemplars can be applied as a set of reasonable criteria for people to follow.

The 'official' historians and criticisms of their work

Two types of authors wrote orthodox history, the first being private individuals who were not official historians, and for whom writing history was a private

business. Sima Qian was an example of this kind of historian as he wrote *The Records of History* in a private capacity, hoping that his work would be recognised by the state. The second type included official historians who worked in the State History Department, which was established in the Tang dynasty (618) and lasted until the end of the Qing dynasty (1911), when history writing was a national enterprise and a collective work. 'The 24 Dynastic Histories', which were orthodox histories, were mostly written by official historians. The approach to historical study fostered by this practice of 'official' history writing has been criticised by modern Chinese and Western scholars, e.g.

They were historians who only knew the dynasty exists but not the nation ... , only knew individuals but not a collective group ... only knew the past but not present affairs ... , only knew facts but did not have any ideals. (Liang Qichao, quoted in Lam, 1980: 5–6)

Considerable studies have been made of the extraordinary development of textual criticism in China from the second century BC ... The development of textual criticism did not bring with it any great advance in the higher forms of what we should call 'criticism' — namely, the scientific assessment of the value of evidence, and there has been considerable study of ... one of the main reasons for the peculiar character of Chinese historiography — namely, the remarkable organisation that lay behind the historical writing. ... The decisive element was the fact that historical writing was so much an official affair, and was bureaucratically organised. History came to be regarded as a useful guide for governors of states, and on the whole it was written by officials, for officials. It had the peculiar characteristics of what I should call 'civil service history'. (Butterfield, 1961, quoted in Tu, 1981: 34–35)

This review of Chinese historiography points to a situation where, before 1911, the central function of orthodox history was to provide moral exemplars for the emperors and their officials. In addition, history was written to serve the interests of the state — for example, loyalty was defined in terms of the current interests of the state; and Chinese historiography focused on the political elite, the imperial court and individuals, rather than on broader socio-economic or cultural themes. Commenting on the characteristics of traditional historiography in China, Plumb (1969: 12–13) wrote:

The Chinese pursued erudition, but they never developed the critical historiography which is the signal achievement of Western historiography over the last two hundred years. They never attempted, let alone succeeded, in treating history as objective understanding.

Plumb's criticism may rather overstate the case as there were historians (not official historians) like Zhang Xuecheng (1738–1801) who did take a more critical

approach to their work. In the process of historical investigation, he took note of the following concerns: ‘record actual events’ (*ji shi*), ‘discard doubtful materials’ (*que yi*), ‘find out the truth’ (*qiu zhen*) and ‘be sceptical’ (*huai yi*). Yet, as far as the orthodox history is concerned, Plumb’s comments about the lack of critical historiography are valid.

The Republican Period

An impediment to modernisation or a vehicle for rejuvenation? Hu Shih versus Qian Mu

In the republican period (1912–49), intellectuals such as Hu Shih and Chen Duxiu proposed abandoning traditional classical studies and replacing them with Western learning. This is referred to as the May Fourth Movement, sometimes called the May Fourth New Cultural Movement, in which scholars and students advocated the introduction of science and democracy as measures to reform China in the face of foreign threats. During this period, Confucian classics were denounced as impeding the Westernisation of the state. In the 1930s, there were disputes in academic circles as to whether Confucian classics should be incorporated into the primary and secondary school curriculum.⁹ At that time, the essence of Confucian classics, which included moralism, cultural values and didacticism, was integrated into the subjects of Chinese Language, Literature and History. However, in the late 1930s and mid-1940s, when China was invaded by Japan, history in general and Confucian classics in particular were regarded as an important means of stimulating patriotic sentiments.¹⁰ Among a number of competing approaches to history were those of Hu Shih and Qian Mu. Hu favoured a complete Westernisation of China and regarded China’s classical studies, especially Confucian studies, as discredited and irrelevant to the problems China faced in the modern world, and therefore to be discarded (Hu, 1935: 39). Qian Mu, however, saw history, and particularly Confucian studies, as a source for revitalising the spirit of the Chinese people in the face of adversity.

The work and influence of Qian Mu

Qian Mu’s classic work *The General History of China* (1947)¹¹ shows his belief in the practical functions of history. Yet, unlike the traditional historians who, through writing about the deeds of historical figures, set up a framework of behavioural criteria for people to emulate or avoid, Qian Mu sought to adapt the Chinese historiographical tradition to serve the purpose of bolstering Chinese national and cultural identity. Thus, in Qian’s work, culture becomes an identifiable past, as he views it as a source of life-force for the Chinese people;

and it is this cultural identity that revives their confidence and vitality in times of crisis, such as foreign threats and the spread of communism. In the introduction to *The General History of China*, Qian (1947: 7) wrote:

National history requires two conditions: first, the true cultural evolution of the nation has to be revealed. This serves as the essential knowledge for those who want to understand China's political, social, and cultural development. Second, it should categorise the problems appearing in history for people's reference. The former aims at identifying the sources of our national life and the driving force of our whole history; the latter points out the symptoms of the disease from which our nation is suffering, hence finding ways to improve the situation.

In his narrative, Qian made use of historical events, people and systems to reflect on China's current situation and support his own political views. For instance, in the 1930s, in response to the influence of ideas about representative government and proletariat dictatorship, Qian referred to the government institutions of the Tang dynasty, where he claimed checks and balance already existed to limit the power of the emperor, and the official system as recorded in history demonstrated its effectiveness in administering the state. As a result, according to Qian, representative government modelled on that of the West was unnecessary (ibid.: 13). In the same vein, he argued that capitalist and proletariat classes did not exist as, in traditional Chinese society, commercial activities were not popular and merchants were not powerful enough to exploit the poor. Hence, for Qian, the Marxist idea of revolution provoked by workers and peasants to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat was not applicable to China (ibid.: 19).

Qian emphasised the unique features of Chinese culture in order to counteract what he regarded as the improper influence of non-Chinese ideas. He intentionally focused on those parts of history which he thought could assist in promoting nationalism and patriotism, and at the same time reinforced a sense of cultural identity among the Chinese in the face of the Japanese invasion and the spread of communism. His ideas were influential in the 1930s and 1940s and, according to Hu (1988: 144), Qian's *The General History of China* had a significant effect on history students in Taiwan.

Qian fled to Hong Kong after the communist takeover in 1949, and in 1950 set up New Asia College,¹² which became one of the colleges of the Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1963. He was the Dean of the College for 15 years (1950–65), and his book *The General History of China* became, and still is, one of the most popular references for Chinese History students in Hong Kong. Some of Qian's students, including K. T. Sun and F. L. Wong, taught Chinese History in the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) and were authors of some of the earliest local Chinese History textbooks.

Post-1949 China

After the communists set up their regime in 1949, official historiography in China was initially based on Marxist-Leninism, and historical developments were ascribed to the operation of dialectic materialism and the class struggle. Plumb (1969: 87–88) criticises Chinese historians of this period for their indiscriminating application of generalisations drawn from Western experience:

Chinese historians, aided and abetted by Western students of their country, snatched at Western generalizations, particularly Marxist ones, and applied them to Chinese data. But this was rather as if the detailed concepts of advanced chemistry were used on a large quantity of freshly discovered biological facts. ... To apply these in any meaningful way to China on the data available was well-nigh impracticable. Once the traditional generalizations were removed, Chinese history collapsed into fragments. The narrative of dynasties remained, of course, but explanation vanished.

However, after the Cultural Revolution, China was more inclined to the cultivation of patriotism, nationalism and the market economy, and hence historiography became less concerned with tracing the operations of the ‘laws’ of Marxist-Leninist historical theory.¹³ Since the 1980s, Qian Mu’s work has been rehabilitated in historical studies in universities.

HISTORICAL EPISTEMOLOGY IN CHINA

The Nature of Historical Knowledge: Political and Ethical Issues in Confucian Doctrine and Innate Reflection as a Method of Explanation

In imperial China, the main concern of intellectuals was the contemplation of political-ethical issues, such as loyalty and filial piety, and any interests beyond that were considered subsidiary. In politics, the emphasis was on the affirmation of political ideals and principles, while in ethics it was on the issue of self-reflection in order to achieve high moral standards. The nature of reasoning about political-ethical issues was considered to be basically innate, and the innate understanding of individuals was the origin of all knowledge (Chiang, 1924: 53) — that is, epistemologically, the experiential world was interpreted through the Confucian doctrines. The spirit of positivism was largely ignored and, instead, intuition, imagination and empathy were used to acquire knowledge of historical events and the deeds of individuals. Consequently, in terms of epistemology, it was the ‘idealist’ school (Chou, 1993: 64–65), operating through narratives, which characterised Chinese historical study.

This view of historical knowledge leads to a method of explanation which is rigid and formulaic. For example, for individuals who want to achieve perfection in political-ethical issues, the following steps should be taken: investigate things (*ge wu*); extend knowledge (*zhi zhi*); be sincere in thoughts (*cheng yi*); and rectify the heart (*zheng xin*). In this way one can achieve the following ideals: cultivate individuals (*xiu shen*); regulate families (*qi jia*); administer the state (*zhi guo*); and stabilise the world (*ping tian xia*) (Chiang, 1924: 80–81). This kind of innate reflection implies that historical knowledge involves a subjective, spiritual or even transcendental state, based on insight of a unique and essentially personal nature (Feng and Chou, 1996: 79).

The Concept of ‘Holism’ in Knowledge and the Use of Narratives as a Method of Explanation

Since Chinese scholars in the imperial period considered it important to inherit and preserve Confucian doctrines, knowledge was conceived of as the comprehension and enhancement of the ideology of the sage, rather than as the generation of new, personal views. ‘Narrating but not interpreting history’ (*shu er bu zuo*) reflected Chinese historians’ perceptions of epistemology. As a result, traditional historians contributed little, if anything, to new knowledge. In this respect, the Chinese Studies Committee¹⁴ in Hong Kong, in reviewing the history of Chinese studies in China, commented on classical studies:

The person who could readily point his finger at the place in the Classics where a particular gem of knowledge was hidden was considered learned and well-informed. Thus, many Chinese scholars of the old school tended to regard perfection as residing in the past, and all they could hope for was to reach some degree of emulation. To them, therefore, the western idea of progress was a foreign conception; they were quite content with looking back to the glorious past. (Report of the Chinese Studies Committee, 1953: 2)

The features of epistemology in historical study in China were, therefore, manifested in the detailed narrative of events and individual actions. The decline and fall of a dynasty, for example, would be explained in terms of the incompetence of individuals such as emperors and courtiers. Structural, macroscopic perspectives — including such aspects as economic changes, social structure, and the interactive relationship between politics and the economy — were given little, if any, emphasis. In short, the characteristics of epistemology in traditional China were an individual’s innate understanding of issues, of which political-ethical issues were the main concern, and a concept of holistic knowledge, where Confucian doctrines were used to expound rather than to re-interpret.

HISTORY PEDAGOGY IN CHINA

The Imperial Period (Pre-1912)

In the mid-nineteenth century, a classical education based on the literary studies of the ‘Four Books’ (*Si Shu*) and ‘Five Classics’ (*Wu Jing*) was regarded as the key to achieving ethical refinement and to solving the practical problems of life. Moreover, as the main subject for the State Examinations, Confucian classics played a dominant role in education in imperial China. Hong Kong’s Chinese Studies Committee made the following remarks about the pedagogy of classical education:

As passages of the Classics had often to be reproduced during State Examinations, children were taught to *memorise* them as soon as they began their schooling — whether or not they could puzzle out their meaning did not matter at this stage. *This largely accounted for the centuries-old Chinese method of teaching — memorisation and recitation before excogitation — which served its purpose in the day when winning distinction in the State Examinations was the aim and ambition of most scholars.* (italics added)
(Report of the Chinese Studies Committee: 1)

Of course, learning by memorisation and recitation was not conducive to free expression and original thinking. Also, the situation became even worse in the Ming dynasty (1368–1644), when the standardisation of the public State Examinations (*‘Eight-leg system’*) led to an emphasis on the refinement of language rather than on originality of thought and content. In pedagogy, therefore, the emphasis was:

... in a piece of well-known Chinese literature — with harmonious rhythm, poetic phrases and many classical allusions and quotations, the very last word in beauty and elegance — often lacking in sincerity and at times amounting to very little, as ‘matter has become the slave of manner’. (ibid.: 2)

During the Qing dynasty, this kind of literary study continued until the mid-nineteenth century, when some Chinese scholars began to be concerned about its deficiencies and sought to find ways to enhance learning. In the late nineteenth century, for example, Zhang Zhidong advocated: ‘Let Chinese learning be the essence, and Western learning provide material efficiency’ (*zhong xue wei ti, xi xue wei yong*), and this principle became the basic educational policy of the time. ‘Let Chinese learning be the essence’ implied that, in pedagogy, the main concern was still the indoctrination of students in the Confucian classics. Hence memorisation and recitation of the ‘Four Books’ and ‘Five Classics’ continued to be predominant until the end of the Qing dynasty in 1911.

The Republican Period (1912–49)

The May Fourth Movement of 1919 promoted the use of colloquial style Chinese (*baihua*) to replace classical style Chinese (*wen yan*)¹⁵ as the medium of expression. At the same time, with the introduction of science and technology in the 1920s and 1930s, scholars such as Hu Shih began to challenge the didactics of classical Chinese. Although Hu's proposal 'I write what I speak' (*wo shou xie wo kou*) did facilitate the free expression of ideas, Confucian classics still played a major part in the curriculum, and straightforward indoctrination remained the dominant style of pedagogy. For example, during the republican period (1912–1949), the teaching of Chinese history was mostly confined to the understanding of orthodox history rather than its interpretation. When writing *The General History of China*, Qian Mu compared his work with that of 'the 24 Dynastic Histories',¹⁶ which reflects the high regard still given to orthodox history in general and the status of Confucian classics in particular. In brief, the major characteristics of the teaching of history in China were: the indoctrination of orthodox history in general and Confucian doctrines in particular.

Historiographical study in China is better understood in the context of its socio-political system and related cultural beliefs. Confucianism and imperial politics in China led historians to see history as a doctrine whereby views on individual events and important people were firmly established, and the function of history was thus geared towards providing exemplars to guide the behaviour of individuals. As the doctrines were generated from individual events and people, and each was narrated in great detail, positivist inquiry did not take root in traditional China. Correspondingly, pedagogy manifested itself in the transmission and memorisation of established knowledge rather than in interpretation based on evidence.

THE PRESENT STUDY

Following the analysis in this chapter of the major forces which have been seen to be influential in curriculum change, and the review of historiography in China, Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5 discuss the findings of the study. The study covers the period from 1945 to 2005, and the evolution of Chinese History has been divided into three conceptual phases related to its status within the school curriculum: emergence, consolidation, and crisis and opportunity. The first phase traces its emergence as an independent subject from 1945 until 1974, when Anglo-Chinese schools and Chinese middle schools followed the same CEE syllabus. The second phase, from 1974 to 1997 (the end of the colonial rule), was a period of consolidation for the subject, during which time it was not only able to secure its independent status against attempts to incorporate it into a new Social Studies subject, but also to become a common core subject for Form 1–3 (F1–3). In the

third phase, from 1997 up to 2005, Chinese History faced a period of crisis in which its independent status was threatened by the SAR government's proposed reforms to the curriculum, but successful attempts were made by the subject community to resecure its place as a separate subject in the school curricula.

Chapter 2 provides a context for the detailed discussion of the development of the Chinese History curriculum in subsequent chapters with a brief review of politics, society and education in Hong Kong, from its beginnings as a British colony up to the present. The chapter also traces the way in which Chinese History emerged as a separate subject and consolidated its independent status at all levels in both Chinese middle and Anglo-Chinese secondary schools, and discusses the part played by political and social forces. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 each focus on one phase of the development of Chinese History, and analyse three aspects of the curriculum: the curriculum development process, the curriculum aims and content, and the impact of the curriculum on teaching, learning and assessment. The decision-making processes of the respective subject committees are analysed, and the relative roles and degrees of influence of the government subject officers, academics and schoolteachers who made up the subject committees are identified in order to determine the dominant force(s) in the decision-making process, and whether the approach to curriculum development was centralised or decentralised. The material for the analysis of the curriculum development process was obtained from interviews with members of the subject committees, minutes of meetings and other primary and secondary documents.

The curriculum aims and content are examined in order to determine how and to what extent they reflect the views of officialdom and the socio-political background of the time. The main issues considered are: whether Chinese History was intended to give students a cultural or a national identity; whether it was to be a vehicle for developing critical thinking or for the inculcation of orthodoxy; whether the emphasis was on interpretation of events based on source material and reasoned argument, or on memorisation of factual accounts; and finally, how it might contribute to civic, moral, national and ethnic education. It should be noted that in the early phase (1945–74) the curriculum was mainly set out in the lists of topics contained in the examination syllabuses and textbooks, and the content of the curriculum and the scope of study reflected the parameters defined by curriculum developers. Following the issuing of teaching syllabuses from 1975 onwards, however, the aims, content, methods and assessment were more clearly delineated for teachers' reference.

The impact of the curriculum on teaching, learning and examinations is looked at in order to assess in what ways and how far the official curriculum was actually realised at the classroom level. This is done through an analysis of examination questions, marking schemes, examination reports and textbooks, as well as the perceptions of teachers and officials as recorded in committee meetings and interviews.

Finally, Chapter 6 summarises the findings of Chapters 2 to 5, and identifies the pattern of change in the development of Chinese History, as well as the various kinds of forces which have been instrumental in determining the nature and scope of the subject. The relative impact of each of these forces is assessed, and the findings are then discussed within the wider theoretical context established in Chapter 1.

Terminology¹⁷

This study uses the following terms:

- **'Chinese History'** refers to the school subject devoted to the study of the history of China — as distinct from the separate subject 'History'. Chinese is used as the medium of instruction and assessment.
- **'History'** refers to the school subject that comprises topics from both Western and Asian history, and is studied and assessed through either English or Chinese.
- **'history'** refers to the discipline of 'history', or 'history in general', rather than a school subject.
- **'Anglo-Chinese schools'** are schools using English or a mixture of English and Chinese as the medium of instruction, while using English for assessment. Since 1998, with the enforcement of the new medium of instruction policy, the 114 remaining Anglo-Chinese schools have had to adhere to using English as the medium of instruction and assessment for all subjects other than Chinese and Chinese History.
- **'Chinese middle schools'** are schools using Chinese as the medium of instruction and assessment for all subjects other than English.
- **'Marking schemes'** are the point-reward-basis marking criteria used for CEE Chinese History.
- **'Orthodoxy'** refers to the historical views prescribed in the official dynastic history: 'the 24 Dynastic Histories'. The views were Han-centred, moralistic and geared to consolidating the rule of the current dynasty. 'The 24 Dynastic Histories' was later taken as the 'blueprint' for the interpretation of dynastic histories.
- **'Cultural History'** as specified in the Chinese History curriculum includes the following aspects: institutions, economic development, intellectual thoughts, examination systems and external relations. 'Traditional Chinese culture' specified in the aims of the curriculum refers to a homogenous vision of the culture of China's majority Han nationality.
- **'Political History'** is synonymous with dynastic history in that the history of the imperial courts, in particular the deeds of emperors and other key persons, is the main focus of study. It is not political history in its Western sense. The historical views of the dynasties are based on the state orthodoxy compiled in 'the 24 Dynastic Histories'.

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. The *Spring and Autumn Annals* covered the history of the period from 722–481 BC. There have been disputes among historians as to whether the author was Confucius.
2. Culture can be divided into spiritual culture and material culture. The former refers to the political and moral disciplines of the nation (or race), where loyalty and filial piety were the essence of the ideology. Material culture refers to, for example, four inventions in particular (the compass, gunpowder, paper-making, and movable-type printing), as well as art, science, technology and literature. Historically, culture in China has been taken as identified with the culture of the Han race.
3. At different times, Tu Weiming makes use of different ideas to reinterpret Confucian thoughts. According to him, 'moralism' and 'rationalism' are among the many ideas he has used to interpret Confucian thinking. See Tu, 1999: 19–38.
4. He Bingdi suggests the use of 'humanism' to interpret Chinese culture (see He et al., 1998: 73–102).
5. Tu Weiming specifies the relationship between political legitimacy and Confucian studies through an illustration of the interpretation of Confucian thoughts by political leaders such as Lee Kuan Yew, Jiang Zhongheng and Jiang Zemin.
6. Orthodoxy refers to the views prescribed in 'the 24 Dynastic Histories'.
7. 'The 24 Dynastic Histories' were histories of the imperial dynasties, or more precisely histories of the imperial families. Altogether there were 3249-*juan* (thread-bound volumes, usually containing a much shorter text than a volume in modern book publishing).
8. The Six Classics are: the *Book of History*, the *Book of Odes*, the *Book of Changes*, the *Book of Rites*, the *Book of Music* and the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. These six books are Confucian classics which followers of Confucianism must read and abide by.
9. In 1935, the *Education Journal* in China (vol. 25, no. 5) published an issue on 'Experts nation-wide express views on classical studies'. Various views were given, but the majority were in favour of including classical studies in primary and secondary schools since they represented the essence of Chinese studies and could serve as the medium to promote moral education.

10. In the *Education Journal* (1941, vol. 31, no. 11), renowned historians expressed their views on the aims of history education in the face of the Japanese invasion. Qian Mu, Chen Lifu, Li Dongfang, Miao Fenglin and others stated that history education should aim at promoting patriotism and nationalism.
11. The book was compiled from Qian Mu's lecture notes when he was teaching in Peking University. He placed great emphasis on the role played by intellectuals during adverse periods in history.
12. According to 'The History of the History Department, New Asia College' (K. T. Sun, 1983), New Asia College was established 'to enhance the study of Chinese culture'.
13. For example, in the history syllabus issued in Beijing in 2001, the aims of history teaching do not include the law of 'class analysis'.
14. The Chinese Studies Committee was appointed by the government in 1952 to make recommendations on Chinese Studies in Hong Kong. It is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.
15. Confucian classics were all written in classical style Chinese, which had a highly condensed vocabulary and refined literary style.
16. Qian Mu used the chronological approach when writing *The General History of China*. His main reference was taken from 'the 24 Dynastic Histories'. See *The General History of China*, 1947: 1.
17. Hong Kong, Mainland China and Taiwan all have distinct transliteration systems, and therefore names that appear in the study are translated according to the relevant system. For Cantonese names, initials are used for the first names (e.g. K. C. Au).

CHAPTER 2

1. The main riot which took place in Kowloon on 10 October 1956 was a conflict between the KMT and CCP. On 13 October, the Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai expressed to the British ambassador in Beijing his dissatisfaction with the Hong Kong government's treatment of the KMT members in the riot. Some KMT rioters had been arrested. See *Hong Kong Pictorial History*, Hong Kong: Tai Dao Publishing Limited, 144.
2. *Hong Kong Hansard*, 1950: 41, cited in Lau, 1982: 36.
3. In April 1966, a protest against a rise in Star Ferry fares led to riots which included looting and arson. Also, in 1967, when the Cultural Revolution reached its height in China, communist unions in Hong Kong took the lead in labour disputes and later broadened the disputes into an anti-colonial administration movement. Order was restored at the end of 1967.
4. For Anglo-Chinese Schools, Chinese History became an independent subject in 1956 (F6–7), 1960 (F1–3) and 1965 (F4–5). For Chinese middle schools, it was in 1962 (F1–3), 1965 (F5) and 1967 (F4–5).
5. Reported in *Sing Tao Evening Post*, 30 September 1973.
6. Reported in *Workers' Weekly*, 17 September 1973. 'Peiping' is a term referred to by the national government and/or KMT. 'Beijing' is used after the establishment of the PRC in 1949.
7. Front page, *Oriental Daily*, 7 March 1975.
8. Louise Mok, Principal Inspector, Social Studies and P. S. Chan, Senior Inspector, History.

9. Reported in *Oriental Daily*, 8 March 1975.
10. The views were expressed by Dr Y. S. Yu and Dr C. I. Tang, both professors at New Asia College of the Chinese University of Hong Kong which was founded by Qian Mu, a rightist.
11. In 1982, 1984, 1985 and 1986, when there were disputes between China and Japan, there were newspaper articles discussing the lack of instruction on contemporary Chinese history in local schools.
12. Feature article, *Wen Wei Bao*, 22 June 1975.
13. Junior secondary Chinese History syllabus, CDC, 1982: 22.
14. Minutes of the CEE Chinese History subject committee, 28 May 1984 and 28 January 1986.
15. Minutes of the CEE Chinese History subject committee, 25 February 1987 and 29 April 1987.
16. This document was found in the press cuttings file, Advisory Inspectorate, dated 15 October 1990.
17. There were editorials and joint declarations from university teachers attacking Wong's recommendation.
18. Reported in *Ming Pao*, 8 July 1994.
19. Reported in *Wen Wei Bao*, 26 September 1996.
20. F1–3 Chinese History syllabus, CDC, 1997: 8.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Hong Kong Economic Journal*, 8 January 2000. The author was K. H. Yip, a Chinese History professor in the Hong Kong Baptist University.
23. For example in the 'Rationale for Development' it states 'Hong Kong, as a SAR of China and an international financial centre, is in need of a new generation of residents who possess an enhanced sense of national identity and cultural understanding as well as a global perspective. Elements of learning in the contexts of Chinese history and culture need to be strengthened in the curriculum as early as possible in all types of schools' (*Learning to Learn*, Consultation Document, CDC, November 2000: 4). Also, in the 'Summary', it states: '... included Chinese History elements as essential contents for learning', *ibid.*: 18).
24. The aim is stated in the Association's homepage <http://www.hktache.org>, translated from Chinese.
25. Members of the Society's preparatory committee included 10 Chinese History panel chairs, three vice-principals, three teachers and nine lecturers from the tertiary institutions.
26. The results of the survey undertaken by the Association revealed that more than 90% of teachers thought that a comprehensive national history education could enhance students' national identity and that Chinese History should become a core course for junior secondary students.
27. *Learning To Learn*, Consultation Document, CDC, November 2000: 42.
28. Y. F. Sum, *Ming Pao*, 20 April 2000.
29. Hong Kong Teachers' Association of Chinese History Education, reported in *Da Gong Bao*, 28 November 2000.

CHAPTER 3

1. Since the minutes of meetings before 1969 are not available, the percentage is based on the attendance at meetings held in 1969–71.
2. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 18 March 1969.
3. Letter sent to the Chairman of the CEE Chinese History subject committee, 19 May 1969.
4. I cannot identify any curriculum guideline for F1–5 when Chinese History became an independent subject in 1960. From the textbook written by K. L. Wong in 1963, the syllabus ran from the pre-historic period (~2100 BC) to 1945.
5. *Recommended History Guidelines for 5-year Chinese Middle Schools*, ED, 1962: 2–3.
6. In the 1958 CEE examination syllabus (English), it specified that the syllabus was to match the A-level requirement. In 1965, the Chinese middle schools set up a five-year curriculum. In 1967, when Chinese History emerged as an independent subject in the CEE (Chinese), the examination handbook set out that it matched CUHK's entrance requirements.
7. It should be noted that D. C. Lam headed the History section in which Chinese History was subordinated to History. He had not studied Chinese History at university.
8. Anglo-Chinese schools examination syllabus, 1965: 13.
9. Ibid.
10. CEE (English) examination syllabus, 1966: 12.
11. Here the 'Yuan Empire' was a derogatory term that indicated the invasions by Mongols. For those dynasties administered by the Han race, the word 'empire' was seldom used.
12. Annual Reports (1968–74), Examination Section, ED.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. The examples included have been referred to in the official curriculum.
16. Marking scheme, CEE (English), ED, 1971.
17. Ibid., 1973.
18. CEE (English) question, 1970.
19. This topic was listed in, for example, K. L. Wong's textbook, Book 5: 13.
20. K. L. Wong (1963) *Chinese History*, Book 5, Hong Kong: Wang Fung Books, 15; and Sun K. T. (1965) *Chinese History*, Book 3, Hong Kong: Everyman's Bookstore, 45.
21. Ibid.: 35 and 47.
22. K. T. Sun (1960) *Chinese History*, year 2, Hong Kong: Everyman's Book Company, 8–14.
23. Y. C. Chan (1972) *Chinese History*, part 2, Hong Kong: Ling Kee Publishing Company, 171–72.
24. CEE (English) question, 1972.
25. Marking scheme, ED, 1972.
26. K. T. Sun (1960) *Chinese History*, year 4, first term, Hong Kong: Everyman's Book Company, 11–12.
27. Interview with L. Y. Chiu.
28. The A-level focused on remote periods of history (~1122 BC to 1911), which matched the expertise of staff, not a single one of whom specialised in modern Chinese history. Information about the course can be found in the University's calendars 1956–74.
29. *Chinese History for Anglo-Chinese Schools*, First Form, First Semester, Everyman's Publishing Company, 1960.
30. H-level syllabus, 1967–74.
31. Interview with L. Y. Chiu.

32. The analysis starts from 1956 because in that year the A-level Chinese History emerged as an independent subject.
33. A-level examination syllabuses, 1956–74, and H-level examination syllabuses, 1965–74.
34. In view of the absence of data on the A-level during this period (the syllabus only specified the time-frame and aspects of content to be examined, without referring to any events or people), only the H-level syllabus is referred to as a source of data.
35. H-level examination syllabus, 1965.
36. The subjects listed for students' rating were Chinese Language, Mathematics, Chinese History, World History and English.

CHAPTER 4

1. An introduction to Chinese History teaching, internal document, Advisory Inspectorate, ED, undated.
2. Chinese History syllabus (F1–3), CDC, 1975: 3.
3. *History Bulletin*, No. 5, ED, 1979: 68.
4. Chinese History syllabus (F1–3), CDC, 1975: 3 and 1982: 6.
5. *Ibid.* (1982: 6).
6. *Ibid.*: 19.
7. *Ibid.*: 16.
8. *Ibid.*, 1975: 32.
9. Curriculum circular, No. 21, Chinese History, CDI, ED, 1993: 12.
10. *Ibid.*: 15.
11. Syllabus for Chinese History, F1–3, CDC, 1975: 3.
12. Syllabus for Chinese History, F1–3, CDC, 1982: 6.
13. *Ibid.*: 13.
14. *Ibid.*: 18.
15. *Ibid.*: 26.
16. *Ibid.*: 30.
17. *Ibid.*: 31.
18. In the Yuan dynasty, there was prejudice against the Han race in appointing officials.
19. Chinese History syllabus (F1–3), CDC, 1975: 32.
20. *Ibid.*: 31.
21. Chinese History syllabus (F1–3), CDC, 1975: 38.
22. *Ibid.*: 35.
23. Four questions would be set from the Shang dynasty to the Ming dynasty (~1600 BC–1643). Another four questions would be set from the Qing dynasty (1644) to 1976.
24. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee, 23 May 1983.
25. Chinese History syllabus (F4–5), CDC, 1990: 7.
26. Reported in *South China Morning Post*, 6 June 1989.
27. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 11 October 1996.
28. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 7 December 1996.
29. Chinese History syllabus (F4–5), CDC, 1990: 11.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Chinese History syllabus (F4–5), CDC, 1990: 6.
32. *Ibid.*: 11.
33. *Ibid.*: 15.

34. Ibid.: 12.
35. Ibid.
36. Chinese History syllabus (F4–5), CDC, 1990: 6.
37. All Chinese History textbooks contained similar narratives, e.g. *Chinese History* (1993), Book 4, Everyman's Book Company, 124 and 126; *Chinese History* (2000), Book 2, Hong Kong Educational Publishing Company, 32 and 72; and *Chinese History* (2000), Book 2, Modern Education Company, 28 and 78.
38. Report of the Chinese History seminar (F4–5), ED, 1998: 9.
39. Mong (pseudonym), *Wen Wei Bao*, 22 July 1980.
40. Ibid., 17 March 1981.
41. W. C. Liu, *Ming Pao*, 2 April 1986.
42. Reported in *Ming Pao*, 5 November 1994.
43. S. S. Yung (a Chinese History teacher), *Economic Journal Newspaper*, 21 August 1984.
44. Report of a survey in *Oriental Daily*, 19 November 1982.
45. Cho Fung (pseudonym), *Economic Journal Newspaper*, 1 March 1985.
46. Reported in *South China Morning Post*, 10 June 1990.
47. CE reports, 1980–97.
48. Ibid.
49. Y. H. Cheng, *Economic Journal Newspaper*, 31 July 1982.
50. *Young Post*, 13 May 1986.
51. Flora Kan (Lecturer, HKU), *Hong Kong Standard*, 30 May 1990.
52. Marking scheme, Chinese History (CEE), 1981.
53. Ibid., 1991.
54. Jennifer (pseudonym), *Sing Tao Yat Po*, 13 August 1989. This article was kept in an ED file and marked 'Distribution AD (CIS)' which reflected that officials did pay attention to the views expressed in the article.
55. Chinese History syllabus (F1–3), CDC, 1982: 6.
56. Chinese History syllabus (F4–5), CDC, 1990: 6.
57. Permitted teacher (pseudonym), *Ming Pao*, 27 July 1988.
58. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 11 October 1996.
59. The question was set in 1970, 1973, 1975, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1991, 1994, 1996, 1998 and 1999.
60. This was the 1983 CEE marking scheme. There was no major difference between this one and those that appeared in different years.
61. *Chinese History*, Book 3, Ling Kee Publishing Company Limited, 1983: 171–73.
62. *Chinese History*, Book 3, Everyman's Book Company, 1980: 174.
63. The question was set in 1972, 1976, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1987, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1997 and 2000.
64. Marking scheme, CEE, 1987.
65. Chinese History syllabus (F4–5), CDC, 1990: 6.
66. Ibid.
67. A-level subject committee minutes, 30 October 1979.
68. Members from schools, if they had graduated from HKU, were mostly Chiu's ex-students.
69. For example, the meetings held on 23 September 1982, 24 September 1985, 30 September 1986 and 10 October 1987 were at HKU's Chinese Department.
70. All students were to follow a two-year sixth form programme. CUHK could no longer offer a four-year degree course.

71. Minutes of meeting, A-L subject committee, 30 September 1986.
72. Examination regulation and syllabus, A-L, 1994: 152.
73. 'History education', in Wong H. W. (1993) *Secondary School Curriculum Development*, Hong Kong, Commercial Press, 153.
74. Interview with L. Y. Chiu.
75. The HKEA officer (1979–93) C. N. Leung told me that letters sent to schools aimed at notifying them of the proposed changes to the existing curriculum. As expected, very few schools responded to the letter.
76. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (H-level), 7 November 1980.
77. Chinese History syllabus (A-level), CDC, 1992: 6.
78. *Ibid.*: 14–15.
79. *Ibid.*: 16.
80. *Ibid.*: 15–16.
81. K. Y. Law, *Wen Wei Bao*, 8 July 1996.
82. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (H-level), 6 October 1987.
83. K. Hung, *Ming Pao*, 14 March 1986.
84. It should be noted that the question format of the A-level was different from the CEE. In particular, A-level tended to ask more 'evaluation' questions, and hence illustrative examples were far fewer than in the CEE.
85. Examination question, A-level, 1986 and 1987.
86. *Ibid.*, 1986 and 1992.
87. H-level and A-level examination reports, 1980–89.
88. Examination question, H-level and A-level, 1989.
89. Examination question, A-level, 1988.
90. *Ibid.*, 1997.

CHAPTER 5

1. The report of the questionnaire survey on the revised syllabus of the F1–3 Chinese History, CDC, 1997.
2. Reported in *Wen Wei Bo*, 17 January 1997.
3. Chinese History syllabus (F1–3), CDC, 1997: 16. The Chu state and the Han state were at war. Chu's Xiang Yu was defeated by Han's Liu Bang. Xiang committed suicide in the Wu river.
4. Chinese History syllabus, F1–3, CDC, 1997: 22. Shi Jingtang was a non-Han. At that time there were territorial conflicts between the Han and the non-Han people. The objective might imply that the 'nation' was taken as the Han's nation and hence even the non-Han people should put the interests of the Han as their top priority.
5. C. W. Chan, *Wen Wei Bao*, 1 February 1997.
6. Editorial, *Sun Pao*, 24 February 1997.
7. Survey report on the revised Chinese History syllabus (1997), CDC, paragraph 3.2.2.
8. Chinese History Teaching Series, Humanities Section, CDI, ED, vol. 5: 3.
9. *Chinese History*, Book 2, Modern Education Publishing Company, 2000: 83–88.
10. *Ibid.*: 12.
11. *Chinese History*, Book 4, Everyman's Book Company Limited, 1997: 179, 211. *Chinese History*, Book 4, Ling Kee Publishing Company Limited, 1998: 165, 196–98.

12. Terminal examination paper, F2, 1999, Confucius Hall Middle School.
13. *Chinese History*, Book 1, Manhattan Press (HK) Limited, 1999: 44.
14. *Ibid.*: 106.
15. *Ibid.*, Book 2, 16.
16. *Ibid.*: 21.
17. *Chinese History*, Book 2, Hong Kong Educational Publishing Company, 2000: 20, 25; *Chinese History*, Book 2, Modern Education Publishing Company, 2000: 18, 20; *Chinese History*, Book 4, Everyman's Book Company, 2000: 13, 17; *Chinese History*, Book 4, Ling Kee Publishing Company, 1998: 50, 108 and 111.
18. C. F. Kwan, previously editor of Chinese History textbook, Modern Educational Publishing.
19. School A, F1 final examination, 2000.
20. School B, F2 mid-term examination, 1999.
21. School A, F1 mid-term examination, 2000.
22. School C, F2 mid-term examination, 1998.
23. School D, F1 final examination, 2000.
24. School E, F1 final examination, 1999.
25. Textbooks incorporating the official charts of moral and civic values include, for example, Hong Kong Educational Publishing Company, 2000, Modern Education Publishing Company and Manhattan Press HK Limited, 1999.
26. S. W. Lau, K. W. Wong, W. H. Siu and W. Y. Chung.
27. For example, *Chinese History*, F4, Manhattan Press (HK) Limited 1997: 146; *Chinese History*, F4, Everyman's Book Company Limited 2000: 122; *Chinese History*, F3, Hong Kong Educational Publishing Company, 2000: 108.
28. *Chinese History*, F4, Manhattan Press (HK) Limited 1997: 192; *Chinese History*, F4, Everyman's Book Company Limited 2000: 152; *Chinese History*, F3, Hong Kong Educational Publishing Company, 2000: 144.
29. *Chinese History*, F 3, Manhattan Press (HK) Limited, 1997.
30. *Chinese History*, F3, Everyman's Book Company Limited, 1997.
31. *Chinese History*, F5, Ling Kee Publishing Company Limited, 1999.
32. This part is taken from Kan and Vickers, 2002: 80–81.
33. *Chinese History*, F. 3, Manhattan Press (HK) Limited, 2000: 163.
34. These six schools were: Schools A, C, E, F, G and H.
35. *Chinese History*, Book 2, Modern Education Publishing Company, 2000: 85.
36. S. W. Lau, K. W. Wong, W. H. Siu and W. Y. Chung.
37. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 12 October 1994.
38. Reported in *Wen Wei Bao*, 3 April 1998.
39. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 11 February 1995.
40. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 20 September 1997.
41. Recommendation of the 2001 CEE Chinese History examination syllabus, minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 13 January 1998.
42. Minutes of meeting, Chinese History subject committee (CEE), 15 September 1999.
43. Senior form Chinese History Teaching Series, CDI, 2000: 6.
44. *Ibid.*
45. Reported in *Apple Daily*, 7 April 2000.
46. *Chinese History Curriculum and Assessment Guide (F4–5)*, CDC-HKEAA Joint Working Group, 9.

CHAPTER 6

1. This was recorded in *The Spring and Autumn Annals* (see Chapter 1).
2. See Appendix III, IV and V, Report of the Chinese Studies Committee, ED, 1953: 54–55.
3. This was the case especially after the June Fourth Incident in 1989. In the early 1990s there was a massive increase in emigrants seeking overseas passports.

Index

- academic curriculum 6, 144
- administrative absorption of politics 26, 171
- Advisory Inspectorate 31, 53, 79, 113, 150, 157, 159
- A-level 49, 60–1, 70, 74, 76–7, 103–5, 110, 139, 145–6, 158, 165–6
 - Chinese History subject committee 101–2, 107, 160
 - Chinese History syllabus/curriculum 71, 72, 150
 - Examination 73, 75, 106, 108–9, 143, 159, 161
- Anglo-Chinese school 22, 24, 34–7, 53, 56–60, 62–3, 84, 89–90, 156, 158, 166
- apolitical 7, 26, 31, 34, 50
- AS-level 101–7, 145–6, 150, 166

- Basic Law 28–9
- block marking 81, 129–30
- Brown, A. G. 37–9, 54

- CEE 35, 37–8, 41, 49, 55, 60–2, 64–5, 67–8, 76–7, 82, 96–7, 100, 102, 108, 124, 130–3, 135, 137, 139, 143, 145–6, 151, 157, 160–1, 167
 - Chinese History subject committee 54, 81, 90, 150, 158–9, 162, 165
 - Chinese History syllabus/curriculum 22, 44, 89, 94–5, 98, 129, 166
- Chen Duxiu 17
- Chen Zhili 47, 50
- Chinese Communist Party (CCP) 11, 26, 31, 37, 61, 139, 145, 156
- Chinese History's chronological approach 38, 57–8, 60–3, 77, 92, 95, 110, 121, 134, 141, 147, 152, 156
- Chinese History's curriculum development process 23, 50, 77, 82, 110, 113
 - CEE 53, 79
 - H-level, AS-level, A-level 70, 101
- Chinese History's independent status 2–3, 22–3, 33–4, 49, 51, 113, 134–6, 141, 149–52
- Chinese History Educators' Society 45, 47, 49
- Chinese History subject community 3–5, 23, 43–4, 48–51, 53, 65, 77, 79, 83, 113, 133–7, 140–1, 145, 147–9, 151–3
- Chinese Middle School 34, 37, 66, 74
- Chinese Studies Committee 1, 20–1, 36, 56, 76, 156, 163, 166
- Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) 18, 70–2, 77, 101–6, 110, 150, 158, 160
- classical style Chinese (*wen yan*) 22, 156
- Clementi, Cecil 34
- colloquial style Chinese (*bai hua*) 22
- colonial curriculum 11, 146, 168
- colonialism 2–4, 8–10, 12, 50, 91, 145–6, 167, 169–70, 173–7
 - collaborative 147–8
- Confucius 13–4, 106, 142, 155

- Confucianism 14, 22, 93, 107, 155
 contemporary history 40–1, 43, 61, 72, 77, 81, 95, 101, 103, 106, 108, 145
 core subject 13, 22, 32, 40, 43, 140
 Crozier, Douglas 56
 culture 1, 3, 8–10, 12, 33, 36, 45, 48–9, 53–4, 57, 68–9, 71–2, 79, 90, 96, 98, 100–1, 103, 106, 113, 118, 121, 132, 134–5, 147, 157, 169–70, 172, 174–5
 Chinese 11, 13–4, 18, 24, 34, 39, 40, 44, 77, 84, 86–7, 88, 92, 105, 107, 111, 115–7, 127, 136, 139, 141, 143, 156, 173, 178
 nature of 155
 cultural history 24, 36, 40, 58, 60–3, 76–7, 80, 84, 86–7, 89–90, 92, 98, 103, 106, 110, 111, 115–6, 121, 127, 136, 139, 142, 147, 173
 cultural imperialism 2–3, 8–11, 168, 177
 Curriculum Development Committee 31, 171
 Curriculum Development Council 31, 150
 Curriculum Development Institute (CDI) 46, 49, 80, 86, 113–5, 120, 131–5, 150, 159, 161–2
 curriculum reform 44–5, 51, 79, 103, 110, 113, 133, 137, 140–1, 149, 174
 Cultural Revolution 19, 38, 41, 81, 97, 146–7, 156
- data-based question 82, 101–2, 105, 143
 decolonisation 2–4, 7–8, 12, 101, 140–1, 145–6, 149, 171, 176
 decontextualised 62, 70, 74–5, 77, 101, 110, 120, 128, 139–40, 147–8, 153
 depoliticised 11, 13, 31, 62, 70, 74–5, 77, 101, 110, 139, 140, 147–8, 153
 Director of Education 31, 43, 46, 56, 81
 dynastic history 15, 24, 38, 40–1, 50, 58, 60–5, 71–2, 76, 80–1, 84, 86–7, 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 101, 106, 108, 110, 115, 120–1, 127, 134, 147
- Education Commission Report 33, 102, 104, 165, 168
- Education Department 1, 5, 39–40, 46, 80, 83, 140–1, 166, 177
 Education Ordinance 31
 end-date 37, 41, 81, 84–5, 90, 101–2, 106, 116, 120, 140, 145, 147
 epistemology 4, 19–20, 142
 Everyman's Book Company 99, 121, 123, 158, 160–2, 167
 evolution of the status of Chinese History 22, 35
 emergence 22, 34–5, 53
 consolidation 22, 34, 38, 79
 crisis and opportunity 22–3, 44–5, 50, 113, 136–7, 141
 examination syllabus 23, 54–5, 63–4, 67, 70–1, 73, 76, 89–91, 101, 105–6, 130–1, 150, 158–9, 162, 166
- Fehl, Noah 66–7, 73, 170
Five Classics 21
Four Books 21
 Four Seas Publishing Company 100
- Grantham, Alexander 26
 guidelines 32, 109, 173
 teaching 37, 55, 57–61, 63, 68, 83, 92, 120, 143, 158
- Han-centred 3, 24, 57, 59, 64, 68, 70, 73, 75–6, 86, 88, 92–3, 98, 100, 104, 107, 109–10, 111, 115–6, 121–2, 128, 136–7, 139, 142–4
 historiography 4, 13–7, 19, 22, 38, 59, 105, 142, 145, 169
 History and Culture 49, 134
History as a Mirror 15
 H-level 61, 70–7, 101–10, 139, 146, 150, 158–9, 161, 165–6
 Home Ownership Scheme 28
 Hong Kong Educational Publishing Company 123, 126–7, 160, 162, 167
 Hong Kong Examinations Authority (HKEA) 31, 49, 70, 80–2, 89–1, 97, 101, 102, 104, 108, 110, 114, 129, 130–1, 133, 135, 150, 161–2, 166

- Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers 5, 42, 45–6, 48
- Hong Kong history 44, 77, 80–3, 103, 115, 119–20, 127–8, 136–7, 139–40, 146, 173–4
- Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) 1–3, 12, 23, 27–9, 33–4, 44, 50–1, 114–5, 128, 133, 141, 148–9, 152–3, 157
- Hong Kong Teachers' Association of Chinese History Education 48
- Hong Kong University (HKU) 54–5, 70–2, 77, 79–80, 101–5, 110, 150, 160
- Hu Shih 17, 22
- identification 145, 147
 China/national 46, 50, 115, 118–20, 125–7, 134, 136–7
 cultural 40, 92, 146
- identity 1, 5, 23, 34, 145, 150, 169, 174, 177
 Chinese/national 2, 7, 13, 32–3, 39, 44, 46–7, 49–51, 57, 65, 77, 96, 128, 140, 143, 148–9, 157
 cultural 17, 18
 Hong Kong 12, 26, 136
- June Fourth Incident 27, 30, 42–3, 126, 163
- Key Learning Areas (KLA) 45, 47–8, 134–5
- Kuomintang (KMT) 11, 26, 31, 37, 125, 139, 145, 156
- Li Ka Shing 28
- Liu Zhiji 14–5
- Ling Kee Publishing Company 66, 99, 121, 123, 126, 158, 160–2, 167
- linked dot and line approach 114
- macro-level 4, 8, 145
- Manchus 59, 68–9, 73, 88–9, 93, 100, 110, 116, 121–2, 124, 132, 143
- Manhattan Press 126–7, 162, 167
- marking scheme 41, 67–9, 81–2, 97–8, 100, 129, 131, 158, 160
- mass education 6, 9–10, 140, 144
- May Fourth Movement, 17, 22, 119, 125
- meso-level 4, 6, 8, 145
- micro-level 4, 150
- Middle Kingdom 36, 68
- model answers 67, 94, 108–9
- Modern Education Publishing Company 100, 123, 126–7, 160–2, 167
- Mongols 59, 64, 68–9, 73, 88, 92–3, 99–100, 110, 116–7, 119, 121–2, 136, 143, 158
- moral and civic education 114–5, 117–8, 122, 124–5, 128, 137
- moral exemplars 13, 15–6, 71, 92–3, 139, 142, 144
- moralizing 15, 71, 76, 92, 101, 111, 142–3
- nation-building 2, 6, 115, 149, 175
- National History 18, 45, 47, 49, 145, 157
- nationalism 10, 18–9, 35, 119, 142, 145, 156
- New History 45, 49, 91, 133–4, 137, 141, 151
- New Senior Secondary Curriculum 33, 49, 135, 149
- non-Han race 59, 64, 68–9, 73, 75, 93, 107, 110
- official historians 13, 15–6, 59
- One China policy 44
- one country, two systems 27–8, 115, 149, 153, 168–9, 172, 175–6
- Opium War 36, 38, 108, 125–6
- orthodoxy 14–5, 23–4, 59, 93, 101, 111, 142, 155
- Patten, Chris 43
- patriotism 2, 18–9, 77, 118–9, 148, 156, 169
- pedagogy 4, 21–2, 139, 144, 170
- People's Republic of China (PRC) 2–3, 7, 26–7, 29, 31, 37, 40, 42–3, 47, 50–1, 77, 81, 119, 126, 139–40, 146–7, 149, 153, 156
- Personal, Social and Humanities Education (PSHE) 45, 47, 91, 134–5, 137, 141, 151
- point-reward-marking 81–2
- Policy Address 1, 32–3, 44, 165
- post-colonial education 2, 12–3
- Principal Officials Accountability System 29

- Professional Teachers' Union (PTU) 5, 39, 45
project-based 140, 143
provisional syllabus 82–6
- Qian Mu 17, 19, 22, 70, 74, 156–7, 175
- Records of History* 15–6
rote learning 31, 73–4, 93, 95–6, 144
- School Based Curriculum 32, 48, 135, 141
Sima Guang 14–5
Sima Qian 14–6
Six Classics 15, 155
Social Studies 8, 22, 38–40, 81, 83, 140, 144, 152, 156, 174, 178
Spring and Autumn Annals 13, 142, 155, 163
Syllabus and Textbook Committee 37, 55, 150
- teacher association 5, 45, 47, 49–50, 136–7, 141, 145, 152–3
- teaching syllabus 23, 40, 57, 63, 82–6, 89–90, 93, 103–6, 115, 146, 166
temporary syllabus 83–6
Tenant Purchasing Scheme 28
Textbook Review Committee 82, 103
The 24 Dynastic Histories 15–6, 22, 59, 76, 85, 89, 106, 111, 139, 142–3, 155–6
The General History of China 17–8, 22, 156, 175
The General Meaning of Literature and History 15
theme-based 71–2, 103, 105
Tung Chee Hwa 1, 27, 32, 44, 48
- utilitarian 4, 144
- world history 36, 45, 47, 56–7, 66, 81, 159, 169–70
Wright, George Bateson 34
- Zhang Xuecheng 15–6
Zhang Zhidong 21