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Studying the 1967 riots:
An overdue project

Ray Yep and Robert Bickers

The 1967 riots are understudied, but the events which began in May 1967 in Hong Kong led within a year to 51 deaths, 4,500 arrests, and a campaign of bombings which threatened to destabilize the colony. What began as a strike at an artificial flower factory became a major anti-colonial movement led by local leftists, which was eventually countered by a full range of emergency and security measures instituted by the colonial administration. The press and the education system became areas of conflict, and the impact of the events spilled over into Sino-British relations more broadly, and to outbreaks of violence in London, Shanghai and Beijing. By any objective standards this was a major crisis. However, while the public memory of the event is still alive, the public representation of these months of conflict is muted — there is little mention of them in the Hong Kong Museum of History, and most works on post-war history of Hong Kong allocate no more than a few pages on this subject.¹

Despite the paucity of analysis, accounts of the event contrast sharply. Notwithstanding the poor working conditions and appalling state of welfare provision in Hong Kong during the 1960s, John Cooper argued that ‘whatever the causes of this unrest were, they could in no way be sufficiently sound to justify the “reign of terror” which was to characterize the daily life of the Colony throughout the long summer of 1967’.² His indictment focused on the violence of the political campaign instigated by the communists who started ‘with the assumption that the Colony would bend under pressure as easily as Macao had done’.³ Cooper’s view finds resonance in an unexpected source; Jin Yaoru, a local communist boss in charge of propaganda work in the 1960s, voiced similar views on the influence of external sources on the unfolding of disturbances almost three decades later. In his book on Chinese Communist Party’s Hong Kong policy, he argues that the anxiety of the local party leadership to prove its loyalty to the radical movement in Beijing was the main impetus behind the campaign.⁴ Hong Kong’s 1997 reunification with China seems to have emboldened a segment of the left-wing camp to talk about the events, and more work on the issue has been published in recent years.
Gary Cheung’s collection of interviews with several key players in the communist camp adds further ammunition to Jin’s argument. While not disputing this basic argument, the account by Zhou Yi, former deputy chief editor of *Wen Wei Po*, provides a more nuanced analysis of the involvement of leftists in the confrontation. By contextualizing the event against the background of the unabated persecution of leftist organizations and individuals by the colonial administration in post-war Hong Kong, Zhou portrayed the turbulence simply as an explosion of anger fuelled by grievances at the persecution endured by the communist sympathizers over the years, and the violence unleashed as self-defence in the face of colonial ferocity. On the other hand, with the benefit of access to the now-open Foreign Office files, Liang and his colleagues have made a very important contribution to the general understanding of the matter by bringing in the views of the British and colonial governments. Based on the official records of communications between London and Hong Kong during that period, their analysis offers invaluable access to the thinking and calculation of the ‘British’ side and thus constitutes an important supplement to the various left-wing accounts mentioned above.

This project is a response to the renewed interest in the 1967 riots. Despite the ‘mini-boom’ in publications on the event over the last few years, most analyses remain journalistic or partisan. This book aims at revisiting two fundamental questions. First, what had really happened during the riots? By this, we do not mean simply the chronology of events (which is well documented) but aim at uncovering the dynamics and logic of the interaction between the different parties concerned. Second, we wish to explore the importance of these events. Were they a turning point in Hong Kong history or is that an exaggeration? Was it really a legitimacy crisis, just a storm in a colonial teacup, or a test as argued by former colonial officials? ‘How fatuous the whole thing was,’ reflected former governor Sir David Trench in 1987, ‘[t]here was no issue between us and the people who were rioting except that they wanted to riot and we didn’t want them to.’ So, do they in fact belong to the obscurity that has mostly enveloped them? Were the social reforms of the post-riots years simply inevitable even without the turbulent explosion in 1967? We aim here to look beyond narratives of confrontation and the parochial dimensions of the event by placing our analysis in a wider context. We conceive the events in 1967 in a wider historical perspective and focus on how the previous experience of local disturbances in the colony had shaped and influenced its responses and perceptions of the challenge faced in the 1960s. We also try to place the analysis in the wider context of the late British Empire as the unfolding of events was determined not only by the concerns and anxiety of the colonial state during the Hong Kong emergency, but also by calculations of the British government that concern higher national interests, such as the diplomatic relationship with China, and strategic imperial planning.

In the following sections, we will present an overview of the main concerns of this collective effort. Specifically, the contributors intend to uncover four major
issues in our analysis: historical continuities and the potency of the China factor, the importance of the riots, the capacity of the colonial state, and the relationship between the colony and the sovereign power. Before we proceed to this discussion, three key points about the background of the events need to be elucidated.

**Heroes or villains?**

First, we need to consider whether it is appropriate to use the term ‘riots’ to describe what happened in 1967. The Hong Kong and British governments quickly adopted ‘confrontation’ as their formal term for the events that unfolded from May 1967 onwards. The prisoners’ issue, which continued until 1972, was usually referred to in Foreign and Commonwealth Office parlance as one concerning ‘confrontation prisoners’. We might understand more fully the response of British official minds if we remember that they viewed the events at the time as a ‘confrontation’, that is, a formal contestation of British power, involving popular internal as well as external forces. The related term that was used, though less frequently, was ‘emergency’. This had practical and technical consequences. ‘I believe that it would be wise,’ suggested General Sir Michael Carver, Commander-in-Chief Far East, after his visit in July 1967, ‘to recognize that Hong Kong faces a situation which, although not styled as such, is in effect an emergency, and to adjust the methods of all concerned accordingly.’ When debating the colony’s response to the escalating bombing campaign in September 1967, diplomat Sir Arthur Galsworthy sketched the comparative experience of ‘previous emergencies elsewhere’, in ‘the Malayan, Kenyan, Cyprus and Aden Emergencies’, and in Rhodesia for good measure. Hong Kong was, after all, one colony amongst others. Using the contemporary term would help focus attention on the wider context of the events, and help their placing within that broader context of late British Empire history and popular contestations of British colonial rule. Whilst there were clearly unique aspects to the 1967 events, such as its relationship to the Chinese Cultural Revolution, there were also commonalities in the response of the British to the situation which might be argued to help us better understand the events if we move away from the commonly used term.

The term ‘riots’ is, however, more commonly adopted by the local population in Hong Kong in both Chinese and English (and it is how retired British officials often label it). Publications relating to the events are catalogued under ‘Riots, 1967’ in the Hong Kong University Libraries, while they are usually indexed under ‘Riots’ in histories of Hong Kong. The term, ‘riots’ (baodong), carries negative connotations of violence, wantonness and destruction, as it does in English. Notwithstanding the leftist coinage, *fanying kangbao* (‘anti-British and anti-violence campaign’), is commonly used by that camp and it characterizes leftist action as justifiable acts of self-defence against colonial oppression. The collective memory of the event as ‘riots’ reflects widespread popular contempt and condemnation of the disturbances...
that took place in 1967. Chinese public opinion was clearly on the side of the colonial administration in 1967. More recently, the public outcry provoked by the government’s decision in 2001 to award the Grand Bauhinia Medal to Yang Jiang (Yeung Kwong), the former chair of the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions, is illustrative of this general sentiment. Many people who had gone through the long summer of 1967 found it hard to accept the bestowal of such an accolade on someone who presided over the All Circles Anti-Persecution Struggle Committee, the body nominally in charge of all left-wing activities during that period. In reality, the events of 1967 alienated the left-wing from the local society and drove it into marginality. For much of Hong Kong popular opinion these were ultimately ‘riots’. Xu Jiatusn, who came to Hong Kong to take over the post of director of the New China News Agency in 1983, recalled that ‘when I first arrived, some local cadres told me that after the riots, there was a general fear of Chinese officials in Hong Kong. Local people even dared not go into Chinese product department stores. Our cadres had to hide their official affiliation. Most people treated us with contempt and called us the leftist (zuozi) behind our back.’13 The title of this volume includes both key terms, riot and emergency, with neither privileged. In the chapters, however, except where used in quotations, the contributors mostly use the term ‘riots’. This should not be taken to indicate that we agree with this characterization of the events above any other; rather, adoption of this term simply reflects our respect for the sentiment of the generation who have witnessed the episode, and the resilience of the label in popular usage.

A Crown Colony

Hong Kong was part of Britain’s contracting imperial patrimony. It is in fact easy to forget that Hong Kong was a colony, and that it was one amongst others, however uniquely placed (while the overall number of colonies was steadily shrinking).14 It was, as John Darwin notes, a ‘most unusual colony’ on a number of counts, but there were few, if any, territories which matched the ideal template, and while we might agree that it was more unusual than most, the literature has for too long neglected to examine Hong Kong in its wider colonial context.15 Two moments at which the colony might have reverted to Chinese rule — in 1945 and in 1949–50 — passed without incident, and it seemed that it was a colony which could not be shaken off.16 Nobody wanted it ‘back’. Meanwhile, in the decade preceding 1967, thirty British colonial territories had secured independence; the Gold Coast, Kenya, Straits Settlements, Nigeria, Cyprus, Western Samoa and Jamaica were among those states from which the British had withdrawn. The process continued: in summer 1967 an inglorious and bloody endgame was being played out in Aden.17 The Colonial Office itself had been so denuded of its charges that it was merged with the Commonwealth Relations Office in 1966, and its increasing administrative overlaps with the Foreign Office presaged the merger of the two into the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in
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October 1968. Nonetheless, Hong Kong remained a colony, with an administration recognizable ‘instantly as “British”’, as Wm Roger Louis notes, and it was both a product of its colonial history and of its complete integration into the formal apparatus of colonial rule (not least the circulation of staff). It was also integrated into the informal and insidious world of colonial assumptions and attitudes, not least about White British relations with non-white peoples.

Hong Kong’s 1967 trial thus took place within the active sphere of British colonial policymaking, strategies and history. Its leading officials were men who had served in colonial administration across the world, and had done so during the heyday of the British Empire. Governor Sir David Trench was the Indian-born son of an engineer. His colonial service career had begun twenty-nine years before May 1967, and he had served in the Solomon Islands and in Hong Kong. Colonial Secretary Michael Gass first served on the Gold Coast in 1939, and thereafter in Gold Coast/Ghana, the West Pacific and in Hong Kong. Philip Rogers, who chaired the Cabinet’s Defence Review Working Party on Hong Kong, joined the Colonial Office in 1936, serving in Jamaica as the governor’s private secretary. Trench and Gass may have adapted themselves and their assumptions to the realities of cold war Hong Kong, but they brought to their posts, as did many of their more junior officers, assumptions and experiences from elsewhere in the pre-war and post-war empire. This was not simply a matter of administrators and their attitudes, but was fully structural. Georgina Sinclair’s account of late-colonial policing, for example, places the Hong Kong police firmly within this networked and circulating colonial world.

We also need to remember that, as on many other occasions in Hong Kong’s past, there were divergences and disagreements between British colonial policy and diplomatic policy. There were also discrepancies between the viewpoints of the Hong Kong colonial government and those of the British embassy in China. The former was par for the course of metropolitan/colonial relations within the British Empire. Men on the ‘spot’ administered their territories within the realms of practical local politics, balancing central instructions and requirements with realities (as they saw them) on the ground (and they usually felt that they saw them rather more clearly than the men behind desks in Whitehall). Hong Kong was not alone in having an administration which could frustrate London’s instructions and evade its requirements. The latter situation — which prompted what were in effect at times competing and contradictory foreign policies with central or regional power in China — was more unusual. The Foreign Office line was always ultimately the dominant one, and the diplomats were consistent in their efforts to remind the Colonial Office that British China policy was only partially concerned with Hong Kong.

The Hong Kong emergency also took place in other contexts — in the Chinese Cultural Revolution, and the Cold War, and it took place while the experience of the establishment of the People’s Republic was still fresh in planners’ minds — British firms and interests, and British nationals had effectively been held hostage as the
new regime took over the Chinese economy and drove out foreign interests. It also took place as the colonels consolidated the April coup in Greece, the Wilson government applied to join the Common Market on 11 May, Israel launched the six-day war on 2 June, the Federal Army mutinied against the British in Aden later that same month, and the Biafran war began in July. Hong Kong struggled to keep a place in UK headlines over the year. A bomb or two is news, but 1,778 of them were a statistic that failed to maintain the headlines in the face of such competition. British policymakers had a wide range of issues to confront in early 1967. More widely, although Harold Wilson’s first government had asserted a commitment to maintain a strong British military presence in the ‘East of Suez’, longer-term thinking about Britain’s world role and the economics of his second term were forcing the radical rethink that was to lead to the January 1968 announcement of the intention to withdraw forces from Southeast Asia and the Gulf. As the workers at the San Po Kong Artificial Flower Factory clashed with the Hong Kong police, the British state was intensely discussing how far its responsibilities should stretch.

No dinner party in Hong Kong

Regardless of the causes of the confrontation or its labels, the disturbances which started in 1967 were strikingly violent. Table 1.1 provides a succinct account of the intensity of violence during this turbulent period.

The disturbances started as a labour dispute in an artificial flower factory in Kowloon in April 1967. The row between police and the defiant factory workers on 6 May marked the beginning of violent confrontation. The intervention of the communist-dominated Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions two days later signalled the politicization of the events. The turning point, however, was the involvement of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 15 May 1967. A protest statement was passed to the British chargé d’affaires in Beijing, which was followed by anti-British demonstrations in the capital and in Guangzhou, accompanied by sympathetic editorials in the People’s Daily. The local leftists took note of these developments and formed an All Circles Anti-Persecution Struggle Committee (Gangjiu guojie tongbao fandui gangying pohai douzheng weiyuanhui) in Hong Kong the next day. This heralded the full-scale mobilization of local communists into the territory-wide anti-colonial campaign.

The leftists pursued the campaign with a multi-front approach. The struggle after May 1967 entailed the following.

Demonstrations. This was the most common tactic deployed in the early stage of the events. Union members, students and supporters were called to the street to make their voices heard. Thousands of protesters were mobilized to challenge colonial authority by rallying outside the Governor’s House in mid-May 1967. Such gatherings of left-wing supporters outside government premises and court houses
Table 1.1
Statistics of disturbances in Hong Kong, 11 May 1967–1 June 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casualties</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killed</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prisoners</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>4,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property damage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ammunition expended by police</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of occasions</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of ball</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ammo. used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bombs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explosions</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True bombs</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoax bombs</td>
<td>4,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False alarms</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNA, FCO 40/53, Serial No. 115, June 1968.

clutching the Little Red Book in their hands characterized the first two months of the confrontation.

Strikes. A ‘general strike’ was called in late June with more than twenty trade unions responding to the appeal. While the impact of the four-day event was less significant than leftists’ expectations of it, the strong presence of left-wing unions in transport services and public utilities (see Table 1.2) suggests that their actions caused considerable interruption of normal life.

Propaganda. Propaganda was a key battlefield between communists and the colonial administration during the confrontation. For left-wing activists, the nine pro-Beijing newspapers in Hong Kong provided moral support and encouragement, ammunition against imperialism, cues for action and major means for mobilization and propaganda. These titles, with daily circulations totalling more than 400,000, contributed about a quarter of the total newspaper circulation in Hong Kong. The papers were flooded with rhetorical attacks on the ‘atrocities and repressions’ of the colonial government and with personal abuse of the governor, Sir David Trench. They reprinted editorials and articles from People’s Daily, and the leftist’s
Table 1.2
Staff position of public transport and utility companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public utility company</th>
<th>Strength prior to disturbance (A)</th>
<th>Number dismissed after strike</th>
<th>Strength by the end of 1967 (B)</th>
<th>(B)/(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Star Ferry</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong and Yaumati Ferry</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Tramways</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Motor Bus</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowloon Motor Bus</td>
<td>7194</td>
<td>4907</td>
<td>4505</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Electric</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Light and Power</td>
<td>2745</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong and China Gas</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNA, FCO 40/52.

interior interpretation of the confrontations. Chinese members of the Hong Kong Police Force were singled out by the communist press for a consistent propaganda barrage. Intimidating messages warning Chinese personnel not to be the ‘running dogs’ of the British appeared regularly. In addition to the orthodox press, many ‘mosquito’, ‘underground papers’ were published by left-wing groups after the colonial administration tightened its squeeze on the communist papers in August.

**Bomb attacks.** The leftists resorted to a more radical armed strategy in the form of a campaign of bombing when large-scale arrest sweeps of radicals by police began in July 1967. While most of these ‘bombs’ were hoaxes, there were still nearly two thousand genuine bombs or attempted attacks. Government premises, police stations and public utilities were common targets of these incidents, but civilians were not immune to these threats. Normal life was severely affected and the colony was shocked by the death of two young girls as a result of an explosion in North Point on 21 August. The effectiveness of such tactics as leverage for the struggle against the colonial government is debatable, but it undoubtedly aroused a great deal of resentment from the general public, and perhaps more than anything indicated the alienation of the left from the populace and its general impotence. This wave of terrorism gradually faded out by the end of 1967.

**The China threat.** The most potent weapon available for the leftists, however, was the threat of a potential takeover of the colony by China. Local communists suggested throughout the campaign that they had clear and full endorsement of Beijing for their radicalism in Hong Kong. As a matter of fact, although Beijing’s involvement was evident, it is debatable whether or not the local campaign was fully orchestrated by the Party centre. However, editorials in the *People’s Daily*, mass rallies in major cities, financial donations to local trade unions and the Chinese Foreign Ministry’s diplomatic pressure on the British camp were illustrative of
high-level support for the radicalism in Hong Kong. The attack on the premises of the British Mission in Beijing by the Red Guards on 22 August 1967 was a naked act of retaliation against the Hong Kong government’s decision to close down the operation of three communist papers in Hong Kong. However, it was the clash at Sha Tau Kok in July 1967 that put the confidence of local population on the edge of collapse. The conflict between several hundred Chinese residents and Hong Kong police in the border on 8 July resulted in the deaths of five policemen and the mobilization of British military force.

The colonial administration under Governor Trench responded with no less determination. While observing a restrained approach in handling the crisis in the early weeks and hoping that the tension would soon subside — ‘We tried to do it softly, softly,’ he later reflected, ‘... without capitulating,’ more assertive measures were deployed as it became evident that the disturbance had the capacity to persist for a protracted period. Once clearance from London was granted, levers of state coercion were fully utilized in combating the radicals. The administration used a combination of new regulations and old-style force to strike hard at the leftists. The strategy involved the following components:

Raids of communist premises and arrest of left-wing leaders. As part of the strategy of disrupting the co-ordination of leftist activities, the police force resorted to large-scale arrests of trouble-makers through raids on communist premises. Based on intelligence provided by the Special Branch, searches of the offices of trade unions, communist schools and cinemas became more frequent after early July 1967. The most dramatic episode was the raid on the Qiaoguan Building in North Point on 4 August, where the alleged headquarters of the leftists was housed. Backed up by military force, teams of policemen landed at the roof of the building from helicopters and crashed into the premise. Members of the All Circles Anti-Persecution Struggle Committee were specific targets of these raids. Many were arrested in follow-up action and detained in the centre at Morrison Hill for interrogation.

Emergency legislation. The colonial government also brought in further emergency legislation to combat the rioters. These legal devices imposed new restrictions on activities such as making inflammatory speeches and displaying relevant materials (such as banners and posters), possession of dangerous goods and offensive weapons, and assembly. These measures widened considerably the powers of police to combat the emergency, but their immediate and their longer-term repercussions for civil liberties and the rule of law were evident.

Banning of pro-communist papers. Communist newspapers were always seen as the major pillar of the left-wing campaign, and Trench was determined to take the initiative in this area. After intensive exchanges with London, five editors and publishers of three pro-communist newspapers, Tin Fung Yat Po, Hong Kong Evening News and Afternoon News, were arrested on 9 August. The three papers were eventually suspended for six months and three of the prosecuted were sentenced to three years’ imprisonment.
Closure of communist schools. Local communists had established a strong hold in local education in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, given the colonial administration’s general reluctance to involve itself in social welfare provision. The government certainly found little comfort in such development and a drive to close down schools without proper registration, many of them left-wing schools, was launched in the early 1960s. The ‘problem’ of Chinese state or party-affiliated education was one of long-standing within British Asian possessions. The fear re-emerged during the confrontation in 1967. An internal report of the colonial government in late 1967 reiterated that ‘there is evidence of sustained and intense communist and subversive indoctrination’ within communist-controlled schools. In the evening of 27 November, an explosion was heard from Chung Wah Middle School. An injured teenage student was found with one hand and three fingers lost. The police found explosive powder and chemicals suitable for bomb-making as well as evidence of other explosions on the premises. Consequently, six people were arrested and the director of education closed the school until 15 August 1968. Other communist schools were raided and searched in the following weeks and more than a hundred students and teachers were detained and arrested.

Militarization of the response. British soldiers played a mainly back-up but nonetheless key role in confronting rioters during the riots. However, their presence had a key role in maintaining public confidence. For many, it was an important sign of British commitment to the colony. At the time of the disturbances, there were approximately four thousand British troops and five thousand Gurkhas in the territory. As disturbances proliferated, the original plan for reduction of British forces outlined in the ongoing Defence Review was reversed. Instead, a further Gurkha Battalion arrived in late June 1967. The British battleship, HMS Bulwark also visited Hong Kong in May 1967 as a further gesture of commitment. In the use of combined and co-ordinated police and military force against the leftists lay one key to the success of the clampdown, but it was the loyal effectiveness of the police, and their garnering of widespread public support that maintained the important civilian character of the administration’s response to the events.

‘Winning hearts and minds’. Propaganda warfare is a common counter-insurgency activity as was demonstrated in the Kenyan and Malayan emergencies in the 1950s and 1960s. A publicity committee headed by the deputy colonial secretary was formed in the early weeks of the disturbances. Both Hong Kong and London agreed that a more permanent base for ‘psychological operations’ was necessary in order to co-ordinate the efforts of Radio Hong Kong, the Government Information Department, the police, and other departments. Themes stressed in the materials disseminated by these units included the damaging effect of the Cultural Revolution on China and the importance of stability for the Hong Kong economy. The Hong Kong Government Office in London initiated a new programme to ‘project the image of the Hong Kong government’ in the ‘right perspective’ to the Chinese community in Britain and more widely in Europe. The operations and effectiveness
of the psychological warfare remain unexplored, yet it is undeniable that there was popular support for the colonial government during the riots, especially after the commencement of random bomb attacks by the leftists. Contemporary observers were not slow to assert that the government had failed in the ordinary course of events to communicate effectively with the population. Its public image needed a makeover.38

This sketch of the strategies deployed by both sides in the struggle outlines the tensions faced by the local population during the riots period and the interruption to social order they experienced. The unfolding of events is, however, primarily a reflection of the interaction and contestation between domestic and external forces that had a major stake in maintaining or reversing the status quo of the colony. The objective of this exercise to revisit the history of the 1967 riots is thus not simply to produce a more detailed narrative of the events; instead, the task here is to provide a more nuanced understanding of the nature of colonial rule in Hong Kong. To elucidate the point, let us look at the several issues that are central to the analysis in this volume.

**Historical continuity and relevance of the China factor**

‘Policy makers are heirs before they are choosers’, Richard Rose has argued.39 Colonial governors learnt from their predecessors when it came to handling emergencies and contingencies, and there were also striking similarities in the perimeters of policy options between crises. As revealed in the chapter by Georgina Sinclair in this book, the circulation of personnel between colonies and centralized imperial thinking on specific issues such as policing models contributed to establishing common approaches to handling crisis and thus forging certain connections between historical episodes. Historical continuities can be expressed in temporal terms as well. John Carroll’s comparison between the strike boycott of 1925–26 and the 1967 riots is illustrative of such an approach. The most obvious parallel uncovered in his chapter is the potency of the China factor and the extent to which events in mainland China could affect the colony. Carroll argues that despite the local social, economic and political conditions in the 1920s and 1960s, both disturbances could not have occurred without extensive support from within China. For the 1967 riots, the respective analyses of Wong and Yep also show how local developments resonated with the rise and fall of radical factions in Chinese politics. Radicalism in China and its spill-over appeared to be the regular source of instability in the colony, and return to normality in Hong Kong eventually came when the mainland government chose a change of direction. For colonial administrators, crisis management in the colony always needed to commence with informed guesswork about China’s intentions. Bickers’ chapter in this volume demonstrates how the confrontation in Macao, the so-called ‘12.3 Incident’, which happened six months before the outbreak of violence in Hong Kong, shaped the
course adopted by the colonial administration during the 1967 riots. The humiliation of Portuguese authorities in Macao shaped the template of British strategic planning for the colony and the cost of indiscriminate concessions to the communists was, as a result, deemed unacceptably high by segments of the policy community.

The historical continuity of the relevance of the China factor in colonial governance is demonstrated not only in the form of the ‘export of revolution’ or of violence, but also in terms of frameworks of reference used by Hong Kong people as well. Despite emotional attachments to the motherland, the mainland alternative also denoted instability and political radicalism in local eyes. The general uneasiness with the latter concerns, as uncovered by Carroll and Yep’s analyses, ironically helped to reinforce colonial rule in Hong Kong during the crisis period. For people who lived through the 1967 riots, the choice of loyalty between the motherland and an alien rule was made easier in the face of the political reality of chaos and fanaticism in the Mainland. Perversely, troubles in China may have reinforced general contentment with, or acquiescence in, the second best option open to Hong Kong’s populace: stable alien rule. This was one key to colonial governance in the territory and was central to the success of the colonial administration in securing public support on both occasions in the 1920s and 1960s. Basic services were maintained during the strike period as a result of the volunteer activity of many local people. Tung Wah Hospitals also provided a food service that helped minimize the impact of the disturbances. David Trench achieved no less a success in mobilizing social support in the 1960s. Hundreds of social and community organizations pledged support for the government during the first week of the events. ‘This support for the colonial government during both disturbances certainly reflected the concerns to preserve order and, especially in the case of the business and professional elites, class interests’, Carroll contends. The enthusiasm of Shouson Chow and Robert Kotewall during the 1920s and the loyalty of the Executive Council to the governor during the riots certainly confirmed such view. For these elites or the local community in general, the status quo, no matter how imperfect it was, was still more preferable to the alternative scenario of violence and uncertainty. After all, this was the reason why many had fled to the colony from the Mainland in the relatively recent past.

**Capacity of the colonial state**

A standard characterization of the colonial authority until the late 1960s is of a ‘minimal state’. As Ian Scott argued, ‘for much of its history, the activities of the colonial state in Hong Kong did not serve to distinguish the territory from other tropical, backward, disease-ridden, barely self-sufficient imperial acquisitions’. Implicitly, therefore, Scott notes that it was, as it on the whole was, a fairly typical colonial state in terms of how it perceived its remit to engage with and shape local society. Indifference and distance were regarded as defining characteristics
of governance of the colony. The resolve of the colonial state to posit itself as a proactive administration was further tested by the challenges to its legitimacy from the Chinese Communist Party across the border. Consequently, there was a general sense of insecurity and incomprehension concerning local society among colonial officials. Leo Goodstadt has suggested that officials ‘never felt completely secure in their authority and were never entirely free from the fear that the public might desert them’.41 The chapter by David Clayton in this volume certainly confirms this image of an indifferent, distant state. His analysis shows that despite growing pressure from London, colonial administrations under Robert Black and David Trench persistently declined to take concrete action to regulate industrial relations before the riots.

The reluctance to penetrate and engage with local society, however, should not be taken as equivalent to weakness. Comments of senior colonial officials deriding the riots as a ‘storm in a teacup’ as documented in Wong’s chapter may be an exaggeration, yet the colonial state’s success in withstanding the 1960s storm is vivid proof of its tenacity and capacity. As revealed by Catherine Schenk’s contribution, the colonial authority’s ability to maintain public confidence in financial institutions provided another key to its survival during this stormy period. Its fiscal strength also allowed uninterrupted support for the propaganda and law enforcement teams to counteract leftist activities. The colonial state also demonstrated its coercive capacity during the confrontations and its ability to call on wider imperial force. As described in Sinclair’s chapter, its experiences in handling earlier disturbances turned out to be a blessing in disguise: the local police was well prepared for the task and performed admirably in disrupting the leftist network, arresting ringleaders and raiding communist premises. Reinforcement of the British garrison certainly helped maintain the confidence and morale of the police, yet it was the effectiveness and loyalty of this local civilian force that held the key to eventual success in containing the disturbances. Nonetheless, the events of 1967 prompted a rethink in the ongoing Defence Review discussions about the level of military commitment to be made to the colony. As a result, initial plans were changed and forces were redeployed permanently to Hong Kong from Southeast Asia (notably Royal Air Force helicopters and the Brigade of Gurkhas). It is tempting to see this significant enhancement of the military presence, especially when combined with the turn to a more proactive state, as representing nothing short of a formal re-occupation of the colony, one which lasted until the 1997 handover. The survival of the colonial state did not simply hinge upon its coercive capacity alone, however. In fact, the alien authority also demonstrated its symbolic capacity in winning the trust and support of local people during the confrontation. Gregor Benton has shown how the government’s representative office set out, with some success, to engage systematically with the Chinese population in Britain, and build effective ties with community organizations.42 For residents of the colony and their confreres
overseas, as Carroll points out here, colonial rule ultimately was preferred as the law and order option against the political fanaticism and chaos offered by the leftist alternative. Such support, however passive in nature, did lay down foundations for the perpetuation of colonial rule.

Nevertheless, the most salient feature of the strength of the colonial state was revealed by its capacity to reform and revitalize itself after the riots. Unlike previous post-crisis reforms, such as the inclusion of Chinese members on the Executive Council after the strike-boycott of 1925–26 and the aborted proposals of the Young Plan in the aftermath of the Japanese occupation, the changes introduced after the riots were much more comprehensive and drastic. The so-called ‘MacLehose years of social reforms’ witnessed fundamental changes in policy concerning public housing, education, workers’ rights, and medical services. They indicated a departure from the previous position of detachment and heralded a more proactive approach of colonial governance. Smart and Lui argue, however, that these changes are not merely responses to the crisis of the riots. For the British, the main lessons of the confrontation in 1967 were the vulnerability of Hong Kong and the dim prospects for British rule over the territory beyond 1997, these authors contend. Thus, they believe that when MacLehose took up his office, the governor found it important to boost public confidence and to secure hegemonic leadership before China raised questions concerning the future of Hong Kong. The social reforms were therefore part of the preparation work for the forthcoming negotiations with the Chinese.

**Importance of the riots**

Regardless of the motivation behind these social reforms, the 1967 riots have always been seen by many as the turning point of the history of colony. Ian Scott, for example, argues that the disturbances ‘illuminated the weakness of the system and pointed to the need for change . . . and that a new political order and a new basis of legitimacy were urgent requirements’. Authors in this book, however, offer a different view. The major argument forwarded by Smart and Lui is that while consenting to interpretations of the nature of the 1967 riots as a catalyst for social reforms in the 1970s, they contend that the changes in the aftermath of the event actually only make sense in the context of previous disturbances and the challenge that they posed to colonial authority. The MacLehose reforms were, therefore, products of reflections on the merits and demerits of various responses to a long list of challenges to the colonial regime: the Kowloon Walled City incident (1948), the Tung Tau Comfort Mission riot (1952), Double Ten disturbances (1956) and the Star Ferry riots (1966). Whereas the 1967 riots were seen as being externally provoked, all these confrontations stemmed from local problems that needed to be addressed and showed the limitation of responding with stop-gap measures. These incidents also exposed the vulnerability of the administration to local frustration and the necessity of capturing active support if the regime was to survive.
Clayton’s work challenges the conventional wisdom that claims the 1967 riots as the turning point from another angle. Using the case of labour law on the eight-hour working day for women, Clayton argues that while the mass protests in the 1960s did provide ammunition for some benevolent bureaucrats in Hong Kong and London to circumvent business opposition to reform and justification for policy shift, the radicalism of 1967 failed to prompt fundamental change in the attitude of those who opposed state regulation of the economy. For the progressives, the year 1967 revealed workers’ frustrations and signs of market failure, yet for the pragmatists, the fear of social revolution soon receded in the aftermath of the riots. For some, the loss of credibility of left-wing unions may have even emboldened their opposition to reforms as well. The ‘watershed’ argument probably needs to be refined.

**Relationship between the colony and the sovereign**

Scholarly works have highlighted the autonomy enjoyed by the colony, and argued that the governors were not always subservient to their superiors’ opinions in London. Bickers’ previous work reveals the Foreign Office’s irritation with Hong Kong’s pursuit of local diplomacy with the Guomindang authorities between 1917 and 1927, which directly defied London’s instructions to Hong Kong to communicate with China only through the Legation in Peking or the Consul at Canton. Colonial governors had also demonstrated repeated stubbornness in adeptly resisting reform initiatives from London when they found the latter’s proposal inconvenient. Miners’ case study of the abolition of *mui tsai* system, a disguised form of slavery, uncovered how local administration could defuse and resist the pressures and efforts of two foreign secretaries and the British parliament. Goodstadt attributes this ‘informal devolution’ to the remoteness of Hong Kong issue from the mainstream of British politics as the relevance of Hong Kong faded with the rapid shrinking of British Empire in the post-war period, but this is a common feature in colonial governance.

Essays in this volume suggest that central to the dynamics of the relationship between the colony and the sovereign is their respective interpretation of ‘British interests’. For the colonial governor, effective governance in the territory was the primary interest of the British Empire in Hong Kong. London, however, did not always concur. From time to time, the colony appeared to be dispensable in the light of larger strategic interests. Carroll’s chapter reveals that there were occasions during the interwar years when British officials had considered surrendering Hong Kong as a gesture of British goodwill in the face of rising Chinese nationalism. Contributions by Bickers, Schenk and Yep in this volume also reveal that evacuation was an option seriously contemplated by London during the early weeks of the confrontation in 1967. Yep’s chapter further refines the analysis by bringing in the tension between British diplomats in Beijing and the colonial administration. The mandate to maintain a ‘foot in the door’ in China and vulnerability in the face of
violence prompted the diplomats in the British Mission in Beijing to propose a more accommodating approach in handling the disturbance in Hong Kong, whereas David Trench firmly believed in using a more confrontational style for preserving British interests. As Bickers and Yep suggest, British officials were convinced that this was the approach which would best bypass the slippery road to a ‘Macao-style’ scenario. London acted as the final arbitrator of the contrasting views during this period. While the colony’s analysis might have prevailed during the most turbulent months of violent confrontation, the concern of diplomats in preserving Sino-British relationship resumed primacy once signs of Communist China’s desire for normalcy were on the horizon.

Conclusion

This volume is not a definitive account of the 1967 events. There are clearly lacunae in our analysis. Firstly, given our reiteration of the importance of contextualizing Hong Kong developments in the frame of Cold War politics, an evaluation of the role of the United States in the unfolding of events in 1967 is imperative. London’s decision to withdraw from ‘East of Suez’ and its subsequent reduction of the British military presence in the Far East further enhanced the relevance of the American factor in the strategic thinking of the British government towards Hong Kong. For the communists, the response of the Americans — the leading imperialist power and a ‘special friend’ of the British Empire — towards the crisis in Hong Kong was certainly a factor to be considered as well. The Taiwan factor should also be further explored. Secondly, the role of Beijing in the disturbances in Hong Kong warrants more in-depth analysis. Interviews with left-wing leaders conducted by Wong and others have provided some valuable access to their partisan views of the origin of the event, yet more archival research is essential. The selective opening up of the 1950s and 1960s archives of the Chinese Foreign Ministry may herald a possibility for further research. In addition, Red Guard activities in Guangdong also warrant a re-examination given that party activities in the colony came under the jurisdiction of the provincial party organization. A deeper knowledge of the PLA activity in the province would also be valuable. Thirdly, the general mood of the local population before the riots remains unexplored. Cathryn Clayton’s current work, which is based on the oral testimony of events in Macao and Hong Kong in 1966–67, will provide new insights here. The official conclusion that the events of 1967 were simply a political provocation by the communists might overlook domestic causes of these social disturbances. It was, claimed William Heaton, ‘a good place to start a revolution’, owing to its social disequilibrium.46 As Smart and Lui have further pointed out in this volume, the colony had gone through a series of confrontations in the post-war years and these should make us ponder the general frustration with the colonial regime on the eve of the 1967 riots. While our focus
here is on urban Hong Kong, we trust that more research in future will be carried out to explore the course and impact of the events on the New Territories. The border territories were indeed the site of a number of important events and it is our hope that Benton’s work exploring the impact of the events in London’s Chinatown can be further developed to help us better understand how overseas Hong Kong people responded to the crisis in the colony.47

We have grouped the chapters into three sections. The first section explores the actions of the main actors in the unfolding events: the Hong Kong leftists, the Hong Kong government, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and Beijing. These chapters discuss such issues as the evolving strategies adopted, the debates and disagreements about those strategies, and the decisions that needed to be made. The chapters also locate the angry days of 1967 in the longer-term history of Hong Kong and Sino-British relations, and more widely, British late colonial history. The second section analyses specific policies that were carried out both before and during 1967. The essays here explore the legacy of the events in social policy, housing, and labour policy. In the third section, we have included transcribed testimonies of a number of ‘witnesses’ to the events. They had personally experienced the confrontation as adults, or as children, and reflected on the events for us at the 2007 conference. They joined our public forum and shared with the audience their accounts of the events after forty years. Their input provides us with an important supplement for our analysis — testimony to the emotion unleashed by this turbulent period in the 1960s. A systematic study of the state of mind of the local population is, however, required for a more refined understanding of the impact of the events and the ways in which they have shaped Hong Kong society and politics since. In retirement, British administrators such as Trench or Arthur Maddocks (Trench’s political advisor from 1968) argued for the ‘storm in a teacup’ view, and claimed that it was ‘a rather curious sequence of events’ (Maddocks), a ‘fleabite’ (Trench), one which really ought to embarrass those concerned and really should not be taken seriously. ‘They wanted to riot,’ said Trench, ‘and we didn’t want them to.’48

We hope that this book has instead demonstrated that the May days of 1967 and their impact on the 1960s should be taken more seriously. The events have not been explored widely in the last forty years, and we hope that in this book we have provided new questions and a new research agenda for the study of colonial rule in Hong Kong.
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