

shocking news of how the political situation was playing out on the mainland, and how it dealt with the resulting internal and external shocks to the Hong Kong Government.

Part 2 takes the author's book, *May Fourth in Hong Kong: Colonial Scenario, Nationalism and Localism*, as its focal point. In it, the author attempts to elucidate how research into the May Fourth Movement in Hong Kong was based on discourse which viewed the periphery from the center. This discourse has its origins in a self-serving view of history (*daguo shiguan* 大國史觀) that took shape under the influence of political factors that came into being during Hong Kong's return to Chinese control in 1997. By looking at related research, we are able to get a sense of how China's internal fluctuations were able to critically affect Hong Kong's political development. Some of these fluctuations led to instantaneous knock-on effects within Hong Kong society, while the effects of others were nipped in the bud through the stringent control of the Hong Kong government. Nevertheless, in addition to being on the receiving end of these aftershocks that emanated from mainland politics, it is not hard to see how the relentless spread of China's cultural orthodoxy from its locus in Beijing out into the periphery had grown to encompass Hong Kong, so much so that Hong Kong had also become an ideological battleground for the domestic political struggle between left and right.

In addition to shaking off the received narrative of the May Fourth Movement in Hong Kong, one other purpose of this paper is to show how research has clarified our knowledge of the May Fourth Movement in Hong Kong through the examination of archival materials, memoirs, journals, newspapers and letters. The author hopes that by doing this, he will be able to provide new perspectives for analyzing the dynamic history of national identity within Hong Kong society, and at the same time demonstrate to a greater extent Hong Kong's metropolitan function and position as an ideological strategy. The paper will also discuss how we can use these materials to uncover new areas of interest in the field of regional history, and also demonstrate its unique and complex nature. Through this, the paper will clarify the context of a number of historical developments and so bring us closer to the 'truth', and thus help us to resolve issues extant in China's grand historical narrative.

Looking to the future, the author believes that the above research provides us with a solid foundation for delving into the question of how Hong Kong's 'colonial character' came into being.

Third Session Comments

SUGANO Atsushi (Meio University)

Professor Pan gave a presentation which introduced us to the *Hu Shih Archival Materials Search System* and the *Database of the Collected Works of Hu Shih*. Professor Chan gave a presentation on "how to use historical records to find new areas of enquiry on the May Fourth Movement". Based on the content of these talks, I would like to make a few comments from the following three stances: 'commonality', 'plurality' and the 'internal and external'.

From Professor Pan's talk we were able to learn about the status of cross-strait academic collaboration between China and Taiwan in the field of modern and contemporary Chinese history. It goes without saying that Hu Shih was the flag bearer for Chinese literature and Chinese cultural reform. Furthermore, under a new drive amongst academic circles in China and Taiwan to find 'commonality' and 'plurality' in historical views, he is also being reevaluated as a key figure in republican history. I would like to ask Professor Pan two questions which relate to 'commonality' and 'plurality' in the significance of the role that Hu Shih played in contemporary Chinese history.

The first question concerns political factors that are immanent in the issues of 'commonality' and 'plurality'.

Scholars in mainland China have succeeded in transforming past views and evaluations on Hu Shih. Meanwhile, Taiwanese scholars have done much to find ‘commonality’ and ‘plurality’ with the mainland in their historical views. However, to what extent has opinion changed on Hu Shih in Taiwanese academic circles? As we all know, Taiwan went through three regime changes after martial law was lifted. I’m particularly interested in hearing about whether or not Professor Pan faced any kind of difficulties in collaborating with mainland institutions to build the *Hu Shih Archival Materials Search System*, under these varying political circumstances.

The second question concerns the future possibilities of research on Hu Shih: in what areas in particular does Professor Pan believe further research is required? Allow me to give an example from my own research. In mid-1950s Taiwan, under the banner of pushing modernization forward, a debate over whether or not the government ought to once again promulgate the usage of simplified characters broke out. Although Hu Shih was not in Taiwan at the time, and was instead based in America, those scholars who agreed that a reform of Chinese characters, pinyin and national language was necessary, often used Hu Shih’s opinions to legitimize their own views. It goes without saying that Hu Shih played an exceedingly important role in every historical juncture of Chinese cultural reform. However, how much ground is there left for research to cover regarding the influence he had over academic opinion during his time spent in America from 1949 until his return to Taiwan in 1958?

In Professor Chan’s stimulating presentation, he introduced the results he achieved across two pieces of research, whilst also explaining the importance of utilizing FO and CO archival materials. Using these kinds of archival materials to reconsider Hong Kong under British control during the period of the May Fourth Movement will be of great use to understanding the complicated nature of May Fourth discourse that Hong Kong experienced. Keeping in line with the theme of today’s symposium, I would like to ask Professor Chan two questions relating to the ‘internal and external’.

The first question regards the ‘internal and external’ identity of researchers. When I began to study postwar Taiwan’s cultural and linguistic policies, I felt that as a foreign scholar, it was much easier to touch upon politically sensitive issues in my position as a third party. If we take ‘internal and external’ as keywords to discuss ‘internal and external’ identity when engaging in research on Hong Kong, in what areas can scholars who are native to Hong Kong, and those who aren’t, exhibit their own personal strengths? Furthermore, how can they simultaneously steer clear of oversimplifying the object of their research?

The second point concerns the ‘internal and external’ of introducing the results of one’s research. If we take it as a given that historical research is done to appease real-life needs, there is always a risk that historical reality will be used to appease those ends. I am a researcher based in the Japanese ‘periphery’ region of Okinawa and, furthermore, at a university which is located in Okinawa’s ‘periphery’. I find being based in such an environment useful both for looking at history from numerous viewpoints and for being critical of the historical view posited by ‘big-nationism’. What I would like to ask Professor Chan is this: when reevaluating various orthodox historical views from ‘periphery’ regions, to what areas do you attach importance, and in what manner do you alter the way you introduce the results you achieved in your research to scholars and readers who are either ‘internal’ to Hong Kong or ‘external’ to Hong Kong? Furthermore, what kind of response have you received from people ‘internal’ and ‘external’ to Hong Kong respectively?

Exactly 97 years have passed since the May Fourth Movement. Coincidentally, ‘97 is also the year in which Hong Kong was returned by the British back to mainland China. In this third and final session of the day, this ironic combination of Hu Shih, the May Fourth Movement and Hong Kong could be called a ‘fortuitous coincidence’.