

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Remembering Different Pasts: An Analysis of History Textbooks in Mainland China and Taiwan

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4wz1z7qp>

Author

Ye, Anyi

Publication Date

2016

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Remembering Different Past: An Analysis of History Textbooks in Mainland China and
Taiwan

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Education

by

Anyi Ye

March 2016

Thesis Committee:

Dr. John S. Wills, Chairperson

Dr. Margaret A. Nash

Dr. Begoña Echeverria

Copyright by
Anyi Ye
2016

The Thesis of Anyi Ye is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Remembering Different Past: An Analysis of History Textbooks in Mainland China and Taiwan

by

Anyi Ye

Master of Arts, Graduate Program in Education, Society, and Culture
University of California, Riverside, March 2016
Dr. John Wills, Chairperson

History textbooks often cause friction in diplomatic relations between nations, especially between East Asian countries. Several studies have demonstrated that revisions to history textbooks can be the result of changes in a state's interests, resulting in different, often conflicting, accounts of historical events in history textbooks that represent the political ideologies of different nations. Despite the large number of studies of textbook content, there has been limited research examining the representation of specific historical events in the high school history textbooks of Mainland China and Taiwan. This investigation analyzed two widely used textbook series in Mainland China and Taiwan, focusing on the accounts of four armed conflicts — the Battle of Penghu, the First Sino-Japanese War, the Second Sino-Japanese War, and the Chinese Civil War — to discover if these textbooks presented different accounts of these events and if so, if these accounts reflected the different ideological interests of these nations. Findings indicate that these textbooks do present different accounts of historical events and that these represent official historical narratives that reflect the differing political ideologies of Mainland China and Taiwan and that these narratives provide students with collective memories of the past that shape the national identities of Chinese and Taiwanese citizens.

Table of Contents

Part 1 - Introduction	1
1.1 Statement of the problem	1
1.2 Research Questions	3
Part 2 - Literature Review	3
2.1 Research on Post-Soviet countries' history textbooks	3
2.2 Research on the changes in Taiwan's history textbooks	5
2.3 Comparison and contrast of history textbooks from Mainland China and Taiwan	6
2.4 Comparison and contrast of history textbooks from China and Japan	7
Part 3 – Theoretical Framework	9
3.1 Apple	10
3.2 Wertsch	13
3.3 Other researchers' concepts	14
3.4 The conceptual framework of this study	15
Part 4 – Methodology and Methods: Content Analysis	15
Part 5 – Findings: Texts and photos in describing the four armed conflicts	19
5.1 The Battle of Penghu	19
5.2 The First Sino-Japanese War	21
5.3 The Second Sino-Japanese War	25
5.4 The Chinese Civil War	38

Part 6 – Discussions.....	44
6.1 The conflicting historical accounts and the state interests.....	44
6.2 Implications of the investigation.....	46
Part 7 – Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research.....	48

***REMEMBERING DIFFERENT PASTS: AN ANALYSIS OF CHINA'S AND
TAIWAN'S HIGH SCHOOL HISTORY TEXTBOOKS***

Part 1 - Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In July and August 2015, hundreds of Taiwanese students surrounded their Ministry of Education to protest the new high school history curriculum guidelines (Cole, 2015; Makinen, 2015; Ramzy, 2015; Tsoi, 2015; “Taiwan students,” 2015). The new guidelines emphasize the links between Mainland China and Taiwan (Tsoi, 2015) and neglected to include information about Japan’s positive contributions to Taiwan during the Japanese Colonial Period from 1895 to 1945 (“Hundreds take,” 2015; Jiji, 2015; Teng, 2015). These new, incomplete descriptions of Chinese history upset Taiwanese students. Angry Taiwanese students claimed that their new history textbooks conveyed a “pro-Mainland China ideology” and a “‘China-centric’ view” (Marquand, 2015), which would brainwash them to accept the “One China” policy (Jiji, 2015; Marquand, 2015).

In addition, some protestors were concerned about the way Japanese people and their government was portrayed in these books. One student protestor stated that if Japanese people had been informed of the new history curriculum guidelines that portrayed Japanese colonizers as “bad”, they would be upset by this unfair description. She also argued that the Taiwanese curriculum creators should stand with the Japanese colonial government when looking at the history of Taiwan, and said that the negative

descriptions of the Japanese colonial government “violated the United Nations’ universal values” (Wang, 2015, as cited in “Taiwanese students,” 2015).

On the other side of the Taiwan Strait, Mainland China’s mass media held a different attitude toward the new guidelines. China’s main official newspaper, *People’s Daily*, preferred the new history textbooks, commenting that the old history textbooks described China as a foreign nation, whitewashed Japan’s colonization of Taiwan and Mainland China, and advocated for the belief that Taiwan is an independent nation (Ren & Wu, 2015). Another official news website commented that the old history textbooks deceived Taiwan’s younger generations by exculpating the Japanese army, and argued that the new history curriculum offers the “true history” to teenagers in Taiwan. But, the news website claimed, the new history curriculum has been attacked by people who believe in “Taiwan independence” (Zha, 2015) from China. Mass media and people from Taiwan and Mainland China had opposite opinions towards Taiwan’s history curriculum guideline in 2015.

Although Taiwanese students and mass media in Mainland China supported different versions of Taiwan’s history textbooks, both groups were concerned about biased history textbooks conveying inaccurate ideas to Taiwanese students. As a result, these students might acquire incorrect knowledge about Chinese and Taiwanese history and the Japanese colonization of Taiwan and China. Research has examined history textbook controversies between two rivaling nations (Müller, 2011; Nozaki, 2008; Rotberg, 2006; Worden, 2014; Sneider, 2013). However, little research has focused on history textbooks published in Mainland China and Taiwan. Both Mainland China and

Taiwan were invaded by Japan twice in the last 120 years, have experienced ideological conflicts directly with each other since the 1940s, have signed several economic agreements since 2008, but have hardly reached a political consensus for over sixty years. This investigation analyzes Mainland China and Taiwan's history textbooks in order to understand the different national interests and ideologies presented in them.

1.2 Research Questions

To investigate the different descriptions in Mainland China and Taiwan's history textbooks, this study intends to answer the following two questions:

First, do China's and Taiwan's history textbooks present different accounts of the same historical events and characters?

Second, if they do present different accounts, do these different accounts of historical events represent official knowledge (Apple, 1990, 2000) or official historical narratives (Wertsch, 2002) that reflect the ideological interests of the Chinese and Taiwanese governments?

Part 2 - Literature Review

2.1 Research on Post-Soviet countries' history textbooks

There is a large body of research on the political ideologies behind history textbooks. For example, differences in Soviet and post-Soviet Russian texts affected Russian people's beliefs towards Russian history and the history textbooks (Wertsch, 2002). The Soviet-era history textbooks indirectly stated that foreign intervention (i.e. Britain and the U.S.) caused the civil war and overstated the Communist Party's leadership in the war. In contrast, history textbooks published in post-Soviet Russia

treated the civil war as an extension of the October Revolution of 1917, and the books depicted Russian people, the Orthodox Church, and other traditional, cultural forces as the heroes in the war (Wertsch, p. 110). Wertsch also proposed that school history forms subjective collective memory rather than objective historical accounts for a state.

Wertsch's study showed how history textbooks convey nationalistic propaganda to students and how the state exerts control over historical knowledge.

Other post-Soviet states also had conflicting ideas towards the revision of history textbooks. Worden (2014) interviewed policy makers to understand the role of competing national identities in preventing an agreement on the revision of history textbooks in Moldova. One of Worden's interviewees who supported Moldovan identity opposed the inculcation of Romanian ideology, favoring instead "European values" to replace both "Soviet ideology" and Romania's "aggressive nationalism" (Worden, p. 46). This interviewee claimed that the old, Romanian history textbooks failed to present Moldova's "true history" (Worden, p. 45), and the new history textbooks should "tell Moldovan schoolchildren the 'truth' about their country" (Worden, p. 45). On the other hand, another interviewee supported Romanian ideology, because he and other Moldovan citizens had Romanian ethnicity. They believed that the inclusion of Romanian ideology in history textbooks is the historical truth of Moldova (Worden, p. 48). These interviews disclosed that policy makers try to edit history textbooks to meet their political needs, and history textbooks can be used as a political tool to encourage students to think about history in ways that benefit the state. Worden's study supports Wertsch's argument that

school history and history textbooks help form the collective memory and national identity for a nation.

2.2 Research on the changes in Taiwan's history textbooks

Taiwanese scholars also investigated Taiwan's history textbooks. Su (2007) compared a new series of Taiwanese history textbooks (published during 1989-1995) with an old series (published during 1978-1989). She found that the earlier series represented stronger ethnic and political ties between China and Taiwan, covered fewer historical events and examples of Taiwanese experiences, ignored Dutch and Japanese settlers' contributions, and exaggerated the Chinese Nationalist (KMT)¹ government's achievements and its re-unification policies. She concluded that Taiwan's history textbooks function politically to legitimate particular values and political powers, which indicates an ideological shift that is "consistent with the government status quo" (Su, p. 241). Su's findings revealed that history textbooks change with the government's position, which is an expression of state power.

Another investigation in Taiwan also discovered that history textbooks from different eras contained different descriptions of the same events, people, and places. Liu and Hung (2002) found that Taiwan's history curricula before and after the 1990s had different narratives about the same historical events. Liu and Hung's (2002) and Su's (2007) findings were similar: earlier history textbooks showed compelling political,

¹ The Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT) was a capitalist party in China. This party established the Republic of China in 1912. The KMT retreated to Taiwan after the party lost the Chinese Civil War in 1949.

ethnic, and cultural relationships between Taiwan and China. In Liu and Hung's study, history textbooks published after the 1990s presented stronger political views that China and Taiwan are two separate states, and the changes were a result of the new political ideology during that period of time (Liu & Hung, p. 585). Liu and Hung's investigation further disclosed that Taiwan's history textbooks reflected the political ideologies of a newly independent Taiwan.

By re-analyzing the history textbook controversy in 1997, Chang (2011) demonstrated that the interaction of changing political conditions and academic discourse led to the revision of history textbooks in Taiwan. He found that the history textbooks revised in 1997 represented Taiwan-centric views and no longer depicted Taiwanese history as a part of orthodox Chinese history (Chang, p. 127). The book provided a balanced view towards the Japanese colonial period and called for a relationship based on "equal and reciprocal interaction" (Chang, p. 130) between Taiwan and China. Chang concluded that the politicians, as well as historians and educators, shaped the historical narrative in Taiwan (Chang, p. 130). Although Chang maintained that history textbooks are not a direct reflection of political ideology, his analysis further demonstrated the role of state power on the revisions of history textbooks.

2.3 Comparison and contrast of history textbooks from Mainland China and Taiwan

Other scholars found that the changes in history textbooks were consistent with a state's internal status quo and international trends. Mao (1996) investigated world history textbooks published from 1950 to 1960 and from 1980 to 1990 in Mainland China and

Taiwan. According to her investigation, the main ideology in Mainland China's history textbooks gradually switched from Marxist standpoints to capitalist/western standpoints. The decay of Marxist faith resulted from the Chinese government shifting its focus from "class struggle to modernization" and "from isolation to reform" (Mao, 1996, p. 104). Taiwan's world history textbooks gradually replaced descriptions of traditional social formations (i.e., personal interests, class, and dominant, reigning families) with discussions of the legitimacy of regimes, which reflected the trend of nationalism during the two periods of time (Mao, 1996). Furthermore, both Mainland China's and Taiwan's world history textbooks showed their efforts to include historical figures and events from Third World countries (Mao, 1996). Mao (1996) argued that both Mainland China and Taiwan tried to keep pace with the de-Europeanization in the world history movement. Thus, Mao's study demonstrated that changes in history textbooks mirror a nation's internal political situation and international environment.

2.4 Comparison and contrast of history textbooks from China and Japan

High school history textbooks also serve as a tool for patriotic education in East Asian countries. Sneider (2013) compared several history textbooks from China and Japan and found that the selection of what historical events are covered in those history textbooks relies on data provided by national government agencies (p. 38). Japan's history textbooks convey the idea that Japan was not responsible for other countries' aggression or brutal acts during World War II. This idea is embraced by Japanese political leaders, because they see themselves as victims rather than aggressors in the war

(Sneider, p. 50). China's history textbooks focus on the Communist Party's leadership during the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937 - 1945), yet the Chinese Nationalist Party's (KMT) battlefronts were almost absent from them (p. 44). According to Sneider, this textbook narrative is "in tune with the Patriotic Education Campaign begun in the 1990s" (p. 46). Sneider's study further demonstrated that the state provides specific political ideas for history textbooks which in turn are meant to influence students to be patriotic citizens.

Some scholars have argued that history textbooks strongly reflect and serve those with political power. Wang (2009) agreed with Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) that history textbooks are used as "ideological tools to promote a certain belief system and legitimize an established political and social order" (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991, as cited in Wang, 2009). Wang compared and contrasted history textbooks from China, Japan, and South Korea. In his investigation, China and South Korea adopted a victim/victory narrative to describe their respective countries' losses (victimhood) during WWII while emphasizing Japan's criminality and victory (Wang, p. 109). Wang noted that China and Japan used different names for the same historical events (Wang, p. 114). For example, China referred to the tragedy in Nanjing in 1937 as the "Nanjing Massacre," whereas Japan called the event "Nanjing Incident" (Wang, p. 114). Furthermore, Wang discovered that China and Japan attempted to create joint history textbooks to serve as a peace building tool between the two nations (Wang, p. 118). Wang's investigation further supports Wertsch's argument that, when history textbooks

are largely regulated by the state, they can serve as ideological tools to educate the next generation in accordance with the interests of the state.

In summation, numerous studies have proved that history textbooks are not neutral. In post-Soviet countries, where nations and their people faced ideological conflicts after the dissolution of Soviet Union, policy makers manipulated history textbooks and curriculum to establish new, different official accounts of history and national identity for the state. History textbooks in Asian countries also changed in the past sixty years. Several scholars found that history textbooks in Taiwan evolved in accordance with the state's policies and shifting status quo. Textbooks in Japan and China offer different descriptions about the same historical events, such as World War II, and as a result, students in the two states have conflicting knowledge and opinions towards the war. History textbooks do not present objective, neutral historical knowledge for students. Rather, they represent the interests and power of the state and convey the ideologies that the state wants its citizens to learn and believe.

Part 3 – Theoretical Framework

Research on ideology, school knowledge, and curriculum inform my research strategy and data analysis. Apple's (1990, 2000) theory linking curriculum and ideology and his concept of official knowledge and Wertsch's (2002) theorizing on collective memory and his concept of official historical narratives inform the theoretical and conceptual framework I will be using in my analysis of data.

3.1 Apple's (1990, 2000) concept and theory

According to Apple, only certain groups' knowledge is socially legitimated in school. Knowledge from dominant classes, gender groups, and racial groups can be "partially institutionalized and realized" in "publicly supported schools" (Apple, 2000, p. 64) through the process of a state's textbook adoption policy (Apple, 2000). Such knowledge is filtered through political screens and assessed through political criteria, and eventually it can become the official knowledge in a nation (Apple, 2000). This process determines what kinds of knowledge is selected to be included in textbooks and taught to students. Apple defined this knowledge as official knowledge, because it reflects and is a product of either the state's or dominant groups' interests and therefore it serves as an expression of state power and/or the power of dominant groups.

The process of legitimizing dominant groups' knowledge is not smooth. Apple (1990, 2000) stated that the state serves as a site for inter- and intra-class conflict and compromise. Different classes, racial groups, and genders struggle, negotiate, and compromise during the process of determining whose knowledge and what kinds of knowledge will count as official in schools. It is important for these groups, because schools make such knowledge to be "knowledge for all" in a state (Apple, 1990, p. 64). According to Apple, the state has to "balance the opposing interests of different segments of dominant groups" (Apple, 2000, p. 64); therefore, official knowledge is negotiated knowledge that mirrors the power of the state and several dominant groups' interests.

Apple (1990, 2000) further argued that official knowledge is largely constructed through the power relations within a state. Dominant groups can impose their interests

and values on marginalized groups by altering textbooks to regulate what students would learn and would not learn in school (Apple, 1990, 2000). By utilizing textbooks, knowledge favored by the state and dominant groups will be transmitted to and accepted by marginalized groups and future generations. Knowledge from textbooks, considered official knowledge, becomes the state-approved knowledge that every student who attends schools will learn (Apple, 2000).

Furthermore, according to Apple's (1990) book *Ideology and Curriculum*, there is a linkage between ideology and school knowledge (also can be defined as official knowledge, because schools distribute the official knowledge to students, as stated above). Apple claimed that schools are not neutral institutions or isolated from other institutions. Instead, schools are significantly affected by and connected with political, economic, and cultural interests and power; schools also maintain the social division of labor by labeling students based on their social status and historical institutions (Apple, 1990). Moreover, a dominant part of school knowledge embodies social interests which "mirror a number of the ideological prepositions" (Apple, 1990, p. 24). For instance, students adopt social rules during games, which indirectly serve a social order; students are taught that science is objective and empirical in school, where students cannot see the political dimensions involved in scientific process and argument. Thus, school itself and school knowledge are not neutral; rather, they reflect mainstream ideologies that represent the interests of dominant groups and therefore preserve existing social hierarchies within a state.

Schools also reproduce ideologies when teaching students socially accepted rules and norms. According to Apple (1990), students learn to obey social, economic, and cultural rules in classrooms beginning in kindergarten, all of which directly and indirectly include certain ideologies: “Social norms, institutions, and ideological rules are continually sustained and mediated by the day-to-day interaction of commonsense actors, as they go about their normal practices. This is especially true in classrooms” (Apple, 1990, p. 50). Also, schools maintain the structural inequalities of power and students’ unequal access to resources. They provide “different kinds of knowledge and dispositions to different kinds and classes of people” (Apple, 1990, p. 25). Therefore, school knowledge preserves and perpetuates the ideologies of inequality for the state.

Apple’s argument applies to democratic societies, where dominant groups exert their considerable influence on forming official knowledge in the first place, and then the state balances the interests of different dominant groups when creating curricula. Apple also found that school knowledge preserves state-approved ideology, namely reproducing institutional inequality in classrooms and schools. On the other hand, in less democratic and/or authoritarian states, the government directly produces school knowledge and ideologies. As stated above, several researchers found that states like Japan, China, and Taiwan have a much more direct and influential role in determining school knowledge, especially official historical knowledge. In such cases, Wertsch’s theory of official historical narrative and collective memory supplements Apple’s argument in analyzing official knowledge.

3.2 Wertsch's (2002) theory

To be more specific, schools' instruction in history reflects and reproduces a state's ideology. Wertsch (2002) claimed that a state's production of official historical narrative reflects the ideological interests of the state. The official historical narratives create a collective memory and "successive sole truths about the past" (Wertsch, p. 76), rather than teaching students history. According to Wertsch (2002), history and collective memory are different. History is distanced from any particular perspective, mirrors no particular social framework, has a critical reflective stance, and recognizes ambiguity. In contrast, collective memory has a single committed perspective, reflects a particular group's social framework, is unself-conscious, and is impatient with ambiguity about motives and the interpretation of events (Wertsch, p. 44).

For Wertsch, history instruction is an education in collective memory. For example, he found that the Soviet Union's official historical narrative was a univocal official collective memory, because the state only provided the pro-communist ideologies (Wertsch, 2002). History textbooks published during the Soviet Union regime and the post Soviet Russia presented conflicting descriptions about the Communist Party, foreign countries, and Russian people. As a result, people who attended school during and after the Soviet Union Russia perceived themselves as Russian citizens and Russian history differently. This phenomenon disclosed that history instruction plays an important role in forming national identity (Wertsch, 2002).

Moreover, the different historical accounts also proved that history textbooks give accounts of specific historical events that are consistent with the interests of the state

(Wertsch, 2002). Since the official historical narrative presents the state's viewpoint and social framework, it represents the state's ideological interests and history instruction provides students with a collective memory of the past that reflects the interests and power of the state.

3.3 Other researchers' concepts linking history textbooks and political ideology

Other scholars (Chang, 2001; Liu & Hung, 2002; Sneider, 2013; Su, 2007; Wang, 2009; Worden, 2014) have also investigated official historical narratives, and they found that different descriptions in history textbooks are often in accordance with the state's ideological interests. In Chang's (2001), and Liu and Hung's (2002), and Su's (2007) studies, the state of Taiwan changed the descriptions of some historical events and people in its history textbooks many times. The changes in every period of time reflected the ideological shift in Taiwan's government. For instance, earlier history textbooks in Taiwan presented stronger ethnic and political ties between China and Taiwan than books printed after 1989, and they also emphasized the re-unification policy that both Mainland China and Taiwan belong to China (Su, 2007).

Sneider (2013) and Wang (2009) found that China and Japan had different descriptions for the same historical events, and they depicted each other from very different perspectives in specific historical narratives. Both scholars argued that the two states taught students the state-approved ideology through history instruction. For example, supported by politicians, history textbooks in Japan transmit the ideas that Japan is not responsible for the aggression or brutal acts in World War II to the younger Japanese generations (Sneider, 2013). History textbooks in China emphasized Japanese

criminality and Chinese Communist Party's leadership in the World War II (Sneider, 2013; Wang, 2009). Worden's (2014) investigation, the reason why two parties tried to edit Moldovan history textbooks in different ways was because they had different political interests and both parties considered history textbooks as a tool of teaching students the "correct ideology" about the state. Worden claimed that Moldova's history textbook controversy was consistent with its political ideological conflicts. Overall, much research demonstrated that history textbooks and history instruction reflect a state's ideological interests and conflicts.

3.4 The conceptual framework of this study

The conceptual framework of my study is that school knowledge, especially knowledge in history textbooks, is not neutral but results from the conflicts among different ideologies and interest groups, including the state, and therefore represents what Apple (1990, 2000) conceptualizes as official knowledge and what Wertsch (2002) called official historical narratives. As such, my analysis of Chinese and Taiwanese textbooks was focused on uncovering the ideological interests and conflicts reflected in the accounts of historical events, treating these accounts as examples of official knowledge or official historical narratives consistent with the interests of the Chinese and Taiwanese governments.

Part 4 – Methodology and Methods

I rely on qualitative methods for this study, given their affordances to provide in-depth understandings of phenomena and behaviors by analysis of social interaction,

meaning, and communication (Preissle, Tesch, & LeCompte, 1993). Given that my research questions are interested in understanding how textbook content may reflect the ideology and interests of the state, content analysis of textbooks is an invaluable method for answering the two research questions. According to Krippendorff (1969), content analysis is “the use of replicable and valid method for making specific inferences from text to other states or properties of its source” (p. 103). To investigate if China’s and Taiwan’s history textbooks reflect opposing political ideologies, I used content analysis to analyze specific historical events in Chinese and Taiwanese textbooks.

I conducted a content analysis of Chinese and Taiwanese history textbooks to understand the influence and interests of these governments in providing students with particular narratives of historical events. Newman (2003) pointed out that content analysis is a method that “seeks to analyze the content of the text, which can refer to words, meanings, pictures, symbols, ideas, themes, or any message that can be communication” (as cited in Sano, 2009). According to Beringer, literary analysis involves: “(1) reading the literature; (2) noting the themes; (3) discussing the themes; (4) supporting conclusions with examples” (as cited in Alridge, 2006). My research attempted to follow these recommendations. In comparing and contrasting Mainland China’s and Taiwan’s history textbooks, I found evidence of the two states providing different descriptions of the same historical events.

I selected textbooks based on Sneider’s (2013) two criteria in his research: textbooks should be either most widely used or for college-preparatory level courses. Textbooks in my investigation met the two criteria. First, textbooks that I selected were

the most widely used in Mainland China and Taiwan. In Mainland China, *Ancient Chinese History* (People's Education Press [PEP], 2003) and *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* (PEP, 2003), are two widely used history textbooks. The two books were edited and published by People's Education Press (PEP), which is the only authorized publisher until recently (Sneider, 2013, p. 38). In Taiwan, 24% and 45% of high schools use history textbooks published by KangSi in teaching Taiwanese and Chinese history in 2009, respectively, which consisted of the largest proportion in Taiwan's history textbook market (Mao, 2013, p. 128). In addition, because KangSi published *History 1* (Wang, 2005) for Taiwanese history instruction and *History 2* (Wang, 2005) for Chinese history instruction, *History 1* and *History 2* were probably the most common history textbooks in Taiwan from 2005 to 2009 and so these textbooks were also included in my study.

Second, history textbooks selected in Sneider's (2013) project were provided for college-preparatory level courses. This criterion intends to "capture the educational material more likely to have been used by elites in all the school systems" (Sneider, 2013, p. 38). According to People's Education Press's website, its history textbooks are used in regular high schools ("Curriculum Standard," 2003), where students study and prepare for China's National Higher Education Entrance Examinations. Mao's (2013) study shows that high schools in Taiwan purchased KangSi's *History 1* and *History 2* for compulsory college preparatory history courses. Therefore, the four textbooks, Mainland China's *Ancient Chinese History* and *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* and Taiwan's *History 1* and *History 2*, meet this criterion.

As shown in Sneider's (2013), Wang's (2009), and Wertsch's (2002) research, the descriptions about wars were usually controversial, because they reflect the conflicting interests of different countries or competing political ideologies. Chang (2011), Su (2007), and Liu and Hung (2002) found that during the past sixty years the state of Taiwan provided markedly different narratives about Mainland China, Taiwan, and Japan as well as the Chinese Nationalist Party (a capitalist party also known as KMT) and the Communist Party of China (CPC). During Taiwanese students' protests in July and August 2014, a majority of student protesters could not accept the new history textbooks' descriptions and comments about Japanese colonization. Therefore, I adopted the four researchers' results and concerns in my investigation. I focused on armed conflicts either between Mainland China and Taiwan, between China and Japan, or between the Capitalist Party and Communist Party. In the four history textbooks, there are four armed conflicts that met my criteria: the Battle of Penghu (1683), the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945), and the Chinese Civil War (1946-1949).

The armed conflicts were worth investigating for three reasons. First, all four conflicts involved the territory of Mainland China and Taiwan. Second, the results of the conflicts almost determined the future of a state. For example, after the Battle of Penghu, Taiwan officially became a county in China; because of the First Sino-Japanese War, Japan colonized Taiwan for fifty years; since the Capitalist Party was defeated in the Chinese Civil War, the Party and its army retreated to and has been staying in Taiwan for over sixty years. Third, both Mainland China's and Taiwan's history textbooks offered

detailed descriptions and comments about the four armed conflicts. All four history textbooks spent several pages or even a whole chapter on presenting the background, process, and the results of each conflict.

To explore the different descriptions of the four armed conflicts, this study attended to analyzing words and photos presented in history textbooks, as Newman (2003) suggested above. In addition, Mao (1996) argued that the presentation of historical figures in textbooks also mirrored what a state wanted to teach its students, thus I analyzed both historical events and historical figures shown in these events. To sum up, the content analysis of this investigation focused on: (1) textual descriptions of the four armed conflicts; (2) photos presented in the four armed conflicts; (3) textual descriptions of historical characters; (4) photos presented in describing historical characters in Mainland China's *Ancient Chinese History* and *Modern* (PEP, 2003) and *Contemporary Chinese History* (PEP, 2003), and Taiwan's *History 1* (Wang, 2005) and *History 2* (Wang, 2005).

Part 5 – Findings: Texts and photos in describing the four armed conflicts

5.1 Battle of Penghu (1683)

This armed conflict was a 1683 naval battle that took place on the Taiwan Strait. The battle was fought between the Zheng regime in Taiwan (also known as Formosa) and the Manchurian-led Qing government in China. In *Ancient Chinese History* (People's Education Press [PEP], 2003), there is only one short paragraph describing this battle. The book states that Zheng Chenggong's family dominated Taiwan since he retrieved it.

In 1683, the Qing government's navy defeated Zheng's family in Penghu, and as a result Taiwan became a part of Qing's territory (PEP, p. 137). Neither this chapter nor anywhere else in the book explains from whom Zheng Chenggong retrieved Taiwan, why he stayed there and continued to rule, the effects of Zheng's family's rule on Taiwan and its people, and why the Qing government fought against Zheng in the first place. Under this paragraph are two photos. The first is a portrait of Shi Lang, the Qing Government general who conquered Taiwan. The other photo depicts a city building. According to the photo's annotation, the Qing Government built this building for the County of Taiwan.

In contrast, *History 1* devotes an entire chapter to a detailed description of Zheng's regime in Taiwan and including the battle of Penghu. This chapter notes that the Manchurians overturned the Ming Dynasty and then established the Qing Dynasty in 1644. Because Zheng was loyal to the Ming Dynasty, he wanted to fight back against the Qing Dynasty's Manchurian ruling family. With the help of an army, Zheng seized Taiwan from Dutch colonizers, ruled the island, tried and failed to attack Mainland China, and largely improved Taiwan's social and economic development (Wang, p. 31). Later, Zheng's regime lost the battle of Penghu (Wang, p. 35), resulting in Taiwan being taken over by Qing government (Wang, p. 38).

Several photos are displayed in this chapter. Like *Ancient Chinese History*, one of the photos is Shi Lang's portrait. Three of the other photos depict the battle. One of these shows Zheng's army attacking Dutch colonizers; one shows Zheng's military camps when he fought against the Dutch colonizers; and one shows the Dutch colonizers and Qing's army working together to attack Taiwan.

After analyzing the accounts of the Battle of Penghu in both textbooks, it is quite clear that they provide different narratives of the battle and represent official knowledge about the past that reflects the interests of the governments of Taiwan and China. The story about the Battle of Penghu in *Ancient Chinese History* demonstrates China's ownership of Taiwan. The causes of and the events during the Battle of Penghu are not important from the Chinese perspective, probably because the textbook simply needs to represent China's ideological interests that Taiwan belongs to China. *Ancient Chinese History* reproduces the collective memory among its readers that Taiwan has been a part of China since ancient times, and the Chinese identity should be applicable in both Mainland China and Taiwan.

On the other hand, *History I* depicts Zheng Chenggong as a hero and Taiwan as a separate nation with well-developed social and economic systems before 1683. Zheng's defeat of the Dutch colonizers combined with his personal political interests enabled him to establish a new, independent regime in Taiwan in this period of time. Thus, *History I* reflects and reproduces the ideological interests of the current Taiwanese government that Taiwan is an independent nation, and the textbook also creates the collective memory of a proud, independent Taiwanese national identity.

5.2 The First Sino-Japanese War and the Treaty of Shimonoseki (1894-1895)

Mainland China's textbook *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* (PEP, 2003) notes in detail the background, battles, and consequences of the First Sino-Japanese War. It presents evidence that the Chinese marines in the Beiyang Fleet,

China's first navy, fought bravely against the Japanese navy. The book also praises the leadership of two Chinese generals, Deng Shichang and Ding Ruchang (PEP, p. 49). According to what the book says, the Treaty of Shimonoseki was the most unfair treaty in Chinese history because: (1) many parts of China, including Taiwan, became territories of Japan; (2) China paid millions of dollars to compensate the Japanese army; (3) China opened four cities to Japanese trading and ships, allowed Japan to build factories and sell goods in those without paying import taxes. Five photos are displayed in this chapter showing the two countries' naval battles on the Yellow Sea, the Japanese army killing unarmed Chinese people, and the portrait of Deng Shichang. A table breaks down China and Japan's naval forces and losses (both civilian and military) during the war.

The second half of the chapter tells a story about how after the war people in Taiwan protected their homeland from Japanese colonizers. It states that Qing's soldiers and residents in Taiwan voluntarily established an army and bravely fought against the Japanese army, although eventually the army failed to drive the Japanese colonizers from Taiwan. According to the 'comment section' in this chapter, people in Taiwan were loyal to China and always tried to reunite Taiwan with China (as a Chinese territory) during the fifty years of Japanese occupation (PEP, p. 52). Next the text, a photo displays people in Taiwan fighting against the Japanese army, while a separate map exhibits the Japanese army's marching routes and the battlefields in Taiwan. The descriptions in this book suggests an emphasis on the following to Chinese students: that the Chinese navy tried its best to fight against Japan, that China lost much of its land and money because of the war

and the treaty; and that people in Taiwan were loyal to China even though they had been ruled by Japan for many years.

Taiwan's Chinese history textbook *History 2* (Wang, 2005) briefly mentions the First Sino-Japanese War and the resulting treaty twice. The first time the war and treaty are mentioned is only on a timeline in the preface to a chapter about Chinese modernization. The second time the war and treaty are mentioned is in an extended timeline at the end of the book, which may not be the required reading for students in Taiwan. This book offers detailed descriptions of several historical events that happened before and after the First Sino-Japanese War but ignores the war itself and the resulting treaty. Taiwan's history textbooks seem to imply that the First Sino-Japanese war and the treaty were not important in Chinese history.

Taiwan's Taiwanese history textbook, *History 1*, gives a different account of the war. It only states that the Qing government lost the war, and it mentions neither the naval battle nor the severe consequences of the treaty. The book notes that elites in Taiwan were loyal to the Qing government, so they decided to establish the Republic of Formosa to protect Taiwan from becoming a part of Japan (Wang, p. 92). As shown in the textbook, the Republic of Formosa had its own national flag. According to the photo's caption, the Republic's flag was a golden tiger with a blue background, and Qing's national flag was a blue dragon with a gold background. Similar national flags indicate the close relationship between Taiwan and the Qing Government. Two more photos demonstrate that at that period of time, the Republic of Formosa had its own government-

issued checks and postage stamps. Another picture in this chapter has a caption that shows that Qing's people were imagining that Taiwan's army could defeat the Japanese.

The official historical narratives in these two history textbooks, again, represents Mainland China's and Taiwan's different ideological interests and their efforts to provide collective memories that inform distinctly Chinese or Taiwanese national identities among readers of these textbooks. The comment section in Mainland China's textbook *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* indicates that people in Taiwan were loyal to China because of their Chinese identity, a representation that underscores that Taiwan is part of China and therefore provides a common national identity uniting the Chinese and Taiwanese people. In contrast, both Taiwan's *History 1* and *History 2* indirectly convey the idea to Taiwanese readers that the Chinese government did not care about Taiwan, and directly describes an unreliable, weak Chinese government and the independent, brave, and patriotic Taiwanese people as playing an important role in this event. These different official accounts of the First Sino-Japanese War reflect these two states' different interests in providing collective memories that inform different national identities: from the perspective of China, people in Taiwan and in Mainland China share the same Chinese identity and consider China as the homeland; however, from the perspective of today's Taiwan, Taiwan has been an independent state with a strong Taiwanese national identity, as evident in the account of this event. The fact that the historical accounts of the First Sino-Japanese War are compiled in the Taiwanese rather than in the Chinese history textbook exemplifies Taiwan's political ideology. The First

Sino-Japanese War is separated from Chinese history just like Taiwan should be – and has been –separated from China.

5.3 The Second Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945)

5.3.1 The Nationalist Party and the Communist Party in Mainland China's textbook

The second Sino-Japanese War occurred parallel to World War II. There are fifty-five pages in four chapters in *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* offering detailed descriptions of the war. According to Mainland China's book, the main reason for the war was a Japanese financial crisis in the early 1930s, which caused the Japanese government to invade China in order to relieve class conflicts (PEP, p. 13). Before the Second Sino-Japanese War officially began, Chiang Kai-shek, the top ruler in the Republic of China, pursued the policy of “resisting foreign aggression after stabilizing the country” (PEP, p. 17). That is, Republic of China would not resist Japanese invasion at that point of time, and the China's priority job should be eliminating the Communist Party of China (CPC) from China (PEP, p. 13). Thus, the Communist Party's leaders and soldiers had to fight against the Nationalist Party and the Japanese at the same time (PEP, p. 15). For instance, even though Japan colonized northeastern China, the Communist Party sent its elite party members to help the people there set up a “Northeast Anti-Japanese United Army” in order to fight against Japanese invaders (PEP, p. 14). In this section of *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*, one photo is a portrait of a Communist leader, and another photo shows a battle between the Chinese and Japanese armies. There are five photos in this chapter, none of which are related to the Nationalist

Party. The lack of photographic recognition of the Nationalist Party shows that the chapter fails to acknowledge the contributions of the Nationalist Party.

According to *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*, the turning point of Chinese resistance was the “Xi’an Incident,” during which the two parties finally collaborated. Zhang Xueliang and Yang Hucheng kidnapped the Nationalist Party’s Chairman Chiang Kai-Shek and required him to stop the civil war in order to resist the Japanese. This is known as the “Xi’an Incident” (PEP, p. 26). The pro-American and British Nationalist members tried to rescue Chiang Kai-shek, and the Nationalist members, who were pro-Japan, wanted to attack Zhang Xueliang and Yang Hucheng. With regard to the Communist Party, the book states that facing the complicated political situation, the Communist Party of China was insightful and cared about China’s national interests; thus the Party proposed that the Xi’an Incident should be resolved peacefully, and they sent Zhou Enlai to Xi’an to negotiate (PEP, p. 26).

After the Xi’an incident, the Communist Party and the Nationalist Party allied as a united front to fight against Japan, and the Second Sino-Japanese War officially started. The communist troops agreed to form the New Fourth Army and Eighth Route Army. These two armies were under the control of the Republic of China, the state founded by the Nationalist Party. With regard to the combat during the war, *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* directly and indirectly ignores the Nationalist Party’s contribution to the war. For instance, the book lists three main battles between the Nationalist army and the Japanese army. The books states that the Nationalist army lost the first two battles—the Battle of Shanghai and the Battle of Taiyuan (a province in

northern China)—resulting in Japanese army occupation in two important places (PEP, p. 31). Moreover, it is worth noting that the book champions the performances of several Communist leaders, such as Zhu De, Peng Dehuai and Lin Biao, during the Battle of Taiyuan; however, the book only presents the general of the Nationalist army, Li Zongren. The last battle was in Taierzhuang (a small town in today's Shandong Province in Mainland China), where the Nationalist Party finally won a battle. However, according to the textbook's comments section, Japan's occupation of northern, central, and southern China resulted from the Nationalist Party's incorrect strategy, despite the fact that the Japanese occupation was caused by the Nationalist Party's victory in the battle (PEP, p. 32). All three battles are illustrated by maps marked with the lines of the battlefront. A photo depicts soldiers in Shanghai fighting against Japan, but what party the soldiers belonged to is unknown.

According to *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*, the capitalist Nationalist government was quite disappointing. Chiang Kai-shek was a dictator in China. His Nationalist Party trained many spies to persecute and kill Communist Party members, people who fought against Japan, and people who wanted democracy in China. Because of the Nationalist Party's economic monopoly, factories bankrupted, people who worked in factories lost jobs, and farmers became poorer. The capitalist government led by the Nationalist Party exclusively controlled China's financial industry. As a result, government officials owned half of the whole country's capital (PEP, p. 41). Even worse, the Nationalist Party's vice chairman, Wang Jingwei, betrayed China. He collaborated with the Japan invaders to establish a pro-Japan government in the capital city Nanjing in

1938 (PEP, p. 45) where the Japanese army killed thousands of innocent Chinese people in 1937 (PEP, p. 31).

Furthermore, the Nationalist Party broke the Nationalist-Communist alliance in 1939. From then on, Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Party fought passively against Japan but actively against the Communist (PEP, p. 38). In Fall 1940, Chiang ordered the New Fourth Army and Eighth Army² to travel northward across the Yellow River. Then the Nationalist army secretly attacked the New Fourth Army in a forest for seven days, resulting in a majority of New Fourth soldiers' deaths. Then Chiang Kai-shek announced that the New Fourth Army represented the rebel forces and imprisoned communist General Ye Ting (PEP, p. 39). In sum, *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* depicts the Nationalist Party and Chiang Kai-shek as villains during the Second Sino-Japanese War.

On the other hand, the Communist Party is described as a messiah in *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*. Before the Second Sino-Japanese War officially began, the Communist Party already voluntarily sent its elite party members to assist people living in Northeastern China to fight against Japanese invaders. After China declared the war against Japan, the official Nationalist Party army fought against the Japanese invaders on the frontline, but lost most of the battles as stated above; at the same time, the unofficial Communist Party's guerilla forces were sabotaging the Japanese from behind their own lines. The Communist Party established the "Anti-Japanese Bases" (PEP, p. 32). These bases were located in various rural areas where the Communist members

² Soldiers in the New Fourth Army and Eighth Route Army were communist.

commanded the guerilla forces, propagated their political belief, established communist economy in China's countryside, and carried out the "Yan'an Rectification Movement" (PEP, p. 44).

To be more specific, the Communists conducted administrative, land, and tax reform that favored poor peasants who earned low wages, barely had property, and always worked for land owners. Through the rectification movement, the Communist Party and Mao Zedong wanted to clear out communist members who had "wrong ideas." Although the Party made some unjust cases during the rectification movement, it soon corrected its mistakes, according to the textbook (PEP, 45). Three photos support these descriptions: one photo shows that Communist Commander Nie Rongzhen commanded a battle (PEP, p. 32); another photo depicts people prepared to bomb the Japanese army at one of the anti-Japanese bases (PEP, p. 43); and according to the third photo's caption, farmers demonstrating support for the Communist Party's economic policy in the countryside (PEP, p. 45).

According to *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*, Mao Zedong published *On Protracted War*, a book comprised of a series of his speeches. In this book he refuted the Nationalist Party's pro-Japanese ideas that Japan would destroy China soon. He also argued that China had the resources to win the war, because China had a large territory, large population, and a variety of natural resources.

Moreover, this textbook offers a misleading description about the end of the Second Sino-Japanese War. It noted that Mao correctly pointed out that if China relied on the majority of its people and fought against the Japanese invaders over a long period of

time, then China eventually would achieve the victory (PEP, p. 33). Moreover, after World War II ended in Europe in May 1945 and the Soviet Union destroyed the Japanese army in Northeastern China, Mao published a statement calling on all forces in China to fight against Japan. The Communist army declared that they would kill all enemies who refused to surrender. The textbook then stated that Japan surrendered on August 15th, and Chinese people eventually won the war (PEP, p. 45). Such descriptions imply that it was all because of Mao's leadership and Chinese and Soviet forces that China eventually won the war. The Nationalist Party's contribution to the war disappears in this section, as if the Nationalist army did not do anything to end the war.

Mainland China's history textbooks adopt a framework of "heroes versus conspirators" in describing the Communist Party and Nationalist Party in China. In *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*, the Communist Party and Mao Zedong are portrayed as heroes who led China to win the Second Sino-Japanese War, while the Nationalist Party and Chiang Kai-shek are described as the conspirators who betrayed China and the Chinese people. The official accounts of this warfare in Mainland China's textbook reflect China's state interests by legitimizing the Communist Party's efforts to liberate China since the 1930s. Moreover, it is very likely that the positive descriptions of the Communist Party reinforce a shared collective memory in Mainland China, which fosters the Chinese identity among the Chinese readers. Chinese readers may receive pleasure from winning the Second Sino-Japanese war and be proud of being Chinese. Thus, depicting the Communist Party as the heroes in the Second Sino-Japanese War is consistent with the state interests of China and the Communist Party.

5.3.2 The Nationalist Party and the Communist Party in Taiwan's textbook

Taiwan's history textbook *History 2* offers a brief description about the Second Sino-Japanese War in seven pages, compared with the fifty-five pages in Mainland China's *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*. Stories and pictures presented in *History 2* are also quite different from those in Mainland China's textbooks. *History 2* notes that the Japanese invasion resulted from the ideas of the "supreme Japan," the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere," and Japanese militarism (Wang, p. 193). This book also describes Chiang Kai-shek as a pacifist, claiming that he wanted to stop the Japanese invasion through diplomacy rather than resist against Japanese invasion (Wang, p. 195). Also, Chiang insisted on his "resisting foreign aggression after stabilizing the country" (Wang, p. 195), so he required Nationalist army to clear out Communist members in Northwestern China. With regard to the Xi'an Incident, it states that the communist party positively influenced Zhang Xueliang and Yang Hucheng to force Chiang Kai-shek to collaborate with the communists and resist the Japanese invaders (Wang, p. 195).

Moreover, *History 2* argues that the Nationalist army had a wise strategy in fighting against Japan. That is, the army tried to prolong the war by sacrificing China's territories at the beginning of the war. This strategy attracted the Japanese army to travel to China's inland regions, and the Chinese army was able to trap the Japanese. With regard to the Battle of Shanghai, the textbook does not directly state whether the Nationalist Party won the battle. Instead, it noted that the Battle of Shanghai successfully broke Japan's propaganda that Japan was able to ruin China in three months; the battle

also boosted Chinese soldiers' morale and extended the time for people and the Chinese government to transfer their properties. *History 2* then praises that the international society was impressed by the Nationalist army's militancy in the Battle of Shang (Wang, p. 197).

History 2 further states that, from 1938 to 1941, Japan only occupied China's major cities and traffic routes and could not conquer the whole country. In addition, the Japanese army was not able to fight against both Nationalist and Communist armies who often used the guerilla forces. According to the textbook, this period of time was the most difficult time during the war. Although Japan tried to lure the Republic of China into surrender, the government was impervious to Japan's scheme. Japan then turned to support the vice chairman of the Nationalist Party Wang Jingwei to establish a puppet Nationalist government in capital city Nanjing. After Japan attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, China officially declared the war against Japan and became a member country of the Alliance of World War II. In 1943, Chiang Kai-shek met with the U.S. President Roosevelt and British Premier Churchill to discuss military cooperation and the post-war international order. Soon after the U.S. dropped nuclear weapons in Japan, Japan surrendered to the Alliance of World War II and returned the four Provinces in Northeastern China, Taiwan, and Penghu back to the Republic of China. China eventually won the Second Sino-Japanese War after eight years of fighting (Wang, p. 198).

Four photos, two maps, and one calligraphy support this description of the Second Sino-Japanese War. According to the annotations of the three photos, they demonstrate

Japan's occupation of Shenyang (the biggest city in Northeastern China), the Nationalist army fighting against Japanese in ditch, Chiang Kai-shek discussing combat plans with high-ranking military officers, and Japanese representative submitting the capitulation to Nationalist General He Yingqin, respectively (Wang, p. 197). One map shows China's territory and Japanese occupation in Northern China before the Marco Polo Bridge Incident on July 7, 1937 (Wang, 195). The other one shows four zones – the Japanese occupation, Republic of China's occupation, the Soviet Union's occupation, and the independent autonomy region – in China's territory (Wang, 196). The calligraphy is about "resisting foreign aggression after stabilizing the country," written by Chiang Kai-shek, which states the reason why Chiang wanted to eliminate the Communist Party before resisting the Japanese aggression (Wang, p. 195).

In a separate chapter, Taiwan's history textbook tells the story of the Communist army during the Second Sino-Japanese War. It states that the Communist Party took advantage of the war to promote the party and did not exert its power on resisting the Japanese army (Wang, p. 207), even though the Communist party's guerilla forces successfully attacked the Japanese (Wang, p. 208). With regard to the New Fourth Army, the textbook states that the army not only refused to obey the Nationalist government's rules but also tried to take over Nationalist army's occupation in Northern China. In addition, the textbook noted that Mao Zedong utilized the rectification movement to empower himself, and from then on Mao became the unchallengeable leader in the Communist Party (Wang, p. 208). Compared with Mainland China's history textbooks,

Taiwan gives very negative accounts of the Communist Party during the Second Sino-Japanese War.

Interestingly, Taiwan's Chinese history textbook *History 2* also uses the "heroes versus conspirators" frame. But the textbook presents the Nationalist Party and Chiang Kai-shek as the heroes, who tried to avoid the war in China in the first place, repelled the Japanese enemy, and eventually sent a general to accept Japan's surrender. The Communist Party and Mao Zedong are depicted as the conspirators, because the Communist army sabotaged the then Chinese government's army, and Mao Zedong controlled the supreme power in the party and persecuted Communist members during the war. The textbook reproduces the idea that the Communist Party should not rule the state of China or any state because they are vicious conspirators. This idea indirectly promotes the understanding that Taiwan should not be a part of China and does not want to interact with the communist China.

5.3.3 Japan in Mainland China and Taiwan's history textbooks

Both Mainland China's *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* and Taiwan's *History 2* present the Japanese army's evildoing and criminality during the Second Sino-Japanese War. There are two sections in *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* elaborating upon the cruel Japanese occupation in China. According to this textbook, Japan took over China's arable land for military use, forcibly bought agricultural products at very low prices, built hundreds of factories and then sent the products to Japan, robbed every bank in the occupation areas, and culturally enslaved Chinese teenagers by sending them to Japanese schools, disallowing them to speak

Chinese, and brainwashing them. Three photos in this section display some of these acts (PEP, p. 37).

In the next session, *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* further notes that the Japanese army sent more than half of its troops to mop up the Communist army and innocent Chinese people in Communist Party's anti-Japanese bases since 1941. The Japanese Army adopted the "Three Alls Policy," that is, burn all, kill all, and loot all in its occupation. Moreover, Japan even used poisonous gas and lethal bacteria to try to kill all people in the bases inhumanely (PEP, p. 42). To resist Japanese invasion, Chinese official army, guerilla forces, and local people collaborated and invented several strategies to fight back (PEP, p. 43).

Taiwan's Chinese history textbook *History 2* depicts Japan with a photo and two paragraphs. The first paragraph states that wherever Japanese aggressors went, they cruelly treated the Chinese people by robbing, raping, and killing. The Japanese army killed thousands of innocent Chinese in Nanjing after they occupied this city, and the ways of killing were very inhumane. Under this paragraph, a photo shows Japanese army robbing Chinese people's property (Wang, p. 197). The second paragraph notes that the Japanese army used poisonous gas for killing. Japan's Unit 731 troop undertook live Chinese people to do biological and chemical experiments in order to produce biological weapons in Northeastern China (Wang, p. 198).

On the other hand, Taiwan's Taiwanese history textbook *History 1* emphasizes Japanese colonizers' contributions to Taiwan, Taiwan's politics and art, Taiwanese people joining the Japanese Army after the First Sino-Japanese War (1895) and before

the end of the Second Sino-Japanese War (1945). This textbook provides the accounts of Japanese domination in Taiwan in six chapters about forty-four pages. The first chapter describes Japanese army's attack of Taiwan and culturally and physically enslaved both Chinese people in Taiwan and native Taiwanese people (Wang, p. 96). The next two chapters state that Japan built infrastructure (i.e., railways, electricity, and modern hygiene), established Japanese language based schools and colleges, enacted agricultural policy that focused on sugar and rice in Taiwan (Wang, p. 103), and taught Taiwanese people the Gregorian Calendar (Wang, p. 107). According to the comment section, the infrastructure and values that built up by Japanese colonizers stabilized Taiwan's society, boosted Taiwan's economy, fostered Taiwanese elites, and prolonged Taiwanese people's average life expectancy (Wang, p. 107).

The textbook further introduces several political parties in Taiwan, stating these parties fighting for political equality, voting rights, laborers' and farmers' rights, and establishing an independent Taiwan during the Japanese domination of Taiwan around 1930 (Wang, p. 114). During the same period of time, Taiwanese writers promoted Taiwanese-language-based literature, and artists invented new Taiwanese style painting that incorporated Eastern and Western painting styles, as well as music and opera (Wang, p. 120).

Two of the six chapters present the evidence of Taiwan and Taiwanese people's lives during the Second Sino-Japanese War. According to the Taiwanese history textbook, to satisfy the needs of military expansion, Japan Japanized Taiwanese people so that they would be loyal to Japan and then work for the Japanese army (Wang, p. 126).

Many Taiwanese proudly joined Japanese army and fought on behalf of Japan. Writing letters with blood to state their willingness to join the Japanese army was popular among young Taiwanese. Besides the text, one photo shows a blood letter, and another photo displays a sign “Voluntary Soldier’s Home” that Taiwanese soldiers hung on the door (Wang, p. 131). There are over two hundred thousand Taiwanese people that joined the Japanese army and navy during the war, cited from the Japanese government (Wang, p. 133).

It seems that Mainland China’s *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* and Taiwan’s *History 2* reach an agreement on Japan’s cruelty and criminality during the war, yet the two textbooks offer slightly different emphasis. While Taiwan’s textbook only presents the Japanese army’s evildoing on the Chinese people, Mainland China’s textbook provides the historical accounts that the Japanese army mistreated innocent Chinese people and focused on attacking the Communist army. *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* does not mention if the Nationalist army also faced similar hardships. Again, Mainland China’s textbook ignores the Nationalist Party and prefers to pay more attention to the Communist Party’s doings during the war. Such emphasis is consistent with the “heroes versus conspirators” official narrative that represents the Communist Party as the hero during the Second Sino-Japanese War, which further informs the collective memory among Chinese readers that it was the Communist Party that saved China. In addition, the preference for the Communist Party over the Nationalist Party is an expression of state power; since the Communist Party rules the

state of China textbooks present favorable official historical accounts of the Communist Party.

The Taiwanese history textbook *History I* further establishes a Taiwanese collective memory which supports a national identity as Taiwanese among its readers. In this textbook, Taiwan was a part of Japan but trying to become independent from Japan before the Second Sino-Japanese War; during the war, the Taiwanese people were loyal to Japan and joined the Japanese army. Such descriptions help form the Taiwanese collective memory. That is, Taiwan has always wanted to be an independent country, and when Japan attacked China, people in Taiwan considered themselves as Japanese and/or Taiwanese Japanese rather than Chinese. Therefore, combined with the negative images of the Communist Party, the historical accounts in the textbook reproduce the ideological interests of Taiwan that the state of Taiwan should not be ruled by communist China and its people are not Chinese, but Taiwanese.

5.4 The Chinese Civil War (1946-1949)

5.4.1 The Chinese Civil War in Mainland China's history textbook

The Chinese Civil War was fought between the Nationalist Party and the Communist Party after China defeated Japan in the Second Sino-Japanese War. This war is known as the “War of Liberation” (解放战争) in Mainland China's history textbooks. According to *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*, the U.S. encouraged Chiang Kai-shek to start the war by giving the Nationalist army planes and weapons so that Chiang could attempt to steal the victory in the Second Sino-Japanese War from the

Communist Party (PEP, p. 48). A picture and its caption beside the text show that the U.S. provided planes for the Nationalist army to send its soldiers everywhere in China. Following this victory in August 1945, Chiang pretended that he wanted to negotiate with the Communist Party for sovereignty, but in fact he secretly prepared to fight against the Communist army.

On October 10, 1945, the two parties signed the “Double 10 Agreements,” stipulating the following major clauses: that they would establish a new, independent China; they should avoid war; the Nationalist Party should stop its single-party hegemony in China; people in China would have democracy and freedom. The textbook further notes that even though the Communist Party made enormous concessions, the two parties could hardly reach an agreement on the legalization of the Communist army and Communist liberation areas (PEP, p. 50). Later the Nationalist Party, the Communist Party, other political parties, and other independent politicians signed a second agreement, stating that they would reshuffle the Republic of China, reorganize armies nation-wide, and draw up a constitution in China. According to the textbook’s comment section, this agreement would likely have broken Chiang Kai-shek’s dictatorship, realized democracy in China, and established a new government peacefully; therefore, a majority of people in China favored this agreement. Nonetheless, the Nationalist Party soon tore up the agreement, so China was not able to realize democracy and peace at that time (PEP, p. 51).

Modern and Contemporary Chinese History then states that the Nationalist army, supported by the U.S., started to attack the Communist Party’s liberation areas located in

northern, central, and eastern China, so a large-scale civil war broke out in the summer of 1946. At the beginning of the Chinese Civil War, the Nationalist Party had the military advantage and economic strength (PEP, p. 51). When interviewed by American journalist Anna Louise Strong regarding his disadvantaged situation, Communist leader Mao Zedong famously pointed out that, “all reactionaries are paper tigers” (PEP, p. 52). The textbook comments that this famous statement largely encouraged the Chinese people to fight against the U.S. backed reactionary Chiang Kai-shek (PEP, p. 52).

After failing to occupy all the Communist liberation areas, the Nationalist army focused on attacking two areas: Shanbei and Shandong. Nonetheless, Mao Zedong and the Communist central leaders remained steadfast in Shanbei in order to command the Civil War. The Communist army eliminated thousands of Nationalist soldiers, including the No. 74 crack troops armed with U.S. made weapons (PEP, p. 53). At the same time, the Communist army expanded to a total of 1.9 million soldiers. Then the Communist Party ended their defense strategy and turned to counterattack the Nationalists (PEP, p. 59). The Communists defeated the Nationalists in three important battles: the Battle of Liaoshen, the Battle of Huaihai, and the Battle of Pingjin (PEP, p. 60). The Battle of Liaoshen liberated Northeastern China. The Nationalist General Du Yuming escaped with over three hundred thousand Nationalist soldiers during the Battle of Huaihai. Another Nationalist General Fu Zuoyi surrendered during the Battle of Pingjin (PEP, p. 62).

After the three battles, Chiang Kai-shek pretended that he wanted peace with the Communist Party again. Mao Zedong offered eight conditions to Chiang about how to

end the war and govern China. In early April 1949, the two parties reached an agreement based on the eight conditions; however, on April 20th, the Republic of China (ruled by the Nationalist Party) refused to sign the agreement. Therefore, the Nationalist Party's conspiracy was exposed, according to the textbook's comments (PEP, p. 65). Then on April 21st, Communist Chairman Mao Zedong and General Zhu De commanded the Communist army to march across the Yangtze River to liberate the whole country. On April 23rd, the Communist Army occupied Nanjing, the capital city in the Republic of China, which formally ended the Chinese Civil War.

According to *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History*'s comment section, there are several factors contributing to ending the Chinese Civil War. First, the Nationalist Party's dictatorship resulted in the vast majority of people in China opposing the party. Second, the Nationalist army had very low morale during the war. Third, the Nationalist Party misgoverned China – the unemployment rate and inflation skyrocketed, and the Nationalist officials were frequently corrupt (PEP, p. 67). Fourth, the U.S. stopped supporting Chiang Kai-shek, and the Nationalist Party wanted a new leader to replace Chiang (PEP, p. 68). On the other hand, the reason why the Communist Party won the civil war is because: effective Communist leadership; Marxist and Maoist theories; insistence on armed fighting over negotiation; unification of all powers; support from the majority of the Chinese people (PEP, p. 68).

5.4.2 The Chinese Civil War in Taiwan's history textbook

Taiwan's *History 2* chooses the relatively neutral term “civil war” (内战) to name the war between the two parties and offers a relatively brief account for the war. The

textbook claims that the Communist Party was backed by the Soviet Union and took the Japanese army's weapons before the civil war. The negotiation between the Communists and Nationalists did not make peace, even though the U.S. sent George Marshall to China, who acted as a mediator for the two parties (Wang, p. 199). Both parties were confident that they could win the war (Wang, p. 200), because the Nationalist Party had the military advantage, while the Communist Party believed that they could defeat the Nationalists by prolonging the war.

History 2 lists several factors that resulted in Nationalist Party being at a disadvantage later in the Chinese Civil War: the Communist army's tactics were flexible so that they often defeated the Nationalists; Chinese peasants supported the Communist Party; the U.S. recalled Marshall and stopped supporting the Republic of China; and the Nationalist soldiers had very low morale during the war; the Nationalist officials were corrupt (Wang, p. 200).

Moreover, according to the comment section in the Second Sino-Japanese War chapter, the reason why the Nationalist Party could not promote the economy and democracy in China was because it needed to concentrate on fighting against Japan, which largely caused the Nationalist Party to lose its regime in Mainland China. At the same time, the Communist Party took the advantage of the Second Sino-Japanese War to develop its political and military power in order to contend against the Nationalist Party. Also, at the end of the Second Sino-Japanese War, the secret Yalta Agreement harmed the Republic of China's territorial sovereignty (Wang, p. 199).

History 2 then states that the Communist Party had the military advantage which resulted from the three decisive battles (the Battle of Liaoshen, the Battle of Huaihai, and the Battle of Pingjin). Additionally, at this time, two Nationalist generals negotiated with the Communists, and the U.S. declared that it would not step into China's domestic affairs. Then the Communist Army marched southward in order to occupy two important cities, Nanjing and Shanghai. Finally, the government of the Republic of China retreated from Mainland China to Taiwan on December 27, 1949 (Wang, p. 201). From then on, the Republic of China has had no standing in Mainland China, according to *History 2*.

From the terms that the textbook privileges, it is apparent that *Modern and Contemporary Chinese History* narrates the historical accounts of the Chinese Civil War from the pro-Communist viewpoint. The textbook insists on the “heroes versus conspirators” framework and relies on positive and negative words to describe the Communists and Nationalists, respectively. For example, the term “War of Liberation” instead of “Chinese Civil War” in this textbook implies that the Communist Party liberated the state of China and the Chinese people through fighting against the Nationalist Party. When presenting the stories of the Nationalist Party, the textbook uses negative words, such as “steal,” “escape,” “conspiracy,” and “misgovern” to depict the Nationalist Party during the war. These positive and negative words in Mainland China's history textbook represents the Communist Party's doings during the war as benefiting China, while the Nationalist Party almost destroyed the country and its army was weak despite the U.S. supporting them. Word choice reflects the interests of Communist China

and a collective memory that communicates that it was always the Communist Party that saved China from danger.

The evidence shown in *History 2* demonstrates that the Nationalist Party failed to defeat the Communists in the Chinese Civil War. When providing the factors that resulted in the Nationalist Party's failure, *History 2* offers more external reasons (i.e., the Second Sino-Japanese War, Chinese peasants, and the U.S.) and fewer internal reasons to explain why the Nationalist Party was defeated in Mainland China and retreated to Taiwan. Thus, the historical accounts presented in *History 2* obscure the problems that the Nationalist Party made and diverts the Taiwanese readers' attention to the role of foreign countries and the Communist Party. These historical accounts mirror the ideological interests of the Nationalist Party, the dominant group in Taiwan since 1949, and further reinforces a positive Taiwanese collective memory by representing the Nationalist Party as an excellent ruling party.

Part 6 – Discussions

6.1 The conflicting historical accounts and the state interests

As the findings above demonstrate, history textbooks in Mainland China and Taiwan present significantly different historical accounts of the four armed conflicts and major characters in Chinese and/or Taiwanese history. I have discussed three primary groupings of examples in this investigation. The first grouping includes significant differences in portrayals of the Chinese-Taiwanese political and national relationship prior to and following the Battle of Penghu and the role of Governor Zheng Chenggong

and his family in Taiwan. The second group of examples derive from the First Sino-Japanese War that provide conflicting descriptions of the Qing government's reaction to Japan and Taiwanese people's patriotism. The third group of examples demonstrate that the differing descriptions about the Second Sino-Japanese War and the Chinese Civil War are consistent with the ruling party of each state. Given these findings the answer to my first research question is clear: China's and Taiwan's history textbooks do present different accounts of the same historical events and characters

The differences in Mainland China and Taiwan's history textbooks are the expression of the two states' official knowledge. According to Apple (1990, 2000), official knowledge is a product of either the state's or dominant groups' interests, and therefore it serves as an expression of state power and/or the power of dominant groups. In these terms, the four armed conflicts selected in this investigation are examples of official knowledge. For example, the framework "the Communist Party is a hero while the Nationalist Party is a conspirator" reveals the state power of Communist China. By contrast, "The Nationalist Party is a hero while the Communist Party is a conspirator" framework in Taiwan's history textbook largely reflects the way that the dominant political group in Taiwan, the Nationalist Party, perceives and recounts the official Chinese history in Taiwan. In Mainland China's textbooks, the hidden ideology that Taiwan has been part of China since ancient times also serves the political interests of China, which has tried to annex Taiwan since 1949. As an expression of the state power of Taiwan, Taiwan's history textbooks indicate that Taiwan is an independent country by constantly noting that the state strived for independence for years.

These differing historical accounts can be considered as representing official historical narratives that reflect the competing interests of these two nations. In Wertsch's (2002) investigation, the official historical narrative is consistent with the political ideology of a nation-state. Through history instruction students are provided official historical narratives that create and support collective memories of the past which reflect the ideological interests of the state. Mainland China's and Taiwan's history textbooks establish very different collective memories of Chinese and Taiwanese history and therefore offer resources for constructing different national identities for citizens of each state. As stated above, China's history textbooks convey two main ideas to its readers: that Taiwan is part of China and the Communist Party is the most legitimate party for Chinese people. In contrast, the official knowledge in Taiwan implies that Taiwan is an independent state and the Communist Party is the villainous dictator in China. As a result, students in Mainland China probably develop a pro-Communist Chinese identity and consider that people in Taiwan also share this Chinese identity. On the other hand, Taiwanese students likely develop a Taiwanese identity that is distinct from China and they would not consider the Communist Party as a legitimate party or Communist China as their motherland.

6.2 Implications of the investigation

Since Chinese and Taiwanese textbooks offer conflicting understandings of their national histories, this may result in conflicts and misunderstandings between citizens in Mainland China and Taiwan. For example, readers may leverage state-approved

historical “truths” against each other and may therefore find no way to reconcile their differing worldviews. These opposing “truths” may cause academic debate between historians and hatred between civilians belonging to each state. Furthermore, because the Taiwanese national identity and the idea of Taiwanese independence already prevail in Taiwan, it is less likely that people in Taiwan hold positive attitudes about the state of China, which always claims that “Taiwan is an inalienable part of China” (Yu, n.d.). From the perspective of China, when more and more Chinese interact with Taiwanese, Chinese people probably find out that they do not share the same national identity. Chinese policy makers may realize that it is increasingly difficult for China to peacefully annex Taiwan. Thus, history instruction may influence international relations between states by providing different, and in this case competing, collective memories and therefore different and potentially oppositional national identities to citizens of each state.

As stated at the beginning of this investigation, Taiwanese student protestors claimed that the new guidelines would brainwash younger Taiwanese generations. These student protesters have strong desires to prevent the state of Taiwan from “manipulating” historical accounts and “brainwashing” young Taiwanese citizens. However, they may not realize that the official knowledge that they learned in history class was not based on objective historical accounts but were instead collective memories which were largely determined by Taiwan’s previous state interests. Editing historical accounts in textbooks can cause ideological conflicts between the civilians and the state, as Wertsch (2002) found in his study in Russia, and is evident in the protests of Taiwanese students. Even though the pro-China ideology reflects Taiwan’s current state interests, the state of

Taiwan may not be able to inscribe this ideology into history textbooks given the protests by Taiwanese students. These protestors have a strong Taiwanese national identity and they may continue to insist on preserving an anti-China collective memory, which will continue to thwart China's efforts toward reunification with Taiwan in the near future.

Part 7 – Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This investigation focused on discovering if there were opposing historical accounts in Chinese and Taiwanese textbooks and probing the potential political interests of Mainland China and Taiwan that might be present in the content of these textbooks. The most significant limitation is the limited scope of historical accounts that were selected and analyzed and the small number of textbooks included in this study. Although history textbooks within a state are usually edited based on the same curriculum guidelines, textbooks printed by different publishers for different regions may not present exactly the same accounts for the same historical events. Therefore, future research would benefit from expanding the number and variety of textbooks included for study and expanding the number of historical accounts to be analyzed.

In addition, content analysis was the only method used in this investigation, but observing the use of these textbooks in classrooms and interviewing students who read these textbooks would yield important additional data. For example, does Chinese and Taiwanese history instruction that uses these textbooks reflect the political ideologies evident in my analysis? Do Chinese and Taiwanese students who are instructed with these textbooks agree with and accept these ideologies? Future research should conduct such studies to investigate how Chinese and Taiwanese students think about their national

history and if their opinions are consistent with the state's ideology reflected in their textbooks.

References

- Alridge, D. P. (2006). The Limits of Master Narratives in History Textbooks: An Analysis of Representations of Martin Luther King, Jr. *Teachers College Record*, 108 (4), 662-686. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00664.x
- Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2002). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.
- Cole, J. M. (2015, July 24). Taiwanese students occupy education ministry over textbook controversy. Retrieved from *The Diplomat*:
<http://thediplomat.com/2015/07/taiwanese-students-occupy-education-ministry-over-textbook-controversy/>
- Hundreds take to Taiwan's streets to demonstrate against 'one China' textbook revisions*. (2015, August 2). Retrieved from ABC: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-08-03/hundreds-demonstrate-in-taiwan-over-one-china-textbooks/6668470>
- Jiji. (2015, July 31). Taiwan students storm ministry amid furor over 'pro-China' textbooks. Retrieved from *The Japan Times*:
<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2015/07/31/asia-pacific/taiwan-students-storm-ministry-amid-furor-pro-china-textbooks/#.VslVTpMrJKO>
- LeCompte, M. D., Preissle, J., & Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (1969). Models of messages: Three prototypes. In G. Gerbner, O. R. Holsti, K. Krippendorff, W. J. Paisley, & P. J. Stone, *The analysis of communication content: Developments in scientific theories and computer techniques* (pp. 69-106). New York: Wiley.
- Müller, G. (2011). *Designing history in East Asian textbooks*. New York: Routledge.
- Mao, C. (2013, June 1). What, How, and Why? A Study on Senior High School Teachers' Selection of Textbooks. *Journal of research in education sciences*, 58(2), 123-147.
- Mao, W. (1995). *World history in China Mainland and Taiwan secondary school textbooks*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Stanford University, Stanford.
- Marquand, R. (2015, August 4). Taiwan, protests over history textbooks are about the future. Retrieved from *The Christian Science Monitor*:

- <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-Pacific/2015/0804/In-Taiwan-protests-over-history-textbooks-are-about-the-future>
- Nozaki, Y. (2008). *War memory, nationalism and education in post war Japan, 1945—2007*. New York: Routledge.
- People's Education Press. (2003). *Ancient Chinese history*. Beijing: People's Education Press.
- People's Education Press. (2003, May 21). *Curriculum standard*. Retrieved from People's Education Press:
http://www.pep.com.cn/gzls/js/tbjx/kb/kb/kcbz/201008/t20100831_840724.htm
- People's Education Press. (2003). *Modern and contemporary Chinese history*. Beijing: People's Education Press.
- Ren, C., & Wu, Y. (2015, June 25). Three questions for the controversy over Taiwan's history curriculum guidelines. Retrieved from *People's Daily*:
<http://tw.people.com.cn/n/2015/0625/c14657-27204423.html>
- Rotberg, R. I. (2006). *Israeli and Palestinian narratives of conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sano, J. (2009). Farmhands and Factory Workers, Honesty and Humility: The Portrayal of Social Class and Morals in English Language Learner Children's Books. *Teachers College Record*, 111(11), 2560-2588.
- Sneider, D. (2013). Textbooks and Patriotic Education: Wartime Memory Formation in China and Japan. *Asia-Pacific Review*, 20(1), 35-54.
- Taiwanese students: Writing Japanese colonization in textbooks, will Japanese be angry? (2015, 8 05). Retrieved from *China.com*:
http://military.china.com/important/11132797/20150805/20139173_all.html#page_2
- Teng, Y. (2015, July 24). What does Taiwan's textbook change and what does the protestors go against. Retrieved from *iFeng*:
http://news.ifeng.com/a/20150724/44241304_0.shtml
- Tsoi, G. (2015, July 27). Taiwan has its own textbook controversy brewing. Retrieved from *Foreign Policy*: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/07/21/taiwan-textbook-controversy-china-independence-history/>
- Wang, C. (2009). *History I*. Taipei: KangSi Cultural Company.

- Wang, C. (2009). *History 2*. Taipei: KangSi Cultural Company.
- Wang, Z. (March 21, 2009). Old Wounds, New Narratives: Joint History Textbook Writing and Peacebuilding in East Asia. *History & Memory*, 21(1), 101-126.
- Wertsch, J. W. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Worden, E. A. (2014). *National identity and educational reform: Contested classrooms*. New York: Routledge.
- Yu, S. (n.d.). Taiwan - an inalienable part of China. Retrieved from *Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the United States of America*: <http://www.china-embassy.org/eng/zt/999999999/t36717.htm>
- Zha, W. (2015, August 3). Feelings of the controversy over Taiwan's history curriculum guidelines: Do not use the 'Taiwan independence' idea to deceive the next generation. Retrieved from *Xinhuanet*: http://news.xinhuanet.com/tw/2015-08/03/c_1116125863.htm