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Introduction
1
Background on Hong Kong and Theoretical Framework

1.1 Introduction

This chapter will first provide some very brief background about Hong Kong, because Hong Kong is the focus of the discourses analysed in this book. The chapter will then review the literature on the three key theoretical terms in the title of this book: critical discourse analysis, historiography and identity. After this, something will be said about other theories and the methods used in this study. This will be followed by a summary of each chapter. Finally, a checklist will be given of the main discourse theories and methods of textual analysis used in each chapter.

1.2 Hong Kong

Hong Kong is a former British colony and now a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC). Hong Kong is located in the southern part of China and has a population of approximately 7 million. Its total land area of 1076 km² is made up of three distinct parts: Hong Kong Island, ceded to the British in perpetuity in 1842; the Kowloon peninsula, ceded to the British in 1860; and the New Territories, coming under British control according to the terms of a 99-year lease agreed with China, in 1898. Each of the three parts of Hong Kong was taken over by the British following minor Sino-British wars and, consequently, the legitimacy of Britain's sovereignty has always been contested by China, although that country never took any concrete steps to retrieve control, stating that ‘[t]he Hong Kong issue should be resolved through negotiation when conditions permit’ and that ‘the existing status of Hong Kong should be maintained pending a solution’ (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2000). In the early 1980s, with the approach of the expiry of the lease on the New Territories in 1997 and British concern about what would happen to Hong Kong, negotiations were entered into. These negotiations resulted in 1984 in agreement that, under the terms of a ‘Joint Declaration’, on 1 July 1997,
sovereignty over the whole territory would return to China and that Hong Kong would become a Special Administrative Region of that country. Based upon the Joint Declaration, which went into considerable detail in specifying the terms of the return, China published its own ‘Basic Law’, a mini-constitution for post-1997 Hong Kong. Both the Joint Declaration and the Basic Law state that Hong Kong would retain a high degree of autonomy under Chinese sovereignty and that its way of life, including its capitalist economic system, its common-law legal system, its free press, its freedom of worship, its right of assembly, its academic freedom and its two official languages (Chinese and English) would remain the same for 50 years following the change of sovereignty.

Not long after the signing of the Joint Declaration, demonstrations for greater openness on the part of the mainland government, in Tiananmen Square, in the centre of Beijing, led to many deaths, following the intervention of the People’s Liberation Army. This created great concern in Hong Kong and led to mass emigration on the part of Hong Kong people to countries such as Canada, Australia and the United States (although many subsequently returned). The British refused to give right of abode in Britain to all Hong Kong people, but, in 1990, passed the British nationality act, allowing 50,000 families to obtain British citizenship, the idea being that this would encourage those key members of society offered right of abode in Britain to remain in Hong Kong. In order to further reinforce confidence, the British Hong Kong government, under Governor David Wilson, embarked on a public spending campaign, the most important element of which was a new airport. The Chinese government was suspicious that the British were trying to use up Hong Kong’s financial reserves in paying British contractors working on the airport and tried to block this project, although it eventually went through.

By this time, Governor Wilson and his Foreign Office colleagues had come to be judged by the Conservative government of the time, under Prime Minister John Major, to be too accommodating to the Chinese government, especially with regard to the negotiations over electoral arrangements in the lead-up to and following the handover. Accordingly, in July 1992, Major appointed a ‘political’ governor, Chris Patten, as its representative, to take a harder line in dealings with the mainland government. Patten introduced proposals for political reform designed to give Hong Kong greater democracy. The Chinese viewed this as interference in its internal affairs (because the reforms would run beyond the handover) and ostracised Patten, mounting a vitriolic verbal campaign against him, referring to him as a ‘whore of the East’, a ‘serpent’ and a ‘criminal who would be condemned for a thousand generations.’ In spite of this Chinese opposition, however, Patten pushed through his reforms.

On 30 June 1997, at a ceremony in Hong Kong presided over by the Chinese president, Jiang Zemin, and Prince Charles, the colony was formally
transferred from Britain to China. In their speeches, both Charles and Jiang commented on the great achievement of international cooperation that was represented by Hong Kong’s reversion.

The first chief executive of the Hong Kong SAR (equivalent to governor), Tung Chee-hwa, had been selected prior to the handover by a small circle of Hong Kong Beijing supporters and mainland legal experts and members of the PRC hierarchy. The first thing that Tung did after his appointment was to oversee the dismantling of the Patten reforms and the organisation of elections for its replacement under the old system legislature (something that the Chinese had warned would happen). Faced with a range of other difficulties, including an avian flu epidemic, a right of abode issue concerning the rights of children born in Hong Kong to mainland citizens to remain in the SAR, problems with education concerning a switch from English to mother-tongue instruction, and, above all, the fallout from the Asian financial crisis, which led to a crash in the property and employment market, Tung proved to be very unpopular with the people of Hong Kong. In spite of this he was selected by Beijing in 2002 for a second five-year term.

Early in his second term, Tung tried to implement an article in the Basic Law which required the Hong Kong government to draw up anti-subversion legislation. This proved hugely unpopular, due to concerns about restrictions on Hong Kong citizens’ freedom, freedom which they had been promised in the Joint Declaration. Early in his second term, Tung was also criticised for his government’s mishandling of an epidemic of SARS. These issues and others led, in 2003, to a mass demonstration of some 500,000 people calling for Tung to resign. Following further criticism, including a public dressing down from the PRC president himself, Hu Jintao, in 2005, Tung resigned, officially for health reasons.

During the post-handover period, debate continued in Hong Kong over democratic development. According to the Joint Declaration and the Basic Law, Hong Kong is to work gradually towards universal suffrage for the chief executive and the legislature. There was much argument in Hong Kong over the pace of this reform, with the Hong Kong government (and Beijing) favouring a slower pace of development and a legislative framework that gave it more control, and the pro-democracy parties favouring a faster pace of development and a more broadly based Western-style electoral system. In 2004, following the failure on the part of the Hong Kong government, under Tung, to win the necessary two-thirds majority in the Legislative Council for its proposals for limited democratic development, the Chinese government unilaterally decided that it would impose the Beijing/Hong Kong government model. Universal suffrage for the chief executive and the Legislative Council would not occur before 2017, it declared. Following that decision, debate continued in Hong Kong over the exact form of the elections and a demand on the part of the pro-democracy camp for a ‘road map’ showing how the 2017 model will be arrived at.
Following Tung’s departure, his successor, Donald Tsang, was first appointed acting chief executive until a selection procedure could be organised to formally appoint him. This having been done, Tsang was confirmed in his position, to serve out Tung’s shortened term, until 2007. He was then reselected (unopposed) for a further five years until 2012. In 2007, an electoral reform proposal put forward by Tsang was voted down, failing to get the required two-thirds majority in the Legislative Council, due to the pro-democracy parties refusing to support it. In 2010, however, a further revised package received the reluctant support of most of the pro-democracy legislators and it was passed. It looks as if, by 2017, Hong Kong will have universal suffrage, but that there will be built-in features that will ensure that Beijing has ultimate control, a model more akin to that of Singapore than to that of Western democracies.

Hong Kong is often described as a meeting of East and West, based on the traditional Chinese heritage of its inhabitants and the influence of British colonialism and international capitalism. It is an important centre for trade and finance and, since the handover, has become increasingly important as a funnel for mainland trade and investment. Hong Kong people are well educated and sophisticated, many of them having lived or studied overseas. In elections, pro-democracy parties consistently win majorities, although the make-up of the Legislative Council, with its functional constituencies (small constituencies based on designated individuals and organisations representing special interests), together with pro-Beijing parties, ensures that the government can usually get its way. On the few occasions when it has failed to do so, the Hong Kong government has called upon the mainland government to impose its policies. Most Hong Kong people resist political control from Beijing, however, while at the same time embracing China as the motherland for culture and heritage.

The chapters in this book cover the period from the appointment as governor of Chris Patten up to and including the time of Tung Chee-hwa. They thus cover both the pre- and post-handover period, although they do not go right up to the tenure of Donald Tsang.

1.3 Critical discourse analysis

The model of critical discourse analysis (CDA) employed in this volume is influenced primarily by Norman Fairclough (e.g. 1989, 1995a, b, 2003), Ruth Wodak (e.g. 2001, 2002) [see also Fairclough and Wodak, 1997]), and Teun van Dijk (e.g. 1987, 1988a, b, 2008a), although insights are also drawn from other (critical) discourse analysts and other social and discourse theories.

In this book, the term discourses is used in the plural to differentiate it from the singular term discourse. The latter refers to language use in general, while the former refers to specific sets of meanings expressed through particular forms and uses which give expression to particular institutions.
or social groups (Kress, 1989; Foucault, 1984). Discourses vary from person to person, because people’s views of the world and relations with it vary, depending upon their individual circumstances. Discourses are not the same as texts (written or spoken). Texts are manifestations of discourses and discourses are manifested through text (and other semiotic systems), but they are not the same thing.

Discourse is related to ideology in so far as discursive practices reflect subjective understandings of the world. Discourse is thus infused with the ideological assumptions of its creators. Discourses may present subjective versions of reality with a view to imposing particular ideologies onto subjects. They may thus reflect power struggles within society.

CDA is concerned with the relation between language and society from a critical perspective (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997: 258). For CDA, discourses are conceptions of the world, connected to the relations people share with the world, depending on their social positions (Fairclough, 2003). Discourses can thus be conceived of as ‘ways of representing aspects of the world – the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the “mental world” of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world’ (Fairclough, 2003: 124).

Fairclough’s conception of discourses as expressive of systems of knowledge and belief, social relations and social identities is derived from the linguistic theory of Halliday (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004), referred to as systemic-functional linguistics (SFL). SFL emphasises how language simultaneously performs three major functions: (i) representing the world (ideational function), (ii) enacting social relations and identities (interpersonal function) and (iii) (an enabling function) realising the other functions as text (textual function). In relating SFL’s theory of the characteristics of language to CDA, Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 258) see discourse not only as representing social situations and relations, but at the same time as being constitutive of them: ‘it [discourse] constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people’. What distinguishes CDA, indeed, from the approach of, for example, Foucault and other post-structuralists to discourse is its emphasis on linguistic form. CDA posits a dialectical relation between macro social structures of discourse and micro linguistic features (Fairclough, 1995a). Social structure determines linguistic form, but, at the same time, linguistic form determines social structure (Fairclough, 1995a: 28).

Fairclough (1995a: 28) relates this dialectic between the macro and the micro to the term ‘critical’ in CDA: ‘[t]he critical approach has its theoretical underpinnings in views of the relationship between “micro”... and “macro” structures which see the latter as both the conditions for and the products of the former and which therefore reject rigid barriers between the study of the “micro”... and the study of the “macro”.’ CDA emphasises both the power of discourse in producing and reproducing unequal power relations, on the
one hand, and the role of discursive structures in activating ideologies, on the other (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The term ‘critical’, as Wodak has explained in an interview (Kendall, 2007), is derived from the Frankfurt School and other sources and does not necessarily imply negativity, but refers to ‘not taking anything for granted, opening up alternative readings (justifiable through cues in the texts); self-reflection of the research process; making ideological positions manifested in the respective text transparent, etc.’ (in Kendall, 2007). At the same time, there is no denying that an important function of CDA is the unmasking of hidden assumptions in discourse, assumptions which may not be obvious even to its users, as they have become naturalised, or part of common-sense understanding (Barthes, 1972).

In relating the micro and macro, Fairclough (2002) relates CDA to Gramsci’s (1971) notion of hegemony. For Fairclough (1992: 92), hegemony is ‘leadership as much as domination across the economic, political, cultural and ideological domains of a society’. Hegemonic struggle can be related to discourse in so far as social structures and discursive structures are in a mutually defining relationship. Social structure is manifested in its discursive practices and discursive practices are constitutive of social structure, in society’s norms, conventions, relations, identities and institutions (Fairclough, 1992: 64). This means that changes in society are reflected in changes in discursive practice and vice versa.

In bringing hegemony and discourse together, one can talk of discursive hegemony. By this is meant, as Fairclough (2003: 218) defines the term, ‘the dominance and naturalisation of particular representations’, how certain discourses come to prevail in given sociopolitical contexts, as a result of a struggle between the relevant political actors. This conceptualisation of discursive hegemony is an extension of Gramsci’s broader notion of hegemony, which conceives of power as being based on acquiescence and consent, not just force, that is to say hegemony consists of both ideology and physical force. The emphasis put on the discursive dimension of hegemony here, how the struggle for political dominance is at least partly constituted through discursive means, is derived from Laclau and Mouffe (2001), who see discourse as central to their influential rearticulation of the notion of hegemony.

The creation of a hegemonic discourse concerned with national and sociopolitical identity implies the projection of a common identity onto subjects as belonging to an autonomous community and expressing a single national and political culture (Smith, 2002). This struggle for discursive hegemony underlies most, if not all, of the discourses analysed in this book. Thus in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, we see how Chris Patten, the last British Hong Kong governor, tried to project a particular image of Hong Kong’s identity onto its people, while in Chapter 8 we see how Tung Chee-hwa, the first Chinese chief executive of the newly formed Special Administrative Region of China, partly tried to perpetuate this view, but also attempted to make changes to it, to fit in with the post-handover status quo. In Chapter 7, on
the other hand, we see how a pro-Beijing newspaper, in its depiction of the Hong Kong ‘patriot’, strove to impose a pro-mainland view of the prevailing political scenario. In Chapter 6, we see two contrasting discourses competing in the public domain of Hong Kong: the Utilitarian discourse, which is characteristic of those who support greater democracy and autonomy for Hong Kong versus the Confucianist discourse, which is employed by representatives of China and the pro-China camp in Hong Kong. Each of these different discourses can be seen to be striving for discursive hegemony.

CDA enables us to look into the discourse dimensions of injustice, inequality and the abuse of power in general. The social, political and cultural organisation of dominance in the language structures of a discourse is constitutive of a hierarchy of power. As one of the essential functions of text and talk is to persuade others to one’s point of view, it is possible to analyse the linguistic structures and the discursive strategies of a discourse in order to uncover the power struggle, social inequality and other forms of social and political problems (van Dijk, 1993a).

In order to uncover the linguistic structures and the discursive strategies of a discourse referred to in the previous paragraph, it is necessary to consider the context in which they are made. CDA, in line with Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics, views context as constraining the properties of texts (spoken and written); at the same time, however, properties of texts contribute towards the creation of social structures and contexts. Indeed, analysis in CDA involves what Halliday (1961) a long time ago referred to as ‘shunting’ between textual properties, on the one hand (the micro), and social context (the macro) (referred to as the context of situation in Hallidayan linguistics (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004)), on the other.

Van Dijk (2001b: 108) distinguishes two levels of context: global and local. The global level concerns the overall social, political, cultural and historical structures in which the discourse takes place while the local level concerns the immediate interactional situation.

The approach to context in Wodak’s (2001) ‘discourse-historical’ approach to CDA fits with van Dijk’s global level and puts particular emphasis on the historical background (for more on this, see the next section on history): ‘In investigating historical, organizational and political topics and texts, the discourse-historical approach attempts to integrate a large quantity of available knowledge about the historical sources and the background of the social and political fields in which discursive “events” are embedded.’ This approach is very close, in fact, to that adopted in this volume, where the sociohistorical background is very important to the textual analysis in all of the individual case studies.

In contrast to Wodak, van Dijk’s own approach to context puts more emphasis on the local dimension. Van Dijk is particularly concerned with how context is mediated through cognition, how individuals relate text and context through ‘subjective mental models on-goingly constructed by the
participants of the current communicative events …’ (van Dijk, 2005: 95). Van Dijk (1991) is concerned with what is implicit in discourse and how ideology is transmitted between individuals through the implicit transference of mental models, of which what is spoken or written, the text, is only the tip of an iceberg of sets of attitudes. Van Dijk is particularly interested in racial discrimination in discourse: ‘… we want to know how political discourse is involved in the enactment, confirmation or challenge of attitudes and ideologies about ethnic groups, ethnic relations, or issues such as immigration and integration’ (van Dijk, 1991: 87–8). Racial discrimination is the theme of Chapter 10 in this book.

There has been a growing trend in CDA towards the integration of cognitive linguistics into the enterprise. This can be seen as an extension of van Dijk’s ‘socio-cognitive’ approach, just referred to. An early example of this is the work of O’Halloran (2003), who combines four cognitive frameworks: connectionism, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistic evidence on inference generation, and relevance theory. Another development in this direction is that of Charteris-Black (2004, 2005), who has focused on metaphor and examined how metaphors convey intentions, motivations and ideologies that underlie language use. In the present volume, there is a focus on the use of metaphor in the discourse of Chris Patten (Chapter 3) and in a pro-Beijing Hong Kong newspaper (Chapter 7). Charteris-Black uses a technique for identifying metaphors used in CDA by the present author (Flowerdew, 1997a) and which is employed in the present volume (Chapters 2, 3 and 8), that of corpus linguistics, although the present author uses this technique not just to identify metaphor, but also other rhetorical tropes (see also Baker, 2006; Baker et al., 2008). A further application of cognitive theory in CDA is that of Hart (2010), this approach also drawing upon evolutionary psychology. The present volume does not delve into this territory, however.

CDA is not without its critics, an early one being Widdowson (see Widdowson, 2004 for the latest version). Basically, Widdowson accuses CDA of bias and for ignoring context. This argument has been well documented and there is not space enough to go into it here (but see e.g. Fairclough, 1996), although Meyer (2001) provides some answers to these criticisms, arguing that all human beings are socially positioned and that CDA is at least open about its commitment. Meyer also provides a set of criteria for evaluating CDA, including representativeness, reliability, validity, completeness, accessibility and triangulation (see also Flowerdew, 1999). Blommaert (2005) is critical of CDA for being too focused on text at the expense of context and for focusing too much on first world issues at the expense of less developed countries. There is some truth in Blommaert’s critique and, in its emphasis on history (see below), this volume, hopefully, goes some way to answering this critique.

A further critic of CDA and one who must be referred to here is Shi-xu (2004). This is because, not only does this writer critique CDA (and Western discourse analysis in general), but because, in his book, *A cultural approach*
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to discourse, he has also written specifically about Hong Kong. Shi-xu (2004) critiques Western discourse analysts, who, he argues, claim to be objective and universal, but are, in fact, no such thing, but rather the tools of Western imperialism (see Unger, 2005 for a critique of this view). What is needed instead, to counter this alleged cultural imperialism of Western discourse analysts, according to Shi-xu, is a deconstructive approach to this discourse, on the one hand, and an approach focused on developing cultural harmony, by finding positive aspects in non-Western traditions, on the other.

It is in Chapter 5 of A cultural approach to discourse that Shi-xu deals specifically with Hong Kong. He begins by arguing that the West needs to understand ‘cultural Others’. He then demonstrates how this might be done, by examining contrasting Western and Chinese (including mainland and Hong Kong) media discourses about Hong Kong’s change of sovereignty. The Western discourses marginalise and leave out positive aspects of the change of sovereignty, Shi-xu finds, which are emphasised more in the Chinese discourses. For example, the British refer to the change of sovereignty negatively, according to Shi-xu as a ‘handover’, while the Chinese refer to it more positively as a ‘return’. The Western discourse sees Hong Kong as an independent entity, while the Chinese discourse sees Hong Kong as linked to China in a ‘mother and child’ relationship (see Chapter 8 of this volume on this metaphor). The Western discourse sees Hong Kong’s success as resulting from the influence of the British, while the Chinese discourse sees it as due to the efforts of the Hong Kong people. This analysis is in many ways admirable and it is good that a Chinese scholar has taken on the task, for an international readership, of demonstrating the contrasting cultural views on Hong Kong’s return, to use the preferred Chinese term. In deconstructing the British discourse on Hong Kong, Shi-xu, in fact, is doing a similar job of deconstruction as that undertaken in the present volume.

However, while critique of Western discourse is to be encouraged, according to Shi-xu, critique of non-Western discourse is frowned upon. In another publication, Shi-xu (2009) critiques CDA work on non-Western discourses (including that of Achugar [see below] and that of Flowerdew and Leong [2007] [in large part reproduced as Chapter 8 of the present volume]), referring to such work as examples of ‘Westcentric definitions and judgements of non-Western situations’ (p. 33). Instead of critique with regard to non-Western discourses, a perspective from ‘in-between’ cultures should be adopted, drawing inspiration from indigenous methodological approaches, Shi-xu argues. Shi-xu (2009: 38) draws on traditional Chinese philosophy for his ‘in-between’ position, claiming that ‘[w]e can evaluate communicative practices in terms of whether they are conducive to unity and harmony, or detrimental to them’. With regard to traditional Chinese cultural approaches, it is unfortunate that Shi-xu argues for the application of this Confucian notion of ‘harmony’, however. Harmony is a term which has been appropriated as a slogan by the PRC government (also, more recently, by the Hong Kong government) and it
has become the focus of a powerful counter-discourse among Chinese people. In this respect, Zhang et al.’s (2011) claim, based on cognitive and evolutionary psychology and Habermasian discourse ethics, that the critical faculty is universal, is pertinent. Why should critique be encouraged of manipulative Western discourses, but not of those emanating from non-Western sources, one might well argue against Shi-xu.

Shi-xu thus takes a different cultural view from that of the present book. The position taken here is that CDA should seek to uncover naturalised and manipulative discourses wherever they may be found and, in the context of Hong Kong, this applies to both pre- and post-handover discourses. Shi-xu, on the other hand, prefers to limit critique to Western discourses and to seek ‘harmony’, with an emphasis on the positive in non-Western discourses. There is thus an issue of conflicting subjectivities between the present book and that of Shi-xu.

Shi-xu’s approach has affinities with what Martin and Rose (2003) have proposed as ‘positive discourse analysis’ (PDA), an approach which they present as an antidote to CDA and which highlights positive, affirmative aspects in discourse, although Martin and Rose’s agenda is for discourse in general, while Shi-xu puts a special emphasis on non-Western approaches. As has been written elsewhere (Flowerdew, 2008), however, with regard to PDA, with both Martin and Rose and Shi-xu’s approaches, there may be a danger of propaganda taking the place of dispassionate critical analysis.

1.4 History and historiography

Historiography is concerned with how the past is written about. It is a meta-level of analysis concerned with historical writing. Meaning and purpose are not inherent in historical data, some historiographers have emphasised strongly: historians impose interpretations on past events, people and situations (Ankersmit, 1994, 2001; White, 1973, 1978, 1987; Jenkins, 1991, 2003). It is historians who create history, according to this view, not what happened in the past. Although ‘professional’ historians strive for objectivity and impartiality, they are, to an extent, prisoners of language and discourse. The past is not organised systematically into sequences of events. Historians select which events to include in their accounts and sequence them chronologically. They stress the importance of some events, people and situations and downplay or remain silent about others. They impose causality, by arguing that certain events, people and situations are responsible for others. They also chop history up into convenient ‘periods’ and apply labels, such as Renaissance and Enlightenment, labels which are added to historical processes post ipso facto and of which the participants living at the time are unaware. Roland Barthes (1997) argued eloquently in his essay, ‘The discourse of history’, that the transparency effect of historical accounts is created through the absence of the author in the text. This use
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of an impersonal style misleadingly encourages a reading whereby the text appears to be directly related to the historical event, process or situation, unmediated by authorial intervention.

Michel Foucault has been influential in the social sciences for his conception of discourse, although his approach is much more abstract than the more linguistically focused CDA (Fairclough, 2002). Foucault is important to this volume for bringing together the two concepts of discourse and history. Foucault’s ‘genealogical’ approach to discourse emphasises the historical construction of modern-day concepts such as madness (1988), discipline (1991) and sexuality (1978), demonstrating, through an ‘archeological’ analysis (1970), how these concepts have developed historically. However, in line with the view expounded in the previous paragraph, Foucault’s conception of history is not that of a rational, linear construct, but rather of something that may be plural and inconsistent. Historical truth does not follow an inevitable progression for Foucault, but may develop by chance and be influenced by power and interest.

Historians are not only responsible for the content of their writings, but also the form. Writing about the past, like any writing, indeed, as discourse analysts are very much aware, is also reliant on rhetorical tropes. Hayden White is perhaps the best known historiographer to emphasise this point. White has written that, in addition to its referential function, historiography...

... cannot not operate the other functions which modern linguistics identifies as the different functions of the speech act: expressive (of the authors’ values and interests), cognitive (of audiences’ emotions, interests, prejudices), metalinguistics (seeking to clarify and justify its own terminology and explanatory procedures), phatic (establishing communication channels) and poetic (by which structure is transformed in sequence). (Cited in Jenkins 2003: 45)

For White, the historical representation of the past is essentially a linguistic enterprise. White made the following programmatic statement about his approach: ‘I will consider the historical work as what it most manifestly is – that is to say, a verbal structure in the form of narrative prose’ (White, 1973: 2). For White, historical texts can be classified according to the four deep poetic structures of metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy and irony. The reading of a historical text is thus not like that of a mathematical equation, but more like that of a poem. Because of this ubiquity of the figurative, for Jenkins (2003:46), a follower of White,

[the connections between the people, events or situations presented in historical discourse are therefore not logical connections but are metaphorical/allegorical. Further, since none of the discrete events which it is thought took place can be described as having in themselves an inherent
arrangement or storyline (let alone some intrinsic value that is objectively there and which cannot be ignored), then the processes by which such inert phenomena are turned (troped) and emplotted into a narrative form they were never in has to be ... fictive. Hence, what ‘realism’ the narrative has must be that of the rhetorical figure. What else could it be?

Following on from this line of reasoning, another historiographer, Ankersmit (2001), has argued that histories are nothing but ‘proposals’. Histories are not to be judged on the basis of their faithfulness to some objective truth, but with regard to each other, as aesthetic objects. What leads us to prefer one historical writer over another is not how close they may come to some putative objective historical reality, but one’s own individual disposition, one’s personal life experience, according to Ankersmit (2002).

It must be emphasised that the view just presented of historiography, the linguistic turn in historiography, if you like, is not well accepted by most practising historians and a strong version of this perspective is not argued for here. The following is a series of quotations from Arthur Marwick (2001: 2–3), a more conservative historian, who represents the more traditional, mainstream view and who has vigorously countered ‘postmodern’ conceptions of history:

... what happened in the past influences what happens in the present, and, indeed, what will happen in the future, so that knowledge of the past – history – is essential to society.
... human beings are not born with knowledge of how to build bridges or make television sets: they have to learn it. Similarly, human beings are not born with knowledge of the past (though it often seems to be assumed that they are): they have to learn it, and that learning, at whatever a remove, and however filtered (through school lessons, magazines, television, or whatever) comes ultimately from the researches and writings of historians.

To my mind, it is an enormous tribute to historians that we already do know so much about the past: about ancient China, about the Renaissance, about poverty and ordinary life in an incredible range of different cultures, about the denial and gaining of civil rights by, for example, women, blacks, gays; about the origins of the First World War; about Russia under Stalin and Germany under Hitler; about the recent machinations of the CIA and MI5. How has all this knowledge come about? It has come about ... through large numbers of historians doing history in strict accordance with the long established, though constantly developing, canons of the historical profession.

There are three main points here: first, knowledge about the past can inform present and future society; second, there is a need to learn about
the past and such knowledge comes from historians; and third, history has already informed us about a whole range of past phenomena, knowledge which, again, has come down to us via the established methods of historians. These are all valid points. History does play an important role in society, historians are the originators of historical knowledge, such as it is, and historians and their accepted methods, in large part, are responsible for this knowledge, however filtered that knowledge may be.

Are these points incommensurable, however, with the linguistic perspective put forward above? Perhaps not. While one might not accept, contra Baudrillard (1994), for example, that history could be written in the form of anagrams, in rhyme, or as acrostics (which might be a logical conclusion of the linguistic view), one might agree with Ankersmit (2001) to the extent that, in considering and comparing historical accounts, one is, to a considerable degree, making decisions about which set of ‘truths’ might be preferred, based on one’s individual predilections, in addition to their actual degree of ‘truth’ or ‘falsity’. To an extent, individuals are ruled by their particular socialisations and subjectivities. Interpretations of historical accounts are dependent on one’s own social values just as the accounts themselves are dependent on the values of the historians who created them. This is to be borne in mind, it might be pointed out here, in passing, by readers when evaluating the contents of this volume, because this applies to interpretation in CDA as well as more broadly in history. Nevertheless, it might be argued that there is an element of sophistry in the strong linguistic view, denying as it does any role for representation.

1.5 Historiography and the population at large

This book will examine how the past has been created, not by ‘professional’ historians, but by politicians, journalists, public relations professionals, museum curators and members of the general public. If, in spite of their best efforts to ensure ‘objectivity’, even professional historians are somewhat prisoners of their own rhetoric and that of those who originally created the documents they work upon, what then of these other purveyors of the past? Museum curators may, like historians, strive for objectivity, but, as will be shown in Chapter 9, they may be swayed by political considerations; journalists may lay claim to being objective, but they may also be swayed by the editorial policy of their editors, as will be seen in Chapter 7, and as for politicians, here one is dealing with a totally different animal; as will be seen, in particular in Chapters 2 and 8, they are likely to put their own ideological and political spin on any interpretation of history.

In an analysis of the Waldheim affair in Austria, Mitten (1992) uses the metaphor of the many-layered Austrian Mozartkugel, or Mozart cake, to demonstrate the relationship between historical material and public consciousness. The Mozartkugel has four concentric layers which can each stand for a different
level of historical consciousness, according to Mitten’s metaphor. At the centre are the historical materials to which the historians have access. In the second layer are the specialised historians, who have a variety of interests, ideological viewpoints, personal histories, degrees of intellectual honesty and scholarly competence which are likely to give rise to a range of interpretations of the given historical materials. In the third layer are the non-specialist intellectuals, consisting of teachers, journalists, writers and other non-historians (and one might add, too, that, importantly, politicians also operate at this level). This layer is likely to give rise to a further range of interpretations, because these people are subject to a similar disparity of viewpoints and prejudices as the historians. In the fourth, outer, layer is the majority of the population not included in the previous layers. These people, again, are dependent on the previous layer of the intelligentsia for their knowledge and opinions about history. Their ideas will be filtered down to them through school lessons, newspapers, oral accounts from family and friends, and through history books, if they read them. (Although Mitten does not say so, there should really be one further layer right at the centre of the cake. This is the actual historical events, because many historical documents are just that, documents. They are reports of what has happened, not actual events and are thus subject to the various biases of those who created them. This, therefore, makes the ‘person in the street’ even further removed from the actual ‘truth’.)

What this metaphorical account of Mitten’s means for the average person is that what counts as ‘history’, as the past, can only have meaning in relation to the values current in contemporary society, because received knowledge about the past is filtered down through the predilections and prejudices of other people, whether they be the original chroniclers, specialist historians, teachers, journalists or family and friends. And, as Mitten points out, there is a tendency for conceptualisations of the past to reinforce the assumptions of the dominant political culture, for them to become naturalised, to use a term familiar in discourse analysis.

As Mitten points out, the story is nevertheless not quite as severe as all this, because, in theory at least, individuals are free to engage their critical intelligence on the material available to them and in many societies there are enough materials to be had for individuals to develop alternative views to the prevailing ones. The amount of access and amount of control exercised over the flow of information by the dominant class, however, varies very much from society to society.

1.6 A historiographical approach to (critical) discourse analysis

What is meant by a historiographical approach to discourse? By this is meant, following the above discussion, an approach which conceives of the discourse analyst as a historiographer, as someone who considers texts (and
their contexts) which deal with ‘historical’ events, people and situations in a critical way and recognises their essentially figurative nature. There is a role for the (critical) discourse analyst as mediating between Mitten’s various layers, in deconstructing the language used to purvey historical knowledge. This can be either between the second and third layers – the specialist historians and the non-specialist intelligentsia – or, especially, between the third and fourth layers – the non-specialist intelligentsia (in particular in the case of this book, politicians and journalists) and the population at large. A historiographical approach to (critical) discourse analysis will seek to reveal the hidden assumptions in received and naturalised historical accounts, with a particular emphasis on the language used in their elaboration.

In addition to the dimension of a historiographical approach just described, the methodology adopted in this book is also inherently historiographical in so far as the project that will be reported upon is a longitudinal one and deals with an important real world ‘historical’ event. There is a role for discourse analysis in the writing of history, in considering discourse as it is created synchronically, and creating critical first readings of (discursive) events (including written texts) as they take place over time. This book may be exceptional in this respect, in studying a historical process as it unfolds over a period of more than a decade (although see below especially on Wodak).

In studying discourse from a synchronic perspective, an extra dimension is added to the analysis. Traditionally, discourse analysts focus on individual texts or groups of texts; they may consider intertextuality, how the text under consideration relates to other texts, and in this sense their analysis is historical. Fairclough emphasises this point, for example, in his book on discourse and social change (Fairclough, 1992, see below), but there is a tendency to provide a static snapshot rather than a dynamic analysis which gives due emphasis to the longitudinal dimension of discourse as it develops over time. A diachronic analysis allows for an understanding of what changes over time and what stays the same. An understanding of discourses of the more distant and of the more immediate past allows for a better understanding for discourses of the present. This is considered to be an important contribution of the present volume.

1.7 Other discourse analysts and history

This book is not unique in considering discourse in a historical context. In fact, a number of critical discourse analysts have taken a historical turn in recent years.

Norman Fairclough (1992), referred to earlier in this context, is the best known critical discourse analyst to argue for a historical approach, in his programme for the study of discourse in social change. Fairclough argues for four minimal conditions for such an undertaking (Fairclough, 1992: 8–9). First, an approach to discourse and social change should be multidimensional,
capable of showing relations between discursive change, social change, and properties of texts. Second, it should be multifunctional, showing how changing discourse practices contribute to changes in knowledge, in social relations and in social identities; the method of analysis should allow for the interplay of these three. Third, it should be a ‘method for historical analysis’ (emphasis added). It should focus upon ‘articulatory’ processes in the structuring of texts and in the longer-term structuring of the ‘orders of discourse’; this can be analysed at the textual level in terms of intertextuality and show how changes in textual structure correspond with changes in social circumstances. Fourth, the approach should be critical. Critical means showing how meanings may be hidden and at the same time demonstrating how there may be resistance to discursive and social change and how this may also be indexed in discourse and text. In his earlier work, in the 1980s and 1990s, Fairclough applied his method to analysing what he saw as tendencies towards ‘democratisation’, ‘commodification’ and ‘technologisation’ of discursive practices (e.g. Fairclough, 1992), while, in his later work, he has considered discourse and social change in relation to ‘globalisation’, ‘neo-liberalism’, ‘new capitalism’ and the ‘knowledge economy’ (e.g. Fairclough, 2003, 2006).

As already mentioned, perhaps the best known discourse analyst taking a historical approach is Ruth Wodak, who, as previously noted, has even named her approach the ‘discourse-historical method’ (referred to elsewhere by Wodak also as an ‘approach’). In a number of projects (summarised in Wodak [2001]), Wodak and colleagues have analysed various discriminatory, racist, anti-Semitic and chauvinist aspects of discourse from a critical and historical perspective. The historical dimension of the analysis in the discourse-historical method is a part of the overall contextual analysis. Thus in a study of the 1986 election campaign of Kurt Waldheim, Waldheim’s own account of his alleged non-involvement in Wehrmacht atrocities in the Balkans and the deportations of Jews from Greece was analysed in the context of the ‘historical facts’ (Wodak, 1991: 70). In this way, Wodak argues, she and her colleagues were able to show ‘the disfiguring of facts and realities’ in Waldheim’s version of the story. In another study, this time of the commemoration of 50 years since Hitler’s occupation of Austria, a number of documents were brought into comparative analysis: the publication and media treatment of the report by a commission of seven international historians on former president Waldheim’s Nazi past in 1988; the official political commemoration of the Austrian ‘Anschluss’ in March 1938; the unveiling of a ‘memorial against war and fascism’ by a sculptor and the controversial discussions that preceded it; a play on Austrian anti-Semitism ‘then and now’; and the fiftieth anniversary of the November pogrom. This comparative analysis allowed Wodak and her colleagues to develop

a differentiated examination of the official political and media recollection, and a critical consideration of the Austrian National Socialist
past, of the often conflicting narratives on Austrian history and of some related convenient myths, such as Austria as the first victim of the Nazi politics of dictatorship and territorial expansionism.

In all of four studies reviewed in her overview article, Wodak (2001: 72) argues that ‘it was possible to follow the genesis and transformation of arguments, the recontextualisation throughout different and important public spaces resulting from the social interests of the participants and their power relations’. In sum, the historical dimension of the discourse-historical approach allows Wodak and her colleagues, in a way similar to that of the present volume, to create a diachronic analysis, going beyond the time-bound snapshot nature of most contemporary discourse analysis.

In an edited volume bringing together CDA and SFL approaches (which are seen by the editors as complementary), Martin and Wodak (2003) present a range of papers studying various aspects of discourses on and/or about history in various parts of the world. Genres covered include political speech and interview, TV talk show, newspaper, history textbook and the bureaucratic planning process. As Martin and Wodak (2003) argue in their introduction, the collection ‘deals with the construction of time and value in a post-colonial (and post-WWII) world where discourses of or about history and the past are central to on-going processes of reconciliation, debates on war crimes and restitution’ (p. 2). Martin and Wodak argue further that ‘every society which has to deal with traumatic events creates myths and taboos around these events. Pasts are rearranged, transformed, recontextualised, substituted, mystified or totally changed’ (ibid.). This treatment of the past resonates strongly with the view of history presented above and with that to be found in many of the chapters of the present volume. Furthermore, Martin and Wodak link historical writing with the theme of identity. ‘Such strategies also relate to the construction of national and also individual identities. Identities need founding myths and certain pasts, which they can integrate easily and positively’ (p. 11). This theme is also to be found in the present volume.

Wodak has also written, with Michal Krzyzanowski (Krzyzanowski and Wodak, 2009), the introduction to another volume dealing with the past (Galasinska and Krzyzanowski, 2009), in this case, the sociopolitical changes undergone by the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In this introduction, Krzyzanowski and Wodak apply Fairclough’s model of social change supplemented by insights from the discourse-historical method. In particular, they emphasise the historical dimension:

… discourse must be seen from the perspective of its historicity: it is in synchronic discourses that earlier discourses are frequently ‘recontextualised’ (Wodak, 2001). The distinctive contribution of the Discourse-Historical Approach thus lies in ‘the analysis of historical and political topics and texts … and their continuity’ (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 7).
Accordingly, the systematic analysis should illustrate how on-going transformation is linked to and draws on previous (historical) stages and discourses in complex ways.

One important way in which transformation comes about in discourse is through ‘intertextuality’, how different discourses or fragments of discourses are linked and can be taken from their original contexts to reappear in different historical conditions (Krzyzanowski and Wodak, 2009). In the context of Central and Eastern Europe, this is demonstrated in the diachronic analysis of Galasinska and Krzyzanowski (2009), which shows how elements of discourses of the Communist period before 1989 are still present after 1989. In the present volume, this phenomenon can be noted in Chapters 2 and 8, where the outgoing British governor Patten’s discourse is taken up and adapted by his successor, Tung.

This phenomenon of continuity and discontinuity is also focused upon in a monograph by Mariana Achugar (2008), which studies the discursive construction of memory in military discourse in Uruguay. Achugar writes of the diachronic aspect of her study as follows:

A historical focus is important because it allows us to notice the dynamic aspect of discourse and the importance of time in the construction of our knowledge of the past: memory. By focusing on how discourse is constructed and reconstructed over time it is possible to see continuities and discontinuities – what changes and what remains, how the inter-psychological is internalised as intra-psychological. (p. 25)

Echoing another point about the value of a diachronic approach made earlier, Achugar continues this quotation as follows:

By analyzing a series of texts related by belonging to the same discursive formation3 (Foucault 1982) the goal is to understand the interrelationships between different texts and how certain discourses are reproduced or reappropriated by others. In this way, the historical focus serves as a window that allows not merely the observation of the instances as finished products, but rather the observation of the construction processes of language and memory.

In focusing on memory, Achugar’s work resonates with other volumes which deal with memory and reconciliation. A monograph by Annelies Verdooolaege (2008), for example, focuses on the discourse of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) (see also Norval [2009] on the theme of South Africa’s apartheid past). Verdooolaege (2008) begins from the simple premise that ‘[c]learly, for a full understanding of a discursive event one always has to take into account the historical position
from which a person speaks’ (p. 99). In her analysis, Verdooalaeg notes how different participants speak from different historical positions and orient to various time frames, most notably the pre- and post-apartheid periods. She notes that, for many of the TRC testifiers, there remained a level of continuity between the apartheid past and the present and that many of the apartheid conflicts remained the same. This phenomenon applies to the discourses in the present volume, where there are overlaps in pre- and post-reversion Hong Kong discourses.

Verdoolaeg also makes the point that, in her analysis, ‘[t]he past was brought to the present TRC moment and at the same time, the present experience of testifying before the HRV Committee was extended to the future’ (p. 99). This point about the past projecting into the present and into the future is one that is often made in the historiographical literature. A justification for reflection on the past is to be found in its value for the present and the future. In the context of the present volume, this is particularly notable in the discourse of Patten and Tung; the values that they identify as traditional to Hong Kong carry over to the present and can be carried forward into the future. Verdooalaeg, echoing insights by Blommaert (2005, see below), refers to this application of the discursive moment ‘with an eye to the future’ (p. 102) as historical layering.

In relation to collective memory, Achugar (2008: 12) also talks about this telescoping of time in terms of ‘collective memory as a process that is situated in the present and that uses fragments of the past to create a narrative that will be used in the future’. This telescoping of past, present and future explains why Chris Patten and the outgoing British administration were so keen in their speeches to demonstrate a continuity between these three points in time, as will be shown in Chapter 2.

A number of volumes have appeared which deal with the theme of commemoration. Commemoration is a form of historical layering, in Verdooalaeg’s terms, in so far as it involves a reflection on the past with a view to the present and the future. Reference has already been made to the study by Wodak and colleagues (Wodak, 2001) of the exhibition commemorating 50 years since Hitler’s occupation of Austria. A more recent edited volume is that of Titus Ensink and Christoph Saur (2003) entitled The art of commemoration: Fifty years after the Warsaw uprising. The chapters in this volume consider various aspects of this topic from a discursive perspective. In their introduction, Ensink and Saur make a number of observations of relevance to the present volume. Drawing on Nietzsche, they note two approaches to history: ‘historicism’, where the past is used to legitimise the present, where the present is constructed as a prolongation of the past, and where the past and the future are in an equivalent relationship; and ‘oblivi-onism’, which is a reaction to historicism, which is seen as putting too much emphasis on the past at the expense of the present, and which involves the systematic forgetting of the past. Ensink and Saur see commemorations as
doing the work of both approaches (p. 7); commemorations encourage the remembrance of things which the organisers want their audience to remember but they also ignore aspects of the past which their organisers prefer their audience to forget. This feature of discourse is not limited to commemorations, it may be added, but is present in most, if not all, political discourse, and as such is a recurrent theme throughout the present volume.

An important contribution has been made to historiography and discourse by Jan Blommaert (2005). Blommaert is critical of CDA for not taking account of history (but see Wodak [in Kendall 2007] for a refutation of this point). Blommaert’s particular insight for discourse and historiography is his notion of ‘layered simultaneity’, how, although it takes place in real time, discourse nevertheless carries with it different layers of historicity, layers of which participants may or may not be aware. For Blommaert, this can only be got at through ethnographic analysis. This is where Blommaert takes issue with CDA, arguing that it needs to deal more critically with what he refers to as ‘forgotten contexts’. Although this criticism of CDA may not apply to all of its proponents (Wodak being the most notable exception, as reviewed above), there is some truth in this claim. The examples used by Blommaert in presenting his model highlight how discourse does not travel well across time (and space). What may be valued in one historical context may not be valued or may even be stigmatised in another time period. This is very obvious in the present volume in the adaptation of the discourse of the outgoing administration by the incoming one (Chapter 8) and in the care taken by the museum curator interviewed in Chapter 9 to create a historical exhibition that would be accepted by both the ‘the left’ and ‘the right’.

Finally, in this review of discourse analytic perspectives on history, mention should be made of the work of Coffin (2006). Working within an SFL framework, Coffin presents a linguistically oriented study of historical texts written for and by secondary school students. Coffin’s linguistic approach convincingly demonstrates how history discourse has its own specific genres and lexicogrammar. Although the present volume tries to limit or explain the technical terminology as much as possible and is eclectic in its approach to textual analysis, the approach to lexicogrammar is broadly functional in the SFL tradition.

1.8 Discourse and space

As well as time, discourse analysis needs to consider space, the other dimension of context. It is significant that in classical rhetoric the two types of ‘actualisation’, or scene creation – *chronographia* (actualisation of time) and *topographia* (actualisation of space) (together with *prosographia* [actualisation of people] – are grouped together (Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 1992: 154–5) (see Chapter 3 for more on this) (see also Bakhtin’s [1981] notion of *chronotope*, the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships
in discourse). In more recent years, attention has begun to be given to the relation between discourse and space by a range of discourse analysts. Lou (2010: 625–6) has written on this topic as follows:

Research on narrative and place has shown that not only can place evoke and enrich stories (e.g. Basso, 1988; Johnstone, 1990; Myers, 2006), stories can in turn create place (e.g. Finnegans, 1998; Johnstone, 1990; Schiffrin, 2009). From the latter social constructionist viewpoint, narrative about place presents us with rich material for analyzing how the politics of place-making comes into play through language and discourse (Modan, 2002, 2007).

And, in a similar vein, Johnstone (2004: 68) elaborates that:

A space becomes a place through humans’ interaction with it, both through physical manipulation, via such activities as agriculture, architecture, and landscape, and symbolically, via such activities as remembering, ‘formulating’ (Schegloff 1972), depicting, and narrating.

Other texts talking about history and discursive change referred to above are located in distinct spaces (nation states): Achugar (Uruguay); Verdooolaege (South Africa); Galasinska and Krzyzanowski (Central and Eastern European states); Wodak (Austria). The reason for this is simple: historical events take place in geographical spaces and historical events are very much bound up with nation states. Hong Kong, of course, is not a nation state. Now, it is a ‘Special Administrative Region’ of China and before that it was a British colony, or ‘dependent territory’, as it was officially titled. However, its identity is very much tied in with the identity of those two nation states. Each of the chapters in this book is very much about Hong Kong and Hong Kong is evoked one way or another in just about all of the texts analysed. Hong Kong’s identity as a place is subject to what Blommaert (2005: 157) refers to as ‘inequality in mobility of semiotic resources’, although the term is used here slightly differently from Blommaert. By this is meant the way Hong Kong and its identity are conceived of differently, according to the semiotic resources which are drawn upon by the interpreters. For both Britain and China, Hong Kong is a metonym. It represents something much bigger than its tiny geographical area would merit. For the British, Hong Kong was the last of its significant colonies and, in many ways, its return to China in 1997 represents the end of empire. Hong Kong is also represented as a great success story for the British of British rule (thanks to British free market principles and rule of law, according to this British view). What was referred to as ‘a barren rock’ by Lord Palmerston when Hong Kong was first seized in 1848 was transformed into a centre of great wealth and enterprise. Because Hong Kong was seen as a symbol of British rule, this may explain why, at the last moment,
many would say, (limited) democracy was introduced to the colony, to put the icing on the cake of British values, so to speak. For China, on the other hand, a different set of semiotic resources is drawn upon when the notion of Hong Kong is evoked. Hong Kong was seized from China after wars (referred to as ‘opium wars’, because the British wanted to be able to trade unhindered in that drug). Hong Kong’s return to China is interpreted as the conclusion of a century and a half of national shame and the source of patriotic joy. For the British, Hong Kong’s return is a ‘handover’; for China, it is a joyous ‘return to the Motherland’ (Shi-xu, 2004: 154). These differing spatial conceptions are most salient in the present volume in the chapters devoted to the discourses of Chris Patten (Chapters 2, 3 and 4) and to Tung Chee-hwa (Chapter 8), but, as already stated, they also underlie all of the texts analysed in this volume. The coming together of space and time is particularly salient in the analysis of extracts from Patten’s speeches in Chapter 3.

An important binary opposition and contextual parameter for all of the discourses in this volume is Hong Kong’s relationship with, on the one hand, mainland China, and on the other, Britain and the rest of the world. According to the terms of the Joint Declaration and the Basic Law, and in accordance with Deng Xiaoping’s formula of ‘one country, two systems’, Hong Kong is promised a high degree of autonomy under Chinese sovereignty. For Chris Patten and the pro-democracy supporters in Hong Kong, the two systems and high degree of autonomy are emphasised – Hong Kong as distinct from China. For China and the first chief executive, Tung, and his Hong Kong supporters, following the change of sovereignty, more emphasis is added to the ‘one country’ part of the formula. This tension is very evident in the history museum chapter (Chapter 9), because the curator of the exhibition is keen to represent both sides. Whether or not they are for greater closeness with China (‘the Motherland’ in Tung’s and the pro-China discourse) or for greater autonomy (the ‘two systems’ in the one ‘country, two systems’ dichotomy), both the outgoing administration and the incoming one nevertheless supported Hong Kong’s integration in the world economy, as part of globalisation. This is most clear in Chapter 11, which is about Hong Kong and globalisation and in Chapter 12, which is about Hong Kong as a ‘world class city’.

### 1.9 National identity

Time and space together collaborate in the creation of identity. One’s identity is to be found in where one comes from, both in terms of space and through time. The notion of cultural or national identity has been the focus of much study in recent years. Wodak et al. (1999: 290) state that:

> [t]he national identity of individuals who perceive themselves as belonging to a national collectivity is manifested, inter alia, in their social
practices, one of which is discursive practice. ... The discursive practice as a special form of social practice plays a central part both in the formation and in the expression of national identity.

Given this important discursive dimension of identity, identity can be projected onto subjects (Kress, 1989). Kress (1989: 15) gives the example of the political leader whose role is to give definition to an entirely new group. It is the leader's role in such a situation to produce texts which bring together hitherto disparate discourses in a unified, coherent manner. Where changes in ideology are rapid (as in the case of Hong Kong), this may be accompanied by a rapid change in the discursive construction of identity. Of course, there is no guarantee that the projected identities will be taken up by individuals. To quote Chiapello and Fairclough (2002: 195), ‘a new discourse may come into an institution or organisation without being enacted or inculcated’. As Stuart Hall (1996a: 6) has noted, given the possibility of such change, however, identities are ‘points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us’; they are constantly in the process of change and transformation. Nevertheless, the elaboration of cultural and national identity is ‘a gradual process in which histories, traditions and social memories are invented, revised and reproduced’ (Ma and Fung, 1999: 498).

Identity is usually defined in relation to the Other (Martin, 1995: 2): ‘The life of a human being as a person requires the presence of the Other, that is, the perception of someone different and the establishment of a relationship with him/her/them.’ As Stuart Hall (1996a: 4) puts it: ‘... it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks, to what has been called its constitutive outside that the ‘positive’ meaning of any term – and thus its ‘identity’ – can be constructed.’ If identity is viewed as positive, then the Other must be viewed as negative; the Other is the marked form which is excluded, while the self is unmarked and essential (Derrida, 1981; Laclau, 1990, cited in S. Hall, 1996a: 5). This ‘Othering’ dimension of identity is most obvious in the present volume in Chapter 10, where people from mainland China are the object of discrimination on the part of Hong Kong people. It is also evident in Chapter 7, where the notion of the Hong Kong ‘patriot’ is set against that of the pro-democracy parties.

Identity politics is inextricably concerned with relations of power, of agents, or agencies, imposing their will. Political leaders have much power in projecting cultural identity. They have ready access to the mass media and use press secretaries, or ‘spin doctors’, to put over their message. On the other hand, the exertion of power will always also encounter resistance (Foucault, 1980; Flowerdew, 1997b, 2008). In Foucault’s words, the existence of power relationships ‘depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance: these play the role of adversary, target, support, or handle in power relations. These points of resistance are everywhere in the power network’
Critical Discourse Analysis in Historiography (Foucault, 1980: 95). This is most clearly represented in Chapter 4 of the present volume, where members of the Hong Kong public tried to resist the language power of British Hong Kong governor Chris Patten in a public meeting (see also Flowerdew, 1997b). It is also very evident in Chapter 7, where one Hong Kong newspaper resisted the attempt at discursive hegemony on the part of another.

Identity has also been analysed in terms of narrative (Martin, 1995; Ricoeur, 1992; Wodak et al., 1999). Individuals may consider their identity in terms of the stories they experience or imagine. Being both real and fictitious, narrative identity is open-ended and amenable to revision. Because individuals are always parts of groups, a group identity can be construed in terms of a narrative, just like an individual’s identity can (Martin, 1995: 3). A collective narrative must define a group in terms of sets of criteria, such as language, ethnicity, social class, attitudes, beliefs, and so forth. In terms of political narrative, Martin (1995: 5) stresses the role of individual leaders and how a few individuals play essential roles in constructing the identity narrative of the group. This is highlighted most clearly in Chapters 2 and 8 of this book, where the language power of the last British Hong Kong governor, Chris Patten, and the first chief executive of the Hong Kong SAR, Tung Chee-hwa, attempt to project an identity on to Hong Kong and its people. Collective narratives are also present in Chapter 11, on Hong Kong as a globalised city and in Chapter 12, on Hong Kong as a world class city.

Strath and Wodak (2009) have noted how, in historical accounts, certain events are foregrounded and acquire what they refer to as ‘iconic status’, as a foundation for a historical ‘turning point’ or new national identity narrative. They mention 1914, 1945, May 1968 and November 1989 as turning points in twentieth-century European history. China, too, has such events: 4 May 1919, when there were student demonstrations in Beijing which prepared the ground for the founding of the Communist Party, is a date recognised by most educated people in China; 1949 and the founding of the PRC is another iconic date; as is 4 June 1989, the so-called Tiananmen ‘incident’ (referred to by Chris Patten as ‘the killings of Tiananmen’ and by others as a ‘massacre’, or ‘crackdown’). This latter event is not recognised by the authorities in mainland China, but is commemorated every year in Hong Kong with a candlelight vigil attended by thousands of people – in 2009 there were estimated to be over 150,000 (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/8083569.stm).

Such events are closely connected to what Strath and Wodak (2009: 16) refer to as ‘the crisis concept’ and ‘contentious value mobilisations (right/wrong, good/bad society, friend/enemy, etc.)’. Hong Kong and 1997, the year of the change of sovereignty, clearly fits into this category of historical turning points: 1997 has its element of crisis, with hundreds of thousands of Hong Kong people emigrating in the lead-up to the reversion for fear of the ‘communist takeover’ and seemingly endless negotiations between
Britain and China over the terms of the change of sovereignty being just two manifestations of this crisis mentality. And 1997, of course, is also clearly a turning point in history. Furthermore, it is iconic in the sense that the term ‘1997’ acts as a metonym for a whole range of sociopolitical changes. One difference between 1997 and the other transformational events referred to above, of course, is that 1997 was foreseeable, while the other events may only be considered retrospectively.

Strath and Wodak (2009) also talk about ‘collective memory’ and how such memories are discursively constructed in line with national myths (p. 18) and contribute towards national identity building (p. 20). In Chapter 2 of this volume, we will see how Chris Patten elaborated such a myth about the British legacy to Hong Kong and in Chapter 8 how Tung Chee-hwa perpetuated this myth, with notable changes of emphasis. Strath and Wodak (2009: 18) further talk about how ‘[t]he media constructs, through a plurality of voices, images [of Europe in their case] with a positive or negative load’. This phenomenon is well illustrated in Chapter 7 of the present volume where different voices are drawn upon by a pro-mainland newspaper to create a myth of the so-called Hong Kong ‘patriot’. Similarly, myths are projected in Chapter 11 (Hong Kong as a globalised centre for business) and Chapter 12 (Hong Kong as a ‘world class city’).

1.10 Hong Kong and the question of identity

With such a sudden political change as that represented by Hong Kong’s change of sovereignty, the society needs to radically adapt its conception of cultural and national identity. The need for a change of cultural and political identity was noted by the outgoing Hong Kong colonial government in the lead-up to the reversion and is expressed in the following extract from a government document issued in 1996, hence just before the reversion, on civic education in the schools:

... the civic learner needs to know the cultural and political identity of Hong Kong as a Chinese community, as a British colony for a certain period, and as the HKSAR of China from July 1997. At a time of political transition, we need our citizens to actively adopt a new national identity, and to be participative and contributive to bring about smooth transitions, to sustain prosperity and stability and to further improve the Hong Kong society. (Education Department, 1996, p. 21, cited in Bray, 1997: 16)

The call for a ‘transition’ in cultural and national identity suggests that Hong Kong people had a clear sense of cultural and national identity in the first place, but the question of identity in Hong Kong has always been problematic. Ma and Fung (1999: 199) describe the development of Hong Kong identity as having followed an ‘erratic path’: it is, in fact, a good example
of what Martin (1995: 3) refers to as an identity having ‘nothing to do with homogeneity and permanence’. Although the population of Hong Kong is 95 per cent ethnic Chinese, Hong Kong people mostly either came to Hong Kong from the mainland to escape Communist rule or are the children or grandchildren of such people. Colonial policy, by minimising contact with mainland China, created a space for the creation of a local Hong Kong identity, which thus can be said to be determined in terms of the cultural differences between Hong Kong and the mainland (Ma and Fung, 1999: 500). Hong Kong people have traditionally seen themselves as sophisticated and Westernised, in contrast to the ‘less civilised’ mainlanders (Ma and Fung, 1999). Even now, although the former British colony is a Special Administrative Region of China, Hong Kong people are reluctant to label themselves as ‘Chinese’ when asked to do so in opinion surveys. They prefer to refer to themselves as ‘Hong Kong people’ or (to a lesser degree) as ‘Hong Kong Chinese’. Of course, identity is multifaceted and, in the case of the people of Hong Kong, three dimensions of identity seem to be particularly salient: ethnic identity, cultural identity and political identity. However, these dimensions do not necessarily coincide. One can say ‘I am Chinese’, but such a statement can have different meanings according to these three different dimensions. As to the first, no Hong Kong Chinese would be likely to deny that they are ethnically ‘Chinese’. However, politically, because they do not want to identify with the PRC government, they might say that they are not ‘Chinese’ in this political sense. Then again, as suggested by Ma and Fung (1999), they might not want to be considered ‘Chinese’ in the sense of sharing cultural values with mainland Chinese.

The cultural identity discussed by Ma and Fung (1999) can be contrasted with the identity as projected on to the Hong Kong people (in the sense that Kress (1989), as cited above, describes the term ‘projection’) by its political and business leaders (both before and after the change of sovereignty). This identity, which stresses the free market economy, the rule of law, individual freedom and democratic institutions, is designed for the international business community — to encourage international business to view Hong Kong as a centre for international trade and investment. This is the Hong Kong identity which is projected most notably in some of the chapters in this book (Chapters 2, 8 and 11), although another chapter (Chapter 8) projects a very different identity onto the Hong Kong person, that of the Hong Kong ‘patriot’.

1.11 Modes of analysis of this book

In line with Fairclough’s conception of the relation between discourse and society as dialectical and mutually constitutive, of discourse practice reflecting social structure and social structure reflecting discourse practice, the analysis in this book recognises two interactive levels: a macro-level
and a micro-level, with analysis taking the form of what Halliday (1961), using his train metaphor mentioned earlier, refers to as ‘shunting’, moving back and forth between each of the two levels. The analysis is conducted via a consideration of the sociohistorical context as it relates to the texts, on the one hand, and of the texts as they relate to the sociohistorical context, on the other. In an earlier book (Flowerdew, 1998), the focus was more on the sociohistorical than the textual context. In this volume, there is more emphasis on textual analysis, and the reader is referred to the earlier volume for a fuller sociohistorical account (going right back to the initial seizure of Hong Kong by the British). Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise the diachronic nature of the analysis. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, diachronic analysis allows for an understanding of what changes over time and what stays the same. An understanding of discourses of the more distant and of the more immediate past allows for a better understanding of discourses of the present.

More immediate contextual analysis is presented here, based on a range of methods, including the following: participant observation as a member of the Hong Kong public exposed to the media on a daily basis during the whole period of the analysis; a study of various documents, such as government reports and archives and Hong Kong newspaper archives; large electronic corpora of public pronouncements by Chris Patten and Tung Chee-hwa, during their periods of office for corpus-based analysis; interviews (with Chris Patten and his advisers, and with Dr Ting, director of the Hong Kong Museum of History (Chapter 9); interviews with members of the public attending the history museum exhibition (Chapter 9); participant observation of Legislative Council meetings, including those attended by Patten and Tung; and interviews with public relations insiders for ideas on branding for the chapter on Hong Kong as a world class city (Chapter 12). The various approaches used in the study allow for triangulation, a powerful tool in validating the results of analysis, the theory being that more confidence can be had if different methods arrive at the same conclusion.

The analysis is informed by various social, discursive, pragmatic and linguistic theories. Thus, in Chapter 2, for example, a theory of political genres, pragmatic theories of presupposition and involvement, as well as theories of lexical structuring and reiteration are used to show how Chris Patten promoted a myth about the British legacy to Hong Kong. In Chapter 3, a classical theory of tropes is applied to understand how Patten used language as a persuasive device to exert language power over the Hong Kong people and persuade them to support his political reform proposal. In Chapter 7, a theory of metaphor is used to understand how a pro-Beijing Hong Kong newspaper developed a model of the Hong Kong ‘patriot’, with a view to establishing discursive hegemony for its political position. In Chapter 12, theories of branding, genre chaining and intertextuality are employed to show how the Hong Kong government promoted to the people
of Hong Kong and the world at large its conception of Hong Kong as a world class city. In two chapters (Chapters 2 and 8), corpus linguistics techniques are used to analyse the lexical and collocational patterning of Patten’s and Tung’s discourse, with a view to establishing their discursive formations (see note 3) and analysing their political rhetoric.

1.12 Summary of the rest of the book

The following is a chapter by chapter summary of the rest of this book.

Part 1: The Discourse of the Outgoing Administration

During the greater part of the colonial period, public discourse in Hong Kong was relatively closed, with only token representation of the voices of the majority of the population in government decision-making. It was only with the Joint Declaration, signed by Britain and China in 1984, that real advances began to be made in democratisation, with the drafting of the Basic Law, which contained proposals for the gradual development of limited democracy. Following the introduction of direct elections in 1991 and an impending second round in 1995, the British government sent a ‘political’ governor, Chris Patten, who tried to open up the polity and public discourse. This first part of the book analyses this discourse, as created by Patten and his allies.

Chapter 2: The Discourse of Colonial Withdrawal

Based on a large corpus of speeches, interviews, public meetings, writings and other pronouncements, this chapter critically examines the discourse of the last British Hong Kong governor, Chris Patten, in the five years leading up to the change of sovereignty over Hong Kong from Britain to China in 1997. The thesis of the chapter is that in its focus on four issues – the free market economy, the freedom of the individual, the rule of law, and democracy – each of which was designed to highlight an aspect of what Patten promoted as Britain’s legacy to Hong Kong, Patten’s discourse can be characterised in terms of a myth concerned with ensuring that Britain could withdraw from its last major colony with honour.

Chapter 3: Rhetorical Strategies and Identity Politics in the Discourse of Colonial Withdrawal

Skilful use of the rhetorical tropes which typify the language of serious political occasions – described here as ‘rhetorical weight’ – is closely associated with charismatic political leaders. This chapter studies the political rhetoric of Chris Patten, a skilled exponent of this verbal art, showing how he used rhetorical weight to promote his political agenda. Detailed analysis of four segments of Patten’s political oratory, spread over the period of his five-year term of office, highlights his heavy use of the tropes of metaphor, antithesis,
parallelism, actualisation, and the unities of time, place and action. The chapter demonstrates how the use of these tropes related to Patten’s overall political goals and their manipulative nature within the context of his discursive construction of Britain’s imperial/national history and identity.

Chapter 4: Discourse and Social Change in a Public Meeting

This chapter documents discursive and social change taking place in Hong Kong during the transitional period leading up to the change of sovereignty from Britain to China. It does so by means of a detailed analysis of a political meeting involving the British Hong Kong governor, Chris Patten, and members of the Hong Kong public. The meeting took place in October 1992, a day after Patten introduced proposals to widen the democratic franchise. Patten used the meeting, the first time a Hong Kong governor had made himself openly accountable to the public at large, to demonstrate the sort of democratic discourse for which the reform proposals were designed to create a framework. The analysis focuses on two main ways Patten highlighted the democratic nature of the discourse: the use of mise en abyme, or a ‘play within a play’ structure, and the downplaying of overt markers of hierarchy and power asymmetry. Although Patten’s aim was to demonstrate openness and accountability, his ultimate control of the discourse belied the democratic agenda he ostensibly promoted. The analysis consequently also focuses on the manipulative dimension of Patten’s discourse. The conclusion considers to what extent the meeting might mark a real shift to a more democratic order of public discourse in Hong Kong.

Part 2: Intercultural Discourses in Transitional Hong Kong

During the transitional period, the competing discourses of the pro-democracy group in Hong Kong, supported by Britain, and of the pro-Beijing forces, supported by mainland China, as the two main political groupings are typically characterised in Hong Kong, came into conflict. This part of the book examines these intercultural aspects of the political transition.

In dealing with intercultural issues, there is always a danger of essentialism, or stereotyping. As Scollon and Scollon (2001: 174) note, the perennial problem of intercultural communication analysis is having to constantly look for differences between people while at the same time guarding against positive or negative stereotyping. Stereotyping arises when individual members of a group are focused upon and these individuals are claimed to have the characteristics attributed to the whole group. The problem with stereotyping is that, while it may be possible to identify typical features of a particular cultural group, no individual member of that group will represent all of these features. As Scollon and Scollon (2001:171) note, it is not possible to classify all Asians and all Westerners together, for example; it is difficult to find clear differences where one culture can be unambiguously differentiated from another (Scollon and Scollon, 2001: 174).
Scollon and Scollon’s solution to this problem is to restrict comparison to what they refer to as ‘discourse systems’. A discourse system, according to Scollon and Scollon (2001: 5), involves ‘everything that can be said or talked about or symbolized within a particular, recognizable domain’. This is very similar to the definition of ‘discourses’ (as used in the plural) in this book: ‘specific sets of meanings expressed through particular forms and uses which give expression to particular institutions or social groups’. Discourse systems, according to Scollon and Scollon (2001: 176), are ‘sub-cultural systems where contrasts between one system and another are somewhat more strongly made’. These subcultures, or discourse systems, or discourses, are the units of analysis employed for the intercultural case studies presented in Part 2 of this volume.

Chapter 5: Face in Intercultural Political Discourse
This chapter examines issues of intercultural discourse during Hong Kong’s political transition, focusing on different conceptions of face. Application of a model of Chinese face proposed by Bond and Hwang (1986) provides a means for explaining certain aspects of the breakdown in communication that occurred between the Chinese and British Hong Kong governments during the transitional period. The chapter contributes to an understanding of intercultural political negotiations, while demonstrating the explanatory power of Bond and Hwang’s model. At the same time, the chapter highlights problems with ‘universal’ models of face because of their lack of emphasis on cultural relativity.

Chapter 6: Competing Public Discourses in Transitional Hong Kong
This chapter describes two competing discourses at work in the public domain in Hong Kong during the period leading up to the change of sovereignty in 1997. The two discourses are loosely labelled Utilitarian and Confucianist. The Utilitarian discourse is characteristic of those who support greater democracy and autonomy for Hong Kong, while the Confucianist discourse is employed by representatives of China and the pro-China camp in Hong Kong. The Utilitarian discourse promotes egalitarian values and may be confrontational. The Confucianist discourse is more hierarchical and consensus-oriented in nature. The two discourses are illustrated by means of brief descriptions of a set of discursive events reported in the press and by four texts: a television news item, a television interview and two newspaper articles.

Chapter 7: Metaphors in the Discursive Construction of Patriotism: the Case of Hong Kong’s Constitutional Reform Debate
This chapter considers the notion of patriotism, as promoted by the pro-Beijing camp in the transitional period, with a specific focus on the role of metaphor. The chapter examines reports and opinion pieces from two local
newspapers published in the early post-colonial period concerning this issue of patriotism. The following questions are posed:

1. What are the different metaphors that are used in the discursive construction of patriotism?
2. How do these metaphors vary according to the contrasting ideologies of the two newspapers?
3. What role does the use of these metaphors have in the hegemonic struggle between the two newspapers over what is an appropriate conception of patriotism?

The findings and possible answers to these questions not only assist in gaining a better understanding of the role of language in constructing the identity of a patriotic Chinese, but they also contribute to an understanding of the politics and tensions between the local and the national under the unprecedented ‘one country, two systems’ of post-colonial Hong Kong.

Part 3: The Discursive Construction of a New Hong Kong Identity

With the change of sovereignty in 1997, the incoming pro-Beijing administration needed to establish a discursive identity for the new SAR of China. This discourse constructed Hong Kong citizens as also citizens of the People’s Republic of China. At the same time, however, it tried to maintain a continuity with the previous regime (referred to as a through-train), in order to ensure local and international confidence. This part of the book considers these issues.

Chapter 8: Identity Politics and Hong Kong’s Return to Chinese Sovereignty

This chapter critically examines the discourse of the first chief executive of the Hong Kong SAR of China, Tung Chee-hwa, during his first five-year period of office, following the return of Hong Kong from British to Chinese sovereignty in 1997. Based on a large corpus of primarily speeches, but also interviews, press conferences and other pronouncements, and a parallel corpus of media reports and commentary, the analysis demonstrates that, in the interests of a smooth handover and the policy of ‘one country, two systems’, Tung’s discourse, in its basic configuration, mirrors that of the last British colonial governor, Chris Patten, as set out in Chapter 2. However, there are certain notable variations; in particular, there is a new emphasis on the need for a knowledge-based economy, the importance of Chinese values and identification with China, and a downplaying of democratic development.

Chapter 9: Discourse as History: History as Discourse. ‘The Rise of Modern China’ – a History Exhibition in Post-Colonial Hong Kong

Following Hong Kong’s retrocession to China as a SAR with a high degree of autonomy, there was great interest in the extent to which the formula
of ‘one country, two systems’ was working. In September 1999, the Hong Kong History Museum held a special exhibition called ‘The Rise of Modern China’, which proved a fruitful site for investigating the balance achieved between the ‘one country’, on the one hand, and the ‘two systems’ dimensions of the formula, on the other. Investigation was carried out by means of a lengthy interview with the director of the museum, a close reading of the texts and artefacts, and interviews with visitors to the exhibition. In spite of the great care taken by the museum director to create a ‘preferred reading’ which would satisfy majority public opinion, an analysis based on the texts and visitor interviews considered the exhibition to be biased in favour of ‘one country’ over ‘two systems’.

Chapter 10: Discriminatory Discourse Directed towards Mainlanders

This chapter analyses the discriminatory discursive practices of one leading liberal Hong Kong newspaper, *The South China Morning Post*, highlighting the continuing discrimination against people from mainland China, in spite of the reversion of sovereignty. The data for the study consists of a total of 80 articles concerning one news event, Chinese mainlanders claiming the right of abode in Hong Kong during the period 30 January 1999 to 19 August 2000. A review of the rather diffuse literature leads to the development of a composite taxonomy of discriminatory discursive practices. The Hong Kong data is then tested against this taxonomy. Examples of all of the strategies in the taxonomy are found to be present in the Hong Kong data, with certain local variations due to the particular situation of Hong Kong. The findings are all the more striking because the people who are the focus of the discrimination are from the same ethnic and linguistic background. In contrast to the news stories, a comparison with the editorials on the right of abode issue in *The South China Morning Post* reveals a much more liberal tone in the latter. This raises the question as to whether it is the news stories or the editorials which represent the true institutional ideology of this influential Hong Kong newspaper.

Chapter 11: Globalisation Discourse: Continuity with the Old

This chapter presents an analysis of the discourse of globalisation from the perspective of Hong Kong. It shows the continuity in the pre- and post-colonial discourse in the area of the economy in strongly supporting globalisation and the free market economy. The chapter takes the form of a detailed analysis of a speech delivered by the Hong Kong chief executive, Tung Chee-hwa, in London in October 2000, highlighting the SAR government’s measures to address the challenges posed by globalisation and its ability in capitalising on the assumed benefits of the global phenomenon. The textual analysis shows that globalisation is discursively constructed as immutable and that it is the role of the government to manage the consequences of globalisation.
Chapter 12: The Discursive Construction of a World-Class City

With the coming of globalisation, which, as shown in Chapter 11, is strongly supported by the post-colonial government, there has been increased competition among cities internationally to become so-called ‘world cities’, i.e. centres of high technology, industry, trade, banking, finance, professional activity, higher education and the arts. This chapter describes and analyses how post-colonial Hong Kong attempted to discursively construct itself as such a city. Applying ideas from CDA, genre theory and branding, the chapter considers the governmental consultation process designed to promote Hong Kong as a world city and shows how this is influenced not only by the government’s control of the various genres which make up the consultation, but also by its use of language. Textual analysis, as demonstrated in a focus on three documents, grounded in the political situation, highlights the manipulative nature of the consultation process.

Conclusion

Chapter 13: Conclusion

This chapter summarises the main findings of the study, particularly with regard to the three theoretical constructs in the title of the volume and as discussed in this chapter: CDA, history and identity. The study has shown how official discourses have changed in some respects during the period of transition, but in other areas have been maintained. Specifically, with regard to political issues, official discourse has come more in line with the ideology of mainland China. On the other hand, concerning economic issues, the official position has remained relatively constant, in line with Hong Kong’s continuing position as an international centre for trade and finance. In terms of discourse theory and method, the study has demonstrated the value of a longitudinal historiographical approach both in terms of the contribution that it can make to discourse theory and in terms of the role that discourse can play in developing an understanding of real world issues and in historiography. It has also demonstrated the possibility of a multi-method approach in a long-term study, involving ethnography, textual pragmatics, rhetorical analysis, cognitive linguistics, genre analysis, systemic-functional linguistics (SFL) and corpus linguistics.

1.13 The main discourse theories and methods of textual analysis used in each chapter

In this volume, as already indicated, the reader will find that many social, discursive, pragmatic and linguistic theories are employed. Those employed in each chapter are listed as follows.

Chapter 2: The Discourse of Colonial Withdrawal
  • myth in discourse
  • four discursive strategies used by Patten in the promotion of his myth:
the transformation of old political genres and the introduction of new ones,
- presupposition,
- involvement (the use of indexicals),
- lexical structuring and reiteration.

Chapter 3: Rhetorical Strategies and Identity Politics in the Discourse of Colonial Withdrawal
- language and power
- indexicals
- involvement (Tannen, 1989)
- manipulative discourse
- *mise en abyme*
- order of discourse (Foucault, 1982)
- turn-taking

Chapter 4: Discourse and Social Change in a Public Meeting
- identity
- identity politics and national identity
- political rhetoric
- rhetorical tropes:
  - metaphor
  - antithesis
  - parallelism
  - actualisation
  - the classical unities

Chapter 5: Face in Intercultural Political Discourse
- intercultural political negotiations
- Chinese face systems (Bond and Hwang, 1986)
- (problems with) ‘universal’ models of face (Matsumuto, 1988)
- cultural relativity

Chapter 6: Competing Public Discourses in Transitional Hong Kong
- discourse systems (Scollon and Scollon, 2001)
- the cooperative principle (Grice, 1975)
- indirectness
- high- and low-context cultures (Ting-Toomey, 1988)
- individualism and collectivism
- face in discourse (Goffman, 1967, 1971)

Chapter 7: Metaphors in the Discursive Construction of Patriotism
- metaphor
- discursive construction of patriotism
- discursive hegemony
- intercultural discourse

Chapter 8: Identity Politics and Hong Kong’s Return to Chinese Sovereignty
- myth in discourse
- intertextuality/recontextualisation
- four discursive strategies used by Tung in the promotion of his myth:
  - the transformation of old political genres and the introduction of new ones
  - presupposition
  - involvement (the use of indexicals)
  - lexical structuring and reiteration

Chapter 9: Discourse as History: History as Discourse. ‘The Rise of Modern China’ – a History Exhibition in Post-Colonial Hong Kong
- (national) identity in discourse
- discourse as history
- Van Dijk’s (1997) transformational model of text selection
- conditions of production and reception
- discourse and ideology
- presupposition
- abstraction in discourse
- heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981)

Chapter 10: Discriminatory Discourse Directed towards Immigrants from the Mainland
- media discourse
- ideology in discourse
- discriminatory discursive strategies

Chapter 11: Globalisation Discourse: Continuity with the Old
- discursive agency
- discursive construction
- listing
- metaphor
- nominalisation

Chapter 12: The Discursive Construction of a World Class City
- branding
- genre
- genre chaining
- genre colonies
- intertextuality
- voice in discourse (Bakhtin, 1981)
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