

MEMORANDUM
on
Chinese Education
in the
Federation of Malaya.

file

Printed by
THE ART PRINTING WORKS
Kuala Lumpur.

MEMORANDUM ON CHINESE EDUCATION IN THE FEDERATION OF MALAYA.

This Memorandum is written by the Malayan Chinese Association (representing the Chinese community) and its Chinese Education Central Committee (representing both Chinese school committees and teachers), in order that the Chinese points of view vis-a-vis Education in the Federation of Malaya may be fully expressed and understood. It is intended to present this Memorandum to the Federation of Malaya Government, members of the Federal Legislative and Executive Councils, members of the Central Advisory Committee on Education, the people of the Federation at large and in particular to all those charged with the responsibility of shaping the Malayan Nation of the future through education. It is also intended to distribute this Memorandum widely abroad.

There is no point in concealing the fact that this Memorandum has been prepared because of the fears created in the Chinese community of the Federation by the provisions of the Education Ordinance 1952. Under those provisions, the teaching of Chinese is so inadequate and optional that it has led to the belief that the establishment of English-medium and Malay-medium National Schools is the forerunner of the closure of Chinese vernacular schools and the end of Chinese education in the Federation.

Indeed, the Barnes Report (which recommended schools of the type that the Federation Government plans to build on a national scale) says on page 75,

- Para 4: "In principle, we recommend the end of separate vernacular schools for the several racial communities, and their replacement by a single type of primary school common to all".
- Para 5: "Our scheme would be seriously weakened if any large proportion of the Chinese, Indian and other non-Malay communities were to choose to provide their own primary classes independently of the National School."

In order to achieve "the end of separate vernacular schools for the several racial communities," the Barnes Committee recommended "that in the allocation of public resources to primary education, priority should be given to the National School." This recommendation was accepted and incorporated into the Education Ordinance 1952 in Sections 18, 19 and 20, which state that where sufficient National Schools have been established, Government grants-in-aid to vernacular schools in the vicinity will cease. How the end of vernacular schools will be brought about is, therefore, clear beyond doubt.

This is contrary to the recommendation in paragraph 31 of the Report of the Special Committee (Paper No. 70 of 1952) on Educational Policy. Paragraph 31 reads:—

“We have already stated our belief that vernacular and English schools which remain outside the National pattern can still make a valuable contribution towards the achievement of our educational objects, and we deem it to be one of the purposes of the proposed legislation to create the conditions under which their contribution can most effectively be made.”

The Education Ordinance does not create such conditions.

This has led quite naturally to considerable misgivings among the Chinese in the Federation.

We agree with His Excellency the High Commissioner that there has been “a certain amount of misconception in the matter.” It was for the very purpose of dispelling that misconception among the Chinese community of Malaya that a petition was sent to Government in the first instance.

We would be failing in our duty to His Excellency the High Commissioner if we did not say at the outset that the misconception may well have an adverse effect on the attempts being made by the Government to mould a Malayan Nation.

It is obvious that if any one community is suffering from any sense of grievance, then that community tends to look at the formation of a Malayan Nation with possible suspicion.

This is not necessarily the case among the majority of Chinese in Malaya; indeed, we do not think (and certainly hope) that it is so. What we do say is that the misconception does exist, and that misconception may lead to the consequences already suggested.

Surely, therefore the risk should not be run, and the misconception should be dispelled.

Not by the Chinese alone is it realized that Chinese education, and through it, Chinese culture have made, and can continue to make, great contributions to the ultimate culture of the future Malayan nation. Thinking Malaysians realise that the future Malayan nation, to mould its own culture, must draw on the cultures of such great civilisations as the Chinese and Indian, not forgetting the cultures of the West.

In this task of moulding culture, education will play an indispensable role. Western, Chinese and Indian cultures can only be reached and assimilated through the Western and Chinese and Tamil languages. To

deprive this country of Chinese and Tamil education is to deny to Malaysians the means through which to evaluate and assimilate the cultures of the great Chinese and Indian civilisations. Yet this is precisely what the Education Ordinance 1952 seeks to do. No other reason can account for the inadequacy of the provisions of the Ordinance for the teaching of the languages of the two great Chinese and Indian civilizations.

Clause 21 (2), (4) and (5) of the Ordinance state:

“(2) National schools shall be of two types:—

- (a) those in which Malay is the main medium of instruction; and
- (b) those in which English is the main medium of instruction.

“(4) At a national school in which English is the main medium of instruction, instruction in Malay shall be given to all pupils as and from the commencement of the third year of the school course. In addition, instruction in Kuo Yu and Tamil shall, subject to the provisions of sub-section (5), be available for those pupils whose parents or guardians request instruction in such languages and such instruction shall be available in all years of the school course.

“(5) Instruction in Kuo Yu or Tamil need not be made available at a national school unless there are in such school fifteen or more pupils of the same linguistic standard in such language and whose parents request instruction in it.”

It is quite clear from these clauses that the teaching of Chinese in National Schools is optional. It is conditional upon a request by the parents of pupils, of whom there must be a minimum number of the same linguistic standard. And even if these conditions can be satisfied, the time for tuition in Chinese is entirely left to the discretion of the education authorities.

The Education Ordinance 1952 does not specifically state the teaching time to be devoted to Chinese, although the Special Committee on Education Policy, on page 6 of its report (Paper 70 of 1952) recommended half-an-hour a day during school hours and another half-an-hour a day after school hours. This is not considered adequate.

We refer in this connection to the remarks of The Bishop of Singapore who is reported in the “Straits Times” of Sept. 8, 1951, as saying:

“To impose one language on multi-racial society is the mark of a tired and moribund condition and never of a living civilisation.”

Surely the proposed policy of the Educational Department comes dangerously near to falling within the orbit of this indictment.

Sinologues the world over have spent their lifetime studying Chinese and deriving the best from Chinese civilization and culture. To make-believe that the lack of specific provisions of periods of time for the teaching of Chinese in the Education Ordinance 1952 is adequate for the purpose of acquiring a basic knowledge of Chinese as the key to Chinese culture, is sublimely ridiculous. Existing Chinese schools, which devote 60 to 75 percent of their curricula to Chinese, still find their teaching of Chinese inadequate for assimilating even the rudiments of Chinese culture. How much worse would be the position in Federation National Schools teaching Chinese as an optional subject and, even at that, for periods of time unspecified in the Education Ordinance 1952 and entirely left to the discretion of the education authorities. In fact, if the Barnes recommendations are any criterion—and here it is important to remember that the Barnes recommendations are the basis of the Education Ordinance 1952—the whole idea of establishing National Schools is that they should replace vernacular schools.

The Barnes Committee on Page 75 of their report says:

“We recommend the end of separate vernacular schools for the several racial communities and their replacement by a single type of primary school common to all.”

This visualizes the end of Chinese vernacular schools, the end of the impact of Chinese civilization and culture upon the Federation of Malaya and, consequently, upon the future Malayan nation.

That would be a calamity of the first order to Malaya, especially to the process which must precede the moulding of a Malayan culture. Malaya has no culture of her own worth talking about. Malaya must draw from the civilizations surrounding it for the best material with which to create the ultimate culture of her own. And, without fear of contradiction, the greatest civilizations surrounding Malaya are Chinese and Indian. That this fact is recognized by the highest institution of learning in Malaya is illustrated by the recent purchase by the University of Malaya of some 80,000 volumes of Chinese literature for its library. The Chinese library of the University of Malaya will thus have twice as many books as its English library.

The provisions for the teaching of Chinese under the Education Ordinance 1952 are, therefore, ill-advised and ill-conceived. This is borne out by the fact that the Ordinance is based on the recommendations of the Barnes Committee, calling for the replacement of vernacular schools by National Schools. The Barnes Committee (on which there was neither a Chinese nor an Indian representative) not only wanted to put an end to Chinese and Tamil schools, but also calculated to deny to Malaysians the keys to two of the world's greatest civilizations. These keys are the Chinese and Tamil languages.

At this stage, it is pertinent to deal briefly with the Barnes Report. The Barnes Committee, consisting of five Europeans and nine Malays, was appointed in 1949 with the following Terms of Reference:

"To inquire into the inadequacy or otherwise of the educational facilities available for Malays, having regard to the proposals contained in Council Paper No. 68 of 1949 and in the First Report of the Central Advisory Committee on Education, with particular reference to

- (i) The system of Malay vernacular education;
 - (ii) the method of selection of students for admission to Malay Trading Colleges;
 - (iii) the means of raising the scholastic attainment and improving the pedagogic training of College students;
 - (iv) the content of curricula of the Malay Teacher Training Colleges;
 - (v) the methods required to raise the scholastic attainments of pupils in Malay schools;
 - (vi) the steps necessary to advance the education of Malays in English;
 - (vii) any desirable improvement in organization such as the creation of local education authorities or other local bodies with similar functions,
- and to make recommendations."

The recommendation of the Barnes Committee for the creation of National Schools is, therefore, completely ultra vires these Terms of Reference. They made educational recommendations for Malayans rather than Malays. And yet the Federation of Malaya Government accepted and acted on the recommendations, vide the Education Ordinance 1952. The Chinese in the Federation would have found nothing to quarrel with the Barnes Committee if it had confined its investigation and recommendations to its Terms of Reference.

That it was never intended that the Committee should deal with non-Malay vernacular education was manifestly clear from the Committee's Terms of Reference and from the absence in the composition of the Committee of Chinese and Indian representatives. The Committee's recommendations on National Schools and the replacement of vernacular schools by them should, therefore, in all fairness have been cast aside as ultra vires by the Special Committee on Educational Policy, especially as the recommendations were made by the Barnes Committee **in the absence of Chinese and Indian consultation and advice**. Five Europeans and nine Malays serving on the Barnes Committee, with all due deference to them, could scarcely presume to determine the future of Chinese and Tamil education in the Federation of Malaya. Nor would it be proper and just for the Federation Government to allow such presumption, and to accept and act on recommendations which were ultra vires the Terms of Reference of the Barnes Committee.

While the Federation Government has accepted the anti-Chinese recommendations of the Barnes Committee, it has also chosen to ignore the recommendations of the Fenn-Wu Report, and some of the recommendations of its own Special Committee on Educational Policy, e.g. the specific period of time to be devoted to the study of Chinese (Page 6 para 17) and the continued existence of vernacular schools (Page 9, para 25) of Paper No.70 of 1952.

Dr. William P. Fenn, associate Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees of a dozen institutions of higher learning in China, and Dr. Wu Teh-yao, an official of the United Nations, were invited to Malaya to make a study of Chinese schools in the Federation. The purpose of the mission was "to survey sympathetically but objectively the entire field of the education of Chinese in Malaya, and to recommend such constructive changes and improvements as would lead to the Chinese schools making the great contribution to the future welfare and happiness of the people of Malaya and, in particular, of the Chinese who have chosen that prosperous land as their home."

No fair-minded person can possibly object to the following observations and recommendations of Drs. Fenn and Wu:

- (1) Each racial group in Malaya is culturally distinct and independent; each has its own language, customs and social habits; each has its own history and tradition.... In spite of the fact that Malaya has long been in contact with the West and has been governed by one Western nation for over a century, and despite the superficial aspects of Western culture everywhere evident, that culture has not yet succeeded in providing the common ground for complete cultural fusion.... Because of the psychological and emotional attachments of the racial groups, any attempt at the moment to force unwilling fusion will almost certainly lead to further cleavage, which neither Malaya nor the world can afford.
- (2) What can be hoped for is a peaceful and co-operative relationship among diverse elements in which community of interest rather than differences are naturally stressed. There can be no justification for turning Malaya into a cockpit for aggressive cultures. By virtue of its composite population, it should be a land where the developing culture draws its validity from acceptance of the high values of other cultures. The people of Malaya will have to learn to understand and appreciate their cultural differences. They should be proud of their spirit of mutual tolerance.
- (3) No group whose concern is completely the preservation of its own culture or whose basic loyalty lies elsewhere can render patriotic service to Malaya. At the same time, no deculturized group will have anything to offer. The resulting culture will be the weaker for the poverty of its contributing units.

- (4) A new culture can only come from the natural mingling of diverse cultural elements for generations. In this process, elements which do not command appreciation disappear, while those which do, need no political or external support.
- (5) Malayanization can only be the result of a give-and-take which is based on increasing awareness of community of interest and the need for mutual tolerance and co-operation. The people of Malaya should cherish what is fine and non-divisive in every cultural strain, for out of present diversity may come future glory.
- (6) It must be recognized that Malay has been made an official language and is a required subject of instruction in all schools in Malaya. As the indigenous language of the country, spoken extensively throughout the Malayan archipelago, it deserves study by all the peoples of Malaya. Such common knowledge can contribute to communal understanding and co-operation. The practical wisdom of the Chinese has enabled them to foresee the advantages, and they have on the whole accepted Malay as a required subject in the last two years of Chinese primary schools.
- (7) It is obvious that English is to a great extent a common business language for all races in Malaya. As such, it is also a world language. The social, academic, scientific, cultural, economic and political advantages it can give a child need no amplification. Again, the practical wisdom of the Chinese has prompted them to pay more attention to the teaching of English in Chinese schools.
- (8) We must remember that Chinese is one of the great languages of the world, key to one of the world's great cultures. Its beauty and richness are unquestioned. Nothing is to be gained by trying to deprive any section of the population of what a knowledge of Chinese has to give.... Because of its difficulty and the time involved in mastering it, the study of Chinese is likely to be undertaken largely by the Chinese. They should be helped and encouraged in their concern for the Chinese background of the Malayan culture of the future.
- (9) Chinese schools will persist in Malaya for a long time to come. Any attempt to crush them will result, as it has already done, in greater determination to preserve them. And Chinese schools in the open are greatly to be preferred to Chinese schools underground. They cannot be eliminated until the Chinese themselves decide that they are not needed, which will happen only if and when there is an adequate and satisfactory alternative.

- (10) The answer (to our educational problem) is rather to recognize the need for the existence of Chinese schools, and to strengthen them and find for them their proper place in the educational system....Malayan-centred, Chinese private schools will offer a valuable outlet for Chinese initiative and public spirit....Chinese schools must be helped to conform more nearly to the ideal (not necessarily present practice) for schools in Malaya, and be given a sense of being equal partners with other schools in the task of providing for future citizens of Malaya the best possible preparation for life there.
- (11) A common approach through a common textbook would further communal understanding and co-operation in building a truly Malayan community.
- (12) What is needed for Chinese schools, as for others, is a series of modern textbooks designed to develop the skills, information, and attitudes required by children living in Malaya.... There is also need for improvement in the quality of teachers in Chinese schools and in their conditions of service.

It is astounding that the Federation Government should have chosen to ignore these recommendations and should have, instead, adopted the recommendations on National Schools of the Barnes Committee, which are ultra vires the Committee's Terms of Reference.

The Chinese in the Federation maintain that the quickest and most effective medium for malayanizing any racial group is the language of that group. The Chinese language should be used to malayanise the Chinese through malayanised textbooks standardized for all schools. It is pertinent here to refer to the recommendations of Mr. H. R. Cheeseman, C.M.G., a former Director of Education, Malaya, in Council Paper 53 of 1946, stressing the need for free primary education through the mother-tongue in Malay, Chinese, Tamil and English.

In 1950, the Central Advisory Committee on Education under the chairmanship of Mr. M. R. Holgate, then Director of Education, Malaya, also recommended provision for teaching of Chinese and Tamil in future primary schools.

Mr. Cheeseman, who has had 41 years' experience of education in Malaya, in a series of articles in the Straits Times on Sept. 4, 5 and 6, 1951, denounced the Barnes report and recommendations as "educationally unsound."

The Barnes Committee was not unaware of the importance of instruction in the mother-tongue. On Page 23, paragraph 16, the Committee states:

"The weight of authority in educational opinion is heavily on

the side of the view that a child's natural development is best promoted when his early education is in the language of his home."

And yet the Barnes Committee went on to recommend the use of Malay in all primary schools, as an equal partner in a bilingual system (the National School under the Education Ordinance 1952), as it offers the benefits of mother-tongue education to the largest proportion of the total population! This was exactly what the Fenn-Wu Committee warned against: "...care must be taken not to prostitute education to political purposes...." Just because half the population speaks Malay, it does not necessarily follow that Malay is the mother-tongue of the entire people. Nor is Malay the mother-tongue of the people merely by reason of its being one of the official languages of the Executive and Legislative Councils.

We submit that it is unsound to ignore the language of another racial group—the Chinese—almost as large as the Malays in the Federation, and larger than the Malays if Singapore is included. Chinese language is the key to the untold treasures that lie in the rich lodes of Chinese literature. This Chinese literature has a valuable contribution to make towards the construction of a common Malayan civilization, culture and way of life to be attained by a united Malayan nation now in the course of formation.

The mother-tongue is the true vehicle of mother wit and is one with the air in which a man is born. Through its mother tongue, the infant first learns to name the things it sees or feels or tastes or hears as well as the ties of kindred and the colours of good and evil. Hence in all education, the primary place should be given to training in the exact and free use of the mother-tongue.

The lack of adequate provision for teaching in the mother-tongue is contrary to the spirit of Clause 8 of the Education Ordinance 1952, which states:

"In the exercise and performance of all powers and duties conferred and imposed on them by this Ordinance, the Member and the Department shall have regard to the general principle that, so far as is compatible with the national educational policy, the provision of efficient instruction and the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure, pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents."

The history of Chinese education in Malaya dates from 1819, when private Chinese schools were established in Singapore. In Kuala Lumpur, the first Chinese school was set up in 1907. It is the now-famous Confucian School. Today, there are about 1,200 Chinese schools in the Federation alone, with a total enrolment of 250,000.

The future of these 250,000 and, indeed, of the entire Chinese segment of the Malayan population cannot be of no consequence to the Federation Government. A great civilisation that has endured during the last 5,000 years is the heritage of these Chinese. The new Malayan

nation can gain much from this civilisation. And the only way to ensure such gain is to maintain and encourage the teaching of Chinese as part and parcel of the Malayan educational system. For without this key to Chinese culture, it will be impossible for Chinese Malaysans to absorb all that is good of that culture; it will be impossible for Chinese Malaysans to pass on to other Malaysans that good.

We shall now deal with particular aspects of Chinese education about which the Chinese have expressed, and still maintain, special fears.

The Chinese are grateful to the High Commissioner for this assurance: "The Chinese teacher will continue to find a useful place in the education system of this country for very many years to come." Nevertheless, they realise that "very many years to come" will be precisely the time it takes to bring National Schools into being in sufficient numbers to replace Chinese and Tamil vernacular schools as recommended by the Barnes Committee. In other words, the end of Chinese and Tamil education in this country is a matter of time and availability of Government funds. This is quite clear.

The Government of the Federation of Malaya, in reply to representations by Dato Sir Cheng-lock Tan, President of the Malayan Chinese Association and Chairman of the M.C.A. Chinese Education Central Committee, made the following statements, to which we now reply:—

Statement (1) "Neither the Report of the Special Committee on Education nor the Education Ordinance 1952 denies the Chinese language and culture have a valuable contribution to make towards Malayan education and culture. Indeed, the Report, in paragraph 25, refers to vernacular schools as being valuable nurseries of existing cultures. The Report recommends and the Ordinance provides for the teaching of Kuo Yu in National Schools, which is a clear indication that the Special Committee was fully aware of the value of the Chinese language and culture."

Reply: We agree with this statement but the complaint is that there is a grave risk (in the absence of specific provision in the Education Ordinance) that this "contribution" will not be made use of. It is to be observed that no guarantee is given that the "contribution" will be made use of. Indeed, the Report of the Special Committee states: "We do, however, accept the view expressed to us by the Director of Education that the final answer to the question of how much of the limited primary school hours should be devoted to the learning of Kuo Yu or Tamil can, as in the case of English and Malay, only be found by experience, and we consider that the Education Department should be allowed a reasonable amount of elasticity in the application of the general principles which we have enunciated." The wording of Section 21(5) of the Education Ordinance is such

that the Director of Education can, under certain conditions, rule that instruction in Kuo Yu or Tamil be not given. This directly conflicts with Section 8, which states that, wherever possible, pupils shall be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents.

Every one reads with appreciation the official statement that "there has been no suggestion that the Chinese language and culture should not be preserved and given its rightful place in Malayan Society."

We are now asking His Excellency the High Commissioner to take steps to make certain that the Chinese language and culture should be preserved and given its rightful place in Malayan Society.

The Chinese community agrees with the Government that Chinese language and culture have a valuable contribution to make towards Malayan education and culture. If we follow the spirit of this official statement in attempting to find a suitable solution to the complicated problem of Malayan education, there will be satisfaction on all sides.

Unfortunately, this does not appear to be the case. The conflict between statements and facts, and the inconsistency of statements themselves leave the Chinese frustrated. On the one hand, it is stated that vernacular schools are "valuable nurseries of existing cultures." In the very next paragraph, it is contended that "it is a matter of some doubt whether many Chinese schools, as they exist at present in the Federation, do more than provide instruction in Kuo Yu, the Chinese national language," having, therefore, little to do with the development of Chinese language and culture.

Are Chinese Schools as vernacular schools "valuable nurseries of existing cultures" or not? If they are, they should be preserved. But apparently the Federation Government has decided that they are not, for the Education Ordinance, 1952, contains an obituary of Chinese Schools. That Government intends to do away with all, not "many", Chinese schools eventually is not contested.

Kuo Yu will be taught only if the parents or guardians request instruction in the language, and if there are fifteen or more pupils of the same linguistic standard. This could hardly be looked upon as an encouragement to the development of the Chinese language and culture in Malaya. Optional teaching would not carry us far, especially as Chinese is not an easy language. It may be argued that if the Chinese in this country are not anxious to have their children educated in Chinese, there is nothing Government can do about it. The same argument applies also to the principle of free, compulsory primary education. Does that mean we should not have compulsory education at all?

It is said that no provision of teaching of Chinese is generally made in the present English and Malay schools and the Chinese in this country should exult in the fact that the teaching of their language is, for the first time, provided for in the English-medium and Malay-medium National Schools.

The point is by the establishment of the National Schools, Government subsidy to Chinese schools, which is derived mainly from taxes paid by the Chinese, will be withdrawn. Chinese schools will definitely not be in a position to compete with free Government schools. Government is, therefore, forcing Chinese schools to close down.

Statement (2) "It is not correct to say that education as given in a school is alone responsible for the preservation of virtues and culture. The mainspring of any virtues, whatever they may be, is the Home. It is a matter of some doubt whether many Chinese schools, as they exist at present in the Federation, do more than provide instruction in Kuo Yu, the Chinese national language, and inculcate and develop a spirit and sense of partition from the rest of the Malayan community. There are in Malaya, many Chinese in whom the typical Chinese virtues are highly developed, who have never attended Chinese schools but who have received their education through the medium of English."

Reply:

This statement, shorn of generalities, avoids the main issue, which is that Education as given in Schools is responsible if not solely, at any rate largely, for the preservation of virtues and culture.

While it is admitted that the home is a mainspring of virtues, it is contended that the school is a most important nursery of moral values and cultures. Lack of schooling or education may well make a person less virtuous, because it will hamper his understanding and appreciation of moral, philosophical and cultural values.

The great traditions, virtues and cultures of China are to be found in the writings of such sages as Confucius, Mencius, Lao-tze, etc. Without a competent knowledge of Chinese, it is impossible to emulate these traditions, virtues and cultures. A competent knowledge of Chinese is acquired at school, not in one's home.

It is not impossible—though it is rare—for a Chinese to acquire Chinese virtues without knowing the language. Except to a most searching and receptive mind, virtues inherited from one's own Chinese ancestors are soon forgotten without further cultivation through schooling. It is always more desirable to have a workable knowledge of the language in order to appreciate its culture or moral values.

Statement (3) "Furthermore, having regard to the feelings strongly expressed to us on behalf of the Chinese and Indian communities, additional instruction on the same optional basis should be available throughout the primary course for a further half hour daily immediately following normal school

hours. We do, however, accept the view expressed to us by the Director of Education that the final answer to the question of how much of the limited primary school hours should be devoted to the learning of Kuo Yu or Tamil can, as in the case of Malay and English, only be found by experience, and we consider that the Education Department should be allowed a reasonable amount of elasticity in the application of the general principle which we have enunciated."

Reply :

The provisions of the Education Ordinance 1952 hardly bear this out. It is not considered that the strong feelings of the Chinese and Indian communities were acceded to by the Special Committee when they set out to formulate the educational policy. Practically all Chinese associations, all Chinese school committees and teachers, all Chinese newspapers and other available cultural organs, all Chinese students, and in fact practically the entire Chinese community expressed strong opposition to the Barnes Report which is the basis of the present education Ordinance.

The desperate cry for equal opportunities for the development of the languages of the Chinese and Indians, as advocated by the former Directors of Education, Dr. R. O. Winstedt and Mr. H. R. Cheeseman, was ignored.

The Indian community had likewise made its demand but was also not heard.

There are even open-minded and intelligent Malays who oppose the Ordinance (See Utusan Zaman Editorial, 18th August, 1953).

But the architects of the Ordinance swept aside the findings of foremost educationists and the representations made by the majority of the population. Instead, they suggested that there should be some teaching of Chinese and Tamil—strictly on an optional basis.

Would an English child, for instance, be able to master the English language and appreciate the values of English traditions and culture after going through a six-year period with half-an-hour's learning of English per day? If not, the same should apply to the Chinese and Indian children, as their respective language is by no means easier to grasp than English. The desirability and practicability of extra-curricular teaching, mentioned in the official statement, even if implemented, are open to question on grounds of physical strain, etc.

Statement (4) "The question of the disappearance of Chinese schools, as they exist at present, as separate entities, must not be confused with the disappearance of the Chinese language and culture; the two things are not identical. To argue that the Chinese language and culture will disappear if Chinese schools as we know them at present disappear shows little faith in the inherent durability of the Chinese language and culture."

Reply: It has been stated that vernacular schools are valuable nurseries of existing cultures, and we agree. It is, however, extremely doubtful that National Schools, as designed at present, can possibly replace vernacular schools as "valuable nurseries" of existing Chinese and Indian cultures. We now hear the argument that even if the Chinese schools as valuable nurseries of Chinese culture disappear, we should not take it to mean the disappearance of Chinese language and culture, or else we would be blamed for showing little faith in their inherent durability. This would, indeed, be tantamount to hitting man with a big stick and saying: "A big, hefty man like you surely can survive this little blow."

It is correct to say that the closure of Chinese schools and the disappearance of the Chinese language and culture are not identical things. But Chinese schools and Chinese culture are complementary. One is the key to the other.

Statement (5) "Kuo Yu is often described as the National Language and it is, of course, the National Language of a unified China. It is the dialect used in a particular part of China which, for political reasons, was made the national language and the medium of Chinese education in China. The extension of the use of this language as a medium of education in Malaya was a natural consequence of the expansion of the political conceptions of a united China extended to include Chinese overseas."

Reply: Kuo Yu is generally used in China, just as Malay is used as the common language in Indonesia. It has no political significance whatsoever. Kuo Yu is considered by many the source of many dialects in China, and a study of Chinese history will show that it was for educational, cultural and communicational reasons that it was adopted as a common spoken language in China. It was even originally called Po Tung Hua (language in common use). When it was so adopted, it was never suggested that any political group in power intended to impose a language on the people. As Chinese schools in Malaya were generally known to be under the cultural influence of China, it was only natural that the language movement started in China in 1917 should have its repercussions later in Malaya. It

is rather presumptuous to read into this any political significance, as there has never been any suggestion that Kuo Yu was used by the Government of China as an instrument to establish its political influence in Malaya.

Statement (6) "Whatever may have been the attitude of the Governments of this country when this process began, it is clear now that Kuo Yu cannot be accepted in a united Malaya as a national language."

Reply: Kuo Yu or Po Tung Hua is a Chinese language. The Federation of Malaya agreement speaks only of official languages and not the national language. It will be up to the future Malayan nation to determine what will be its national language.

But we maintain that the languages of 2,152,906 Chinese and 665,593 Indians (as against 2,863,603 Malays and Malaysians) should not be ignored or relegated to an inferior status, especially as the ultimate culture of the future Malayan nation must draw from the cultures of two of the world's greatest civilisations—Chinese and Indian.

Statement (7) "Further, it is incorrect to describe Kuo Yu as the home language and mother tongue of the Chinese in Malaya".

Reply: Kuo Yu is generally accepted as the basic tongue of the Chinese, and it is considered by many the source of various Chinese dialects. While the accent of the spoken language varies, the written language is all the same. Even various dialects, though pronounced differently, have the same rhymes. There is no comparison between Chinese children learning Kuo Yu and their learning a different language.

In this memorandum, we are dealing with Chinese schools. Kuo Yu is used as the language medium in these schools.

We repeat that Kuo Yu is generally used in China, just as Malay is used as the common language in Indonesia. Surely there is no political significance whatsoever in Malay also being used in Malaya.

Statement (8) "It must be remembered that the educational principle quoted (teaching through mother-tongue) had its origin in the West and it was applied to bi-lingual societies or to the development of bi-lingualism among peoples whose languages all belong to the same language group and whose thought processes are therefore very much akin. This principle should not be applied to people whose language groups differ widely and fundamentally".

Reply: This is astonishing. It would appear to be commonsense that if the languages and thought processes of the peoples

in a country are further apart, there is all the more reason—to steer clear of accusation of totalitarianism—to refrain from imposing on them a single language and a single thought process.

Moreover, people speaking the same language may not necessarily have the same thought process. We believe, if Germany continues to be divided, in the next generation the children of East Germany will differ greatly from the children of West Germany in thought process, having more similarities probably with the Russian children.

This merely underlies the importance of unity of hearts and minds, rather than the uniformity of languages.

Unity of hearts and minds in Malaya, we suggest, can best be achieved through Malayan reorientation of text books and curricula common to all schools in Malaya, whatever their language-medium of instruction.

If the use of French, German and Italian by the people of Switzerland has not proved a barrier to National unity, why should the educational authorities apparently be afraid that the use of three languages in Malaya will have a different effect.

If the three languages Malay, Kuo Yu and Tamil are objectionable on the ground that they stem from different sources and have fundamentally different thought-processes, then the English Language must be equally objectionable.

The argument might be more cogent if Malay was the only language with which we were concerned, but it is NOT.

The following official statement was made in the then Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements on May 28, 1923:

“The educational value of tuition in a foreign language unless the pupil has first been grounded in a good, general, mental training in his own language, is doubtful.”

Elaborating upon this, Dr. R. O. Winstedt, then the acting Director of Education, Straits Settlements, quoted this conclusion of the world's expert educationists:

“This very distinguished body which reported on the Universities of India came to the conclusion that the ideal was that every child should first of all be taught to think in its own mother-tongue and that one of the difficulties of our educational system in India was that from MacCaulay's time downwards, we had neglected that ideal.”

According to this conclusion, the Chinese in Malaya who speak Chinese at home must necessarily receive instruction through the medium of their native tongue as they can best develop themselves along the lines of their own culture and tradition in which they can take deep root. People do not become more civilized by losing contact with their own roots. A man's speech is like his shadow, inseparable from his personality.

The same Commission that reported on Universities in India held that, in all education, the primary place should be given to training in the exact and free use of the mother-tongue.

The obvious question is: What is the mother-tongue of the Chinese in Malaya? The answer has been given in the reply to statement (7).

Statement (9) "There can be no comparison between the legitimate claims of the Malays to have a Malay medium National school on the one hand, and the Chinese to have a Chinese medium National school on the other."

Reply: The Chinese are primarily concerned with the preservation of Chinese culture and education. They are gravely concerned over the "end of vernacular schools." As has already been explained, Malaya can draw much from the 5,000-year-old civilisation of China. The key to the virtues and culture of this civilisation is Chinese education. The Chinese, therefore, are perturbed by the "end of vernacular schools." They want Chinese Schools to be part and parcel of the Malayan educational system.

Though comparison is odious, it may be pointed out that in the Federation there are 2.8 million Malays and 2.1 million Chinese. There are more Chinese in Singapore and the Federation are taken as one. This comparison is drawn in reference to comparison between "legitimate claims" to have Malay-medium and Chinese-medium schools.

Statement (10) "What it would seem is being sought at the moment is that Chinese language, culture and education should be allowed to continue its exclusive and separatist position in a Malayan society".

Reply: Let us once and for all make it abundantly clear that Chinese community in this country has never sought, is not seeking and will never seek exclusive and separatist position in a Malayan society. They are merely asking for equality and justice. What is sought is the use of the Chinese language as the best medium of reorientating Malayan

Chinese into Chinese Malaysians.

Chinese schools have for long been adopting English and Malay as compulsory subjects. With proper modifications, they may be made a common ground for the fusion of Malayan cultures, especially Chinese and Malay.

The Governor of Singapore, Sir John Nicoll, proposed on 20th October, 1953, a type of bilingual school in which a Chinese pupil will have as his media of learning Chinese and English "from the start to the end of his school career." Representatives of Chinese schools in Singapore, after a few meetings with Government officials, are reported to have accepted this proposal and promised to see to it that their schools, without changing their basic pattern, carry out this bilingual principle before qualifying for the increase of Government grant.

As the Fenn-Wu Report has also pointed out, Chinese are more likely to accept bilingualism or even trilingualism rather than any compulsion on their adopting either English or Malay or both. (page 6, paragraph 14 of Fenn-Wu Report).

We also realize the importance of a common medium of communication. As a matter of fact, at a meeting of the representatives of the Chinese School Committees and teachers in the Federation on 9th November, 1952, it was unanimously decided, inter alia,

"That we suggest the use of mother tongues of the composite races as the main teaching media for the proposed National Schools, granting equal opportunities to the development of Malay, Chinese and Indian education, and adopting English as a compulsory subject with the view to making it a common language for all."

This cannot be construed as a suggestion to establish or perpetuate an "exclusive and separatist position".

Statement (11) "Many Chinese schools... inculcate and develop a spirit and sense of partition from the rest of the Malayan community."

Reply:

To any impartial observer, this is an unfair statement. The accusation, if true, should apply to English, Indian and even Malay Schools as well, as detailed in the Fenn-Wu Report (Chapter III, Malayan Education).

Owing to the weakness of the past educational system in Malaya, various schools often place greater emphasis on the interests and origins of their founders.

As the Malaysians are now awakening to the idea of self-government and the building of a Malaysian nation, the Education Department tends to blame its own neglect on Chinese schools.

Let every one concerned be assured that given sympathetic handling, Chinese schools will welcome any effort to reorientate their present textbooks to conform to the Malaysian background, and to suit the pattern for Malaysianisation.

But the emphasis must be on "contents" rather than "languages." Indeed, the Malaysianization which we all aim at can best be achieved through the media of various important languages now in use in Malaya. It will be infinitely more difficult to reorientate the Chinese through English or Malay than through their language. In fact, in our humble opinion, this method will fail.

Statement (12) "In 1947 there were 63,681 pupils in the 1st-year class in Chinese schools; in 1948 only 54,568 remained for the 2nd-year class and by the sixth year, i.e. 1952, only 10,633 remained. There seems little indication here of a general desire among Chinese parents in the Federation to allow their children to complete their primary education through the medium of Kuo Yu".

Reply: It is not fair to quote statistics of reduced enrolments as an indication of the general desire of Chinese parents to allow their children to complete their primary education through Kuo Yu.

In spite of the past discriminatory policy towards Chinese schools and their graduates, the general enrolment has increased from 172,000 in November, 1946, to 257,781 in July, 1953.

The general decrease of enrolment as the standard advances to a higher level is unavoidable, especially owing to the economic and other difficulties after the war.

This is not only true of Chinese schools, many of which were closed down as a result of the Emergency, but also of other schools. For example, in 1947 there were 78,258 in Standard I in Malay schools; in 1948 only 55,681 remained in Standard II and in 1949 there were only 49,402 in Standard III.

This does not appear to be more favourable than in Chinese schools, in spite of the much more favourable conditions under which Malay schools function.

Are we therefore to take it that Malay-medium schools, like Chinese schools, should eventually be done away with?

Summary of Grounds of Protest

(1) That the recommendation of the Barnes Committee for the establishment of National Schools, accepted by the Federation Government, was ultra vires the Committee's Terms of Reference;

(2) That the recommendation of the Barnes Committee for the replacement of vernacular schools by National Schools was also ultra vires the Committee's Terms of Reference;

(3) That in Sections 18, 19 and 20 of the Education Ordinance 1952 is implied the acceptance of the recommendation mentioned in (2) above;

(4) That the recommendations of the Fenn-Wu Committee on the future of Chinese schools were rejected practically in toto, notwithstanding the fact that it was the Federal Government that invited Drs. Fenn and Wu to study, report and make recommendations on Chinese Education;

(5) That it is not in the interests of the Malayan nation of the future to deprive present and future Malaysians of the key—Chinese language—to Chinese culture that has endured over the last 5,000 years;

(6) That it is not in the interests of Malaya virtually to destroy (Chinese) schools of nearly half the population;

(7) That the inadequate provision of tuition of Chinese under the Education Ordinance 1952 will not help the cultural fusion that is expected to lead to the creation of a Malayan culture;

(8) That the inadequate provision of tuition of Chinese is totally out of keeping with the taxes being paid by the Chinese in the Federation.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion, we respectfully submit that it will be detrimental to the creation of a Malayan culture (which must draw from the cultures of the ancient Chinese and Indian civilisations) to eliminate Chinese schools. Tuition in Chinese in National Schools will be so hopelessly inadequate that Malaysians, especially Chinese Malaysians, will be deprived of the key to Chinese culture.

The aim of our educational policy should be, as recommended in paragraph 31 of Paper No. 70 of 1952, to create conditions under which vernacular schools can make the most effective contribution to the ultimate culture of Malaya. This implies that vernacular schools should be encouraged (rather than eliminated), urged to adopt standardized, Malayanised textbooks. Based on the principle of equality of education for all, the goal of a common Malayan outlook and a community of interests can assuredly be reached.

It will not be in the interests of the future Malayan nation to deny to itself the contributions that Chinese and Indian cultures can make to her cultural development. Yet this is exactly what she seeks to do through the elimination of Chinese and Indian vernacular schools and through inadequate tuition of Chinese and Tamil in her National Schools.

Since such tuition in National Schools cannot possibly be adequate, taking into account the fact that Chinese and Tamil are by no means easy languages, the solution is obviously to retain vernacular schools and make use of them as weapons of Malayanisation. Chinese schools should be won over to this point of view, rather than be antagonised by threat of closure implied in the Barnes Report and the Education Ordinance 1952.

Dato Sir Cheng-lock Tan, K.B.E., D.P.M.J., J.P.,
President,
Malayan Chinese Association
and
Chairman
M.C.A. Chinese Education Central Committee

Dated 31st March, 1954.

馬來亞聯合邦華文教育問題備忘錄

吉隆坡美術承印

馬來亞聯合邦華文教育問題備忘錄

本備忘錄乃由馬來華公會（代表華人）及馬來華公會華文教育中央委員會（代表校董會及教師）雙方所撰成，以求華人對於馬來亞聯合邦當前教育問題之意見，可得充分表達及為衆所瞭解。本備忘錄擬呈馬來亞聯合邦政府，聯合邦立法會及行政會議員，聯合邦中央教育諮詢委員會委員，聯合邦人民及特別是負責以教育塑造馬來亞國前途之人士。本備忘錄亦擬在聯合邦以外，廣予傳播。

坦白言之，吾人之撰寫本備忘錄，實源於聯合邦華人對一九五二年教育法令條文所引起之戒懼。根據該法令條文，華文之教授時間甚短，且屬選科性質，因而使人相信，政府之設立以英語及馬來語為授課媒介之國民學校，毋乃為關閉聯合邦華文學校及終止華文教育之前驅。

事實上，巴恩報告書（該報告書建議設立國民學校，而為聯合邦政府所接受及擬在聯合邦普遍創辦）第七十五頁有言：

第四段：「在原則上吾人建議終止本邦各民族不同之方言學校，而以一種適合於全體之小學代之。」

第五段：「倘若大部份華人，印人及其他非馬來人，可得自由以辦理彼等與國民學校不相聯屬之小學，則吾人之計劃將遭受到嚴重之削弱。」

為求達到「終止本邦各民族不同之方言學校」，巴恩委員會乃有建議，「以公款津貼小學教育時，應予國民學校優先權。」此建議為政府接納，此可於一九五二年教育法令第十八，第十九及第二十條見之。該數節述明當國民學校創辦後，其鄰近之方言學校，將不能繼續獲得政府津貼。根據這一點，方言學校之將終止其壽命，已是昭然若揭。

但吾人攷之教育政策特別委員會報告書（一九五三年立法會文件第七十號）之第三十一段，其言則反乎是。該第三十一段之言：

「吾人已表達過吾人之信念，即有異於國民學校模型之方言與英語學校，仍可在建成吾人教育目標上，作其有價值之貢獻。同時吾人認定本法案目的之一，厥為如何使彼等之貢獻，能作最有效率之發揮。」

教育法令並未規定如何實踐此目的。因之聯合邦華人，自然難免疑團滿腹矣。

吾人同意欽差大臣所言，華人「對此事有若干誤會。」正因如此，吾人乃呈文政府，以求有以廓清馬來亞華人此等誤會焉。倘吾人當事之始，不為欽差大臣陳言，華人之誤會容足以影響政府企圖塑造馬來亞國之努力，則吾人誠有失厥職。

倘任何一種族心懷不滿，則該種族對建立馬來亞國不無以可疑之眼光視之，至屬明顯。

此非必謂馬來亞之華人，大多數為如此者；誠然，吾人不以為（當然亦不期望）華人將為如此者。吾人之所欲言者，厥為誤會存焉，而誤會或可引起上述之結果。因此吾人自不宜冒此險，而誤會亦有加以廓之必要。華文教育及文化，對未來之馬來亞國文化可作之貢獻，其價值不但華人本身明瞭，即其他人士亦可見之。

凡有智慮之馬來亞人，均認為將來馬來亞國之欲塑造成其自己獨特之文化，則必須吸收如中國與印度之偉大文明之文化，同時亦不忘西方之文化，熔於一爐乃可。

在此塑造文化之工作中，教育將負有其重大之使命焉。然而西人，華人及印人文化之能滙合與同化，實非有賴西人，華人及印人之文字不為功。是則取締本邦華文及印文教育，乃無異從馬來亞人手中奪去估量及同化偉大之華，印二文化之工具。但此竟顯然為一九五二年教育法令所追求者。蓋除此以外，教育法令對於教授該兩偉大印文化之語言，其所規定時間之不充分，殆難有其他理由矣。

教育法令第二十一(二)，(四)及(五)云：

「(二)國民學校應分為二類：

甲，以馬來語為主要授課媒介之國民學校；與及

乙，以英語為主要授課媒介之國民學校。

「(四)在以英語為主要授課媒介之國民學校，學生之獲得馬來語之教授，將自第三年級程度開始。除此之外如學生之父母或監護人請求教授其子弟國語及印語時，則可根據第(五)節之規定於小學各學年中加入該兩語言課程授受之。

「(五)在國民學校中，國語或印語之課程不必開設，除非此等學校有十五名或十五名以上同等程度之學生并且經其家長請求開班者。」

從此等條文而言，在國民學校之華文教授，乃顯然為選科性質，且條件上規定須經學生父母之請求，以及必須有最低限度之同等程度人數。甚至此等條件均已具備，而教授華文之時間，仍得交由教育當局自行決定之。

雖然聯合邦教育政策特別委員會，在其報告書（立法會文件第七十號）之第六頁建議每日在上課時間內可教授半小時，及課餘時間，可另教授半小時，但一九五二年教育法令，則無特別規定教授華文時間，此乃不合理者。

星洲主教在一九五一年九月八日在「海峽時報」曾作下列警語：

「在種族複什之社會，如擬施行統一語言之計劃，將必促成一萎靡及死氣沉沉而絕非活潑滋長之文明。」

誠然，聯合邦教育部所建議之政策，無疑將趨於陷落此預示之軌道。

世界之漢學家曾耗畢生之精力研究華文，以求吮取中國文明與文化之精華。因此，一九五二年教育法令，對特別規定教授華文之時間，猶付闕如，乃欲人相信由此而獲得華文基本之智識，作為深造中國文化之鎖鑰寧非可笑孰甚。攷諸現存之華校，其課程由百分之六十至七十為華文功課，猶覺未足以吸收僅中國文化之基本要素。聯合邦國民學校對華文採用選科制，即此，一九五二年教育法令亦未特別規定教授之時間，而須完全交由教育當局酌斟決之，其相差何遠。事實上，倘巴恩報告書之建議足以視為標準者，吾人應謹記，巴恩報告書之建議，乃一九五二年教育法令所根據草擬而成，則其整個建立國民學校之觀念，在乎國民學校取方言學校而代之。該報告表第七十五頁云：

「吾人建議終止本邦各民族不同之方言學校，而以一種適合於全體之小學代之。」

由此乃可期望將來華文方言學校之消滅，以及華文文化對聯合邦及將來馬來亞國影響之消逝。

此將為馬來亞最大之悲劇，特別是指在塑造過程中馬來亞文化而言。馬來亞尚未有值得自豪之特獨文化，因之馬來亞必須從其隣近各國之文明中，擷英取華以之構成其本身之統一文化。吾人可坦然指出，馬來亞鄰國之偉大文明，厥為中國與印度之文明

。馬來亞最高學府馬來亞大學之承認此事，吾人於其最近購買八萬本中文書籍行以充實其圖書館一舉，可以見之。馬來亞大學之華文圖書館，現時藏書已多於英文圖書者一倍矣。

由是觀之，一九五二年聯合邦教育法令所規定教授華文各節乃出於未能集思廣益與思慮不週之故。其所以如斯者，亦由於教育法令步巴恩委員會之建議，以國民學校取方言學校而代之之故。巴恩委員會（無華人與印人代表參加）不僅欲終止華文及印文學校，且蓄意從馬來亞人手中奪去開啟世界最偉大文明之門之鎖鑰。此等鎖鑰即為華文與印文。

吾人於此謹就巴恩報告書，作一簡略之檢討。巴恩委員會由五名西人及九名馬來人所組成，在一九四九年被委定以研究下列事項：

「根據一九四九年立法會文件第六十八號與及中央教育諮詢委員會之第一次報告書所作之建議，以探討巫人教育之設施是否適當，其應特別注意之事項如下：

甲，巫人方言教育之制度；

乙，挑選學生保送入馬來訓練學院之方法；

丙，提高學術程度及改善學院學生師資訓練之方法；

丁，馬來師資訓練學院之課程內容；

戊，提高馬來學校學生程度之方法；

己，提高馬來學生英文程度之必需步驟；

庚，任何組織上之應興應革事宜，諸如設立地方教育當局或賦有同樣職責之其他團體與及提出建議。」

觀此，巴恩委員會之建議建立國民學校，可以說是與上述委定之任務，離題萬丈。渠等結果竟為馬來亞人提出教育之建議，而非為馬來人。可是馬來亞聯合邦政府又從而接受之，并且根據此等建議而製成一九五二年教育法令。倘巴恩委員會能遵守其研究事項之範圍以進行調查與建議，則聯合邦華人何勞與巴恩委員會爭辯。

巴恩委員會之原非被委處理非馬來方言教育，自可從委員會之無華人及印人代表參與，洞見無遺。因之委員會之建議建立國民學校及以代替方言學校，應為教育政策特別委員會本合理原則視為離題并加以擱置，尤其是巴恩委員會所作之建議，事前未經與華人及印人商洽及未徵取彼等之意見。巴恩委員會之五名歐洲人及九名馬來人，不論其能力如何，當不能員決定聯合邦華人与印人教育前途之責。聯合邦政府方面亦不宜容忍此種潛越之舉，謬然接納建議而執行之，所以此種建議乃與巴恩委員會所被委研究之事項，漠不相關者。

聯合邦政府一面接受巴恩報告書反華之建議，另一面則抹視芬吳報告書之翫莠，及政府自身所委任之教育政策遴選委員會之若干意見，例如第六頁第十七章所示關於規定時間俾學習華文事，及一九五二年議會文件第七十號之第九頁第廿五章所提之使方言學校繼續存在事。

芬威廉博士為中國十幾間高級教育機關之董事會副秘書，而吳德耀博士則為聯合國一官員，二位皆受聘來馬研究聯合邦華文學校教育者。該調查團任務為「對馬來亞華文教育作一有系統及客觀之全面檢討，並提出建設性之改良建議俾華校能對於馬來亞人民將來之福利及幸福，尤其對選擇此繁榮之地域為其家鄉之華人作偉大之貢獻。」

任何心地公平之人士皆不致反對芬、吳二博士所作下列之觀察及建議：

(一)馬來亞各種族集團在文化上各具特質及各自獨立。各族皆有其自身之語言，風俗與社會習慣以及自身之歷史與傳統。……馬來亞與西方接觸雖甚長久，且為西方國家統治一世紀以上，吾人僅可見到西方文化之皮毛，蓋此等文化迄未能熔合各種文化於一爐。……由於種族集團各自所具之心理及情感因素，目前任何強迫及非出於自願之熔化嘗試定必引起更大之分裂，而此分裂則非馬來亞及全世界所能受者。

(二)吾人所冀望者厥為在複什份子中求取一平和而合作之關係，而且着重於種族和諧而非種族差別。吾人不應將馬來亞化為文化侵略之戰場。由於人口之複什，本邦應着重吸收現有文化之最高價值，因而發展自己之文化。馬來亞人應引此互忍精神為榮，將無所裨益。馬來亞將來之文化必因此而感貧弱，蓋其組成之份子亦貧弱故也。

(三)新文化僅可由各不同文化份子經過許多年代之自然混合而達到。在此過程中，其不值推崇者將自消滅，而值得推崇者則無需政治及外來之援助而長存。

(四)馬來亞化僅可在彼此相與之精神中實現。此種精神必須基於各族對彼此和諧及互讓互助之認識有以增長。馬來亞人民必須維護各文化傳統中之優良及不可分割之部份，因未來之光榮實來自目前本邦文化份子之複雜也。

(五)吾人應了解巫文經成為一官方語言並為馬來亞所有學校必修之科目。巫文本為本邦固有語言，兼為馬來羣島廣汎所採用，因此頗值得全馬人士之學習。對巫文之普遍學習具促進種族間互相理解及合作之用。華人之實際智慧足令彼等預視此種益處，為此彼等已一般接受此語文為小學最後二年之必修科目。

(六)英文經成為馬來亞各種族間通用之主要商業語文，兼之亦為一世界性之語文，其可予一兒童之社會，學術，科學，文化，經濟與政治方面之利益不言可諭。華人之實際智慧亦早已促使彼等在華校內注意英語文之教學。

(七)吾人不應或忘者乃華文為世界上偉大語言之一，及為一通向世界偉大文化之一鑰匙，其美麗及豐富乃無可疑義者。吾人莫解從本邦任何部份之人民中奪去華文智識之惠有何裨益。……由於學習之困難及所費時間之多，華文之學習或大部份僅限於華人而已，彼等對馬來亞未來文化應具之中華背景一事之關心應予協助及鼓勵才是。

(八)華文學校將在馬來亞內長時間繼續存在，任何破壞此等學校之企圖，將使加強維護此等學校之決心，此點已有事實可據。公開之華校當較地下華校為可取。此等華校惟有華人自身決定無需之時始可消除，而僅可於獲得適當及可令人滿意之變通辦法後始能產生。

(九)對吾人教育難題之答覆寧為承認華校存在之必要，及將彼等加強並使彼等在教育體系中得適當之地位……以馬來亞中心之私立華校可予華人自發心及公益心一寶貴之出路……吾人應協助華校使其更接近馬來亞學校之理想（非指現境）及使其感覺在未來馬來亞公民建立最佳生活之準備。工作上乃與其他學校立於同等之地位。

(十)通過共通之教科書可促進民族間之相互理解及合作從而建立一真正之馬來亞社會。……華校教師質素及服務環境之改善亦為必要。

(十一)華校亦如其他學校，需要新式之教科書俾發展居住馬來亞兒童所需之技能，智識與風度……華校教師質素及服務環境之改善亦為必要。

聯合邦政府置此等建議於不顧，反而採用巴恩報告書所提，純然超越該委員會委任狀範圍之國民學校方案，實令人驚訝不置。

聯合邦華人堅信，將任何種族集團馬來亞化之最速及最有效媒介莫如利用各集團之語文。應用華人語文及受適用於各種學校之馬來亞化教科書，以教授華人學子，乃為將華人馬來亞化正確之途。於此，吾人願引述前任馬來亞提學司芝士曼先生在一九四六年議會文件第五十三號之建議，彼堅主通過母語（巫文，華文，印文，英文）以實施免費初級教育。

一九五〇年中央教育諮詢委員會，在當時提學司何格氏主持之下，亦建議在將來之初等學校內教習華文及印文。芝士曼先生具四十一一年之馬來亞教育經驗。於其連載於一九五一年九月四，五，六日之海峽時報內之論文中，彼深斥巴恩報告書之建議為「不合教育原理」。

巴恩委員會並非不明母語教育之重要性，於報告書第廿三頁，十六段該委員會稱：

「教育方面權威意見均側重於應用家庭語文之初期教育，而達成兒童最佳之自然發展一點。」

但巴恩委員會却建議所有初級學校應用馬來文，使其於雙種語文制度（如一九五二年教育法令下設立之國民學校）下與英文佔同等地位，蓋因巫語為本邦大部份人民之母語！此點為芬吳委員會所警告者：「……應予注意者為莫濫用教育以適應政治目的……」雖有半數人口使用巫語，然此並非說巫語即為全人口之母語。更不能因巫語為立法會議及行政會議所用官方語言之一從而以巫語為人民之母語。

吾人認為林視其他另一種族集團——華人——之語文為無理者。此一集團人數在聯合邦與巫人集團相差無幾，如包括新加坡則較之龐大。華人語文為通至豐富中華文學寶藏之鑰。而此中華文學確具寶貴材料足以貢獻於未來統一馬來亞國之文明，文化及生活方式之建立。

母語為獲得「母慧」之最佳捷徑，且為與生俱來者。初生之嬰兒以母語而識所見，所感，所嘗及所聽之物，以母語而明親屬之關係，及辨是非善惡，似此豈非應將之教育兒童使能確切及自由應用其母語乎？

對於母語教授未有適當之規定乃違反一九五二年教育法令第八條之精神。該條文謂：

「教育閣員與教育部於運用及執行本法令賦予之權力及責任時，應顧及一般原則，即在不違反本邦教育政策與有效教學，以及在不浪費公帑之範圍內，應依照父母所願將學子加以教育。」

馬來亞之華文教育遠溯自一八一九年，其時私立華文學校首先在新加坡設立。吉隆坡之首間華校乃設於一九〇七年，即為目前之尊孔中學校。目前單聯合邦方面即有華校一千二百間，在學學子數目達二十五萬名。

此二十五萬學子之將來，以及馬來亞華人全體之將來，聯合邦政府不能置之不顧。流傳五千年之偉大文化即為此輩華人之遺產，於新馬來亞國之文化有莫大之價值。為獲益計本邦必須保持與鼓勵華文之學習，俾成為馬來亞教育體系中之一環，捨此華籍馬來亞人將無法吸收該文化所有優點，亦無法將此優點傳予其他馬來亞人。

吾人茲擬略論華人深感不安之有關華文教育各點。

華人固感欽差大臣之下列保證謂：「在未來長久歲月中華文教師仍將在本邦教育體系中佔有用之地位，」然彼等亦同時明白所謂「未來長久歲月中」正為建立足夠數目之國民學校以代替華校及印校所需之「長久歲月」，如巴恩委員會所建議者。換言之，本邦華印教育之終結僅為時間及政府資金之問題，此蓋顯而易見。

馬來亞聯合邦政府於答覆馬華公會會長及馬華公會華文教育中央委員會主席拿督陳慎祿爵士之抗議書時曾提下述論點，吾人謹此分別答覆：

論點(一)

「教育特別委員會之報告書及一九五二年教育法令，均未否定華人語言及文化能對馬來亞之教育及文化作有價值之貢獻。事實上，該報告書之第二十五段，且曾指出方言學校是現時馬來亞文化之搖籃。該報告書建議，而法令中並規定國民學校內將教授國語，此舉顯示特別委員會充份認識華人語言及文化之價值。」

答覆：

吾人同意此種論點，所不滿者乃此中有一不利用此「貢獻」之極大危險（由於教育法令內特別規定之缺如）。吾人深知政府迄未保證利用此「貢獻」。誠然，特別委員會報告書曾謂：「惟吾人願接受提學司對吾人所表示之意見，即在甚有限之小學課程時間內，究竟若干應撥供為國語或印語之學習，其最後答案僅可如英巫文之情形由經驗中求之，且吾人以為應予教育部相當程度之自由，以執行吾人所闡明之一般原則。」教育法令第廿一條第五項之條文却謂提學司得在某種情形下停止給予國語或印語之教授。此項直接與第八條衝突，因該條謂可能範圍內學子應依照父母之願望加以教育。

任何人於閱及欽差大臣覆信中之官方聲明稱，「政府向未建議不應保存中國語言文化及在馬來亞社會中不予以合理地位者」時，無不感覺欣慰。吾人僅此請欽差大臣採取步驟以證實華人之語言文化必予保存，及必在馬來亞社會中予以合理地位之意向。華人社會對所謂華語及其文化，於建設馬來亞教育及文化時，能作有價值之貢獻一事，甚表贊同。倘吾人根據此精神尋求馬來亞復什之教育問題之合理解決，相信其結果必能使各方面均感滿意。

不幸者，實際情形並非如是。政府不但言行不一致，所言亦每自相矛盾使令華人極感失望。一方面政府謂：方言學校為「現時馬來亞文化之寶貴搖籃」，而在次一段則謂「現時聯合邦許多華校除教授「國語」（中國國語）外，外是否尚有其他意義實屬疑問」，故其對華語及華文文化之發展，絕少助益。究竟方言學校之華校是否為「現存文化之寶貴搖籃」？如確係如此則應予保存。可是聯合邦政府之答案為「非」，乃極顯然，因一九五二年教育法令包含一道華校計告。政府之立意消除全部華校，而非「許多」華校，乃無可致辯者。

國語僅限於十五名或十五名以上語言程度相同學子之父母或保護人請求時始加以教授。此舉絕難視為鼓勵華語及華人文化在馬來亞之發展，自由選擇之學習斷難收效，尤以華文為難學之語文。或有置辯曰：假如本邦華人自身既不願其子女受中文教育，政府何能為力。此置辯亦可應用於免費強迫初級教育一節。吾人亦不應有強迫教育乎？或有謂目前之英校與華校通常皆無教授華文之規定，因之本邦華人對英語或巫語之國民學校首次規定教授彼等語文一節應引以為喜。

問題之癥結端在由於國民學校之設立，政府即將取消華校之津貼，而此津貼乃大部取自華人之納稅。華校至此將絕難與免費之政府學校競爭，政府乃無異強迫關閉所有華校。

論點(二)「維護道德與文化若云端賴學校教育，實為錯誤。一切美德之源泉，厥在家庭。目前聯合邦許多華校，除了教授「國語」（中國國語）及培養與發展一種與馬來亞其他社會分離之精神及意識外，是否尚有其他意義，實屬疑問。在馬來亞之內，不少華人向未就學華校，但受英文教育。而能高度發展典型之中國美德。」

答覆：

此論點不但過于空泛，且避免正題。吾人所爭者為美德及文化之維護縱非全賴學校教育，亦大部賴於斯。吾人於承認家庭為美德之源之餘，不能不堅持學校為培養道德及文化之搖籃。缺乏教育並非不能影響一人之美德，因該人對道德、哲學及文化價值之理解力及賞識力經已因此受阻矣。中國偉大之傳統，德行與文化可由孔子，孟子，老子諸聖賢文章中見之。除非有充份之中文智識，斷難效法此等傳統，美德

及文化，而充份之中文智識僅可由學校中而非家庭中得之。

不認識華語而獲知中華美德者實鳳毛麟角。除感悟力極強者外，祖宗遺留之美德如非繼續通過學校之培養將立被遺忘。為使能領略某種文化及道德價值，須對該語言有應用自如之智識，乃無可置辯者。

論點(三)「本委員會因鑒于華，印兩民族向吾人強烈提供意見之故，特規定在需要時增加小學部每日半小時之授課時間，其上課時間乃緊接於教學之後。惟吾人願接受提學司對吾人表示之意見，即在有限之小學課程時間內，究竟若干應撥供為國語或印語之學習，其最後答案僅可如英巫文之情形由經驗中求之。且吾人以為應予教育部相當程度之自由，以執行吾人所闡明之一般原則。」

答覆：一九五二年教育法令中並無此規定。吾人以為當特別委員會開始起草教育政策時，對華印兩族之強烈反對，亦並未增加以接受。實際上，所有華人社團，所有華校董教，所有華人報章及其他文化機關，所有華校學生，幾乎整個華人社會都曾強烈反對現時教育法令所脫胎之巴恩報告書。華人要求馬來亞主要種族之語言須有同等發展之機會，如前任提學司溫斯特博士和芝士曼先生所主張者。但此種要求之慘烈呼聲，竟為人充耳不聞。印人社會亦曾發出共鳴，但不聞者亦如是。甚至若干開明之馬來亞人士亦持反對新教育法令之議。(見一九五三年八月十八日與都山沙受巫報社論)。

惟新教育法令作者，竟把教育專家過去之精論，以及大部份人民之意見束諸高閣。彼等提議在自由選擇之原則下，加入短促之時間以教授華文及印文。

譬如一英國兒童學習英語，如每日僅獲半小時，時經六年，試問彼能否讀通英語和領會英國之傳統及文化真義？如不能，華印人士之兒童亦如是，因華語與印語，比之英語，並非較為容易學習也。上述關於額外課程之教授事，縱使付諸實施，亦以身體疲勞之種種原因，其能否可行，實屬疑問。

論點(四)「關於現有華校之絕跡問題，吾人認為不應與華人之語言及文化絕跡混為一談，因二者不相表裏。倘華人斤斤致辯謂，華人語言及其文化，將隨時時吾人所知之華校絕跡而絕跡，此毋乃顯示華人對其語言文化之持久性缺乏信心矣。」

答覆：上述方言學校乃馬來亞文化之寶貴搖籃，吾人亦贊同此言。惟照現時所設計之國民學校，其不能成為現時華文文化與印文文化之「寶貴搖籃」，無可置辯。今吾人所聆聽之爭辯，却為縱華文文化寶貴搖籃之華校既已消滅，猶不能謂華語及華文文化亦與之俱亡，否則，吾人將蒙對華語及華文文化之傳統持久性缺乏信心之譏。此種立論，實無異於持巨杖毆人猶云「若君之大塊頭，當可承此輕輕之棒打也。」

華校消滅與華文絕跡雖非全為一事，但華校與華文乃相輔者。彼此均為對方之鎖鑰。

論點(五)「國語乃指統一之中國國語而言。但查國語本為中國某一部份所用之方言，其後以政治理由遂成為國語，并用以為中國教育之媒介語。『國語』用之以馬來亞為教育之媒介，則無疑是統一中國之政治意識擴展至海外華僑之結果。」

答覆：「國語」在中國廣泛之應用，正如巫語在印尼一樣的廣泛之應用，原無任何政治之含義。若干人士認為國語是中國各地方言之泉源。凡研究中國歷史者，當知在中國「國語」之被採用為普通話時，純為教育、文化與交往方便之理由。從未聞有任何執政階級，蓄意將其語言，強人民通用。由於馬來亞華校通常均受中國文化發展之影響，故中國於一九一七年產生之語言運動，從而波及馬來亞。若謂此影響含有任何政治意味，實近荒謬，蓋吾人從未聞中國政府擬以國語為工具以求鞏固其在馬來亞之政治勢力也。

論點(六)「無論馬來亞政府過去對此之態度如何，目前吾人實無法接受『國語』為馬來亞之『國語』之一。」

答覆：國語或普通話為華人之一種語言。馬來亞聯合邦協定祇提到官方語言，而未說及統一之國家語言。將來馬來亞國語之為何，此須由將來馬來亞國決定之。

但吾人所堅持者，即二百一十五萬二千九百零六名華人及六十六萬五千五百零三名印人（比對二百八十六萬三千六百零三名之馬來人及馬來西亞人）之語言決不應被忽略或被擠至劣等之地位，特別是當塑造將來馬來亞國統一之文化時，有需從世界兩大文明——中國與印度——取材也。

論點（七）「其次，「國語」之被指為馬來亞華人之母語，亦未見其然。」

答覆：華人普遍承認國語為華人之基本語，并且若干人士尚認為「國語」為中國各地方言之主流。華語在發音上雖與各地方言而有不同，但其文字却一致。且在各地方言中，發音雖各殊異，但其韻律乃不相軒輊者。因之華人兒童之學習「國語」與學習另一種不同之語言絕不能相提并論。

在本備忘錄吾人乃針對華文學校者。現時華文學校均以「國語」為授課媒介。

「國語」之在中國普遍使用，正如馬來語之在印尼普遍使用，其情況同焉。馬來語同時之在馬來亞使用，自無其政治意義，此點前已提及。

論點（八）「母語之教育原則乃源自西方，并曾施之於兩種語言之社會。惟須知在此種社會之人民，其語言同屬於一語言系統，故其思想之程序亦彼此相近。但此教育原則（母語教育原則）不宜實行於語言系統在基本上相距甚大者。」

答覆：此為一令人詫異之議論，因從常識而言，倘一國家各民族之各種語言與思想程序愈為迥異，則更不應以一獨特之語言和一獨特思想程序，強使該國之各民族採用，庶免受人指為獨裁專政。尤有進者，一國家之人民雖操同一之語言，但其思想程序自非必然相同。茲試以德蘭為例：吾人相信如德國繼續被分割為二，則下一代東德之兒童，其思想程序將與西德兒童之思想程序，截然相距，此時東德兒童之思想程序反可能與蘇聯之兒童者趨於一致。此乃藉以證明一國家之民族，在心理與思想之團結，其重要性實有過於語言之統一焉。

吾人認為為求馬來亞各民族心理與思想之統一，莫善於制定馬來亞化之課本及課程，以普遍適用於馬來亞之學校，勿論學校之以何種語言為教授媒介。

倘瑞士人民之應用法文、德文及意文，未足構成國家統一之障礙，則教育當局又何懼於馬來亞應用三種語言將發生不同之效果。倘馬來語、「國語」及印語乃因彼等之源流迥異，是以基本之思想程序亦迥異，而作為反對之理，則英語亦應同樣在被反對之例乃可。設吾人所關心者祇係馬來語，則此爭論或較為有力，但事實非如是。

茲錄一九二三年五月二十八日海峽殖民地立法會之官方意見如下：

「教授外國語言之能否獲致其教育價值，須視學子是否對其本身之語言，先有良好，普遍及思想之訓練而立下基礎而定。」

當時海峽殖民地代理教育司溫斯特博士於發表此意見之餘，並曾引世界教育專家之結論如下：

「該負責報告關於印度各大學之考察團所得之結論，認為每一兒童應先學習以其母語思構。印度教育制度困難之一，乃由於自麥哥尼時代以來，吾人忽略此觀念。」

根據此一結論，馬來亞華人之在家說華語者，必須以華語作為受教育之媒介。唯其如是，華人始能循其自己之文化與傳統獲到最大之發展，從而根深蒂固。人類絕無因脫離其自己本國文明之根基而變成更文明者。人類之語言，猶人之影子，不能與其形

分離。

該報告印度大學之攷察團主張在一切之教育中，吾人必須先訓練兒童，使能準確與自由運用其母語。

故問題為：馬來亞華人之母語為何？其答案見於答覆論點第七時之解釋。

論點（九）「巫人之要求設立以巫語為媒介之國民學校與華人之要求設立以華語為媒介之國民學校，兩者之間，於理原不能相提并論。」

答覆：華人所最關心者，厥為中國文化與教育之保存。渠等對「終止方言教育」尤刻難忘。如上所述，馬來亞可從中國五千年文明中取材不少，而通此至文明之道德與文化大門之鎖鑰，即為華文教育。因此華人對「終止方言學校」之事憂憤莫名。華人認為彼等之學校應為馬來亞教育體系中之一環。彼等甚至願意考慮如一九五三年十月二十日星洲總督列諾爵士所作之建議，即設立一種學校，俾華人之子弟可於「求學之整個期間」內得以華文及英文為學習媒介。

吾人可指出，在聯合邦馬來人只有二百八十萬，華人有二百一十萬。倘星洲與聯合邦合而言之，則華人口更大。吾人之作此比較，乃欲以顯出，建立以馬來語為授課媒介以及以華語為授課媒介，彼此之間，其「合法要求」為何如矣。

論點（十）「目前本邦華人所追求者，似乎企圖在馬來亞社會繼續保留華語，華文與華教之特殊及分離之地位。」

答覆：吾人願於此作最後一次極誠懇之指出，本邦華人社會從未在馬來亞社會中，冀求「特殊」和「分離」之地位，現時如是，將亦如是。華人之要求，僅為「平等」和「正義」。華人為欲之使華人馬來亞化，最好的媒介為利用華語，如斯而已。

華文學校之採用英文及巫文為必修科，為期已久。吾人若加以適當之改革，則華校可能成為馬來亞文化尤其華巫文化之交匯所矣。

星洲總督列諾爵士於一九五三年十月廿日提設立複語學校之建議，俾華童得於「在學之整個時期內」，以華文及英文為學習媒介。新加坡華校代表與政府官員數度磋商後，據報載已接受該建議，並保證華校於不改變其本質時，將實施複語教授原則，以求獲得津貼金之增加。

芬吳報告書亦曾指出，華人寧願接受複語或甚至三種語言之教授原則，而不願被強迫應用英文或巫文，或英巫文兩種而已。（芬吳報告書第六頁第十四段）。

吾人亦非不了解共同交往工具之重要。其實於一九五二年十一月九日聯合邦華校董教代表大會時曾一致議決：「應以各民族之母語教育為原則，即中印巫文教育一律平等，唯須以英文為必修之主要科，以期英文為聯合邦共通語言」。此絕不能謂為擬建立或保持「特殊及分離之地位」也。

論點（十一）「聯合邦許多學校……正培養與發展一種與馬來亞社會隔絕之精神與意念。」

答覆：任何公平之人士，對政府單獨指責華校為「培養一種與馬來亞社會隔絕之精神與意念一事」，均感未稱公允。縱政府斯項指摘容或不謬，亦應同時加之於英校，印校，甚至巫校亦然。一如芬吳報告書（馬來亞教育第三章）之詳細指出者。由於馬來亞過去教育制度之未臻健全，故各種族學校乃常對本身創設人士之利益與原始，不無側重之弊。迨現時馬來亞人民日漸覺悟到自治政府和建設馬來亞國之意義，教育部乃將其本身之疏虞，竟全部歸咎於華校。吾人可向關心華校之人士保證，倘華校能獲致善意之看待，吾人將歡迎把現時之教科書改編，以求適合馬來亞之環境。但修編之所指，是在「內容」之改革，而非「文字」之變換。事實而言，馬來亞化最佳辦法，莫如在現時馬來亞所應用之幾種重要語言媒介上努力。倘企圖馬來亞化華人

，而出之於採用英語或巫語，而非華語，則當困難無窮。其實吾人認為此種辦法，且將歸失敗。

論點(十二)「查一九四七年，聯合邦華校小學一年級學生共六萬三千六百八十一人，至一九四八年二年級學生存五萬四千五百六十八人，延至一九五二年六年級學生，僅有一萬零六百三十三人，由此可見，聯合邦華人之父母，鮮願其子女在華校修畢其小學課程。」

答覆：吾人對引用統計字數，顯示華校學生於升至較高年級時，人數逐漸減低，以象徵華人父母對其子女完成華文初等教育表示冷淡一節，認為甚為不公。雖然政府過去一向對華校及其畢業生採用歧視政策，但華校所註冊之學生，一九四六年十一月共有十七萬二千人，時至一九五三年七月增至二十五萬七千七百八十一人。至其續年升級學生之數減退，原無法避免，尤其是戰後經濟困難，不無影響。此點不僅在華校如是，其他種族之學校亦莫不如是，何況華校尚有不少因緊急法令之關係而致停辦。

至於他校情形，如一九四七年，在巫校一號之學生共有七萬八千二百五十八人，遞至一九四八年，二號之學生，僅餘五萬五千六百八十一人，又一九四九年三號之學生，祇剩四萬九千四百零二人。准是觀之，雖然巫校之辦理有其特別有利之條件，但巫校之情形并不比華校為佳。吾人是否以為巫語學校亦有應如華校之被消滅乎？

抗 議 理 由 歸 納

甲，巴恩委員會主張建立國民學校，而為聯合邦政府所接納之建議，實與該委員會原被委辦之事項相違。

乙，巴恩委員會主張以國民學校代替方言學校之建議，亦與該委員會原被委辦之事項相違。

丙，一九五二年教育法令第十八、十九與二十各條乃包含接受上述乙項之建議。

丁，芬吳委員會對華校將來之建議，實際完全被拒絕。聯合邦政府竟不顧芬吳兩博士之來研究華文教育，及後提出報告與建議，乃應聯合邦政府所邀請者；

戊，由現時與將來馬來亞人手中奪取吸收擁有五十年歷史之中國文化之鎖鑰——華文，乃非未來馬來亞國之利。

己，消滅幾近本邦全人口一半所擁有之華校，乃非馬來亞之利。

庚，一九五二年教育法令所規定不充足之華文授課時間，不能有助於本邦文化之溶合，從而希冀其由此產生一馬來亞獨特之文化。

申，不利於華文教授之規定，是完全抹煞聯合邦華人付稅所應享之權利。

結 論 與 建 議

在結論中，吾人謹虔敬指出消滅華校將有損害於馬來亞文化之建立（此文化必須從古老中國及印度文明中所取材）。由於國民學校規定華文教授時間之不充足，馬來亞人，特別是馬來亞華人，無異將被摒於中國文化之門外。

吾人之教育政策，正如一九五二年立法會文件第七十號第三十一段所建議者，應使方言學校能作最大之貢獻，以求建設馬來亞文化。基此，方言學校有應鼓勵其發展（而非消滅）。使其採用同一標準之馬來亞化課本。基於各民族教育平等之原則，馬來亞

共同之前途與及各民族共同之利益之目標，乃能必然達到。

否定中國與印度文化對於馬來亞文化發展可能之貢獻，乃非將來馬來亞國之利。但馬來亞現時正踏上此途，蓋政府正企圖消滅華人及印人方言學校，而在國民學校中又不給予充足之華文印文教授時間。

由於國民學校之難以給予充足之華印文教授時間，由於華文與印文乃非易學之文字，是則問題之解決，顯然有賴於保留方言學校，并從而運用之，以作為馬來亞化之利器。為此理由，吾人應鼓勵華校之循此途發展，而不應取巴恩報告書與及一九五二年教育法令所蘊藏威脅其關門之敵視態度。

一九五四年三月廿五日

馬華公會會長
馬華公會華文教育
中央委員會主席

陳禎祿