

Human Rights Education in Taiwan: The First Ten Years

Mab Huang

Joseph K. Twanmoh Chair Professor, Soochow University, Taiwan
Founding Editor in Chief, *Taiwan Human Rights Journal*

Abstract

My paper is primarily concerned with the first ten years of human rights education in Taiwan, roughly from 1995 to 2005. It will describe and analyze the initiative by the academic community and NGOs in promoting human rights education, why they chose to do so and how the government of Taipei City and the central government responded to their pressure as well as the policy measures adopted. Reference will be made to the first international conference on human rights education held in Taipei in 1998. The decade ended in roughly 2005 when the Chen Shui-bian's administration shifted its concerns from human rights education to that of education in the history, geography and culture of Taiwan. A few words will be said about what has happened since that time. During the first term of Ma Ying-jeou's presidency, Taiwan succeeded in ratifying the two international human rights covenants in 2009 and invited international experts to come to Taipei to review the initial national report in 2013 and the second national report in 2017. Both times the experts, in their concluding observations and recommendations, have stated categorically that Taiwan must frame a comprehensive plan for human rights education. The government is thus obliged to do so. NGOs, by comparison with the first decade, are much more experienced, endorsed with more resources and deeply involved in human rights education, either in a general sense, or in the specific area of their concern. It is, however, too early to assess the achievements and shortcomings of the second ten years of human rights education in Taiwan.

The literature which will be used in this study includes official documents, academic papers as well as personal observations. As this author

has been involved with the effort to promote human rights education from the early years, his observations and reflections shed much light on the decades-long endeavor.

Keywords

human rights education, Taiwan, academic community, Chen Shui-bian, Ma Ying-jeou

I. Introduction

In the year 1995, the author of this paper was recruited by Soochow University in Taipei, a private university first founded around the turn of the twentieth century in Soochow, China, and regrouped in Taipei in the early fiftieth. Prior to his return from the United States, he had taught at National Taiwan University and National Cheng-chi University as a visiting scholar and had kept in close contact with friends and colleagues in the academic community and the emerging non-governmental organizations. The first thing he did upon his return to Taipei was to begin to experiment with human rights education. He persuaded his colleagues in the Department of Political Science at Soochow University to offer courses in women's rights, human rights philosophy and ethics, the rights of the indigenous peoples and international protection of human rights, among others. He then approached colleagues in the Taipei Municipal Teachers College (now University of Taipei) and National Yang-Ming Medical College (now National Yang-Ming University) to jointly propose a three-year research project to the then National Science Council for developing teaching material and training teachers for primary and secondary schools as well as pre-school children. Unfortunately, the project was only funded for the first year, excluding the pre-school children component. The proposal of the second year would have invited experts in various fields, such as the environment and sexuality, to write essays as appendices to the proposed textbook. It was rejected, the reason given by the reviewers being that teaching of the course "constitution of the Republic of

China” at the university level made the proposal superfluous.¹ Could there be any better demonstration of the conflict between traditional values and the domination of the political ideology of an authoritarian government on the one hand and the emerging educational reform agitation on the other? The old guards in the educational field still held onto their power tenaciously. The research team, however, was not deterred and continued with their plan.

In retrospect, it is quite clear that this author and his colleagues were urged on in their efforts by two events. He had taught human rights since 1977 in New York State University and was deeply inspired by the United Nations “decade for human rights education 1995–2004” and the movement for educational reforms in Taiwan during the early 1990s. The latter was clearly a mirror of the democratization of the Taiwan political process. It aimed at breaking free of the control of the educational system by the teachers colleges which in turn were dominated by the political ideology of the Chinese Nationalist Party. A huge demonstration took place on April 10, 1994. In response, the government headed by Lee Teng-hui established a Commission on Education Reform and appointed Dr. Lee Yuan-tseh, then President of the Academia Sinica, as its chair. Rising high as a laureate of the Nobel Prize in Chemistry and having the trust of both the government and the people, Dr. Lee was judged to be the right person for the task. He did indeed assemble a large team and they worked fervently in a period of two years to report back. Altogether, the Commission issued four reports from April 1995 to November 1996 as well as a final report. The reports were as comprehensive as they were ambitious, taking upon themselves to tackle all the issues confronting the existing educational system at that time. The agenda included, among other things, enacting a *Basic Law on Education*, founding a National Institute of Educational Research and comprehensive budget planning as well as promoting the education of indigenous people and persons with disabilities. It was literally an encyclopedia on educational reform, coming close to a utopian blueprint for the modern age.

1 The proposal for funding was divided into four components, yet it was subsidized for one year, excluding the pre-school component. The following year’s proposal would have invited six experts in various fields such as environment, sexuality, etc. to compose articles as appendices to the human rights textbook. Two reviewers at the National Science Council rejected the proposal. They were of the opinion that since teaching “Constitution” at the university level contains human rights education materials, the proposal was superfluous. A revised application was declined. No application was made in the third year, yet the research work continued.

The educational reform movement in Taipei, plainly, was not explicitly concerned with human rights education, yet as it explicitly endorsed the right to learning as a fundamental human right, it definitely made advocacy of it easier. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the achievement and the defects of the reform efforts or the many criticisms voiced against Dr. Lee, which are still being heatedly debated.

The United Nations' initiative in human rights education met with support in many countries, giving a role to the government, NGOs as well as concerned individuals, yet it did not elicit much response in Taiwan. The reasons are not difficult to ascertain. Taiwan, or formally the Republic of China, was expelled from the United Nations in 1971, and Beijing succeeded in representing China. As a result, Taiwan was isolated in the international community and hardly informed of the new development, either in theory or practice, concerning the idea of human rights. And resentment against the United Nations made it easier to neglect its endeavors.

II. The Initiative for Human Rights Education

The very beginning of a human rights education initiative in formal educational institutions was most unassuming. This writer remembers vividly a conversation he had with Professor Yin-chang Wu, the head of the Bureau of Education of Taipei City under Mayor Chen Shui-bian. Professor Chou Pesus, then Executive Director of the Bo-Yang Foundation for Human Rights Education, had arranged the meeting at the Alumni Center of National Taiwan University and the date was October 25, 1995. Professor Wu patiently explained that the result of years of teaching the rule of law was hardly promising indeed. Instead of learning the spirit of the rule of law and how the law should provide standards of behavior for society, the students were more concerned about the reduction of penalties for minors. In part because of this experience, Professor Wu was interested in human rights education and promised to help. In fact, Professor Wu did served as an advisor to the research team being organized at that time.

In working together, the participants from the three institutions of higher education apparently enjoyed a sense of excitement and challenge. They met almost every month to discuss and chart their plan. Professors Chou Pesus and Huang Song-li from Yang-Ming Medical College, both experts in public health, Professors Dan Jau-wei and Tang Mei-ying from the Taipei Municipal

Teacher's College and Lecturer Chen Mei-hua, a young feminist scholar, and this author from Soochow University, regularly attended the meetings. It must be the bad habit of intellectuals, especially when they initiate a new project, to argue and debate endlessly on what they have already decided to do. In this case, the argument was heated and repetitious. It tended to center around several questions: Should human rights education be promoted in Taiwan? Are universal human rights values merely a product of Western culture? And assuming that human rights education was acceptable, how would it be implemented? This wrangling indeed could be dubbed the "Asian Values" debate writ small and its antagonists were primarily Professor Dan Jau-wei and Lecturer Chen Mei-hua. It was not that clear if Professor Dan was always serious, yet he was plainly enjoying arguing on behalf of the traditional Confucian ethic. Fortunately, the friendship and trust among the research group was not affected.

When it came to concrete projects, the consensus at that time was to go for compiling teaching material, especially for primary and secondary schools, and the burden fell to a large degree on Professor Tang Mei-ying and her students, many of them teachers at primary and junior secondary schools. Subsidized by the Taipei Bureau of Education, Professor Tang Mei-ying held a workshop in November 1997, which some thirty primary and junior secondary school teachers attended, either voluntarily or recommended by their principals. Four months later, in March 1998, another workshop was convened, ending in mid-June. The participants met on a weekly basis, mostly on Friday afternoons, with topics ranging from the concepts and history of human rights, children's' rights, the constitutional protection of human rights, and planning and revision of teaching materials. They gave emphasis to the integration of theory and practice and the selection of topics suitable for teaching purposes. In July and August 1998, a third workshop, formally an advanced workshop, was held with 15 participants. They were divided into four teams, gathering each Friday morning. One team specialized on translating certain United Nations documents and foreign textbooks into simple and easily understandable language for teaching purposes, including a few chapters from *Educating for Human Dignity: Learning about Rights and Responsibilities* by Professor Betty Reardon of Columbia University. The other three teams revised the teaching materials compiled by the March and June workshops (Tang, 2001).

The pre-school component was supervised by Professor Lin Pei-rong of the Taipei Municipal Teachers' College. She used games in the classroom to teach mutual respect and tolerance. Her questions included: Does the teacher favor clever students or students from rich families? Are students from poor families more likely to be bullied? She has accumulated much information, yet due to a lack of funding, the preliminary analysis has not been published.

Next to compiling teaching materials, much attention was paid to ascertaining the attitude of students at all levels of education, the reason being that the better their attitudes were known, the better to reach them. In 1996, under the supervision of Professor Hawang Shiow-duan of Soochow University, 1,200 college and university students all over Taiwan were surveyed using random sampling from three classes of institutions: universities and colleges, teachers' colleges and specialized colleges. The survey focused on the students' opinion on various human rights issues, including political attitudes and gender equality. However, given the lack of resources, only a part of the survey results has been analyzed, for which see Professor Hawang's (1998) article in the *Soochow University Political Science Journal*.

Parallel to the survey discussed above, Professor Chou Pesus of Yang-Ming Medical College had taken on a survey of secondary school students in 1994. She was concerned with the widespread habit of smoking and drinking among teenage students, and she took the advantage of the survey to include attitudes on human rights, such as the reactions of parents, teachers and peer groups towards their behavior and if their privacy was respected. This survey, using random sampling, encompassed students from 100 schools (50 junior secondary schools, 14 senior secondary schools, 21 vocational schools and 15 junior colleges). The response from more than 10,000 students produced a number of interesting and meaningful conclusions. For example, smoking and drinking on campus were not resented by fellow students, but admired as "fashionable" behavior. Professor Chou published her analysis of the survey results in the *Chinese Journal of Public Health* in 1998 (Chou et al., 1998).

In the summer of 1998, the Yang-Ming Medical College Crusade which had been founded by Professor Chou in the 1970s officially announced an "Education Camp for Junior Secondary School Students," that would bring human rights ideas into remote towns and villages through small group activities focused on smoking, drinking, chewing betel nuts and taking drugs.

To summarize the experience of the previous three years, an international conference was organized jointly by Soochow University and Taipei Municipal Teachers College in November 1998, with scholars and experts from the U.S., Europe and the Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Center, Osaka, Japan. A “Workshop for Teachers of Junior Secondary and Primary Schools” was held at the Taipei Municipal Teachers College and drew more than 100 participants. The presentations by Professor Audrey Osler from United Kingdom, Mr. Jefferson Plantilla from Osaka Information Center and Dr. Ted Orlin from Utica College, Syracuse University, U.S., were particularly warmly received. An exhibition of human rights posters on Soochow University campus also attracted much attention.

If this first international conference was a sign that Taiwan had launched, and could sustain, human rights education by itself, the completion of the Human Rights Monument on Green Island further confirmed that transitional justice has been placed on the agenda. With the support of President Lee Teng-hui, Bo Yang, who had been jailed in that off-shore penal institution for 9 years and 26 days, had this to say at the inauguration of the Monument:

The five decades of white terror were over. Looking into the future, we hope for an era when mothers will no longer weep (for their children and loved ones jailed on Green Island)... Only an honest attitude towards historical mistakes will ensure the future and prevent any recurrence of evil. The Monument testifies to the world, that we the people have the capabilities and wisdom to terminate political persecution, continue to monitor the government, implement democracy and promote human rights education (Bo Yang, 2000).

Before the presidential elections, this author with the support of some of his colleagues at Soochow University, began to promote the establishment of a human rights center. They met with much opposition, and it was only through a university-wide campaign and persuasion that the Chang Fo-chuan Center for the Study of Human Rights was set up in December 2000, the first of its kind in Taiwan, dedicated to teaching and research as well as training of NGO people.² This author was elected to serve as its chair. The following

² For the setting up of the Chang Fo-chuan Center for the Study of Human Rights, please refer to Hawang Shiow-duan (2001).

month, January 2001, the Center sponsored a large international conference at which President Chen Shui-bian was the keynote speaker. The theme of the conference was a comparative study of the plans for a national human rights commission, as the academic community and the NGOs had been demanding the establishment of a national human rights commission based on the Paris Principles for some time. As an indication of the high hope and enthusiasm, more than twenty scholars and experts were invited from Asia, Africa, Europe and Northern and Southern America to take part in the conference.

III. The Role of the Central Government

As has been described above, the central government had been responding to the agitation for educational reform. The Ministry of Education adopted a policy to include human rights topics in the school curriculum in September 1998 through its *General Guidelines of Grades 1–9 Curriculum of Elementary and Junior High School Education*. The Guidelines delegated the decision-making power to the schools in order to streamline courses and cultivate the students' capabilities, replacing the previous system and its rigid requirements with flexible principles. It divided teaching into eight learning areas and six topics. The former are: Languages, Health and Physical Education, Social Sciences, Arts and Human Sciences, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Living Skills and Activities. And the latter are human rights, gender equality, the environment, information technology, home economics, and career planning. The program was designed to improve the linkage between knowledge and real life, breaking the restrictions of each subject as well as encouraging the autonomy of teachers' expertise. However, there is a built-in defect in the implementation of human rights teaching. It was stipulated that human rights should be "incorporated" into different courses, such as courses on the Chinese language, history or social science. Rights did not have a separate course to call its own. The criticism, as could be expected, was that "incorporation (融入)" could so easily become "meltdown (融化)" with no trace left. To put it differently, if no teachers in a school are committed to human rights education, and/or there is no support from the principal, the stipulation would come to naught. Unfortunately, the criticism turned out to be accurate, and it is still a serious problem in many a school ever since.

A year later, the 1999 *Basic Law on Education* explicitly provides for the right to education, stipulating that the objective of education is respect

for basic human rights, and emphasizes the principle of equal access to education. This basic law no doubt was the triumphant conclusion of the educational reform movement. In the famous words of Dr. Lee Yuan-tseh, “educational reform this time is for real, the purpose of which is to train and nurture every student (1996)”. It was indeed an ambitious plan, but could it be sustained?

Upon the inauguration of the new government in the year 2000, Chen Shui-bian solemnly pledged to abide by international human rights standards. It proceeded to set up a Human Rights Advisory Committee at the Presidential Office chaired by Vice-President Annette Lu in October 2000. It was composed of scholars, lawyers and NGO people. It was entrusted with the task of bringing about a National Human Rights Commission. Unfortunately, this promise to set up a national human rights commission was not kept, nor that of adopting a bill of human rights during the eight years of Chen Shui-bian’s presidency.

Almost simultaneously, a Human Rights Promotion Task Force was established in the Executive Yuan, an NGO Committee at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for supporting human rights NGOs in their liaison with international society and a Human Rights Education Committee at the Ministry of Education with which this paper is primarily concerned.³

Prior to setting up this Committee, the Ministry of Education had invited representatives from academia and NGOs to meet and discuss how to proceed with human rights education and they also established an internal coordination mechanism and division of labor among its departments and bureaus. As is to be expected of a government bureaucracy, the Ministry in the first meeting of Committee in April 2001 came prepared and three documents were adopted. They were the “Implementation Plan for Human Rights Education,” the “Main Points for the Establishment of the Committee for Human Rights Education,” and the “Main Points for Subsidizing NGOs in Human Rights Education Activities.” These provided the legal basis of the work that would be done in the following years.

To further facilitate their work, the Committee in its meeting in October 2001 decided to form four sections, the Research, Development and

3 For the first year of Chen Shui-bian’s administration, this author was a member of all these committees. He served in the Committee of Human Rights Education until 2005.

Evaluation Section in charge of over-all planning and guidance, the Teacher Training and Curriculum Planning Section, the Social Promotion Section and Publicity and Campus Environment Section. As they were the workhorses of the whole enterprise, what they did and how they went about their tasks deserves to be scrutinized.

To begin with, the Research, Development and Evaluation Section proceeded to commission a study from Professor Feng Chao-lin of National Cheng-chi University on Guidelines for Evaluation at Each Level of Schools. It was well-done and was widely used. Another commission went to Professor Lin Chia-fan of the National Taiwan Normal University on “Campus Regulations vs. Students’ Rights and Responsibilities: Perspectives from a Study of Legal Cases in the United States and Taiwan.” As the issue of students’ rights was rapidly emerging, this study was extensively cited.

The publication of a bilingual human rights dictionary was also supported by this Section. This author was put in charge of the project. As editor-in-chief, he recruited an international team of some twenty scholars and experts to join him. Compared with other human rights dictionary’s, it was so designed that the dictionary does not only include important international laws, conventions and institutions, but important persons and events, especially those related to developing countries. Special attention was paid to female leaders in the field, such as Eleanor Roosevelt, Rosa Parks, and Louise Arbour, among others. Furthermore, to reflect the different legal systems of China, Hong Kong and Taiwan, the dictionary was divided into four parts: International and the three ethnic Chinese communities. The project took three years to complete and was published in 2007. Five thousand copies were printed, and distributed to all primary and secondary schools as a reference book.

As early as 2001, the Committee had planned to set up human rights resource centers in the northern, central and southern parts of the island respectively, but budgetary constraints prevented their establishment. It was not until November 2005 that funding was available for the Chang Fo-chuan Center for the Study of Human Rights at Soochow University to set up a Human Rights Education Advisory and Resources Center. It was charged with consolidating resources, setting up databanks as well as providing information and consultation services to various education authorities and schools in counties and townships. This was indeed a meaningful initiative,

yet it came too late to be of use as will be explained in the following part of this essay.

The Teachers' Training and Curriculum Planning Section, drawing upon the work done by Professor Tang Mei-ying and her students, held workshops for teachers from primary and junior secondary schools in cities and counties in all parts of the island, not excluding the off-shore island of Kinmen. Altogether, from January 2000 to August 2002, 13 workshops were given. Generally speaking, the workshop was either a one day or three day affair and university professors and experienced teachers were invited to lead the discussion. Less frequently, workshops were designed for school principals and deans of student affairs. This author remembers vividly that in many of the workshops in which he took part, he was challenged by the school principals and teachers as to why human rights should be taught. They complained that outside troublemakers (that is, this author and his colleagues) were only making their life miserable. They were not to be easily persuaded.

The Social Promotion and Publicity Section was primarily concerned with sponsoring Human Rights Weddings, a brain child of Bo Yang. He fervently believed that human rights begin at home, and if husband and wife pledge to treat each other with respect and dignity, human rights would take root and permeate the community. The Section also sponsored a series of documentaries, entitled *Taiwan's Human Rights Journey*, which aimed at exploring and explaining the human rights situation in Taiwan, with a look toward the future. It was a product of many people, professors, teachers as well as NGO people, with the help of many government ministries. It took more than a year to complete. Divided into three parts, the first two dealing with the concept of human rights and international human rights law respectively, and the third taking up various issues such as rights of women and rights of the aged. They were distributed as supplementary teaching materials to all primary and secondary schools.

At this time, the Chang Fo-chuan Center for the Study of Human Rights was funded by the Ministry of Education to organize a lecture tour in collaboration with community colleges in Taipei City, Taipei County (now New Taipei City) and Keelung City. More than thirty scholars and experts were mobilized. The lecture topics include the idea of human rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the two International Human Rights Covenants and nine specific rights, such as those of women, children,

indigenous people, the environment, gays and lesbians. Ten community colleges participated in the project.

The Campus Environment Section began its work slowly, first with an emphasis on barrier-free campuses, later it came to focus on removing physical punishment and other unreasonable regulations, while encouraging schools to adopt reasonable complaint procedures. It cannot be said that the Section had an easy job. For barrier-free campus, the obstacle clearly was traditional neglect and lack of funds, while the struggle against physical punishment would still take years to make a difference.

Going beyond the domains of the four Sections of the Committee, several NGOs received funding for workshops or summer camps for students. For example, the Taiwan Association for Human Rights was provided with funding to sponsor two study campus for university students in 2002 and 2003, while the Chinese Association for Human Rights received support for its winter camp for indigenous culture and the publication of its annual Taiwan Human Rights Index, among others.

From the brief account given above, it is clear that the early years of Chen Shui-bian's administration marked the high point of human rights education efforts, and the government had set in place a fairly effective coordination mechanism. The universities, schools at all levels as well as NGOs all benefitted from its support. Obviously support from the central government was indispensable. Then and now.

IV. The Great Setback

What came next was a great setback, and it arrived without warning, or without a clear warning. Several events contributed to the weakening of, if not withdrawal from support for human rights education by the central government, and left educational institutions and NGOs very much on their own. The first event took place in 2004, the tenth anniversary, ironically, of the April 10 demonstrations for educational reform. Several NGOs, including the Taiwan Association for Human Rights, the Association for the Promotion of Rights of High School Students, the Association of Women Scholars, the Eden Social Welfare Foundation and Yung-ho Community College jointly launched a Friendly Campus Alliance campaign, for the purpose of fighting against physical punishment and protecting students' rights. From their declaration, it can be seen they were clearly committed to

human rights education (Coalition for Friendly Campus, 2004). Yet there was a sense that the opposition to human rights education was gaining ground, and the Ministry of Education was seeking a compromise formula. The attacks, as could be expected, came from politicians and community groups committed to traditional values who regarded human rights as a product of Western civilization which, as such, should be rejected. Yet unfortunately, some influential leaders in various fields close to the Chen administration, apparently for different reasons, thought that a shift could be navigated without doing much hurt. The whole drive was turned into an excuse for not pushing the idea of rights, but for harmony, for keeping the campus quiet and sedate. At the time of this writing, the Ministry of Education still argues that by promoting friendly campuses, they are doing human rights education. More on this later.

The second event had a more serious impact. In the early months of the second term of Chen's presidency, Professor Tu Cheng-sheng, a well-known scholar and an academician of the Academia Sinica was appointed to be Minister of Education. Prior to his appointment, he had been known for his theory of how to teach history, which emphasizes understanding Taiwan instead of China as had been the case since the end of World War II. Dubbed the theory of a concentric framework, it proposes that "the teaching of history should start from an understanding of Taiwan, from local to global, to be expanded to China, Asia, and the world (Tu, 2007)." As soon as Professor Tu was appointed Minister, he immediately proposed that the educational system must be "Taiwan-centered" (sometimes also translated as Taiwan-centered subjectivity) and its goal a quest of Taiwanese self-knowledge and national identity (Tu, 2015). Professor Tu had indeed never said that human rights education should be neglected, nor international liaison be denigrated. In his speech at the London School of Economics, his Alma Mater, he said the very opposite. To quote:

In 2004, in the position as Minister of Education, I proposed four directions regarding education policies: First, to cultivate modern citizens, that is, to get across the ideas of human rights and rule by law in order to realize democracy. Second, to establish the consciousness of Taiwanese subjectivity, that is, to unearth the "Taiwan" buried under the debris of "China" and make it stand upright. Third, to advocate a global vision, that is, to compare

Taiwan's education with those of other developed countries in the global context so as to shorten the distance. Last, to emphasize the importance of social justice, that is, to allocate more educational resources to minority ethnic groups and disadvantaged individuals (Tu, 2007).

Yet in everyday reality, the tension between being a modern citizen committed to the ideas of human rights and the rule of law and that of cultivating Taiwanese subjectivity was palpable, and could not but contribute to the weakening of the former in terms of priority, allocation of resources and bureaucratic procedures.

And the coup de grace was administered in September 2005 by Frank Hsieh, then the Premier. Pressed by Chinese Nationalist Party lawmakers that many committees in the government did not have any legal foundation and the threat of cutting off their funding, he agreed to change the name of the Human Rights Education Committee to that of Human Rights Education Consulting Group, abolishing the original division of labor, cutting funds and completely revamping its working procedures. Since then, the Consulting Group has met once every six months, hardly taking any important initiative. At the time of writing, only the project, entitled K-12 EA MOE Curriculum and Instruction Consulting Team coordinated by Professor Lin Chia-fan is active, struggling to fulfill the mandate of helping primary and secondary school teachers in their difficult task of teaching human rights in a not so friendly environment.

Thus, the first ten years came to an end on a sad note.

V. Concluding Remarks

The brief description and still less than adequate analysis could not explain fully why things happened as they did, why a promising beginning ended abruptly in defeat. Nevertheless, they point to culture and politics as the main culprits. First, the traditional values of a harmonious, hierarchical social order still had appeal to a substantial part of the community and individual rights were suspect. It could be seen clearly in the attitude of principals and teachers in the primary and secondary schools. It is a declining force, no doubt, but it was an obstacle nevertheless.

Secondly, politics. Taiwan was witnessing a rapid change in politics,

the economy and society. The agitation for educational reform was a manifestation of it, and a more open, free and democratic society was desired by most people, especially the educated and the young. Yet politicians were quick to change their mind. It would be difficult to hold them to their previous commitment. In his second term, it is clear that for various reasons, including facing the charge of corruption against him, his family members and his staff, Chen Shui-bian's interest in human rights perceptibly declined. Again, Frank Hsieh, apparently without much thought gave in to the pressure of the opposition party regarding the Committee of Human Rights Education.

Ultimately, with democratization, it could be anticipated that Taiwan nationalism would be on the rise, in part stimulated by and opposed to Chinese nationalism and Beijing's aggressive policy of unification. Dr. Tu's policy of a Taiwan-centered educational system came as no surprise. But is that absolutely in opposition to human rights education, or can they not co-exist?

Human rights education in Taiwan did not die. As mentioned earlier, the experts invited to come to Taipei to review the national human rights reports regarding the obligations assumed voluntarily by Taiwan under the two international human rights covenants both in 2013 and 2017 forcefully reminded the government that it must come up with a comprehensive plan for human rights education (Huang, 2017). Thus, the government is obliged to do so. The second part of this article will deal with what happened in the second ten years.

Reference

- Bo Yang. 2000. "Women You Zhihui, Yeyou Nengli Shixing Minzhu [我們有智慧，也有能力 實行民主] (We have the Wisdom and Capability to Practice Democracy)." In *Green Island Human Rights Memorial*. Taipei: Human Rights Education Funds.
- Chou, Pesus, Liou Mei-yuan and Chang Hong-jen. 1998. "The Present Status of Human Rights Perception and Behavior and their Relationship to Smoking and Drinking Among Adolescent Students in Taiwan." *Chinese Journal of Public Health* 17(4): 303–316.
- Coalition for Friendly Campus. 2004. "Zhongjie tifa; jianli youshan xiaoyuan [終結體罰，建立 有善校園] (End Physical Punishment, Establish a Friendly Campus)." <https://www.tahr.org.tw/news/361>. Latest update 6 April 2004.
- Hawang, Shioh-duan. 1998. "Renquan jiaoyu yu daxuesheng dui gongminquanli taidu zhi fenxi [人權教育與大學生對公民權利態度之分析] (An Analysis Political Rights Attitude of

- College Students in Taiwan).” *Soochow Journal of Political Science* 9: 171–202.
- Hawang, Shiow-duan. 2001. “Zhanwang Taiwan renquan yanjiu de xin shiye: Chang Fo-chuan Center for the Study of Human Rights de shezhi yu fangxiang [展望台灣人權研究的新視野：「張佛泉人權研究中心」的設置與方向] (Envision the Human Rights Research in Taiwan: The Setting and Goals of the Center for the Study of Human Rights at Soochow University).” Paper presented at the International Conference on National Human Rights Commissions: Promoting and Protecting Human Rights, The Grand Hotel, Taipei, 2–4 January.
- Huang, Mab. 2017. “After the Review, Then What?” Paper presented at the Tearing Down Walls: A Pathway to Peace, Healing, and Humanity, Universidad Madero, Puebla, Mexico, 27–31 May.
- Lee, Yuan-tseh. 1996. “TVBS Lee Yuan-tseh Tan Jiaogai Linian [TVBS 李遠哲談教改理念] (TVBS Lee Yuan-tseh on Notions of Education Reforms).” Commission on Education Reform Web site. <http://www.sinica.edu.tw/info/edu-reform/tvbs/t1.html>. Accessed 22 November 2003.
- Tang, Mei-ying. 2001. “Human Rights Education in Schools: The Curriculum Development and Teachers Training Program in Taiwan.” Paper presented at the International Conference on National Human Rights Commissions: Promoting and Protecting Human Rights, The Grand Hotel, Taipei, 2–4 January.
- Tu, Cheng-sheng. 2007. “Taiwan's Educational Reform and the Future of Taiwan.” Press Release. 10 January. <https://bit.ly/2HIpS2e>. Latest update 3 March 2007.
- Tu, Cheng-sheng. 2015. “Zhuti jiaoyu, yishi xingtai yu wenhua siwei [主體教育、意識形態與文化思維] (Education for autonomy of Taiwan, Ideology and Thinking about Culture).” *Visions* 12(Winter). http://www.lthsociety.org/index.php?action=visions_detail&id=122&cid=157&ccid=151&tag=. Latest update 1 February 2016.

台灣人權教育：第一個十年

黃默

東吳大學端木愷講座教授
台灣人權學刊創刊主編

摘要

這篇文章討論台灣所推動的人權教育，並聚焦於第一個十年——亦即 1995 年至 2005 年的情形。文中敘述、分析了學界與非政府組所推動的人權教育，推動的動機，以及台北市政府和中央政府對這些倡議的回應，提出的政策等。與此同時，我也會介紹 1998 年在台北所舉辦的「第一屆人權教育國際研討會」。2005 年開始，陳水扁政府的教育政策轉向關心台灣的歷史、地理與文化，人權教育的第一個十年因此告一段落，我對此也會稍做說明。2009 年，即馬英九總統的第一個任期中，台灣批准了兩個國際人權公約，並在 2013 年邀請國際專家來台為政府提出的首次「國家人權報告」進行審查，2017 年更進行了第二次的審查。在這兩次國際審查的結論性意見與建議中，審查委員都明確指出，台灣應該為人權教育提出完整的規劃，因此，這是政府應該負起的義務。在非政府組織方面，比起第一個十年，他們顯得更有經驗。無論是整體上，或是在各個組織所關懷的特定領域，他們對人權教育的推動都更為深入，也掌握更多資源。不過，要評斷台灣人權教育的第二個十年究竟取得了哪些成就，或有哪些不足之處，現在仍為時過早。

本文的寫作參考了官方文獻、學者的論文、以及我自己的觀察。我在早年便投身人權教育工作，相信在這方面的觀察與反思，有助於釐清這數十年來努力的成果。

關鍵字

人權教育、台灣、學術界、陳水扁、馬英九
