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Introduction

Several social scientists who are interested in ethnicity (e.g. Keyes 1981; Nagata 1981; De Vos and Romanucci-Ross 1982) have suggested that the maintenance of ethnic identity by a particular ethnic group relies on distinguishing cultural attributes which members manipulate for the purpose of identifying and realizing the existence of their own group. In other words, people organize cultural attributes, such as language, religion, ethnic name, territory, and aesthetics, as a set of symbols for ethnic identification. Based on ethnic symbolism, in most cases, a particular group effectively distinguishes itself from others. According to the primordialist theory (see e.g. Geertz 1973b; Isaacs 1974; Shils 1957; Keyes 1976), people receive such a set of cultural attributes by descent. Ethnic boundaries are thus maintained from generation to generation so long as radical changes in the political-economic context of a particular group do not occur (cf. Keyes 1981: 27).

Recently, scholars have attempted to define the nature of ethnicity by means of new strategies. In addition to analyzing individual life histories (e.g., Bentley 1987), the relationships between tourism and ethnic change are an area of special concern among anthropologists (see e.g. MacCannell 1976; Graburn 1976, 1980; van den Berghe and Keyes 1984; Brewer 1978). Scholars use the term “ethnic tourism” to deal with the phenomenon of ethnic-cultural contacts through the process of tourist activities. Ethnic tourism, according to van den Berghe and Keyes (1984:344), refers to “[T]ourism wherein the prime attraction is the cultural exoticism of the local population and its artifacts (clothing, architecture, theater, music, dance, plastic arts), constituting an interesting special case of ethnic relations.” Margaret Byrne Swain, in another situation, defines this concept more directly as “the marketing of tourist attractions based on an indigenous population’s way of life” (1989:85). Most cases of ethnic tourism are “tourism of inferior aborigines,” involving contact between the aborigines and temporary intruders, such as tourists, travel agents, and state representatives.

In most studies of ethnic tourist phenomena, such as the ethnic handicrafts of Micronesian peoples (Nason 1984), travel agents in the Indonesian tourism industry (Adams 1984), expressive culture of the French community of Louisiana (Eisman 1984), American Indian tourist attractions in California (Evans 1986), or the Eskimo life-style in Alaska (Smith 1989), scholars concentrate on whether the host or native groups manage to maintain some original cultural traditions, i.e. cultural traits historically recognized by academic circles, regardless of whether their meanings have been modified or redefined. What attracts tourists, domestically and internationally, most often lies in the existence of such “cultural items,” which may soon disappear. So far, I have found no studies of an ethnic group whose traditional culture has totally disappeared, but which still manages to function as an object of ethnic tourism. In this chapter, I use the case of the Atayal of Wulai in Taiwan to discuss how an indigenous people who have lost all their own traditional artifacts, clothing and other attributes, and who also have been incapable—unlike the Micronesians described by Nason (1984)—of manufacturing a “new style of indigenous artifacts and clothing,” have, in spite of no longer being culturally exotic, nevertheless devised a strategy for making a living from ethnic tourism. Moreover, I also discuss the process through which the Atayal shape cultural symbolism in order to maintain ethnic boundaries.

The Atayal of Wulai

Traditionally, anthropologists have divided the indigenous people of Taiwan into nine ethnic groups (Atayal, Ami, Saisiat, Bunun, Tsou, Rukai, Paiwan, Puyuma, and Yami) (Ruey Yih-fu 1972a) or ten (adding the Thao, who are most often classified with the Tsou or with the assimilated ping p’o or “plains aborigines”) (Ch’en Ch’i-lu 1968; Ruey Yih-fu 1972b). It is interesting that although this classification has been in use since World War II, we still find no anthropologist in Taiwan who has defined the term “ethnic group.” Scholars continue to follow the classificatory system that Japanese ethnologists used during the Japanese occupation period (1945). Anthropologists, such as Ruey Yih-fu (1972a), concerned themselves with Chinese translations of those groups the Japanese scholars rec-
ognized as distinct ethnic groups. Ch'en Chi-lu's classification of the Thao as separate from the Tsou was based on an observation that the Thao, like the other nine groups, still maintain their own language and culture and have yet to be assimilated (Ch'en Chi-lu 1968:13). In short, both Japanese and Taiwanese ethnologists (e.g. Uturikawa et al. 1935; Ruyi Yih-fu 1972c) recognize objective attributes, such as common language, customs, or social organization, as defining an ethnic group. What they neglect is the role of ethnicity or "ethnic identity" in identifying an ethnic group.

The "Atayal" (in phonetic and official English spelling) or "T'aiya" (in romanization of the Chinese pronunciation) were created as an aboriginal group in 1893 in the academic environs of Japanese ethnography, and the categorization has since been used by Chinese ethnographers (cf. Ruyi Yih-fu 1972a). Customarily called T'aiya tsu or "T'aiya people", this group is the second largest indigenous population in Taiwan. In 1981–82, the Atayal totaled 70,105 people, or 22.8% of all 306,831 Taiwanese aborigines (Liao Shou-chen 1984: 399; Hsieh Shih-chung 1987: 10). The Atayal are distributed in the northern mountainous regions of the following eight counties: T'ai-pei, T'ao-yuan, Hsin-chu, Miao-liao, T'ai-chung, Nan-t'ou, Hua-lien, and I-lan (Ruyi Yih-fu 1972b: 501). There are three sub-groups of the Atayal people: Atayal proper, Tseole, and Sedeq. This distinction is based on linguistic evidence (Ch'en Chi-lu 1967: 43–53), but scholars still believe that a common cultural complex exists among these scattered Atayal groups (Ruyi Yih-fu 1972b: 504–506; Wei Hui-lin 1956).

The Nationalist Chinese government of Taiwan has established 30 shan ti hsiang (mountainous administrative units) for the shan ti jen (literally mountain people, referring to aborigines) in indigenous areas of Taiwan. Wulai, where I conducted fieldwork, is the only shan ti hsiang in T'ai-pei county. It is located 27 kilometers south of T'ai-peii city (see Map 8.1). The indigenous people of Wulai are one of the sub-groups of Atayal proper. Wulai hsiang is composed of five villages: Chung-chih, Hsin-hsien, Fu-shan, Hsiao-yi, and Wulai. Except for Wulai, the Chinese names of the villages were given by the government. Several venerable elders of the Wulai Atayal point out that their original ancestor Yawuihuna migrated from the Papawaka area (Li-hsing village of Jen-ai hsiang, Nan-t'ou) a long time ago. His five sons, Peho, Tana, Iban, Payas, and Bukan, occupied Limogon and Jiacong (Fu-shan), Lahau (Hsin-hsien), Raga (Hsiao-yi), Nicco (Chung-chih), and Wulai respectively (Ch'en Sheng-jung and Chang Ju-chen 1989: 10–12). Since Wulai is a shan ti hsiang, the hsiang chang (the administrative head of the hsiang) must be an indigenous resident, though ironically, the Atayal are a minority of the population of Wulai, in 1983 numbering 1,697, slightly fewer than the 1,725 local Han-Taiwanese/Chinese (Chang Chih-yuan 1983: 217).

The total population of Wulai hsiang decreased from 3,422 in 1983 to about 3,100 in 1987 (Handbook 1987: 7). Most Atayal residents believe that many of their people left Wulai because of the difficulty in finding a job there. In January 1990, the number of voters in Wulai was 2,189: 907 Atayal and 1,261 Han-Taiwanese/Chinese. In other words, an indigenous candidate running for hsiang chang must acquire support from the Han residents as well as from his own people. This situation makes for an interesting political culture, which influences socio-cultural change among the Atayal as well as the development of Atayal ethnicity.

**Wulai as a Recreational Resort**

Wulai is renowned for its beautiful scenery and hot springs. It is one of the two areas in Taiwan first exploited for ethnic tourism (the other is Sun
Moon Lake in Nan-t'ou county). In 1964, the Wulai Feng-ch'ing Ch'u Kuan-li So or Administrative Office of the Wulai Scenic Area (AOWSA) in Wulai was founded. It is estimated that the number of tourists coming to Wulai has averaged about 3,000 per day since the mid-1960s. Tourist revenues have become the most important economic resource in Wulai. Although the government has actively encouraged the Atayal residents to plant firs and mushrooms, the great majority of this indigenous group, especially the women, continue to depend on the tourist industry to earn a living.

The Wulai recreational area (see Map 8.2) includes two parts. Fu-shan and Hsin-hsien villages are located in the inner part of Wulai township, where access is limited for security reasons, i.e., for protection of the mountainous areas. Tourists can apply for a permit from the local police office, but organized tours arranged by travel agencies have yet to make an impact on this region. Wulai and Chung-chih villages, however, are open to the public. Because all the scenic places and entertainment centers are in the vicinity of Wulai village, Wulai rather than Chung-chih has become the location where most tourists go. Activities of ethnic tourism, such as selling artifacts and dancing, are confined to this area. Not only have many Atayal residents of Fu-shan, Hsin-hsien, and Hsiao-yi moved to Wulai village to serve tourists, but quite a few Han people have also moved there for the same purpose. At present, the Wulai Atayal depend heavily on tourism. My informants are worried about the decline of tourism in Wulai because of the new and modern recreational resorts, especially the large-scale "aboriginal cultural villages" which are being established near Sun Moon Lake, Nan-t'ou county, and Ma-chia, Ping-tung county.

I was told that the development of Wulai tourism has been very slow. What people see today in Wulai is virtually the same as what was there in the 1960s. Both civil servants at the hsiang level in Wulai and local residents complain that there are fewer and fewer tourists. Some store owners say they could not remain in business without the arrangements they make with travel agents to have tourists brought to their stores. Recently Wulai residents realized that a large number of the tourists are international visitors. Every Wulai resident knows clearly the routes arranged by the tour guides. In the morning, a couple of tour buses arrive at a parking lot in the Wulai resort. A tour guide with a flag brings a horde of Koreans or Japanese onto the main street of Wulai and passes over a bridge across the Nan Shih River. Some of the tourists take photographs. They then take a minitrain, which is a well-known traffic tool in Wulai, to the pu pu ch'iu or the waterfall area. Many Han people regard the waterfall as the most beautiful attraction in the area. Tourists are then taken to the larger shopping stores to buy souvenirs and to have their pictures taken for no extra
charge with young indigenous women who serve as clerks. The next step is to climb a slope up to Wulai Shan-ti Wen-hua Ts'ung (WSTWHT) or the Wulai Aboriginal Culture Village (WACV) to view performances of aboriginal dancing. Finally, the group has lunch at a restaurant in order to taste native food products, after which they go back to T'ai-pei.

The entire tour lasts about three hours. Some tour groups even leave before noon without having lunch there. During this short time, native merchants must find opportunities to earn money. On the one hand, they spend time and money to acquire tourist information and to contact travel agencies; on the other hand, competition among the different stores and enterprises is fierce. Under these circumstances, the Atayal and Han residents, who both believe the Han are better at business than the Atayal, face each other in an interactive context to earn a living.

Ethnic Roles in Tourism

The Nan Shih River divides Wulai village into two parts (see Map 8.2). The main street, on the left bank, has nearly forty restaurants and shops, all selling native game and wildfowl or aboriginal clothing and artifacts. However, only one restaurant and one shop belong to aborigines. Almost all of my Atayal informants indicated that all these buildings originally belonged to aborigines. The Atayal lost much of their land because they were unfamiliar with modern economic concepts. They were lured by the promise of immediate gain, and consequently feel cheated by the Han. Thus, before passing over the Lan Sheng Bridge to the other side of the river, the needs of tourists are largely met by the Han shop owners.

Most of the Atayal live on the hill on the other side of the river. Customarily, both the Han and the Atayal call the aboriginal community pu lo or “tribe” although the traditional characteristics and functions of tribal organization have disappeared. Some informants said that they distinguish the lower part of the community (hsia pu lo or “lower tribe”), from the upper part (shang pu lo or “upper tribe”). From the lower tribe, in which the minitrain station is located, westward to the waterfall is the second area where tourists interact with local people. As on the main street, there are several stores selling ethnic products around this area. A school teacher and respected elder told me that only six of nearly thirty stores here belong to Atayal. A couple of clerks said that most owners are Han, but the majority of employees are Atayal.

The Han population has obviously invaded the inner part of the Atayal community. The most convenient locations for serving tourists and earning money are nearly all occupied by Han. Even employees of the minitrain center are mostly retired Han-Mainlander soldiers. This center belongs to the Bureau of Forests of the Provincial Government of Taiwan in stead of to the Wulai hsiang government. The area where the Wulai Aboriginal Culture Village is located is composed of four major buildings: the WACV, the Chief Restaurant, the Wulai Tourism Company (WTC), and the Naluwan Culture Plaza (NCP). The former two units are run by Shan-pao Kuan-kuang Ku-fen Yu-hsien Kung-ssu, or the Mountain People Tourism Company (MPTC), known locally as Shan-pao Kung-ssu (SPKS). All shareholders are indigenous people. As far as I know, many of the shareholders, including the current head of the Wulai hsiang government, are descendants of previous heads of the tribe.

Han businessmen have invested in the WTC. They established a huge entertainment center, the Yün Hsien Le Ytan (YHYL) or “Mystical Paradise,” on top of a hill across from the WACV which they rent from the Bureau of Forests. A cable car, which is the only form of transportation between the two hills, has become one of the main attractions that tourists, especially domestic visitors, are eager to try in Wulai, but the indigenous residents do not enjoy any of its profits. Nevertheless, it is the Naluwan Culture Plaza which my Atayal informants blamed and criticized the most. The site of the NCP was originally reserved for establishing a park. Residents say the previous head of the hsiang arbitrarily changed the plan to aid a Han entrepreneur, who had an intimate connection with many local leaders in Wulai, to build the area’s largest recreational plaza. Some of my indigenous informants are anxious about possible fierce competition between their WACV and the NCP in the future.

In short, the WACV and the Chief Restaurant, owned by the MPTC (or SPKS), are the only means for the indigenous residents to tap into the tourism industry. Young Atayal women either dance at the WACV or sell souvenirs in stores. Young men serve as taxi drivers to take tourists from the WACV to the tour bus parking lot when dance performances finish. During the day, only elders and children are to be found in the Atayal community. Those adults working for the tourist industry return to their homes at dusk. Women then busy themselves taking off heavy makeup and preparing dinner. Men wash vehicles or join together to play Chinese chess. In conversations with me, several Atayal intellectuals showed sympathy for women who have to work and cook, as well as seriously criticizing ambitionless young Atayal taxi drivers who could challenge themselves by seeking employment in urban areas.

It is thus evident the Atayal are in an inferior position socially and economically. Almost all restaurants, hotels, and recreational-entertainment spots are run by Han businessmen. Except for a few shareholders of SPKS, most aborigines are laborers hired to drive taxis, dance, or sell clothing and artifcats. It is clear that the Han residents who own the restaurants, stores and taxi companies gain more profit from tourists. Although Atayal political leaders recognize this situation, they have never pushed to im-
prove aboriginal rights and status, either with respect to the minority position of the Atayal generally, or with respect to the inferior economic status of the Atayal in Wulai. For example, two candidates campaigning for the position of hsiang chung in January 1990 never mentioned their ethnic backgrounds. Their first consideration was, after all, to gain support from the majority of voters, who are Han. Even though many Atayal ethnic leaders (including the head of Wulai village, two brothers of the Wulai hsiang chung, and several school teachers) complained to me privately about the establishment of the NCP near the WACV, they do not dare to fight for aboriginal rights in a public forum. Under these conditions, the indigenous people seem unlikely to create opportunities in the local tourist industry. They remain passive in interaction with Han residents and tourists.

Cultural Change and Daiyan Identity

Cultural change among indigenous Taiwanese peoples has attracted the attention of some of Taiwan’s anthropologists (e.g. Wang Jen-ying 1966; Huang Ying-kuei 1975). A major condition of such change is that an extremely high percentage (more than 95%) of aborigines practice Christianity (cf. Hsieh Shih-chung 1987:84; Li Yih-yuan 1978:62). Generally speaking, conversion to Christianity among aborigines has been a continuing phenomenon since the 1950s, when intensive contacts between these peoples and Han-Chinese appeared, and the traditional cultural system of aborigines was broken down with great speed. One thus may not be surprised that traditional material culture—such as clothing, housing, artifacts, and daily and ritual utensils—has also disappeared at a very fast rate.

Indigenous languages are rejected by the younger generation. Many aboriginal friends of mine told me they felt ashamed to speak their mother tongue because it was considered an “uncivilized dialect” in primary school. Traditional aboriginal political and economic institutions have been completely replaced by the modern Chinese bureaucratic system. Moreover, traditional relationships between members of an indigenous community, such as the gaga of the Atayal, an organization of ritual groups based on common descent which controlled social functions (Olieslager 1986), have disintegrated and lost validity with the introduction of national education, Confucian moral standards, and legal concepts of the state. Although it is clear that all nine groups of Taiwan aborigines are changing (i.e., toward assimilation), the Atayal of Wulai admit that they are the worst at maintaining their traditional culture. In the minds of Wulai Atayal, the indigenous peoples maintain some traditional features not only in order to distinguish themselves from the Han but also to glo-

rify the culture which they inherited from their ancestors. By “traditional culture” they mean primarily items of material culture or observable activity, such as clothing, artifacts, or rituals such as the harvest ceremony. Several intellectuals lament the fact that unlike ethnic groups in eastern and southern Taiwan, such as the Ami, Rukai, and Paiwan, who still dress in traditional attire to celebrate the harvest every year, the harvest ceremony has not been held in Wulai since the middle of the 1960s.

Of the households I visited in Wulai, I found that none kept traditional clothes, baskets, or looms. Mr. Ch’en Sheng-jung, a teacher in the Wulai primary school, with the assistance of his Han colleague, Mr. Chang Jui-chen, published a small book entitled Taiya Wen-hua tsai Wulai (Atayal Culture in Wulai) in 1989. In this book, Ch’en describes several cultural features of the Atayal: subsistence living, weaving, house style, wedding ceremonies, rites of passage, harvest rituals, clothing, dances, language, religion, legends, myth, witchcraft, and taboos. But except for matters of legend and myth, which he learned directly from two or three village elders, Mr. Ch’en either gathered material from a few records and from academic literature, or found his data in the room in the corner of the second floor of the Wulai Aboriginal Culture Village where ancient aboriginal artifacts are displayed. In other words, the Atayal cultural characteristics that Ch’en introduces for the most part no longer exist in the daily lives of the indigenous people in Wulai. The publication of this book reflects the anxiety and embarrassment of indigenous intellectuals over the loss of their traditions. When I was in the field, Mr. Ch’en revealed his own uneasiness about the disappearance of a spiritual life based on Atayal traditional culture.

Nevertheless, it is interesting for us to note that Wulai’s Atayal—who speak Mandarin Chinese, wear the same clothes as the Han people, live in modern concrete multistoried houses, and believe in the social values of the Han-Taiwanese/Chinese—still distinguish themselves from the Han. The Atayal in Wulai call themselves Daiyan in opposition to “Mugan” (Taiwanese), “Kelun” (Mainlanders), and “Kelang” (Hakka).

This ethnic map in the minds of Wulai’s Atayal is similar to the common classification of ethnic units in Taiwan. Everyone in Taiwan believes that tai yang wen or “Taiwanese”, wai shang wen or “Mainlanders”, k'o chu wen or “Hakka”, and shan ti wen or “aborigines” are the four main kinds of peoples living on the island (cf. Hsieh Shih-chung 1987: 8–9). However, the Wulai Atayal have a more detailed interpretation of local ethnic situations. Some of them regard Daiyan as a general name for all the aboriginal peoples in Taiwan, and Taiya (in Chinese pronunciation) as one group of the Daiyan people. Other informants, by contrast, believe that Daiyan, the original meaning of which is “human” in the Atayal language, is a name for the Atayal only, and Taiya, which transliterates Daiyan, is an incorrect
pronunciation created by the Japanese and carried over by the Chinese. The reason they have two different interpretations of the term Daiyan is that they are claiming a pan-Taiwan aboriginal identity and an Atayal identity simultaneously. Atayal know and identify themselves as Taiya tsu or "Atayal people", but it is more common for them to tell non-aboriginal strangers that they are shan ti jen, mountain people or aborigines.

Regardless of different interpretations of the term Daiyan, the Wu-lai Atayal do identify themselves as Daiyan. The ethnic boundary between Daiyan and other ethnic categories, especially Mogan (since most Han residents in Wu-lai are Taiwanese) is clear. Some informants indicated that they can distinguish between Daiyan and Mogan by physical appearance, but I doubt it. People know each other's ethnic background because almost all residents of Wu-lai are acquainted with each other. They already know who is a member of what particular group before they have a chance to guess.

The questions before us, then, are these: How do the Daiyan people maintain their ethnic identity when all cultural features are gone? Which ethnic markers do Daiyan people adopt and internalize, and which do Mogan (Taiwanese) recognize, to distinguish one from the other? In other words, in the network of ethnic interaction that is Wu-lai, can we discover why Daiyan is permanently Daiyan?

We will assume that the Wu-lai Atayal have developed an adaptive strategy that allows them to maintain their own ethnic existence and still deal with a complicated environment where Taiwanese control the resources of tourism. That territoriality in Wu-lai superficially separates the Atayal from the Han, seems obvious. As I have described above, the left bank of the Nan Shih River forms a Han community while the other side, known as the pu lo or "tribal area", is where the Atayal are concentrated. However, the lower part of the pu lo (Hsia pu lo) has gradually been occupied by the Han, who have profited from tourism and other local business. The pu lo is not an exclusively Atayal community anymore. Though the upper part of it (Shang pu lo) is still a "purer" area, I found that more and more Han millionaires, through secret deals, have received permission from the government to set up luxury villas near the edge of the shang pu lo, which is a reservation area for aborigines. In short, territoriality is definitely not a critical element in formulating Daiyan ethnicity and maintaining ethnic identity.

Religion is another emblem of particular ethnic groups. Some of my Atayal informants affirmed that the local Han never believed in Christianity, which is a universal faith among Daiyan. It seems to me that Christianity has indeed become the main symbol distinguishing the Atayal from the Han. However, this situation is generally true for all aborigines in Taiwan. That is, Christianity stands as a symbol of power introduced from Western civilization that indigenous peoples appropriated in order to cope with the continuous impact of Han-Chinese civilization. It thus should be seen as a universal symbol of pan-Taiwan aboriginalism. The Daiyan use Christianity to strengthen their identity as "mountain people" or aborigines, but they still cannot manipulate this Western religion as part of their own cultural traditions. "Tradition", according to folk theory, must be something very old and inherited from original forebears, and Christianity does not represent the "Daiyan "cultural tradition". What, then, is the cultural symbol of Daiyan? I suggest that the ethnic symbol of Daiyan can be found in the processes of ethnic tourism.

Shan-pao Kung-ssu as a Situational Ethnic-cultural Symbol

In the brochure printed by the Shan-pao Kung-ssu or Mountain People Tourism Company, ethnic matters introduced to tourists include the Ab-original Art Shop, the special display of ancient aboriginal products from ten tribes, native dances, and the chieftain statue. On the back of the performance program of the aboriginal dances, an advertisement can be seen—"Wulai Aborigival Culture Village features an exhibition of the culture of the ten mountain tribes of Taiwan and aboriginal handicrafts for sale". The art and handicrafts shops are obviously the main objects of interest for the tourist. Brochure information leads the reader to believe that the handicrafts for sale are "aboriginal" and "traditional". Under the title "Aboriginal Works of Art Shop", the brochure indicates, "The price is fair; choose whatever you like." "Tourists must pass this art shop before reaching the dancing platform when they enter the Wu-lai Aborigival Culture Village. Clerks in the art shop are usually the first to talk with tourists, who are most often Korean or Japanese. If she (all clerks are Atayal females) discovers the tourist is Chinese or Taiwanese, she frequently gives up soliciting business because, in her experience, Mogan and Kelu tourists are usually not willing to pay entrance fees to get inside the culture village. Even if a few of them enter the art shop, they never buy anything. Domestic tourists are considered hostile to the business of the art shop; unlike international tourists, they are usually suspicious about the authenticity of the artifacts. As much research (e.g., van den Berghe and Keyes 1984: 343–352; MacCannell 1976; Graburn 1976) points out, "tourists travel to exotic places often in search of the "authentic" other" (van den Berghe and Keyes, 1984:349), so the host people have to endeavor to exhibit authenticity. Through the process of exhibiting "staged authenticity", in van den Berghe and Keyes' terms (1984:349), host and tourist must establish a mutually-communicative relationship. Simply put, the aborigines present themselves as "authentic", communicating that "these arti-
facts and clothing I am showing you are authentic aborigine-made products. Now, you have successfully contacted Taiwan aborigines and acquired proof if you take some of these arts back home.” Clerks, when they determined my status as a domestic tourist, reluctantly answered my inquiries about the origin of aboriginal artifacts and clothing: “All are manufactured by mountain people.” However, every resident of the Wulai recreational area knows that the so-called shan ti fu or “mountain people clothes” come from a factory in P’u-li, Nan-t’ou county. All the forty-odd shopping stores owned by Mugan, as well as the Aboriginal Culture Village owned and run by the Daiyan, flaunt the information that they sell traditional clothes, but all the clothes are the same style in every shop. Some people also mentioned that in all ethnic tourism locations in Taiwan, one finds the same so-called “mountain people clothing” from the factory in Nan-t’ou. Although I did find some Mugan residents wearing “aboriginal clothes” in wintertime because they felt warmer, almost all of my Daiyan informants at SPKS not only rejected these clothes as part of their Daiyan tradition but also expressed disgust at the thought of dressing in them.

Regarding artifacts, such as mats and figurines, people also know the locations of the factories (in T’ai-pei and T’ai-chung) which produce them. Ironically, some family members of the people who are hostile to pseudo-aboriginal clothing and artifacts work in SPKS. In general, the range of interpretations of contemporary expressive culture among different Daiyan family members are based on the situations they encounter. Family members sometimes contradict each other regarding the selection of cultural symbols which serve as ethnic markers. There is an exhibition room in the Aboriginal Culture Village where quite a few traditional clothes, utensils, weapons, ornaments, and boats are on display. Every Daiyan resident thus has a rough idea of the material culture of ancient aborigines.

Unlike the Micronesians in Nason’s description, who still have their own experts to manufacture mettooch objects or “beautiful, valued goods” (Nason 1984:426), in Wulai the meaning of such objects has changed to cater to tourism; in Wulai, the indigenous people not only do not have the motivation to produce traditional goods, they also have no one who has the ability to make them. Additionally, the Han manufacturer in P’u-li has neither the motivation nor the interest to manufacture goods in the traditional style. He, at his pleasure, produces what he imagines to be close to shan-ii ti wei-tao, or “mountain cultural flavor”. Moreover, it is very rare to see a tour guide suggest to his guests to view the exhibition room, after shopping and watching dance performances. The interactive network among these people of different backgrounds can be seen in Figure 8.1.
Aborigines in the SPKS are unwilling to admit the spuriousness of those "traditions for sale" because it is a strategy for maintaining their living. Although they know that old things from their ancestors remain in the exhibition room, they are indifferent. By contrast, aborigines not part of the tourist industry, such as teachers, civil servants, and ministers, do not accept pseudo-traditions as authentic, because those artifacts are completely different from the things displayed in the exhibition room. This aspect of cultural identity among different members of the same aboriginal family is obviously inconsistent and contradictory.

Interestingly enough, I find that this gap has been compensated for and filled in by another important activity within SPKS: the dance performance. In reality, the dance performance of the aboriginal women in Wulai is the most critical tourist attraction. For the purpose of advertising this aboriginal activity at Wulai, the SPKS has built a statue of a bridegroom carrying a bride on his back (representing the traditional wedding pattern of Daiyuan) on the other side of the bridge across the Nan Shih River. Another statue of a warrior is located near the waterfall. At the entrance gate to the theater for dance performances, there is a huge statue of an Atayal chief. Tourists presumably should know that they are in a place which is very different from Taipei. Moreover, I assume that aboriginal residents may be reminded of their non-Han identity when they pass these statues every day. Statues with traditional attire are a primary symbol of the aborigines. The dance performances, rather than the sale of artifacts, strengthen the indigenous identity of Wulai for both the Daiyuan themselves and the tourists. At the very least, like the statues, all dancing women wear authentic traditional clothes.

In the performance, audiences watch ten dances. The hostess introduces them one by one in order. Tourists receive information about the colorful attire and ornamentation of the performers, and about the songs, sung in the aboriginal language. Furthermore, they are told that "all these performances are indigenous". However, in the program, these ten performances include dances of other aboriginal groups—Saisiat, Yami, and Ami. In other words, the repertoire of this Atayal dance group includes not only local dances but dances from indigenous groups all over Taiwan. Moreover, eight of the thirty people in this dance group come from ethnic groups other than the Atayal. The controller of stage lights (who is the brother of Wulai's hsiang chang) and several performers told me that because few young local Daiyuan women show an interest in dancing, the instructor cannot help but recruit members from other groups. The only requirement is that all members must be Taiwan aborigines.

The last item on the program is the "Traditional Wedding Ceremony". I observed that the bridegroom's trousers look like the Paiwan or Rukai style of black with snake totems (cf. Li Sha-li 1983). An Atayal performer responded to my inquiry, "Well ... hmm, it is our T'aiya style." But a Rukai dancer insisted that the trousers are traditional Rukai clothes. With regard to the specific ethnic origin of the costumes worn in particular dance numbers, none of the dancers I asked could figure it out. I was told that the teacher asked his dancers returning home to take pictures of their own traditional clothes. Then the teacher designed dance costumes based on the photographs. Therefore, not only the dancers, but the costumes they wear and the songs they sing are a mixture of all the Taiwan aborigines. Although 70% of the dancers are local Atayal women, they have never seen dance ceremonies or analogous rituals in their daily lives, nor have they had the chance to acquire information about Atayal expressive culture. They assume that what they wear are traditional clothes, that what they perform are traditional dances and songs, but these young women do not inquire what Daiyuan tradition really is.

After dancing, performers stand for photographs in front of the statue of Wulai's old chief. (It is said that this statue is an image of the father of the hsiang chang currently in office.) This and two other statues are virtually the only opportunity that tourists have to see indigenous male attire. (In fact there is a fourth statue located at Yulin, Hsien Le Yuan, owned by the Wulai Tourism Company, which is not included as a regular sightseeing object for international tourists.) Tourists, mostly Korean and Japanese men, are nonetheless satisfied with the appearance of authentic indigenous culture.

The dancers, too, believe they are playing "tradition". These tourists have successfully brought "tradition" back. Clerks in the SPKS also urge tourists to watch the dance performances and encourage them to buy artifacts to get more "tradition", in addition to their pictures to take back. Daiyuan outside of SPKS and tourism feel that the dance performance is the only tradition retained in Wulai. Some of them realize, more or less, that the dance attire, as well as the contents of dance and songs, are changing, but they feel that they have not strayed too far from tradition. The clothes which the dancers wear, when compared to the clothes for sale, are indeed more like those old remains in the exhibition room. Daiyuan informants, being careless of different ethnic backgrounds in the dancing group, simply identified some traditions as part of the process of dance performance within SPKS.

To summarize, activities related to the dance performances in Wulai form a contemporary Daiyuan or Atayal cultural attribute. It is a system based on the newly produced Atayal female culture, since tourism in Wulai has been developed from the 1960s on. In Taiwan folk theory, the word wen-hua or "culture" means tradition. When an independent people or ethnic group is identified or accepted, the most important thing for its members to grasp is what their culture or tradition is. Something must be
2. The formulation of "cultural tradition" is based on the manipulation and interpretation by a particular people themselves, especially when the tradition is utilized as a powerful element to maintain ethnic boundaries. Tradition, instead of being typical objective existence as ethnographies have described, is imagined, shaped, and defined by holders or sharers of the tradition in a meaningfully current situation. This indicates that tradition is not necessarily something "really old". It is a significant thing to living people, even though it is put in terms of ancestral heritage. The primordial sentiment of a particular ethnic group functions by identifying shared tradition.

3. Even when an ethnic group's original cultural traits have disappeared, it can still mold an exotic expressive culture to attract tourists. This system of cultural expression may have nothing to do with the original cultural traits, but it is probably the only manner in which the native is able to imagine a personal relationship to the ancient heritage. It is thereby easier to emphasize authenticity to both tourists and natives alike. The assurance of authenticity stimulates tourist consumption, but the aborigines themselves avoid questioning the authenticity of their "traditional things" in order to confirm their own identity.

4. In a situation where there are many distinct indigenous groups—American Indians, Australian aborigines, and the aborigines of Taiwan—any unique ethnic group may synthesize features of other groups with its own and redefine the new synthesis as "tradition," without much concern over where specific "alien" elements originated. This phenomenon often accompanies the possibility of alternative identities: that of one's own ethnic group and a pan-indigenous one. It may also form the cultural basis for a pan-ethnic identity movement. When a pan-ethnic movement is initiated and supported by indigenous peoples living in an area of ethnic tourism, the ethnic-cultural symbol which has integrated cultural elements of various peoples may, at this time, go beyond its original use to become a symbol of pan-indigenous identity.

Conclusion

Taiwan or Atayal culture in Wulai has experienced a radical process of change since the end of World War II, from the growth of tourism in the 1960s to the present decline. Contacts with the T'ai Pei metropolitan area via a convenient traffic system were the original factor causing intensive cultural change in the Atayal of Wulai. Tourism has been the most decisive means of introducing indigenous culture to Han people, and to international visitors in the more recent period. The continuous impact of the Han population, culture, and political-economic system has disorganized Daiyan tradition, but the Daiyan, in reaction, have created a set of new traditions, i.e., expressive culture of the dance performances, for the purpose of earning a living through tourism. Furthermore, they manipulate this daily show of new-found tradition as an emblem of common identity. This is one of the trends of various indigenous ethnic groups in the previous half century in Taiwan. Other areas which are famous for ethnic tourism, such as Sun Moon Lake, Taroko Gorge, or even the newly established Chiu-tsou Wen-hua ts'un, or Formosan Aboriginal Culture Village in Yu-ch'ih, Nan-t'ou and the T'ai-wan Shan-ti Wen-hua Yuen-ch'ü or Taiwan Aboriginal Cultural Park in Ma-chia, P'ing-tung, should be studied in light of these findings in Wulai.

Finally, based on my research discussed above, I propose the following theoretical conclusions about ethnic relationships and ethnicity:

1. Members of an ethnic group may cooperatively run an enterprise. This enterprise may not only become the major economic resource of a particular people, but may also act as a significant cultural symbol for ethnic identity. In other words, while a cultural symbol can become commercialized, business also can become a foundation for shaping ethnicity.
PART FOUR

Culture with a Big C: Literature and the Arts

This last part of our volume deals with the expressive products of the human mind—those representations of the mental and social reality that are at the same time important parts of that reality. If the first three parts of the book presented the opinions of historians, anthropologists, political scientists, and sociologists about what was going on in Taiwan, this last one discusses how members of the society present what is going on in literary and artistic works. In doing so, they raise again many of the themes discussed in the earlier chapters of the book—what does it mean to be of Taiwan; how does one, and how should one, balance the anchors of old habits and morals against the lure of new possibilities; how have values and ethics changed; what meanings do customary or innovative activities have for members of the society?

The authors of the chapters in this section treat several different facets of expressive culture, or Culture with a big "C." Chu Yen's essay on recent short fiction addresses these questions with a cry from the heart: Where is the anchor? Echoing the moral pessimism of Huang Chün-chieh's ethical-moral public opinion surveys (Chapter 5), Chu finds that authors of almost every persuasion portray characters in the middle of a crisis of identity that is also a moral crisis—they are caught up in what seems like a rudderless boat awash in cultural change and uncertainty, and whether they cling desperately to an outmoded tradition or follow the lure of an untested modernity, they do not resolve the crisis, because the society as a whole, while aware of the problem, has not come to any consensus about the resolution. There could be no more graphic illustration of the importance of literature for understanding cultural change as a whole.

The cultural producers described by our next two authors, Michelle Yeh writing about poetry and Jason C. Kuo writing about painting, further illustrate the uncertainty of the quest for a new cultural direction. The modern poets analyzed in Yeh's chapter are looking for a new kind of expressive medium, with little or no debt to the formal verses of classical po-
entry, yet necessarily Chinese enough to be able to derive little from modern poetic models in other languages. They do this without much help or guidance from members of other Chinese societies, since very little poetry comes out of the repressive mainland or the much less reflective Hong Kong. They are searching for a Taiwan style if you will, a style that is contemporary and is still Chinese; in this the poets represent a microcosm of the whole society's quest.

The painters portrayed in Jason Kuo's chapter are more explicitly and outspokenly trying to tie their work to the culture of the island of Taiwan in the postwar period. They have deliberately eschewed classical landscape and portrait painting, modernist influences from the West, and older imitations of the Western oil painting tradition that reached Taiwan through Japan in colonial times. Rather in subject matter, style, and color, as well as in the community of painters and critics they have established, they again replicate the whole society's quest in pictorial representation. They, like the poets, strive to be neither "traditional" nor "Western" but to be Taiwan painters; the hitch here, as everywhere else, is that there is as yet no consensus about how best to represent or portray the emerging Taiwan.

Our last chapter returns us to literary expression, but confines itself to one particular sort of literature and one particular sphere of social relations. This is Sung Mei-hwa's analysis of recent feminist literature. The feminist writers described here are, in a way, like the Atayal aborigines portrayed in Hsieh Shih-chung's anthropological analysis in Chapter 8. They represent a group—women in general—that they see as oppressed in today's society, not left out of the recent cultural changes but brought along in the changes in what remains an inferior position. But unlike the Atayal, the feminists' reaction is not the re-creation of a reassuring if fictitious tradition, but rather the search for a new path forward, a way to solve gender conflicts in the context of the great cultural changes that are going to happen anyway. Conscious feminists represent a tiny portion of Taiwan's women today, but their very existence, with their critiques and their questionings, is itself an indication of the fluidity of Taiwan's current cultural situation.

These final chapters are thus integral to the picture that the whole book paints of Taiwan today. The artists, writers, poets, and critics not only analyze Taiwan's changing culture through their works; they are also an integral part of it, caught up in the same waves of change, puzzled by the same dilemmas, seeking in the same way for roads to the future.
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Sociocultural Change in Taiwan as Reflected in Short Fiction: 1979–1989

Chu Yen

An Eventful Decade

For the Chinese in Taiwan, the period 1979–89 was one of confusion. It was also a period of unparalleled progress and torrential change. In extending diplomatic recognition to Communist China, the United States ended formal relations with the Republic of China on January 1, 1979, nine months after Chiang Ching-kuo was elected president of the ROC. Then US President Jimmy Carter abrogated the 1955 mutual defense pact with the ROC, effective December 31, 1979. This unilateral annulment of the long-standing partnership between the US and the ROC consternated both the government and the people in Taiwan.

Over the years, political opposition forces loosely called "Tang-wai" (literally, "outside the [Nationalist] Party") gained influence through electoral competition and street demonstrations. On November 28, 1986, opposition politicians organized the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). The emergence of this political body struck terror into the hearts of many people not only because some DPP members strongly advocated separatism, but also because many people believed that real two-party elections would cause radical changes in the legislative structure. On July 14, 1987, Chiang Ching-kuo decreed an end to the martial law which began in 1949, but the new national security law made in its stead by the Legislative Yuan excited suspicion in both the Nationalist Party (KMT) and the DPP. The death of Chiang Ching-kuo on January 13, 1988, was a national shock.

To the world's utter surprise, people in Taiwan and other related overseas islands stood firm and created an "economic miracle" amidst this trying decade. Taiwan kept progressing "as the world's best economic performer" (Copper 1989:38). In the very agonizing year of 1979, Taiwan's foreign trade expanded thirty percent, with a favorable trade balance of 1.3 billion US dollars. As a matter of fact, "[s]ince 1979, the year in which