China Economic Inspectorate. Ying also states in error that *Lishan Nongchang* was ‘Zhong’s only work set against...[the] backdrop [of Japanese colonial rule]’ (146). Indeed, Zhong wrote only a very few other works (short stories and essays) with that time setting and the extent to which he excludes the colonial experience from his opus is certainly remarkable, but the detail here is inaccurate. In this essay there is also one little problem in the translation from the Chinese: the title of the important story ‘Zhutouzhuang’ should be ‘Bamboo Village’ – ‘zhutou’ is Hakka for bamboo (147). In the Index, Zhong Lihe’s given name appears as Lei.

I must quibble with the book’s title and subtitle. I might have suggested *Writing Modern Taiwan: Towards a New Literary History*. The volume acknowledges here and there its own scant treatment of the colonial period, 1895-1945 (e.g. Lai He is mentioned in passing on page 69 only), but does not explain why the literature of Ming-Qing Taiwan is completely excluded. Essentially *Writing Taiwan* is a collection of essays almost exclusively on post-WWII Taiwan fiction; to justify the title it would need to include scholarship on the greater range of Taiwan literature from pre-Han settlement to the twenty-first century included in Wang Dewei’s (David Der-wei Wang) Chinese language anthology *Taiwan: cong wenxue kan lishi* (*Taiwan: a history through literature*, Taibei: Maitian, 2005). As to the subtitle, ‘a history’ surely should be a monographic or comprehensive work, but the present volume makes no real pretence other than in this phrase on the front cover, and in the rather grandiloquent Preface and Introduction, to present a unified, definitive interpretation of a period or field. The subtitle tends to obscure the fact that the book arises out of a conference, a very fruitful meeting of minds in this instance, but falls some way short of a distillation of an entire branch of literature, showing some quite major omissions. Whether or not any such distillation is desirable is another question. For now, let us celebrate this important contribution to Taiwan literature studies.

Tommy McClellan

*University of Edinburgh*


In the first half of the seventeenth century, the Dutch East India Company established trading posts on Formosa and Manhattan. It was part of a historical process in which European countries expanded their influence throughout the world, built up trade networks, exploited natural resources, and established various types of colonial regimes. To some observers, such as Wallerstein, European expansionism gave birth to global capitalism, a new world system, or a process by which Europeans entered as new players into previously existing
trade networks (see Eric Wolf’s 1982 *Europe and the People without History*). In all continents, these actions changed local social relations and brought previously unrelated peoples into new relations with one another. These relations were often characterized by exploitation and inequality. The Austronesian peoples of Formosa subsequently lost their territory to the Dutch, the Manchurians, the Japanese, and eventually to the Republic of China. The Iroquois of Manhattan and beyond lost territory to the Dutch, the English, the French, and eventually to the United States and Canada.

In the second half of the twentieth century, after a war fought against the Nazi variant of racism, a global process of de-colonization took place. New countries were formed out of former colonies, but often one ethnic group continued to dominate other marginalized groups. This was the case on Formosa, where the Austronesians remained subaltern in relationship to the Chinese. In long-independent settler colonies such as Canada, ‘Indians’ started demanding greater recognition of their sovereignty and rights. In the last two decades of the century, a global social movement united these disparate peoples under the identity of ‘indigenous peoples’ (a process described in Ronald Niezen’s 2003 *The Origins of Indigenism*). With growing international recognition of collective human rights, new conventions were adapted, national laws were revised, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) were established to promote indigenous rights. On 13 September 2007, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples with 143 votes in favour, 4 against, and 11 abstentions. Amidst this global Zeitgeist, indigeneity has also become a new field of social scientific inquiry.

To date, the most detailed scholarly work in a European language on this global social movement on Formosa is Michael Rudolph’s (2003) *Taiwans multi-ethnische Gesellschaft und die Bewegung der Ureinwohner*. This book stands out because of its focus on indigeneity as a social movement. The bibliography is impressive, and Rudolph deals seriously with the ideas of both Taiwanese and western scholars. He provides a strong, detailed history of the indigenous movement and a good ethnography of both Shuiyuan (水源) and Sandimen (三地門). Without a doubt, this book should be in the library of all serious scholars of indigenous Formosa. Those who don’t read German can get the main theoretical argument from Rudolph’s many book chapters, but will miss out on a rich ethnography.

Strongly influenced by Taiwanese anthropologist Hsieh Shih-chung and his concept of Taiwan’s indigenous leaders as ‘elites without people’, Rudolph looks at the movement, its supporters, and the ‘ordinary people’ in Taroko and Paiwan villages. His argument is based on that of political scientist Paul Brass, who in *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison* (Sage Publications, 1991) hypothesized that ‘ethnic self-consciousness, ethnically-based demands, and ethnic conflict can occur only if there is some conflict between indigenous and external elites and authorities or between indigenous elites’. Throughout the book, Taiwan’s indigenous peoples are referred to by the acronym YZM, for yuanzhumin (原住民). The ‘elites’ are the ‘KMT-loyal political YZM-elites’ (primarily public servants and elected officials) and ‘oppositional YZM-elites’ mostly affiliated with the Presbyterian Church. This choice of words draws
attention to the local dynamics of the movement rather than legitimizing their place in a global social movement.

Rudolph places these struggles in the context of Taiwan in the 1990s, when Taiwan was developing multi-cultural politics, Gemeinschaft and Taiwanese subjectivity (400). During this time, KMT-loyal elites and oppositional elites competed for resources in struggles over such issues as use of ethnic names, inclusion of indigenous rights in the constitution, legal autonomy, and language instruction. The KMT-elite were more inclined toward assimilation if they could get good positions for themselves (403), whereas the oppositional elite sought a new essentialist identity in the international discourse of aboriginality (405). The ordinary people, however, saw little use for (and even disadvantages to) such goals as linguistic preservation and the creation of autonomous zones (427). Rudolph claims that ordinary people perceive autonomous zones as making them ‘like apes in a zoo’, whereas opening reserves up to a free land market would make them free and equal to others (351); an argument which also appears in his 2004 English article ‘The Pan-Ethnic Movement of Taiwanese Aborigines and the Role of Elites in the Process of Ethnicity Formation’.

This approach could hardly be more different from the usual approach in Canada, where anthropologists often emerge as advocates for indigenous rights (e.g. the works of Michael Asch, Richard Salisbury, and Colin Scott) or write sensitive ethnographies from as close to the native perspective as possible (e.g. Toby Morantz’s The White Man’s Gonna Getcha), all without looking at indigenous demands as social movements. In Canada, the usual assumption is that indigenous peoples have inherent rights to sovereignty because of their presence on territories before European and other forms of colonial expansion. The only exception is Thomas Flanagan’s First Nations? Second Thoughts, which exposes the ‘fiction’ of aboriginal sovereignty and argues that only a small elite of activists, politicians, and well-connected entrepreneurs benefit from the political agenda of indigenous rights. As a European scholar in a country with no indigenous peoples, Rudolph has no ongoing relationship with his research partners and can afford to be more distanced.

Peter Kulchyski’s slim new pocket book Red Indians (2007), published by a left-wing press in Manitoba, stands in stark contrast with Rudolph’s tome. The most obvious contrast is that Rudolph capitalizes all of his nouns, since he writes in German; whereas Kulchyski refuses to use a single capital letter for the entire book. By doing so, he encourages readers to rethink history and avoids the tricky problems in indigenous studies of which words to capitalize – Indian? Aboriginal? Indigenous? (7). Defining economic development as ‘raping the land for the benefit of the rich’ (135), he weaves together a fable in which Canada’s indigenous people have resisted capitalism since the beginning; hence the title. He takes a historical jab at the US, saying that their fight against the British ‘was also a revolution against aboriginal rights’ (24). Canada, of course, emerges as morally superior, but only slightly so. This book lacks the footnotes and detailed scholarship of Rudolph’s work, yet for that reason would make a good undergraduate text. It tells a good story and is a fun read.

---

1 Available here: http://www.taiwanfirstnations.org/movement.html.
These two books can best be contrasted in terms of opposing political ideology. Rudolph’s book is informed by liberal assumptions that nationalism is dangerous and individual rights the best path toward liberation. His views on the common people wishing to mortgage their land rather than live on ghetto-like reserves are similar to those of Thomas Flanagan, who advocates giving individual land ownership to Canadian Natives so that they can freely sell their land or use it as collateral for loans. Kulchyski’s book is a leftist Canadian pamphlet – financed by none other than the Canadian government. These books illustrate that research on indigenous issues always involves some kind of political positioning. One book is more in line with the Enlightenment ideals of neo-liberalism; the other with the collectivist demands of the UN Declaration and local nationalisms. In Taiwan as in Canada, these opposing ideologies are still struggling for ascendancy. Indigenous communities, and the communities of scholars who study them, are all battlegrounds in a struggle that is far from finished.

Scott Simon
Ottawa University

Taiwan Journal of Democracy
Published by the Taiwan Foundation for Democracy
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This brief review focuses on a recent issue - Vol. 3 (2), 2007 – of the Taiwan Journal of Democracy. The journal’s stated brief is to provide ‘an open forum, free of cultural and partisan bias’ for the publication and dissemination of ‘articles comparing the experiences of new democracies’. The editorial and advisory boards of the journal indicate the international scope and ambition of the journal, as do the articles themselves. Indeed, in this particular issue there are essays on Mexico (Hsiao-Yun Yu), Latin America more generally (Michael Coppedge, and Peter H. Smith with Melissa R. Ziegler), the Post-Soviet region (Mark B. Beissinger) and Taiwan (Laurence Whitehead) as well as on issues including political leadership (John Kane), so-called ‘Presidentialism’ (Robert Elgie) and a review essay on theories of democratization (Guillermo O’Donnell).

As academics are increasingly encouraged to specialise and to develop regional expertise two dangers are apparent: the first is that scholars will come to accept regions, nations and cultural areas as ‘natural’ objects of enquiry – they will, in other words, become voluntarily blind to the historically formed and politically and economically conditioned logic of area categories that shape and condition the production of academic knowledge. Secondly, the possibility of theory – of universal theory – will slide into the background as scholarly endeavour fragments into a series of domains of expertise defined by specific skill-sets, with each domain increasingly myopic to the fact that ‘we’ live not in neatly defined nations, regions or cultural areas but rather in an increasingly inter-connected, globalizing world.

Thankfully, journals like this one offer a welcome and indeed valuable platform for thinking differently and, indeed, for thinking comparatively. According to