In the search for a Taiwanese identity rooted in the land of Taiwan the Japanese colonial past plays an ambiguous role. The Japanese colonial sites became a constituent part of the new identity and cultural narrative of Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s, when a memory boom was experienced in Taiwan representing new politics both cultural and economic which differed from the previous political periods of Japanese and post-war KMT (Kuomintang; Chinese Nationalist Party) rule.

Min-Chin Chiang presents the extreme complexity of sharing the Japanese colonial past in postcolonial Taiwanese society. In this book she examines possibilities of decolonization through community-based heritage activities. Problems and ambiguity stemming from the tentative transformation from colonialism to locality help to trigger further thinking or warn against the ideological trap of taking mutuality in ‘sharing’ the past for granted.

Hence, decolonization does not necessarily mean ‘removing colonial material traces’. Preserving colonial sites through recognising the contested nature, actively exploring and engaging controversial voices, insist on finding out historical depth of every memory version attached to the site, and transforming structural inequality with persistent locality building would better contribute to trigger a decolonizing process. This is the significance of the colonial sites as ‘heritage’ for the postcolonial society.

Archeological Studies Leiden University (ASLU) is a series of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University since 1998. The series’ aim is to publish Research and PhD theses of Archaeology and covers the international research fields of European Prehistory, Classical-, Near Eastern-, Indian American- and Science-based Archaeology.
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It was an evening in 2005, after a tough day like many other days at the museum park where I was working. My colleague and I were sitting on the port embankment, looking at the lights shining from the mountain town where we worked, on the other side of bay. The construction of the museum was nearly complete, and it had already been open to the public for several months. Thinking about all the complexities and difficulties of the past three years, I felt exhausted, and asked my colleague, “What are we striving for? Have we made any meaningful changes after all this hard work?” I thought about the misunderstandings we had had with some local people, and the pressures from county government, the local councilors, state enterprises and so on. Museum and heritage work is a dynamic process and it can often feel like its value is easily forgotten. My colleague answered, “Look at those new constructions in the neighbourhood area”. She pointed to the lights. “They have improved little by little. This is because of the museum.” This was the moment I decided to begin my research on heritage.

Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s saw a heritage and museum boom throughout the land. Almost every local government strove to improve the local economy and enhance the political reputation of the mayor through museum and heritage tourism. This was encouraged by the central government as a means of national identity building in the 1990s and 2000s. The theme of heritage burgeoned especially when it was connected to international diplomacy and domestic social issues. Meanwhile, the press focused on the negative results of this boom, such as the fact that many museums which had been heavily subsidized by the central and local governments eventually ended up as ‘mosquito halls’. Used as a political means to earn local support in elections, many museums and culture centres were constructed and opened in advance of elections; however, there was no long term plan or professional personnel for operation. After luxurious opening ceremonies, many museums ended up as empty spaces, with mosquitoes as their only visitors.

My colleagues and I were lucky enough to be working for a daring mayor who provided great help in gaining support from the stiff bureaucratic system, and who persuaded property owners to participate in the museum project. The 2000s was also a time of relatively good cultural and economic investment from the county government, and so we had plenty of resources in terms of finance and personnel. This allowed us to work towards cultural and educational targets despite facing certain difficulties. Indeed, in comparison with many other cases in Taiwan, the situation at our museum was quite good. Other sites had to deal with problems including a lack of professional staff owing to legal restrictions on government organisation, a lack of financial support from local councilors and mayors because of disagreements over cultural necessities, resistance from local residents or property owners, and uncontrolled or short-sighted displays and research projects conducted by private companies and university units, whose contracts were agreed by the Government Procurement Act (Caigoufa 投購法). These structural deficiencies posed a great obstacle to the accumulation of culture in Taiwan. At present, we have numerous luxury constructions built by famous architects, yet few long-term plans to manage the heritage sites in a sustainable way.

A Local Museum—locality and community

Our museum park, the Gold Ecological Park in Jinguashi, was built as an ecomuseum and opened to the public in 2004. Jinguashi was a gold and copper mining area from the Japanese colonial period to the 1980s. The Gold Ecological Park was aimed to pre-
serve the mining remains and improve the local economy through heritage strategies. The term ecomuseum indicates an ideal model of researchers redeveloping the area through cultural industries with community participation, and it also incorporates the state programme of ‘community building’. However, when the model was put in place in the locale, the problem of translating these notions into practice became a big issue.

The locale itself presented challenges for our work as staff of the museum. First, the land and buildings belong to two national enterprises, not the museum or Taipei County Government. Second, the local residents did not trust the county government owing to previous issues of land ownership and architectural renovation. The tourist management department established in the town by the county government the previous year had a bad relationship with the local residents. When the museum team first came to the locale, the local residents did not welcome them, and regarded them as just another government body. Third, this locale used to be a mining district, and development of the entire area has been conducted according to old mining legislation. This was a major obstacle to many previous development plans in this area, for instance turning the old mining tunnels into a tourist attraction. Fourth, the town is situated on the outskirts of an urban centre. Owing to its declining economic condition, the majority of the population is made up of mostly elders and children. Young people and adults have left home for better job opportunities, and those who chose to stay in their hometown did not seem to want to cooperate with other members of the town. There was little sense of a community. Due to these factors, the museum team was already on shaky ground when starting the ecomuseum which required a relationship of mutual trust, community awareness and a passion among the residents to participate in the scheme.

The intention of the county government was simple. Heritage tourism is a means to improve the local economy, and may be an asset to the cultural reputation of the county mayor and local politicians. However, the intention of the museum team did not entirely fit these expectations. During the process, I often thought about what our targets were. As a county museum, we could simply be an ecomuseum, built to fit the government bureaucracy and policy of the time. But we thought that since we had both the resources and professionalism, the museum should help the local people in the long run. If museums and heritage are a means of economic improvement, the improvement should be achieved in a sustainable way, and should benefit the local people. That means that the museum should belong to the local community in the future, when a community is eventually formed and when they know what they want to do with their heritage.

Re-mapping Memories

We quickly realized that there was no ‘community’ in the town. The adult generation, except the elders and their grandchildren, had several local societies. However, many of their leaders would not cooperate with each other, and in some cases even showed mutual antipathy. The people who voiced their opinions to the county government and researchers were mainly males. The views of the local females were seldom heard. When we started to collect opinions in the locale, we thought that the history of working in the tunnels, operating the mining machines and so forth was the only history of the town. We later discovered, however, that the past, just like a community, has no single common story: there are numerous memories, not one single ‘memory’.

Alongside gender and occupation, a structural factor was also an obstacle to the formation of a community. When we started to renovate a Japanese residence, we were aware of having little data about the house. Only after the participation of an artist who grew up in the residence during her childhood did a memory version suddenly spring up. She told us vivid stories about living in the house and the neighbourhood, how she played with brothers and neighbours, how her school life was different from that of the other children from miners’ families, etc. She is from a Chinese mainlanders’ family, and her father used to be a high-ranking manager in the mining company. Fascinated by her stories, I was stunned at

1. The mainlanders refer to the group of people who emigrated from China to Taiwan with the KMT retreat in the 1940s and 50s.
the same time. I realized that there was more than one memory version to deal with. Investigation of diversified memories compelled me to look into various social frameworks. This situation of diversified social frameworks was one of the major factors resulting in the fragmented sense of community. In order to build up a sense of community, it would be vital to represent this diversity. Meanwhile I realized that the colonial structures and asymmetrical hierarchy are still alive in an unconscious way. Even our museum, a county apparatus, represents an extension of a kind of colonial structure.

This was an incentive to investigate the underlying fabric of colonial remains in Taiwan. The representation of colonial ‘heritage’ can never exist separately from an understanding of its structure. Without awareness of ‘coloniality’, no postcolonial ‘subjectivity’ can be formed. People can fully welcome heritage tourism from colonial connections or simply reject the whole colonial past, but without some negotiated sense of continuity with the past, they will be unable to develop civil power and sustain a sense of place, such as that which existed during colonial periods.
Chapter One: Introduction

Taiwan has been experiencing a ‘memory boom’ since the 1990s. This ‘memory boom’, represented by increasing numbers of museum and heritage sites, is closely related to a new pursuit of locality after the end of Martial Law in 1987. During the periods of Japanese colonial occupation and KMT (Kuomintang; Chinese Nationalist Party) authoritarian rule, the sense of place and memory of Taiwan was intentionally erased by the ruling party. In the 1990s, the sense of place and memory of Taiwan was accentuated and became instrumental in creating a different eco-political narrative. Since 1994, a new policy has been promoted by the central government, namely the Integrated Community-Making Programme (社區總體營造). After the Taiwan-centred DPP (Democratic Progressive Party) candidate won the presidential elections in 2000 and 2004, the community-building programme was continued to an unprecedented scale by the DPP government. Amid this grand community-building scheme, cultural heritage projects received enormous attention and government resources. Interestingly, the Japanese colonial sites were largely designated as cultural heritage within this burgeoning memory boom, and together with many Taiwanese heritage sites they represent a new political, cultural and economic politics which differs from the previous political periods of Japanese and postwar KMT rule. In other words, the Japanese colonial sites became a constituent part of the new identity and cultural narrative of Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s. In the search for a Taiwanese identity rooted in the land of Taiwan the Japanese colonial past plays an ambiguous role.

Japanese colonial sites used to be regarded as the ‘poisonous leftovers of Japanese imperialism’ during the postwar KMT governance. The Chinese KMT government took over Taiwan after Japan’s defeat in the Second World War. In order to disconnect the Taiwanese link to Japan after 50 years of colonial rule, the KMT government strengthened the superior status of ‘orthodox’ Chinese culture and language with the assistance of Martial Law. Numerous Japanese sites, especially those representing rich religious or political symbolism, for instance Shinto shrines, were demolished, reconstructed or deserted. Within the hierarchy of the state heritage framework, Japanese sites were considered outside of the category of cultural heritage. Even Taiwanese vernacular architecture struggled to qualify as cultural heritage.

This situation changed in the 1990s. In 1991 the first two Japanese sites were designated as national historic monuments (guji 古蹟), protected by the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act implemented in 1982. In 1998 a considerable number of Japanese sites were designated by the Taipei City Government as municipal historic monuments. In the 2000s, nu-
numerous Japanese buildings were reported by county or city governments as being ‘historic monuments’ or ‘historic buildings’ and were renovated with subsidies from the central government under the funding framework of ‘reutilising unused spaces’ (xianzhi kongjian zailiyong 閑置空間再利用) which is closely related to the community-building programme. This shows a shift in the conception and value of what is ‘historic’. Japanese sites gradually ceased to be seen as poisonous residues and became legitimate sites of memory in Taiwan. However, it is noteworthy that the Japanese sites did not become sites of memory only after the official recognition; rather, the perception of Japanese sites has long been interwoven with the image of Japan produced by remaining colonial structures, KMT neo-colonialism, the Japan-Taiwan relationship under the cold-war framework, and the Japanese mass-media commoditization in Asia. For many Taiwanese people, Japanese sites in their hometowns represent their proud past, and are their sites of memory. Thus, they can also be a place of hope for the revival of the local economy. For government officials in the 1990s and 2000s, the image of Japan was an advanced model which covered both global economic and cultural terrain. Conserving and reusing the Japanese sites not only shows the emerging multicultural narrative of a de-sinicized Taiwanese identity, but also expresses enthusiasm in building an advanced new country through utilizing heritage spaces to evoke civil awareness and a sense of community. This might even trigger local development, as in the successful machizukuri examples in Japan. Within this framework, Japanese colonial sites, which have long been sites of memory for different groups of Taiwanese people, are used as a locality reproduction strategy for postcolonial society in Taiwan. However, the contested nature of colonial sites, particularly salient when looking at controversial memories attached to the sites, often results in ambiguity during the process of heritage-making and interpretation.

In the 1990s, the global order was reorganised after the dissolution of the Cold War structure. New nations and area leagues formed and competed for new political and economic terrain. Heritage, already institutionalised in the 1970s by UNESCO and always inseparable from nationalist projects, was also implemented for negotiations between nations and areas. The issue of a colonial past not only relates to diplomatic affairs between the former colonizer and colonized nations, but also concerns domestic struggles resulting from the colonial past, for instance the land claim of indigenous groups on their traditional territory in settlers’ countries, or ethnic controversies resulting from migration in former colonizer societies. What were once seen as ‘embarrassing’ colonial sites, either sites of past ‘glories’ or of past ‘shame’, have been reinterpreted within the new world heritage framework and within the projects of global and national institutions. As a result, Asian sites and sites with multiple values have been increasingly designated as world heritage since the 1990s, following UNESCO’s emphasis on cultural diversity and universal value. Intra-regional and national cooperation on heritage projects includes ‘shared’ heritage sites, yet at the same time, armed threats to controversial sites have not disappeared. Moreover, the unbalanced relationships between postcolonial nations and the states and communities in the global heritage arena can easily become analogous to the power hierarchy of colonial periods. Within this framework, the value of colonial heritage to postcolonial communities is arguable, and this question is often answered with rhetoric of development and worked under a top-down mechanism.

Lying outside of the diplomatic sphere framed by the United Nations, sites in Taiwan are not allowed to be included in the World Heritage List and related heritage network. Yet Taiwan’s heritage policies and

4. This thesis recognizes the end of Martial Law in 1987 as the beginning of the postcolonial stage of Taiwan.
practice mostly refer to conventions and models legitimated by international institutions such as UNESCO and ICOMOS, even though Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations. It is therefore necessary to understand the global context within which Taiwan appropriates these international conventions. Taiwan’s isolation is due in part to the fact that the most influential colonial experience in Taiwan was with Japan, not Western powers. Hence, in relation to heritage affairs, Taiwan has no direct connection to influential western countries in UNESCO, in contrast to, for example, the link between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

Nevertheless, since the 2000s the government of Taiwan has nominated its own ‘Potential World Heritage Sites’, and has invested professionally and financially in supporting the conservation work of world heritage sites. This nomination of potential world heritage sites is seen as preparation for joining in with UN and UNESCO-based international heritage affairs in the future. Stressing the locality of Taiwan in the global arena has been a strong theme within the state cultural department in implementing potential world heritage policies. This is in line with Taiwan’s search for a position in the global arena within the remapping process of a new world order, politically and economically, after the Cold War.

Although the state heritage activities of Taiwan are politically and diplomatically similar to those of many postcolonial new nations, the issue of representing Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan provides a unique angle from which to approach ‘shared heritage’. Within the context of flourishing localism resulting from resistance to former colonization of KMT, Japanese colonial sites have been incorporated into local heritage not only through top-down policies but also by autonomous initiatives of social or community groups. The subjects who ‘share’ the site as heritage are not restricted within colonizer-colonized, state-state, state-local networks. Rather, an emphasis on the local autonomy of small-scale places by state community-building projects and privately initiated conservation movements in Taiwan has triggered an alternative means of sharing heritage. Although controversy, negotiation and ambivalence in the process of representing the colonial past are inevitable, Taiwan’s case of representing Japanese heritage may contribute to an understanding of the value or impact of colonial heritage for postcolonial communities aside from tourist and diplomatic effects. Further, it contributes to the exploration of whether local autonomy can change the meaning of colonial sites and can turn colonial sites into community heritage. In this regard, ‘sharing’ is not always a one-way process which fits in a power hierarchy in which the former colonizer shares the techniques of preserving their architectural remains with the former colonizer by training programmes and subsidies. The active role that Taiwanese heritage workers play in engaging Japanese architects and related professionals in renovating Japanese sites is different from this one-way sharing. To some degree, this active role shows that postcolonial communities in Taiwan have been empowered to break from the colonial hierarchy by sharing what is now their heritage, no longer the heritage of the colonizer.

This thesis presents the extreme complexity of sharing the Japanese colonial past in postcolonial Taiwanese society, and examines possibilities of decoloni-
zation through community-based heritage activities. Five Japanese colonial sites were chosen for investigation. While none shows an ideal successful outcome, all represent an ongoing process. Problems and ambiguity stemming from the tentative transformation from colonialism to locality help to trigger further thinking or warn against the ideological trap of taking mutuality in ‘sharing’ the past for granted.

1.1 COLONIAL HERITAGE IN THE GLOBAL SPHERE

1.1.1 Situating ‘Shared Heritage’: the Heritage Mechanism of UNESCO

UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), an official organization of the United Nations, was founded in 1946 and has become the leading body of the global heritage mechanism. Another leading international organization, UNESCO-affiliated, is ICOMOS (the International Council on Monuments and Sites), which was founded in 1964 at the same time as the adoption of the Venice Charter. Both the establishment of ICOMOS and the adoption of the Venice Charter concluded and institutionalised the European concern with built heritage that began in the late 18th century as a consequence of the burgeoning nationalism of the region at that time. The vital role of ICOMOS in providing consultation for UNESCO on world heritage issues is assisted by various Scientific Committees on specific professional categories. Regarding the issue of colonial built heritage, the Shared Built Heritage (ISCSBH), formerly the Shared Colonial Architecture and Town Planning, is one of these International Scientific Committees.

The Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage was legislated in 1972, stimulated by the safeguarding of the Abu Simbel temples in Egypt in 1959. This first action initiated several international campaigns, and eventually led to the adoption of the Convention. Among the criteria for nominating world heritage by the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, ‘outstanding universal value’ was a central concept. However, the definition of ‘outstanding universal value’ has been considered as Eurocentric by scholars (Labadi 2007, 152-3), as half of the nominated sites are located in Europe and North America.

In the 1990s, a paradigm shift seemed to occur within UNESCO World Heritage policy. Significant change was suggested by UNESCO’s ‘Global strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List’, and by Japan’s proposal of the Nara Document on Authenticity in 1994 (Willems and Comer 2011, 162). Moreover, since the 1990s an increasing number of hybrid sites from Southeast Asia began to be listed as World Heritage, including colonial sites and sites of local historical significance (Askew 2010, 30). This was in accordance with UNESCO’s major focus on ‘cultural diversity’ in facing the challenges of global political, social and economic dynamics within a new world order after the Cold War (Logan 2002a, 2002b; Long and Labadi 2010). Within this context, UNESCO initiated a scheme in 2000 called the ‘Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity’. This led to the proposal and ratification of the ‘Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage’ in 2003 and the ‘Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions’ in 2005.

As Logan (2002) suggests, the formation of international organizations such as the UN, UNESCO, ICOMOS etc. reflected the fact that a “spirit of goodwill and optimism infused twentieth-century modernism” (Logan et al. 2010, 4). UNESCO activities, as well as other programmes in cooperation with the UN, which combine culture with development plans, also reflect this tendency. While it may seem strange to link modernism with claims of diversity, they are ac-

---

9. Decolonising the layered colonialism of both the Japanese and postwar KMT regimes.
10. Owing to the construction of the Aswan High Dam, the valley in which the Abu Simbel temples were located was due to be flooded. The governments of Egypt and Sudan appealed to UNESCO, and an international campaign for safeguarding the site was launched in 1959. See the official website of UNESCO: www.unesco.org (accessed 13 July 2011)
11. For instance the World Bank, Asian Development Bank (ADB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF).
tually two sides of the same coin. The intention to find “universality in diversity”, alongside a “belief in humanity’s steady progress towards better things” and a tendency to apply best models of conservation and management in various world heritage sites underlies the implementation of cultural diversity projects (Logan 2002b, 52). In the 1990s, this modernist tendency was applied to the heritage field through projects of ‘development through conservation’ in various locales. Simultaneously, the “gaps, inconsistency and lack of commitment” between the targets of UNESCO and the perception of local governments and communities was salient, and led to revisions of policies (Logan et al. 2010).

In the 2000s, the terms ‘shared heritage’ and ‘mutual heritage’ became buzzwords in the global heritage arena. In May 2010, the UNESCO quarterly journal, Museum International, published an edition entitled ‘Shared Heritage, Shared Future’ based on an international workshop in 2009 at the University of Massachusetts in the US. Discussions in this special edition depart from two propositions: recognizing diversity, and admitting the inflexibility and conflicting nature of heritage. I suggest that this represents an extension of the aforementioned UNESCO stance on endorsing ‘cultural diversity’. In this regard, ‘shared’ and ‘mutual’ have been gradually broadened to include various regions or groups to provide an optimistic vision of dealing with conflicts in an individual context. To take examples from the edition, ‘shared heritage’ can be adopted in the context of Palestine, the indigenous issues in a settlers’ society, ethnoreligious conflicts within a country, and diasporas all over the world. Lacking a clear definition, ‘shared heritage’ paradoxically highlights the discordant nature of heritage by accentuating the mutuality, and indicates that wider and deeper complexities may be awoken in further exploration of interpreting, theorising, and negotiating the subject, power balance and action strategies of ‘sharing’.

1.1.2 Situating ‘Shared Heritage’ in the Context of the Netherlands

In the case of the Netherlands, the terms ‘shared heritage’, ‘common heritage’ or ‘mutual heritage’ replaced ‘colonial heritage’ in policy and projects rather earlier than in other counties. It is for this reason that the Netherlands was selected here for research and investigation of the ideological and operational framework of colonial heritage at a national level. According to Roosmalen, as early as 1988 the term ‘mutual’, when defining colonial heritage as a ‘bilateral affair’, was used during a seminar entitled ‘Change and Heritage in Indonesian Cities’ in Indonesia (Jakarta, 1988), and has been used ever since (Roosmalen 2003, 123, note 1). It is interesting to note that the term ‘mutual heritage’ was suggested by the Indonesian Minister of Culture, Fuad Hassan, to replace ‘colonial heritage’ for the occasion. Since the mid-1990s, the Dutch government has encouraged and funded projects concerning Dutch colonial heritage overseas (Fienieg et al. 2008, 24). In 1998, the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Shared Colonial Architecture and Town Planning was inaugurated and chaired by the Netherlands. The name of the committee was changed to the International Scientific Committee on Shared Built Heritage in 2003.

Colonial Collections and Postcolonial Connections

Other than built heritage, the terms ‘shared’ and ‘mutual’ heritage also emerged in museum collections of colonial objects. Among institutes concerned with colonial collections and knowledge genealogy, the strong tie between the Leiden-based Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde (National Museum of Ethnology) and the Jakarta-based National Museum of Indonesia have contributed to the rhetoric generation and publicity of ‘shared’ and ‘mutual’ heritage. This institutional tie is a colonial legacy and is inseparable from the context of colonial knowledge production. As indicated by Ter Keurs (2007, 5), Dutch collections of Indonesian objects represent the Enlightenment ideology of scientific knowledge. The beginnings of the collection of the Bataviaasch Genootschap (currently the National Museum of Indonesia, Indonesia and National Museum of Ethnology, the Nether-
lands) lie in the eighteenth century, when scientific curiosity drove collecting activities alongside colonial expeditions. Large collections of Indonesian objects, VOC archives and maps, as well as scholarly activities, mainly anthropology and archaeology, are colonial legacies which materialise in public and research institutions in the Netherlands today. These institutions, with research resources and strong connections to the postcolonial partner, became the platform for developing international cooperation based on ‘mutual heritage’, as the idea of cultural heritage has prevailed in the Dutch diplomatic arena.

In the 2000s, a tendency within Dutch cultural policy to develop international relationships through cultural heritage was notable. For instance, in January 2004, the Museum of Ethnology in the Netherlands and the National Museum of Indonesia conducted a joint project on ‘Shared Cultural Heritage’ (Ter Keurs 2007, 2). This project consisted of a series of events including a conference (23, 24, 25 March 2006 in Amsterdam) and two exhibitions (August 2005 in Jakarta and December 2006 in Amsterdam). It is worth noting that while the exhibition in Jakarta was named Warisan Budaya Bersama, which is an Indonesian translation of ‘shared cultural heritage’, the exhibition and conference in Amsterdam, Collecting Cultural Heritage in Indonesia: Ethics, Science and Politics, did not include the word ‘mutual’ in the title (Ter Keurs 2007, 2). The question arises of whose cultural heritage this conference aimed to represent. This question can also be asked of the project ‘Shared Cultural Heritage’ when we look at the collection categories: scientific expeditions, archaeological sites, individual collectors, colonial exhibitions, gifts and military expeditions, all of which fall within the context of Dutch collecting activities (Ter Keurs 2007, 2). This project was financed by the Netherlands Culture Fund (HGIS), the Indonesian Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, Foundation De Nieuwe Kerk and KLM Cargo (Ter Keurs 2007, note 7), and the conference was financed by the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, the CNWS (School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies) of Leiden University and the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS) etc.

Common Heritage within International Cultural Policy

Since 2000, ‘common cultural heritage’ has become a priority within Dutch international cultural policy. In fact, as early as 1997, projects relating to the theme of colonial heritage attracted political interest and received financial support, mostly subsidized by the Dutch Cultural Fund (Fienieg et al., 25). This political interest reflects concern for both colonial past and contemporary multiculturalism, and reflects the influence of “specific interest groups and broader expert networks on negotiations, within heritage policy, regarding colonialism and diversity” (Fienieg et al., 37). In 2011, when cuts to cultural budgets are common in the Netherlands and around the world, the ‘common heritage policy’ has received approval from the Dutch government to continue. In the document Meer dan kwaliteit, een nieuwe visie op cultuurbeleid (More than Quality, a new vision on cultural policy), which contains the essence of new...
Dutch policy in 2011, it is stated that part of Dutch “common heritage is dispersed around the globe, as remnants of a past that the Netherlands shared with other countries. Examples of this heritage are archives, buildings and shipwrecks. The Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009-2012 is aimed at conservation and future of this heritage in eight countries. Based on the experience obtained through this programme, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and OCW (Education, Culture and Science) will set the priorities for the coming years” (OCW 2011, 5).18

Domestic Dynamics: cultural identity and cultural diversity

The emerging importance of shared cultural heritage is linked to domestic social and political dynamics, and in particular, issues of multiculturalism. Cultural identity has become a priority concern. Searching, reinforcing and branding ‘Dutchness’ is core to cultural policies, in both the domestic and international spheres. Since the mid-1990s, cultural diversity has been a topic in both political and cultural sectors. According to the 2009 Cultural Policy in the Netherlands, “between 2005 and 2008, the focus was on establishing ‘intercultural connections’. ‘White’, established institutions were to make efforts to attract more ethnically mixed audiences, while multicultural institutions were to cease emphasising their separate status in favour of mutual solidarity” (2009, 57-58; italics added for emphasis). In other words, instead of praising diversity, a convergent Dutch identity is pursued through policies which encompass all sectors. A part of identity building, the Canon of the Netherlands19 drew tremendous public attention in 2006 and 2007 (Oostindie 2008). Spatial planning programmes under the heading ‘A More Beautiful Country’ and the Belvedere Programme have also aimed to deploy Dutch cultural identity in spatial and architectural design. As stated in the Belvedere memorandum, “cultural-historic identity is to be seen as a determining factor in the future spatial design of the Netherlands, for which government policy shall aim to create appropriate conditions”.20 This idea of cultural identity is also deployed in foreign cultural policy, including projects under the theme of ‘shared cultural heritage’.

The Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009-2012 states that by “maintaining, managing, using and highlighting” heritage, a critical reflection on the past, as well as mutual understanding of not only the past, but also the present and future, can be fostered. The hope is that relations and cooperation between countries can be strengthened, while the “conservation of common cultural heritage can help to strengthen cultural identity, promote socioeconomic and cultural development and raise the profile and quality of the living environment”.21 From this, we can take three angles when viewing the purpose of cultural heritage policies: firstly, we can focus on the diplomatic function that the common heritage is expected to serve. This converges with the policy intention of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, one of the two major partner ministries of the Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009-2012.22 Second, it indicates the tendency of Dutch policy to strengthen cultural identity through place and cultural heritage. This intertwines with the third angle, which concerns culture and development.

Culture and Development

The Netherlands is perhaps the only country in the world that has been planned right down to the

18. The original text is “Gemeenschappelijk cultureel erfgoed: een deel van het Nederlands erfgoed ligt wereldwijdverspreid, als overblijfsel van een verleden dat Nederland met andere landen heeft gedeeld. Voorbeelden van dit erfgoed zijn archieven, gebouwen en scheepswrakken. Het programma Gemeenschappelijk Cultureel Erfgoed 2009-2012 is gericht op behoud en toekomst van dit erfgoed in acht landen. Op basis van de ervaringen met dit programma zullen het ministerie van BZ en OCW de prioriteiten voor de komende jaren nader bezien” (OCW 2011, 5)
19. The Canon of the Netherlands was presented by the canon committee in 2006 intending to provide supplementary teaching materials concerning Dutch culture and history for schools.
22. This relates to the tendency of integrating government departments’ relevant projects for efficiency and better cooperation.
last tree. The landscape is an artefact, a man-made work of art. The Netherlands is a beautiful country, and can become even more so if we respect the quality of its cities and landscapes and enhance that quality with twenty-first century architecture.23

In the last two decades, two dimensions of the theme ‘culture and development’ have been merged under the framework of intra-ministries cooperation. One dimension is domestic issues and is largely concerned with spatial planning; the other is foreign policies, and the adoption of cultural strategies for aiding economic development and the human rights of developing countries. The latter is similar to UNESCO’s intentions of using heritage projects as developing strategies, as noted previously in section 1.1.1.

Regarding ‘culture and development’ in the domestic sphere, in the document Art for Life’s Sake: Dutch Cultural Policy in Outline, the minister of Education, Culture and Science, Dr. Plasterk states his new directions concerning cultural heritage issues: (1) “From focusing on structures to focusing on structures in their surroundings”; (2) “From conservationist to development-driven” (2008, 29). His first point indicates a change in Dutch heritage conservation from preserving a single site or building only, to including the surrounding environment. The second point shows the ambition of the government to combine spatial planning—Dutch uniqueness—and historical conservation in shaping a ‘more beautiful country’ with a Dutch identity. Moreover, it shows the belief of policymakers in merging heritage projects with development strategies. Both directions actually continue previous cultural policies such as the Belvedere Programme (1999-2009) and the Action Program on Spatial Planning and Culture (2005-2008).

Usually included in the International Cultural Policy section of Cultural Policy in the Netherlands (2003, 2006 and 2009), the projects concerning ‘shared cultural heritage’ reflect the domestic cultural and socio-political tendency to pursue targets of culture, development and Dutch cultural identity. As documented by the Centre for International Heritage Activities, projects of mutual heritage often converge with projects of the Culture and Development Programme, “which focuses on the support of cultural identity in developing countries,” conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.24 The Culture and Development Programme was developed in 1991 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The programme aims to use culture as a development aid in order to contribute to the cultural identity of developing countries. Within the scheme, art, movie and cultural heritage are major domains. The policy document Art without Borders, a letter from the Minister of Education, Culture and Science and the Minister for European Affairs to the President of the House of Representatives, describes the international cultural policy of the Netherlands from 2009 up to 2012. Building stronger ties between international cultural policy and culture and development policy is accentuated in this policy document. The Common Cultural Heritage Policy is one cultural strategy to aid the practice of ‘cultural diplomacy’.

The Belvedere Programme

The Belvedere Programme was initiated in 1999 in the Netherlands for urban development in terms of spatial planning combining cultural history. This is a long term, state-led programme, planned to last until 2010. Two-third of the cities and one-third of total land of the Netherlands had been designated as the Belvedere area.

As stated in the memorandum document of the Belvedere programme (2000, 3), its main objectives are to view cultural historic identity as “a determining factor in the future spatial design of the Netherlands, for which government policy shall aim to create appropriate conditions”. The programme will “locate, label and map all those landscape regions and cities in the Netherlands which are perceived as having a clear distinctive character and which, therefore, can

---

23. Quoted from Art for Life’s Sake: Dutch Cultural Policy in Outline, 27.
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contribute to the creation or enhancement of a local identity” (Ashworth et al. 2007, 64). By linking ‘cultural history’ and ‘urban planning’, this programme intends to strengthen place identity as a counterpoise to economic and cultural globalization (Ashworth et al. 2007, 65). In this regard, heritage is instrumental to urban development. Locality is regarded as a crucial element in this programme. A similar strategy in Taiwan, the project Constructing the New Urban and Rural Landscape (chengxiang xin fengmao 城鄉新風貌), is part of the scheme of ‘community building’. In both countries, memory and locality are used as a pragmatic means to reformulate the future of a society. In the Netherlands, this is mirrored by international cultural policy, and applied to ‘Dutch heritage overseas’.

Responses to ‘Shared Heritage’

“Since these objects were all created by Indonesians, how can you call this ‘shared’?”

As ASEM (Asia-Europe Meeting) is an intra-regional platform, respecting the value of ‘cultural diversity’ has always been a focus among these discussions for pre-setting an ‘equal’ framework, accommodating countries with unbalanced economic and political statuses. Since participants of ASEM are mainly government representatives of nation-states, discussions on cultural heritage are based on state initiatives and strategies regarding national heritage. The research organiser of the 2010 roundtable meeting of IIAS indicated that the intrinsic connection between heritage and nationalism underlies the claim of cultural diversity. In this regard, domestic diversities may be excluded for selected sites or heritage models representing the legitimated national culture and national pride. It is arguable that stressing the value of ‘diversity’ and ‘sharing’ could possibly lead to reconciling conflicts, avoiding oppression and inequality, and eventually to aiding cultural identity, sustainable development and human rights. Responding to the intrinsic conflicts resulting from nationalism and imperialism in global projects of cultural diversity, leading international institutions such as UNESCO have emphasised the direct engagement of ‘communities’ and ‘civil societies’ instead of national governments in order to prevent state oppression of diversified cultural expressions. However, how this strategy can work within the structure of country-based institutions is still being experimented with. Taiwan’s heritage projects within the state community-building scheme since the 1990s represent an example of state-initiated attempts in incorporating civic and civil societies in heritage practices. Discussions of this in Taiwan have unearthed the complexities of engaging local communities in actual heritage practice, and can be a reference for other country- or UN-based projects engaging local communities.

Moreover, the link between heritage and development promoted by diplomatic strategies ironically stresses the contrast between Europe and Asia, the

25. The title of the ASEM meeting was The Cultural Heritages of Asia and Europe: Global Challenges and Local Initiatives (a roundtable meeting in preparation for the Fourth ASEM Cultural Ministers’ Meeting). It was held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, on 2-3 September 2010.

26. See the Chairman’s Statement of the Fourth ASEM Cultural Ministers Meeting in Poznań, Poland, on 9-10 September 2010.

27. See the programme of The Cultural Heritages of Asia and Europe: Global Challenges and Local Initiatives.

28. See Background Document of The Cultural Heritages of Asia and Europe: Global Challenges and Local Initiatives, Amsterdam, the Netherlands on 2-3 September 2010.
West and East, the former colonizer and colonized, and the advanced and developing. In the structure of colonialism, this hierarchical contrast between the West and East was internalised in either the colonizer or colonized society in projects of modernisation; and this hierarchical relation, again, copied by the aiding/receiving relation of development projects within the postcolonial global network. For instance, the colonial construction of modern industries and the according labour structures forged an image of modernisation and hierarchy in both the colonized and colonizer societies. The rhetoric of ‘development’, which prevails in the postcolonial global sphere, is analogous to the colonial hierarchy. The ‘advanced’, in sharing the ‘best practice’ of conservation, is often the one who has the economic power to decide which site to invest in financially. However, when reconnecting sites with local communities, sites which represent foreignness and colonial symbols, coloniality must be transformed and the site must produce value for the postcolonial society. In this, heritage mechanisms require further effort and a more delicate model of operation. Why, and for whom, to conserve colonial heritage is still a question in many postcolonial societies.

1.2 CONCEPTUAL THREADS

1.2.1 Memory

This thesis has two conceptual threads: memory and place. In order to clarify the problems that result from interpreting colonial heritage in the postcolonial context, the approach of memory has been applied through two stages of memory activities: in the first stage, the heritage practice involves exploring and re-collecting multiple layers of memories as uncovering the postcolonial complex. These memory activities lead to the second stage—negotiating, engaging and building sites of memories of the postcolonial communities. The memory approach can help to indicate the gap between material remains and heritage value, and to reveal the actor network of heritage practice in postcolonial places. In combination with memory, particularly through the memory acts in stage two, the concept of place or locality provides access to the core issue of transferring a colonial site into a base for locality production. This section (1.2) is to be divided into two parts: the first part discusses on the juxtaposition of memories, and can be used to identify the meanings and contributions of colonial heritage to a postcolonial society. In this regard, heritage practice can do more than display the diversity of memories and multivocality of interpretation. Its significance lies in locality reproduction, which heritage may help society to generate. The second part of this section focuses on the concept of place and locality in order to step further into the issue of community-building through cultural heritage.

Sites of Memory

Pierre Nora proposed the concept of lieux de mémoire (sites of memory) in Representation in 1989. This reflected growing interest in memory studies since the 1980s, and has intensified debates on the relationship between memory and history in the decades since. Nora presented the idea that “memories need to be actively remembered, and thus memory needs to take root in the concrete object or site, and needs to be maintained through anniversaries or celebrations, otherwise it becomes overtaken by, or lost in, the authority held by universal claims of history” (Smith and Waterton 2009, 47). In this regard, heritage is the physical embodiment of memories. The interpretation practices at heritage sites, such as educational events, exhibition projects and ritual or ceremony occasions etc., contribute to storing, maintaining and even reshaping memories.

The concept of ‘sites of memory’ was explained by Nora as a modern phenomenon—something that is in-between real memory and history. He suggested that real memory lies in the unconscious and spontaneous sphere of life (e.g., in customs and habits), and that sites of memory are created and maintained through material and memory tactics. Sites of memory originate from the modern fear that “there is no spontaneous memory, that we must deliberately create archives, maintain anniversaries, organize celebrations, pronounce eulogies, and notarize bills because such activities no longer occur naturally” (Nora 1989, 12). Sites of memory are produced in the sphere between the defense and resistance of memories, between the push and pull of history.

As Nora mentions, “modern memory is, above all, archival. It relies entirely on the materiality of the
The immediacy of the recording, the visibility of the image” (Nora 1989, 13). The popularity of monumentalization is evident in the Western world. This phenomenon is closely related to the postmodern nostalgia toward “origin, rootedness, and belonging” (Lowenthal 1985; Butler 2006). Hence, it has become entangled with identity issues central to nationalism. Outside the Western arena, this European-derived consciousness and strategies of using past for identity building were also shared by new nations, many of whom were released from their colonial status, intending to consolidate their national identity or legitimize the government with a version of a ‘collective’ past and future. Ferdinand de Jong and Michael Rowlands note the tendency of ‘the State in Africa’ to monumentalize itself (De Jong and Rowlands 2007, 13). This tendency was reinforced by support from UNESCO and embodied in various mnemonic tactics comprising museums, monuments, artifacts, documentation, and so forth. In Taiwan, during the memory boom in the 1990s and the decade since, the number of museums and heritage sites increased remarkably. According to statistics from the Chinese Association of Museums, in 1989-1990 the total number of museums in Taiwan was 99; yet it increased to 580 in 2007.29 This, too, is in accordance with the transformation of identity politics from the Chinese-centred identity narrative under the postwar KMT rule to a Taiwan-centred narrative in the 1990s and 2000s.

Prominent memory studies have responded to emerging public culture and multicultural awareness. Barbie Zelizer (1995) reviewed the development of memory studies and noted the contested relationship between history and memory within the realm of historical studies. Although the accuracy of memory remains a matter of debate, the emergence of memory has challenged the dominant authority of history and its profession and allowed diversified versions of the past to become visible. Michael Rowlands and Christopher Tilley (2006) noted that the sphere of public memory is mainly in the cultural, rather than scholarly, arena. Many social groups have fought for their right to select and represent their own past, coupled with their desire to participate in cultural politics and the democratic process. Since the 1980s, these struggles have appeared mainly in terms of heritage (Rowlands and Tilley 2006, 502). For instance, the issues concerning indigenous rights in terms of repatriating objects and redirecting interpretation have resulted in canonical changes in academic disciplines such as archaeology (Smith 2004). In Taiwan, the variety of heritage sites and the trend of memory re-collection challenged the KMT-led narrative of Chinese identity. Spanish, Dutch, and Japanese sites, as well as indigenous and Hakka places, have been increasingly nominated for conservation. All of these sites serve as components of a unique Taiwan identity.

The fear that history may devour memories implies the contested relationship between authorised and diversified discourses of the past. Zelizer (1995) reviewed the emergence of memory studies and examined the entanglement of history and memory studies. Many history researchers have expressed their worry about the inaccuracy of memory studies; yet others, for instance the oral historians and the French Annales School, used memory studies as a meeting field for bringing in other disciplines and diversifying objects and redirecting interpretation have resulted in canonical changes in academic disciplines such as archaeology (Smith 2004). In Taiwan, the variety of heritage sites and the trend of memory re-collection challenged the KMT-led narrative of Chinese identity. Spanish, Dutch, and Japanese sites, as well as indigenous and Hakka places, have been increasingly nominated for conservation. All of these sites serve as components of a unique Taiwan identity.

past. We have to be aware that the important point here is not “how accurately a recollection fitted some piece of a past reality”, but rather “why historical actors constructed their memories in a particular way at a particular time” (Zelizer 1995, 217). The vibrancy of memory reminds us to be cautious about intentions to fix, manipulate and authorise the past, which may be dressed as history or collective memory. These intentions cannot be separated from political power, for instance of a national state, as Klein (2000) warned.

This caution has equal importance to both the studies and practices of heritage. Being the materialisation of memory and history, heritage has been largely used for constructing national imagination. Through heritage legislation and management regulations, it has been regarded as an embodiment of a fixed, stable and authorised past. The memory approach helps to juxtapose representations of the past, and to unearth the hidden power network of actors. “Heritage is a cultural process”, according to Smith (2006), and the practice of heritage initiates activities of memory. In the recalling and telling process, memories are formulated, and even altered by the tellers and interpreters. Aside from the tellers and interpreters, other actors in the heritage network can influence the interpretation. Their diversified “social frameworks of memory” (Halbwachs 1992) interact and result in an unfixed face of the past. This memory version further affects the practice and representation of heritage. Heritage is actually much less tangible than it has been regarded.

Social Frameworks of Memory

The concept of ‘social frameworks of memory’ aids the examination of the contesting and tangled pasts in the dynamic process of representing colonial sites. The social framework of memory was proposed by Maurice Halbwachs in his On Collective Memory (1992). Individuals formulate memories through mutual initiation and confirmation. Through this process, a collective memory is generated, maintained and re-affirmed. Furthermore, groups situated in different social frameworks—whether separated by education, socioeconomic class, gender, family, or generation—have distinctive collective memories constructed by their respective members, and these collective frameworks are “precisely the instruments used by the collective memory to reconstruct an image of the past which is in accord, in each epoch, with the predominant thoughts of the society” (Halbwachs 1992, 40). The ‘predominant thoughts’ in the cases presented in this thesis refer to the changing national narratives and ecopolitical context. This transition has allowed Japanese associations to be accepted and even welcomed in present-day Taiwanese society.

Halbwachs’ approach is present-centred, and he states that “the beliefs, interests, and aspirations of the present shape the various views of the past as they are manifested respectively in every historical epoch” (Halbwachs 1992, 29; Introduction by Kaesler, D.). He goes on to explain that it is through the participation of group members of the current generation in commemorative meetings that “we can recreate through imaginative re-enacting a past that would otherwise slowly disappear in the haze of time” (Halbwachs 1992, 28; Introduction by Kaesler, D.). This is similar to contemporary heritage discourses—the past is a product of the present mind. Yet there is still continuity of the collective memory. The perception of the past, constructed by a specific group within its own social framework, is formed and maintained through continuous mutual recognition such as commemorations and ‘physical props’ such as monuments, archives and objects. This echoes the social practices of many contemporary institutions like museums and heritage sites. Being locations of “secular ritual” (Duncan 1995), museum and heritage places often serve as an instrument to maintain a version of the past by continuous events for instance cultural activities and exhibitions.

Jan Assmann further develops the concept of collective memory proposed by Halbwachs. Although the distinction between cultural memory and history itself is questionable, Assmann elaborates on the social dimension of collective memory and offers insight into the formation of identity through memory tactics. He proposes a transition from communicative memory, characterized by its temporality, to cultural memory “the area of objectivised culture” (Assmann 1995, 128). The identity of a group of people is forged and solidified through “formative and normative impulses” from the knowledge produced by cul-
Cultural memory. Cultural memory, different from communicative memory, has fixed points, and these points are “figures of memory,” consisting of “fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance)” (Assmann 1995, 129). This resonates with Nora’s concept of sites of memory. A sense of identity is shaped, reinforced, and represented by sites of memory—or, to use Assmann’s words, figures of memory. These sites of memory are sustained only through the continuous practice of mnemonic tactics.

**Ambiguities of Heritagizing Colonial Sites**

When sites of multiple memories, such as colonial places, are created with the intention to produce a single locality, a transformation is necessary. This transformation needs to take into account the questions of how and to what extent a site can be commonly accepted. Heritage cannot be separated from the concepts of inheritance, volition, identification, and ownership (Howard 2003). Hence, heritage is legitimized and sustained by the communal recognition of a group of people. This recognition is based on their collective sense of belonging and connection to the material existence. The connection is usually in the form of memory. When a heritage site is legitimized as a place of local distinctiveness and local pride, this site is supposed to represent a local past, already collectively recognized by local people in terms of their collective memory. In the case of colonial heritage, this premise is ambiguous. Three levels of colonial ambiguity emerge in the process of ‘monumentalizing’ colonial sites: first, the gap between the material fabric of colonial remains and the cultural context of the postcolonial society; second, the difference between the subject of memory and the subject of heritage; and third, the substantial discordance between coloniality and locality. Regarding the first level of ambiguity, the material fabric of colonial remains left in the postcolonial locale is situated in a culturally diversified context. During the process of heritage interpretation for instance, by means of architectural restoration, interior display, or cultural activities, the cultural context of the heritage site is foreign to the postcolonial society. Hence interpretative activities often seem isolated, temporary and ambivalent before a postcolonial audience. For example, Japanese architecture is the product of Japanese artisan craft and living customs. Thus, the renovation of a Japanese temple in Taiwan is often faced with a lack of the necessary artisan skills. The associated cultural activities in Japanese style, according to the historical and cultural background of the site, may also seem ambivalent and unfamiliar to the postcolonial Taiwanese residents and cultural workers. Moreover, this ambiguity makes the conservation principle of authenticity questionable. In the case of Taiwan, some Japanese sites endure more changes than others at the hands of later generations. If the purpose of renovating the site is to represent local memories and to catalyze community awareness, it is questionable whether it is necessary to return the site to its original Japanese condition by removing later changes. Defining whose version is authentic inevitably removes others from the recognized past.

Regarding the second level of ambiguity, the original owner of the material remains and direct memory is cut off, thus removing the strong ties connecting the place and sense of belonging. Under the new demands of heritage, these colonial sites are transformed into places of local heritage. However, considering the significance of heritage, which is usually associated with the concepts of inheritance, ownership, volition, and belonging, sites of ‘colonial heritage’ are tied only weakly to the place and to current communities who were previously the inferior group in the colonial social hierarchy and who often kept their distance from the places belonging to the superior group. For instance, many Japanese residences in Taiwan were the accommodation of Japanese officials or company administrators. Under the discriminatory treatment of the Taiwanese during colonial times, most locals were not able to live in these residences. With no living experiences or active memories connected to these residences, the postcolonial local communities have little connection to these sites. This is also related to the third level of ambiguity: in the era of community building, heritage is a means of strengthening local identity by a sense of rootedness and belonging. However, this intention goes against the coloniality residing in the material remains in terms of the structural inequality caused by colonial
hierarchy, which often is not realized by the postcolonial communities and removed from the current society. If interpretative activities are not initiated, decolonization will not take place, as local communities would not participate in deciding on their heritage and future.

Ultimately, I would argue that a colonial site has to go through two stages of transformation when becoming a site of locality. In the first stage, the site needs to be open to the dialogue of multiple memories and to the exploration of memories that used to be marginalized. This is also what is involved in the process of decolonization. Through this open dialogue, a recognized representation of the past is gradually generated for the production of sites of memory. This awareness of community leads to the second stage, where the sites of memory are transformed into sites of locality. A collective version of the future is formulated in the long-term process of maintaining the sites of memory and transforming these sites into sites of locality. This version is anchored in the multifaceted locality, which comprises dimensions of civil awareness, social welfare, environmental concern, economic improvement, and so forth. The sites of memory, in this regard, are no longer the demonstration of a homogenizing national identity, suppressing other identities within or across the national boundary, but are rather a social agent pursuing a future with humanistic concerns.

The Future of Memory and Heritage Studies

Memory studies up to now have constituted a remarkable challenge to dominant narratives of the past. Diversified memories have been continuously unearthed within the “First World”, especially memories from the previous peripheries, for instance the memories of females, labourers, indigenous and colonized people, although many of these memories continue to be ignored. This is similar to the heritage field. The claim of multiple interpretation and community participation has been pronounced in the relevant fields of anthropology, archaeology and museology. However, as Confino (1997) argued, contemporary memory studies often pay much attention to trivial, individual studies, and yet neglect their relationship with the social context. Often there seems to be a focus on political issues, while “the effect of memory on the organization, hierarchization, and arrangements of social and cultural relationships” is ignored (Confino 1997, 1393). Moreover, representations of the past are merely discussed, with only a rare examination of how these representations are received. It is insufficient for memory studies to simply display multiplicities of memories and not try to figure out how national manipulation is internalized into personal conceptions in daily lives. Nowadays, the interpretation of heritage sites is required to address multiple voices. However, aside from the juxtaposition of diversity, is there any advancing vision of human societies that memory and heritage practices can assist? If not, the future of memory and heritage studies may be condemned within the boundaries of cultural relativism.

The core issue concerning the use of memory and that which explains the booming phenomena of memory studies is the role of the nation. As Appadurai (2008) describes, the “general business of retrieving the past, remembering, materializing that memory and commemorating it” actually “leads directly to the business of the nation” (Appadurai 2008). The construction of national imagination requires the ‘signatures of the visible’ (Appadurai 2008, 215), visible devises for displaying and legitimating national identity such as monuments, rituals, ceremonies, archives, museum displays and so on. In this regard, museums, heritage sites and archaeology as ‘signatures of the visible’ create products to stress national identity or add to the political profile of the nation-state or its political figures. The practice of recollection in many cases has led to large scale ethnic violence. Is there any form of recollection less “predatory” (Appadurai 2008), which does not exclude others? Is it possible that a representation in an exhibition hall shows multiple memories? This question was posed by Appadurai and is still awaiting an answer.

Moreover, the approach of memory reveals a profound struggle within heritage discourse and practice: although ‘heritage’ is gradually being recognised as a cultural process, when we get into the actual practices, for instance the designation procedure, renovation, display etc., a fixed version of representing heritage is unavoidable. To renovate a building, the version of the past needs to be decided.
in advance because it affects the construction material and architectural form used by the constructor. Standardization is also required to meet the demands of management. However, who decides these criteria? Which memory are these criteria to be based on? If memory studies contribute to challenging existing authority by representing diversified pasts, how can the representation of multiplicity be put into practice when the conservation and management of heritage inevitably shows a materialised, frozen, homogenized, single past? Regarding the sites of colonial heritage, usually extremely contested sites of memories, the issue of representation is not only a process of competing and negotiating, but also process of re-awakening, re-occupying or even removing localities.

1.2.2 Place and Locality

1.2.2.1 Place, Site and Landscape

There are three terms with a spatial connotation frequently seen within the context of heritage management: place, site, and landscape. The meaning of place is differentiated from the neutral and physical term ‘space’. ‘Place’ is not simply a physical container, as space is. It is characterised by its bond to lived experiences, and has a dialectical relationship with human perception, emotion and social reactions. Space turns into place “through traditions, memories, myths and narratives and its uniqueness confirmed and legitimated in terms of their relationship to particular representations of the past” (Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge 2007, 54). The term “sense of place” (Tuan 1977) is closely related to the identity-building of a community through its communal perception of a place. Sense of place provides a sense of rootedness and belonging for an individual or group identity to reside. At the same time, place is a contesting field for identities. One’s perception and interpretation of a place may differ from other groups and individuals. The discourse of how power relationships manipulate place has emerged in the Western arena, while the conflicts between old authorities and indigenous communities have been intense during recent decades. Heritage is a place where identity is created and contested, and as Smith (2006, 75) notes, “[i]n a very real sense heritage becomes a cultural tool that nations, societies, communities and individuals use to express, facilitate and construct a sense of identity, self and belonging in which the ‘power of place’ is invoked in its representational sense to give physical reality to these expressions and experiences”. The issue of multivocality of place expands the boundaries constructed by attempts to fix an identity on a place.

The term ‘site’ is used frequently in the field of archaeology to represent the physical base for archaeologists to excavate the past materials and to construct the meaning of the ‘authentic’ past. The frequency of usage within the field of archaeology has been gradually replaced by ‘place’, as seen in the heritage charters and documents internationally circulated, for instance the Australian Burra Charter and the English Power of Place. This rhetoric change implies a transformation from traditional beliefs about a stable and fixed ‘site’ where ‘authentic' knowledge is discovered and produced scientifically, to a less tangible ‘place’, connecting people through sense of identity. The meaning of a heritage place is expanded and differs depending on different groups of people. The change from site to place signifies an essential change in Western heritage discourse, particularly regarding the emerging issue of community in perceiving the heritage place.

Landscape is an issue of long-term concern in Western academic circles. It has been recognised more as a symbolic sign rather than concrete space for dwelling (Ashworth et al. 2007). Stephen Daniels (1993) sees landscape as echoing, negotiating and being “encoded” by social, political and cultural complexes. As Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007) explain, this works through two dimensions: first, landscape continuously interacts with the changes of diverse identities, reflecting the social differences represented by multiple images and representations. Second, landscape, as a huge-scale visible landmark which can be perceived by people at a distance and from different angles always invites multiple interpretations. Hence “a single landscape can be viewed simultaneously in a variety of ways, emphasising how hegemonic interpretations are always open to subversion” (Ashworth et al. 2007, 61).

In the Burra Charter, place is defined as a “site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include compo-
ponents, spaces and views”. Place seems a neutral and physical environment in which ‘cultural significance’ is performed. This is related to its function. Cultural significance was proposed by the Australian ICOMOS as part of the criteria for heritage management. In order to put into practice at sites, the definition has to be concrete; however, the rather ideological term ‘cultural significance’ has been proposed by the Australian ICOMOS to replace ‘place’ in order to reopen the heritage sphere to multiple communities. It is always difficult to define physical boundaries and regulations for ideological intentions. What does ‘cultural significance’ mean and how to put it into practice? The question is still debatable.

1.2.2.2 Meaning of Locality

In order to unearth the meaning of ‘locality’, three frameworks need to be reviewed: first, the definition of locality within the context of globalization; second, Japan’s famous model of ‘community building’—machizukuri. This model had a remarkable impact on the policies and practices of Taiwan’s community building promoted by the state in the 1990s and 2000s. Third, we need to look at the overwhelming phenomenon of indigenization in Taiwan during the past decades. The indigenization phenomenon accentuates living experiences and emotional connectedness to Taiwan, and this has become a core subject in many fields, for instance literature, historical research and education.

Locality and Globalization

Localization is frequently understood as a reaction to globalization. It is related to the local reactions to resist or appropriate the exterior forces and influences brought by globalization. Aside from the ‘locality’ produced at actual locations, usually the peripheries, the fact that locality production lies in non-spatial spheres has also been noted by researchers. In his book Modernity at Large, Appadurai (1996) defines locality as “a complex phenomenological quality, constituted by a series of links between the sense of social immediacy, the technologies of interactivity, and the relativity of contexts” (Appadurai 1996, 178). He used the term ‘neighbourhood’ as a concept paired with locality, referring to “the actually existing social forms in which locality, as a dimension or value, is variably realized. Neighbourhoods, in this usage, are situated communities characterised by their actuality, whether spatial or virtual, and their potential for social reproduction” (Appadurai 1996, 179). Neighbourhood is a relatively concrete and spatial form, consisting of local knowledge and social links. Appadurai regards locality as existing and being maintained by constant activity, for instance ritual performance and social activity. He asserts “locality as a phenomenological property of social life, a structure of feeling that is produced by particular forms of intentional activity and that yields particular sorts of material effects” (Appadurai 1996, 182). In this regard, heritage and museums are the social practice of locality production. Furthermore, locality is not necessarily tied to a concrete location. Under the circumstances of immigration, internet communication and electronic media, the collective imagination of locality is not restricted to an actual geographical point. It can be possibly generated and maintained in hybrid locations, like the cases of ‘China Towns’ all over the world.

Japan’s Machizukuri 町作為

The Japanese model of machizukuri has been the most influential model on Taiwan’s community-building. The model was brought in as part of Taiwan’s policy-making framework by governor Chen Chi-nan 陳其南, a member of the central government during the transition of political ideologies from Chinese nationalist to the indigenization of Taiwan in the 1990s. In order to understand the meaning of ‘locality’ in contemporary Taiwan, the aims, features and practices of machizukuri need to be understood first.

Machizukuri is composed of two words in Japanese: machi (community) and zukuri (making). Watanabe (2007) presented the rhetorical meanings and hence the characteristics of this wide-spread phenomenon in 1990s’ Japan. Machi has two corresponding Chinese characters: 作 (neighbourhood) or 街 (street). Both contribute to its implications: first, the scale of machizukuri is small. In contrast to the national and prefectural scale of urban planning, machizukuri relates to planning in neighbourhoods and streets. Second, machizukuri refers to the physical (街, street) and the non-physical (作, neighbourhood) simulta-
neously. It encompasses not only the urban infrastructure and housing environment, but also the welfare and culture of the local community. Furthermore, the word zukuri highlights the importance of a ‘process’. Rather than creating a perfect final ‘product’, machizukuri is more concerned with a continuous process of community participation. According to Watanabe, zukuri also implies ‘handmade’. He suggests the “surprise and joy when people began to realize that they can now create themselves something that used to be monopolized and made only by the experts of the market and government” (Watanabe 2007, 41). Although the definition and practice of machizukuri has diversified and not every case yields a successful result, we may understand it through its targets and orientation.

Machizukuri is an outcome of Japan’s economic and political changes in recent decades. These changes were largely in response to the environmental crisis after rapid economic growth in the 1960s, a contesting relationship between the central and local governments, political transitions in the leading party, and the bursting of the bubble economy in the 1990s. These factors together stimulated machizukuri. Within the social context, local residents realised the need to participate in the process of creating a liveable and sustainable place. They adopted consistent and gradual changes to the existing environmental fabric rather than huge development projects and the construction of new buildings. They made efforts to create a ‘shared place’ based on their cultural uniqueness, lifestyles and local characters. Conserving the historical fabric is one of the core elements, consistent with environmental concerns, citizens’ welfare, and civil participation, contributing to an ideal model of machizukuri. These concerns are aims of Taiwan’s community-building as well and are the core issues of locality reproduction in this thesis. The definition of locality in this regard relates to the communal consciousness of a shared place, and the recognition of the uniqueness of this place. This consciousness is actualised by the autonomous participation in planning, the efforts in maintaining and improving the living environment, and the civil awareness of fighting for welfare and own-lifestyles in the place. Heritage has great power to mediate the production of locality.

Taiwan’s Indigenization (bentuhua 本土化)

The concepts of place and locality gained particular attention in Taiwan within the trend of indigenization. This term in Taiwan’s context is better seen as a contrast to Sinicization, rather than Westernization or globalization. The core consciousness of indigenization is to reconnect the people to the land of Taiwan. It is closely related to the Chinese term xiangtu 續土, which is composed of two words: ‘hometown’ (xiang) and ‘soil’ (tu). The spatial scale of xiangtu is relatively small, usually not larger than a county in regards to administrative area. This allows xiangtu to act in accordance with the national narrative. It was able to escape from the Chinese national narrative because it could be explained as the concern for rural hometowns, but still under the larger national imagination.

Indigenization was first used by the Nativist Literature movement in the 1970s in Taiwan.30 Still under the oppressive Chinese nationalist ideology, many authors who wrote about subjects relating to living experiences in Taiwan became entangled in an enormous debate with other groups of writers. A-Chin Hsiau (2000) discusses the transformation of collective memory in the narration of Nativist Literature after the early 1970s. In the development of historical narratives, the history of Taiwan and the history of xiangtu emerged as part of the major discourses and gradually transformed and gained superior status. Knowledge of local geography and history was accentuated and became an essential subject in the obligatory education system. The place of Taiwan and local area replaced ‘China’ for the location of national identity. In this regard, locality (difangxing 地方性) is the product of indigenization, a feature of ‘genuine’ Taiwanese culture. It serves as a location of identity and collective imagination.

30. Nativist Literature Movement (Xiangtu Wenxue Yundong 續土文學運動) marked a refocus in literature on the themes of Taiwan, for instance the living experiences of common people, as opposed to the absence of Taiwan under the political propaganda of the KMT. However, this provoked fierce debate. Within the authoritarian political atmosphere under the KMT rule, Nativist Literature was attacked by other groups of writers and called ‘labourers’ literature’ (in other words, the ‘communist’ literature), or as a promoter for the Taiwan separatist movement.
The conceptual content of locality was further expanded by community-building projects in the 1990s and 2000s. Against a background of a change in national narratives, the transformation of economic structures and the rise of local governments, community-building was heavily promoted by the central government. The name of this nation-wide project was the Integrated Community-Making Programme (shequ zongti yingzao 社區總體營造). The phrase shequ yingzao (社區營造) has symmetry with its Japanese counterpart: shequ 社區 mirrors machi 町, as both mean community or neighbourhood; yingzao 營造 parallels zukuri 作, as both refer to making, building and constructing. This shows the Japanese influence on Taiwan’s community construction and the vision and definition of locality. Community-building in Taiwan has three targets: making landscape, making people and making industry (zaojing, zaoren, zaochan 造景, 造人, 造產). Hence, locality is characterised by its spatial aesthetics, citizen awareness and economic ability.

By viewing an array of concepts, from space to locality, we have seen that the meaning of locality comprises dimensions of identity building, a sense of community, citizenship, environmental care and economic purpose. A vision of the future which lies in locality is pursued through heritage places in Taiwan. This corresponds to the transformation of identity narratives. This strategy is ambiguously applied to colonial heritage, which originally was intended as a spatial device to mark the local sense of place as inferior to the imagination of a faraway home country.

1.3 TAIWAN, JAPAN AND THE NETHERLANDS: SCALE AND CRITERIA

Despite the fact that this research is mainly concerned with the representation of Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan, in order to look deeper into this theme we need a broader framework. Heritage originates from responses to the social situations of contemporary society. The past is used to deal with present issues and to plan future strategies. Hence studying a heritage site is inseparable from an understanding of its historical layers, scientific attributes, social factors, economic impact and actor network. In the case of colonial sites, historical layers are of particular importance regarding the recollection of multiple memories. Furthermore, the concept of heritage in Taiwan is a Western import. This concept was first recognised by government officials and researchers of Taiwan in investigating its Japanese and Korean counterparts, before the official legislation of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act in 1982. The heritage legislation and policies of Taiwan refer to conventions and models approved by UNESCO and ICOMOS, even though Taiwan is not recognized as a member of the United Nations. To understand heritage development in Taiwan we have seen the operation of a global heritage mechanism in section 1.1.1. Furthermore, UNESCO is a governmental institution, and its heritage activities actually operate within state-state networks. Regarding the theme of colonial heritage, investigating the Netherlands’ activities in colonial heritage in both the international and domestic spheres helps to elaborate the ideology and operation of the international mechanism as introduced in section 1.1.2.

1.3.1 Case Studies in Japanese Colonial Heritage in Taiwan

In order to appreciate the actual situation of representing Japanese sites at local places in Taiwan, this research analyses five Japanese sites in Taiwan: one in the north, one in the centre, one in the south and two in the east. The sites are: Jinguashi Mining Remains 金瓜石, Tongxiao Shinto Shrine 通霄神社, Ciaotou Sugar Factory 橋頭糖廠, Qingxiu Yuan 慶修院 and Jiangjunfu Residential Area 將軍府. The data in the case studies mainly stem from two sources. One source is reports of planning and renovation, research on local history, oral records concerning the site, publications of site managers, news reports etc. The other source is field studies, including interviews and participant observation (Jinguashi), conducted by the author from 2006 to 2011 and from 2002 to 2005 for the participant observations of Jinguashi.

This research has selected sites with as much variety as possible in order to unearth the full complexity of Taiwan’s heritage practices, particularly their difficulties in interpreting and managing Japanese sites. The research period is from the 1990s until the year 2008, when the state community-building programme was shrunk to a smaller scale according to the changes of the incumbent party and policy focuses.\(^{32}\)

\(^{32}\) In 2008, the incumbent party was changed from DPP (Democratic Progressive Party) to KMT (Kuomintang; Chinese Nationalist Party).

Scale of Cases: defining ‘local’

These sites are relatively small if we compare them to many research titles concerning national or world heritage sites. All cases here are county-managed heritage sites. This criteria of scale aims to look into the actual complexity of heritage practice in a post-colonial locale, especially within the context of the rising importance of local governments in the 1990s and 2000s. These microscopic studies represent real actors participating in and influencing heritage-making. In the instance of a global-local nexus, the meaning of ‘local’ refers to the counterpart of global or international. In other words, ‘local’ often refers to a country government in contrast to global intra-governmental institutes, such as the UN or UNESCO when regarding the global heritage mechanism. In contrast the ‘local’ here does not refer to the local state government in the nexus of global-local within the international heritage arena, but it refers to a concrete geographical ‘local’ area in which a sense of place, bodily experiences, memory and identity of communities can root.

This is due to the intrinsic connection between heritage and the nation-state. It is agreed by researchers that the emergence of heritage is closely related to the rise of nationalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the European context, and this connection has been strengthened by most newly independent nations, particularly postcolonial ones. They implemented heritage for identity building, raising their national profiles and attracting international investment. While recognising this, the thesis defines ‘local’ as an actual locale where the dynamics of heritage practice is actually going on and actors are directly interacting and influencing the heritage practice at the site. The scale of ‘local’ in this thesis is much smaller than the nation-state and smaller even than province and county, but may equal a village or several neighbourhoods in direct relation to the heritage site studied. In this regard, I would like to explore the autonomy of individuals and communities amid the dynamics of heritage construction, seeing heritage as more than simply a vir-
tual product of nationalism, intra-state power play or global mechanisms. Such small-scale cases enable a better examination of ‘social frameworks’ and contesting memories, since memory relies on an intimacy of person(s). Through observing how local actors receive and respond to the dominant narratives of the state concerning heritage and community making, it is possible to see social agency and recognise the role of local actors as active subjects in contributing to and negotiating with the ‘predominant thoughts’.\textsuperscript{33} not simply acting as an unconscious mechanical element of the state, a group or a period.

Built heritage is the main research target of this thesis. Architecture itself and the attached environment are both incorporated into the investigation. The scale of a ‘neighbourhood’ is considered the basic size of my research field. A ‘neighbourhood’ in this regard does not refer to an administration district like a 里 (residential unit) or 里 (village) as is normal in Taiwan when talking about community. The relations between the heritage site and their neighbourhood area are paid particular attention in this research. Two points are important here: first, the concern of integrity in preserving built heritage; and second, the actor network of heritage activities relating to the site is closely associated with local actors in the neighbourhood. The definition of neighbourhood in this thesis refers to Appadurai’s assertion that “neighbourhoods are situated communities characterised by their actuality, whether spatial or virtual, and their potential for social reproduction” (Appadurai 1996, 179). Even though community is always a vague concept and is difficult to define, or may even have not formed yet in the local area, it is important to identify the subjects of memories, the acts of the subjects in the heritage or sites of memory construction and the products of their acts. A neighbourhood is a reasonable size for this consideration.

\textit{Criteria of Selection}

Heritage awareness and discourse in Taiwan emerged mainly from conservation issues regarding 古迹 (historic monuments) within the professional field of architecture. This led to the institutionalization of heritage studies in Taiwan mainly within the field of architecture. In order to present the context of heritage development in Taiwan, a selection of built heritage is taken into consideration in this research: all five sites are built and tangible heritage as UNESCO has defined it.

All five sites were constructed during the Japanese colonial period (1895-1945), and have retained most features of the Japanese building fabric. They (or partial buildings within the defined complex) are all ‘historic monuments’ or ‘historic buildings’ under the framework of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act, and all were renovated in the 1990s and 2000s in accordance with the ‘era of localism’ defined by this thesis. Regarding their original functions, two are former industrial sites, two are religious sites and the other is an area for military residences. As for their current use and managing bodies: Jinguashi Mining Remains were planned as a museum park, and are managed by a museum team of county government. Ciaotou Sugar Factory is a cultural park, managed by Taiwan Sugar Cooperation, a national enterprise. Part of the park is used by a local cultural society for art and cultural activities. Qingxiu Yuan is open for visits, and currently (2011) managed by the Hualien County Bureau of Cultural Affairs. Jiangjunfu Residences are partly used as a community centre for community activities and a display of local history. Tongxiao Shinto Shrine is managed by Tongxiao Township Office. All five sites belong to public departments, including local governments, national enterprises and a national ministry.

1.4 \textbf{THESIS STRUCTURE AND CHAPTER PLAN}

Chapter One: Introduction

This thesis intends to explore the possibility of transforming colonial remains into postcolonial heritage. That is to say, it is an attempt to see how locality reproduction can be mediated by the practices of colonial heritage. Thus in the first chapter we began with a discussion of the major conceptual context: memory and locality. The memory approach allows an in-depth overview of colonial heritage as a contesting field of memories with diverse social frame-
works. When applying the memory approach to ‘colonial heritage’—the phrase itself is an ambiguous combination—memory recollection presents a fundamental gap between the material fabric and the sense of place with which a local heritage is normally endowed. This gap implies the difficulties heritage practitioners may face when dealing with colonial heritage in the postcolonial context.

The first chapter has provided a framework for this research, taking three dimensions of the framework into consideration: the global heritage mechanism of colonial built heritage, the theoretical threads of memory and locality in examining the nature and ambiguity of colonial heritage, and the scale and criteria of selecting case studies from Taiwan’s Japanese colonial sites.

Taiwan’s heritage policies and conceptualization process mainly reflect influences from international institutions. ‘Heritage’ is a new, imported concept and often shows an interpretative gap from the Chinese translation of wenhua zichan 文化資産. This importation was in accordance with globalising forces in the post Cold War re-composition of world order, and Taiwan’s domestic social change in the wake of fast-paced industrialisation, urbanisation and political democratization. As Taiwan’s heritage policies and practice mostly refer to conventions and models legitimated by international institutions such as UNESCO and ICOMOS—even though Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations—it is necessary to know the global context within which Taiwan appropriates these international conventions. A part of this chapter has elaborated this global framework in relation to cultural and colonial heritage.

Chapter Two: Japanese ‘Heritage’ in Postcolonial Taiwan

This section examines the ambiguity of representing Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan. The conceptual significance of heritage, memory and place are explored and used to examine the general phenomena of interpreting Japanese colonial remains as local heritage. The first part discusses the gap between heritage intentions and the colonial fabric. It begins with the ambiguity of embedding heritage, a term closely associated with concepts of volition, identification, people and ownership (Howard 2003), in the material remains left by people who are geographically remote and even historically antagonistic to the current local community. This section further presents the phenomenon of the memory boom in Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s. This memory boom was a consequence of political and economic changes during the period, namely the ‘era of localism’. The latter part of this chapter presents the development of heritage discourses and practices within the context of ‘community building’. It examines how Japanese colonial remains entered the category of ‘heritage’ in Taiwan and shows the link between this ‘heritagization’ process and emerging localism, and also the pro-Japanese attitude shaped within the structure of dual colonialism.

Chapter Three: Single Case Study: Jinguashi Mining Remains

This thesis began its discussion at the scale of the global heritage arena before reducing its perspective to the nation of Taiwan. In Chapters Three and Four it then moves to concrete sites in a micro-frame. In order to reveal problematical issues of heritage practice generated in the postcolonial context, this research will focus on an in-depth single case study and a multicase study. The case studies are divided into two parts: the first part (chapter three) concentrates on a single case, the Jinguashi Mining Remains; the second part (chapter four) examines the four remaining sites as a multiple case study. The single case study aims to provide an in-depth perspective and to serve as the discussion basis for the multicase study.

This chapter on the Jinguashi Mining Remains delves further into the issues of representing Japanese colonial heritage from four dimensions: contested memories resulting from layered colonialism; issues of the top-down community approach in representing the site as an ecomuseum; colonial ambiguities which emerged from interpretative activities in the process of heritage making; and difficulties in reproducing locality within the postcolonial actor network. This case exemplifies many local heritage-building initiatives within the prevailing localism in contemporary Taiwan, as well as the role of the emerging local governments in this memory boom.
The authorised discourses of community-building and the implementation of heritage activities have been re-appropriated in the locale and revised in ongoing negotiations.

Chapter Four: Multiple Case Analysis

Here four sites are analysed: Tongxiao Shinto Shrine, Ciaotou Sugar Factory, Qingxiu Yuan and Jingjunfu Residences. The case of Tongxiao Shinto Shrine elaborates on the contested nature of Japanese colonial sites in Taiwan. Owing to the dual colonialism structure of Taiwan, interpretative activities represent the negotiation of memories of generations and social groups in connection to the site. The case of Qingxiu Yuan, also a religious site, identifies a controversial situation between different ethnic groups. However, memory activities have continued at Qingxiu Yuan, which allows the process of making sites of memory to continue. This process has been stopped in the case of Tongxiao Shinto Shrine, and no ongoing interpretative activities have been held since renovation was completed in 2005. In the cases of Ciaotou Sugar Factory and Jiangjunfu Residences, community initiatives were crucial to the conservation and development of the area. Heritage activities have evoked feelings of belonging, rootedness and pride in both cases, and initiated civil awareness, strengthening the sense of community. However, the trend of heritage commoditisation in close relation to the ideology of development and global consumerism seems to underlie these autonomous acts. Regarding the case of Japanese built heritage, this underlying strength ironically links with the image of Japan in the mass-circulation of media commodities. As a result, the sense of locality and rootedness shaped by community-building heritage activities must inevitably face co-optation by commoditised Japanization. Further observation is required to see whether the grassroots initiatives may transform the coloniality of the site to locality production, or whether we will witness a merger with global consumerism. Will these sites eventually become like many other exotic tourist sites representing commoditising homogeneity rather than locality?
When I first entered the Zhanghua wudedian 彰化武德殿 (butokuden in Japanese) in Zhanghua 彰化 City in 2007, I noticed an interesting hybrid of historical layers and unconscious use of the past. This is common to many Japanese ‘heritage’ sites that have emerged over the last two decades.

Inside this newly renovated Japanese building was a modern restaurant. You could order coffee and cake, or some light food. Its remodelled interior was like many other cafes in urban Taipei. The restaurant was run by a private company which had signed a contract with the Zhanghua 彰化 municipal government for commercial use of this historical site— another example of the famous BOT34 model promoted by

Fig. 2.0.1 Zhanghua Wudedian in July 2007. A waxen statue of a Japanese samurai (knight, warrior) temporarily stood at the entrance and later was moved to a side of the building. Photo was taken by the author.

---

34. BOT: Build-Operate-Transfer is a form of project financing, wherein a private entity receives a concession from the private or public sector to finance, design, construct, and operate a facility stated in the concession contract. This enables the project proponent to recover its investment, operating and maintenance expenses in the project. In Taiwan, the Act for Promotion of Private Participation in Infrastructure Projects (Act for PPIP) was promulgated in 2000, since then BOT has become a model for cutting down the government expenditure, accelerating development and improving public service. See the official website of PPIP: http://ppp2.pcc.gov.tw/pcc_2010/en/Introduction.aspx (accessed 23 August 2011)
the state government. Amid the urban, casual atmosphere of this café, an altar with tablets inscribed with names stood in the middle of the building. Visitors found themselves in front of this altar immediately after entering the space.

The names on the tablets are those of the national heroes and martyrs of the Republic of China (ROC). In the postwar period, many Japanese colonial sites were deliberately demolished or used for different functions by the KMT (Kuomintang 国民党; Chinese Nationalist Party) government, particularly religious and political sites. The Zhanghua butokuden represented Japanese nationalism and Shinto beliefs, and was therefore a target for remodelling. It was therefore transformed into a martyrs’ shrine (忠烈祠) for the worshiping of national heroes (Chen Xin-an 1997, 26). In 2001 the building was nominated as a municipal ‘historic building’ (歷史建築) and received subsidies from the Council for Cultural Affairs (CCA) for restoration. The renovation was completed in 2005, and the building was planned to be opened in 2007 as a restaurant run by a contracted enterprise. Interestingly, the altar of the martyrs was not removed and was worshipped by restaurant staff with no understanding of who they worship and why. Rather than respecting the martyrs, these restaurant staff worshipped because of their folk belief: showing respect to a spectral power in order to guarantee one’s safety and smooth business. During my field visit in the summer of 2007, a manager told me that the altar was going to be concealed behind a cloth printed with colourful images in order not to scare the customers.

This is a familiar situation at many Japanese ‘heritage’ sites in contemporary Taiwan. From the 1990s onward, the status of Japanese sites gradually transformed from being considered a poisonous leftover of imperialism to ‘sites of memory’. In 1991 two Japanese colonial buildings were the first to be designated as ‘historic monuments’, and since 2002 a large number of Japanese sites have been designated announced in 1937 that all the schools should set altars in the dōjō. In colonial Taiwan, alters were placed in most butokuden, including the Zhanghua butokuden.

36. After the Japanese period, most colonial remains were removed or changed by the KMT (Kuomintang 国民党) in an effort to eliminate any reminders of Japanese rule. The butokuden buildings were kept as martial arts training centres for the police of the KMT government. Some buildings were turned into Zhongshan Public Halls (Zhongshan tang 中山堂) or centres of living supplies for military personnel, public servants and teachers (jun gong jiao fuli zhongxin 军人教育福利中心) (Chen Xin-an 1997, 1-2). The Zhanghua martial arts centre was later transformed into a martyrs’ shrine (忠烈祠) for the worship of national heroes.

37. According to the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act, a ‘historic building’ (歷史建築) is a heritage level legally lower than guji 古蹟 (Historic Monument).

38. Subsidies from the Local Museums project (地方文化館計画).

39. The restaurant was in fact not in operation after my visit. This was due to problems surrounding an architectural license. My visit in 2007 was during a trial promotion of the restaurant.
as heritage sites and received subsidies from the state government for renovation. These subsidies were closely related to the state’s Integrated Community-Making Programme. Under this scheme, the status of Japanese colonial sites was dramatically changed to places of local pride and local memory; many sites were expected to become catalysts for the invention of community identity and economic revival. In the process of architectural renovation and management after renovations, however, the ambiguity of representing ‘heritage’, or a ‘site of memory’, is inevitably revealed. This ambiguity refers to the drag between ‘foreign’ and ‘local’ in representing ‘Japaneseness’ at a site of local identity. It also refers to the impact of structural colonialism that continues in postcolonial society, and to representations of Japaneseness in relation to the image of Japan within the global consumerist framework. Moreover, this ambiguity emerges from an environment where locality and community has been enthusiastically promoted by the central government. Projects in making sites of memory on the local level were greatly supported by subsidies from the central government. Nevertheless, this top-down prospect of locality confronts the actor network of local society. Constructing a collective past of Taiwan has always been a dynamic process. Local actors are not simply passive receivers. Each has a separate framework of memory, and strategically reacts to the authorised prospects. Within this actor network, the Japanese past is re-edited and sometimes contested by different actors for their various prospects of locality. As a result, some of these sites have been transformed to sites of memory, while others eventually became deserted ‘mosquito halls’, losing their connection precisely to the local communities which are supposed to be their owners under the scheme of community-making.

The Zhanghua butokuden is one example among many of Japanese heritage sites which were ‘rehabilitated’ in the ‘era of localism’. This chapter aims to provide a framework for subsequent analyses of such case studies. We begin with a discussion of the paradoxical phrase ‘colonial heritage’, revealing the inevitable ambiguity of its interpretation. Considering the distinctive complexity and multivalence of Taiwanese experience and memory of Japanese colonialism, particularly since the 1990s, the ambiguity of Taiwanese conceptualisation of Japanese colonial sites is all the more profound. During the ‘era of localism’ that accompanied Taiwan’s democratization and the decline in KMT dominance, Japanese colonial sites were changed from being official places of hatred to ‘sites of memory’ in the government narratives and heritage policies. Nevertheless, local perception of colonial sites was not necessarily in accordance with official narratives. In the 2000s, numerous Japanese sites were designated as heritage. At the same time, disagreement still existed, for example in the case of the renaming of Taoyuan Martyrs’ Shrine to Taoyuan Shinto Shrine. These Japanese sites have been incorporated into diversified conceptualizations and appropriations by postcolonial actors. These local actors had been active within the framework of the ‘predominant thoughts’ (Halbwachs 1992). They responded to the government narratives or reinterpreted and appropriated the narratives strategically. In doing so these local actors sometimes challenged decisions made by the bureaucratic system, resulting in changes; sometimes, their acts reinforced authorised discourses. Discussions on the representation of Japanese sites in Taiwan allow a close look into this dynamic. In the case of the Zhanghua butokuden, despite the architecture being in the style of the Japanese imperialist period and rich in Shinto associations, it was registered as a cultural heritage site and renovated using government subsidies in expectation of the reward of tourist revenue and local identity. At the same time, the site remains ‘foreign’ to the postcolonial community for various reasons. Local communities have attached their own distinct memories to this site, while the intention of the local government was to use it for local tourism. The memory discourses propagated by the central authorities have not always fit the memories of local communities, and especially the different reinterpre-

40. ‘Mosquito hall’ (wenzi guan) is a phrase used to satirise the states of these buildings; constructed and renovated by the government with a large budget, they are now left unattended as breeding grounds for mosquitoes.

41. Era of localism, defang shidai, refers to the 1990s and 2000s when Taiwan gained enormous attention in many fields. A “new era of localism” (xin defang shidai) was anticipated by Chen, Qi-nan in 1997. The phrase was taken from the Japanese counterpart (Lü 2002, 24).
tations of Japaneseness have caused disagreement. The dynamics represented by heritage activities at Qingxiu Yuan Temple are an example of this: the grassroots’ activist organization who managed the temple from 2003 to 2010, tried to reconnect the temple to the past of the Japanese immigrants and the earlier indigenous community. The reinterpreting activities of the organization on the one hand raised diverse opinions among the postcolonial indigenous communities; on the other hand, they were challenged by intentions of the local government in turning the site into a tourist attraction through bringing in a popular image of Japan.

The second section of this chapter examines the historical context of this ‘era of localism’. The state community-building initiatives of this time lasted for one and a half decades (1994-2008), and provided a supportive environment for heritage-making. Within this environment, the recollection of local memories prospered under government support and grassroots endeavours. The traces of Japanese colonialism, once suppressed by the postwar KMT regime, evoked diversified memories and provided fields for claiming one’s own past. In using the colonial sites of foreign cultural context to assert self-identity and uniqueness, reinterpretation is crucial. However, the top-down community-making projects at heritage sites often lacked processes of reinterpretation. This is largely due to the rigidity of the bureaucratic system. The government mechanism deals more easily with building renovation with a fixed budget and visible results, than with management and community-building plans which require creativity and flexibility with long-term investment. In other words, the latter is difficult to fit into the rigid budget and bureaucratic procedure which was originally designed mainly for preventing corruption. Moreover, reinterpretation was often delayed or restricted by development-oriented incentives underlying the community-making projects. Even if reinterpretation had been initiated in the process of heritage making, the representation of Japaneseness as local heritage would inevitably mean a continuous process of re-fitting Japaneseness to Taiwaneseness. This second section of this chapter examines the results of incorporating Japaneseness into Taiwaneseness in the period from the 1990s to 2008. The final section investigates the quantitative changes made to Japanese colonial sites in the period, in order to reveal the transition from ‘Japanese colonial sites’ to ‘cultural heritage of Taiwan’.

2.1 THE COLONIAL ‘HERITAGE’?

2.1.1 Whose ‘heritage’?

The meaning of ‘heritage’ cannot be separated from the concept of ‘people’. Following Peter Howard’s definition, the Western connotation of heritage is closely associated with the concepts of ‘inheritance’, ‘volition’, ‘identification’ and ‘ownership’ within the major European languages: “the usual French word for heritage is patrimoine and the Spanish patrimonio comes from a similar root, stressing the concept of familial (and patrilineal) descent, but also the national patrimony, the holdings of the group.” (Howard 2003, 7-8) Howard also notes that the word ‘heritage’, an Anglo-Saxon concept, relates to the concept of ‘inheritance’. This relationship can be seen in French today—the French word héritage exclusively refers to ‘legacy’ (Howard 2003, 6). This close relationship between heritage and one’s legacy can be seen from the UNESCO’s conceptualisation of heritage: “Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration.”

Since the semantics of ‘heritage’ originates from the social context of familial and patrilineal relationships, ‘heritage’ exists only when it is claimed to be owned by people. The concept of heritage always revolves around the question of whose heritage it is.

In Taiwan, the phrase ‘cultural heritage’ was translated as wenhua zichan (文資產; lit. ‘cultural assets’) and formalized as such in the first Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (Wenhua zichzn baocun fa 文化資產保存法) in 1982. Prior to the use of wenhua zichan, the terms guji 古蹟 (‘historic monu-
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ment’) and guwū古物 (‘antique’)\(^{43}\) were used in daily conversation, academic discussions and popular media. The phrases guji and guwū reflect the tradition of Chinese historical writing (Zhao Jun-xiang 2003). Features of ‘materiality’ and ‘antiquity’ are essential to both phrases. The conceptual substance of wenhua zichan is connected to these Chinese terms, and embodies the inevitable difficulties of Taiwan’s place-making movements through heritage construction in recent years. As Wang Hsing-luen asserts, “…the Chinese term ‘wenhua zichan’… is literally translated into ‘cultural assets’. Whether a mistranslation or an intentional coinage, this formalized term keenly reflects what ROC cultural officials have in mind when they speak of culture: culture, after all, is regarded as a kind of ‘asset’ endowed with values and productivity.” (2004, 792) In comparison to strong personal linkage and a sense of rootedness suggested by the Western term ‘heritage’, the translation wenhua zichan is rather connected to material quality and economic value. This connection was particularly salient when heritage projects became strategies of community-making in the 1990s and 2000s, as discussed in section 2.2 of this thesis. The relatively strong pragmatic concern of ‘cultural assets’, as opposed to the emotional connectedness of ‘cultural heritage’, has been behind Taiwan’s official conceptualisation of heritage.

The systematic conceptualisation and practice of historic preservation was first brought to Taiwan under Japanese rule. The Preservation Act of Historic Sites, Resort and Natural Heritage (史蹟名勝天然紀念物保存法) was declared by the Japanese government to cover Taiwan from 1922, as well as thirty-five other Japanese domestic legislations.\(^{44}\) However, the legislative context of Taiwan’s current heritage act relates more to the ROC legislations in China. In 1930, the Preservation Act of Antiques (Guwū Baocunfa 古物保存法) was promulgated by the ROC government (led by the KMT) in China. After the Second World War, Japan ceded Taiwan to the ROC government, and the Chinese Preservation Act of Antiques replaced the Japanese Preservation Act of Historic Sites, Resort and Natural Heritage as official legislation on Taiwan’s historic preservation. However, not until the Cultural Revolution in China did the ROC government begin to consider issues concerning historic preservation. In late 1960s, the Ministry of the Interior (Neizhengbu 内政部) initiated the process of revising the Preservation Act of Antiques in order to show the cultural superiority of the ROC over the communist PRC (People’s Republic of China) (Lin Hui-cheng 2011, 73). This revision process was ended with the legislation of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act in 1982.

The criterion of ‘antiquity’ underneath the legislation and designation in the 1980s embodied the Chinese nationalist narrative of KMT government. By stressing the significance of Chinese civilisation and its historical traces, sites of Taiwanese, Japanese and aboriginal cultures were excluded, and the status of KMT in leading a authentic cultural ‘China’ was legitimated.\(^{45}\) Jeremy E. Taylor has pointed out that the “question of time and vintage was a criterion of guji codification as set out in the 1980s legislation” (2005, 162). The feature of ‘antiquity’ was part of the entire discourse of “ROC nation-building on Taiwan and its claims to the inheritance of ‘five thousand years’ of Chinese civilisation” (Taylor 2005, 163).

---

43. For example the Regulations for the Preservation of Relics, Scenic Spots, and Artefacts (Minsheng guju guwu baocun tiao-li 史蹟名勝古物保存條例), formulated in 1928 by the ROC (Republic of China) government in Nanjing, was the Preservation Law of Ancient Artefacts (Guwu baocun fa 古物保存法) promulgated in 1930, and became the only legislation for historical preservation until 1982 and the proclamation of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (wenhua zichan baocun fa 文化資產保存法).

44. On December 29 in 1922, the Taiwan Governor-General Office promulgated the “Order of Implementing Administrative Laws in Taiwan” (行政諸法臺灣施行令). Thirty-six domestic laws in Japan were officially implemented in Taiwan—the Preservation Act of Historic Sites, Resort and Natural Heritage is among the thirty-six (Lin Hui-cheng 2011, 53).

45. In 1966 Mao Zedong started the decade-long Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China. In order to show that the KMT reign in Taiwan preserved the authentic Chinese culture compared to Communist destruction in the Cultural Revolution, the KMT leader Chiang Kai-shek initiated the Chinese Cultural Renaissance Movement in Taiwan in 1966. This movement shows the KMT’s enthusiasm to be the orthodox representative of China despite the KMT having lost its reign over China to the Communist Party at the end of the Chinese civil war in 1949. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Chinese Cultural Renaissance Movement was intended by the KMT to legitimate the Chinese orthodox status of the KMT in the Cold War world structure, and to consolidate the KMT rule in Taiwan by strengthening the Chinese nationalist narrative through cultural policies.
Yan Liang-yi (2009) also noted that the first guji (historic monument)\(^{46}\) designated before 1985 contributed to a national narrative of Taiwan’s inseparable cultural and historical connections to China under postwar KMT governance. This narrative is represented by the 18 sites\(^{47}\) designated in 1983, the first series designations after the implementation of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act, which either relate to the Han people’s resistance to foreign invasion, or to Taiwanese assistance to the Qing repression of rebellions in Taiwan. Other versions of the past were meanwhile excluded, for instance the indigenous sites and Japanese remnants (Yan Liang-yi 2009, 20-21). The criterion of ‘age’ helped to disqualify Japanese colonial sites from a national list of preservation, and hence helped to exclude the colonial past from the history of Taiwan (Taylor 2005). This criterion of what can be regarded as ‘historic’ was not changed until the 1990s.

2.1.2 Is there any colonial heritage?

If the core concept of ‘heritage’ is associated with an individual or community who owns, inherits, and decides to pass on a precious belonging to the next generation, then who is the subject that owns the colonial heritage? If heritage is, as the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO has declared, “our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations”\(^{48}\) then in the case of colonial heritage in Taiwan, who is “we”? Does heritage belong to the colonizers who created the objects, dwelled in the built environments, applied cultural significance and custom to the material products and hence have strong emotional connections to the places and objects? Alternatively, do the colonial remnants belong to the postcolonial community, the former colonized, who found the material remains in their recovered homeland, and who have lived with and within the remnants and have developed a sense of place? Can these colonial remnants be conceived as the ‘heritage’ of the postcolonial community, contributing to their identity and deserving to be preserved for the next generation?

Two perspectives on colonial heritage are dealt with in this section: the material remains of the colonizer in the postcolonial locale; and the material remains of the former colonized people in the colonizer’s national territory.

Regarding the first perspective, the term ‘shared heritage’ as well as those of ‘mutual heritage’, ‘common heritage’ and ‘heritage overseas’ have been proposed by heritage management practitioners over the last decade to deal with the overseas material remains of European countries, mostly with the material products resulting from former colonization (Fienieg et al. 2008, 25). The aim of these overseas projects is either to improve the diplomatic interactions of countries, or to promote the national identity and pride of different countries (Fienieg et al. 2008, 37-52). This was also reflected by the international policy of the global governance institutions. According to the Heritage at Risk report of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) of 2001-2002, a Shared Colonial Heritage Committee was added to the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee network in 1998. In 1999, during the ICOMOS Assembly in Mexico, it held its first formal meeting. The report pointed out that the Shared Colonial Heritage refers to the architecture, urban planning and infrastructure introduced overseas by European colonizers in the period from the late 15th century to the Second World War.\(^{49}\) The target of this committee was clear: “…it shall concentrate on the influence of the various

46. The Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (Wenhua zichan baocong fa (文化資產保存法) defines guji, historic buildings and villages as “the constructions and related infrastructures with historical and cultural significance, built by human beings for their living needs.” (Translated from The Cultural Heritage Preservation Law: No. 1, article 3, category 1; the original text is: “古蹟，歷史建築，聚落：指人為生活需要所營建之具有歷史，文化價值之建築物及附属設施。”)

47. 古蹟類，淡水紅毛城，隘鰲崎炮台(鯤鯓池城)、澎湖天后宮、台南孔子廟、鹿港迎恩寺、北鎮武廟、台南白河(安平古堡鹿鳴)、基隆二沙灣炮台(澳門天險)、五妃廟、金廈橋公園、彰化孔子廟、玉經樓、台北府城北門、鳳山縣舊城、大天后宮、邱良勳李於李坊 (Li Qian-lang 1988).


50. It only focused on the colonies established by European nations, and, in the early decades of the 20th century, the United States. The report summarized the major threats to the European colonial remains overseas as: the emerging nationalism and identity-building of newly established nations; war damage; the departure of colonial regimes; economic pressures; urban issues; development programmes, etc. Mainly considering the holistic physical conservation of European colonial heritage, the committee seemed to regard the ‘partner’ nations, those newly established postcolonial countries in which the material remains are located, as the origin of potential threats to ‘European’ heritage. The question of how the heritage could be shared was scarcely mentioned.

This perspective seems to have been modified in the later organization and public occasions of the ICOMOS. In 2003 its original title of Shared Colonial Architecture and Town Planning, set up in 1998, was changed to the International Scientific Committee on Shared Built Heritage (SBH). Currently chaired by the Netherlands, the SBH aims to “support public and private bodies engaged with preservation, management and research of (mutual) heritage. It would like to promote the integration of heritage into the social and economic fabric and processes of communities.”

Rather than focusing on the physical intactness of European remains, the participation of the partner countries is now accentuated. This coincides with developments in indigenous and postcolonial discourses in the Western arena.

However belated, the above changes in the ICOMOS agenda are a reflection of how critiques of heritage practices regarding the remains of colonized people have inspired an increasing Western attention to inclusive and participative heritage practices. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, indigenous political movements gained wide public attention in the White settler countries, mainly the United States and Australia (Smith 2004, 4-6). Along with the increasing popularity of ‘heritage’, the institutionalization of archaeology, and the democratic and liberal atmosphere of Western governments, the indigenous movements not only stimulated public concern about indigenous rights but further fertilised the awareness of community participation within Western heritage practices and academy. This was also reflected in Western-based international heritage activities. At the World Archaeological Congress in Southampton in 1989, for instance (Fieneig et al. 2008, 34), Western-centred heritage management and archaeological practices were criticised and developed into a wider concern about including cultural, regional and ethnic diversity. Extended from the issue of indigenous heritage, the awareness of cultural diversity and heritage claims from once-peripheries—for instance the ethnic minorities and newly independent nations—facilitated the theoretical, practical and policy revisions of heritage practices (Skeates 2000; Smith 2006).

2.1.3 Making postcolonial places

…President Chen Shui-bian addressed the significance of renaming the ‘Chiang, Kai-shek Memorial Hall’ to ‘Taiwan Democratic Memorial Hall’. He mentioned that ‘this event represents the actual practice of freeing the space, thoughts and spirit controlled under the previous authoritarian rule’.

…the destruction of Japanese colonial heritage such as the Joseon Government-General building
“Heritage,” writes Laurajane Smith,

is about a sense of place . . . While heritage is representational or symbolic both in its physicality and in the intangible acts of doing or performing heritage, it is also a process and a performance where the values and meanings that are represented are negotiated and worked out” (2006, 74,77).

The ‘concreteness’ of materiality is a crucial component of heritage, as the immobile built environment is the most prominent means of stabilising and imprinting the desired past into the locale. The spatial physicality is not only a negative container, but acts as an influential ‘actor’—interacting with the individuals, communities and interest groups resulting in the interwoven bodily experiences and ‘sense of place’. In research on the colonial heritage of the former Belgian Congo, Johan Lagae asserts that since colonization is a form of appropriating a territory, it is always operating with a “physical impact” such as erecting monuments and constructing buildings. These acts of spatial construction serve to stress one’s presence in a colonized space, and the act of ‘making a presence’ in a colonial context is inseparable from the play of power and issues of culture and identity. In Lagae’s words, “[m]onumentality is a characteristic almost intrinsically inherent to colonial architecture and urbanism, as these are instruments to articulate the power relations between ‘colonizers’ and ‘colonized’” (Lagae 2004, 173-4). ‘Place making’, therefore, is largely used by colonizers to “produce self-legitimating narratives but also […] to disinherit locals and local memory” (Butler 2007, 38). Japanese construction of the Government-General buildings in Seoul and Taipei were good examples of this materialisation within the colonial context. The project of the Government-General buildings not only altered the spatial fabric and local landscape, but also imposed a power hierarchy through the material presence of the buildings and city planning, and through the removal of local spatial context.

As Lagae notes, ‘monumentality’ was the reason for colonizers to conserve and select sites of ‘heritage’. And since traditional African buildings were mostly constructed from earth, ‘monumentality’ became the excuse for exclusion. This also represents the colonial hierarchy recreated by the colonizer for displaying the superiority of the colonizer’s ‘civilisation’, and thus the presumed inferiority of the colonized culture. This hierarchical structure of colonialism was parallel to the ideological development of guji in postwar Taiwan. Under the rule of the KMT, ‘anti-utility’ was the major criterion for nominating a site for conservation. Compared to the ancient civilization of the colonizers’ ‘inner land’ (內地; lit. the mainland or homeland), most sites in Taiwan were considered too young to be valuable for conservation. As Taylor has suggested, before the ‘indigenization’ (本地化) movements were fostered in the 1990s, the criteria of age had not been challenged by prominent claims for conserving the local heritage.

Since heritage is often used by the colonizer to create “signatures of the visible” (Appadurai 2008, 215), it is inevitable that postcolonial communities feel strong hostility towards these material symbols of colonial rule. Lim Jong Hyun discusses the fierce debate between the government and diverse social groups in dealing with the Japanese colonial buildings in the Republic of Korea. As a result, the Joseon Government-General building was eventually dismantled under a strong nationalist claim of “the policy of ‘correction of Korea’s history’ by removing colonial heritage” (Lim Jong Hyun 2007, 183). Many of the post-Soviet nations are undergoing transformation and reconstruction of national identity, represented by their policies on coping with Soviet monuments and memorials (Forest and Johnson 2002). During the 2000s the intense debates on the
former Chiang Kai-shek statues and monuments were highlighted by the public media in Taiwan.\(^{57}\)

However, in contrast to the hostility directed towards KMT monuments, the government and public discourses of Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s showed rather a favourable attitude towards Japanese colonial remains. Since the 1990s, a prominent number of Japanese religious and industrial sites, and colonial architecture, have been designated as municipal or national ‘heritage’, and promoted as local tourist attractions. What are we to make of this?

2.1.4 Japanese ‘heritage’ in Taiwan

The buildings constructed by Japanese during the Japanese occupation could not be regarded as \textit{guji}; only those representing the resistances of our people to Japanese rule (could be regarded as \textit{guji}) (Lin Heng-dao 1974).

“We only watch Japanese channels and the NHK news” (Interview of Mr. and Mrs. Qiu in 2009).

During our interview in 2009, Mr. and Mrs. Qiu, the former principal of Tongxiao Primary School and his wife, recalled their attendance in the ceremonies of the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine during the Japanese colonial period. “Only students who performed well in the school were able to join”, they mentioned with pride. Mrs. Li was one of the female dancers wearing Japanese traditional dress and dancing in slow and elegant motions in front of the shrine. Mr. Qiu was one of the trumpet players. We were talking in Mr. and Mrs. Qiu’s living room while the television was broadcasting Japanese programmes, and they told me “we only watch Japanese channels and the NHK news”.

On the streets of Taiwan, you may be surprised to see Japanese words printed on Taiwan-made products, restaurants and business logos. On television you can watch Japanese channels around the clock, and when enquiring about a Taiwanese person’s holiday plans, you may well hear about a trip to Japan. According to data collected by the Interchange Association (Japan) (IAJ) (日本交流協會), Japan remains the most favourable and familiar country for people in Taiwan.\(^{58}\) However, Japanese-built remains were not included in the heritage list until 1991. Over one decade since then, the number of Japanese sites listed as \textit{guji} (historic monuments) and historic buildings rose rapidly from 2 to 845. Taylor (2005) suggests that the changing criteria of historical preservation are in accordance with the growing popularity of Taiwanese history in the 1990s, and that they show a pro-colonial tone in interpreting the Japanese past. This can also be found in daily conversations in Taiwan, in which the Japanese colonial infrastructure is often referred to as being the foundation of Taiwan’s modernisation. To the locals of Taiwan, the sites of the Japanese past are often the place of local memory, and have even become the sites of local pride and identity.

Taiwanese ‘Japan Syndrome’\(^{59}\)

The ‘Japan Syndrom’ issue of \textit{Reflection Quarterly (當代)} discusses this trend towards fond remembrance of the Japanese. This special issue was published in January 2010, after the success of the hit film \textit{Cape No.7 (海角七號)}. The film revolves around a set of Japanese love letters, written by a Japanese teacher who was forced to leave Taiwan at the end of the Second World War. Sixty years later in Hengchun恆春, an economically depressed town in South Taiwan, the male protagonist, a postman who used to be a rock musician in Taipei, joins the town’s musical self-promotion project. He meets the Japanese female manager of the band and through the sixty-year-old love letters coincidently retrieved by the postman they gradually overcome their individual life struggles in searching for the intended recei-

---

57. For example the debate on renaming the Chiang Kai-shek Memorial Hall, and on the removal of statues of Chiang Kai-shek represented the fierce postcolonial conflicts surrounding the rewriting of urban texture and the remaking of political place in Taiwanese society.

58. Research report by the Interchange Association (Japan) (IAJ) (日本交流協會)

59. The phrase ‘Taiwanese Japan Syndrome’ is a translation of Taiwan de riben zhenghouqun (台灣的日本症候群), proposed by the sociologist Wang Horng-luen 汪宏倫 for the theme of a special edition of the journal Reflection Quarterly (當代) in January 2010.
ver of these letters. The scenes reflect the real situation in many places in Taiwan: the young generation leave home to look for better life in urban areas, especially Taipei, and developing the local tourist industry seems the only hope to improve the local economy, even though large enterprises monopolise the local tourist industry through BOT projects. In this film, many Taiwanese slang words, Japanese and Mandarin words are used, reflecting the linguistic mixture of many Taiwan locals. Ethnic multiplicity is shown by the appearance of indigenous actors among the major figures. If this film presents the period of Taiwan’s localism, it also reflects scenes of ‘Taiwaneseness’. It is noteworthy that ‘Japaneseness’ is an important element to grassroots ‘Taiwaneseness’.

The great success of Cape No.7 in box offices in Taiwan and Hong Kong raised fierce debates about the Japanese association of this film, and attracted particularly strong responses from internet users from China. A famous blogger called the film “a great poisonous grass” (大毒草), spreading colonial ideology.60 Similar controversies had occurred in the past in Taiwan, such as debates on destroying and renaming the Taoyuan Shinto Shrine,61 and criticism of Japanophiles (ha ri zu哈日族). It is undeniable that a ‘Japan complex’ exists in Taiwanese society, although this differs between individuals and communities. The special issue of Reflection Quarterly

examines this seemingly ‘pro-colonial’ phenomenon from diverse angles.

Investigations into the issue of pro-colonial attitudes usually start from the concept of ethnic differences, particularly the difference between the mainlanders’62 and Taiwanese groups.63 It is commonly believed that the Taiwanese group shows a more favourable attitude for Japan because of their collective memory of Japanese colonial experiences. In contrast, the mainland group shows hatred, resulting from their resistance to the Japanese invasion during the Sino-Japanese War. In a newspaper article, the scholar Que Hai-yuan64 clarified the difference in understanding of the Eight-year War against Japan (八 年抗戰; the Second Sino-Japanese War) between the two groups: a larger percentage of the mainland group showed recognition of the importance of the war. The percentage increased with age. Huang Zhi-hui (2010) expands the discussions on the Taiwanese attitude toward Japan to include major ethnic groups, for instance the indigenous and Hakka groups. Despite distinguishing between different group attitudes toward Japan based on ethnic categorisation, Huang recognises the problems in assessing the attitudes of Taiwanese to Japan by only considering ethnic background. She notes the necessity of elaborating on layers of historical experience and including factors of generational, social status and vocational differences. This is important when we compare the diversities that Huang has noted to the results of the field studies of this thesis. For instance, memory recollection in Tongxiao shows the diversified memories connected to the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine, and this diversity is associated with different social frameworks, particularly generation, gender, vocation and historical experiences (See Section 4.1).

61. In 1985, the event surrounding the Taoyuan Shinto Shrine (桃源神社) for the first time drew public attention to the issue of Japanese colonial architecture. As a rare Shinto shrine remaining intact in postwar Taiwan, Taoyuan Shinto Shrine was planned to be renovated entirely into a new building functioning as a martyrs’ shrine of the ROC. Li Zheng-long 李正隆, who won the competition to determine the architect, decided to preserve the original architectural fabric instead. This announcement drew great attention from public and press, and evoked fierce debates (Ye Nai-qi 1989, 104-9). The shrine was eventually conserved in its original form yet was designated as a “historic monument” (guji 古蹟) only after 1994. The conflicting attitudes toward Japanese sites had not changed even a decade later; the Taoyuan Shinto Shrine was designated as a historic monument as late as 1994, and the renaming of the building from the Taoyuan Martyrs’ Shrine to the Taoyuan Shinto Shrine still faced strong objection in 2007. See “Event of Preserving the Taoyuan Shinto Shrine” at the website of Encyclopaedia of Taiwan: http://210.69.67.10/web/index (accessed 2 November 2010)
62. Mainlanders refer to the group who immigrated from China to Taiwan with the KMT retreat in the 1940s and 50s.
63. The civil war of China in 1949 resulted in large-scale political immigration from China to Taiwan. These immigrants are known as ‘mainlanders’ (wai-sheng-ren外省人,) and count for around 13% of the population (according to Huang Xuan-fan, 1993, Language, Society and Ethnic Identity, Taipei: Crane Publishing Co.).


Japan, China and Taiwan

The pro-colonial attitude has to be considered alongside the triangular relationship between Taiwan, Japan and China. Japan and China here are not political entities such as the PRC (People’s Republic of China), but refer to the imaginary and conceptualised Japan and China. This imagination and conceptualisation frequently mixes with diplomatic and political entities, and accordingly adjusts the distances between self and other, thereby identifying the self. The comparison between the Japanese and KMT rule is perennially heard in daily conversation and at academic occasions. As one of many examples, a former employee of the sugar factory in Ciaotou 揚頭 described the differences between the management of the factory under Japanese and KMT rule in an oral account recorded by local cultural society in the late 1990s. He mentioned the abuse of personnel by, and lack of professionalism of, the KMT management. In comparison, he claimed that the Japanese managers were much more effective and professional (Kaohsiung County Government 1997, 88). This kind of description provides an example of what Ching (2001) has claimed: as a result of the lack of any decolonization process by the break-up of the Japanese Empire,

“[in] Taiwan, the sudden void left by the Japanese colonizer after ‘liberation’ was filled not by the Taiwanese but by the takeover army from mainland China. The graft and corruption of the mainlanders fostered in the Taiwanese a deep resentment against the Chinese, and they consequently reconstituted and reimagined their colonial relationship with Japan.” (Ching 2001, 20)

This sentiment has frequently been represented within modernisation discourses in the form of comparison. Within the comparison, images of the KMT army, the imagined KMT China and the political PRC have been mixed and formed a negative image of China, strengthened by economic competition and diplomatic conflict between Taiwan and the PRC. This image stands in contrast to that of the ‘modernised’ and ‘advanced’ Japan, generated from the mixture of colonial modernity and Taiwan’s self-identity in the global arena. This imagination process is inseparable from identity consciousness in Taiwan.

According to data analysis by Chuang Jing-Yi and Li Mei-Chih (2003), the factor of ‘Taiwan consciousness’ is more effective than “ethnic division” in explaining pro-Japan interpretations. The results of this research show that the interviewee who identifies her/himself as ‘Taiwanese’ rather than ‘Taiwanese and Chinese’ showed a greater pro-Japan attitude, by valuing Japan more positively than China, feeling less close to China and interpreting Japanese negative historical behaviours in a more positive way (Chuang and Li 2003, 119-120). It suggests that “distancing from China and being close to Japan are two sides of identifying Taiwan” (背離中國與親近日本是認同台灣的一體兩面反映) (Chuang and Li 2003, 113). In the 1990s, the national narrative of Taiwan was in transition from being China-centred to Taiwan-centred. Japanese cultural associations concomitantly became a component of ‘Taiwanese-ness’, constructing a unique culture of Taiwan and stressing the differences between Taiwan and China. Wang Horng-luen (2004) states that in order to shape a unique ‘Taiwanese culture’, a new model of multiculturalism replaced Chinese nationalism, proclaiming a Taiwanese national identity under the governance of the Democratic Progressive Party (Minzhu jinbu dang 民主進步黨 DPP). He proposes that “[u]nder the new mosaic model of multiculturalism, aboriginal cultures, along with the once disgraced imprints of Japanese colonialism - both of which were repressed and destroyed under the KMT’s project of Chinese culture - are now preserved and promoted to a ‘national’ status to represent Taiwanese culture.” (2004, 806) In this regard, the Japanese remains are valued as ‘heritage’ which represents a component of Taiwanese identity. Furthermore, this is interwoven with regional and local identities that construct regional heritage. The past is represented, intensified and even reshaped by contemporary museums and through the interpretation of heritage.

---

65. The definition of “ethnic division” is derived from Chen, Chuang and Huang (1994, 5).
2.2 PLACE AND LOCALITY: CULTURAL HERITAGE AND COMMUNITY BUILDING

The 1990s signified the beginning of Taiwan’s “era of localism.”66 Local places in Taiwan, as well as the idea of Taiwan as a place, were to gain unprecedented status in both political narratives and social practice. “Place” in Taiwan has been imbued over time with social attachments by a variety of agents, each with their own motives. President Lee Deng-hui 李登輝 bound the place of Taiwan to the narrative of “living community”67 in 1993, in order to legitimate the nation-state, local governments held festivals spotlighting products or attractions with local distinctiveness, local groups participated in the recollection of local memories, and architectural and planning professionals worked on the conservation of historical buildings. These acts, as well as place-based social and environmental movements, gradually converged into the state-led Integrated Community-Making Programme (shequ zongti yingzao 社區總體營造), which was officially inaugurated in 1994. Amid the prevailing place-centered phenomena, the past of a place was frequently perceived as representing a utopia which was rapidly fading or had been already lost as the result of development. People in both the public and private sectors in Taiwan believed that the reconstruction of the present based on an ideal image of the past, would contribute to a better future. In this regard, “sites of memory” (lieux de mémoire) (Nora 1989, 7) quickly spread in conjunction with the aforementioned place politics. Local museums and heritage sites in Taiwan rapidly increased in number from the 1990s. Not only do they serve as what we might call ‘memory tactics’ (De Jong and Rowlands 2007) in determining the distinctiveness of a place—in other words, strategically rebuilding the sense and identity of a place according to present needs—but are also expected to mediate the construction of a better future in terms of locality production.

As Chen Qi-nan and Sun Hua-xiang (2000, 4-12, 4-13) note, the strategy of place-making, in other words, “developing the cultural distinctiveness of local places”, directed cultural policy in the post-Martial Law era, and this was closely related to the prevailing discourse on globalization in the 1990s. Globalization has been appropriated to serve the context of Taiwan, and the term seems to appear everywhere, from government announcements to scholarly discussions and public discourse. The political stress on globalization has been interwoven with an attempt to define the position of Taiwan in the global arena as a place bounded by the identity of a living community, particularly regarding diplomatic and economic competition. If, within the global arena, the criterion for being classified as an advanced country is how ‘local’ or ‘unique’ it is, then it is necessary to build a recognizable and irreplaceable local culture. ‘Globalization’ has been taken up as a strategic discourse in order to mediate a variety of diverse motives. Within the context of localism in Taiwan, the ‘globalization’ discourse justifies the imperative for Taiwan to pursue its policy of ‘Taiwaneseness’ and also the uniqueness of Taiwan’s places. Hence, the images of ‘global’ and ‘international’ are closely tied to Taiwan’s discourse linked to the local. This implies a developmentist mentality in Taiwan’s place-making movement. The pursuit of cultural distinctiveness simultaneously means economic benefit and a national profile as an advanced, modern country.

66. A “new era of localism” (defang shidai 地方時代) was anticipated by Chen Qi-nan 陳其南 in 1997. The phrase comes from a Japanese counterpart phrase (Lu 2002, 24).
67. Shengming gongtongti 生命共同體.
CHAPTER TWO: JAPANESE ‘HERITAGE’ IN POSTCOLONIAL TAIWAN

The perception of the global is inseparable from the image of modernity. Su Zhao-ying (2001, 54-55) identifies a modernist character in the state’s policy of classifying and institutionalizing cultural affairs. This tendency reached its zenith in the late 1980s, as revealed in the proposal of the Great Cultural Nation (wenhua daguo 文化大國) by the CCA (the Council for Cultural Affairs; Wenhua jianshe weiyuanhui; 文化建設委員會). The proposal itself referred to Japan’s Great Life-style Nation Five-Year Project (生活大國五年計畫). The influence of Japan, as well as that of modern Euro-American countries, is essential to the development of Taiwan’s cultural policies, based as they are on the image of modernity. Su suggests that this modernism underwent a fundamental change when the community-building programme (the Integrated Community-Making Programme) was initiated. However, a central argument of this study is that this image of modernity has been and was initiated. However, a central argument of this study is that this image of modernity has been and remains projected onto community-building. This is not only indicated by the rhetorical use of terms such as ‘advanced countries’ in the pronouncements of leading figures,69 but also by importing community-building models from these ‘developed’ countries, especially the Japanese place-making model of machizukuri (street/neighbourhood-making).

The physicality of memory and place in the form of heritage is embedded with diverse social attachments; it triggers emotional connections between individuals and places, as observed in many community-building projects. This section examines the substantial components of locality in the context of Taiwan’s community building initiatives. Locality seeks to project the multi-faceted image of a collective future. Its essence has changed over time, as a result of the collision of various actors. Three separate frameworks are identified in this research: globalisation, machizukuri and community-building. Together, the three comprise the significance of locality in Taiwan. The section concludes with a number of case studies, which examine the social practice of place-making through the development of controversial sites of memory. It attempts to reveal the dialectical relationship between state propaganda and the local practice of community-building, and the dilemma generated from the uses and abuses of global/local discourse.

The data in this section mainly stem from two types of sources. One is government policy papers, news reports, articles, speeches and publications about and by leading figures. The other type is field studies, including interviews (Ciaotou and Jinguashi) and participant observation (Jinguashi), conducted by the author from 2002 to 2011. Regarding the analysis of the community-building movement, this section investigates the essence of the “authorized discourse” (Smith 2006, 11), namely, the discourse produced by major figures and government bodies within the context of Taiwan. This section begins the analysis of the discourse of policy makers and leading figures concerning the organic nature of the community-making movement. This authorized discourse has been in transition and has often interacted with, or been challenged by, a diverse variety of local practices, grassroots concerns, social networks and public conceptualization. The case studies in this section reveal the actual responses and products generated from these interactions in Taiwan.

2.2.1 Colonial Heritage as Sites of Memory

Monumentalization has been in vogue in the Euro-American countries. Along with the more material perspective of monumentalization, memory studies has become a rapidly growing area of scholarly as well as public interest. Since the 1980s, research into the workings of memory have been widely developed. The phenomenon is closely related to the post-modern focus on nostalgia in relation to ‘origin, rootedness, and belonging’ (Butler 2006; Lowenthal 1985). It is entangled with issues of national identity. This European-derived consciousness and strategy aimed at linking the past and identity were also co-constructed by governments of newly established nations, many of which had been freed from colonial status. This approach was adopted as a means of consolidating their national identity or legitimizing the government through an account of a collective past and future. In Taiwan, a memory boom emerged in the 1990s: the number of museums and heritage sites increased remarkably in tandem with the transforma-

tion of identity narratives. The memory boom was also related to changes in the eco-political structure, when Taiwan moved away from labour intensive industries and a demand for leisure emerged.

Prominent memory studies have responded to an emerging public culture and multicultural awareness. Many social groups have fought for their right to select and represent their own past. This is a claim for participation in cultural politics and the democratic process. In Taiwan, the challenge to the dominant narrative of identity was represented by a variety of heritage sites and the trend of memory recollection. Sites of Spanish, Dutch and Japanese remains, as well as indigenous and Hakka locations, have been increasingly nominated for conservation, in contrast to previous, Chinese-centered heritage policies. This trend was also exemplified by the increasing number of ‘local cultural and historical workers’ (zaidi wenshi gongzuozhe 在地文史工作者) who appeared in the late 1980s (Lü 2002, 16-18), the Nativist Literature Movement, and emerging concerns regarding the conservation of architecture after rapid industrialization and urbanization (Ye Nai-qi 1989).

The ‘memory boom’ mentioned earlier is closely related to the new pursuit of locality which developed after the political changes of 1987.71 During the colonial and authoritarian eras, the sense of place and memory in relation to Taiwan was intentionally erased by the ruling powers. In the 1990s, however, this sense of place and memory was accentuated and served different eco-political purposes. A new policy initiative was promoted by the central government, namely the Integrated Community-Making Programme (shequ zongti yingzao 社區總體營造).72 This programme was concerned with the development of a vision of the future, mediated by heritage-making and other projects such as the reinstating of traditional crafts and ecological preservation, emphasizing local uniqueness for the purpose of tourism.

Like many other movements concerned with local, grassroots strength, the historic preservation movement in Taiwan existed prior to the community-building movement. Within the community-building movement, preservation was a subset of different goals and interests. Yet it can also be argued that the heritage-making project was often the link between these diverse interests, and a core element in strategically unifying diverse objectives. This is visible, for example, in a project aimed at conserving a particular historic area in Jinguashi. This project included urban development, landscape reformation, tourism development, industrial transformation and cultural development. These programmes were financially supported by community-building projects of different state departments. The fact that the heritage-making project can serve as a motivating and unifying core for the community-building programme can be seen in grassroots examples in many local regions, for instance the case of Ciaotou 橋頭 Sugar Factory which will be investigated in a later section of this thesis. Endowed with local memory and emotional attachments, the sites of the past appear in the era of localization as the starting point for the re-creation of the future of local communities.

Heritage-making has been ambiguously applied at colonial sites, which were originally created by the colonizer as a spatial instrument subordinating the local sense of place to the imagination of a far away “home country.” It is often noted that the colonial sites either become void of memory, function and meaning or a contested field of memories and interpretations, depending on the continuation of memory activities. Natural attachment to a place – as required by community-building movements – disconnects when the original cultural context is altered to correspond to postcolonial eco-political structures. It is hence necessary to explore memories and connections attached to the sites during the process of building the sites of memory. Colonial heritage often triggers contested interpretations, but it also generates new possibilities for engaging multiple voices and

70. The term ‘local cultural and historical workers’ (zaidi wenshi gongzuozhe 在地文史工作者) refers to local individuals or groups, mostly amateurs, who dedicate themselves to collecting, recording and researching local culture and history based on a strong sense of love of hometown. Many of these local workers have been participating in editing teaching materials on local history for local schools, and in arranging guided tours for cultural tourists during the rise of Taiwan’s indiginition and domestic tourism.

71. Specifically, the lifting of Martial Law in 1987.

72. The translation is according to Lü Hsin-Yi (2002), The Politics of Locality: Making a Nation of Communities in Taiwan, 10.
cultivating the potential strength of place as a social agent. The discordant nature of memories attached to colonial sites indicates a potential space for exploring previously marginalized voices, engaging communities in building new social proximities to the place, and assisting in the development of a collective version of locality by cultivating local autonomies.

2.2.2 Locality in the Context of Taiwan

2.2.2.1. Locality in Connection to Machizukuri

The Japanese model of machizukuri has had a great influence on Taiwan’s community-building. The aims, features and practices of machizukuri have been reviewed in section 1.2.2 in the previous chapter.

It is worth mentioning that Neighbourhood Associations73 have played a proactive role in the development of machizukuri in Japan, although this differs case by case and has changed over time. They have received attention from some researchers for being “an essential part of Japanese civil society” (Hashimoto 2007, 224). Taiwan’s community-building units of shequ 社区 (community, neighborhood) are substantially different from Japan’s Neighbourhood Associations, and these shequ imply the structural difficulties of putting the Japanese community-building model in place in Taiwan. Appropriation and alterations are inevitable in the process of reinterpretting machizukuri in Taiwan.

The positive public perception of Japan’s machizukuri is mainly thanks to Professor Miyazaki Kiyoshi 宮崎清 and the area of Furukawa-chō 古川町 in Japan. Miyazaki and Furukawa-chō cannot in themselves represent all the diverse examples of machizukuri, and may not provide a complete understanding of machizukuri. They are, however, the most widely quoted names when reflecting on machizukuri in Taiwan.

Miyazaki Kiyoshi 宮崎清

Miyazaki has been invited to Taiwan regularly since 1991 by the Taiwan Provincial Handicraft Institute (台灣省工藝研究所). His visits were initially expected to bring to Taiwan information about the Japanese experience in relation to the revitalization of population-reduced areas. It was believed that the insights gained could help to address Taiwan’s economic problems, associated with the aftermath of industrial transformation. Since then, he has been invited to join numerous community-building events, from coordinating government projects, to giving public lectures and taking part in numerous community-building promotion events. His concepts and approaches were regarded as being compatible with a community-building project proposed in 1994, and so the Handicraft Institute and the CCA (Council for Cultural Affairs) agreed upon a convergence of government resources (Weng and Miyazaki 1996, 169). As Su (2001) recalls, the community-building projects of the CCA were greatly influenced by Miyazaki. In 1997 the First Community-Building Exposition was held and a “Miyazaki Pavillion” displayed Japanese examples of community building.74 Miyazaki showed particular concern with “conserving and appreciating the living aesthetics and traditional values, not on the issues of reconstructing the spaces and civil society” (Su 2001, 137). The different focuses of community-building imply a divergence in the practice and targets of community-building. Miyazaki’s version of locality was perceived and reinterpreted by many government, scholarly, and activist figures surrounding the community-building programme.

73. Neighbourhood Associations (NA) are widely distributed organizations joined by residents of regions in Japan. The basic unit of the NA is a household. Participation in a NA can be autonomous or compulsory, regulated by the policies of the municipality. The assembly of an association is responsible for arranging activities for improving the living environment and quality of life of residents, and may also be in charge of communicating between the local government and residents etc. Please refer to Shizuka Hashimoto 2007, 224–246.

The utopian image of locality as expressed by Miyazaki is best represented in the form of a series of questions: “Can you still see the clear starry sky at night? Are you able to enjoy safe and healthy food? Is garbage not strewn everywhere? Can your children play safely? Do family members get together often? Are you an important figure participating in the community festivals and rituals? Do you appreciate the objects in use? Do you create something with your own hands?”

The scenes implied by these questions certainly existed in the past, yet have been lost in the process of urbanization. Miyazaki’s ideal images of a shequ comprise respect for nature, proximity of family, the legacy and creativity of traditional crafts, valuing hand-made objects, continuity of history and culture, and a safe and clean living environment. These ideals should be autonomously motivated and practiced in cooperation with the government and other stakeholders. Two of the most quoted elements of Miyazaki’s concept are, first, the creative transformation of traditional crafts, and second, the five aspects of local resources: “person, culture, production, nature, landscape” (人, 文, 産, 地, 景). The first element was particularly reinterpreted in connection to the production of cultural products, while the second element was widely used and expanded with diverse interpretations in numerous dissertations and reports. In light of the approach of Miyazaki, ‘area revitalization’ (quyu huohua 区域活化) has been the major objective of many community-building projects in Taiwan. Economic improvement through cultural products and tourism are often expected by community-building participants, despite the fact that Miyazaki himself clearly states that the economic benefits should not serve as a major driving force or represent the expected result of community building.

Many primary school students in Taiwan learn the story of Furukawa-cho from texts like these in their Guoyu 国语 (Mandarin) textbooks. Furukawa-chō is a small, mountainous town in Gifu Prefecture, Japan. The image of this Japanese town was first introduced to Taiwan in 1994, the initial year of community-building. Constant contact and educational visits have been arranged since then. Yet the story of Furukawa-chō only later became widely known due to a TV programme, “The Vision of A City” (城市的遠見), produced by the Public Television Service (PTS) in 2001. This visual material has become a popular educational aid for many lecturers, promoters and community workers.

Furukawa-chō is associated with the image of thousands of swimming carp. The river in which the carp live was polluted in the 1960s, and later cleaned by the collective efforts of the locals, a scene which impressed Taiwanese audiences. This autonomous maintenance of a clean and comfortable living environment is perceived in Taiwan as the essence of Furukawa-chō. The landscape and architectural fabric, as well as the traditional crafts and festivals of the town are preserved autonomously within the community. As described by a member of a community-building organization: “Furukawa-chō is nearly the ideal of community workers in Taiwan.”

The Legend of Furukawa-cho 古川町

“If you walk in the town of Furukawa-cho, you can see the traditional temples, well-plant flowers, the clear stream, and swimming carp. It is as beautiful as a wonderland.[…]

Walking in Furukawa, you can sense its history and culture; walking in Furukawa, you realize the importance of the quality of life; walking in Furukawa, you will want to make your shequ better and beautiful.”


77. Hanlin Edition 翰林 教科 (2010) Guoyu 国语 (Mandarin) Year 7 (Grade 4, the firstsemester), Section 13.


80. The E-Paper of the Charming New Hometown No. 73: the
2.2.2. Changing Locality within the Shequ Movements

The term *shequ* was initially used to gain financial support from the United Nations (UN). The beginning of national policies concerning shequ development was roughly in accordance with the policies of the United Nations in the 1950s, in particular Social Progress through Community Development (published in 1955). Subsidized by the United Nations, the postwar KMT government invested in public infrastructure, improving the standard of living in Taiwan and reducing poverty. Shequ, which was translated from the English word ‘community’, implies that the will of the state is applied to every geographical and administrative unit of local neighborhoods. It not only reflects the manipulation of state power over the local (Huang Li-ling 1995), but also represents what Lü observes: “the term shequ in this period triggered the imagination and expectation of a developing country toward modernization.”

This rhetorical shequ was grafted onto an apparently contrasting value context in the 1990s. During this period, the significance of community was redefined in the term shequ. President Lee Deng-huí’s promulgation of the concept of a “living community” (*sheng ti*) in 1993 provided an ideal political environment for the development of the policy of the Integrated Community-Making Programme proposed by the Council for Cultural Affairs (CCA in short) in 1994. Since the 1990s, shequ has been expected to achieve a multi-faceted development of the production of locality.

The title of the state-oriented community-building movement includes the term ‘integrated’ (*zhe ti*). It suggests that community-building projects incorporate multiple perceptions and interpretations, based on different geographical and industrial conditions of regions, and operate within a complicated network of public and private sectors. Because of the requirement of ‘integratedness’, the organic and holistic nature of shequ is difficult to clarify. In tandem with the rapid increase in the participation of scholars, local groups and grassroots organizations in community-building, the actual interpretations and practices of this conceptually compounded phrase have inevitably become diverse in nature. This section investigates the essence represented by the “authorized discourse,”

Alongside the aforementioned influence of the Japanese machizukuri model, the development of the concept of community-building in Taiwan owes much to Chen Qi-nan 陈其南, who was the deputy minister of the CCA during the proposal period of the community-building programme (1993–97) and minister of the CCA from 2004 to 2006. His notion of shequ and locality has endured, despite changes in the interactions between the diverse ranges of ecopolitical actors.

The idea of ‘citizenship’ has always been central to Chen’s concerns. In his widely distributed article, “The Meaning of Integrated Community-Making,” he argues that citizenship is critical in solving the contemporary social problems in Taiwan. Building up citizenship is urged in places with poor spatial aesthetics and quality of life, and an absence of community awareness. Chen states that “the substance of community-building is to make citizens (zaoren 造人)” and that citizenship “aims to raise the will and awareness of participating in public affairs; and to raise the aesthetic level of the living environment.”

The aesthetic quality of space and culture is particularly

---

84. This article has been published or quoted in many places, for instance: Magazine *Shuishalian* (水沙連), Quarterly Journal of *Yangshan Cultural and Educational Foundation* (仰山文教基金會季刊), and *The Communities in Taiwan* (台湾的社羣) etc.
85. Chen Qi-nan, “Developing the great Taiwan through small communities—the meaning of integrated community-making”
larly stressed. As subsequent minister of the CCA, he proposed the concept of “cultural citizenship”. Cultural citizenship embodies Chen’s vision of community-building: a utopian image of society lies in every living culture with beauty, and this signifies that civilization has been achieved by the efforts and autonomy of local communities.

An equally important article co-authored by Chen in 1998, “Retrospection on the Community-Building Movements in Taiwan,” (Chen Qi-nan and Chen Rui-hua 1998, 21-37) showed perspectives of locality other than Chen’s own vision of cultural citizenship. Alongside concerns about spatial quality and public taste, the concept also included cultivation of citizen awareness, equality in distributing public resources and the establishment of community learning systems. The locality reflected by this vision shows a genealogical link to former grassroots movements, and presents concerns in relation to social welfare and equality. However, this aspect of locality has been less emphasized within discourses addressed by Chen Qi-nan and state policy implementation.

During the time of Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) governance between 2000 and 2008, the Integrated Community-Making Programme was strengthened through national-scale projects such as the New Hometown Community-Making Programme (xinguxiang shequ yingzao jihua 新故鄉社區營造計畫) announced in 2002 and the Healthy Communities Six-Star Programme (Jiankang shequ liuxing jihua 健康社區六星計畫) in 2005. The second stage of the New Hometown Community-Making Programme and the Project of Local Museums remained in the CCA annual plan for 2009, although with less prominence. 86 Instead, developing ‘cultural industries’, in other words, enhancing economic value through cultural products has gradually become core of state cultural policy. Notions and projects surrounding cultural industries and economic profits from cultural products emerged and were stressed by the state cultural department regardless of the ruling party. This economic drive grew stronger after the Taiwan-centred DPP party lost the presidential election in 2008. Still, community-building programmes allowed grassroots initiatives and all sort of social movements to develop, supported by civil ideology and government subsidies, through a state narrative stressing love for the earth and the community of Taiwan. Thus, the economic drive, which always exists in the mind the ROC cultural bureaucrats in the form of taking cultural heritage as ‘assets’ as mentioned in previous sections of this thesis, were able to be balanced to some degree by civil claims on social, environmental and ecological welfare. The following section shows the economic considerations underneath the community-building programme, and points out the growing impact of economic motivation as ideals of community-building lost support from the state government. Moreover, a discussion on this economic drive offers insights in the complexities of making Japanese sites into local heritage within the community-building framework. Lacking direct memory linkage to local communities, Japanese colonial sites are easier than other sites to be directed by a drive to commoditize within a space devoid of memory and rootedness.

2.2.3 The Economic Drive in Community Building

During his speech at The Third National Culture Congress (第三屆全國文化會議) in 2002, Chen Qi-nan, a ‘minister without portfolio’ for the Executive Yuan (行政院政務委員), stated that the “economy should only be a means or tactic, not the target” (Chen Qi-nan 2002, 49). This speech was reminiscent of Miyazaki’s stance on the secondary role of economic rewards in the development of community-building. However, a redirection of targets in community-building crystallized in the White Paper on Culture, published in 2004 by the CCA. The slogan “culturalized industry, industrialized culture” (文化產業化, 產業文化化) was introduced early in 1995 when the state community-building programme had been underway for just a year. Since then, the concept of ‘culture as assets’ for economic profits and area regeneration has been addressed by the state and local governments regardless of political background. The 2004 White Paper on Cultural Affairs elaborated on “culturalized industry, industrialized culture”. It stated that “the concept of ‘cultural industries’ (wenhua chanye 文化產業) has become the
core of the Integrated Community-Making Programme” (Council for Cultural Affairs 2004, 194). This growing emphasis on the economic effects of community-building emerged in the Consultation Symposium of Community-Building Works, the Executive Yuan (行政院社區營造工作諮詢座談會), held by Chen only two weeks after his speech at the National Culture Congress. According to Luo Zhong-feng (2004), the participants stressed the need to develop the following issues in the face of the eco-political and cultural crises brought on by globalization: revitalizing areas, cultivating a new vision of local residents, and developing a new economic model. Luo points out the ideological discordance between the humanistic initiatives of community-building, and the substance of cultural industries. This discordance is also reflected in the case studies introduced in this section.

2.2.3.1. Case Studies: Ciaotou (Qiaotou) Sugar Factory 橋頭糖廠

Ciaotou started community building from the very beginning of the state’s ambitious promotion of the shequ programme. Since 1994, a series of cultural events, conservation activities and educational courses have been held by the Ciaotou Township Office 橋頭鄉公所. The Kio-A-Thou Culture Society (橋仔頭文史協會) was founded in 1996 and became the spearhead of community-building work, second only to the township office. The initiation of Ciaotou’s community-building programme was in reaction to the state project, New Town. This project was an urban development scheme aimed at solving the problem of overpopulation in city centers. Ciaotou, a suburb of Kaohsiung City, was included in the project.

The township office came to realize that this scheme might bring destruction to Ciaotou, since the plan aimed at development and showed interest in the real estate market, without proper concern for the historical fabric and cultural context of Ciaotou. Therefore, community-building projects were initiated. Activities such as workshops on the history and culture of Ciaotou, environmental education and research groups on the New Town project have been held since 1994. These activities were initiated by a group of Ciaotou inhabitants, who demonstrated their collective awareness and capacity to mobilize by creating the first state National Festival of Culture and Art 全國文藝季 in 1995. This festival was part of a series of state programmes which aimed to explore and present local distinctiveness and, most importantly, to show the state’s intentions to empower regional governments for the first time regarding cultural affairs. Ciaotou attracted one million visitors. This number of visits, on the one hand, persuaded the property owner, the state enterprise of the Taiwan Sugar Corporation, to transform the local sugar factory into a cultural park. On the other hand, the visits encouraged the gathering and training of Ciaotou’s community-building core members.

The Japanese colonial landscape of the local sugar factory has played an important role in catalyzing the sense of community in Ciaotou. Despite the fact that the experiences of the “white iron gate” and colonial exploitation still exist in the memory of residents, the sugar factory, which was founded by the colonial power and resulted in a change in Ciaotou’s industrial and social structure, is, in an ambiguous

88. Local residents call the gate blocking the office area of the sugar factory the “white iron gate.” The office area has been separated from the residents since the Japanese colonial period, and was detached from the local community by a ‘white iron gate’ under surveillance of security guards during the postwar period and remains so at the present time.

89. According to oral records, a number of local elders recalled how former generations were forced by the Japanese police to give up their ownership of the land to the Japanese sugar company. See Kaohsiung County Government 1997, 72–92.

90. In order to build up the sugar industry in Ciaotou, the Japanese sugar company, with police assistance, forced local people to give up their land and to adopt new forms of industry and labour, such as growing sugar canes or becoming hired labourers working for the sugar factory. The landscape of Ciaotou endured great change as well during the building of the sugar industry. The spatial division of Ciaotou since then was following colonial hierarchy—the factory and associated residential area belonged to higher class of Japanese managers and
way, also the core of local distinctiveness and pride.\footnote{Ciaotou is proudly known as the town of the first modern sugar industry in Taiwan.} The fear that the New Town project would destroy the sugar factory greatly aided the formation of Ciaotou's community awareness programme. The core community-building practitioners, organized during the community-building projects, became more and more involved in conservation protests and memory recollection activities. Their cooperation with the Cultural Bureau of Kaohsiung County, alongside pressure from the property owner of the factory, successfully resulted in the area of the sugar factory being designated a guji 古蹟 (Historic Monument). The Sugar Corporation changed its development plan for the sugar factory site during the popular National Festival of Culture and Art and there is now a museum of sugar industry since 2006 and a commitment to the development of a “Cultural Park,” focusing on the sugar industry.

After a decade of community-building, however, the sense of community has not resulted in a collective vision of the future. This discordance surfaced with the construction of a metro line in Ciaotou. In 2000, the Kio-A-Thou Culture Society initiated a series of resistance activities against the new metro, taking particular issue with the fact that the construction work would destroy parts of the sugar factory. At that time, the stance of the Culture Society was not supported by other opinion leaders or the township office. Lin Jing-yao 林敬堯, initiator of Ciaotou's community-building project, later contended that:

“The Factory cannot be conserved only in terms of its cultural heritage […] its conservation has to be an asset to regional development […] not merely in relation to the perspective of cultural value, [the conservation] should offer a leisure function and create job opportunities. Thus the conservation should be considered with regard to regional scale, not only be considered in terms of the details. If the large scale spatial elements, the ecological environment, the spatial culture, and the architectural fabric remain visible, we should conserve them; others can be compromised when new needs and values emerge” (interview by the author in 2008, italics added).

He expressed his disappointment with the Culture Society, pointing out that although the Society itself was renting and using an office in the sugar factory, it seemed to be neglecting the community issues of the entire town.

Japanese colonial modernity has been transferred to the locality of Ciaotou in the process of continuous memory activities within the factory area. The sugar factory has gradually become a site of memory for Ciaotou. However, this site of memory has failed to catalyze a communal vision of the future in the face of forces of modernization. In the early years of community-building, a multifaceted version of locality was envisioned. Lin articulates his targets of community-building work as: “making civil servants, making professionals and making citizens” (造官,造匠,造人) (Lin Jing-yao 1996); ensuring that community schools and workshops represent the wider concerns of citizens’ lives: holding courses aimed at “making citizens” on subjects such as capacity and leadership training, education and culture, landscape planning, financial management and the economy, ecology and the environment.\footnote{See Brochure of the First Community School, 1995.} This version of locality was later discontinued. A vision based on economic improvement seems to have come to dominate the image of a better future.

2.2.3.2 Case Studies: Jinguashi Mining Remains 金瓜石礦業遺址

The construction of museum and heritage sites is popular among municipalities in that they stimulate regional development and raise political profile. This was particularly salient in the era of localism. The plan for the Gold Ecological Park,\footnote{The Gold Ecological Park is a municipal museum built in the Jinguashi 金瓜石 area, Taipei County. The museum aims to preserve the industrial heritage and local memory of Jinguashi, and aid local development.} which opened to the public in 2004, was among these initiatives. Concerned with the distinctiveness of Jinguashi's...
landscape and history, the municipal government’s plan for the Gold Ecological Park followed the ideal model of an ‘ecomuseum’, 94 a type of museum which gained great popularity in the era of localism in Taiwan. Often, the understanding of ‘ecomuseum’ has been based on a Japanese translation of “living environment museum” (生活環境博物館). 95 The Gold Ecological Park was suggested by the planner, who has Japanese associations, in order to revitalize Jinguashi. The designer suggested that a convention concerning the preservation of the landscape and spatial fabric resonating with the Japanese machizukuri model should be created and signed by the residents.

The plan for the Gold Ecological Park fitted well with many government programmes and state community-building propaganda. The renovation of old Japanese residences attracted various funds from state departments: the Project of Local Museums (地方文化館計畫) of the CCA, the Doubling the Tourism (觀光倍增計畫) of the Tourism Bureau of the Ministry of Communication and Transportation (交通部觀光局), and the Reconstructing the New Urban and Rural Landscape Plan (城鄉新風貌改造) of the Department of Construction, the Ministry of Interior. All of these policies were designed to aid locality production in alignment with the community-building discourses of leading figures in the state government such as Chen Qi-nan on improving spatial aesthetic quality and revitalizing local regions through cultural strategies.

A strong economic drive dominates the development of the Gold Ecological Park. Not mentioning the intention of the Taipei County government toward regional development, politicians and leading figures in the local area have expressed concerns about economic rewards since the implementation of the museum strategy. Within these fragmented communities, tourism development has gained communal recognition as the most attractive development programme. This resonates with Xiang Jia-hong’s observations based on his experiences as a community practitioner:

“I asked the students (all of whom were residents of the community) to write down and present the reasons for doing shequ work. Most answers were ‘in order to make the shequ better’. But when I asked further, ‘what do you mean by better?’, the two most frequent answers were to make the living environment clean and beautiful and to develop industry […] This enthusiasm is common in communities new to community-building and who are not familiar with the concepts of community-building. It is the same for many of the communities which have experience with community-building, and even for the professionals in the community-building field. That is to say, industry has always been a focus point of great concern within community-building. Thus, within the discussions on policies and projects between ministries and government departments, the development of industry is the only item receiving trans-departmental agreement.” (Xiang Jia-hong 2008, 63) (my translation)

Disappointment of local residents over the lack of immediate economic revenue from the project of the Gold Ecological Park has caused a difficult relationship between the museum and local residents, and this has weakened the potential for community-building.

2.2.5 Building locality at sites of memory

The two examples discussed in this section represent the use of the Japanese colonial past as a resource when creating locality in Taiwan, either with regard to local identity, social cohesion or economic prosperity. Regarding identity, the colonial past helps formulate the identity of a place based on local distinctiveness, in this case distinguishing Taiwan, as a place, from its competitor China. This, in part, naturally follows from Taiwan's efforts to be viewed as a member of the international community, especially the community of ‘advanced’ countries. Moreover,
the ‘golden past’ of a place – some aspects of which are the result of the colonial past, for instance the sugar industry in Ciaotou and the mining industry in Jinguashi – has frequently been projected as an image of a future which is characterized by modernity and development.

In conjunction with the strong economic drive of the state community-building programme, the expectations of regional revival and the rewards of tourism play a major role in most locales. A strong economic incentive for local development was witnessed in both Jinguashi and Ciaotou, both of which saw the use of memory sites as a strategy for creating local distinctiveness and regional revival. The multifaceted locality targeted at the beginning stage of heritage-building has gradually converged with the pursuit of economic development. A noteworthy issue that Miyazaki warned us about in an interview in 2004: “community-building is not for earning tourist revenue”. The humanistic aspects concerning a better quality of life, the empowerment of the community, the accumulation of culture, social welfare, and social equality and justice are often sacrificed for the sake of economic benefits.

In an era of localism, the authorized discourse on ‘the local’ – an agent showing potential strength in resisting or responding to global homogeneity – is ambiguously phrased as globalization, i.e. as a means of “building a bridge between Taiwan and the world through local mobilization” (quanzhong jiegui meituan 全球接軌, 在地行動) and “winning in the face of global competition.” It was expected that the local would simultaneously trigger a substantial change in Taiwanese society, which has long been influenced by a development-centred ideology. This development-drive has often led to a dilemma in local place-making practices, as revealed in the case studies in this section.

In the 1970s and 1980s, grassroots localism emerged in the form of environmental, political and cultural movements in Taiwan. It represented resistance to development-centered state policies, and cultivated an awareness and autonomy of place in the subsequent two decades. These grassroots initiatives have gradually been co-opted into the community-building projects in the era of localism. The state government has provided a large amount of subsidies and promoted terms and concepts in all departments and public occasions for raising community-building awareness and participation. Many social groups – some may be stimulated by the community-building ideas; some were already founded before the community-building policies but with similar aims – strategically used the state community-building phrases to compete for subsidies in supporting their own social targets. Complying with bureaucratic demands from governments, for example by producing reports, writing official documents, meeting accounting requirements and so on, a sort of operational mechanism has developed. Some non-government organisations and community groups, normally without independent financial support, increasingly rely on the subsidies from governments. Especially these community groups performed well and produced spectacular effects. For instance, as Lü (2002) argued, Baimi village (白米村) in Yilan County has easily attracted subsidies from all sorts of government departments by continuously producing what government officials want from it. Eventually many community or social groups lost energy in pushing for government change while having to rely on government support and collaborate with the government. Still, there have been societies or organisations insisting on their own social ideals. They may strategically use the terms and frameworks set by the government yet retain their role as avant-garde citizen groups. Their involvement in community-building and heritage-making projects often leads to series of conflicts with the governments since they do not fulfill all the bureaucratic requirements, which they feel create homogeneity rather than creative diversity centred around the significance of locality. The state community-building programme has created a welcoming environment for grassroots’ social and eco-

97. ‘Accountability’ of economic reward is important for local politics in attracting support. Local politicians as well as community workers easily persuade local groups to support their projects by explaining the projects would improve the local economy.
98. emph type="italic">Challenging the Year 2008, the revised edition of 2003, 1–4.
gical actions, and to some degree encouraged citizen movements and creative diversities; at the same time, it has also appropriated revolutionary energy and aid to standardised community-building ‘products’ by offering subsidises and resources. Hence, one may ask whether the place-making movements of the past two decades have actually made substantial changes to society in terms of accommodating the social welfare/equality-concerned and other diverse facets of locality. An alternative perspective would ask whether the grassroots initiatives and community-building autonomy might eventually fade away.

2.3 JAPANESE COLONIAL HERITAGE IN THE ERA OF LOCALISM

2.3.1 The Historical Context of the 1990s ‘Memory Boom’

According to statistics from the Chinese Association of Museums, in 1989 and 1990 the total number of museums in Taiwan was 99. By 2007, the number had exploded to 580.99 The number guji (historic monuments) also grew enormously during the same period. The sense of ‘locality’ has dominated the discourse on guji and local museums since the 1990s. As the museum scholar Zhang Yu-teng noticed (2007), the 1990s is the “era of localism” of museums. The increasing number of museums in Taiwan since 1991 mainly included large, local museums. These local museums were encouraged by the state policies of “Rehabilitating Unused Spaces” and “Local Museums” within the scheme of the Integrated Community-Making Programme.

The close relationship between historic preservation and pursuit of locality actually emerged before the 1990s within the postwar economic, political and social context. When the KMT lost the Chinese civil war and retreated to Taiwan in the late 1940s, numerous Japanese temples, shrines and other buildings were occupied by KMT armies and their families. In the following decade, the issue of historic preservation was not considered by the KMT government except in the light of tourist demands of the American army100 and the Chinese cultural renaissance movement in the 60s and 70s.101 In the 1960s, Taiwan experienced dramatic change from an agricultural society to an industrial society. Fast urbanization, migration and changes of life style resulted in damage to traditional architecture through urban development, causing nostalgia of lost traditions and lifestyle, and an emerging demand for domestic tourism and awareness of historic preservation. At the same time, social and economic change was informed by the political propaganda of the KMT’s Chinese nationalist narrative. Within the authorised agenda, Taiwanese history and culture existed only in relation to the Chinese ‘mainland’. Two groups of historic preservationists sparked an architectural conservation awareness in the 1960s within the aforementioned context: folk-historical scholars in collecting data on Taiwanese traditional architecture, Lin Heng-dao 林衡道 being the representative figure; and artists and architects concerned with traditional buildings in Taiwan. Their efforts brought about the guji (historic monument) preservation movement in the 1970s. As Yen Liang-yi 顏亮一 (2005) mentions, nationalism, localism and tourism serve as the framework for analysing the development of historic preservation in Taiwan. Prior to the 1970s, the official narrative of Chinese identity and anti-communist propaganda monopolised the field of cultural reproduction in literature, the arts, humanities and historic preservation. This situation began to change in the 1970s. Yen (2005, 9) associates the initiative of historic preservation with the Nativist Literature Movement (xiangtu wenxue yundong)102, and asserts that the movement shows the close relationship

100. Within the Cold War network, Taiwan was along the line of defense of the US sphere of influence. US armies resided in Taiwan in support of the Korean War in the 1950s. Tourist demand of these US army members resulted in rough renovation by the KMT authorities in creating sites of rich Chinese cultural significance for providing an exotic tourist experience.

101. The Chinese cultural renaissance movement (Zhonghua Wenhua Fuxing Yundong; 中華文化復興運動) was promoted in the 1960s and 1970s by the KMT government after the Communist Cultural Revolution in China. The movement was aimed to strengthen the image of KMT’s China (on Taiwan) as the only preserver of authentic Chinese culture.

102. “Back to xiangtu” (huigui xiangtu回歸鄉土; back to the land of Taiwan) and “back to reality” (huigui xianshi 回歸現實) was addressed by a number of writers and evoked fierce debates in the field of literature in the late 1970s. This literature movement
between the institutionalisation of historic preservation and the national identity crisis of Taiwan that emerged from this period.

In the 1970s, many landmark events of historic preservation such as the conflicts on preserving Lin An-Tai Old Residence, reflected a rising conservationist awareness in the public arena. Nevertheless, the KMT Chinese nationalist narrative still dominated the historical preservation field. Taiwanese architecture was able to be qualified as ‘historic’ only when it demonstrated a connection to the Chinese civilization or patriotic ideology of a great China. Until the Martial Law was lifted in 1987, Taiwan-centered discourses had been barred from publicity. Against a background of political liberation during the 1990s and a dramatic change in economic and social environments, Taiwan experienced the aforementioned boom of “museumification” and “heritagization”. As a reaction to the cultural amnesia of the postwar KMT period, the retrieval of local memories coincided with the rapid development of local museums and cases of historic preservation that represented reflection on local identity (Mu Si-mian 1999). With this pursuit of ‘locality’, the collective past has been reshaped by multiple interpretations of memories, indicating the complex forces underlying the reconstitution of the past.

The rapid increase of local museums and heritage sites in 1990s represents a shift of national narrative. In 1993, president Lee Teng-hui proposed the ‘living community’, emphasizing the land of Taiwan as a source of identity. This identity narrative was further framed and demonstrated by the ‘Integrated Community-Making Programme’ since 1994. The leading urban planning scholar and activist Hsia Chu-Joe 夏鈺 九 elaborates on this close connection between historic preservation and state domination (Hsia 1998). In the 1990s, historic preservation served as a means of identity reconstruction for the nation-state. In order to legitimize the national government by earning support from local communities, a combination of community building and historic conservation became the new policy of the national government (Hsia 1998, 1, 4-5). However, the bureaucratic system was not able to deal with the fierce conflicts between rapid urbanisation and participative conservation. Hsia thus asserts that conserving guiji is to create “heterotopia” and generate the locality needed for survival within the fierce competition of global economy, as well as forming a sustainable space for social inclusion. Hsia’s points of social practice and humanistic concern have been influential in the scholarly field of conservation with aid of the National Taiwan University Graduate Institute of Building and Planning, an avant-garde institution in the field of area development with historical conservation.

After the lifting of martial law in 1987, numerous social movements emerged to resist the ‘de-local’ and ‘de-Taiwan’ policies legislated under the Kuomintang (國民黨KMT) version of Chinese nationalism. Meanwhile, the local governments that arose within the new political network played an important role in promoting locality through cultural tourism, utilising such means as museums, cultural festivals and the production of local artefacts. Along with strategic support from the central government and new trends in leisure and tourism, the idea of local specialties was promoted as a catalyser for local development and identity. For example, cultural festivals (wenhua-ji 文化季), which emerged to promote the idea of local agricultural products, crafts and heritage sites were held by regional governments in the 1990s and sponsored by the central government as a part of the national culture programme (Mu Si-mian 1999).

is considered as one origin of cultural-political Taiwanization and Indigenization in later decades (Hsiau A-chin 2005).

103. The Lin An-Tai Old Residence (Lin An-Tai gucuo 林安泰古厝) was built up in 1822 in north-east Taipei as a family residence of the rich merchant Lin Zhi-neng. In the 1970s, the east district became the site of a new urban development plan in Taipei, and it was planned that the residence would be destroyed to make room for broadening the road. After preservation movements raised by cultural and architectural practitioners, the Taipei City Government promised to conserve all building materials of the residence and recompose the compartments at a new location.

104. "Heterotopia" was a cultural geographical concept discussed by Michel Foucault to describe spaces of otherness. Heterotopia deals with spaces with multiple layers which may be invisible, unpleasant and even controversial, yet as mirrors, they reflect the real image of self and represents physical approximation of a utopia.
Within this social and historical context, the idea of developing museums and heritage sites was born and grew rapidly during the 1990s and the following decade. The recollection of local memories was sought by both the government and local residents to reconstruct the local identity which became intertwined with Taiwanese national identity. The representation of the past, as well as the construction of locality, is a dynamic process constantly reshaped by diverse actors within a complex social framework. The interpretation of memory was not only restrained by this grand social framework but also influenced by conflicting conceptions of memory during the actual practices of planning, construction and recollection.

The situation is even more complicated when dealing with colonial sites. Within the museum and heritage boom, Japanese colonial sites received greater attention than ever. In the postwar era, the KMT interpreted Japanese remains as symbols of the enemy country which had invaded China during Second World War. An anxious attempt to cut connections between the local Taiwanese and their previous colonizer was another underlying motive of this official propaganda.

This anti-Japanese attitude changed at the transition of identity narratives of the state from China-centred to Taiwan-centred in the 1990s and 2000s. Over the last two decades, a pro-colonial attitude has emerged in the field of conservation, coinciding with prominent research on Taiwan history (Taylor 2005). Increasingly, Japanese remains have been nominated as sites of national or regional heritage. In addition to the factors of Taiwan’s intense commercial and tourism connections with Japan, the Japanese heritage sites represent a collective mentality, intensified by the new political propaganda of national identity building in the Republic of China (Zhonghua minguo 中華民國 ROC) under the Democratic Progressive Party (Minzhu jinbu dang 民主進步黨 DPP). As asserted by Wang (2004), in order to shape a uniquely Taiwanese culture, a new model of multiculturalism replaced Chinese nationalism, proclaiming a Taiwan national identity. In this regard, the Japanese remains are valued as ‘heritage’ which represent a component of Taiwanese identity. Furthermore, this is interwoven into the regional and local identities that construct regional heritage. Within this complex, a past

![Fig. 2.3.1 Part of the torii (sacred gate) of the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine. In this picture the year of the construction of the shrine, written on the torii according to the Japanese counting system for years, has been scratched off. This sort of postwar defacing is a typical of many contemporary Japanese sites. Photo was taken by the author.](image)

is represented, intensified and even reshaped by the ‘secular ritual’ of the contemporary museum and heritage interpretation.

2.3.2 How Colonial Remnants Became Heritage: reading the numbers

As mentioned earlier, cultural heritage is a new, western concept translated into a Taiwanese context.
Data analysis of this section provides hard evidence on how the ideology of ‘heritage’ has been appropriated in the political and social context of Taiwan, and how Japanese colonial sites have gradually become heritage of Taiwan.

The analysis in this section is based on three figures. Figure 1 and 2 show the number of sites that were designated as guji (historic monuments) and historic buildings each year since 1983, the initial year of the Cultural Preservation Act. Figure 3 shows the number of Japanese sites that were designated as historic monuments and historic buildings each year105 from 1985 to 2008. The year 2008 was the last year of the DPP’s (Democratic Progress Party 民主進歩黨) reign, in which much attention was given to the ‘subjectivity of Taiwan’ through community-building projects. Both tables provide crucial information not only about the conceptualisation process of cultural heritage in Taiwan, but also about the changing perceptions of Japanese remains and their close relationship to the state community-building projects.

Data Collection

The quantitative data in the figures is based on three main sources. The first source is the statistical account in The Almanac of Taiwan Cultural Heritage Conservation: Monuments, Historical Buildings, Human Settlement, Archaeological Sites, Cultural Landscapes, Traditional Arts, Folklore and Related Artifacts, Antiquities (Wenhua zichan baocun nianjian 文化資產保存年鑑), 2001 to 2008. The series was officially published by the state cultural heritage department, the Headquarters Administration of Cultural Heritage (HACH 文化資產總管處), and provides annual statistic data on cultural properties including the number of historic monuments and historic buildings. However, this almanac has only been in publication since 2001. As for statistics prior to 2001, this study has relied on another source: the Retrospection List of Guji on the Past Twenty Years Period106 included in The Almanac of Taiwan Cultural Heritage Conservation 2002. Another list collected in the 2006 Almanac. The Overall List of Different kinds of Cultural Properties (2006各類文化資產總清單), also provides detailed data for comparison and further examination. The third main data source is the official website of the HACH. This is the most up to date version of the cultural heritage list. There are concerns about the accuracy of the data, however, because of the changing nature of online information. Nevertheless, this online database is of great help when selecting cases according to different categories. The primary list of ‘colonial sites’107 in this section comes from the database.

Retrospection List of Guji on the Past Twenty Years Period106 included in The Almanac of Taiwan Cultural Heritage Conservation 2002. Another list collected in the 2006 Almanac. The Overall List of Different kinds of Cultural Properties (2006各類文化資產總清單), also provides detailed data for comparison and further examination. The third main data source is the official website of the HACH. This is the most up to date version of the cultural heritage list. There are concerns about the accuracy of the data, however, because of the changing nature of online information. Nevertheless, this online database is of great help when selecting cases according to different categories. The primary list of ‘colonial sites’107 in this section comes from the database.

105. The term ‘Japanese period related historic monuments and historic buildings’ refers to the historic monuments and historic buildings that were constructed during the Japanese colonial period (1895-1945). They can not be simplified as ‘colonial heritage’ since many of them have Japanese associations such as the architectural or decorative forms, yet were designed or built by local architects or local businessmen.


107. The primary list was established only with the criteria of ‘construction time’. Hence ‘colonial sites’ here refers to the sites constructed during the Japanese colonial period, including the architecture built by the Japanese rulers, by Taiwanese businessmen or the traditional Han residences and shrines built by local families. These sites are not necessarily examples of the ‘colonial heritage’ discussed in the previous section.
2.3.2.1. Interpreting the Increase of Guji Designation in 1985 (Figure 1 and 2)

The emerging significance of cultural heritage

After the proclamation of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (文化資產保存法) in 1982, the first list of Historic Monuments (guji 古蹟) was publicised in 1983 and included 15 sites.108 According to Chen Qi-lu 陳其祿109, the first Minister of the Council for Cultural Affairs (CCA), the 1983 designation of sites as guji was based on a preliminary list provided by the Ministry of the Interior (內政部). Before the official legislation of the Cultural Heritage

---

108. 赤崁樓、淡水紅毛城、二崁砲台(後龍城)、澎湖天后宮、台南孔子廟、鹿港龍山寺、紀功武廟、南臺古堡、臺灣城遺蹟(安平古堡殘跡)、基隆三沙灣砲臺(海烏天險)、五妃廟、金崇福公廟、彰化孔子廟、王得祿墓、台北府城北門、鳳山郡舊城、大天后宮、邱良弼母節孝坊 (Council for Cultural Affairs 1986)

Preservation Law, the controlling organization of historic preservation, the Department of Civil Affairs of the Ministry of the Interior (內政部民政司), started to collect recommendation lists from the municipal governments. The Minister selected 53 sites as provisional ‘First Level Historic Monuments’ (第一級古跡) from a list of more than 300 recommendations from local governments, and sent the shortlist to the CCA for further examination. As a result, 15 sites were designated as First Level Historic Monuments by the Minister of the Interior in 1983, after field assessments conducted by the CCA. In 1985, a list of Second and Third Level monuments was announced. 206 sites were added to the official list. It is noteworthy that the recommendation lists collected from municipal governments during this period matched the field results of Lin Heng-dao 林衡道,110 published in *Taiwan Historica, Taiwan Folkways* and numerous books of field visits and guide information.111 Lin’s influence on historic preservation cannot be ignored, and his attitude toward the question of what can be valued as a historic monument is reflected in the official designation list.

As mentioned previously, the question of what can be valued as cultural heritage is inseparable from the concept of what is historic. Most Taiwanese sites did not qualify as ‘antiquity’ under the China-centred conceptualisation in the postwar era. The local culture and history of Taiwan could only permeate the official version of the past by strengthening Taiwan’s historical connection to China. Historical preservation reflects this strategy. The publication and frequent activities of Lin Heng-dao gradually helped enable the inclusion of the vernacular architectures of Taiwan within the category of cultural heritage by interpreting them as a branch of Chinese architectural culture. However, none of Japanese colonial sites was included in the list. As Lin claimed, “the constructions created by Japanese during the colonial era cannot be qualified as historic monuments, only the ones showing resistances of our people against Japanese occupation can be historic monuments. Our China has to be the subject of the historic monument of Japanese occupation period” (Taiwan Historica 1974, 96; my translation).112

Around the time of the announcement of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act, the modern concept of ‘cultural heritage’ appeared in public discourse, and historic preservation was gradually directed away from the postwar focus on *guji* and *guwu* (古物) antiquity), to a holistic concern with cultural significance. In 1981, Chen Qi-lu, the first chief of the Council for Cultural Affairs, stressed that “cultural heritage doesn’t have to fine and splendid, and doesn’t have to be old. It is identified by showing its significance and value to national culture”113 (*Taiwan Folkways* 1982: 32: 4; 88; my translation).114 This transition from individual objects to cultural significance was reflected in the 1982 Cultural Heritage Preservation Act, and resulted in changes in practice and value, as more categories were included in cultural heritage such as natural resources, folk arts and artifacts. The local culture and natural landscape of Taiwan had now been officially recognised as ‘heritage’. Furthermore, the new concept of cultural heritage encompassed neighbouring countries, especially Japan (Taiwan Folkways 1984, 81; 1982: 32: 2). Yet the Japanese influence was not attributed to the colonial legislation (Preservation Law for the Special Places of Scenic Beauty, Historic Sites and Natural Monuments; 史跡名勝天然記念物保存法), but to visits and international conferences in the 1970s. ‘Culture’ was linked to ‘nation’ in the discourses of leading figures, and appeared as a sign of an ‘advanced’ country in the 1970s and 80s.115

---

110. According to Urban Planning Studio of National Taiwan University Graduate School of Civil Engineering 1980, 11

111. Lin visited and recorded historical sites all over Taiwan. His field results have been published and had great influence in public understanding of historic sites and local history. The publications include *The Origin of Historic Sites in Taiwan* (臺灣史跡源流), *Brief Introduction of Historic Monuments in Taiwan* (臺灣古跡概觀), *Visiting Record of Popular Sites in Taiwan* (臺灣旅行採訪冊), *Guidebook on Historic Sites and Resorts Along the Roads in Taiwan* (臺灣公路史跡名勝之導遊) etc.

112. The original text is "目據時期日本人的建造物不能算是古跡，而我們國徵抗日的才可以算是古跡。目據時期的古跡，必須以我們中國自己為主體。" (*Taiwan Historica* 1974, 96)

113. The original text is “文化資產不必一定要精細華麗，也不一定要年代久遠，主要在於其是否具有民族文化的意義和價值”.

114. This is part of his speech “How to preserve cultural heritage” (如何保存文化資產) at the 21st Taiwan Studies Symposium in 1981.

115. For instance, see the presentation by Ma Yi-gong 馬以工
lu’s speech in 1981 also used examples of Japan, Korea and Germany to emphasize importance of heritage preservation. He warned that if people continued to ignore (natural) heritage preservation, then “we are far from the way to a great nation of culture” (Taiwan Folkways 1982, 89). This connection between culture and being an advanced country has continued in the discourses of leading government figures in the 1990s and 2000s as shown in section 2.2. Japan is of particular importance to the government leaders of Taiwan, whether as an enemy or a partner.

Colonial constructions and cultural heritage

Despite the fact that the concept of cultural heritage opened up in the 1980s, Japanese colonial constructions were still surrounded by controversy. Until the debate on renovating the former Taoyuan Shinto Shrine in 1985. Japanese sites were not considered ‘heritage’.

The fact that Japanese colonial buildings were included in the category of cultural heritage in Taiwan can be linked to research on ‘modern architecture’ (近代建築). Colonial architecture was not recognised as guji and was still a sensitive issue in the 1980s, as seen in a speech on Modern Architecture in Taiwan (臺灣的近代建築) delivered by the architectural scholar Li Qian-lang 李乾朗 at the 17th Symposium of Taiwan Studies in January 1981. Modern architecture’, as defined by Li, meant architectural constructions by foreign influences. In

Fig. 2.3.5 Taoyuan Shinto Shrine in 2011. Photo was taken by the author.

116. See note 61.
117. Here: the wars between Japan and China around the time of Second World War.
118. See “Incident of Preserving the Taoyuan Shinto Shrine” at website of the Encyclopaedia of Taiwan (台灣大百科全書「桃園神社保存事件」): http://210.69.67.10/web/index (accessed 2 November 2010)

and Yang Shi-zhao楊士照 sharing their reflections on visiting Korean and Japanese heritage sites and facilities (Taiwan Folkways 1982, 73-98).

The symposium of Taiwan studies was regularly held at the committee of Taiwan historical and investigative resources for the public understanding of Taiwan history and evoked public awareness of historic preservation. The symposium of Taiwan studies was regularly held at the committee of Taiwan historic.

119. The Committee of Taiwan Provincial Historica (Wenxian Taiwan) was set up by the KMT government in the postwar era for the purpose of accommodating Taiwanese cultural elites and occupying them with local historical investigation, thereby reducing their political participation. The Historical Committee delivered by the architectural scholar Li Qian-lang 李乾朗 at the 17th Symposium of Taiwan Studies in January 1981. Modern architecture’ as defined by Li, meant architectural constructions by foreign influences. In

and Yang Shi-zhao楊士照 sharing their reflections on visiting Korean and Japanese heritage sites and facilities (Taiwan Folkways 1982, 73-98).

The symposium of Taiwan studies was regularly held at the committee of Taiwan historical and investigative resources for the public understanding of Taiwan history and evoked public awareness of historic preservation. The symposium of Taiwan studies was regularly held at the committee of Taiwan historic.
the case of Taiwan, he said, this appeared first in 1860, when the Western powers’ came to Taiwan during Xianfeng’s (咸豐) Qing (清) reign, and has lasted through the postwar and to the contemporary period (see also Li 1980). A large number of Japanese sites were included in the category. This speech shows that the study of colonial architecture itself was hidden under the larger rubric of modern architecture in the 1980s. In his investigation report for Ministry of Interior in 1993 Li explicitly placed his investigation in the context of modern architecture on the buildings constructed in the Japanese period (Ministry of Interior 1993). This interpretation of ‘modern architecture’ which nearly equals to Japanese colonial architecture was continued and became greatly influential in later years.

Emerging Local Governments

Prior to 1985, the entire process of designating a historic monument was under the control of the central government. That is to say, the Ministry of the Interior (Neizheng Bu 内政部) hired professionals and scholars to visit the sites and to propose a list of provisional historic monuments. Based on this list, the Council for Cultural Affairs invited other professionals to re-examine the listed sites, and return the results to the Ministry of the Interior for designation. This procedure was changed in 1985. The municipal and Zhixia 直轄 municipal governments were made responsible for the primary investigations, and proposed the potential list to the Taiwan Provincial Government (the county and city governments) and the Ministry of the Interior (Zhixia municipal governments) for further examination. The results came to the Ministry of the Interior for final evaluation. The ministry would then announce the list of designation, and the level of each individual site. This process was changed again after the modification of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act in 1997. A tendency towards decentralisation was a defining feature in the development of heritage policy, and this was in accordance with the emerging importance of local politics. As shown in the Figure 1 and 2, the number of designated guji 建築 increased significantly in 1998. Most of these sites are municipal-level monuments.

2.3.2.2. Japanese colonial construction in the era of localism (Figure 3)

Several moments in time in figure 3 are worth paying attention to. First, in 1991 for the first time two colonial buildings – Kangyo Bank (勧業銀行) and Tainan Court (台南法院) – were designated as guji. 1991 was the first year in which Japanese sites were formally recognised as ‘heritage’. The change in perspective which led to the recognition of Japanese remnants as heritage was closely linked to the growing research field of modern architecture. In 1976, the Architectural Institute of Japan (日本建築学会) initiated a five-year project of investigating modern architectures in Japan and former colonies; 123 pieces of Japanese colonial architectures in Taiwan were included in the final publication. This was the origin of research on modern architecture in Taiwan (Huang Jun-ming 1997, 7). As noted by Huang (1997), Taiwanese researcher, Guo Zhong-duan 郭中端 assisted the survey of the Architectural Institute of Japan in Taiwan. In 1986, Japanese architectural scholars Toshi, Kenchiku 孤崎 initiated a five-year project of investigating modern architectures in Japan and former colonies; 123 pieces of Japanese colonial architectures in Taiwan were included in the final publication. This was the origin of research on modern architecture in Taiwan (Huang Jun-ming 1997, 7).

120. The Treaty of Tien-tsin 天津條約 was signed between Qing Dynasty and The Second French Empire, United Kingdom, Russian Empire, and the United States in 1858. Taiwan (here refers to Anping 台南, a port in southern Taiwan) was one of the Chinese ports required to be opened for opium import. Christian missionary activities were also allowed in Qing territory after this treaty.

121. (Direct-Controlled Municipality) means cities directly managed by central government. Before December 2010, only two cities, Taipei and Kaohsiung City were categorized as Zhixia City in Taiwan.


123. Prior to 1991, three sites constructed during Japanese colonial era were designated as historic monuments in 1985 (馬偕墓, 臺中林氏宗祠, 臺中張家祖廟) and three in 1988 (台南賓館, 臺南護國寺, 埔洲二度陳宅). Most sites were not considered to be ‘colonial heritage’, and the designating year of two sites associated with ‘colonial heritage’ (臺南賓館, 臺南護國寺) were recorded incorrectly. The correct year would be 1998 for both sites. Please Refer to the official website of Headquarters Administration of Cultural Heritage: http://www.hach.gov.tw/.

Li Qian-lang investigated the Japanese period constructions all over the island. In 1991, architects Li Qing-lang, Huang Qiu-yue, Guo Zhong-duan, and Huang Jun-ming were assigned by the Ministry of the Interior to work with scholars from five countries. This was the beginning of the ROC Research Association of Modern Architectural History (中華民國近代建築史研究會) in late 1980s. Architectural professionals Li Qing-lang, Huang Qiu-yue, and Guo Zhong-duan were assigned by the Ministry of the Interior and the National Science Council respectively to investigate sites of modern architecture on the main island of Taiwan. Li Qian-lang investigated the Japanese colonial era between 1895 and 1945. He stated in the foreword of the report that “modern architecture […] is honest evidence recording modern history; it is also a part of the Taiwanese culture” (Li 1994a, 2). Li’s words show that the criteria for what can be considered ‘historic’ had changed, at least in architectural professional circles and the head heritage administrative departments of the central government. The number of colonial period buildings that were designated as historic monuments increased steadily between 1991 and 1997, showing the gradual transition of state attitudes toward the colonial remains. This attitude was in accordance with the scholarly re-conceptualization of Japanese colonial buildings as modern architecture.

A sudden increase in 1998

All figure 1, 2 and 3 show a great increase in the number of historic monuments in 1998. Out of the 70 newly added sites, 44 were designated by the Taipei City Government. It is worth noting that only 7 of these sites are State Designated Level (guoding 国定), while the others are Municipal Designated Level (xianshiding 省市定). The modification of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act in 1997 made Taipei City, and other municipal governments, a powerful actor in the designating process.

The 1997 modification of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act changed the definition of the classification of guji (historic monuments) from ‘historic significance’ to ‘administrative hierarchy’. In the modified version of the Preservation Law, the original classification of First, Second and Third Level was changed to State Designated (國定), Provincial and Zhixia Municipal Government Designated (省及直轄市定) and Municipal Government Designated (縣市定). After 1999, when the Taiwan Provincial Government (臺灣省政府) was formally relegated to a small administrative unit belonged to the Administrative Yuan, the middle level, Provincial and Zhixia Municipal Government Designated, was changed to Zhixia Municipal Government Designated (直轄市定). The title of each level refers to its controlling organization. That is to say, the municipal governments of Zhixia cities and counties were enabled to organise their own guji examination committees, and designate and manage the historic monuments within their administrative regions. If they believe a certain monument to be highly valuable, they can put forward a proposal to the Ministry of The Interior for the monument to be upgraded to state designated monument. Within this legal framework, the Taipei City Government has the power to select its own heritage. What is noteworthy here is that most of the sites on the 1998 list of Taipei City were created during the Japanese colonial era. Moreover, the mayor of Taipei in 1998 was Chen Shui-bian, a member of the DPP (Democratic Progressive Party 民進党) who are concerned with localism.

125. The two reports are: Overview of Modern Architecture in Taiwan: North Taiwan (1990) and Overview of Modern Architecture in Taiwan: West, South and East Taiwan (1991).
By the end of 1990s, a considerable number of designated historic monuments had connections to the Japanese past. This confirms that the attitude of local governments toward Japanese remnants changed in the 1990s compared to the 80s when the preservation of Taoyuan Shinto Shrine still provoked fierce debates between county government and council. This transition can be observed in the increasing number of local government survey projects on colonial-period architecture. For instance, in 1994 the Tainan City Government commissioned architectural scholar Fu Chao-qing (傅朝卿) to investigate and record the historical buildings in Tainan city, and the results were in 1995. Taoyuan County Cultural Centre asked researcher Huang Jun-ming (黃俊銘) in 1996 to conduct a survey on architectural construction during the Japanese era within Taoyuan county (Huang Jun-ming 1997). As Fu recalled, “the negative attitude toward Japanese architecture gradually improved in the second half of 1990s. This owes to designation of much architecture as legitimate cultural heritage; and owes to the emerging trend of ‘rehabilitation’ (再利用) which gave the chance of rebirth to the colonial architectures” (2009, 3; my translation). However, most of the Japanese colonial buildings could not be included in the heritage list until the creation of a new legal category after 1999.

**Historic buildings as heritage**

On 21 September 1999, Taiwan was hit by an enormous earthquake. Traumatic scenes from the 9-21 earthquake were deeply inscribed in the minds of the Taiwanese. In October, a Cultural Heritage Rescue Team was organised by professionals and scholars, and relevant issues were hotly discussed. The subject of finding a legal status for historic buildings, the provisional guji which had no legal support, many of which were damaged in the earthquake, urged the state government to revise the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act. A new category of ‘historic building’ finally appeared in the new version in February 2000. This new category opens up space for many Japanese buildings, which were not old enough to be qualified as guji yet are rich in historic or local significance. The definition of heritage in Taiwan’s context was widened by the great diversity of these historic buildings. Among the number of designated historic buildings, Japanese colonial constructions now occupy a large proportion. This is the reason for the considerable increase after 2000 shown by Figure 3.

After the earthquake, rescue work and field surveys were organised by professional circles and encouraged with state funds. Subsidies were arranged by the state government for restoring historic buildings of private ownership or owned by local governments. Lists of historic buildings suitable for financial support were proposed by local governments. Once the buildings had been included in the list of state subsidiaries, they had to be registered as ‘historic buildings’ (歷史建築) on the cultural heritage list. The number of historic buildings gradually increased, and between 2002 and 2004, the number reached a climax. The number dropped in 2005, before increasing yet again in 2006 after the revision of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act in late 2005. This quantitative change is closely related to the trend of ‘rehabilitation’ (再利用).

The projects of Rehabilitating Unused Spaces (閒置空間再利用) and Planning and Promoting the Rehabilitation and Conservation of Historic Buildings (歷史建築保存再利用之策劃與推動) were listed in the 2001 annual budget of the CCA (Council for Cultural Affairs). In 2002, the budget of both projects was replaced by A Town, A Museum of Living Culture (一鄉鎮－生活文化館), a six-year project in-
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129. In 1999, 15 out of 40, and in 2000, 14 out of 34 were historic monuments built in the Japanese era.
Rehabilitating the Unused Spaces and Community Building

As mentioned in Section 2.2, the project of Local Museums (地方文化館) was part of the Integrated Community-Making Programme. The CCA provides subsidies for local governments and private organisations to rehabilitate unused spaces in the local area. The programmes can involve exhibition halls, community spaces, folk art centres etc. The applicant can apply for funds to restore old buildings and accommodate operating programmes. Many historic buildings have been selected by local governments or community organisations as targets for funding. After the 9-21 earthquake in 1999, community building was re-stressed in places that had suffered damage because of the earthquake. Simultaneously, the Japanese examples of machizukuri and Miyazaki’s ‘area revitalization’ were appreciated by the state government. The CCA project of Local Museums was one strategy to use cultural artefacts for community building and improving the local economy. Each year, the editorial board of The Almanac of Taiwan Cultural Heritage Conservation invites heritage professionals and scholars to vote for the ten most important events regarding cultural heritage affairs of the year. Two events, ‘Rehabilitating Unused Spaces Comes into Fashion’ and ‘The CCA Actively Pushes Forward the Project to Establish Local Cultural Halls’, were selected separately among the Ten Major Events of the Year 2002 and 2003. As stated by Chen Ji-min (陳濟民), a staff of the CCA, “the Project of Local Museums effectively explores local cultural resources in order to display the rich and multiple cultural uniqueness of Taiwan, to shape the aesthetic cultural spaces in the local, and to increase the tourist resources of the local”\(^\text{135}\). The project of Local Museums was expected to be able to implement diverse political, civil and economic objectives of the state in local areas.

Constructing the subjectivity of Taiwan

Using historic spaces to incorporate multiple community-building objectives has been stressed by the state government in 2000s, especially during the reign of Chen Qi-nan as minister of the CCA from 2004 to 2006. Chen has been a leading figure of community building since the initial year of the programme in 1994, and has continued to be concerned with the community-building progress in his job as Minister without Portfolio at the Executive Yuan. In the preface of The Almanac of Taiwan Cultural Heritage Conservation 2004, he stated his policy objectives and the crucial role which cultural heritage was expected to play in achieving the objectives. He listed ‘extending cultural citizenship, reconstructing the subjectivity of Taiwan and establishing the value of diversity (multiplicity)’ (文化公民權的伸張，台灣主體性的重建與多元價值觀的建立) as three major areas of work for the CCA. Cultural heritage, as he noted, is an “important catalyst for cultural citizenship, resource for constructing subjectivity of Taiwan, and proof for the value of diversity. It is the core to bind the three objectives”\(^\text{136}\). In order to achieve the mission, a programme named Constructing the Subjectivity of Taiwan was proposed by the CCA. This programme comprises projects concerning cultural events, world heritage and Taiwan landscape images. Historic spaces were continually invested in with state funds, and served as the sites of memory for the new nation in order to stimulate the growth of proud citizens. Japanese sites represent the value of diversity, and many have been ‘unused spaces’ existing in local daily lives because their time of creation was not too long ago. Colonial sites were refashioned to serve large state programmes, for instance the Huashan Art Special District (華山
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Aside from showing the outcome of heritagizing Japanese sites in Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s, I aim to first present the social dynamics underneath this period of heritage making. I argue that despite the fact that the state indeed plays a core role in heritage politics, there is no one-way process from state promotion to reception by the local public. Through memory approach, every actor in the process of heritage-making is actively contributing. This process is always dynamic: people at the local level do not naively receive the will of the state. Rather, they may respond to it and use it strategically. Second, I hope to identify the complexity of turning coloniality into locality through case studies in order to contribute to a better decolonized interpretation and to avoid taking for granted Japaneseness during heritage activities. Third, I suggest that, as shown by case studies in this thesis, the developmentist mentality underneath cultural policies and heritage practices within the framework of community-building obstructs grassroots’ humanistic initiatives, and eventually creates a ‘spectacle consumerism’ marked by homogeneity rather than locality and diversity.

137. See Lü Xin-yi 2002.
3.1 WHEN PAST MEETS PAST AT A LOCAL MUSEUM

3.1.1 The Historical Background of Jinguashi

In 1896, the second year of the Japanese colonization in Taiwan, wide-ranging mining activities were officially initiated in Jinguashi金瓜石.138 (Kinkaseki in Taiwanese. According to local elders, the name came from the pumpkin shape of the Benshan本山 outcrop. In 1933 the Taiwan Governor-General Office formally affirmed the name Jinguashi金瓜石 with an official document.

Fig. 3.1.1 Jinguashi in 2005. Photo was taken by the author.
Japanese) Jinguashi is located in the north-east of Taiwan and was discovered as a prosperous gold mining area in the 1890s. Prior to the discovery of gold, five farmer families had moved to this area and had initiated a settlers’ society. The number of residents reached its peak when the Japanese initiated industrial mining businesses in Jinguashi and its neighbour Shuinandong 水湳洞.141

The Japanese colonial authorities allowed applications for mining rights in 1896, and the enterpriser Tanaka Tyoubei 田中長兵衛 first obtained the right to mine in Jinguashi in 1897. This mining business in Jinguashi was later transferred to the enterpriser Ushiroku Shintaro 後宮信太郎 in 1924. However, the large scale and investment demand of the Jinguashi mine determined the insufficiency of individual enterprisers in the management of the Jinguashi mine. Nevertheless, a modern industrial system and machinery were brought into Jinguashi during this period. This industrial system differed greatly from the traditional gold panning and refining approaches. In addition, the rich copper mine was discovered alongside the gold. A large copper refinery plant was built in Shuinandong, a neighbourhood close to Jinguashi, and it became the only place in Taiwan which produced and exported copper at the time.

The wide range of Jinguashi mining resources and the huge capital demand of the mining business mean that success was only possible through the zaibatsu (conglomerate) Nihon kangyomushi kaisha 日本経済株式会社 (Japan Mining Company) who obtained the mining right to Jinguashi in 1933. The company immediately updated the mining equipment and techniques and built a new processing factory in 1935. This processing plant was built in Shuinandong with the most advanced equipment, and was the largest processing site in Asia at the time (China University of Technology 2010, 25). Jinguashi, under the management of the company, gained status as the “first place among the mines of precious metal in Asia” (亞洲第一貴金屬礦山).

The mining business of the Japanese empire, including the mining industry in Jinguashi, was greatly challenged by economic recession during the Second World War. In 1946 the KMT (Kuomindang 國民黨; the Chinese Nationalist Party) government, who obtained Taiwan from Japan after the war, set up a Bureau for Mining Affairs of Gold and Copper (Jintong Kuangwuju 金銅礦務局) to govern the colonial mining business. The bureau was replaced by a newly established state enterprise, the Taiwan Metal and Mining Company (Taiwan Jinshu Kuangye Gongsyi 臺灣金属礦業公司), in 1955.

Dynamic Landscape and Living Spaces

When the Japanese colonizer came to the Jinguashi area, it was observed that there were several dozen Taiwanese residences in Jinguashi (China University of Technology 2010, 68). According to the official documents of land and building ownership, in Year 38 and 39 of the Meiji Period (1906 and 1907), 15 items of land were registered in total, 12 of which were for agricultural use, 3 of which were for building use. Moreover, all belonged to two private owners. Yet in the Year 13 of the Taisho Period (1924) when Ushiroku Shintaro obtained the right to mine in Jinguashi, 30 among 36 items were registered for building use, and 13 belonged to the Tanaka Mining Company along with 3 which belonged to Kamaisi trial and financial business congregates that emerged in the Meiji period and ended after the Second World War. Zaibatsu often involved various types of industries, and some had great influence over the economy, politics and colonial policies of imperial Japan.
Kouzan釜石鉱山株式会社.143 In Showa Year 5 (1930), 21 among 29 were for building use, and 19 of the 29 belonged to the Jinguashi Mining Company.144 This archival information shows that during the Japanese colonial period, Jinguashi transformed from an agricultural society to an industrial society. The mining companies gradually purchased most of the land from private owners. In the postwar KMT period the data shows that all the registered land in Jinguashi and Shuinandong was owned either by state enterprises or the state.145

The profit from mining in Jinguashi was important to the Japanese colonial economy, and the zaibatsu (conglomerate) brought techniques and managing experience from other mining sites in Japan to Jinguashi. For instance, the Tanaka conglomerate had learned from its experiences in Kamaisi Kouzan釜石鉱山, and the Japan Mining Company also had a long involvement in the mining business. Thus the features of the Jinguashi mining site match mining sites in Japan in terms of both spatial allocation and industrial techniques. Along with the transfer of mining rights, the landscape of Jinguashi showed of the results of different mining schemes brought by different companies from their corresponding sites (China University of Technology 2010, 126-131). The spatial elements of Jinguashi, for instance the transportation system of cable carts connecting the tunnels, processing and refinery factories, supporting public facilities of the residences, a police station, a hospital, a school and so on, all represent similarities to affiliate Japanese mining sites. The points by which Jinguashi differs from other sites are land issue146 and discriminate organization under colonial rule. In Jinguashi, the Japanese colonizer forcibly obtained the agricultural land for mining use, and established an ethnically hierarchical society.

In 1897 when the mining industry was initiated in Jinguashi, only a few office and residential facilities were built next to the tunnels in the Benshan outcrop area. Local Taiwanese were living in thatched huts beside the river. In the early 1900s, large factories and refinery facilities were constructed in the area by the Tanaka Company. Various living facilities were constructed in accordant with the expanding industrial facilities and increasing employee numbers. Buildings of this period such as administrators’ and miners’ residences, a Buddhist Hall, a hospital, a post office, a police station, a school and a retail shop give the picture of an industrial city in formation. Besides Jinguashi, an electricity plant and a processing factory were built in the Shuinandong area. When the Japanese mining Company obtained mining rights in the 1930s, the company constructed a new factory in Shuinandong and expanded affiliating facilities in the area, for instance the residences for administrators and workers. During the postwar era, the production and processing of copper played a more important role than gold. A large copper refinery plant was built in 1977 in the Lile哩咾 area outside of Jinguashi and Shuinandong.
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143. Kamaisi Kouzan釜石鉱山, owned by Tanaka Tyoubei, was one of the two largest iron mines in modern Japan.
144. Ushiroku Shintaro obtained the mining right to Jinguashi from the Tanaka family in 1924, and established the Kinkaseki Mining Company金瓜石鉱山株式会社 in 1925.
145. The data refers to China University of Technology 2010, 58-60.
146. In the colonies, the agricultural land was forcefully acquired by the colonizer for mining development. This caused the issue of land as historical background in colonies, yet not at the sites in the colonizer’s inner land (China University of Technology 2010, 141).
During the process of industrial city development, the major living spaces of the Taiwanese were moved from the upper Benshan area to the neighbourhood of the major company living facilities for the Japanese in the lower part of Jinguashi. The transference of the major company living facilities for the Japanese from the upper Benshan area to the neighbourhood of the central area of Japanese residences. Local grocery shops, restaurants, a billiard shop and a clubhouse for Chinese immigrants were clustered along the hilly winding Qitang Street. These buildings were organically built, adjusting to the hilly local environment, and mostly roofed with asphalt for protection against the extremely wet local weather.

The Forever Kaisha会社

As the only profit-earning business in Jinguashi, the ‘kaisha’- the state enterprise constructed during the Japanese colonial period- inevitably bore the responsibility of feeding the people of Jinguashi. The ‘kaisha’ and the local people therefore form an umbilical cord-like relationship. No matter how the organisation changed, from ‘Mining Affairs Bureau of Gold and Copper’ to ‘Taiwan Metal and Mining Company’, we local people, generation after generation, as if referring to ‘mother’, still call the organisation “kaisha” as we did in the Japanese colonial period.149

Along with the development of the mining industry, the hierarchical social structure and spatial fabric in Jinguashi was accordingly rooted during the colonial period and onwards. The Japanese enterprises not only brought modern industrial equipment and systems, but also the fashionable ‘industrial village’ (Chang Ya-chuan 2002) which set out the area for efficient production. The higher-ranked residences and major office buildings were located in the central area of Jinguashi. These residences were built with better material and spatial planning, for instance with private gardens, and were assigned to the Japanese administrative workers or labourer supervisors. Outside of the central area, the employees were assigned ranked residences in accordance with their occupational positions which were closely related to their ethnic backgrounds. Local people used nicknames to recognise these different rank residence blocks, for

Fig. 3.1.3 The long residences of miners in 1914. Courtesy of National Taiwan University Library.
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147. Local residents usually called it the Qitang miao(temple)祈堂廟. See Taiwan Nature Trail Society 2005b, 12.
148. Gongyingshe供應社 in Mandarin.
149. The original text is「為金瓜石的唯一營利事業體，『會社』－這個日據時代撲起的國營機構，無可逃脫的扛著營養所有金瓜石子民的重擔，也就是這種類似母與子的親密關係，所以不管它改製成『金礦礦務局』或是「台灣金礦礦業股份有限公司」，我們在地人一代口傳一代的，就僅是在呼喚母親的名字似的，仍沿襲著它日據時代的名稱－「會社」來稱呼它。」 See Xia Ye-qin 2010, 2.
instance, the Residence of Blue Books (青簿寮)\textsuperscript{150}, Wenzhou Residences (溫州寮)\textsuperscript{151}, and the Residences of High Noses (替鼻仔寮).\textsuperscript{152} Generally, the higher ranked residences were allocated closer to the central area. Most local Taiwanese families, mainly employed by the company for labourer work, rented land from the company and built their own residences. The style and spatial scheme of the Taiwanese neighbourhood was greatly different from the Japanese residences in the central area. The area of Japanese residences was identified by its linear spatial allocation and wooden structures with tiles. In contrast, the area of the Taiwanese residences was characterised by its organic arrangement, for instance on the winding hilly roads, and the red-brick buildings with black asphalt roofs.

Most living needs could be served within this isolated mountain town. The Japan Mining Company built up a hospital, schools, entertainment facilities, bathing houses and a living goods station. Nearly every resident of Jinguashi was an employee or future employee\textsuperscript{153} of the company, and lived on the salary and welfare provided by the company. The people in general were like civil servants, and this distinguished them from, say, people from the neighbouring area of Jiufen which was also famous for gold mining. The mining business in Jiufen was run in a different way: everyone could conduct mining activities by contract with the owner of the mine, whereas the people in Jinguashi were divided into specific professional categories and only received fixed salaries from the company. Stealing gold from the mine was a serious criminal behaviour and strictly monitored by police in Jinguashi. Therefore, while Jiufen became famous for its ostentatiously prosperous street life, Jinguashi remained a relatively moderate place, regulated by a strict company system aided by police surveillance. The Kaisha, ‘the company’ in Japanese, was the king of this isolated local society. It defined the social hierarchy and operational rules, controlled resources and was supported by colonial police power. Local employees who had emigrated from various neighbouring areas were localised within the framework constructed by the company. This framework remains closely related to the collective memory in the area.

After the Second World War, the Japanese Mining Company had to leave Taiwan, and its mining business and properties in Jinguashi and Shuinandong were later transferred to the state enterprise of the KMT government, the Taiwan Metal and Mining Company (Taiwan Jinshu Kuangye Gongsi, 台灣金屬礦業公司), in 1955. The company inherited an industrial and structural legacy in Jinguashi from its Japanese predecessor. The higher ranked positions that had been occupied by the Japanese now belonged to a new group, the mainlanders.\textsuperscript{154} The company, no matter whether Japanese or Chinese, was king in this isolated mining town, and the local residents, again, were situated at the lower level of the social hierarchy.

When recalling the situation during the reign of the KMT, the local Taiwanese residents showed a lukewarm attitude towards their company bosses in the postwar era. They appreciated the better welfare provided by the company, especially as the company funded a local junior high school which had not existed under Japanese rule. And yet, at the same time, they criticised the inequality of the promotion system. Taiwanese employees rarely promoted to manager’s positions as mainlanders and their relatives or affiliates largely occupied these positions.\textsuperscript{155} This is

\textsuperscript{150} Qingbuliao青簿寮 refers to residences of Taiwanese employees. Qingbu青簿 is the salary account book which was kept by the employees. These books were taken to the company retail store and were used instead of money to buy daily commodities.

\textsuperscript{151} Wenzhouliaow温州寮 refers to the residences of immigrant workers from Wenzhou, an area in the Zhejiang省 Province, China.

\textsuperscript{152} Dopingaliao替鼻仔寮 in Taiwanese referred to the residents of the POW camp. ‘Dopinga’ refers to the white foreigners who were characterised as having high and straight noses.

\textsuperscript{153} Elders recalled that when they graduated from the local primary school, the company selected graduates with good performance in the school as their employees.
a major emotional gap between two ethnic groups that has not yet been addressed. Comparisons between the Japanese and KMT companies were made in order to voice feelings of inequality. For instance, it was claimed that the former was more professional and efficient in managing, while the latter used a lot of redundant and unprofessional personnel (Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008).

In 1987 the Taiwan Metal and Mining Company declared its bankruptcy and transferred property and debts to the Taiwan Sugar Corporation and the Taiwan Power Company. The mining business was officially terminated and the town became silent again as it had been a hundred years before. However, the phrase *kaisha* remains in use in the everyday conversation of local elders, as part of their memory of the mining years. As suggested by Laurajane Smith in her discussion of the issue of indigenous heritage in the white settlers’ society, “colonial structural racism was inherent in postcolonial bureaucracies” (Smith 2006, 288). This colonial geneology remained in Jinguashi by means of the state enterprises, the Taiwan Sugar Corporation and the Taiwan Power Company. A newly established museum, the Gold Ecological Park, is also part of these postcolonial bureaucracies.

3.1.2 The Gold Ecological Park in Jinguashi

In 2002, the plan for the Gold Ecological Park in Jinguashi was initiated by the Taipei County Government under the mayorality of Su Jen-chang (蘇貞昌), a powerful figure of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP；Minzhu jinbu dang民主進步黨), the ruling party from 2000 to 2008. Su decided to adopt positive acts in Jinguashi which had long been restricted by land ownership and legislation on reuse of mining land. The museum park was formally opened on November 4th in 2004.

The Gold Ecological Park was one of numerous museum plans on a regional scale during the first decade of this century in Taiwan. It was planned as an ‘ecomuseum’, a new museum model which has been widely proposed by regional governments for fueling local redevelopment. Many of these plans have been financially supported by state departments. The ideas of conserving the living environment of the local ‘community’ and of accentuating community participation are vital elements within this museum model. Hence, the model echoes the vogue of ‘indigenization’ which has dominated all levels and phases of localization movements in the recent decades. A postcolonial awareness of reconnecting people to the land, in this case Taiwan, has been prominent in all fields within Taiwan, including literature, language, and political claims. In terms of heritage and memory work, the ecomuseum incorporates diverse interests in community building, although its original pursuit and context has yet to be fully understood by policy makers and practitioners.

Following the concept of an ecomuseum, the Gold Ecological Park aims to preserve the mining remains and local memory in Jinguashi and search for means of the sustainable development of Jinguashi. The town of Jinguashi and its neighbourhood Shuinan-dong 水湳洞 are regarded as the planning ‘territory’ of this ecomuseum. Same as the catalogue-like model of ecomuseums, a number of historic buildings and mining facilities were opened to the public as satellite museums of the Gold Ecological Park. First, the Information Centre, renovated from the old bus station at the main entrance of the museum park serves as the information hub and guides visitors to satellite sites. Next, an Environmental Education Centre (Huanjing Guan 環境館) provides information on the unique environmental features of Jinguashi including geographical, geological, botanical and architectural characteristics. The Museum of
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156. Because of the dual colonialism in Taiwan, the colonial profits of Japanese colonizer were wholesale replacements for the postwar KMT ruler. This was regarded as “colonial genealogy” in this thesis.

157. ‘Bentuhua本土化 (Makeham and Hsiau 2005: introduction)

158. ‘Territory’ is one important element of an ecomuseum, in contrast to a traditional museum which limits its activities within a museum building.

159. An ecomuseum is often designed like a catalogue. It is comprised of a major site and several satellite sites. The major site often provides general information about the area, and therefore functions as the ‘contents page’ of a book. Satellite sites focus on various categories introduced by the major site.
Gold (Huangjin Bowuguan 黃金博物館), renovated from an office building from the mining era, represents the mining history of Jinguashi and topics relating to gold. Then there is the Benshan Fifth Tunnel (Benshan Wukeng 本山五坑), which was originally a mining tunnel and has been partly renovated and opened for public visits, and the Japanese Residences of Prince Chalet (Taizi Binguān 太子賓館) and Siliandong (四連棟), an extensive building separated into four households, which show the spatial features of Japanese architecture and highlight residential memories associated with the buildings. Finally, the Gold Refinery Building (Lianjin Lou 煉金樓) represents local mining memories through digital devices and archive display. Other than the major facilities, the entire environment of Jinguashi, for instance plants, rail tracks and mining remains spread in the area are considered as exhibits of the Gold Ecological Park. Engaging the local residents is central to the museum’s mission. All of these are in accordance with the holistic features of an ideal ecomuseum model.
3.1.3 When Past Meets Past at the Gold Ecological Park

Owing the majority of land in Jinguashi, the postcolonial institutions, the Taiwan Power Company and the Taiwan Sugar Corporation, maintained the spatial and social fabric constructed by the colonizers. The Japanese companies had started to alter the entire landscape of Jinguashi for manufacturing and administrative purposes. The companies concomitantly established the social hierarchy of Jinguashi on the basis of ethnic division. This social hierarchy was given shape through spatial division, salary levels, work type, housing quality et cetera, and was inherited by the later KMT government. These divisions designate the diversified frameworks of memory and represent the ambiguity of heritage-work, as the postcolonial dislocation of a colonial privileged community emptied the memories, emotional bonds and bodily experiences associated with the material remains of the colonizers, especially when these remains were ambiguously designated as ‘local heritage’ of the former colonized communities. The following part of this section considers the complexity and ambiguity of postcolonial memory recollection within the aforementioned context in terms of the heritage practices of the Gold Ecological Park.

**Tunnels—the past of the miners**

At the first point of contact with the team of the Gold Ecological Park most informants recognised that the priority for visitors was the introduction to and recollection of that the mining and industrial history of the area. Thus the affiliated material remains such as tunnels, mining carts and trails, factories, tools were added to the priority list of the museum collection. Benshan Fifth Tunnel 本山五坑 was selected from among numerous tunnels to represent the local speciality and renovated because of safety and location concerns. The interior display was based on oral records of labour experiences recounted by elders residing in Jinguashi or others recommended by them. This was the same for the display scheme of the Museum of Gold in its premier stage. The selection of subjects was carried out with the help of the memories of male miners, who were current residents and past subalterns with no financial or social capability to move out after the industry’s closure (Su Yu-ling 1996). However, this single voice was the only one taken into account while other memories of the affiliated material remains were exiled.
Japanese Residences—the past of the administrators

Prior to the renovation scheme of Siliandong 四連栋, the excessive visits at the museum park had not much influenced the silent existence of the Japanese residences. The missing pieces of the memory puzzle eventually emerged when the museum realized the insufficiency of existing oral records and written documents of Siliandong. For the interior display, the Gold Ecological Park consulted Guo-Jia Lee 李國嘉, a Jinguashi-born artist, for her living experiences and memories of the Japanese residence during the postwar KMT period, and asked her to lead the projects of oral records, objects collection and interior design. This version of memory, alternative to the previous perception, shook the museum’s existing image of the local past.

Other than the spatial texture of tunnels, machinery, and bodily experiences of industrial modernity, Lee’s stories showed strong emotional bonds to the Japanese residences and revealed a very different memory dimension which belonged to the administrative group. Upon the closure of the industry, this group of residents were relatively more financial able to move out of this economically declining town (Su Yu-ling 1996).

Prisoner of War (POW) Camp Memorial Park—the past of the war prisoners

In a close neighborhood of the Gold Ecological Park, a memorial park for POWs was constructed in 2005 on the site where the prisoner of war camp was located in World War Two. The memories about POW in Jinguashi were documented in a few oral descriptions from local residents who had only observed those foreign prisoners from some distance. From 1942 onwards, thousands of war prisoners, mainly from the British Commonwealth (Britain, Canada, Australia etc.), were sent to Jinguashi in a constant stream and were charged with heavy labour in the tunnels. Some local elders recalled their restricted contact with prisoners under strict surveillance of the Japanese. This contact was eliminated later, as the Japanese dug a tunnel to conceal the passage of prisoners. At the site in the present, there are scarce remains of the walls and a cenotaph. The Taiwan POW Camp Memorial Society invites camp survivors from all over the world to attend the annual memorial ceremonies at the site.

This site receives relatively less attention from the locals and the public despite its significance for humanity. After enthusiastic contact from Michael Hurst, director of the Taiwan POW Camp Memorial Society, the museum managed to include the memory in the display. Years after the opening of museum, the issue concerning the POW camp received better attention, and this can be observed from oral records by the museum in a later period.160

Upon the closure of the mining industry, most employees at the administrative level moved away. The memory version of mining labours became the only phase that researchers and curators could contact at the locale. This memory version was framed by its colonial structure—the social hierarchy, spatial fabric and tenant-landlord relationship. A sense of community based on inclusive memory versions and participants remains fragmentary in the present local society, owing to the residue of the colonial structure.

160. For instance, the oral records of Guashan elementary school alumni in 2008. See Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008.
Furthermore, the extension of community awareness still struggles within postcolonial political dynamics.

**Becoming Heritage?**

Heritage-making in Jinguashi was triggered by incentives from the county government on local tourism and political performance. Without the political influence of the mayor, it would hardly have been possible for a museum to initiate this heritage-work within the fierce political dynamics under social separation and residue from the colonial structure. Yet this political support also had the downside of an extremely compressed time frame for completion. A sense of community within local residents had not been formulated and this was soon hindered by competition when financial resources became available locally in the form of government projects and tourism revenue. Notwithstanding the emerging awareness for claiming the Japanese remains as local heritage, the residents have not expressed a strong desire to engage in the heritage-work. Furthermore, the Gold Ecological Park received the right to lead the development of central Jinguashi by contracting with the Taiwan Power Company and the Taiwan Sugar Corporation. However, the museum has only limited influence on motivating the local communities to participate in heritage affairs. This owes much to the political complexity of the area and local sentiments about land issues.

It has been difficult for the museum to enact heritage interpretations with multi-faceted memory versions. A section of this chapter will elaborate on how colonial ambiguity emerges in the process of heritage interpretation by investigating a ritual practice at the Gold Ecological Park, and will describe how the ambiguity of representing a Japanese site was generated and had interacted with the collective acts of making heritage in Taiwan during the 1990s and 2000s.

### 3.2 THE LOST AND FOUND OF COMMUNITY AT A LOCAL MUSEUM

The fever of the *ecomuseum* has spread into diverse fields in Taiwan during the last two decades. The term was widely seen in regional planning projects, master’s theses, and academic reports. Many of these adopted the ecomuseum as a major solution to regional development, particularly at economic peripheries. The emergence of Ecomuseum fever was inseparable from Taiwan’s “era of localism” (Lü Hsin-yi 2002, 24) and from the ensuing implemented national Integrated Community-Making Programme (shequ zongti yingzao 社區總體營造). Although the latter was mainly referred to in terms of its Japanese counterpart ‘machizukuri’162, the similarities of targets and techniques between the community-building projects and the French-oriented ecomuseum propositions can also be observed from the contemporary discourses in Taiwan. It is these similarities that allowed the concepts of ecomuseum to be more acceptable and more easily appropriated in contemporary Taiwan.

Firstly, both ‘models’ operate on a microscopic level. A ‘community’ and its associated ‘territory’ are presupposed. Secondly, the idea of ‘collective memory’ is central to both community-building and the model of the ecomuseum. Hence memory recollection and heritage conservation serve as important focal points in their practices. Thirdly, the ‘integrated perspective’ is adopted in both models. People and the environment they inhabit form a single whole. They reformulate each other, and their interaction is the base for sustainable development. Most importantly, the autonomous awareness and actions of communities are regarded as the core of both proposals. Finally, both are visions of the future proposed for groups of people. Owing to these similarities, plans for ecomuseums are often perceived to be overlapping with community-building programmes particularly in regional development plans, and compounded with the
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161. The tenure of a county mayor in Taiwan is four years. Hence most mayors want to display their cultural constructions to voters before the next election.

162. Machizukuri refers to the Japanese movement concerning civil participation, community building and place making initiated since the postwar era. Its meaning is vague and evolutive. The analysis of its development and cases refers to Watanabe 2007.
economic incentives which characterised Taiwan’s community-building model. Nearly four decades after the first French initiatives, many ecomuseums have evolved into varieties and some have even disappeared or been left “asleep” (Joubert 2005); concurrently the ideal has been appropriated in Taiwan. This section presents a case in Taiwan—the Gold Ecological Park, a local museum which intends to achieve the ideal of the ecomuseum within the social-political framework of Taiwan.

In France of the 1970s, the *ecomuseum* concept emerged to offer solutions to French contemporary social circumstances. The ideal model has endured variations through geographical and cultural differences; hence its definition is hardly settled. Since the model of the ecomuseum was originally used for its social ideal, the stability of definition is actually not the core concern. The question is whether the museum model indeed offers an approach to reach the ideal of a society. Therefore, as “heritage is a cultural process” (Smith 2004), *ecomuseum* is also an “evolutive” concept. Its feature of “integrated complex” is being consistently adjusted in accord with the dynamic actor-network at each locale within its own “predominant thoughts” (Halbwachs 1992). This is the reason for this section not reviewing the conceptual development, but concentrating on the analysis of a specific case. If the ecomuseum has been regarded as a solution to Taiwan’s circumstances, it is necessary to carefully examine its appropriation, targets and problems of actual application in Taiwan. Hence this reflection can possibly contribute to the global spectrum of ecomuseum practices.

Moreover, the significance of the ecomuseum is that it does not offer a definite framework and fixed model to follow; its challenge to traditional authorities and stimulation of autonomy draws a collective future of a society with a better ‘quality of life’. Hence it is not my intention to ask how museums or heritage projects fit the ‘model’ of ecomuseum, but to figure out how the concepts of ecomuseum stimulate a picture of the future in response to present issues; and how ecomuseums can generate discourses and critically supervise the stakeholders to ensure that they stick to their social missions and public responsibilities. The ecomuseum can never be a manual providing detailed information on ways to deal with all kinds of issues, particularly those related to the economic improvement of a locale. It is, rather, a complex of ideas. These ideas and the approaches to them are always under construction, and need to remain unfixed, as Rivière stated in his “evolutive definition”: “[t]his laboratory, conservation centre and school are based on common principles. […] Its diversity is limitless, so greatly do its elements vary from one specimen to another. This triad, then, is not self-enclosed: it receives and it gives” (Rivière 1985, 182-183).

### 3.2.1 Making an Ecomuseum: The Gold Ecological Park

![Fig. 3.1.2 Official icon of the Gold Ecological Park. Photo was taken by the author.](image)

The choice of the word ‘ecological’ implies significance similar to that of the ‘eco’ prefix of ecomuseum, associated with environmental concern and sustainable development (Davis 2008, 401). The Gold Ecological Park consists of a tourist information centre serving as museum base and several satellites sites, including a historical mining museum, a tunnel, a nature centre, and various Japanese residences. All the facilities were renovated from the old mining remains. There are no physical boundaries defining the museum territory. Local police and post office are located at the centre of the park, and the living spaces of residents are in close proximity to the museum facilities. Considering this close relationship with local communities and the conservation of cultural landscape and local memory, the planning team defined the mission and features of this museum park as those of an ecomuseum. However, the internal and external network of actors in the process of museum-making has challenged the ecomuseum’s mission.

#### 3.2.1.1 Institutionalizing the Ecomuseum

In 1987 when the mining industry in Jinguashi 金瓜石 was ended, Jinguashi reverted back to being a silent town in the mountains. The difference between
Jinguashi and neighbouring Jiufen, only a 10 minute drive away, was amazing. Both were famous for gold production in the Japanese colonial and post-war eras, but Jiufen subsequently became a hot tourist spot. In contrast, the economy of Jinguashi went into a dramatic recession around the time of the closure of the mining industry, leading the younger generation to find work elsewhere, leaving an aged population behind. Compared to Jiufen packed by tourists, tea houses and hotels, Jinguashi was silent, with gorgeous natural scenery, old buildings and mysterious mining remains spread out over the mountains. It seemed frozen in time, and stimulated feelings of nostalgia in urban visitors. The silence of Jinguashi is closely related to the complicated legal status of its land and to the bureaucratic structure determining the local affairs.

Jinguashi belongs to the Ruifang Township in the north eastern district of Taipei County. Owing to its isolated location surrounded by mountains and remote from urban areas, Jinguashi had rarely been noticed by the county government. In Jinguashi, five major government apparatus are related to local lives. The first is the local administrative office of the Taiwan Power Company, under the administration of the Shenao Power Plant. The local office manages a number of old buildings, factories, industrial facilities and tunnels inherited from the bankrupted Taiwan Metal and Mining Company. The second government apparatus is the Jinguashi Management Team of the Taiwan Sugar Corporation. The office is under the Land Development Department and is in charge of managing most tunnels, land and residences in Jinguashi. The staff of the team had to inspect any danger and illegal entries to the tunnels, and is in charge of the rental affairs of land and buildings. Most inhabitants of Jinguashi have to regularly pay land rental fees to the company. The third is the Ruifang Scenic Special Area Administrative Office which belonged to the Bureau of Development, Taipei County Government. The office was temporarily located at Jinguashi before the plan for the Gold Ecological Museum was initiated. The fourth and fifth organisations have close relationships to the lives of Jinguashi residents, yet do not have local offices at Jinguashi. The Fourth is the Bureau of Mines, part of the Ministry of Economic Affairs (MOEA). It is a department of the state government in charge of mining affairs. The legal status of land in Jinguashi remains classified for ‘mining use’ after the closure of the mining industry. Hence the Bureau of Mines is the top managing organisation of land use and tunnels in Jinguashi. Any use of land has to get permission from the bureau in advance, and has to follow the Law for Mining Affairs (Kuangye fa). Finally, the Ruifang Township Office is the legal administrative organization of the Jinguashi area. The aforementioned bureaucratic organisations had operated individually in this remote town without much interaction or conflict until the plan for the museum was finally actualized.

Recomposing the Bureaucratic Balance

Each of the five above-mentioned government organizations had its plan for the redevelopment of Jinguashi, mainly concerning exploiting its tourism potential, like Jiufen. However, none could actualize a plan without disturbing the balance of bureaucratic
territory. This balance was formally reformulated by the signing the Cooperation Agreement (三方共同發展合作意願書) between Taipei County Government, the Taiwan Sugar Corporation and the Taiwan Power Company in October 2002. From then on, the planning team of Taipei County Government was officially legitimated by the agreement and able to communicate with the local institutions, which had previously hesitated to help in order to trouble and extra work load.

The new museum plan seemed promising amid this atmosphere of cooperation between the three most influential parties. However, the Cooperation Agreement also allowed a new power structure to emerge in Jinguashi. In the past, the local institutions had achieved a balance of power in this remote town, without frequent notice from their headquarters. This silent balance was challenged when the museum preparatory team of the county government was recognized by three parties as the leading institution in dealing with local affairs in Jinguashi. Other than the changing balance between local institutions, the power of deciding Jinguashi’s affairs was also transferred between departments of the Taipei County Government during the development of the museum.

In early 2002, the plan of establishing a mining museum in Jinguashi was proposed by the Development Affairs Bureau (建設局) of the Taipei County Government. The bureau organised a provisional team for a Gold-Copper Museum (金銅博物館籌備處) and demanded its subsidiary organization, the Ruifang Scenic Special Area Administrative Office, to be in charge of the collection for and planning of the new museum. When the renovation of museum building was nearly complete, the bureau asked for professional assistance in managing the museum from the Cultural Affairs Bureau (文化局) of the county government. This resulted in the transfer of power in the museum plan from the Development Affairs Bureau to the Cultural Affairs Bureau. This transfer, on the one hand, broadened the content and scale of the museum plan, while on the other hand, it brought about competition and discord between the two bureaus. As a result, the affiliated institution of the Cultural Affairs Bureau, the Yingge Ceramics Museum, was assigned by the county government to be in charge of the planning work, replacing the position of the Ruifang Scenic Special Area Administrative Office in Jinguashi.

A preparatory team which consisted of members of Ceramics Museum staff was officially joined by architectural and planning professionals in May 2002. Together, they proposed a new development scheme which would extend the scale of the museum from simply a building to the entire area of Jinguashi. This plan inevitably involved an extremely complicated network of legal and political actors.

The leading status of the Ceramics Museum in creating a new museum is rather ambiguous. As a secondary institution within the structure of the Taipei County Government, the museum was able to motivate the cooperation of its superior departments depending on the support from the county mayor. Hence, the relationship between the mayor and the museum director was crucial in determining the smooth process of museum construction.

Creating a New Institution

In the initial stages, the planning team of the Gold Ecological Park was within the organization structure of the Yingge Ceramics Museum. The director of the Yingge Ceramics Museum, Mr. Wu Jin-feng 吳進風, was also the head of the preparatory team of the Gold Ecological Park. Members of the team were also employees and followed regulations of the Ceramics Museum, although they mainly dealt with the preparatory work of the Gold Ecological Park.

However, in the later stage of preparatory process, an independent organization of the Gold Ecological Park had to be established (Wu Pei-fen 2009). This dealt with the need for the future museum operation, and the territorial features of the museum park. The Gold Ecological Park consists of 5.2 acres of direct managing area within around 9 acres of the total planned objective area. Most importantly, the museum was planned as an ecomuseum, and hence was expected to involve the environment and commu-

163. Yingge Ceramics Museum was the first municipal museum created by the Taipei County Government. The official website is: http://www.ceramics.tpc.gov.tw/Index.ycm
nities of Jinguashi. At the same time, the museum is a branch of a government institution, and therefore has to serve the bureaucratic framework of the government, whose major principal is preventing abuses and corruption. As an ecomuseum, the Gold Ecological Park should be responsive to the needs of the community and to environmental changes. It relies on immediate, humanistic, interactive and flexible action. On the other hand, as a government apparatus the value of clean-handedness and security is priority. The smooth operation of a government apparatus relies on a strict hierarchical system of document proof, and legal and literary refinement. The problems between an ecomuseum and bureaucratic institutions will be discussed in more detail later in this section.
**Fig. 3.2.7** The Prince Chalet. Photo was taken by the author.

**Fig. 3.2.8** The Gold Refinery Building. Photo was taken by the author.

**Transition of the Organisation Structure**

In November 2004, the Gold Ecological Park was officially opened to the public. On 1 January 2005, the Taipei County Gold Museum was inaugurated as a new independent organisation (duli jiguān 獨立機關) of the Taipei County Government. 13 members of staff were taken from the Yingge Ceramics Museum and legally allotted to the Gold Ecological Park. 164 Two departments, the Education and Planning Department (教育規劃組) and the Operation and Marketing Department (營運推廣組), were allotted under the director (see Figure 1).

The direct managing area of the Gold Ecological Park covers over 6 acres of land and 6 major facilities in 2004. 165 Since the museum area has no boundary, the areas of museum activities overlap with the living areas of the local residents. Hence the administrative work of the museum is far more complicated than for normal museums confined within buildings or walls. For instance, the post office and police station are located in the central area of the museum park, and the post office provides the only banking service in Jinguashi. The bus service connecting Jinguashi to neighboring towns and urban areas is located in front of the major entrance of the museum park. Hence the museum area contains some major walking routes for the local residents. Despite covering such a large space the Gold Ecological Park had only 13 staff as part of its organisation in 2005. 166 The museum had to use flexible, and so often temporary personnel in order to operate smoothly.

In 2007, in accordance with the elevation in status the Taipei County 167, the municipal museums had to adjust their organisational structures. This time, the Gold Ecological Park had three departments and 26 personnel positions. The department of Administration was added to the original structure (Figure 2). This shows the emerging importance of bureaucratic affairs and the changing role of the Gold Ecological Park as a government institution. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the museum from then on was no

164 Prior to the establishment of the Gold Museum, the Yingge Ceramics Museum had 51 personnel. In 2005, this number was cut to 38. This was linked to the financial difficulties of the Taipei County Government at that time. The Yingge Ceramics Museum was built in 2000 when the Taipei County Government had a better financial status (Lin Ming-mei 2008, 65).


166 This was due to the financial difficulties of the Taipei County Government, and the because of the central government (銓敘部).

167 The Taipei County Government was transformed from a municipal county to a Zhixia City 直轄市, which means that the city became directly managed by the state government and belonged to the Executive Yuan (行政院).
longer an independent institution. It became part of the organisation of the Cultural Affairs Bureau. The revised constitution of the organisation structure states “[...] the director is under the orders of the chief of the Cultural Bureau [...]”\(^{168}\). Museum staff voiced concerns that the policies of the chief of the Cultural Affairs Bureau had a great impact on the development of the museum. When the chief of the Bureau does not respect the autonomy of museums, even printed marketing resources have to get agreement from the chief of Cultural Affairs Bureau (Wu Pei-fen 2009, 98). This status change challenged the museum's mission as an ecomuseum, which demands immediate response and sensitivity to the feelings of local communities.

As a government apparatus, this unconventional museum has also been constrained by personnel legislation. The staff of the Taipei county museums are from two sources: the civil service officials (gongwu renyuan 公務人員) and educational personnel (jiaoyu renyuan 教育人員). The latter is especially important for museum services. The educational personnel system was a relatively new system for Taipei County. It was created for the establishment of the first county museum, the Yingge Ceramics Museum, after struggles with the state government. According to this system, the educational personnel are able to enjoy the benefits of normal civil service officials, such as pension and preferential interest rates. In contrast to the state examination procedure for employing civil servants, they are employed according to their professional performance and educational background in the form of interviews and internal examinations within the employing institutions. However, the permitted number of educational personnel is usually very limited, since employing educational personnel is expensive and involves a complicated legal procedure. As a result, the civil service officials and flexible personnel make up the majority of museum workers. This greatly influences the professional function of the museum.

The personnel instability is the same for staff employed throughout the civil service system. Within the system, the Gold Ecological Park represents a local institution with a low hierarchical position. Staff at the Park receive lower salaries with lower classification titles than some staff in the cultural bureau and county government. Hence, civil servants frequently transfer to other positions higher than the museum can provide when their period of obligation has been fulfilled. Even the director is changeable. The museum has been running for 7 years, within which period five directors have been in position. Low hierarchical position and complicated local politics and museum matters are the major factors resulting in the instability of personnel.

3.2.1.2 ‘Community’ in Question

The core idea of ecomuseum lies in ‘community participation’. Yet the term ‘community’ has been widely agreed to be “one of the most elusive and vague in sociology and by now largely without specific meaning”. Community, as well as identity, is dynamic and intangible in response to societal changes. This core feature of community leads to extreme difficulties when the ‘integrated model’ of a museum is put into practice at an actual locale, especially at places of colonial legacy.

As is the case with many other colonial heritage sites, the mining buildings and material remains of Jinguashi actually represented greatly diversified memories. Different groups of people owned various social frameworks in accord with social hierarchy constructed in the colonial era. Regarding representations of the local past, the museum team had to explore different memory versions and help to build up a more inclusive sense of place. This is particularly difficult since local knowledge has been acknowledged only when the new development plan was already being launched. The connection between people and the land was actually a new accentuation, having emerged when different identity narratives of Taiwan were allowed to appear publicly and, later, began to be encouraged by the government from the 1990s onwards. In this regard, the sense of community is actually fragmented.

This fragmentation was reinforced by the economic decline of the town. After the closure of the mining industry, the only industry of Jinguashi was/is now tourism. Apart from some small grocery stores and local restaurants, the Bed-and-Breakfast is the only major business, the benefit of which is limited to a small number of people. Most of the young generation left Jinguashi for better job and educational opportunities. The demographic is characterised by a high percentage of grandparent-headed families. The people running the B&B, many of them having come from Taipei and other metropolitan areas, are the major part of the younger generation in Jinguashi and have the most potential as partners of the museum. However, the issues of admission fee, renovation of houses and land ownership formed obstacles against the building of a relationship of mutual trust. There is great difference between groups of people. And similar to many locales, opinions are always expressed by a limited number of persons. Most residents, especially elder females, are silent about public affairs.

169 Abercrombie et al. 2000, 64; cited from Sheila Watson 2007, 3.
Among the small number of opinion leaders, there is actually fierce competition between specific individuals and groups. Subsidies from the government supporting local affairs, especially those under the grand scheme of the Integrated Community-Making Programme, did not result in a collective sense of community but in competition and hostility toward ‘others’. All the mentioned situations reflect the extreme complexity of defining ‘a community’ to work with.

Moreover, the museum team in a way succeeded to the social position built up by the colonial genealogy and was regarded by the local residents as representative of the league comprised by county government and national enterprises. Issues of land ownership and housing renovation had a negative influence on the relationship between the museum and local residents.

_Memory and Community Work_

In spite of this difficult situation, engaging communities is a must for the Gold Ecological Park. This is not only due to its mission as an ecomuseum, but also the intertwined fate of the museum and Jingua-shi. Apart from regular conservation and interpretation works, several actions were initiated by the museum team in the period from 2003 to 2005 to fuel the consensus of community and generate a collective vista of the future:

1. Recollecting memories and local knowledge: recording oral histories, researching and obtaining relevant archival and material data.
2. Approaching silent groups and exploring ignored memories: some courses and events were arranged such as language learning, yoga practices, singing concerts etc. Despite being seemingly irrelevant to museum works, these events were an important medium to approach females and the elderly, the marginal groups of the local population. Through contacts in these informal occasions, museum staff could gradually develop a trust relationship with the local residents and listen to their voices.
3. Holding training courses for interior and exterior volunteers: the local knowledge and research results collected by the museum could be transmitted to and receive responses from local communities.
4. Cooperating with local schools and the owners of the B&B: for example cooperating with schools to cultivate the local unique flowers threatened by urbanisation.
5. Developing potential cultural industries: if the mission of an ecomuseum is to be an asset to the life of local residents, development of the town in the long term ought to be considered. The mining industry of the past produced only raw materials and hence did not help develop local cultural products and crafts. If cultural tourism is the best choice to revitalise this economically declined area, then the production of potential products with local distinctiveness should be initiated and developed to help the locals get by. Therefore, two projects were designed and put into practice: providing free training courses on goldsmith craft; and introducing resources and training guides for developing ecotourism. The former aims to boost the potential cultural industry and entice the younger generation to stay and develop the locale. The latter is based on the great potential of this place with its rich natural resources to develop a sustainable way of attracting ecotourism. The Silver Grass Festival and hiking activities were held for this incentive. This is in the hope that the trained local volunteers can earn their living as guides introducing their place with pride to visitors in the future.

3.2.2 “Do ecomuseums have a future?”

The question was asked by François Hubert. After a decade of development in France, the ideal model of ecomuseum proposed by the initiators was appropriated at various locations and challenged by contradictions and distortions. His observation is still of great innovative value to our reflections on the ecomuseum fever today. Departing from his points commenting on contradictions represented by some of the French ecomuseums, particularly those which took the participatory approach and community dominance to extremes, the section examined the Gold Ecological Park as summarised below:

3.2.1.1 Issue of Institutionalisation

Contrary to the extreme “community-ecomuseums” just mentioned (Hubert 1985, 188), the Gold Ecological Park was established and financed by the municipal government. The notion of revitalising the local
economy through museum construction had existed within the circle of local opinion leaders for years. The Taiwan Power Company, one of the national enterprises who own the mining properties and land of Jinguashi, drew up its development plan a decade ago. However none of these came into reality until the interference of the county government. This owes to the complicated ownership structure of the land and the legal regulations on the former mining area. Due to its status as a representative of a government body, the museum team was able to receive agreements from different government bodies including the relevant national enterprises and the bureau of mining affairs. Moreover, the annual budget from the county government guarantees the existence of the museum park despite economic and political fluctuations, which otherwise might cause severe crises in the existence of a community-ecomuseum. Within the normal conditions of Taiwan’s dynamic local politics, this top-down model can also be an effective approach to initiate and maintain the cultural works for the longer term at a local level, if cultural practitioners are able to technically resist political influences and stick to their social missions.

Yet in a time of institutionalisation, the nature of an organisation may change along with the process. The issue of naming well represented this ambiguity. Establishing a museum of this unusual form brought great challenges to the bureaucratic system of both the county and central governments. In order to adopt a standard museum’s administrative structure following precedent models used for conventional museums, the unique features of the ecomuseum had to be excluded in the process of institutionalisation. This is related to the structure of organisation and employment of professional personnel within the legal system. The name which would identify the ecomuseum as a museum ‘park’ or ‘area’ (yuanqu 園區) could not be applied, despite the fact that it represents the primary feature of an ecomuseum—territory. This is because the adoption of ‘yuanqu’ would result in an organisational structure like that of a zoo or a local administrative district. Eventually the park was named the “Taipei County Gold Museum” (Taibeixianli Huangjin Bowuguan 台北縣立黃金博物館)\textsuperscript{170}, which is the name used in all official and legal documents. The title “Gold Ecological Park” (Huangjin Bowu Yuanqu 黃金博物園區), however, is still in use as part of the logo shown to visitors, and this collateral usage has led to numerous confusions. Even staff of the museum gradually forgot the essences of the Gold Ecological Park, and followed the track of the bureaucratic administrative body and framework of a conventional museum, the Taipei County Gold Museum.

3.2.1.2 Issue of Conflicts and Scientific Interpretation

The memories and community groups of the local population are greatly diversified at this locale of colonial legacy. Hubert warned against only mystifying the past as utopian for future imagination, as many rural ecomuseums did; “[i]t is [...] difficult to be part of the present as can be seen from the experiences of the ecomuseums in new towns, where social differences are compounded with differences in culture and civilization. What can the ecomuseum do in such places except offer a totally artificial identity to people who have been displaced and who, in addition, come into violent conflict with the ways of the original inhabitants?” (Hubert 1985, 188). In Jinguashi, the current residents are mainly lower-rank employees who worked in the colonial industry. The group of administrators moved out, as they were of higher economic status. In the process of memory recollection, some mentioned the discrimination during the Japanese and postwar KMT (國民黨) regimes (Taiwan Nature Trail Society 2005). As conservation is critical to the ecomuseum, it has been difficult to interpret the residences of the administrative class as local heritage. The museum team actually encountered difficulties trying to cooperate with a member of said class to collect oral history at the locale. Recognising the diversity and discordant nature of memories and communities was the first task of the museum; fuelling an inclusive version of the past without excluding “others”, including different local groups, external professionals etcetera, is the second and toughest mission of the Gold Ecological Park in approaching the ideal of ecomuseum—to be “a mirror in which the local population views itself to discover its own image, in which it seeks an explanation of the territory to which it is attached and of the

170. After December 2010, the formal name of the museum was changed to the New Taipei City Gold Museum.
populations that have preceded it, seen either as circumscribed in time or in terms of the continuity of generations” (Rivière 1985, 182).

The forming of an inclusive version of local past and future requires great efforts from a neutral body, who can work between groups lacking in mutual trust, and build up a platform for potential cooperation. The museum is actually the best candidate, considering its professional resources and its neutrality among local groups. Moreover, the museum is more careful to notice marginal groups, and hence to include previously ignored voices. The oral records of the female and mainlander population were part of this concern. This also echoes the discussion of institution—an official body can be a greater asset within the dynamic circumstances often seen in Taiwan.

3.2.1.3 Issue of Economic Incentive

Economic incentive plays an important role in many ecomuseum projects, and the case of Jinguashi is no exception. The potential benefits of heritage tourism were most effective and accountable in persuading local inhabitants and opinion leaders to agree with the plans for the museum and its conservation activities. However, a community project led by economic incentives inevitably results in controversy.

The aspects concerning better quality of life, empowerment of the community, accumulation of culture et cetera are often veiled by the pursuit of economic benefits, although the economic benefits are not necessarily apparent in every regeneration strategy of heritage, as Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge argued (2000, 169). And “[e]very difficult period sees a proliferation of historical and ethno graphical museums whose purpose is to smooth away worries about the future by extolling the values of the past” (Hubert 1985, 187). Hence even if the heritage strategy is adopted as a major instrument in the case of regional regeneration, wider integrated evaluation and strategies should be considered concomitantly. This structural issue has been rather naively ignored in promoting community participation by accentuating economic benefits from heritage tourism. The condition of the Gold Ecological Park after opening clearly demonstrated this problem. Local shop runners started to argue that they did not benefit from the visitors. It is difficult to communicate about any cultural and operational affairs if the museum cannot guarantee the short-term and foreseeable economic rewards.

3.2.3 A Top-Down Ecomuseum?

The vogue of Ecomuseum in Taiwan was a response to economic-political circumstances, and the concept was applied in various forms within the framework. As the critical element of both ecomuseum and community building, ‘community’ was particularly accentuated by numerous planning agents and research projects, and expected to be a cure-all to regional economic recession. Within this social circumstance, the term ‘bottom-up’ has been presented as the criteria of evaluation and legitimation. However, ‘community’ is a very vague concept, and its relevant practices are still in the experimental stage. In the case of Jinguashi, a collective sense of community has not formed, owing to structural deficiencies. Hence an official body may be helpful in taking a more neutral position, exploring diversities and including voices. The Gold Ecological Park can be an asset in generating a humanistic version of community and sustainable development at the locale with professional and financial resources, if it can stick to the mission of an ecomuseum and craftily resist the interference of the bureaucratic system. This is echoed in Hsia Chu-Joe’s advice to urban planners of Taiwan. The planners should play the role of grassroots activists, and break through the existing power relationship at the local level by exploring the space for “maneuver” and constructing “enclaves of transformation” (Chu-Joe Hsia 2003). This advice is also of great importance to cultivators of museums and heritage.

Furthermore, the museum can help to form a mirror for local communities by providing scientific interpretations. As Hubert stated, “[o]nly by comparing a scientific interpretation with the way the inhabitants...”
see themselves can a dialogue be engendered that might lead beyond this situation” (Hubert 1985, 189). He suggested that ecomuseums should not exclude other possibilities by concentrating only on conservation and community activities, but to find a neutral approach by developing the scientific dimensions of their field. In this regard, the ecomuseum can have a future, because of “the astonishing capacity it has shown for catching up with its own day, for confronting the present in order to offer it a new humanism over and above the image it reflects” (Hubert 1985, 190). If ecomuseums neither restrict themselves to the past, nor detach themselves from the present, then they do have a future, and will provide the societies they serve for with a vista of humanism.

3.3 THE HALLWAY OF MEMORY: THE DIVERSIFIED INTERPRETATION OF COLONIAL HERITAGE

Beginning in the 1990s, “Museumification” or “heritagization” experienced enormous growth in Taiwan in both the public and private sectors. According to statistics from the Chinese Association of Museums, in 1989/90 the total number of museums in Taiwan was 99. By 2007, the number had exploded to 580.172 This section explores the reconstruction of the past by examining the interpretations of collective ceremony and heritage renovation conducted by the Gold Ecological Park, a local museum. The selected case for discussion is Siliandong (四連棟), “A long extensive building divided into four households, each having its own individual entrance and living spaces.” Siliandong is an historic site built in the Japanese colonial period. The significance of this selection is the way in which it reflects on the wider context of Taiwan’s heritage construction.

This section will discuss the process of ritualizing memories as an integral part of heritage construction in postcolonial Taiwan. Through an explanation of the public ceremony used to conclude the structural renovation of the Siliandong Japanese residence in Jinguashi (金瓜石), I will demonstrate the highly complex nature of the ceremony. Understanding the process of ritualizing memories reveals the antagonistic and religiously sensitive issues at stake in the combination of the architectural structure within shifting cultural contexts. The three-layered make up of the ceremony shows how cultural and political interests interact and dominate, affecting the recollection and representation of memory. I argue that intentions to reconstruct the authentic sense of place involve a structural ‘lack of memory’. The section shows the role that local museums play in this heritage making and in the interpretation that comprises multiple voices and conflicting political interests.

3.3.1 Ritualizing Memories

Central to this section is the ceremony used to reshape the collective local memory and its role in museum politics. This ceremony is a microscopic site of memory which provides us with the depth to look into the postcolonial complexity. It serves as a reflective point to examine the difficulties underlying the heritage practice and postcolonial situation of contemporary Taiwan.

172. Please refer to the website of the Chinese Association of Museums (CAM 2007). The number of museums in 1989/90 is based on “The Number of Museums in Taiwan 1989/90-1997” (CAM 2007a). In 1985, the official number of guji (古迹) was 221 (Lin Yi-hong 2005, 23-24). According to the statistics of The Council of Cultural Affairs, ROC, at the end of 2000, the number of guji was 460 (CAM 2007b). By 2004, it had increased to 592 (CAM 2007c).
The Gold Ecological Park was formally opened to the public in November 2004. Based on the concepts of conservation and reutilization, this museum attracted more than one million tourists in the first year. The Siliandong Japanese Residence was renovated that year and opened as one of the major facilities in the museum park after completion of the interior display.

When the structural renovation of Siliandong was completed, the leading architect, Horigome Kenji proposed to perform a shangdongshi (上棟式) ceremony at the construction site. This idea was accepted by the Gold Ecological Park and held on 3 October 2005.

The purpose of the ceremony was to interpret colonial remains as local ‘heritage’. As mentioned by the museum in the ceremony brochure, the renovation of the Japanese residence, and the celebration aimed to conserve the local memory. Interestingly, a first issue in the ceremony concerned the name change to shangdong (上棟) or shangliang (上樑). As part of the renovation project, it was decided by the museum team that the ceremony would follow the name translated from Japanese as shangdongshi, and would be performed mainly in Japanese rituals in order to represent the cultural context of the architectural form. This decision was based on three considerations. First, for a museum, this could be a special educational programme to introduce a Japanese custom closely associated with the current renovation. Second, the entire building was repaired according to its original Japanese form, thus a Japanese shangdong ceremony would preserve this key message. Third, a Japanese ceremony is rarely seen by most Taiwanese these days, and thus would attract media attention.

The shangdong ritual is commonly seen in the Japanese construction process, and has a similar form in Chinese culture known as the shangliang ritual. Both are similar in performance and serve the same purpose. They are held when the main structure of the house is completed. The owner of the house invites guests to participate in the ritual in order to pray for continued safe construction, to celebrate the completion of the most difficult and crucial part of the house, and also to announce that the final completion is not far away. In Taiwan, the ritual is usually called shangliangli (上樑禮) or jiuliangli (就梁禮). The Japanese counterpart is commonly known as shangdongshi (Li Qian-lang 2003, 224).

Conducted in this way, the ceremony ultimately resulted in ambivalence among participants. The performers and audience situated in the different cultural context of contemporary Taiwan, felt alien to the ritual forms closely associated with the Japanese culture. The shangdongshi actually displayed the interpretational fracture while transforming a colonial site to a local ‘heritage’ within the postcolonial context. The decision making in the name of this ceremony implies discordance between the material form and the cultural context during the conservation practices of a colonial site. Since the architectural form of the Siliandong represents the culture and lived experiences of the colonizers, the fracture between the form and its cultural context emerged when the colonizers, who had lived in this cultural context and therefore owned the direct memory, had left the locale. This discordance is represented by the ambivalent emotions toward the Japanese past, and subsequently the ambiguous meaning of local ‘heritage’, when dealing with the material remains of former colonizers.

**Performing the Ceremony**

Shangdongshi was organized and financed by the Gold Ecological Park and was held on 3 October 2005. The museum invited officers from the Taipei County government, the property owner Taiwan Sugar Cooperation (Taiwan Tangye Gongsi 台灣糖業公司), governors and ministers of Rueifang Township, the media, local elders, the local elementary school, as well as other influential figures. The ceremony was held in front of the Siliandong Japanese residence, close to the entrance of the museum park; so other visitors could attend without admission.

---

173. The Japanese pronunciation is “zyōtōshiki” (上棟式). The ceremony at Siliandong was held in Mandarin Chinese.

174. The official English translation was obtained from the website of Rueifang Township: www.rueifang.tpc.gov.tw
The ceremony had three parts: the prayer rite, sanbing (散餅) sanqian (散錢) and shangdong. Originally, the Japanese ceremony for the shangdongshi had strong religious implications. The museum consciously attempted to transform the religious ritual into a cultural event by maintaining the form while preserving only major ritual elements. In tune with the cultural aspect, before the main ceremonies, speeches were presented. It concluded by serving guests sweet rice ball soup (tangyuan 湯圓). The rite of prayer was initiated after the speeches of the county governor, the head of Rueifang Township and the local representative of the Taipei County Council (taibeixian yihui 台北縣議會).

The ceremony was not only a performance announcing the political contribution and investment of the elected mayor and party on the local region, but also a representation of the political fabric entangled with heritage practice at the locale. The museum needed to prepare a political stage for the most influential powers in the region in order to stabilize their support. For a postcolonial heritage practitioner, it is extremely important to recognise the influential actors, to sense the political network and adapt to changeable political situations in order to achieve the ultimate educational and cultural targets.

Prior to the ceremony, the Japanese architect set the altar with ritual utensils, offerings and paper decorations. Those settings consisted of Japanese liquor, food and two important offerings: the wooden panel dongzha (棟札) and a large rice cake. Because the museum staff was unfamiliar with these settings, most of the offerings were prepared by the architect. The rice cake was ordered by the museum from a local sweet shop with detailed explanation, since its shape and function are unknown to Taiwanese people. Paper decoration and table cloth of the altar were white. The background cloth was originally white, but was changed into a red and white striped pattern as a compromise of Taiwanese and Japanese custom. This change was proposed by the museum because white is traditionally considered an unlucky colour by Taiwanese.

After the speeches, the Zhujiguan (主祭官 or the chief person conducting the ritual procession) officiated the prayer rite. He followed the instructions of the Master of Ceremonies (MC), assigned by the museum. This MC guided the ceremony according to the procession arrangements and detailed information given by the museum. The Zhujiguan of this ritual was the Chief Secretary of Taipei County Government (Taibeixian zhengfu zhuren mishu 台北縣政府主任秘書), who was acting as a substitute for the Mayor. Following the orders of the MC, he held the offering with both hands in turn while bowing to the altar. After offering the food and wine to the deity,

175. The Japanese pronunciation is "munafuda".
the Zhujiguan read out a prayer, and led all the attendants to bow together to the deity.

The definition of sacred or secular in this ceremony was rather vague. Regardless of the details of the rite procession or who the performers were identified as, the Zhujiguan was a political leader of the county government, not a religious figure. Moreover, the name of the god/goddess prayed for was replaced by the term “all god/goddess” (zhushenfo 諸神佛), in order to include diverse beliefs, and to avoid the strong religious implications associated with Japanese identity.

The second part of the ceremony was sanbing/ sanqian: the offering of sweets and coins to guests by the owner of the house. The ceremony continued with a ritual of sanbing/ sanqian (delivering sweets and coins). The form and selection of these delivering stuff was also localized depending on what local product would be analogous to their Japanese counterparts: the sweets were packaged mochi (rice cakes 麻糬, Ch. 麻糬), ordered from the same shop in the neighbourhood area. The rice cakes and NT dollar coins were wrapped individually in coloured papers. These were then placed in several bamboo baskets. Important guests were invited on stage to throw these sweets and coins to the audience. Guests included the Chief Secretary, the Assistant Chief of Taipei County Government Culture Bureau (Taibeixian wenhuaju fujuzhang 臺北縣文化局副局長), the Chief of Ruifang Township (Ruifang zhen zhenzhang 瑞芳鎮鎮長), a Taipei County councillor, the director of the Gold Ecological Park, representatives
from the property owners Taiwan Sugar Corporation and Taiwan Power Company. Those figures represented the most essential network of the operation of the museum park.

Although the performance of this rite was unknown to most local people, they were able to participate actively, perhaps due to its more interactive and understandable form. One local elder recalled his experience of sanbing during the Japanese colonial period yet he had forgotten about its purpose and how it was performed. The participating children at the event were too young to have memories of the colonial period and had been educated within an entirely different cultural and political context. *Sanbing/sanqian* was thus a point of connection between generations, yet the interpretation of participants would be completely different since each individual has his or her own “social framework of memory,” a phrase proposed by Halbwachs (1992).

The final part of *shangdongshi* was to locate the *dongzha*. During the traditional Japanese ceremony, the names of the god/goddess who protect the house, the carpentry master, and the Japanese date are written in advance on a wooden *dongzha* panel. This is most significant rite of the ceremony. According to its Japanese orientation, locating the *dongzha* was performed by the chief carpenter. As for the *dongzha* of Siliandong, the name of the god/goddess was replaced by the names of the county governors, the head of the museum, the architect and the constructor. Moreover, the installation of the *dongzha* on the central beam was designed as a main attraction for the media. This implicates the powerful influence of media to many local cultural institutions, comprising their strategies on education and marketing.

**Colonial Ambiguity**

Initially, the ritual procession and altar setting of *shangdongshi* was designed according to Japanese religious customs, coinciding with the living styles
of the original residents, the tradition of artisan craft and the material form of the building. The residents left the building, and its cultural context was changed by the ending of the Japanese colonial era. Only the material form of the building remained at the locale. The sense of place altered with its changing inhabitants. In order to regard the Japanese remains as ‘heritage’, and for reasons of conservation, some ambivalence during the mapping of the material form and the cultural context surfaced. A clear example of this ambivalence was shown in the particular secularization involved in the prayer rite. Not only was it more a secular ceremony, its participants reproduced a postcolonial metropolitan network of power so that the “sacred” significance was transformed into a secular complex. Said otherwise, it was turned into a collective ritual that reinterpreted the past for the present. The different cultural framework was interpreted through a local adaptation of the sacred.

Although the secular performance was the major form of the shangdongshi, its sacred meaning was inevitably bonded with the overlapping Taiwanese custom which originated from the same Chinese tradition as the Japanese one. Hence the sacred ritual based on Taiwanese custom has to be concerned with and practiced simultaneously at the same locale. In order to secure a safe and smooth construction, the constructors adopted the Taiwanese form of the prayer prior to the formal shangdongshi: setting a Taiwanese style altar and praying with burning incense. The museum staff joined as well.

Another local adaptation was the use of a red cloth on the central beam according to Taiwanese custom. Initially, the purpose of shangliangli was based on its religious function as a prayer for smooth construction. However, the presentation of a white Japanese altar revealed the incompatibility with the Taiwanese cultural context. The colour white in Taiwanese culture is often associated with bad luck and not used for most celebrations. The sacred function still needed to be fulfilled yet this was done by having participants adhere to the contemporary cultural context.

As Moore and Myerhoff (1977, 9) have pointed out, in this type of secular ritual the ceremony itself may be an attempt to mask this substantiation of key elements, “and to exaggerate the collective effort, the common cooperation and the collective benefit” in such a way that, “strangers may contribute to the same enterprise. It provided a formal theatrical medium in which the people could be together without interacting very much, but in which their symbols could be juxtaposed in time and space to give apparent unity”. The performance of shangdongshi was a “theatre of memory” (Samuel 1994). A version of collective past was constructed by the gathering of participants. Having diversified “frameworks of memory”, different groups and individuals attended the ceremony and cooperated to “perform a version of the past” and contribute to generating a distinct form of local memory. However, the shangdongshi ceremony represented an effort to formulate a collective memory in one way, and to raise the inconsistency between cultural forms and local memory on the other. The essential issue of ‘whose memory’ emerged from this fracture is what we turn to next.

### 3.3.2 Absent Memory, Conflicting Interpretation

The mission of the above mentioned renovation was to ‘conserve the local memory’, yet the direct memory of this ‘colonial place’ called Siliandong was absent. During the renovation of this building and the preparation of the shangdongshi ceremony, the original residents of Siliandong did not participate. The renovations were conducted according to the general forms of Japanese architecture and to the memory of
most present local people who had never been permitted to live in the Japanese residences in the colonial era because they were preserved for higher level employees. Previous residents provided no input, thus the representation of architecture reflected the distanced observation from outside, mainly from the architecture profession and neighbourhood memory. This sense of distance was felt in the ceremony. Compared to other similar ceremonies held in the museum park, the participants of the shangdongshi ceremony were rather curious observers, not story providers. This alienated feeling was closely related to the fracture between the material remains and a sense of place which had resulted from the colonial structure of the previous period.

This sense of absent memory is the result of a colonial residue which disconnects the sense of place from the material remains. When the ‘heritage’ awareness is considered for postcolonial political and economic intentions, a fracture appears with ambivalence among the local community who are generally common people who lived outside of this privileged area during colonial rule. The alien feelings during the shangdongshi ceremony reveal not only the fracture between the material remains and cultural context, but also the distance between the previously colonized and the colonizers.

The participants of this ceremony were mainly the guests invited by the museum, including local influential figures, museum curators, local students and their teachers. Because it was an outdoor event, the local people and tourists were welcomed to participate without prior invitation. Although some of the current inhabitants of Jinguashi attended this occasion, the original residents of Siliandong, who owned the direct memory and lived experiences in the house, were absent during the ceremony. Owing to the colonial context, these memory holders had left the place, and the current residents of the neighbourhood hold relatively foreign feelings toward this building even though they may pass by it everyday. During the ceremony, the emotional bond to the building, and the sense of place were not familiar to the attending guests. Rather than being constructive informants, the local participants were like passive information receivers, understanding the knowledge and stories of this historic building from the museum’s brochures and guides. How can we explain the absent memory of Siliandong? In order to decipher this, we need to have a look at its history.

Siliandong was built during the 1930s while Japan Mining Company (Nihon kangyomushi kaisha日本開業株式會社) monopolized the entire mining business of Jinguashi (Guo 1984). In order to extract more profit, the Company built new factories and installed modern machinery. They also completely changed the landscape and social structure of Jinguashi according to the contemporary model of an “industrial village” in Japan (Chang 2002, 59-70). Most residents were employees of the Company, living on the salary and facilities offered by it. They were categorized as different occupational levels according to their jobs but more so according to their ethnicity. Office workers were mainly Japanese, receiving a better salary, housing, and company welfare. The social structure was inherited by the later Taiwan Metal Mining Company (Taiwan jinshu kuangye gongsi台灣金屬礦業公司) when the Japanese colonial power left. However, the higher level of the Japanese managers was replaced by the mainlanders’ community. Siliandong, a residence of Japanese and mainlander managers, was unavoidably a symbol of colonial social order. Its building materials, constructed forms and location demonstrate the higher social class of its residents.

A former postwar inhabitant of a Japanese residence recalled this social hierarchy was even represented in the name of the administrative districts. The central district which now contains the Gold Ecological Park and Siliandong, was allotted administrative offices, Japanese residences, and the Prince Chalet which was built for the temporary visit of the Japanese prince. The region was named “Gold Mountain District” (Jinshan Li金山里). The surrounding areas were named in sequence from the centre as “Copper Mountain District” (Tongshan Li銅山里) and “Rock Mountain District” (Shishan Li石山里). She recalled her school experiences that children who came from similar districts were her schoolmates and had similar family status. Children of the Gold Mountain District, who mainly came from Chinese mainlander families, were able to wear shoes and dress well, unlike children from farther districts such as the Rock Mountain District, who were mainly na-
tive Taiwanese or other settler families and might not have had shoes to wear. This division designates diversified frameworks of memory and stimulates the ambiguity of heritage work.

After the closure of the mining business, most residents with better financial circumstances moved out (Su 1996, 187). According to the oral data collected in Jinguashi by the museum,176 the living experiences of the central area, where the higher rank managers mainly resided, were rarely mentioned. Many informants remembered racial and professional discrimination by the Japanese and mainland administrative bodies (Taiwan Nature Trail Society 2005a, 9, 32-33; Lee 2005, 101). The miners who were unable to move stayed in the village, and theirs became the only memory version of the past.

The representation of the past was not only determined by diversified memories of local groups whose social frameworks were formulated by colonial structure, but also impacted by the network of the postcolonial actors. These factors interacted and reconstructed a version of past which was expected to be the core of locality in the present Taiwan. The postcolonial actors will be illustrated in the following section.

Negotiating the Memory of Siliandong

During recollection of local memories by the museum team, two memory versions were competing for the representation of ‘a local past’: the memory of former managers and of lower workers. Their social frameworks were diversified during the previous period of colonization and their memories reformulated within the contesting network of postcolonial actors, interacting with the grand framework of locality pursuit since the 1990s. We shall see how Japanese interests also came into play.

As a materialized symbol of superior social rank during the Japanese colonial period and KMT nationalist governance, Siliandong has little emotional association with the present-day local people who are relatively alienated from this space. Following the heritage construction instruments community building and tourism development, many local residents became aware of the necessity to claim their ownership of the site as their ‘heritage’. The emotional association with ‘heritage’, therefore, needs to be recreated with the representation of the past. However, when it is reconstructed by a top-down force, and not a self-oriented sense of identity which was obstructed by the discordance of collective memories, those interpretative attempts such as collective ceremonies and representation of historic sites, are possibly turned into empty material forms with little cultural significance.

The renovation of Siliandong was financed by the local government and its budget was examined by the county council. The renovation, therefore, was controlled by the official budget act and the political influence deeply related to the struggling balance of power between the county government and the assembly. Focused on the financial and political rewards from the expecting income of heritage tourism and the political propaganda on local development, the county governor, the township head and the local members of the county council were gathered together at the ceremony of shangdongshi. The ceremony was inevitably the demonstration and reclamation of the political will. Through this collective gathering, the relations and social orders in local society were reconfirmed and even reinforced following the present political order. Those present local communities were reorganized by the political resources which were provided by the government and politicians, and the sense of community disappeared when competing for resources from the public sector. For instance, different local societies were formed under the names of tourist development or community development. These societies were led by different people, many of whom fought each other over concern that subsidies from the government might be obtained by competitors from the same area. The interpretation of memory was unified by political pursuit and was spontaneously attached to the political will in order to strive for more support.

176. See Taiwan Nature Trail Society (2005a, 2005b, 2005c) and Kaohsiung County Government (1997). This research is also based on the participant observation of the author at Jinguashi from 2003 to 2005.
The genealogy of state enterprises, which is also a colonial residue, determined the development of Jinguashi. In the past, the Japan Mining Company and Taiwan Metal Mining Company played the chief roles in Jinguashi. They were both landlord and employer for most local residents. This structure has not been completely changed since the closure of mining industry. Taiwan Power Company (Taiwan dianli gongsi 台灣電力公司) and Taiwan Sugar Corporation remain the landlords of local residents, especially the latter which owns most of the land and the Japanese residences. Despite the regional government’s successfully inclusion of them as participants in the museum plan with a BOT (Build-Operate-Transfer) project, the county government needs to pay the rent of the buildings and the land and to arrange the management and approval of large events. Siliandong is one of these cases. The property owner, Taiwan Sugar Corporation, has been willing to rent it to the museum only if the building is not officially designated as guji or ‘historic building’, as they were afraid of the ‘troubles’ caused by the legal restrictions on use and management of historic monument (guji). The Siliandong should be included in the calculation of the BOT plan for final share of revenue earned from museum admission and area development project, for instance the potential earning from remodelling the Japanese residences into hotels and shops. With regard to the representation of Siliandong, the company remained in a passive position. The Taiwan Sugar Company was pleased that the county government replaced it in managing and maintaining the house. However, regarding the legal role and intrinsic change of the company, it continues to maintain an influential role in the future of Siliandong.

As the core actors in the renovation plan, the museum and architect actually played the decisive roles in the representation of memory. However, they held diverse interpretations of this according to their professional intentions. This is particularly true for the Japanese architect, whose personal memory and professional training toward the general forms of Japanese architecture were challenged by the practical situation: the later residents of the postwar era had changed the spaces for their living needs. This situation indicates the ambiguity while dealing with the colonial remains—if the ‘authentic’ form is the first priority to maintain, what kind of ideological pursuit will be materialized by it? Should it be renovated into the original Japanese style if the cultural context is supposed to be in co-existence with the material form? If so, the living traces of later residents may be wiped out by pursuing ‘authenticity’. On the other hand, if the interpretation is chosen to represent the traces of later communities in order to strengthen the sense of sympathy and identity, does the form only demonstrate shallow materiality without deep cultural correspondence? What is the meaning of conserving the colonial remains?

For the case of Siliandong, the different intentions were represented as multiple interior displays. The four separate interior spaces were designed according to the memory of diverse epochs and groups. Concerning the contemporary users, the first one was assigned an administrative function, and the second household was designed as a multifunctional space for art and the viewing of documentaries. The third was a representation of the Japanese period. Finally, the forth household was designed to retrieve a postwar family life. All these four houses were renovated according to Japanese architectural forms and crafts, and some spatial modifications were made to the traces of postwar residents such as changes to the hallways and corridors. Following the recollection of living memories, the interior of the forth household was decorated with furniture popular among richer families during the postwar period. Household objects of the same era were also arranged into the space such as an old radio, clock, kitchen ware, and a lunchbox etcetera. In the third household, the space was decorated with traditional Japanese settings, for instance the paper doors with Japanese painting, a tea set on the low table and a wooden tool horse for the children. All of these formed the framework of the collective memory associated with Siliandong.

177. See note 35 above.

178. According to the investigation of Guo (1984), some of the interior settings of the Japanese residences in Jinguashi had been altered by the later Chinese residents for their personal use and because of different customs.
Any individual who considers him/herself as the ideological owner of Siliandong, is interacting with memories that contrast the social frameworks of local residents, the architect, governors from both central and local governments, curators and the owner of this historic site. The representation of Siliandong and the performance of Shangdongshi are the node of collective memories. A version of the collective past is formulated at this site in terms of its continuous inclusive interpretation.

Furthermore, as Halbwachs (1992, 40) asserted in his *On Collective Memory*, individual memory is located in the social frameworks, and “collective frameworks are … precisely the instruments used by the collective memory to reconstruct an image of the past which is in accord, in each epoch, with the predominant thoughts of the society”. The representation of local past, in terms of the renovation of Siliandong and the ritual of shangdongshi, was in accord with the reconstruction of a collective past of Taiwan since the 1990s. This may not have been intentionally made but it was yet delicately connected by interactive actors, such as national subsides and political networks. Eventually the local past represented by heritage interpretation is always a contesting field of present intentions, as Lowenthal (1985, 210) claimed, “the prime function of memory … is not to preserve the past but to adapt it so as to enrich and manipulate the present”.

### 3.3.3 Making ‘Heritage’

This section has illustrated a dynamic process of heritage building by examining the way in which a local museum conducts interpretation. The Gold Ecological Park is constructed within the context of the Taiwan memory boom since the 1990s, and interpretations found in compromises during the renovation of the Siliandong Japanese residence and the performance of the shangdongshi ceremony. These revealed the extreme complexity of heritage construction in postcolonial Taiwan resulting from the intertwining social frameworks of diversified memories formulated from colonial residues or postcolonial structure. Embedded in the conservation of colonial material remains were intentions of postcolonial locality building. However, the essential ambiguity between ‘locality’ and ‘coloniality’ unavoidably emerged in the process of heritage building.

The renovation of Siliandong was completed in the spring of 2007, and part of the interior was represented as living scenes of a family during the operation of the managing period of Taiwan Metal Mining Company. The interior scenes were designed and displayed by a female artist who grew up in the family of a Jinguashi mining company manager. She was also the project researcher responsible for collecting the oral records of previous residents in the Japanese dormitories. The complicated, time-consuming bureaucratic work for the “Measures Governing Engineering and Procurement” (Caigoufa採購法) and the accounting system of the government often resulted in the discord during the project. Even so, the museum insisted on sharing the power of interpretation and including multiple voices after realizing the structural absence of the living memory of the previous privileged group.

Partly sponsored by the national “Museum of Local Culture” (difang wenhua guan地方文化館) project, the renovation of Siliandong was included in the larger Integrated Community-Making (shequ zongti...
The attempt to engage bottom-up participation in conserving the historic buildings is only a noble dream. At many locales in Taiwan, inclusive heritage-practice is constantly struggling within the drastically changing environment of domestic and global economy and politics. Moreover, top-down community-building projects need follow-up through the government mechanism; however the follow-up is often obstructed under a rigid bureaucratic system. As an intermediary institution, a resourceful local museum can be a positive force to stand for the interpretation that comprises multiple voices. It needs to operate flexibly between the public and private sectors and to insist on educational and responsible representation. This section has shown that a local museum, equipped with financial support and professional resource, can sense the seams of diversified intentions and mend them with inclusive and cooperative interpretation. At least a version of communal locality can be based on educational intention and sincere recollection.

Siliandong was opened to the public in 2007 and chosen as a film set for a TV miniseries drama popular among younger generations, and famous for its cast of young stars. Influenced by the mass consumption and media power, the image of Siliandong is being recreated in the mind of new generations. Instead of a heritage site, the image of Siliandong has been recalled and distributed as a place for ‘romantic encounter of TV idols’. A new collective memory is being shaped through electronic media and tourist visits, and the meaning of ‘heritage’ in Taiwan is being transformed through this interconnectedness regardless of deliberate initiatives or historical causality.

3.4 PRODUCING LOCALITY

In section 2.2 I have explored three contextual frameworks which have shaped the locality of Taiwan and of places in Taiwan during the period since the 1990s: globalization, machizukuri and shequ development. All three provide the contours of locality illustrated by the authorized discourses, and a cer-
tain image of the future. Since the 1990s, ‘culture’ has been taken as the core element that distinguishes locality. “Material effects” (Appadurai 1996, 182) are created in order to sustain the physicality of locality, for instance the huge archival projects of the early 2000s which aimed to build up a knowledge base of Taiwan, the increasing number of museums and heritage sites, and the boom in projects of ‘rehabilitating old buildings’ (jiujianwu zailiyong)182. However, do the claims of the authorized discourses reflect the real situations at local places? In this section, Jinguashi provides an actual place-making example in Taiwan during the era of localism.

The territorial definition of Jinguashi was formally established during the Japanese colonial period. Simultaneously, the neighbourhood and locality of Jinguashi underwent enormous changes, which would later deeply influence the postcolonial local society. As Arjun Appadurai argued, locality is a “structure of feelings.” It is produced by the local subjects, and these local subjects are influenced and transformed by acts of custom and rituals—namely, the bodily interactions with concrete spaces—the production of local spaces, and the interaction between the local subject and localized conceptualization of time and space (Appadurai 1996). Appadurai used the term ‘neighbourhood’ to refer to a relatively physical form of context within which locality is produced. In the case of Jinguashi, neighbourhood refers to the physical territory of Jinguashi, as well as its cultural and historical attributes. According to existing historical records, Jinguashi started to develop when several farmers settled down in today’s Jinguashi area during the 19th century. It developed into an ‘industrial city’ in the Japanese colonial period. The ‘structure of feelings’ and spatial attributes of the agricultural society were forcibly changed by the Japanese colonizers’ enterprises. In other words, the ‘structure of feelings’ of local inhabitants was reformulated in accordance with the migration of multiple groups, changes to the landscape, construction of modern factories and infrastructure, new type of labour, and the introduction of modern ideology.

The conceptualisation of locality in the Japanese period is closely related to the import of modern ideas about time and space. For instance, the Baoshisha (Hill of Time-Telling)183, a hill located in Jinguashi, represents the import of standard time during the colonial period. As an elder recalled (Taiwan Nature Trail Society 2005b, 114-5), the life of local residents was regulated by the sound broadcasting device on Baoshishan at designated times which signified, for instance, the times to start work, break and return home. This broadcasting system was used to ensure industrial efficiency, and at the same time it influenced the residents’ perception of time and lifestyle pace. The locality of Jinguashi was inseparable from the perception of space. The Japanese construction of an industrial landscape, with linear spatial plots and Japanese architectural attributes altogether created a different structure of feelings. This time-space framework represents the experiences of colonial modernity which have been crucial to locality formation in Jinguashi. In addition, Jinguashi is often distinguishable by its Japaneseness from other local places in Taiwan, since most local spatial features have their roots in the period of Japanese rule.

The experiences of colonial modernity in Jinguashi were based upon a hierarchical structure of society. This hierarchy was not only represented by layered spatial features184, but also by differences in religion

---

182. “Local knowledge is substantially about producing reliably local subjects as well as about producing reliably local neighbourhoods within which such subjects can be recognized and organized” (Appadurai 1996, 181). In Taiwan, a series projects to build up a knowledge database of Taiwanese history and culture was funded by the state in the 2000s, for instance the establishment of Encyclopaedia of Taiwan (Taiwan da baikequanshu 台灣大百科全書), the National Repository of Cultural Heritage (guojia wenhua ziliaoku 国家文化資料庫), Taiwan e-learning and Digital Archives Program and so on.

183. It has also been called Shuiluoshan 水螺山 in Taiwanese.

184. The higher class lived in the more central area, and at higher altitudes within this hilly town. For instance, the Shinto shrine was located on the highest point of the town, and the prince chalet, offices and administrators’ residences were in the centre. Beyond the centre were the residences of the Japanese supervisors and workers, while beyond this lay the residential area of the Taiwanese workers. This area was even separated from the Japanese area by a large road (Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008, 2-84).
and custom. As mentioned by elders (Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008, 2-92), the Japanese rulers did not like Taiwanese workers cerebrating the Lunar New Year or holding Taiwanese rituals and festivals. Taiwanese residents had to hold rituals privately. In contrast, Japanese rituals and cultural activities were performed in public. The religious centre of the Japanese residents was the Shinto Shrine on top of the Benshan hill, whereas the religious centre of most Taiwanese residents was the Quanjitang. For the latter group, the most important event was the religious parade of the goddess Mazu. This hierarchical structure was copied by the mainlanders in the postwar KMT era. The mainlanders’ group lived in relative isolation in the central area, and many later became Christians when the Jinguashi Church was established. Most mainlanders attended the religious events of the Taiwanese residents, yet played relatively passive role in them. The diversity in religions and customs represents the complexity of defining Jinguashi as a homogeneous neighbourhood.

In 2004, the Gold Ecological Park project reconstructed the neighbourhood of Jinguashi by changing the spatial attributes and intervening in existing social networks. New bodily experiences were stimulated by the museum’s representation of Jinguashi, such as the renovation of the road paving and historical buildings, and the introduction of a new institution to lead local affairs. Furthermore, this version of locality was strengthened by constant ‘secular rituals’ conducted by the museum, for instance educational events, exhibitions, and guided tours. The locality has been reshaped by the museum’s plans of redeveloping the local and neighbouring areas. The image of locality has been frequently modified and re-modified, while the neighbourhood has been reconstructed, and a new relationship between the neighbourhood and local actors is developing. It is not clear yet whether local subjects, in other words an autonomous community, would be generated through this process and eventually become the agent for future production of locality. Thus, the question of this section is have the practices of the Gold Ecological Park possibly aided the development of a community autonomy as the local subject, and hence helped to produce a unique Jinguashi? This section will also explore how the ‘structure of feelings’ of Jinguashi, which may be diversified between social groups as mentioned in this chapter, has been reshaped through subtle interactions within the museum and local and state actors, especially with the authorized discourses discussed in Chapter Two.

3.4.1 Imaging Modernity: creating a legend of gold

When we arrived in Jinguashi, it was late at night. We used to have no lights in the mountains [of our hometown]. This was our first time of feeling it was so ‘bright’ at night. I saw the office buildings close to the Fifth Tunnel. These buildings were constructed so well. I thought that Jinguashi was such a prosperous place! I heard the ‘shu-shu’ sound of the windmill (Air Compressor). When I passed by office building next to the Prince Chalet, I saw the western building which was so bright with light, accompanied by dogs barking. I realize now it must be from the dogs kept by the Japanese.185

When the mining industry in Jinguashi was terminated in 1987, the town became deserted, separated from urban Taipei, and even from the famous Jiufen. The public image of Jinguashi is mostly as a place of nostalgia, a place of mysterious and sad mining stories. Famous films such as A City of Sadness186 and Hill of No Return187 were shot in Jinguashi, and strengthened this image of Jinguashi. This outsiders’ image is far from the ‘modern’ Jinguashi which exists in the memory of elder residents. Many of the elders explained that Jinguashi was once the sixth prosperous area in Taiwan, behind five provincial level cities (Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008).

A proverb prevailed in old Jinguashi: ‘the superior goods are sent to Jin Jiu (金九; Jinguashi and Jiufen); the inferior products are sent to Taipei.’188 Elder residents described how rich, modern and populous Jinguashi was during the Japanese colonial
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186. Beiqing chengshi 悲情城市
187. Wuyan de shanqiu 无言的丘
188. 「上品送金九，下品送台北」. See Zhang Yi-xi 2007, 34.
period. It was often mentioned that Jinguashi was lit by electric lights when many other places in Taiwan remained in the dark. It used to be one of the most modernized areas in Taiwan. The pride of Jinguashi has been entangled with image of modernity. For most local residents who once were mining workers, the distinctiveness of Jinguashi is inseparable from its golden past: the image of a modern mining town.

Interestingly, this strong image of modernity was not mentioned in the oral records of by mainland residents in their memories of living in Jinguashi. The self esteem of residents, mainly the male mining workers, lies in the experience of modernity during the Japanese colonial period. The Japanese company is remembered as efficient, strict and technically advanced. These memories are often stated in comparison to the ‘backward’ KMT management, which is remembered as having a lack of professional knowledge and being full of redundant personnel. Such a negative comparison is also drawn between the past and present: Jinguashi was such a modern and populous place, yet now it is a marginal area with economic recession, with less than half the population of the Japanese period. This is different from the common understanding of the relationship between heritage and modernity in today’s heritage studies. It usually believed that heritage is product of modernity. The feeling of loss amidst the shift, transient modern world results in the desire to preserve heritage; the nostalgia felt towards a seemingly frozen past reflects the longing for a fixed position of self in a changing world. However, playing a marginal role in the modern commercial network, Jinguashi and its people are in a reversed position. Conserving the past means representing the glory of an advanced Jinguashi which is lost in the present. This is simultaneously converse to the ideas held by the ‘nostalgia tourists’ from urban neighbourhoods who come in search of the ‘good old past’, paradoxically frozen in economically recessed Jinguashi.

3.4.2 The Competing Gold and Green

This is the logo of the Gold Ecological Park: the shape “G” symbolizing both ‘Gold’ and ‘Green’ at the same time, referring to the two core concepts of the Gold Ecological Park. The middle part of this logo represents a distinctive feature in the landscape of Jinguashi, the Teapot Mountain. ‘Gold’ is the major image of the Gold Ecological Park: the museum conserves the mining history of Jinguashi. ‘Green’ symbolizes the mission of the museum to sustainably conserve the natural and humanistic environment of Jinguashi through the method of ecomuseum. These two concepts reflect two versions of the future. The first concept of ‘gold’ shows a version of memory singled out by authorized institutions based on strong media associations with ‘gold’. ‘Gold’ traditionally represents richness, luckiness and financial security, and is closely related to important events throughout the whole life course of Taiwanese people (Yang Shu-ya 2005). This positive image of gold replaces the commonly perceived dark and traumatic associations of the mining sites in Jinguashi. Considering the marketing effects, the cross-departmental preparatory team of Taipei County Government decided to strengthen the element of gold as a major marketing strategy, for instance by holding gold-related activities in the opening programmes, moulding gold bricks for exhibits and using the word ‘gold’ in the title of the museum. The marketing strategy included moulding a 220 kg gold brick for display in the museum. This successfully attracted more than a
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190. This cross-departmental team was joined by various bureaus and offices of the Taipei County Government. It was arranged especially for the establishment of the Gold Ecological Park.
million visitors within a year. However, this actually challenged the original tourist market of Jinguashi which had been based mainly on the uniqueness of Jinguashi’s natural resources and quiet atmosphere.

Moreover, as mentioned in section 3.1, the past of the miners was regarded by the museum staff as the only version of local memory in the early stages of museum planning. Their memories of their working experiences and technology were collected with objects, especially mining tools, by the museum staff. The procedure of gold production and distribution serve as focal points in the museum display. ‘Gold’ functions as the medium through which to revitalize the local area. It is now the representative feature of Jinguashi, and represents its local distinctiveness, and the image of a prosperous and populous future. Local political figures, for instance the local representative of the county council and the Mayor of the town, as well as the media are accountable for this image.

As the element of gold remains in the name and public impression of the museum park, the staff of the Gold Ecological Park seek to extend the connections of museum subjects to gold. During the Japanese colonial period, the gold mined from Jinguashi was roughly refined and transported to Japan. Therefore, there were actually no gold products or goldsmith craft in Jinguashi. In order to extend the museum networks’ and future development of Jinguashi, the Gold Ecological Park designed gold-relevant educational events and topics in the museum display. Two are worthy of attention: the annual Gold Carnival (Jincai jie 金采節) and the Community Goldsmith Workshop. These are regular activities which enhance the element of gold as part of the locality of Jinguashi.

3.4.3 Migrants and Inhabitants

Before beginning oral records of the mainlander residents in 2005, the leader of this oral record project Georgia Lee and I, as the director of the Gold Ecological Park, attended an alumni meeting of Guashan Elementary School, expecting to meet potential storytellers. This was suggested by Georgia Lee, as both she and her mother, who was in her 70s, were graduates of the school. Based on this romantic initiative, we did not predict any hostile attitudes before entering the meeting place. However, when Lee was introduced by the organizer and gave her speech about the project, I became aware of the cold and even hostile responses from the audience. This negative reaction may be a result of our appearance as outsiders, as we are representatives of an ‘outsider’ government institution. Only Lee’s mother was naturally accepted as a member of the alumni. This situation fitted the social structure as described in the previous sections, and highlights the differences in conceptualizing products of locality.

Lee was born in a mainlanders’ family. Her father was a high-ranking manager of the Taiwan Metal and Mining Company during the postwar KMT reign. Lee barely spoke Taiwanese, despite the fact that her mother was actually born into a Taiwanese family and moved to Jinguashi when she was a first year primary school student, during Japanese colonial period. The language and accent of Lee apparently marked her as different from most of the local audience, who mainly spoke Taiwanese. This image of foreignness was strengthened by her cooperation with the museum, the other ‘outsider’. Eventually, although Lee was a renowned artist who created a famous book portraying nostalgic Jinguashi, she was
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191. For instance, to build up cooperation with international mining and gold museums, and with relevant goldsmith artists for producing future subjects in the long run.
not recognized by the audience as a local and failed to collect any stories from the occasion. The absence of the mainlanders’ memory version happened again in a later oral record of the Guashan Elementary School alumni (Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008).

As mentioned previously, colonial modernity forms the base of locality for elderly inhabitants in terms of comparison. Yet this topic of modernity is absent in oral records of the mainlander former-residents. The distinctiveness of Jinguashi in these records lies mainly in the tight connections of the mainlander group. In these oral records, people from Jinguashi usually have great performance in various professional fields, and this is all because of their common living experiences in Jinguashi and having a similar educational philosophy among families (Taiwan Nature Trail Society 2005b). Despite working and living in a close neighbourhood with Taiwanese worker families, the mainlander group mostly stuck together, and developed strong emotional community ties. Moreover, they felt strong bonds to the spaces of the core area in Jinguashi in which they worked, resided and developed bodily experiences. As a later immigrant group, some members of the mainlander group often recalled their past in Jinguashi with romantic nostalgia.192

Having better financial and social status, the members of mainlander group moved away from the grounds of the Taiwan Metal and Mining Company. Only part of the material remains they used to have in the past are conserved within today’s Gold Ecological Park, such as empty Japanese residences where to the mainlanders lived, and old photos recording their memories. Paul Connerton distinguishes “place of memorial” from “place of locus” (Connerton 2009, 10). The former can be considered by examples of place-name and pilgrimage; the latter is understandable through examples of physical spaces. Within this framework, the conceptualization of Jinguashi by the mainlander group may be considered as the idea of memorial place. It seems abstract, with no concrete rooted site, yet cannot be divorced from bodily actions. As Connerton asserts, “the body is a spatial field, and the pilgrim is, at every stage, located: where locatedness refers mainly to mobile actors rather than to things” (Connerton 2009, 18). It also explains how Jinguashi appears as an emotional binder of community in mainlanders’ records, rather than a physical site of detailed spatial features as described in the oral records of the working Taiwanese group. In the minds of mainlander residents, scenes in Jinguashi should be in accordance with images of old Jinguashi, hence changes often bring negative emotional reactions. Enjoying high social status in cities and even abroad, the mainlander group urges the conservation of old and romantic Jinguashi as place of memorial. However, since they have lost the concrete context of ‘neighbourhood’, to quote Appadurai, “without such a known, named, and negotiable terrain already available, the ritual techniques for creating local subjects would be abstract, thus sterile” (Appadurai 1996, 181). It is worth asking here how this romanticized locality interacts with the conceptualization of Jinguashi within the fields of the media and the tourist market, how it interacts with the locality produced by the Gold Ecological Park, and who the local subjects are.

3.4.4 Jinguashi and Community Building

The initiation of the Gold Ecological Park was focussed mainly on regional redevelopment by the county government and state enterprises. It seems that the museum project is not related to the community-building movement that has been active since the 1990s. It also seems that, even if they are related, they are only connected by government documents within the subsidy framework of the state community-building programme. However, the concepts of ecomuseum and community participation were developed in Jinguashi before the initiation of the Gold Ecological Park project. This conceptual thread was closely associated with the heritage preservation and localism movement in Taiwan, mentioned in section 2.2.

During an interview in 2008, a local resident of Jinguashi, Zhang Ying-jie 張英傑 recalled his participation in the planning project for regional regeneration
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192. See Xia Ye-qin 2010 and Lee Guo-jia 2005. This tone may also be relevant to the artist role of the interviewer Ms. Lee.
conducted by the Qinghuan Company.\(^{193}\) Zhang stated that the development of Jinguashi should be distinguished from the commercial Jiufen, and should be based on cultural conservation (Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008, 2-126). During my early contact with him in 2003, he conveyed the ideological impact of his contact with the Qinghuan Company and the Graduate Institute of Building and Planning, Taiwan University.\(^{194}\) Through these contacts, a preliminary version of cultural conservation and community engagement was brought to Jinguashi long before the establishment of the Gold Ecological Park. It is noteworthy that the Graduate Institute has a close relationship with the architectural conservation movement in Taiwan. The representative figures of the Institute were influential participants in the conservation movement which emerged in Taiwan in the 1970s, and also in generating discourses of community-building movements.\(^{195}\) The activities of the Qinghuan Company in the area of Jinguashi and Jiufen brought new ideas about the future of Jinguashi to local leaders and state enterprises.\(^{196}\) A community-based sustainable model of development has long been the concern of this Institute, and this model appeared in the accounts of some local opinion leaders in Jinguashi during the early 2000s. This ideological stance was continued by the team of the Gold Ecological Park. The museum preparatory team engaged Qinghuan Company in the planning of Jinguashi in the preliminary stage. Furthermore, a core initiative member of the museum team was also a graduate of the Institute and had conducted a relevant project in the Jiufen area for a considerable period prior to the museum park. Under the influence of these actors, the ideas of community engagement and heritage conservation became central to the development of the Gold Ecological Park.

The connection between the project in Jinguashi and the community-building movement was also revealed by the participation of the major planner, the Zhongye Company, in the Gold Ecological Park project. This thread is elaborated in the latter part of this section.

3.4.5 Appropriating Japaneseness

Japan, has always played an important role in shaping the future of Jinguashi. During contact between the Qinghuan Company and local residents, learning visits abroad were arranged to stimulate communal awareness. The examples of mining site redevelopment in Japan particularly impressed local participants and provided visual examples for understanding the abstract ideas of community engagement and cultural preservation.\(^{197}\) Although in fact the model presented by the Ruhrgebiet in Germany was actually more frequently introduced in local public occasions than Japanese examples, the enormous scale, investment amount and time-scale, and the geographical remoteness of Ruhrgebiet gave an impression of foreignness. The Japanese examples were more appreciated and mentioned more often by local residents. Similar visits were also arranged for the museum preparatory team of the Taipei County Government in 2002, during which the Qinghuan Company was hired by the preparatory team for premier planning. In order to seek innovative ideas for the promotion of the new museum in Jinguashi, members of the County Government and the Yingge Ceramics Museum, as well as Mayor Su Zhen-chang 蘇貞昌 visited several sites in Japan. Among these sites, the gold mining tourist site Toi Gold Mine 旅遊 肥 金 山 gained particular attention. Combing a tunnel visit, historical gallery, gold panning activities and a souvenir shop, this municipal heritage site became a de-

\(^{193}\) Qinghuan Company was run by alumni of the National Taiwan University Graduate Institute of Building and Planning, and still has close relationship with the institute.

\(^{194}\) The company was founded and led by graduates of the Graduate Institute of Building and Planning, National Taiwan University. The institute has been playing an avant-garde role in the professional field of urban planning and heritage conservation in Taiwan. It is distinguished by its strong image of social concern, and critical and idealist features.

\(^{195}\) The most well-known figure is Hsia Choe-jiu (Xia Zhu-jiu 蕭肇九).

\(^{196}\) For instance planning reports produced by the company for the Ruifang Township Office, Taiwan Power Company and Taipei County Government on the local redevelopment of the neighbourhood areas.

\(^{197}\) For instance, the Sado Gold Mine 佐渡 金 山 and Ashio Copper Mine 足尾銅 山. See Jilong Cultural and Historical Society 2008, 2-126.
development model and potential competitor for the new museum in Jinguashi. The idea of a record-breaking gold brick gained cross-departmental agreement as a major media and market strategy for the new Jinguashi museum. The tourism model of the Toi gold mine became the image of the future of the new museum in Jinguashi among the county governors. Yet this image was subtly transformed by the cultural departments in pursuing a better redevelopment model for Jinguashi with sense of local uniqueness.

In 2003, the Zhongye Company 中冶公司 (Laboratory For Environment & Form; LEF in short) was formally selected for the regional planning and architectural design of the new museum in Jinguashi. The company is led by Guo Zhong-duan 郭中端 who underwent her professional training in Japan and played important role in the early research of modern architecture in Taiwan. As mentioned in section 2.3, Guo was one initiator of the Society of Modern Architectural History Studies, ROC (中華民國近代建築史研究會), in 1990. The society cooperated with their Japanese colleague, the Society of Asian Modern Architectural History, Japan (日本近現代建築史研究会), and published the first general investigation into Japanese buildings in Taiwan. Guo was also a joint-designer of the Dongshan River Park, a paradigmatic project of county-led cultural tourist development in Taiwan’s localization movement (呂син-йи 2002). Dongshan River Park became a landmark of Yilan 宜蘭, and was the result of cooperation between Guo, her husband Horigome Kenji 堀憲憲 and the Japanese Elephant Group 東北采集團.

The Zhongye Company proposed the idea of a ‘living environment museum’ (shenghuo huanjing bowu yuanqu 生活環境博物園區), the Japanese version of an ecomuseum, to the preparatory team. Other than landscape and architectural plans, Guo urged the museum team to draft a residents’ convention for ensuring sustainable conservation. This refers to the Japanese case of machizukuri and the Japanese interpretation of ecomuseum. The proposal of the Zhongye Company also reflected their previous project of preserving Beitou 北投 hot spring in Taipei City. The local residents of the Beitou area autonomously resisted the municipal government’s decision to destruct the hot spring site built during the Japanese period. They formed an agreement to shape the neighbourhood of Beitou into a living environment museum: the hot spring site is a core museum which directs visitors to satellite sites spread throughout Beitou. This ecomuseum aims to “thread more than ten historical monuments and other historical architectures and landscape with the site of the hot spring — the most distinguished local element. [Those sites] are closely related to land development of the hot spring and social culture. [...] this is a cultural blueprint of Beitou’s redevelopment, a community-centred “living environment museum park” (Zhang Yu-teng 2004, 180-181). When the government finally agreed to the conservation proposal by the Beitou community in late 1990s, Guo Zhong-duan and Horigome Kenji were assigned by the Taipei City Government to plan the “Beitou Hot Spring Water-Affinity Park” (北投溫泉親水公園) using ecomuseum concepts. The experiences and concepts developed in the case of Beitou became references for the planning of the Gold Ecological Park. However, these two cases differ greatly in terms of local context, initiators and stakeholders. The spatial planning of the Gold Ecological Park is set out as a ‘catalogue’ and in terms of ideas about heritage conservation and autonomous community agreements toward a collective future, the Park has not been generated according to ideal machizukuri and ecomuseum models.

198. For instance, the two competed for a Guinness World Record for having the heaviest gold brick in the world. In 2004, the Gold Ecological Park obtained a 220 kg gold brick, heavier than the 200 kg brick at the Toi Gold Mine. The record was later returned to Toi Gold Mine when it produced a 250 kg gold brick.

199. Guo Zhong-duan was a PhD researcher in Japan, and was in charge of investigating Japanese modern architecture in Taiwan during the 1970s when the architectural circle in Japan started researching Japanese modern architecture including those in Japanese colonies such as Korea and Taiwan. Please refer to Huang Jun-ming 2000, 231-232.

200. An ecomuseum is often designed like a catalogue. It is comprised of a major site and several satellite sites. The major site often provides general information about the area, and therefore functions as the ‘contents page’ of a book. Satellite sites focus on various categories introduced by the major site.
Over a few years of operation, the Gold Ecological Park has been extending its connections with worldwide cultural institutions. Similar sites in Japan gained particular attention. The ‘Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine (石見銀山) and its Cultural Landscape’ and the machizukuri model of Ikuno Ginzan (生野銀山) are the two institutions most closely connected to the Gold Ecological Park. The frequent mutual visits were also related to the activities of a non-government heritage society in the neighbourhood area of Jiufen. Qiu Ru-hua丘如華201 is an energetic heritage practitioner, and has long cooperation with Japanese machizukuri and heritage organizations. She has mediated numerous experience exchange visits between Japanese and Taiwanese local practitioners. Furukawa-chō, the famous machizukuri example as mentioned in section 2.2, has been her close cooperative partner. In 2004, Qiu’s arranged a workshop in Jiufen, in which ideas about machizukuri were explained to residents and participants, and the representative from Ikuno Ginzan was introduced to the staff of the Gold Ecological Park.

The world heritage site ‘Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine (石見銀山) and its Cultural Landscape’ gained particular attention from the Gold Ecological Park and Taipei County Government. Jinguashi was selected by the Council for Cultural Affairs as a Potential World Heritage Site in 2002.202 Registering the cultural landscape of Jinguashi and the neighbouring Shuinandong水湳洞 area on the World Heritage List is regarded as a mission of the museum. The registration of Iwami Ginzan as World Heritage has been investigated by museum research reports and mutual visits.

Although Japanese examples are regarded as models in redeveloping Jinguashi, and Japanese spatial elements have been located at the central area by museum facilities and followed by local public construction, the Japaneseess in Jinguashi is rather more a ‘spectacle’ than internalized as part of the locality. The model of the tourist-centred Toi gold mine contrasts with the building of a community-concerned ecomuseum in the process of museum and local development. This process also involves the desire to relocate Jinguashi on the global terrain by world heritage nomination. These routes can be integrated and become resources for producing Jinguashi’s locality, yet the process can also be driven by market and media forces with no roots in Jinguashi.

As Appadurai states, local subjects and neighbourhood are mutually generated, through which process locality is produced. During the Japanese colonial period, the local context of Jinguashi was forcibly alternated and reshaped by new spatial elements, ritual activities, labour experiences, social hierarchy and so forth. A zigzag relationship was formed between groups with different social frameworks. Along with the construction of new spaces, bodily experiences and time-space conceptualization, new local subjects were generated and the neighbourhood was created in accordance. Fundamentally different from its Japanese equivalent mining sites, Jinguashi is characterized by a land issue due to colonial structures.203 This issue has remained with the colonial genealogy in the postwar era, and has formed the structural deficiency of machizukuri that Japanese mining sites can avoid. Community-building, as a focal point of these Japan related orientations as promoted by professionals and academics, is obstructed by bureaucratic mentality and fast, overwhelming consumerism as mentioned in previous sections. At this moment, there is still a gap between the museum and local residents in imaging a shared local future.

In creating the local place, ‘outside’ actors—the county government, planning and architectural professionals—brought their own appropriated image of Japan to Jinguashi. This is inevitable, due to the Japaneseess of Jinguashi as represented by its Japanese spatial features. The county government, as ac-

201. A famous leader of a heritage NGO in Taiwan.
202. Due to its historical background, in 1971 the United Nations withdrew its recognition of Taiwan. This has meant that the sites in Taiwan are ineligible for inclusion in the World Heritage List of UNESCO. In 2002 the government of Taiwan started to promote the Potential World Heritage Sites in Taiwan (Taiwan shijieyichan qianlidian台灣世界遺產潛力點) in order to improve the interior understanding of heritage, and at the same time, to explore diplomatic possibilities of rejoining the United Nations and international society.

203. As explained in Section 3.1, note 12.
tor, selected the image of a commercially advanced Japan, utilized simultaneously as a learning model and as a monetary competitor in the global tourist market. The planning and architectural professionals who brought their own image of Japan, mainly consisted of academic, professional and social concerned practitioners, and are connected to the community-building stream. Within this, the Japanese machizukuri is regarded as an advanced model for revitalizing an economically recessed area, improving spatial aesthetics, as in Chen Qi-nan’s discourses about community-building mentioned in section 2.2, and cultivating the formation of community and citizenship. These acts and actors remain foreign to the local residents, despite memories of a past affinity to Japan. Moreover, these practitioners were rather individual actors than a public sector with persistent resources in supporting their community-building actions. Their influences were actually limited by time schedule and budget scale of government projects. Therefore, their community-building ideas were rather difficult to root in Jinguashi.

The Japanese spatial remnants in Jinguashi have been renovated and reinterpreted in terms of ‘heritage’, in expectation of the spatial devices becoming part of locality. Although spaces and material effects are crucial to the generation and maintenance of locality and neighbourhood, they have to interact with local subjects and hence produce local knowledge and become the structure of feelings. For general examples of ‘heritage’, this relationship between community and material is natural; yet for a site of ‘colonial heritage’, as in the case of Jinguashi, interactions and bonds need to be made. The current residents of Jinguashi are mostly elderly people who used to be employees of the Japanese and KMT mining companies. The locality of Jinguashi has long been comprised by a hybrid and hierarchical system of culture and society. Owing to the marginal location of Jinguashi, the current residents have formed a rather enclosed society with its own spatial features, religious system, folk rituals, similar labourer experiences and educational backgrounds. This neighbourhood and locality has not been included in the image of locality produced by the government, museum and planners. Constrained by colonial hierarchy and land ownership, the local residents are still rather passive in their interaction with the spaces previously occupied by a ‘higher authority’ and now by outsiders. If a collective version of locality is not produced by allowing extensive engagement, with the elapsing of the elder generation, local knowledge would be soon lost. At the same time, the spatial elements conserved by the museum such as the tunnel and gold-panning activities, and most importantly, the locality of Jinguashi would become simply a spectacle.
Chapter Four: Multiple Case Analysis

4.1 LAYERED COLONIALISM: TONGXIAO SHINTO SHRINE

4.1.1 Historical Layers of Architecture

The Tongxiao Shrine has extremely ambiguous architectural form. The site is located in Tongxiao (通霄), Miaoli (苗栗) County, in central Taiwan. It was constructed as a Shinto shrine during the Japanese colonization and was covered with a Chinese-style roof and brick walls in the postwar era. The symbol of the ROC (Republic of China) was placed in the middle of the roof during the shrine’s restoration, when its function was changed to that of a martyrs’ shrine intended for the worship of martyrs and Koxinga (1624-62), the Ming loyalists who had defeated the Dutch colonists and established Chinese rule in Taiwan in mid-17th century. In 2005, the site was renovated and nominated as a county historic building (lishi jianzhu 歷史建築). With these changes, the site now represents a visual hybrid comprising a Japanese gate (torii 鳥居) and shrine lanterns, the Chinese Min (閩) style roof and brick walls, the copper cover of the roof, and the ROC (Republic of China; Zhonghua Minguo 中華民國) symbol at the top center. This is a site of multilayered memories.

The shrine was originally built in 1937. It was one of the nationalist projects implemented in the Japanese
The Prince Kitashirakawa Yoshihisa (北王) that martyrs Second World War, the KMT government announced consequently, Taiwan came under KMT rule. After the Japanese colonization in Taiwan ended in 1945; sub-Ship Shrine is wood. The main structure of the Tongxiao shrine is approximately forty-five degrees. The angle of the two sides of the roof is approximately forty-five degrees. The main structure of the Tongxiao Shrine is wood.

Like many shrines in Taiwan, the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine was used to worship the Shinto deity Amaterasu-ōmikami (天照大神), the sun goddess, and Prince Kitashirakawa Yoshihisa (北白川宮能久親王). It is built in the style of shinmeitsukuli (神明造) the major praying hall (haiden 拜殿) is rectangular and characterized by its linear style. The angle of the two sides of the roof is approximately forty-five degrees. The main structure of the Tongxiao Shrine is wood.

Japanese colonization in Taiwan ended in 1945; subsequently, Taiwan came under KMT rule. After the Second World War, the KMT government announced that martyrs’ shrines should be established nation-wide in China. In Taiwan, the central administrative office announced in 1946 that each county/city government should select one Shinto shrine and transform it into a martyrs’ shrine (Huang Ying-sheng 2006, 34). In the case of the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine, the mayor of Tongxiao, Tang Chang-cheng (湯長城), spontaneously initiated the renovation of the shrine, renaming it the Tongxiao Martyrs’ Shrine in 1947. Yet interestingly, there were no tablets containing the names of national martyrs in the shrine. The subjects that those who went to the shrine worshipped were Koxinga (Zheng Cheng-gong 鄭成功) and his generals. They replaced the former Japanese deities. Since the official martyrs’ shrine of Miaoli County was established separately at another place in Miaoli, the Tongxiao Shrine did not obtain legal status and was unable to qualify for a budget that would have enabled it to be maintained as a martyrs’ shrine. Huang Ying-sheng (2006) suggested that this was a major reason why the shrine was later abandoned.

In 1947, the Japanese-style praying hall was changed into a Chinese Min style (閩; Fukkien, or Fujian 福建) building following the plan of Tang Chang-cheng. The original roof with vertical and horizontal lines was rebuilt as a rising ridge with curved lines. Furthermore, the original structure of shinmeitsukuli was surrounded by brick walls in order to create an enclosed ritual space, which is representative of Chinese tradition. Yet interestingly, the Japanese copper roof was kept during the postwar reconstruction despite the fact that roofs in Chinese architecture are normally covered with tiles.

The KMT government moved to Taiwan after being defeated in the civil war of China in 1949. Large numbers of political and military immigrants moved to Taiwan, along with the apparatus of the KMT. Many shrines and Japanese sites were used as residences by the military and their families—the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine being one of them. It was first occupied by the air force and later by the army in 1966 (Guo 2003, 96). This situation continued until 1990 when the township office proposed a new development project for this area.

Within Chinese Nationalist propaganda, the Shinto shrines, as well as other Japanese material remains, were regarded as ‘poisonous residue’ that ought to
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204. The Mukden Incident, happened in 18 September 1931 in Mukden (currently Shenyang), China, was a pretext event of Japan’s imperial ambition in northern part of China, known as Manchuria.

205. The Prince Kitashirakawa Yoshihisa was a member of Japan’s royal family and was assigned to expropriate Taiwan in 1895. He died during this assignment in Taiwan. Under the State Shinto system, he was elevated to a god, and worshipped in most shrines established in Taiwan.
be removed or altered. In this context, the Japanese inscriptions were scratched from the torii of the Tongxiao Shrine (see fig. 2.3.1); additionally, many associated buildings and facilities were destroyed or altered by the military or by illegal occupants. The shrine was abandoned and was nearly destroyed by the devastating 9-21 earthquake in 1999.

4.1.2 Social Mobilization and Collective Memory

The Japanese colonial government adopted a comprehensive programme in accordance with the extensive construction of buildings. The rituals performed during the construction process, routinely scheduled events at shrines, and nationally designated occasions were supported by ideological promotion—for instance, the distribution of Japanese calendars and altar settings and the addition of shrine-relevant contents to textbooks used in elementary schools. Moreover, school children were required to attend scheduled gatherings at shrines; shrine visitation and wedding ceremonies at shrines were encouraged by those in authority (Cai Rong-ren 2002, 85–100). Through this delicate scheme of social mobilization, the colonized people were bound to the shrines and, hence, were expected to assimilate into Japanese cultural identity. As Huang Shi-juan stated,

“the strategy aimed to assimilate the colonized people through the construction of architectural bodies and most importantly, the programme of Shinto shrines. Through the daily routines and religious rituals and festivals, the colonized were assimilated unconsciously.” (Huang Shi-juan 1998, 96; my translation)

This describes the collective memory of the generation who received primary education in the colonial era. This version of memory will be elaborated on in a later section of this chapter.

Compared to the comprehensive mobilization of the Shinto system, the martyrs’ shrines established by the postwar KMT authorities did not result in the same strength of sense of place. This has to do with the different features and functions of the Shinto and martyrs’ shrines: the Shinto shrines function as religious spaces that relate to all aspects of daily life (e.g., weddings, weekly school meetings, places of prayer for success and health, and even funerals), whereas the martyrs’ shrines are mainly part of the state ritual sphere (Huang Ying-sheng 2006, 74–75). Two routine rituals were legislated in 1969: the annual spring ceremony, which involves the worship of the Chinese ancestor, the Yellow Emperor (Huangdi 黄帝), and the autumn ceremony, which commemorates the martyrs. Students and civil servants are required to attend these ceremonies, yet these rituals do not closely connect with the daily lives of ordinary people. Moreover, local people in Tongxiao felt detached from the martyrs’ shrine while it was guarded and resided by the military.206 With a history of feelings of alienation toward the martyrs’ shrines, local residents have relatively weak emotional bond to such places. These factors all played a part in the relatively uncaring attitudes toward the martyrs’ shrines when the political context changed decades later.

This observation holds true even if one considers the historical significance of Koxinga. He is a distinct historical and religious figure in the history of Taiwan, despite the fact that he stayed on the island for merely fourteen months. Considering his relationship with the Chinese Ming dynasty, his Japanese mother and childhood stay in Japan, and his battles with the Dutch VOC (Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie in Dutch; literally the Dutch East India Company), he is a figure of great ‘political correctness,’207 regardless of changing powers. At the beginning of the Japanese colonization, the temples of Koxinga were selected as mediating sites for leading the Taiwanese gradually toward the Japanese belief system. The reconstruction of the Yanpingjunwang Temple (延平郡王廟) into kaizanjinja (開山神社) was a key moment in the reinterpretation of Koxinga for a different nationalist narrative (Huang Shi-juan 1998; Fu Chao-qing 2000; Jiang Ren-jie 2000; Matten 2006). Contrary to the colonizer-oriented actions of shrine/temple building, the change from a Shinto shrine to a Koxinga temple at Tongxiao was a privately initiated event. Yet it is worth inquiring further into the histor-

206. Huang Ming-zheng 黃明政, personal communication 2009.
207. ‘Political correctness’ means that the subject represents and fits in with the contemporary dominant political propaganda.
ical consciousness of Mayor Tang and his contemporaries. Mayor Tang had been a member of the Taiwan Cultural Association during the Japanese colonization, which suggests his political stance and motivation in reconstructing the Tongxiao Shrine into a Han-style building and adding a symbol of the ROC (Republic of China, currently the formal name of Taiwan) on it (Huang Ying-sheng 2006, 35). In 1925, the Tongxiao Youth Association was funded and Tang was a leader of its academic department (Lin Bo-wei 1993). The establishment of this association was under the impact of the Taiwan Culture Association (臺灣文化協會), the most influential organization in the 1920s, aiming at ‘advancing cultural development of Taiwan.’ Through all sorts of study workshops, speeches, newspaper-reading, theatre and film activities, the association evoked enthusiastic responses all over Taiwan. The Culture Association advocated modern knowledge, cultural enlightenment, and became a core agent in generating Taiwanese subjectivity in the Japanese colonial period. Under the colonial rule, the association advocated political participation. The Tongxiao Youth Association was one of these anti-colonialism organizations. This suggests that the renovation of the Tongxiao shrine into a Chinese-Min style building, setting the Koxinga altar and placing the label of the ROC on the roof, may represent this attitude.

4.1.3 Representing the Ambiguous Japanese Heritage

The Tongxiao Shinto Shrine was in a shabby condition when the Tongxiao township office initiated in 1990 a plan to include the shrine and the area surrounding it as part of the Park of Hutou Hill (Hu-toushan gongyuan 虎頭山公園) in an effort to develop local tourism. The Miaoli County government designated the shrine as a municipal ‘historic building’ (lishi jianzhu 歷史建築) in 2002 and renovated the site with financial aid from the Council for Cultural Affairs (CCA). This occurred during the time the state community-building programme was at its climax. The renovation project – completed in June 2005 – faced some significant debates caused by the heterogeneities of the multiple memories related to this site.

In order to retrieve the original status, Guo Jun-pei (郭俊沛), the architect in charge of the renovation project, researched the Japanese form of Shinto shrines and collected local memories by means of interviews. The interviewees he consulted were mainly born in the 1920s during the Japanese colonial period; two were military officers who resided at the shrine during the postwar era. All interviewees were male.208 The topics of the interviews comprised the general memories toward the Shrine; its architectural fabric and spatial allocation; and rituals performed at the shrine. Aside from the interviews done by the architect, the following discussion is based on the interviews done by me between 2008 and 2011, and by other researches.

Japanese or Postwar Style? – Contesting Memories

The issue of removing the KMT logo on Taipei Jingfu Gate (Taipei Jingfu Men 台北景福田) has raised fierce conflicts. The same issue was encountered in the case of the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine in Miaoli County four years ago. At that time some local residents argued the KMT logo209 on top of the Shrine was inadequate, seemingly meaning that “the KMT is greater than god”. They claimed that the logo should be removed yet this opinion was not accepted (by the local government during the process of renovation). The local cultural worker Chen Shui-mu (陳水木) said yesterday, “many young students called the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine the “KMT Temple (Guomindang de miao 國民黨的廟)””. The logo should have been removed a long time ago". (The Liberty Times, 9 June 2009)210

208. The architect Guo Jun-pei mentioned that, “the informants were mainly aged over seventy. There were fewer local residents (familiar with the shrine) after 1949 because it was in use by the military. The local people could not easily get close to the site. Only the military personnel and their families were able to access. Hence oral records of the latter group were much fewer than records of the group born in the colonial era. It implies that the architecture was valued differently by different age groups”. See Guo Jun-pei 2003, 98; my translation.

209. The logo of ROC (Republic of China) and of KMT ( Kuomintang; Chinese Nationalist Party) were originated from the same design, hence the logo on top of the Tongxiao Shinto Shrine was often regarded as the logo of KMT.

210. The original text is: "國家古蹟台北景福田的國民黨神社銘牌

p.112
When plans for renovating the Shrine were made, it was at the beginning uncertain to what original form it should be restored. A lively debate on this issue evolved, resulting in conflicts that not only indicated the diverse frameworks of memory formulated and intensified by the shifting political powers; but also represented the dynamic network of actors in the process of heritage interpretation, including the postcolonial locals whose sense of place is permeable by and interactive with the “predominant thoughts” (Halbwachs 1992) of the nation.

During an interview in 2006, the architect Guo Jun-pei recalled the challenges on deciding the form of renovating Tongxiao Shinto Shrine. He mentioned two different opinions toward which period the renovation should refer: some local residents, mainly the war-time generation, wanted to renovate it to the original Japanese style; yet the architect himself regarded the shrine of current form reconstructed in the postwar era more suitable to record the historical transitions, and represented the “chronicle juxtaposition” of architectural forms (Huang Ying-sheng 2006, 94-99). The latter opinion was also shared by Qiu Shao-jun (邱紹俊, born in 1943), a local politician of the postwar generation. He believed that the change made by the post-1945 regime should be maintained in order to avoid historical discontinuity (Guo Jun-pei 2003, 100). Hence the renovation should allude to the period of the postwar era. A local cultural worker, Chen Shui-mu (陳水木) also mentioned that “if the shrine was to be renovated to its original state of Showa year 12 (1937), to that of the original Japanese Shrine, then it would be emotionally detached from the current local residents: because they do not have the impression (of Japanese style), their feeling is not the same. There would be a gap between the shrine and the memory of the residents” (Huang Ying-sheng 2006, 107-108; my translation). Considering the issue of keeping or removing the KMT logo from the top of the Shrine, it becomes obvious how memory is defined here by social frameworks, which again exert influence on the actual heritage practice of the site.

Diverse Social Frameworks

As shown by the oral records above, memories associated with the shrine differed between generations, particularly in regard to the colonial and the postwar era. The elder generation, who had received its primary education under the Japanese colonization, showed a strong emotional bond to the shrine. In the renovation report (Guo 2003, 100), Yu Rongjue (余榮爵, born in 1923), who was a civil servant of township office during Japanese period, stressed that his Japanese wedding ceremony (shinzenshiki 神前式) had taken place at the shrine, and that he therefore had strong emotional ties to this place. Other informants remembered the passes, lanterns, associated buildings, and environmental aura of the area, and their personal contacts with the high priest. They mentioned the weekly gathering of the local students in front of the shrine, and the national events, parades, and festivals during the colonial era.

Qiu Yun-yan (邱雲炎) and his wife Li Su-lian (李素蓮) recalled their memories of the shrine during my interview (August 2009). They gave detailed descriptions of their attendance at the performance of the ceremonies. “Only students who performed well in the school were able to join”, they mentioned with pride. Li was one of the female dancers wearing a Japanese traditional dress, dancing in slow and elegant motions in front of the shrine, while Qiu was one of the trumpet players. They recalled the parade in the streets and the dancing performance at the current market space during the festivals. During the in-

211. As historian Chou Wan-yao states, the ‘war-time generation’ (zhanzhengqi shidai; 戰爭期世代) refers to those who were around age 15 to 25 when Japan declared its loss in the Second World War in 1945 (Zhou 2009, 236). She divided Taiwanese generations during Japanese colonization into three: the first generation were those in their adulthood around 1895; the second generation were born around 1895, educated within the new colonial educational system yet maintained influences from tradition; the third was the ‘war-time generation’ who experienced the war in their adolescent period and mostly received elementary education within the colonial modern educational system (2009, 149).

212. Guo Jun-pei 2003; Huang Ying-sheng 2006; and interviews conducted by the author in 2009.
terview conducted at their home in August 2009, it was quite telling that the television was broadcasting Japanese programmes. They told me that they “only watch Japanese channels and the NHK news”. After the interview I attended Li Su-lian’s lunch gathering with her female friends whose ages ranged from 70s to 80s. They mainly talked in Taiwanese, but after the meal started to sing Japanese songs learnt from the elderly among them. This is a tradition of their monthly lunch dates. Many of them were teachers or office workers retired from the local elementary school. This indicates their similar social frameworks of memory despite the fact that some of them belong to different generations—with the same gender, similar vocational status, growing up in the same town, they confirmed and reformulated memories among the group and generated a version of collective memory, a version of the past. Their seemingly pro-colonial attitude is shaped by the mutual selection and reconfirmation of memorial events within the social framework, for instance singing Japanese songs and sharing memories of the school where they worked at during their monthly gatherings. The attitude is also generated in responding to the social context where the Japanese cultural remains fit well into the new multicultural model of identity narrative. Li and her friends are able to express freely their connections to the Japanese past when Japanese cultural associations are no longer taboos in public anymore as they were during the postwar authoritarian period.

There was an exceptional member among the group, a lady called Zhou (周) who accompanied her elder sister to attend this gathering. She had relatively tough memories of the Shinto shrine. When others were thinking about weddings of friends at the locale, she could hardly remember anything with pleasure, only that she had to collect wood in the surrounding area because of the poor economic situation of her family. She moved to another area in Taiwan during her adulthood and returned after retirement. Her social framework of memory seemed different, as it was the case with a male called Huang who was born in the postwar age and used to live at the bottom of Hutou Hill (虎頭山) where the shrine is located. He showed relatively few emotional feelings toward the shrine. He played with friends in the open space of the shrine, although local people after the arrival of KMT military could hardly approach the place. Local informants remembered that they went up the hill to worship Koxinga, yet after years his tablets and that of former generals were forgotten and the shrine was nearly deserted.

The different ways of defining and creating memories of the past related to the shrine can be explained by the concept of “communicative memory” as proposed by Jan Assmann. He explains the formation of collective memory by arguing that as “[t]his memory belongs in the intermediary realm between individuals; it grows out of intercourse between people, and the emotions play the crucial role in its process” (Jan Assmann 2006, 3). In our case, the strong emotional bonds of the elder generation that developed in their communal experiences of fateful events during the social mobilization in the colonial period were strengthened in their daily intercourse. The collective sense of belonging can cross generations, for example in the female circle of Li Su-lian. In the ensuing chapter, I analyze the social network related to the renovation of the heritage.

4.1.4 The Actor Network of Heritage Renovation

Ultimately, the architect and professionals were the core actors in the process of renovation, and hence they were the decision maker of representing the past. There are two figures mentioned in the renovation report and in later research: Guo Jun-pei, the architect in charge of the renovation project, and Xu
Hui-min (徐慧民), an architectural researcher in a university of the neighbor county. The former had a clear position in retaining the current fabric constructed during the KMT regime (Huang Ying-sheng 2006); the latter expressed a relatively neutral opinion recorded in the renovation report (Guo Jun-pei 2003). Yet it is suggested in the dissertation supervised by Xu (Huang Ying-sheng 2006) that retaining the postwar fabric in order to juxtapose historical periods was agreed by Xu as well. This opinion was interestingly countered by two civil servants at Township Office. They showed a rather regretful attitude toward the current shrine for lacking a genuine Japanese style. When I pointed out the opinion of Xu, one said sarcastically, “that he is a professional, not a local resident. You professionals always say it is better to remain like this”. Moreover, the civil servants at Township Office were anxious about the mixture fabric having no authentic value to show to the Japanese visitors because it cannot be qualified as genuine Japanese architecture. It suggests that the local tourism particularly the potential economic reward which may be brought by the Japanese tourists is an influential factor to the development of heritage industry in Taiwan. The image of Japan perceived by the civil servants is different from that by the group of war-time generation.

The legal managing body of the shrine is the Department of Civil Affairs (Minzheng ke) of the Township Office. The praying hall of the Shrine has been closed since the renovation, and is only opened temporarily for special occasions. The plan of Hutou Hill Leisure Park (虎頭山公園) was not completed either. Compared to the debates that raged a few years ago on the style of renovation, it seems very quiet in Tongxiao on the issue of reopening and managing the shrine. The Township Office is responsible for the security and environment of the shrine, yet has no budget and positive management plan considering the representation of architectural uniqueness and historical layers. The lack of professional support and difficult financial status of Tong-xiao Town are important factors explaining the rather absent management.

Four years after the renovation, the residents showed rather neutral attitude to the current condition of the shrine. Although Qiu expressed his preference to a Japanese shrine in the renovation report, he mentioned in our talk in 2009 that he could accept the shrine as it is, i.e. in postwar style. It seems that the contesting memories of groups with diverse social frameworks have developed into some agreeable version of collective past after the open process of interacting, reformulating and debating. The memory recollection before the renovation offered a platform for this dialogue. During numerous interviews by architects, researchers, civil servants, the informants reformulated their memories in the repetitive narratives. However, this agreement is not able to form the base for transforming the shrine into a site of locality production. This owes to the discontinued memory activities after renovation.

4.2 INDUSTRIALIZING MEMORIES: CIAOTOU SUGAR FACTORY

I pass through the shady Nanzi Road of coconut trees while sugar cane fields along the road are shining with a relaxing aura under the sunshine of south Taiwan. I head to the north; the road is
gradually narrower and leads to the market of Ciaotou. This is a narrow path yet full of memories. I turn right and reach the sugar factory. Time seems to freeze here: chimney afar, sugar plant, light rail train; the sidings of the old residences, fire bell, air-raid shelters, stone lion in front of Zhongshan Hall; the memories—soaked by the slightly sweet aroma of cane sugar—learning from the residents, and the red bean yogurt ice accompanying chirping crickets in the summer afternoon. These floating memories and relaxing feelings sculpted in time are the attractions of Ciaotou.

Ciaotou 桥頭, generally known by local residents as Kio-A-Thou 橋仔頭 in Taiwanese, is a town in south Taiwan. The town was formed in the 18th century owing to its position on major transportation routes. Currently, Ciaotou is part of Kaohsiung County, close to Kaohsiung, the largest city in southern Taiwan. During the Japanese colonial period (1895-1945), Ciaotou was chosen as the site of the first sugar factory in Taiwan. A railway was constructed for industry and thus the urban development of Ciaotou was determined. During the 1960s, the Provincial Highway (shengdao省道) was built and replaced the railway as the major transportation route. The urban centre of Ciaotou has gradually moved from the Old Street (laojie老街) next to the railway, to an area along the Provincial Highway. The sugar factory, which covers one hundredth of the land of Ciaotou, has played a crucial role in the process of urban development. When Ciaotou is discussed, the sugar factory is always mentioned. It is a representative site of memory for Ciaotou people.

Urban Development of Ciaotou Town

In 1901 Ciaotou was chosen by the Japanese colonial apparatus as the first base in Taiwan for developing a sugar industry. This decision entirely changed both the landscape and the social-economic structure of Ciaotou. In the 18th century, the area of ‘Small Stores Street’ (Xiao-dian-zi Jie 小店仔街), the present Old Street, was the commercial and transportation centre of Ciaotou. The landscape of Ciaotou before the colonial period was characterised by wide, open plains with a few streets of small businesses, and fields for agricultural production.

As the Japanese colonizer brutally acquired land and constructed industrial infrastructures, Ciaotou started to be recognized as a landscape of modern industry: high chimneys, quasi-Western style architecture, sugar cane fields and the long winding cane rails. Because the industrial area was planned as a self-sufficient society, it was set apart from Old Street. The separation of these two areas by the railway line implicates the spatial and also social division that persists even to the present day (Wu Xu-feng 1995, 247-268). (Please refer to locations number 1 and number 2 in figure 4.2.2 below.) Moreover, in order to transport sugar products, Ciaotou was directly connected by railway to Kaohsiung port. In the 1980s, Ciaotou was officially declared a satellite town of Kaohsiung City because of the urban expansion of Kaohsiung and the establishment of the Nanzi Industrial Zone in the surrounding neighbourhood (Wu Xu-feng 1995, 259-60).

Three periods of modernization which altered the landscape of Ciaotou are presented in this section in order to examine the dynamics of conservation, development and community. During the first period, the landscape of Ciaotou was reconstructed by the colonizers and became the core of local uniqueness. In the second period, community engagement played the major role in conserving the historic landscape and achieving the integrity of development and conservation. During the third period, a crisis emerged under expectations of economic revival. This section highlights the dilemma between heritage conservation and regional revival while pursuing the integrity of a historic urban landscape.
In order to exploit its colony in Taiwan, the Japanese government-affiliated Taiwan Sugar Manufacture Company (台灣製糖株式會社), called kaisha (公司) in Japanese by local residents, forcibly obtained the ownership of private land with assistance of police power.\textsuperscript{215} In order to ensure raw materials, 97.7\% of the company’s land was ‘bought’ from private owners (Lin Si-jia 2008, 37). The company grabbed land not only for factory construction, but also for growing sugar cane. Yet only around 20\% of raw materials could be produced by these

\textsuperscript{215} According to the oral records of local residents, some elders recalled how their former generation(s) were forced by the police into agreeing to transfer land ownership to the

company (Kaohsiung County Government 1997 and Kio-A-Thou Culture Society 2001). Moreover, the sugar company grabbed land before the establishment of a legal system of private land ownership which is based on precise land measurement and investigation. This situation allowed the company to ‘buy’ the private land at a low price (Lin Si-jia 2008, 24).
company-owned or rented fields; others needed to be acquired from private farmers (Lin Si-jia 2008, 25). The local farmers either became tenant farmers or hired workers of the sugar company. Any farmers that remained independent were also forced to rely on the company, as they had to sell their sugar cane to the company, backed up by the protection of the Taiwan Governor-General Office (臺灣總督府). Furthermore, the land of independent farmers shrank and it became impossible to provide a sufficient crop to sustain a whole family; hence, more and more the farmers came to rely on the temporary labour jobs provided by the company. The local farmers gradually moved away from agriculture and towards working as labourers. Eventually, the sugar company had come to dominate the local society. This preordained that the future development of Ciaotou would always be tightly interwoven with the policies of the sugar company.

Under colonial management, characterised by a scientific rationality, the spatial scheme of Ciaotou was rearranged to fit industrial requirements. The sugar factory area was the centre of Ciaotou, separated from the local residential area by the railway. Inside the factory area, a self-contained ‘living society’ as well as manufacture facilities was set up by the company. The facilities inside the area included the residences of employees, a school, grocery supplies, medical service, entertainment facilities, and religious settings. Within the walls of the factory area, where mainly the Japanese employees lived, it seemed to be a different and isolated world to local Taiwanese residents whose living areas were mainly located on the other side of the railway. This area was known as Old Street, an organic sprawl of streets lined with Chinese-style red brick architecture which was in stark contrast to linear spatial arrangement of the Japanese and semi-Western style buildings inside the factory area. Thus, the railway also represented social segregation, divided the world of the colonizers and the colonized (Wu Xu-feng 1995). This discriminatory social structure was continued by the postwar Taiwan Sugar Corporation under the rule of the KMT (國民黨; Chinese Nationalist Party) government.

I recall that during one of my visits to Ciaotou in 2007, our car stopped briefly in front of the office area of the sugar factory while looking for directions. We were acrimoniously expelled by the factory guard. When I realized that the one-year-old sugar museum was actually located behind the gate, the tough situation that the administrative department of museum faced was quite understandable. Even though the sugar factory was officially claimed by the Taiwan Sugar Corporation as a cultural park in 2006 after years of conservation movements raised by local residents, the bureaucratic features of a state enterprise remain and indicate the difficulty of its organization to deal with unfamiliar cultural affairs. Moreover, the securely guarded gate shows the continuance of the enclosed role of the Sugar Corporation, self-defined as detached from the local community since the postwar KMT period. However, as a manager of a cultural site in the postcolonial present, the Sugar Corporation has to build up new networks in face of the dynamic leisure market and local society. This is a truly challenging situation for an old governmental organization.

The sugar factory was ceded to the Taiwan Sugar Corporation after Japan’s retreat from Taiwan at the end of the Second World War. Taiwan Sugar Corporation is a state enterprise established by the KMT, and it became the manager of the Ciaotou sugar in—

industry after the war. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Japanese economic and social profits in Taiwan were whole-sale received by the postwar KMT government. The sugar industry is one representative example. Along with the transfer of material properties, the discriminatory social structure was replaced by the Taiwan Sugar Corporation. The dominant role of *kaisha*, previously played by the Japanese Taiwan Sugar Manufacture Company in the local society, was taken by the postwar Taiwan Sugar Corporation. The Japanese who had enjoyed the superior living quality inside the factory area were substituted for mainlanders. Living within the sugar factory area is a symbol of superiority, whether in the Japanese period or under the postwar KMT rule (Kio-A-Thou Culture Society 2001, 24).

Taiwan’s sugar industry was at its peak in the 1950s, when sugar exports occupied 73.6% of foreign exchange income. 217 However, from this time onwards the profits of the sugar industry gradually declined. In the 1970s, a large number of Ciaotou youths left their hometown for work opportunities in newly emerging industrial areas in the neighbourhood, such

---

as the Nanzi Industrial District. The tight relation between the sugar industry and the local community was challenged by new economic conditions. Taiwan Sugar Corporation formally announced the closure of the Ciaotou sugar factory in 1999, and pleaded for a new development plan for the site which would help the financial deficit of the company. After years of struggle and conflict, in 2006 the Taiwan Sugar Museum was funded by the company at the old site of the Ciaotou sugar factory as a cultural and leisure park.

During my field visit in January 2008, I spoke with the site manager of the Taiwan Sugar Corporation in the office building, also a ‘historic monument’. Within this Dutch tropical colonial-style building, time seemed to freeze. Only the manager among the relaxed staff seemed anxious about the day’s work, which included him giving a guided tour for visitors through the museum exhibition. The museum was only open on weekends, he mentioned, as the unfamiliar cultural work associated with a museum was difficult for the staff. As an old state enterprise, the Taiwan Sugar Corporation is part of the huge bureaucratic machine of the government. According to the manager, even the gardener was paid a high salary because of his seniority, and he could refuse assigned jobs. Under the bureaucratic system, the manager was prevented from replacing this employee with other eligible personnel with a more reasonable salary. Hence, all the jobs that came with the new cultural identity of the sugar factory fell on a few members of staff. The bureaucratic rigidness shown by the old Sugar Corporation indicates its difficulties in facing and cooperating with the local communities who have been empowered by the community-building movements in the 1990s and 2000s.

4.2.2 The First Period of Modernization: locality based on modernity

Most local history books start their descriptions of Ciaotou with the establishment of its sugar factory, the first modern sugar factory in Taiwan (Kio-A-Thau Culture Society 2001; 2002; Kaohsiung County Government 1997). This experience of colonial modernity has formed the base of the local identity of Ciaotou. The majority of Ciaotou’s residents have built their self-esteem and local memory on the idea of Ciatou being the ‘first site’ of the modern sugar industry in Taiwan.

As Nead’s (2000, 8) analysis of modernity in Victorian London explains, “space is understood as an active agent of modernity … [it] is never a passive backdrop for the formation of historical identities and experiences, but is an active constituent of historical consciousness.” The new spatial fabric constructed by the colonizers in Ciaotou simultaneously resulted in different bodily experiences within the local community, and this formed the context for a social framework of collective memory (Halbwachs 1992), and constituted the core part of historical consciousness. Thus the landscape of the sugar factory with its high chimneys, cane tracks etc., has served as the major material actor in a sense of local pride and local identity.

Colonial Modernity

“Building a bridge in the middle of the sky; scaling the length underground; black cows leave their tails; turtles wandering on the roads.”

A man, Lu Yi (陸儀), had been repetitively murmuring the poem. He was believed insane by the local people in Wuliling area, part of Ciaotou Township. People realized the real meaning of this enigma-like poetry only after the Japanese constructed electricity wires, measured the lands, prohibited Chinese long-braids and introduced modern cars (Kio-A-Thau Culture Society 2004, 22; my translation).

Many Ciaotou people recall their hometown memories of a landscape with grand chimneys, interlaced rail tracks, and the rising sweet smoke of burning sugar cane. The material remains of sugar manufacturing have become “figures of memory” (Assman 1995, 129) which cannot be separated from the bodily experiences of colonial modernity.

As soon as the Taiwan Sugar Manufacture Company decided to choose Ciaotou as the site for a modern sugar industry, the company applied for the construc-

---

218. The original text is: 半天造銅橋，地下量尺寸，黑牛會落尾，烏龜滿路爬。
tion of a railway station in Ciaotou. Furthermore, it
also applied for a “Ciaotou Post and Telegraph Bu-
reau” (橋仔頭郵便電信局) and an electricity gener-
ating station inside the sugar factory, the first private
generating station in Taiwan (Lin Si-jia 2008, 22-23).
All these new constructions were new experiences
for the local people, and greatly changed their sense
of place.

The local historian Zheng Shui-ping 鄭水萍 describes the dramatic change of the local spatial tex-
ture from features of a Chinese immigrant settlement —red-bricked houses, winding paths for cow-driven
carts, the interlaced spatial arrangement of residence,
temples located at intersections and religious squares —into features of a modern industrial environment—
iron factories, high chimneys, and a mixture of West-
ern-Eastern style architecture. The process of indus-
trialisation went hand in hand with the introduction
of a modern contracts system, the legislation of land
ownership, scientific investigation and measurement
of land etc. Moreover, the scientific production pro-
cess, transportation and irrigation systems, as well as
modern public infrastructures such as telephone
lines, electricity wires and public lighting all rep-
resented new experiences of modernisation for local
residents during the Japanese colonial time, despite
the fact that these modern constructions were aimed
at meeting colonial desires. Other than the new ex-
periences of space, the conceptualisation of time was
altered in accord with the new industrial living style
(Lü Shao-li 1998).

4.2.3 The Second Period of Modernization: A
Withered Tree, a Revival Dream

The material embodiment of local pride, the sugar
factory, was threatened by the state project ‘New
Town’ (Xinshizhen 新市鎮) launched in 1994. ‘New
Town’ is an urban planning model developed in Brit-
da during the late 19th and early 20th century. It
aimed to reconstruct urban suburbs to solve over-
crowding issues in city centres. Ciaotou was in-
cluded in the Kaohsiung New Town project (Gaoxi-
ong xinshizhen 高雄新市鎮), and was planned to be
developed into a new urban area with a population of
300,000. The 27 acres of the sugar factory area were
divided into areas for transportation, parks, and com-
mmercial areas; however, an understanding of the cul-
tural and historical fabric of Ciaotou was not taken
into consideration.

The state announcement of this plan caused a sense
of crisis among the local elites. The Ciaotou-born po-
litician Lin Jing-yao 林敬堯 initiated a community
building movement to try to resist the ill thought-out
development policy. He mentioned:

There was an old tree withered in my home town.
With grief, I suddenly realized how long I had
been away from my hometown; meanwhile, the
national plan of “Kaohsiung New Town” was
being launched. I was aware of the fracture of
memory in the local area. This discontinuity,
owing to the general historical context, had
caused an absence of concern about cultural
depth since the beginning of this urban scheme. I
believed that every city should have its own
memory…and the “New Town” project should
include the local subjects in its plan as funda-
mental components […] Therefore I decided to
return to Ciaotou, as a Secretary of the Township
Office, and to initiate the community building. 219

Lin began the plan with a series of cultural activities
and educational programmes: a grieving ritual for the
dead tree;220 a commemoration event for the polluted
river which included poetry; the founding of study
groups and the establishment of the Kio-A-Thou
Culture Workshop (later the Kio-A-Thou Culture So-
ciety). Not merely concerned with memory recollec-
tion, Lin also aimed to “remake civil servants, pro-
fessionals and citizens” (zaoguan, zaojiang, zaoren

219. Lin Jing-yao, personal communication in January 2008;
my translation.

220. This hundred-year old banyan tree grew in the Shihlong
(仕隆) Elementary School, the oldest school in Ciaotou. The tree
was hence a symbol of memory for numerous local graduates.
Unfortunately, it was struck by lightning in April 1994. Lin Jing-
yao, a graduate of Shihlong Elementary School, decided to initia-
te a commemorative event aiming to reconnect the people and
land of Ciaotou and to raise community awareness and environ-
mental concerns. This commemorative ritual, Shulingji (樹靈祭)
became the symbolic start of Ciaotou’s community-building
movement. It is also a well-known example with historical
significance among Taiwan’s community-building workers since
the ritual was held at the very beginning of Taiwan’s community-
building trend, earlier than community-building events in other
places.
The study and research groups invited professionals to teach and discuss topics on local history, the New Town project, sustainable environment and civil society. These series of programmes successfully drew attention to an awareness of the local identity. Moreover, it fuelled a communal awareness of conserving the historic landscape of the sugar factory.

Sugar Factory: site of the past, actor of the future

As mentioned earlier, the sugar factory has been the symbolic landscape of local pride and local identity. The idea of conserving the sugar factory and developing it as a historic park became an important aim of the local elites, who gathered and trained through workshops in the initial stages of the community building. The newly founded Kio-A-Thou Culture Society took over the leading role from the Township Office in community building, and continuously hosted cultural festivals and educational activities at the site of the sugar factory. However, the property owner, Taiwan Sugar Corporation, was concerned that its property rights might be threatened by the conservation actions. In 1998, a fierce conflict was fuelled by the designation of the entire area of the sugar factory as a Historic Monument of Kaohsiung County. After few years’ negotiation and following a legal lawsuit, in 2002 the sites of Historic Monument within the sugar factory area were redefined to include only 19 sites within the sugar factory. It seemed that the area of historic monument had shrunk. Nevertheless the Taiwan Sugar Corporation agreed with the latter designation in 2002 and confirmed it through legal procedures, unlike the attitude of denial it showed to the former designation in 1998. This change in attitude owes a lot to the local conservation movements raised by the Culture Society.

Despite some ongoing controversy and debate, the Kio-A-Thou Culture Society rented an office and started a government financed ‘artist-in-residence’ project in the factory area. This was an annual cultural event, set up in cooperation with the Kaohsiung County Bureau of Cultural Affairs. Both international and local artists participated, and this event defined the spatial tone of the sugar factory as an artistic cultural park. Meanwhile, the property owner, Taiwan Sugar Corporation gradually adjusted its plan for the sugar factory, and renovated a part of the buildings as a Sugar Industry and added recreational facilities. The collective awareness of maintaining the memory landscape successfully resisted the potential amnesia caused by the New Town project. However, the tangled relationship between the factory, the society and the company also implied an unstable future of conservation.

4.2.4 The Third Period of Modernization: diverse dreams

In late March 2008, Ciaotou suddenly came into the spotlight of the press because of its dramatic transformation from a quiet, nostalgic historic site to the hottest tourist spot. During the opening period of the first metropolitan-rapid-transportation system (KMRT) in southern Taiwan, there were more than ten thousand visitors daily from urban neighbourhoods. However, even as numerous vendors ambitiously bid for stands with ever rising prices in the factory surroundings, crowd numbers instantly withered after the last day of the free trial period for the new metro system. The local inhabitants had experienced annoyance at the disorder and damage brought by the tourists. They have since been bitterly expecting the arrival of future prosperity.

Trees again

Part of the New Town project, the metro construction was the only item to be completed after the plan for the Kaohsiung New Town was declared under revision. The metro route in Ciaotou follows the railway track, and has three stops within the administrative area of the township. One stop is located right in the heart of the sugar factory (please refer to location number 5-2 on fig.4.2.2). The purchasing of land for the construction of the metro started in 2002, at the time when the Kio-A-Thou Culture Society was situated in the factory and the projects of performing arts and artist-in-residence were running. The KMRT was severely criticized by the Culture Society for its scheduled destruction to some parts of the historic buildings and sites. The conflict intensified after the slogan ‘Where are those old trees going to?’ appeared in a nation-wide newspaper (Jiang Yao-xian 2006). The Society argued that the KMRT plan would to remove hundred-year-old trees for the me-
tro construction, and motivated the press, pressure groups and cultural workers to resist this ignorance of the historic monuments and local community. They especially emphasized the fact that the huge concrete metro construction showed a neglect of the visual integrity of the historic area. However, this time, the Society did not receive the same support as a decade ago from the locals. In 1994, a dead tree raised the collective sentiments toward place and memory; nearly ten years later, the reply from a local representative was a call to not oppose the metro simply for the sake of a couple of trees (Jiang Yao-xian 2006, 126). This discordance between local residents was actually a result of the development of community building.

The Sugar Factory and the Old Street

Since the colonial period, the areas of the factory and Old Street developed separately according to a social and economic hierarchy set by the colonizers. The two areas, divided by the railway, represented two different memory versions: the sugar factory was a self-sufficient district in which mainly employees who were of the colonizers’ ethnic group resided; the Old Street was the major commercial and living area for local communities. Living in the district of the factory was a symbol of being a member of the higher class.

This separation remained unchanged after the colonial rule of the Japanese and the KMT authoritarian period. It was even strengthened by the urban planning and development schemes. For instance, the different metro stops further determined this disjunction (Xu Zheng-wang 2004, 10). In addition to the social and physical division, the different statuses of ownership caused numerous controversies. The conservative state enterprise, the Taiwan Sugar Corporation, continues to distance the factory from the local residents. The transformation of the factory into a cultural park was planned by the company, and the local businesses and cultural specialties hardly benefited monetarily from the BOT plan initiated by this old bureaucratic company. Owing to the discriminatory social structure that had resulted from the dual colonialism and because of the postcolonial urban development, most local residents feel remote from the factory space, despite the fact that the sugar factory is the symbolic landscape of Ciaotou. This feeling was deepened by the modern arts events which were not familiar to the local residents. Moreover, in 1995 the Society decided to focus simply on cultural affairs rather than community building. This decision determined the character of the society; illustrated by the lack of motivation amongst local residents to resist the destruction of heritage sites through metro construction.

Moreover, Old Street has also endured conflict between conservation and development. With a great deal of local approval, many old houses were demolished in order to widen the road. The Culture Society again urged the media and Ciaotou-born people in Taipei to pursue an alternative plan of conservation and visual integrity, yet this was regarded as a betrayal to the collective will. It is also noteworthy that the use of the power of press has a two-sided effect in heritage conservation. On the one hand, the press may successfully raise the public attention on conservation issues; on the other, it may cause a separation between communities, shown for instance in the conflicting opinions of the Society and the residents on the issue of Old Street, and the feelings of distrust between potential cooperative groups. During my interview in January 2008, one member of staff from the Taiwan Sugar Corporation mentioned that the manipulation of the media by the Culture Society obstructed possibilities of cooperation from the higher administrative levels of the company.

Historic Urban Landscape: for heritage conservation or for regional revival?

As the community-building initiator Lin Jing-yao asserted in January 2008 during our interview:

The factory cannot be conserved only in terms of cultural heritage…; its conservation has to be an asset to regional development…Not merely the perspective of culture, [the conservation] should offer leisure and job opportunities. Thus, the conservation should be considered in regards to regional scale, not only insist on conserving trivial details. If the large scale of spatial elements, ecological environment, spatial culture, architectural fabric remain visible, we should
conserve them; others can be compromised when new needs and values emerge.

Lin also expressed his disagreement with the art-in-residence project in the factory. He thought that the Society was not able to transform the factory as a base of co-existence and co-development with the local community. “It has become an artists’ laboratory, a temporary private-rented space. This is different from the community building aims”.

In the initial period of community-building in 1996, the Culture Society declared a focus on cultural affairs instead of community-building (Jiang Yao-xian 1998, 70-72). This character was further cemented as the conservation issues of the sugar factory became the major concern of the Society. This focus on the sugar factory was partly strengthened by the financial needs of the Society, which continually receives government subsidies. The Society was obsessed with the factory, and gradually distanced itself from the issues concerning the local residents. Moreover, its role as the cultural elite and media moderator caused further separation from the community and from other potential partners such as the Taiwan Sugar Corporation and the Township Office. Thus the consciousness of conservation was not able to be extended and deepened within the local community and other potential allies.

If the definition of ‘heritage’ cannot be separated from the concepts of ‘inheritance’, ‘volition’, ‘identification’ and ‘ownership’ (Howard 2003), the urban heritage in Ciaotou is an embodiment of the collective will of the local community to recognize it as their valuable inheritance for the next generations. However, within the urban context, the essence of heritage is often challenged by the demand of development. The interview with Lin on the case of Ciaotou in January 2008 offers further thinking on a fundamental dilemma: does the incentive of conserving the local heritage depend on its heritage value, or on its economic benefits to the local residents? In Ciaotou and in many other examples in Taiwan, in the initial stages of conservation these two purposes are usually mixed and provide accountability for conservation reasons to the local residents and media. The regional revival brought by tourism and the cultural industry is expected among cultural elites and local residents while the conservation is launched. The cooperation of diverse stakeholders and institutions is easily formed among the expectation of regional revival. However, the integrity of a heritage site may be sacrificed for larger economic benefits. Furthermore, if the value of local heritage is based on recognition from the local community, can the collective will justify the physical changes to the heritage site, for instance the decision to demolish parts of Old Street?

4.2.5 Historic Landscape, Economic Revival and Local Community

Within the popular globalization discourse, Taiwanese policy-makers and community workers often regard locality reproduction as a key method of survival in the global economy. This has also been strengthened by Taiwan’s postcolonial pursuit of ‘indigenization’ and by the need for industrial transformation. Numerous regions have proposed conservation and reutilization projects in order to shape an image of local uniqueness and pursue economic revival (Lü Xin-yi 2002). However, when development demands conflict with historic conservation, the latter always cedes to the former; a much more rapid process than considering an alternative strategy for integrity.

This section has presented the nexus of conservation, development and community within the urban context. The issue of conservation and development long has been discussed. Within this dynamic field, the ‘community’ may be a remedy in terms of developing a strong sense of place and consciousness of civil society, for instance in the case of Ciaotou during the second period of modernization. The sense of place was rooted by establishing an extensive network comprising the local societies, schools, professionals and government institutions. However, this bond to historic sites (the sugar factory) and living spaces (Old Street) was dissolved by the prospect of the potential economic benefits brought by metro construction. In the case of the factory, this was mainly because of a sense of colonial remoteness

221. “Indigenization”: bentuhua (John Makeham and A-chin Hsiau 2005) also known as the Taiwanese localization movement.
sustained by the aged bureaucratic institution the Taiwan Sugar Corporation. It was also due to the narrowed role of the Culture Society in community building. In the case of Old Street, memory recollection and civil concern have not been deepened by community building, while the cultural elites have been preoccupied with the issues and government cases concerning the sugar factory. In both cases, the ongoing community building that reconnects the community to their places is missing.

As in many other cases of urban heritage conservation, economic benefit is the crucial incentive for the support from either public or private interest groups. For example, the popular cultural festival in 1995 at the factory area was actually the key event that caused the Taiwan Sugar Corporation to change its future direction of the factory. The focus was gradually shifted from selling real estate and property to developing a museum and cultural park. The section has suggested that although economic incentives are unavoidable during heritage practices, sustainable conservation can be stabilized by strengthening local bonds to places in terms of continuous and extensive community building and public education. The education should particularly emphasize a sense of ‘accountability’ for communicating with diverse groups of the local community and other potential partners. Moreover, despite the fact that regional revival motivates a large number of supporters, the priority of education should be to focus on ‘heritage value’ and not economic benefits.

The strategies of ‘co-management’ and ‘cross-scale institutional linkages’ (Berkes 2000; 2004; Carlsson and Berkes 2003) developed within the field of natural resource management may be a stimulus for configuring the dynamics of community, development and conservation. If a relationship of trust can be established between the ‘local resource users’ (Berkes 2004, 625)—in this case, the Sugar Corporation, Culture Society, local residents and County Culture Bureau—a potential alliance may be formed after long-term cooperation and sharing of knowledge and authority. This would sustain the integrity of the spatial fabric and culture while facing the challenges of development.

As a nexus of historic conservation, economic revival and local community, the urban environment is a contesting field for numerous interest groups and for the continuous encounter between the past and modernization moments. As Orbasli (2000, 18) stressed, "conservation has to be proactive and to permit growth and change in the urban structure, responding to the functionality of historic quarters and their spatial organization in relation to contemporary urban problems." Sustainable integrity does not mean merely to ‘freeze the past’; instead, it is based on a full understanding of the cultural depth, historical layers and spatial fabric of the urban environment. This understanding offers the local community a fundamental base from which to navigate the possible future changes and integrity of their place.

4.3 AMBIGUOUS JAPANESENESS: QINGXIU YUAN 慶修院

4.3.1 The Special Social Context of Hualien

Separated by mountains from the west, the east of Taiwan is a different world from the west metropolises. Comprising today’s Hualien County, Taidong County and Yilan County, eastern Taiwan is called houshan (後山; back of mountain) in historical accounts (Kang Pei-de 1999) and daily conversation. As Shi Tian-fu noted, houshan is an isolated society of small groups of various indigenous communities and other settler groups. Owing to it being enclosed by mountains, the development of east Taiwan has been characterised by the feature of ‘isolation’. Hence, various political authorities have worked to ‘solve’ this isolation or use this isolation for other purposes, and this has been the most important force of historical process in east Taiwan. This process has formed the cultural and social uniqueness of the area (Shi Tian-fu 1998, 1-10).

During the period of the Dutch VOC rule (1624-1642), explorations were conducted, motivated by prospects of gold mines, and some areas in the east were subject to military invasion and direct control by the VOC (Kang Pei-de 1999 and Lin Yu-ru...
The power and territorial balance between indigenous groups was rearranged during their contact with the VOC; yet the long term political and social influence of the VOC in the east was limited. Under the Chinese Qing rule (1683-1895), the east of Taiwan was closed by state order for one and a half centuries in order to prevent political revolt by a union of Han Taiwanese and indigenous groups. Only after 1874 was the policy changed to positively control the houshan area. This change was due to the ambition of foreign forces to obtain east Taiwan as a base for overseas trading.

Although entries to houshan were banned by state order in the closing period, some Chinese Han farmers immigrated to today’s Hualien area and established agricultural villages (Zhang Jia-qing 1996, 23-26). Originally, the Austronesian indigenous groups were the major population in east Taiwan. Han immigrants obtained their farming land by trading with indigenous communities. After the lifting of the immigration ban in 1874, Qing state power directly entered houshan through military force. Roads and Han settlements were built as well as administrative organisations. In 1895, Taiwan was ceded to Japan by the Qing rulers. The Japanese colonial government adopted ambitious policies and actions to gain full control over the indigenous societies and the rich natural resources of east Taiwan. The establishment of infrastructure and urban planning during this Japanese period formed the contours of present day Hualien City (Zhang Jia-qing 1996, 23-26).

Lin Yu-ru suggests that the ‘state’ has always played a crucial role in the development of east Taiwan in comparison with the west Taiwan.

From the history of east Taiwan we can see that for the development of east Taiwan, on the one hand, the indigenous groups of the east area had to be pacified or settled; on the other, the development relied on good coordination of capital, labour and infrastructures. Hence the policies and actions of the state are very dominant (Lin Yu-ru 2007, 85; my translation).

This point is of particular importance in explaining the unique social structure of Hualien under Japanese colonial dominance and postwar KMT rule.

When the Japanese colonizers entered east Taiwan in 1896, the ethnic composition of the population in east Taiwan was ninety percent indigenous groups and ten percent Han Chinese (Zhang Su-bing 2007, 62). The Japanese governors and scholars believed that, compared to west Taiwan, it would be easier to assimilate the local communities in the east to Japanese identity since the cultures of the indigenous groups was thought to be less rooted than the culture of the Han people. Thus the immigration of Japanese to east Taiwan was thought crucial in order to stabilize Japanese rule and develop the land. The government-operated immigrant policy was initiated in Hualien-gang Ting (花莲港廳, Administrative District of Hualien Port) in 1910 after the annihilation of the indigenous Chikasowan group and the capture of their traditional territory for building up Japanese immigrant villages. This immigrant project and the development of transportation and public infrastructures led to Hualien having the largest Japanese population in Taiwan during the Japanese colonization. This explains why there are a large number of Japanese architectural remains in present day Hualien. Furthermore, it also indicates the unique yet conflicting historical and cultural context of Hualien when interpreting the past of local sites.

4.3.2 Historical Context of Qingxiu Yuan 慶修院

Qingxiu Yuan (慶修院), a Buddhist religious hall funded by Yoshinomura villagers in 1917, represents the memory of the immigrant village. The building was rediscovered in an indistinct residential area of Ji’an town on the fringes of Hualien City. Surrounded by concrete buildings, trees and large but empty roads, Qingxiu Yuan was inconspicuous even for the residents of the neighbourhood (Zhongguo Gongshang Kejizhuanxiao 1999). During the era of localism, the semi-deserted building was renovated and listed as a historic monument of Hualien County, a site of multiple memories in postcolonial Taiwan.

Qingxiu Yuan (慶修院) is unique in Taiwan. It is a Buddhist temple that originally belonged to a branch of Buddhism specific to one area of Japan. Neither its architectural fabric nor its religious significance is familiar to most people in Taiwan. Regarding the architectural form, it was constructed in 1917, in a period characterized by Japan’s widespread construction of...
Shinto shrines in its overseas colonies. The form of architecture during this period was usually a mixture of both Japanese Buddhist temple and Shinto shrine styles, and Qingxiu Yuan also features this mixture of forms (Zhongguo Gongshang Kejizhuanxiao 1999, 54-65). Qingxiu Yuan was called Shingensō Fukyōsho 真言宗布教所 (religious hall of Shingensō) during the colonial period, and was a gathering place for the Shingensō (真言宗) branch of Buddhism, funded by believers from the Yoshinomura immigrant village.223

This unique architectural fabric and cultural significance defined Qingxiu Yuan as a ‘historic monument’ (guji 古蹟); yet at the same time, they were also the reason why the building gradually became deserted when the congregation of this religious cult—a relatively small group—left the area. Qingxiu Yuan was officially designated a guji in 1997, yet the process of transforming it into a heritage site was not initiated until it was opened to the public in 2003.

Qingxiu Yuan is the property of Hualien County Government and is legally managed by the Cultural Bureau of Hualien County (Hualian xian Wenhuaju 花蓮縣文化局). In 2003, the Cultural Bureau announced a three-year operative-transfer (OT) project,224 during which time it transferred the management of Qingxiu Yuan to the Hualien County Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club (Hualian Xian Qingshaonian

223. Regarding the initiation of this religious hall, there are different records. Zhongguo Gongshang Kejizhuanxiao (1999, 47) and Chen Rui-feng (2005, 118) state that the establishment of the Shingensō Fukyōsho (religious hall of Shingensō) was initiated by a Yoshimura villager Kawabata Mitsuji 川端満二, who raised money from other villagers and funded the Hall in 1917. However, this record differs from the interview data of the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club. According to an interview with Huang Rong-dun 黃榮墩 (Weng Chun-min 2006, 120, 242-3), the Hall was established by Shi Zhi-meng 釋智猛, who was a priest of Shingensō and visited Yoshinomura during a religious trip. He decided to take up residence in the village and started to raise money to fund the Hall.

224. Operative-Transfer means the transferring of management duties to other public or private sectors within an agreed period through contract, thus soon gained popularity among state and local governments in Taiwan when dealing with heritage management.
Gongyi Zuzhi (花蓮縣青少年公益組織), a nongovernmental organization aimed at helping teenagers with the issues they face as adolescents. This organization has long been concerned with issues of historical conservation and has actively been working toward successful memory recollection and the initiation of activities that appropriately interpret these memories.

4.3.3 Contesting Memories at Qingxiu Yuan

A century ago, the land on which today’s Qingxiu Yuan is located belonged to an indigenous group, the Chikasowan (Qijiaochuan 七腳川) community. Between 1908 and 1914, the Chikasowan community was annihilated by the Japanese. This massacre began after a Chikasowan group guarding the indigenous border (aiyu-sen 隘勇線) resisted the unfair labour and low salaries they were subjected to. In response, the colonial government annihilated the community through military force and demanded that other indigenous communities burn the Chikasowan residences and take the livestock that had belonged to them. The few surviving Chikasowans were forced to leave their community, losing large amounts of agricultural and hunting territory. According to Lin Su-zhen and Chen Yao-fang (2009), this traumatic event was a result of the wider political context, including a shift from an indigenous administrative strategy, the development plan of east Taiwan, and the new international political atmosphere. In order to receive the most profit from Taiwan’s mountainous areas, and in order to construct railways and establish Japanese immigrant villages, the colonial government believed it was necessary to acquire this indigenous land. The dispersion of the Chikasowans was actually an embodiment of colonial ambitions.

A hundred years later, this incident is barely remembered by the generation of Chikasowans under the age of thirty (Lin Su-zhen and Chen Yao-fang 2009, 110). Even for the older generation in their 80s today, the recollection of the event is largely heterogeneous. They have mainly heard the stories through personal contact with their parents and grandparents as the latter imparted the experiences of the diaspora. Discussions in the public realm and on public occasions have been rare (Lin Su-zhen and Chen Yao-fang 2009, 111). Although the identity of the Chikasowan remains and is still recognizable through language and customs, their distinctiveness has faded. In 2008, the management of Qingxiu Yuan—the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club—cooperated with the Chikasowan community to launch the hundredth anniversary memorial events, showing their great concern for this silenced past.

Memory of the Indigenous Chikasowan Community

Memory/The Memory of a Japanese Immigrant Village: Yoshinomura 吉野村

After a survey and assessment of the appropriate area and approaches for immigration policy, the Taiwan Governor-General Office 台灣總督府 established the first government-operated immigrant villages (guanying yimincun 官營移民村) on the island. Three government-operated immigrant villages were

---

225. The Roman spelling of Chikasowan is according to Lin Su-zhen and Chen Yao-fang 2009.

226. Prior to the launch of the government-operated immigrant policy in Taiwan, the Taiwanese Governor-General Office encouraged enterprises to recruit Japanese immigrants, a system known as the private-operated immigrant policy. The unsuccessful result of private-operated immigrant policy led to the later establishment of government-operated immigrant villages (Zhong Shu-min 1986, 74; and Zhang Su-bing 2001, 43-45).
established in Hualien-gang Ting: Yoshinomura (吉野村), Toyotamura (豊田村) and Hayashidamura (林田村). Among these, Yoshinomura was located on the former land of the Chikasowan people, where today’s Qingxiu Yuan is located.

In order to build up model villages for Japan’s imperial ambitions of colonial assimilation and southern expansion in Asia, and to solve the issue of insufficient agricultural land in domestic Japan (Zhang Su-bing 2001, 45-46), an ideal spatial plan was proposed for the immigrant village construction in Taiwan after detailed land and geological investigation. This model plan begins with a central village area with an immigrant instruction centre and public facilities such as a school, hospital, religious halls, Shinto shrine etc. The buildings and facilities of immigrant village were arranged in a grid. These villages were connected to neighbouring places and other villages through roads and light railways. Water provision, an irrigation system and animal-preventive fencing was constructed along with the gradual development of the villages. Each family was allotted a residence and some land as soon as they arrived in the village.

The background and experiences of would-be immigrants were of particular concern to the colonial government, as building up a model for immigrant villages was among the strategies of their imperial ambition. Hence, learning from experiences in reclaiming Hokkaido, in 1910 the Japanese government recruited farmers from Tokushima on Shikoku island, Japan, as the priority group because of their relatively good performance in Hokkaido. Yoshinomura indeed became a model village among Japanese immigrant villages in Taiwan, even though the process of reclaiming the former Chikasowan land had been extremely tough for the immigrants.

Most Japanese families who came to immigrant villages in Taiwan were tenant farmers longing for their own land in the new world. These utopian dreams were severely challenged by the weather, diseases, typhoons, earthquakes, wild animals and indigenous people. Kusama Tsunekichi, one of the first group of immigrants, remembered the beginning years at the village:

25 March in Meiji 43 we disembarked in Hualien [...]. We lived in a long hut supported with bamboo and roofed with straw. Nine people crowded in a bed... We lost weight dramatically because of the poor food, different living style and exhausting life [...] We nine people started to work every day at 6 o’clock, and worked until the evening. When we heard the barking of dogs from the indigenous residences, we immediately drew our knives and swords and ran to the immigrant instructive office with caution (Zhang Su-bing 2001, 119; my translation).

Through the gradual completion of public infrastructures and the founding of various mutual-aid societies, life in Yoshinomura improved even after the termination of government support in 1917. The villagers now had roots in Hualien and longed to stay in Taiwan even after the defeat of Japan in the Second World War in 1945. Yet, at the end of 1946, the villagers were ordered by the KMT government to leave Taiwan with a payment of only 1,000 Japanese Yen per person. They gave up their whole life savings when returning to Japan, and many of the second generation became the inferior ‘Taiwan-born (wansei) within Japan’s social hierarchy.

Memories of Postwar Society

After the Japanese had left Taiwan in 1945, the fate of the Shingensō Fukyōshō (religious hall of Shingensō) remained unclear. A local resident Shen (born in 1951) recalled that the building was known as the “house of Japanese monks” or “the haunted
house of Japanese ghosts” during his childhood. When children did not behave well, parents threatened them with imprisonment in the temple. Shen recalled that even though many people occupied the houses and land left by the Japanese, the Shingensō Fukyōsho building was left intact due to the rumour that it was haunted (Weng Chun-min 2007, 130-131).

Shingensō Fukyōsho was later transferred to the care of a faithful Taiwanese Buddhist called Wu Tian-mei 吳添妹. She renamed it Qingxiu Yuan 慶修院, and worshipped Avalokiteśvara (Mercy Buddha; Guanyin Pusa 觀世音菩薩) instead of Fudōmyōō (不動明王; the Wisdom King). The site and its objects were therefore well preserved during the postwar period. The transformation into a Taiwanese Buddhist temple was a major factor in maintaining the operation of the building even under the forceful Chinese nationalist policy regarding the clearing of Japanese remains. Most local residents called Qingxiu Yuan ‘the Japanese temple’ (Riben miao日本廟); some people who did not have specific knowledge of it, called it ‘jinja’ in Japanese (神社; shrine). Due to the continuously good management of Ms Wu, some people began to call it ‘the Buddhist temple’ (Fozu miao 佛祖廟; hut coo bio, in Taiwanese) (Weng Chun-min 2007, 130-131).

In 1983, the family of Ms Wu handed over the temple to the Taiwanese Buddhist priest Shi Xing-liang (釋性良). Yet considering the condition of the building and the regulations on its use, in 1988 the priest established another temple instead of attempting to continue the religious function of Qingxiu Yuan. The original site was then not attended to until it was designated as a historic monument in 1997.

When the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club began their management of Qingxiu Yuan in 2003, the intensive memorialization of this site began. The first memory that came to light was the past of the immigrant village tightly connected to the material remains of the building in terms of its cultural and religious context. The organization by coincidence came into contact with the Japanese priest Saeki Norihide佐伯憲秀 who grew up at Qingxiu Yuan. The strong sense of connection to the place greatly influenced the later memorial activities that were initiated by the organization at Qingxiu Yuan. Japanese Shingensō rituals and research projects on the Japanese immigrant village were launched. The Teen’s Club intended to evoke a sense of the Japanese Buddhist religion, fitting with the original context of the temple, as has been argued by the Bureau of Cultural Affairs.230

4.3.4 Creating the Nexus of Memories

Qingxiu Yuan was designated as a historic monument in 1997, and thus the Hualien County Bureau of Cultural Affairs became its official administrative institution. In line with the policy applied to many heritage cases in Taiwan, the Bureau signed a contract with the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club (Qingshao-nian Gongyi Zuzhi 青少年公益組織), and handed over management duties to the organization in 2003. The contract comprises the organization’s duties of arranging events and activities, conserving heritage, training guides, doing daily maintenance, training volunteers and developing cultural products (The Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club 2007, 14-15). The Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club is an enthusiastic Hualien-based non-government organization. It has long harboured a concern for the welfare of youths and for the cultural issues of the area. However, their strong image of social activism has caused discord in their relationship with the bureaucratic system. Their position as the manager of Qingxiu Yuan has been challenged by the termination of the contract every three years.231

It is important to point out here that Qingxiu Yuan was transformed into a site of memory only after the engagement of the Teen’s Club. The Club started to collect the memories of Japanese immigrants who seemed to have the most direct link to this site. Due to the contact with the family of the original residential abbot, the former religious character of Qingxiu

---

230. According to my interview with Ms Huang, staff of the Hualien County Bureau of Cultural Affairs, in September 2009, the Bureau has not agreed with bringing back the religious function of Qingxiu Yuan which is no longer a temple but a cultural heritage site in the present context.

231. In 2010 the contract was terminated. There were intense conflicts between the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club and Bureau of Cultural Affairs. The management duty of Qingxiu Yuan was returned to the Bureau in December 2010.
Yuan was reinstalled. The Club consciously reconnected Qingxiu Yuan to the Shingensō context through performing the according daily rituals, re-decorating the altar with Shingensō settings and inviting religious practitioners to perform annual goma rituals at Qingxiu Yuan. Since the memory of Shingensō and the immigrant village no longer exists at the original location, a site of memory has been constructed ambiguously through these memory activities. This construction process seems to resonate with Nora’s assertion that “lieux de mémoire” originate with the sense that there is no spontaneous memory that we must deliberately create archives, maintain anniversaries, organize cerebrations, pronounce eulogies, and notarize bills because such activities no longer occur naturally” (Nora 1989, 12).

However, the subject in Nora’s description, who fears the lost of ones past and eagers to graze one’s past through the sites of memory, is different from the role of the Teen’s Club in the case of Qingxiu Yuan. Neither the original memory owner of Shingensō, nor the later residents of Qingxiu Yuan’s neighbourhoods initiated the actions of reconstructing the site of memory. Thus, we need to ask whose site of memory the building actually is.

The Teen’s Club intended to include the past of the Chikasowan community in their representation of Qingxiu Yuan. If Qingxiu Yuan was to become a site of memory, the Club believed, it should be a site of the collective memory of residents with different ethnic and social backgrounds, and this was to include the Chikasowans. This site of memory, therefore, aimed to represent local identity, and be component of the identity of Hualien and of Taiwan, in resonance with the narrative of community-building. However, colonial ambiguity is a challenge for the transformation to a site of memory in this regard. Colonial places cannot be sites of memory, but rather sites of memories in the preliminary stage. This can be further investigated through Halbwachs’s concept of “social frameworks of memory”:

…in reality memories occur in the form of systems. This is so because they become associated within the mind that calls them up, and because some memories allow the reconstruction of others. We can understand each memory as it occurs in individual thought only if we locate each within the thought of the corresponding group. We cannot properly understand their relative strength and the ways in which they combine within individual thought unless we connect the individual to the various groups of which he is simultaneously a member (Halbwachs 1992, 53).

The past of Qingxiu Yuan, as a colonial site, is ‘remembered’ differently by each group when each is situated in a different context of the ‘present’. This is especially clear when the relations of these groups have endured changes in the process of political transition. The Chikasowan people, Japanese immigrants, postwar managers and residents of the neighbourhood, and interest groups in postcolonial Hualien each have their own social framework of memory. The group members reformulate their memory through the process of mutually selecting, strengthening and even modifying past events. Moreover, their social framework of memory responds to the contemporary situation within its larger social context. In postcolonial Taiwan society, multiculturalism has been stressed as part of the national identity of Taiwan, and in resistance to the dominant Chinese-centred narrative forcefully implemented by the postwar KMT government. The Integrated Community-Making Programme (shequ zongti yingzao 社区总体营造) was heavily promoted by the state and applied to local places all over Taiwan. Under this new cultural and political agenda, in Halbwachs’ words the “predominant thoughts”, the pasts of groups who were once seen as inferior were able to appear. These groups, for instance, the newly established Chikasowan Society, could participate in the process of shaping a collective past of a place. However, the emergence of multiple memories associated with colonial sites unavoidably brought conflict and ambiguity to the reinterpretation of the colonial past, within which some groups had been seen as inferior

---

232 In my personal communication with Ms. Weng Chun-min 鄭純敏, one of the two leaders of the Teen’s Club, in April 2011, she mentioned that the religious context should be brought back to Qingxiu Yuan. She said that this could be sufficient support for the independent, sustainable operation of Qingxiu Yuan. This was why the Club aimed to reconnect the Buddhist context while managing Qingxiu Yuan.
to others, and had even endured traumatic experiences. In response to the recomposed social structure which had been formulated within the national narratives of mosaic multiculturalism, these once-inferior groups ‘recall’ and stress particular past events in a way that meets their present needs, such as identity building and political participation etc. Their collective memory is reshaped during this process. The case of the Chikasowan community offers clues to elaborate this point.

The Japanese immigrants shared experiences of traumatic and fateful events during their stay in Taiwan and of their marginalization when they returned to Japan. They are within the same social framework to each other. In regard to the concept of “social frameworks”, the present Chikasowan Culture Society attempts to build up and strengthen the Chikasowan identity by commemorating the annihilation of the Chikasowan community by the Japanese between 1908 and 1914. This traumatic past is a core element of their collective social framework. Through the interpretations of the Teen’s Club at Qingxiu Yuan, these two groups with diverse, even formerly antagonistic, social frameworks are encountered at this site. These are interwoven with the present demands for locality and identity construction within the context of community-building in Taiwan. The memories of the Chikasowan community and Japanese immigrants also interact with the social frameworks of actors within the present political and economic context. A version of past is formulated in the process of contesting encounters and interpretations. One example is the 2008 Consoling Ritual for the hundredth anniversary of the Chikasowan Incident.

An ambiguous ritual

The Consoling Ritual for the hundredth Anniversary of the Chikasowan Incident (Qijiaochuan shijian yibai zhounian weilingji七腳川事件一百週年慰靈祭) was a highly controversial ritual conducted in November 2008 at Qingxiu Yuan. This ritual is called goma (護摩) in Japanese, a representative ritual of the Shingensō religious group.233

The ceremony in 2008 was actually not the first occasion of this ritual at Qingxiu Yuan. In 2006, during the celebration of Qingxiu Yuan’s 90-year anniversary, the goma ritual was held by the priests of Shingensō from the Kōyasan (高野山) region of Japan who had been invited by the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club. Huang Rong-dun 黄荣墩, head of the Club, recalled the difficult preparations for this ritual. His and his colleagues’ unfamiliarity towards the exact religious context is apparent:

Since we had never attended any goma rituals, the preparation was like solving a puzzle. We had to prepare bamboo, [...] 90 branches of pine trees, 400 branches with leaves of juniper trees, a 30-meter straw rope, short bamboo sticks, tea and rice. [...] The priest [...] and his pupils set the altar with the materials we had prepared. Then we realized that [...] the 90 pine branches were the wood of goma, covered by branches with leaves of juniper trees. This setting was enclosed by bamboo and straw rope to define the boundary of the altar. The leading priest processed the rituals to defining boundaries [...]. When the ritual started, the monks blew the ritual spiral shells and proceeded into the courtyard of Qingxiu Yuan. After purifying the place, the leading priest read the prayer and set fire to the goma wood. As the wet and fresh juniper branches caught fire, there was suddenly a five-story-tall smoke column, and immediately an immense fire exploded. It was truly a stunning scene (Weng Chun-min 2007, 249; my translation).

The adoption of the Japanese goma ritual to console the deceased indigenous people during the hundredth anniversary event was ambiguous, particularly because the priests and the deceased were situated in different religious contexts, and they were even situated in previously opposing factions as the colonizer and simultaneously, of clearing the inner spirit and generating new life. The goma ritual consists of two parts: the inner and outer goma. The inner goma ‘burns’ the inner worries and spiritual obstacles through meditation; the outer goma is achieved by setting up an altar for the worship of the God Fudōmyōō (不動明王). The outer goma prays for diminishing disasters and increasing benefits, peace, harmony etc. by setting fire to wooden goma panels.

233. Goma means ‘firing’ in Sanskrit language. The meaning of ‘fire’ in this context is the burning away of all things on earth,
and colonized. The ritual also represents the fundamental discordance between the material remains of the erstwhile colonizer and the heritage practice of the postcolonial society. This is a particularly sensitive issue when the past owner and the current user are antagonistic; and is also related to competition over the right to interpret. A message left on the website of the Chikasowan youth group argued that the managing body of Qingxiu Yuan had no right to dominate and give a voice for the Chikasowan Incident. Fortunately, this ambiguity was reduced when the Chikasowan community participated in the production of interpretation. Their traditional consoling rituals were also held by the Chikasowan community at their old site. Nevertheless, the message also reflects internal conflicts over who can represent the real Chikasowan among Chikasowan descendants who now separated in different buluo (村落; sites of tribes).

In 2001, the middle generation of the Chikasowan community at the current community base \(^{235}\) began to collect memories of their traditional culture and of the Chikasowan Incident. Cai Xin-yi 蔡信一, the executive chief of the Chikasowan Culture Society, recalled their efforts over the years. In the diaspora after the Chikasowan Incident, the Chikasowans escaped to other indigenous communities. Due to decades of cultural mixing and trans-tribe marriage, the cultural distinctiveness of the Chikasowans faded. Cai’s generation initiated the recollection work at the time of the annual Harvest Festival in 2001. He regarded the Harvest Festival as the most crucial occasion of cultural transmission: the tradition of the Chikasowan was re-established through recollecting the details and process of distinctive Chikasowan rituals and through educating the younger generations during the rite of passage prior to the formal ceremony of the Harvest Festival.

This attempt was met with enthusiasm by the Teen’s Club due to its concern with the culture and history of Hualien and the need for heritage interpretation in Qingxiu Yuan. In the year of the hundredth anniversary of the Chikasowan Incident, the community and the Youth Club cooperated in organizing the commemorating activities, including the gona ritual, at Qingxiu Yuan. The series of activities comprised bicycle tours through the old Chikasowan space; a Harvest Festival focusing on the subject of commemoration; a conference discussing the event and commemorating rituals in both the current community base and the old location of the Chikasowan territory. The last commemorating event gathered the members of the Chikasowan people who had dispersed to other areas, and guided them back to the old places of their Chikasowan ancestors. A traditional ritual was held and led by a shaman at the old site. This was followed by praying, grieving and dancing activities at the current public space of the community where the historical pictures of the Chikasowan Incident were displayed.\(^{236}\)

The Postcolonial Actor Network

Cai Xin-yi had positive feelings toward the memory activities at Qingxiu Yuan regarding the Chikasowan Incident. Rather than arguing about who should take the leading role in the interpretation, he stressed the importance of partnership between the Culture Society and the Teen’s Club. He described the cooperation during the series of events commemorating the incident, and mentioned the division of labour – for instance the Teen’s Club is good at arranging conferences and guided tours, while the Society held the Harvest Festival and a photo display at the community public space. This cooperation was beneficial to both parties: the Teen’s Club could combine the Chikasowan commemoration to Qingxiu Yuan’s annual


\(^{235}\) This community refers to the one whose name was originally Miame Community. The community members came from former Chikasowan community, and is the one who moved to the nearest site to the former Chikasowan base among many other Chikasowan descendants lived now in different buluo (村落; sites of tribes).

\(^{236}\) According to Cai Xin-yi, personal communication: September 2009.
event, get media attention and government budget through hosting the commemorative events; at the same time, the current Chikasowan Society could extend the media attention from the Teen’s Club which is always good at motivating the media. This cooperation allowed the current Chikasowan Community (七貂川部落Qijiaochuan buluo) to receive wider attention than other Chikasowan descendant communities. Within the community-building framework, this helps the Chikasowan Culture Society to compete for government community-building subsidies.

Moreover, this section suggests that the aforementioned colonial ambiguity has been dissolved gradually through continuous cooperation, particularly the dual consideration of both the Japanese Buddhist and indigenous religious rituals. As to heritage practitioners such as the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club, it is inevitable that Japanese rituals be performed at Qingxiu Yuan for the sake of coherence with the architectural fabric, memory framework and cultural context. In addition, it is a powerful interpretative action which can attract media and tourist attention. Aside from these points, the Teen’s Club considered that, despite the fact that the inclusion of this traumatic event may cause feelings of unease among leisure visitors and Japanese tourists, the intention to reflect the history of the region and to include the voice of the Chikasowan community should be prioritised. The continuous memory activities of the Teen’s Club at Qingxiu Yuan allow the occurrence of an autonomous subject who can provide an alternative voice to the dominant authority on deciding the future of the local residents. If wider participation persists, it may be possible to transform the site of memory to a site of locality production, aiding to the formation and demonstration of a collective future with inclusive and humanistic significance.

As the neighbourhood of Qingxiu Yuan in Ji’an Town (吉安鄉) is mainly a quiet residential area, the growing activities in and around Qingxiu Yuan met with resistance from the local population. They were rather detached and felt annoyed with the crowdedness and the garbage left by tourists.237 The residents are mainly agricultural and office workers; hence they do not benefit from the rewards brought by local tourism.238 Compared to the close ties to the Buddhist Temple of Qingxiu Yuan during the postwar era, the current residents are only loosely linked to the place. They may know there is a Japanese temple in the neighbourhood, yet they do not have a strong intention to understand and participate. The Township Office also showed a rather passive attitude toward the operation and effects of Qingxiu Yuan.239

In contrast to the local residents, external visitors have expressed interest and excitement about the site. Most bloggers have admired the peaceful atmosphere and were surprised by its “very Japanese” character. Some bloggers recorded the scenes they saw at the site, including the wooden panel commemorating the Chikasowan Incident.240 Many bloggers expressed nostalgic feelings toward the Japanese immigrant village, yet few mentioned specific feelings about the Chikasowan Incident.

4.3.5 Representing Japoneseness

After fierce conflict between the Bureau of Cultural Affairs and Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club in 2010, the management of Qingxiu Yuan was transferred to the Bureau of Cultural Affairs. In April 2011, I visited Qingxiu Yuan again. A celebrative event for Mother’s Day was being held at the site. The event began with a Buddhist ritual, continued with a choir performance, Japanese tea ceremony, family bicycle activity and craft studio. During the process of the various activities, young students wearing Japanese

---


238. Qingxiu Yuan is in Ji’an village of Ji’an town. The village is an administrative centre for Ji’an town, in which many government institutions are located, for instance the town hall, Hualien District Agricultural Research and Extension Centre etc. Many residents of the village are civil officers (Zhongguo Gongshang Kejizhuanxiao 1999).

239. According to my interviews at the Township Office in September 2009.

240. It had been removed when I visited the site in April 2011, under the management of the Bureau of Cultural Affairs. The staff told me that some tour guides complained about it when they brought Japanese visitors here. The guides were afraid that it may cause negative feelings for the Japanese visitors despite the fact that the visitors did not actually complain themselves. However, according to the staff, the panel was removed not because of these complaints but due to spatial simplicity.
yukata (浴衣) walked around the site. They were students of the Japanese department of the local university, and had been arranged as assistants for the tea ceremony.

As yukata is normally worn on casual occasions in Japan, such as festivals, it seemed odd when these young girls, in their yukata and geta, presented tea cups and bowed politely to the participants in the tea ceremony. This ambiguity is as well represented by the Buddhist statues and ema present at a Valentine’s Day celebration at the site. During our interview, Xie, a member of staff of cultural bureau in charge of Qingxiu Yuan, explained future activities to me with excitement, for instance decorating the site with Japanese fish flags (Koinobori) on the day of the Duanwu Festival.

This unsophisticated use of cultural tags is not uncommon when reutilising Japanese historical sites in Taiwan, no matter whether the manager is from the private or public sector. The popular image of Japan, composed of hot springs, Japanese food, tourist sites, popular culture etc., is mainly based on information largely circulated by the mass media. This image has become a strategy for attracting domestic tourists, as Japan has long been the hottest destination for Taiwanese tourists. It is noteworthy that the pro-Japan mentality is not separable from the context of colonialism and the cold war structure (Leo Ching 2000, 765-788); nevertheless, the phenomenon of Japanese tags in current Taiwanese society is more to do with late-capitalist mass circulation in Asia rather than colonial nostalgia. These cultural tags are concerned with the ‘foreignness’ of Japan, resulting in ‘exotic’ tourist experiences, rather than with possibilities to be ‘local’ as desired by community-building heritage practices.

Furthermore, this touristic image is reinforced by the cultural departments of local governments, who are supposed to lead a deeper concern about cultural policies. This is due to the weak stance of cultural departments within local politics, greatly determined by the attitudes of local politicians, particularly the mayor and local councillors. In the case of Hualien County, for many years a periphery to the rich west cities such as Taipei, Taichung and Kaohsiung, the Bureau of Cultural Affairs endures particularly limited resources compared to other departments in the county and compared to cultural departments of other counties. Among the internal departments of the bureau, the Department of Cultural Heritage is notorious for its long working hours, manpower shortage and dealing with sensitive issues, hence it is also known for having a high staff turnover. For instance, Xie, staff member in charge of Qingxiu Yuan,

---

241. Yukata is a casual summer garment in Japanese tradition, usually worn for summer events for instance firework displays or festivals.


243. Ema (絵馬) are wooden plaques on which the believers of the Shinto religion write prayers or wishes.

244. Koinobori (鯉幟) are carp-shaped windsocks for celebrating Children’s Day on 5 May, originally the day of the Tango (Duanwu in Chinese) festival on the Chinese and Japanese lunar calendar.

245. According to a survey conducted by the IAJ (Interchange Association, Japan) (2010, 13-14) on Taiwanese attitudes toward Japan, Japan was the most preferable tourist destination for Taiwanese in 2008 and 2009. In both years, 44% of the interviewees selected Japan as their preferred destination for travel; this percentage was more than 10% higher than the second most popular destination, Europe.

246. According to a survey conducted by the IAJ (Interchange Association, Japan) on Taiwanese attitudes toward Japan in 2008 and 2009, the age group under 40 showed a more favourable attitude towards Japan than age group above 60, who had had Japanese colonial experiences. The younger generation’s information about Japan mostly came from television programmes and the internet (IAJ 2010, 3-4; 7-8; 19-20; 43).
mentioned the difficulties of his situation to me, in that staff at Qingxiu Yuan are all temporary employees and their contracts are terminated within two months. Even Xie himself is a contract worker, and has to renew his contract with the Bureau of Cultural Affairs every year. This instable personnel situation indicates the changeful future of Qingxiu Yuan, and the difficulties of deeper research and knowledge accumulation.

Weng Chun-min, the former manager at Qingxiu Yuan from the Hand-in-Hand Teen’s Club, expressed disagreement about the way that the Bureau of Cultural Affairs had attached Japanese elements to Qingxiu Yuan and to other Japanese historical sites in Hualien. She was concerned that these Japanese elements used by the cultural bureau were simply a shallow application without deep understanding of Japanese culture. The elements such as yukata, as she noted, can be used only when the line between formal occasions and tourist activities is drawn clearly. During the interview with Weng, two issues of representing Japanese historical sites emerged: first, the joining of indigenous elements in making the site of memory for postcolonial communities; and second, differences between deep cultural contents and shallow cultural tags.

I asked Weng about how to include Taiwanese cultural elements in interpretation as creative activities rather than simple copies. In response, Weng recalled an event held by the Teen’s Club on a New Year’s Day at Qingxiu Yuan. Eating *Kagami mochi* (mirror rice cake) is a Japanese tradition at New Year, and so the Teen’s Club combined this with the traditions of the Hakka and Amis (Hualien indigenous people), providing *mochi* soup at the site. In the mean time, they still followed requests from priests of Shingensō and offered white *Kagami mochi* to the god, despite the fact that white is less preferable than red at New Year by Taiwan. In contrast to this creative interpretation, placing *ema* at Qingxiu Yuan is an act of copying, since *ema* is irrelevant to Taiwanese culture. This refers to a second issue, what is the difference between creative cultural invention and shallow cultural tags while reinterpreting Japanese historical sites? For instance, is holding a *goma* ritual different from hanging *ema* in the postcolonial site of Qingxiu Yuan, since they both represent cultural elements absent in Taiwanese culture? These questions indicate the ambivalent line between recreating a site of Taiwanese identity comprised of Japaneseness as one contingent and reconstructing a site of Japaneseness based on Taiwanese image of Japan.

### 4.4 Engaging Communities: Jiangjunfu Residences

Hualien entered the period of urbanisation during the Japanese period. The administrative office of Hualien-gang Ting was established in 1909. This is the first time that Hualien gained an independent and leading status in east Taiwan. In the same year, the project of building the Taidong Line railway was officially initiated. The project urged the urban planning of Hualien. Government buildings, a transportation system, public infrastructure as well as leisure facilities were built under the plan. Private shops, hotels, restaurants etc. appeared along with the development of public infrastructures. Within two years (1910-1912), the number of households of Hualien-gang Ting increased from 545 to 830; the population increased from around 1,600 to 2,400 (Zhang Jia-qing 1996, 60). This rapidly enlarging population required an extension of the urban area. This demand led to two new urban plans in 1916 and 1921. After an urban plan implemented in 1934, the urban area extended to the south, west and east through road construction. The area of Lunjun-gang, where the Jiangjunfu stands, was at the centre of this urban extension. The newly developed Meilun area and the old Hualien-gang City Centre were connected by a bridge beside which the Japanese residences stand (Gao Jun-ming 2008, 63). Lunjun-gang was a core which connects the old and new urban areas yet also a mysterious military space in oversee-

---

247. The administrative area of today’s Hualien County belonged to Taidong Branch Ting of Tainan-Xian (Tainan Xian Taidong Zhi Ting (台南縣台東支廳)) in 1896. In 1897, east Taiwan was separated from Tainan Xian, and instead placed under a newly established administrative institution Taidong Ting (台東支廳). A local office in charge of the Hualien area under the Taidong Ting was set up for managing household and tax affairs. This office was upgraded to the Hualien-gang Branch Ting of Taidong Ting (台東縣花蓮港支廳) in 1901, and advanced to Hualien-gang Ting, an independent administrative institution outside of Taidong Ting, in 1909 (Zhang Jia-qing 1996, 54-55).
ing the urban development in the north and the port construction in the east.

The Japanese immigrants in Hualien returned to Japan after the defeat of Japan in the Second World War in 1945. Shortly after, the fifty percent of the population of Hualien that had been made up of Japanese immigrants was replaced by immigrants from China. As mentioned previously, the role of the state, no matter which ruling authority, has been crucial to the development of Hualien because of its relatively isolated location compared to cities in west Taiwan. Public infrastructure and the property of Japanese enterprises were given to the KMT government.

4.4.1 Jiangjunfu (將軍府; Residence of the General) in Hualien

Jiangjunfu was a nickname for a number of Japanese residences along the Meilun River in Hualien City. These residences were built between 1924 and 1931 (Gao Jun-ming 2008, 71). The map of Hualien-gang Ting in 1931 shows that the function of these Japanese buildings was as residences of the land force army.

Currently eight Japanese residence buildings are located in the triangle space beside the Meilun River and Zhongzheng Bridge. Residence H in the illustration above is the only detached building (獨棟), and thus it was the highest classed residence among the eight residences. It was the residence of Takamura Mituo, the Japanese top commander of east Taiwan during the Second World War. His residence was designated as a guji (古蹟; historic monument) in 2005. Buildings A, F and G are classed as lower than the residence of the commander. Buildings B, C, D, E were residences of lower military officers. All residences (except H) are semi-detached structures (雙佊)249, and were designated as county ‘historic buildings’ (lishi jianzhu) in 2005. The name Jiangjunfu (Residence of the General) is actually taken from the later resident of building H, General Shan Zhi-cheng, in the postwar period.250 The name Jiangjunfu, owing to its accountability easy understood and remembered by local people, is often used to represent the eight Japanese residences along the Meilun River for local residents in current Hualien.

![Fig. 4.4.1 Plan of Jiangjunfu Residential Area. The picture was created by Hsu Wei-jung.](image)

After the Japanese colonial period, the ownership of these residences was transferred to the government of the ROC (Republic of China), and under the management of the Ministry of National Defence (Guofangbu 国防部). Residences in Jiangjunfu area became the houses of ROC military officials, and the area remained rather isolated from most local residents despite the fact that Jiangjunfu is right next to the busy city centre. This location has determined the ambiguous status of the Jiangjunfu area in the process of urban development in postcolonial Hualien.

248. According to Gao Jun-ming 2008, 71. Guo was also a major participator of the project ‘Investigation and Research Report on the Japanese Residences along the Meilun River’. In the final report it was stated that the construction dates back to early 1925 (See Guoli Donghua Daxue Huanjing Zhengce Yanjiusuo 2008, 2.3). The report was finished in January 2008, the dissertation of Gao completed in June 2008; this paper hence chooses to follow the later statement.

249. It is a semi-detached building divided into two households, each having its own individual entrance and living spaces.

250. During the Japanese colonial period, the resident of building H was a colonel (大佐), not a general within Japanese army system.
During the 1990s, the Ministry of National Defence urged the policy Regulations on Renewal of Military Dependents’ Villages (Guojun Laojiu Juancun Gaijian Tiaoli; 國軍老舊眷村改建條例). Many old military residences and land were released for real estate market. The Jiangjunfu area, next to the busy centre of Hualien City, was one of the targets. The Ministry decided to deconstruct the buildings in the early 2000s. This action was resisted by local residents and cultural workers. Eventually, the residences were designated as county historic monuments and historic buildings in 2005.

4.4.2 Grassroots Resistance and Community Building

The fact that the Jiangjunfu area was able to be designated as cultural heritage is due to an ambitious society in the neighbourhood, the Minsheng Community (Minsheng Shequ 民生社區). The Minsheng Community is based in the administrative district of Minsheng Li.251 This li ranges over the busy commercial centre of Hualien City, has a population of 2,200, and 40% of its residents have an educational background of bachelor degree or above.252 Within the area of Minsheng Li, traces of urban development are represented by a mixture of traditional markets, restaurants and hotels and public institutions. Hence the residents of Minsheng Li have greatly diverse occupational and language backgrounds in relation to the social structure of Hualian within the dual colonialism: a group of residents, mainly Taiwanese spoken, work as shop/stand owners at the traditional market, such as the head of Minsheng community Wu Ming-chong; the other group of residents speak standard Mandarin, work at government institutions and many of them are from Mainlander families, such as the influential community member Wang Pei-wen. This district includes part of the old Hualien-gang city centre and the Huagangshan (花崗山; Huagang Hill) area where major government institutions were moved after the urban planning of 1934. The former is characterised by its lively crowded businesses; while the latter is far more spacious and quiet. The population of Minsheng Li, hence, consists of diverse occupational and ethnic backgrounds. To use Halbwachs phrase, these are groups with diverse “social frameworks of memory” (Halbwachs 1992).

In 1999 the head of Minsheng Li, Wu Ming-chong 吳明崇, started organising a volunteer group to help recycling and environmental maintenance. His enthusiastic personality in community work gradually engaged more and more Minsheng Li residents in community affairs. Other than recycling and cleaning, various projects have been arranged by the society of Minsheng Li253 since 1999: neighbourhood watch, community greening, elders care, music and art workshops etc. These activities brought together residents of Minsheng Li and helped to form a sense of community. Moreover, the ambition of Minsheng Li met with a burgeoning community-building phenomenon all over Taiwan, which was under sponsorship from the state particularly from 2000 to 2008.254 Minsheng Li’s community activities gained great support from various governmental funding for community-building projects. However, this financial support could not have been received by Minsheng

---

251. Li 里 is the basic administrative district unit in Taiwan.
253. Hualien City Minsheng Community Development Association (Hualienshi Minsheng Shequ Fazhan Xiehui; 花蓮市民生社區發展協會) was funded in 2005 in dealing with community affairs. The number of members was 277 according to its official website in 2006: http://www.hl-minsheng.org.tw/ (accessed 9 May 2011).
254. The Democratic Progress Party was the governing party of Taiwan from 2000 to 2008. Community-building was among the core state policies at that time.
Li without the participation of community member Wang Pei-wen 王佩雯. As a civil officer familiar with government bureaucratic processes, Wang was able to organise the funding, as state community projects were often criticised about their complicated paper work and bureaucratic inflexibility.\(^{255}\)

Wang was a core figure in the process of conserving the Japanese residences in the Jiangjunfu area. She grew up in a Military Dependents’ Village (júncūn 军村) in Hualien City, a similar living environment to Jiangjunfu. These residences where she grew up were demolished due to new plan of development in the early 1990s and the Wang family moved to a modern concrete house. In order to provide a better and safe environment for the children and elders of the family, Wang and her husband decided to buy the residence of General Shan (building H) and lived there until the early 2000s. In 2001, Wang coincidently attended a course on community-building at Donghua University. During the course, she watched a documentary about a Japanese case of community-building,\(^{256}\) and wrote a group report about maintaining the cultural environment along the Meilun River. Jiangjunfu was a crucial part of the report. Stimulation from the course and affection toward the place of memory motivated Wang’s enthusiastic participation in conserving Jiangjunfu. As a member of Minsheng Li, she also assisted the community’s application for government projects.

As the policy of Regulations on Renewal of Military Dependents’ Villages was accelerated in the 2000s, the Ministry of National Defence was eager to release the land of Jiangjunfu area and destroy the old residences. With assistance from local cultural work-

\(^{255}\) Local communities were always required to present complicated proposals, reports, accounting details etc. These rigid bureaucratic requirements often obstructed spontaneous community projects, and hindered communities not familiar with bureaucratic writing from having state funding despite their commitment to community works. Many government resources fell to companies or other interest parties instead of community organisations because the former were better skilled bureaucratic writers.

\(^{256}\) According to the description of the documentary by Wang, this section suggests that the Japanese case is Furukawacho (古川町). This documentary was broadcasted everywhere during the community-building boom period.

4.4.3 Making Sites of Memory

During the period from 2005 to early 2011, the question of how to reutilize the Jiangjunfu residences was discussed openly in Hualien. These discussions were actually part of the process in making a site of memory. During the first stage, Jiangjunfu was only a memory place for Wang, a former resident. A sense of place toward Jiangjunfu caused Wang’s enthu-

siasm and connection from the former residents. Hence the memory of these residences as military dependents’ residences was surprisingly the only direct memory version of the site available in postcolonial Hualien, and the site evoked strong feelings of affection and connection from the former residents. Moreover, it may be easier for the owner of Jiangjunfu, the Ministry of National Defence, to legitimate a project to represent the area as a site of memory of júncūn (軍村; military dependents’ village).

Through participation in community-building activities, Wang’s affections toward her place of memory met with the feelings of other community members who did not have the chance to live in Jiangjunfu and yet had been using the space as a community office. A new collective memory of the site has been shaped through frequent contact between community members and through fighting side-by-side against the would-be destructors. Jiangjunfu became a heritage site in the mean time when the community began to think of the place as their valued possession which deserves to be preserve for generations. As Wang recalled, when the designation was confirmed in 2005, the community members held banquets at the site, celebrating the fact that the community had finally been able to ‘own’ a historic monument. In this regard, the memory of júncūn (military dependents’ village) had to be adjusted to include more subjects of locality. Further, the need of a much wider inclusive version in interpreting the past
emerged in the process of searching for utilizing directions. This emerging demand was inseparable from the “predominant thoughts” (Halbwachs 1992) in the period of localism during which the self-conscious local communities were constituents of a unique, multicultural ‘living community’ of Taiwan within the narrative of the state. An open platform for discourses was created while a scholarly team from Donghua University joined the project. The team suggested inviting NGOs to reside in these Japanese residences in order to establish a lobby for new issues and wider concern. This project attracted an indigenous organisation Palik Youth Hub (巴黎) which moved its office to the site. The participation of the Palik Youth Hub indicates that a collective past of Jiangjunfu should not exclude the memories of the indigenous group who have lived in the area longer than any other groups and which has a tradition of fishing festivals at the bank of the Meilun River. Comprising also the memory of Japanese residents during the colonial period, a version of interpretation by juxtaposing multiple memories was formulated during the process of dialogue, and gained the agreement of the local community and the Bureau of Cultural Affairs in planning the display of local history at the site.

Fig. 4.4.3 Quiet and green environment of Jiangjunfu residences. Photo was taken in April 2011 by the author.

4.4.4 Representing Japanese Heritage

Years after the successful designation, the area of Jiangjunfu has remained a quiet and pleasant place. Minsheng Li continues environmental maintenance and autonomously cleans the open spaces of the residences and the river bank. Colourful flowers have been planted. When I stepped into the area in April 2011, I found elders coming to the area for a walk; restored residences were used for temporary classes—for instance new-mom instruction, music learning, ecological educational activities; and there was a display of local history and community craft works. The head of Minsheng Li (lizhang 里長), Wu invited me to see the historical model of Hualien displayed in a restored Japanese residence. The model was made by the community after numerous consultations with elders about memories of Hualien seventy years ago. Interestingly, when Wu guided me through the historical landscape of Hualien via the model, Japanese Enka 演歌 music was played loudly which seemed to clash with the quiet atmosphere of the Jiangjunfu area.

The Japanese singing represents the dream of Wu and many of his community colleagues about the future of their heritage, Jiangjunfu. Although further development of Jiangjunfu is still restricted by the Ministry of National Defence, Wu enthusiastically described his dream about the area to me. He imagined a small Japan comprised of a Japanese drinking house, a Japanese barbecue restaurant and staffs wearing Japanese traditional dress. Through this exotic atmosphere, Wu hopes that many visitors will be

---

257. For instance, the letters from Takamura Akira (中村明), son of Takamura Mituo (中村三雄), represent the memory of Japanese residents at this site before the Second World War. See Guoli Donghua Daxue Huanjing Zhengce Yanjiusuo 2008, Appendix.

258. Two households of Building F had been restored by the Bureau of Cultural Affairs with subsidies from the Construction and Planning Agency, Ministry of the Interior (CPAMI in short; Neizhengbu Yingjianshu 内政部營建署).

259. Enka is a genre of Japanese ballad music popular in late 1960s and early 70s. It adopts a relatively more traditional musical style in its vocalism than modern popular music.

260. The buildings and land of Jiangjunfu area still belong to the Ministry of National Defence. The Ministry signs a contract of management with the Hualien County Bureau of Cultural Affairs every half year, and the Bureau signs another annual contract with Minsheng Li for transferring management duties legally to Minsheng Li. However, this cooperation is insecure because the attitude of the Ministry may change any time, especially under the policy of Renewal of Military Dependents’ Villages.
attracted and this may bring a prosperous future to the neighbourhood while many community members of Minsheng Li are running their businesses in the market and city centre. This dream, at the same time, echoes to the image of the area from a member of staff of the Bureau of Cultural Affairs, Qiu. Despite the fact that the Bureau’s is less concerned with business profits, Qiu’s description of a better reutilizing model represents a similar Japanese image. It is unsurprising that both the community and the Bureau of Cultural Affairs have similar ideas about utilization, since the management proposal of Minsheng Li for Jiangjunfu has to be approved by the Bureau. It is actually not uncommon for Taiwanese public and private sectors to apply this selective image of Japan to reutilizing plans of Japanese historic sites. For instance, during my field visit to Qingxiu Yuan, a former Japanese Buddhist Religious Hall in Hualien, activities for celebrating Mothers’ Day were being held by the Bureau of Cultural Affairs at the site. A Japanese tea ceremony was among the activities. Young students wearing yukata were assisting the ceremony. This scene may seem questionable to people familiar with Japanese culture since yukata is worn mostly in casual occasions. Nevertheless, yukata is one of the easy seized tags of Japan and is often seen in events associated with Japan in Taiwan.

4.4.5 Making Japanese Heritage in the Era of Localism

Without strong affection towards a site, normally evoked by personal memories, participants of heritage activities often demand consistent reminders about the meaning of heritage to their personal lives. Since the natural connection between heritage place and people is lacking in the case of colonial heritage, peculiarly salient within the context of dual colonialism in Taiwan, rebuilding links between sites and postcolonial communities determines the strength of support in conservation. The grassroots actions of the Minsheng Community in conserving Jiangjunfu residences became memorial events. These have helped to shape a collective memory for the Minsheng Community, comprised of diversified social frameworks of memory within the context of the layered colonialism and urban development of Hualien. The process of making heritage incorporates multiple voices and versions of memory, and a collective version of the past is shaped through wider engagement. Nevertheless, in the process of transforming the colonial to the local, ambiguities are inevitable. The adoption of Japanese cultural labels indicates a structural deficiency underneath heritage and community-building practices in Taiwan.

As mentioned previously, the Japanese sites gradually entered the legal category of cultural heritage in Taiwan. This transition was in accordance with the emerging era of localism, including the rising role of local governments. In the early 2000s, many of the Japanese sites, which, after the 9-21 Earthquake were placed under the heritage category of ‘historic building’, became targets of ‘rehabilitation’ (zaiyliyong 再利用). This incorporated multiple ambitions, for instance enhancing tourism and cultural infrastructures, catalyzing a sense of community and citizenship etc. Among these multiple incentives, the Japanese sites were expected by many local governments to be reconstructed as sites of local distinctiveness, bearing local pride and tourist attractiveness. Within this trend of rehabilitation, a large amount of funding was provided by the state government to renovate local heritage sites under projects of ‘Local Museums’ or ‘Reutilising Unused Spaces’ within the policy framework of the community-building programme.

Meanwhile, following modifications to the heritage legislation, heritage affairs have become more and more restricted to cultural departments: the Council for Cultural Affairs at state level, and the Bureau of Cultural Affairs within local governments. In other words, the rapidly increasing number of heritage sites bearing complicated community-building expectations have been managed by cultural departments with limited personnel and a relatively low budget. Two issues arise from this. First, heritage sites are more and more often required to represent ‘cultural matters’ only. As a member of staff at the Bureau of Cultural Affairs stressed when I asked about the plan proposed by Minsheng Community for the management of the site of Jiangjunfu, “their

261. According to my personal communication with Mr. Qiu in April 2011.
plans always focus too much on environmental care (huanbao 環保). It is a historic site! The plan has to be a cultural programme. This statement shows a narrower stance compared to the original community-building targets for reutilizing heritage sites. Second, Operative-Transfer (OT), that is, the transferring of management duties to other public or private sectors within an agreed period through contract, thus soon gained popularity among state and local governments when dealing with heritage management. The difficult financial status and large number of Japanese sites in Hualien County has made OT preferable to direct management by the Cultural Bureau. This suggests a possible divergence of management at Jiangjunfu from Minsheng Community to other interest groups in the future. This discordance is particularly salient within the eco-political context of global capitalism, and allows the cultural tags of Japan to be widespread and be welcomed in locales in postcolonial Taiwan.

During the community-building boom in the 1990s and 2000s, heritage sites were expected by leading narrators and local practitioners to function as sites of locality. In this regard, local heritage sites represent local uniqueness, which is irreplaceable. This logic has been strengthened by the popular rhetoric of globalization discourses. For local governments and many community workers, creating a site of local uniqueness means being irreplaceable in the global market. This idea of local uniqueness seems to be in conflict with the use of Japanese cultural labels in Taiwan, since Japan is supposed to represent ‘foreignness’. However, the image of Japan is grafted to a sense of local place in Taiwan not only through structural multiculturalism, but through the “Japanese commodity-image-sound in the circulation of mass culture” (Leo Ching 2000, 764). The latter is suggested by this research as the major factor in the burgeoning use of Japanese cultural labels in heritage projects. The image of Japan represented by Japanese drinking houses, the tea ceremony and yukata is conveyed via mass media, and creates a sense of intimacy with Japan among the younger generations.263 The underlying tone of global capitalism may obstruct the development of grassroots locality intended by community-building promoters. As for the case of Jiangjunfu, notwithstanding the fact that the spontaneous connections between place and community have been lost in the layered structure of colonialism, persistent heritage activities and wide engagement of multiple groups have helped to create a site of memory. All memory activities, for instance art classes and ecological activities, that take place here aim to bond the site and the postcolonial communities. However, the desire for quick consumer effects by hasty cultural attachments indicates that the development of the Jiangjunfu area may be veer off course from being community dominant to being capital dominant.

262. Mr. Qiu, personal communication: April 2011.

263. It is surprising that, a survey on Taiwanese attitude toward Japan by the IAJ (Interchange Association, Japan) in 2008 and 2009 shows higher percent of group under age 40 think Japan is their favourite country and feeling close to Japan. The information about Japan mainly came from TV programmes for all age groups, and partly from internet for the group under 40. IAJ (generally known as Riben Jiaoliu Xiehui 日本交流協會 in Taiwan) is a semi-government organisation of Japan in dealing with cultural and scholarly exchange affairs between Taiwan and Japan.
Conclusion

COLONIAL HERITAGE AND GLOBALIZATION

Heritage became a prevailing phenomenon during the formation of modern nation-states, and was institutionalised when the global order of states was reformed during and after the Second World War and Cold War. Hence, heritage is inseparable from national identity and nationalism. This intrinsic connection indicates the contested nature and power struggle underlying the heritage-making process. While UNESCO has re-tuned the ‘universal value’ of world heritage through the notion of ‘cultural diversity’ in order to reconcile conflicts, the structure of UNESCO as a state-based institution reflects the power hierarchy among nation-states and within domestic spheres, and this shows in heritage activities. This power hierarchy is often in accordance with the eco-political status of its actors. Regarding colonial heritage, an unbalanced relationship often lies beneath the diplomatic usage of the term ‘shared heritage’. This unbalance is often analogous to colonial hierarchy in the postcolonial arena, and is sustained by colonial structural remains in postcolonial societies, for instance in the academic model and institutional authority of archaeology in postcolonial Africa (Schmidt 2009).

The theme of ‘development’ has been a strong drive for claims of cultural diversity in the global sphere, whether for ‘advanced’ or ‘developing’ countries. The modernist belief, which begins with the notion of ‘progress’ and the idea of a thrust toward a sort of super-future, underlies the UNESCO model of the world heritage system. This modernist mentality can be exemplified by the ‘best practice’ in world heritage operation (Logan 2002b, 52-53); and by UNESCO’s projects combining heritage and development. The ‘world best practice’ on the one hand indicates this evolving view of an advanced future, very much determined by material standards; on the other hand, it reflects the inevitable homogeneity resulting from the practice of ‘standardisation’ while creating heritage industries (Graham et al. 2000). Aside from the example of ‘best practice’, many UNESCO projects which combine heritage and development reflect the UN’s mission of sustainable development and poverty reduction. For countries with an inferior eco-political status within the global sphere, heritage projects under the heading of sustainable development attract foreign investment and add political profile. All the mentioned cases suggest that the belief in development in relation to modernism is not deconstructed by ‘postmodern’ power discourses. Instead, this developmentist belief is strengthened when diversity is ascribed to an image of an advanced and developed locality or as a diplomatic strategy for reconciling conflicts stemming from differences.

The hierarchical power relation underneath the global heritage mechanism was constructed under colonial rule, and usually has not been decolonised in the postcolonial global and national sphere. When the hierarchical structure was built up through modernisation projects during the colonial period, the image of the modernised model was often taken by the colonised communities as equal to the image of the coloniser through colonial structural residuals, for instance, the industrial construction and social hierarchy. This image of modernity is interwoven with colonial sentiments and postcolonial negotiations associated with colonial sites. Development of the mining industry in Jinguashi and the sugar industry in Ciaotou and their postcolonial social dynamics are clear examples of this colonial modernity. With their original sense of place yielded to or replaced by colonial interventions, colonial sites are usually easier than other heritage sites to commoditise in standardising phrases. This is due to a lack of a sense of rootedness and a lack of cultural software such as
craftsmanship in association with the built structure. Sense of rootedness often motivates preservation movements; a lack of rootedness can result in ignorance or passive responses from postcolonial communities over the site of former colonial symbolism. Moreover, a split between the built structure and its cultural subject contributes to the ‘standardization’ of preservation and representation. Since the one (former colonizer) who knows best the material and cultural significance has left the site, this vacuum of local knowledge, strengthened by the ‘dual colonialism’, provides an ideal environment for ‘standardizing’ cultural performance or even ‘reinventing’ culture. The global demand of tourism and economic development further pressurizes the process of representing a cultural image for consumption. This also indicates that the ‘best practice’ of a colonial heritage site may be greatly removed from the communities of the neighbourhood. In the case of Taiwan, the ‘foreignness’ of some Japanese sites is strengthened through intentionally displaying a conventional image of Japan which often comes from the mass circulation of media and commodities.

**JAPANESE COLONIAL HERITAGE**

The case of Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan shows similarities and differences to the situation of colonial sites within the postcolonial metropole/colony power unbalance, as mentioned in the previous paragraph. Regarding economic status, Taiwan and Japan are relatively balanced competitors in the global market. However, the image of Japan as an advanced modernized nation is rooted within Taiwan and is represented by heritage activities associated with Japanese colonial sites. Despite the fact that this is similar to postcolonial phenomena in some of other new nations, this Japan-complex is far more than simply colonial nostalgia. The factors of dual-colonialism and refracted modernity situate Japan’s ambiguously in-between the ‘foreign’ and the ‘local’ in postcolonial Taiwan. The image of Japan as an advanced modernized nation has also been strengthened by mass circulation of Japanese commodities in Taiwan and in the global market.

Resistance against dual colonialism—Japanese colonial rule and the postwar KMT governance under Martial Law—led to the prevalence of localism in Taiwan. In accordance with economic and social changes such as fast industrialisation and urbanization, the theme concerning land/places in Taiwan, encompassing both natural and cultural meanings, has been singled out by political figures and public groups for evoking a sense of Taiwanese identity and environmental concerns over land which has been rapidly polluted by development projects. Strong sentiments toward the locality of Taiwan and places in Taiwan—which were suppressed under the localities of Japan and China in the colonial context—have motivated and been evoked by numerous environmental, literature, political and conservationist movements since the 1970s. In the 1990s, the central government inaugurated an ‘Integrated Community-Making Programme’ and concluded the previous locality-relevant initiatives. Within this framework, the Japanese sites were re-categorised from a ‘residue of the evil colonizer’ to ‘heritage of Taiwan’. In other words, these Japanese sites officially represented ‘local’ instead of ‘foreign’ in the late 1990s and 2000s.

It is noteworthy that the relocation of Japanese sites from foreign to local is in closer relation to KMT colonialism rather than to Japanese colonialism. Shown by case studies of this thesis, the praise of the Japanese past often appeared in the oral description in the form of comparison to the discrimination and backwardness of the KMT rule. And these sentiments toward KMT colonialism, here taking the form of displays of intimacy to Japan in contrast to the KMT’s China-centered narrative, are exacerbated by the lukewarm relationship between Taiwan and China in the global arena. Historical and ethnic links between Taiwan and China was forcibly consolidated by the postwar KMT government in order to legitimise its regime in Taiwan. Both the link and resistances against the link have been intensified by political and monetary competition and military threats from the People’s Republic of China. This ambivalent, and often hostile, consciousness of China intensified after the dissolution of the Cold War alliances, when Taiwan’s status as a defensive front for the US was losing importance and when China emerged as an enormous economic entity. This cautiousness and anxiety about Taiwan’s survival under China’s suppression in international society provides space for a new national identity narrative and Taiwan-centred consciousness to mature. In the form of a mosaic model
of multiculturalism in the 1990s and 2000s, this identity narrative accentuating Taiwan’s close connection with Japan in the past and the present aids the construction of a de-sinicised identity of Taiwan. The Japanese heritage sites are a concrete example of this.

**REFRACTED MODERNITY**

The pro-Japan attitude in Taiwan is actually interwoven with historical, political and economic factors. Japan, the former colonizer, became a partner within the Cold War network dominated by the United States. Although the official interpretation of the Japanese past under the postwar KMT government stressed the evil of Japanese imperialism and highlighted Japanese military atrocities committed against the Chinese during the war, the economic relationship between Taiwan and Japan continued both from colonial connections and within the network of Cold War alliances. Moreover, Japan’s image as an advanced model country in Asia was also noted in KMT cultural policies in the 1970s and 1980s. This model image continued in the 1990s community-building and 2000s DPP government discourses. Regarding heritage policy, Japanese sites entered heritage lists no earlier than 1991; nevertheless, the heritage legislation and conservation practices of Japan have always been important references for heritage policy-making in Taiwan. In other words, the Japanese past in Taiwan, and Japan as a contemporary political entity, were conceived differently in official discourse under KMT governance. The former, ambiguous Japanese past, was related to the embarrassing position of Japan in separating ‘us’/local and ‘them’/foreign in accordance with domestic ethnic sentiments; in the latter case, Japan, as a contemporary political entity, was no doubt a foreign country, a competitor, partner and also model country in the global economic and political arena.

The Taiwanese re-connection to the Japanese past was bridged by the discourse of modernity. As noted in section 2.3 of this thesis, the Japanese-built sites re-entered the professional field of architecture and evoked a sense of conserving Japanese buildings under the heading of ‘modern architecture’. Through categorising the colonial past as a stage in a serial progress under the header of modernisation, Japanese-ness is a constituent of Taiwaneseness, and indicates the ‘advanced’ element in the culture of the latter. Furthermore, the conceptualisation of “refracted modernity”264 (Kikuchi 2007) in referring to the Japanised or Japan-translated western-modernisation in Taiwan suggests that Japanese influence is regarded as a part of localisation, and shows that Japan serves as the adjusted model of modernisation, which better fits Asian conditions. In this case, Japan becomes ‘us’ and the West are ‘them’. The image of an advanced Japan is intensified through comparisons to the KMT in the past and to China in the present. This image is reshaped in the new generation which has had no direct Japanese and postwar KMT experience, yet is intimately acquainted with the popular culture of Japan. This image of an ‘advanced’ Japan lies beneath the initiatives of ‘community building’ and beneath the merge of commoditising strength over locality pursuit in many sites investigated by this thesis, for instance the ‘Little Japan’ imagination in Jiangjunfu case.

**COLONIAL AMBIGUITIES**

In the 2000s, a large number of Japanese sites were designated ‘historic monuments’ or ‘historic buildings’ under the legal framework of the ‘Cultural Heritage Preservation Act’. Meanwhile, many Japanese heritage sites were renovated in this period with state community-building budgets under the popular notion of ‘revitalising unused spaces’ in the architectural and policy-making arena. Other than the factor of identity narratives, the prevalence of Japanese sites has been closely related to the rising role of municipal governments and the increasing demands of the tourist market. Many Japanese sites in the metropolitan areas, especially Taipei City, were turned into museums, art centres, café houses, boutiques etc., in tandem with the fast-rising bourgeois urban culture in Taipei. Many sites have been conserved by citizens’ movements, and were listed as heritage by the
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264. The phrase ‘refracted modernity’, used by Kikuchi as a book title (Kikuchi 2007), refers to the perception of Western modernity through reinterpretation from Japan in Taiwan. As an example, the Japanese architects applied Western genre in building modern architectures in Taiwan. This reinterpretation of modern architecture has become origin of understanding the Western architectural modernity for Taiwanese in the colonial period.
municipal government later. In the counties with less financial resources and less developed citizen awareness, the top-down investment in revitalising unused Japanese buildings has been often limited to architectural renovation. Within the community-building framework, reuse of these sites was expected by policy makers and professionals to trigger a sense of community, awareness of citizenship and also local development. To the local governments, the tourist revenue and political profile which might result from these sites have been the major concern. If we look into the network of local actors directly concerning the heritage activities of a site, the affection evoked by memories of the place often became a strong motivation for grassroots conservationist movements. Civil, environmental, cultural issues were concerned by grassroots groups as well as the issue of local development, particularly in terms of tourist revenue. And because of the architectural features and historical associations of the sites, Japanese ‘nostalgia tourists’, the largest international tourist group in Taiwan in the 2000s, were the main target international tourists of heritage projects.

In order to reach the overall target of implementing Japanese colonial sites for civil, political and economic initiatives, re-interpreting the significance of these sites is crucial. This reinterpretation needs to be a persistent cultural process, reconnecting the postcolonial actors to the site through continuous negotiation. In other words, in order to turn the colonial material remains into sites of memory for postcolonial communities, connections between the site and communities—cut during dual colonialism—have to be rebuilt through continual memory activities, or the site remains an uncared-for space. However, in the process of representation in transforming colonial to local, ambiguities are inevitable.

The ambiguities lie in multiple layers. First of all, within the global heritage framework, the mechanism of colonial heritage is often analogous to the power hierarchy of the colonial period. Meanwhile, this power hierarchy is applied in the domestic sphere between the state authority and communities, since the nation-state has been the major actor in determining and participating in the international mechanism. Second, when we come back to the postcolonial society in perceiving the ‘colonial heritage’, ‘why?’ and ‘for whom?’ to conserve remains a issue. Despite the fact that some postcolonial nations are involved in projects of ‘mutual heritage’ raised by former colonizers, the gap between the different concerns of both parties is notable. Taiwan is a distinctive case in the issue of colonial heritage. Instead of being a passive ‘partner’ in this ‘mutual’ relationship, Taiwan has been an active actor in initiating ‘sharing’ activities with the former Japanese colonizer. Nevertheless, representing the colonial past remains ambiguous in postcolonial society. Three internal layers of ambiguity lie beneath heritage activities: the gap between the architectural fabric and cultural context, the absence of a direct memory owner, and the structural residue of colonialism. All these ambiguities indicate that a more nuanced operational model is required in representing colonial sites as heritage. Furthermore, the theme of economic development encompasses the global heritage sphere, including Taiwan. After the rescue of heritage sites is accomplished, this drive for development has been competing with grassroots concerns of locality in the civil, welfare and environmental dimensions. In the case of colonial heritage, the lack of a direct memory linkage between the site and postcolonial communities means that citizen initiatives based upon place-rooted affection may have less power in facing economy-centred initiatives. This is also relevant to the issue of representing Japaneseness in Taiwan.

In the era of localism in Taiwan, the bond between memory and place indeed inspired grassroots initiatives of conservation. The case of Ciaotou Sugar Factory, Qingxiu Yuan and Jiangjunfu Residences showed the haunting effects of place. These conservationists acts have triggered a sense of community and civil awareness toward a vision of a well-inhabited homeland. However, when the rescue stage was accomplished, and when faced with the need for a management programme, factors such as property ownership, bureaucratic inflexibility and development-oriented initiatives have obstructed wider grassroots participation. Under the official translation of cultural heritage in Taiwan, the concept of ‘culture as asset’, explained in section 2.2, has been characterized by this limited development up to date. When heritage sites are legally defined and categorised into official heritage institutions, the uncertainty of grassroots involvement is a poor fit with the rigidity and
standardisation required by the bureaucratic system. This often results in the exclusion of wider participation after heritage designation.

It is undeniable that the creation of heritage is closely related to state initiatives state-constructed frameworks. Nevertheless memory is an intrinsic feature of heritage-making and motivates conservationist acts. This intimate nature of heritage bonds people to place, and may contribute to the formation of subjects who produce locality. Through a memory approach that works at a deeper and more nuanced level than that of the state and government, continuously engaging multiple actors of a local network, heritage can also be a field for empowering the once silenced. In past decades, whether area heritage-oriented, or in the regions where heritage has just started to become a power, heritage has been used by people, including both those in power or subalterns. If heritage can mean more than political games, then its significance may lie in a better, equal platform open for negotiations, within which local autonomies are respected and able to penetrate the power hierarchy to create a better future and locality for them, and for us all.
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SAMENVATTING

Sinds de jaren negentig van de vorige eeuw ervaart Taiwan een ware ‘memory boom’. Deze explosie van eigen geschiedenis, zichtbaar in een dramatisch toegenomen aantal musea en erfgoedlocaties, heeft alles te maken met een nieuwe zoektocht naar loca-
titeit sinds de opheffing van de nationale staat van be-
leg in 1987. Tijdens de Japanse koloniale overheer-
sing en het autoritaire bewind van de KMT (Kuomintang 國民黨, Chinese Nationale Volkspar-
tij) werden Taiwanese herinneringen en Taiwanees bewustzijn moedwillig van overheidswege uitgewist. 
In de jaren negentig werd Taiwanees lokaal zelfbe-
wustzijn juist benadrukt en werd het essentieel in het 
opbouwen van een nieuw ecopolitiek denkkader. 
Sinds 1994 voert de centrale regering een nieuw be-
deel: het Programma Geïntegreerde Gemeenschappen 
(社區總體營造). Na de presidentiële verkiesings-
overwinningen van de DPP (Democratische Progres-
sieve Partij) in 2000 en 2004 werd dit gemeen-
schapsvormende beleid op ongekende schaal 
voortgezet door de nieuwe DPP-regering. Als onder-
deel van dit groots opgezette plan voor het vormen 
van gemeenschappen werd enorm veel aandacht en 
overheidsgeld besteed aan projecten met betrekking 
tot cultureel erfgoed. Interessant genoeg werden als 
deel van deze groeiende explosie van herinneringen ook locaties stammend uit de Japanse koloniale tijd 
tot cultureel erfgoed gebombardeerd; samen met 
grote aantallen Taiwanese erfgoedlocaties vertegen-
woordigen zij een nieuwe culturele en economische 
politiek die anders is dan de politiek van de Japanse 
naoorslogse regime van de KMT gezien als de ‘giftige overblijf-
selen van het Japanse imperialisme’. De Chinese re-
gering van de KMT nam de macht in Taiwan over na 
de nederlaag van Japan tijdens de Tweede Wereld-
oorlog. Om de band tussen Taiwan en Japan te bre-
ken, die was ontstaan na vijftig jaar koloniale over-
heersing (1895-1945), versterkte de KMT de 
superieure maatschappelijke positie van de ‘ortho-
doxe’ Chinese taal en cultuur met behulp van de af-
geroepen staat van beleg. Grote aantallen Japanse si-
tes – met name plaatsen die een rijke religieuze of 
politieke symboliek vertegenwoordigden, zoals 
Shinto-tempels – werden gesloopt, verbouwd of ver-
laten. Volgens de hiërarchie van het systeem van 
staatserfgoed vielen Japanse gebouwen buiten de ca-
tegorie cultureel erfgoed. Zelfs alledaagse Taiwanese 
architectuur kwam slechts met moeite in aanmerking 
door de status van cultureel erfgoed.

Deze situatie veranderde in de jaren '90. In 1991 
werden de eerste twee Japanse sites tot nationale 
‘historische monumenten’ uitgeroepen, beschermd 
door de Wet voor het Behoud van Cultureel Erfgoed 
uit 1982. In de eerste jaren van deze eeuw werden verschillende Japanse gebouwen door provinciale 
overheden en gemeenten aangedragen als ‘histori-
sche monumenten’ of ‘historische gebouwen’, om 
vervolgens gerenoveerd te worden met subsidie van 
de centrale regering binnen het financiële kader van 
‘hergebruik van ongebruikte ruimte’ (xianzhi kon-
gjian zailiyong閒置空間再利用), wat in nauw ver-
band staat met het beleid van gemeenschapsvorming. 
Dit laat een verschuiving zien in de definitie en de 
waardering van wat ‘historisch’ is. Locaties met een 
Japanse achtergrond werden geleidelijk steeds min-

der gezien als giftige overblijfselen en werden legitieme lieux de mémoire in Taiwan. Het is echter van belang om op te merken dat de Japanse sites niet pas na officiële erkenning veranderden in plaatsen van gemeenschappelijke herinnering; in werkelijkheid is de perceptie van Japanse sites al sinds lange tijd verstoord, met het beeld van Japan dat is ontstaan uit overgebleven koloniale structuren, het neokolonialisme van de KMT, de relatie tussen Japan en Taiwan binnen het kader van de Koude Oorlog, en de verspreiding van Japanse massamedia over heel Azië. Voor veel Taiwanezen vormen Japanse gebouwen en locaties in hun geboorteplaats een deel van hun trots geschiedenis; het zijn hun lieux de mémoire. Zo kunnen deze sites ook een bron zijn van hoop voor het herstel van de lokale economie. Overheidsfunctionarissen in de jaren ’90 en de eerste jaren van het nieuwe millennium hadden een beeld van Japan als een geavanceerd voorbeeld dat zowel de wereldorde als het terrein van cultuur besloeg. Behoud en hergebruik van Japanse sites toont niet alleen het nieuwe multiculturele beeld van een gesedimenteerde Taiwanese identiteit, maar laat ook het enthousiasme tot uitdrukking komen dat bestaat voor de opbouw van een geavanceerd nieuw land door het gebruik van erfgoed om zelfbewustzijn en gemeenschapszin bij de bevolking op te wekken. Dit kan zelfs een stimulus zijn voor lokale ontwikkeling, zoals in het succesvolle machizukuri model voor gebiedsgerichte vernieuwing in Japan. Binnen dit kader worden Japanse koloniale overblijfselen, die al lange tijd als lieux de mémoire hebben gediend voor verschillende groepen Taiwanezen, gebruikt als deel van een strategie van vorming van localiteit voor de postkoloniale maatschappij van Taiwan. De omstreden aard van koloniale locaties, van bijzonder belang waar controverse herinneringen aan dergelijke locaties worden, leidt echter vaak tot ambiguïteit in het scheppingsproces en de interpretatie van erfgoed.

Deze ambiguïteit in de beeldvorming van koloniaal ‘erfgoed’ heeft meerdere lagen. Ten eerste geldt binnen het kader van werelderfgoed dat de mechaniek van koloniaal erfgoed vaak analoog is aan de hiërarchie van macht tijdens de koloniale periode. Tegelijkertijd wordt deze hiërarchie van macht intern toegepast tussen de overheid en lokale gemeenschappen, omdat juist de natiestaat de hoofdrol speelt in het bepalen van en de deelname in het internationale systeem. Ten tweede – om terug te komen op de postkoloniale maatschappij en haar kijk op ‘koloniaal erfgoed’ – blijft de vraag ‘waarom’ en ‘voor wie’ te behouden een netelige kwestie. Ondanks de betrokkenheid van sommige postkoloniale Staten in projecten van ‘gedeeld erfgoed’ op initiatief van de voormalige koloniale machten is er een merkbare kloof tussen de belangen van beide partijen. Erfgoedactiviteiten verbergen drie interne lagen van ambiguïteit: de kloof tussen architecturaal materiaal en culturele context, de afwezigheid van een directe eigenaar van de herinnering, en de structurele overblijfselen van kolonialisme. Al deze dubbelzinnigheden tonen aan dat een meer genuanceerd werkmodel vereist is voor de vertegenwoordiging van koloniale locaties als erfgoed. Bovendien is er het motief van economische ontwikkeling, dat het hele terrein van werelderfgoed beslaat, Taiwan niet uitgezonderd. Sinds de voltooing van de redding van erfgoedlocaties voert deze drang naar ontwikkeling op terreinen als maatschappij, welvaart en milieu een concurrentiestrijd met het radicale belang van lokaliteit. Voor koloniaal erfgoed betekent het ontbreken van een directe band van herinneringen tussen de locatie en de postkoloniale gemeenschap vaak dat maatschappelijke initiatieven gebaseerd op een plaatselijke emotionele verbintenis te zwak blijven tegenover economisch geïnspireerde initiatieven. Dit staat in verband met de kwestie van de beeldvorming van Japansheid in Taiwan.

Deze ambiguïteit in de beeldvorming van koloniaal ‘erfgoed’ heeft meerdere lagen. Ten eerste geldt binnen het kader van werelderfgoed dat de mechaniek van koloniaal erfgoed vaak analoog is aan de hiërarchie van macht tijdens de koloniale periode. Tegelijkertijd wordt deze hiërarchie van macht intern toegepast tussen de overheid en lokale gemeenschappen, omdat juist de natiestaat de hoofdrol speelt in het bepalen van en de deelname in het internationale systeem. Ten tweede – om terug te komen op de postkoloniale maatschappij en haar kijk op ‘koloniaal erfgoed’ – blijft de vraag ‘waarom’ en ‘voor wie’ te behouden een netelige kwestie. Ondanks de betrokkenheid van sommige postkoloniale Staten in projecten van ‘gedeeld erfgoed’ op initiatief van de voormalige koloniale machten is er een merkbare kloof tussen de belangen van beide partijen. Erfgoedactiviteiten verbergen drie interne lagen van ambiguïteit: de kloof tussen architecturaal materiaal en culturele context, de afwezigheid van een directe eigenaar van de herinnering, en de structurele overblijfselen van kolonialisme. Al deze dubbelzinnigheden tonen aan dat een meer genuanceerd werkmodel vereist is voor de vertegenwoordiging van koloniale locaties als erfgoed. Bovendien is er het motief van economische ontwikkeling, dat het hele terrein van werelderfgoed beslaat, Taiwan niet uitgezonderd. Sinds de voltooing van de redding van erfgoedlocaties voert deze drang naar ontwikkeling op terreinen als maatschappij, welvaart en milieu een concurrentiestrijd met het radicale belang van lokaliteit. Voor koloniaal erfgoed betekent het ontbreken van een directe band van herinneringen tussen de locatie en de postkoloniale gemeenschap vaak dat maatschappelijke initiatieven gebaseerd op een plaatselijke emotionele verbintenis te zwak blijven tegenover economisch geïnspireerde initiatieven. Dit staat in verband met de kwestie van de beeldvorming van Japansheid in Taiwan.

Na het uiteenvallen van de politieke structuur van de Koude Oorlog werd de wereldorde in de jaren na 1990 opnieuw ingedeeld. Nieuwe staten en regionale bondgenootschappen ontstonden en beconcurreerden elkaar om politieke en economische invloed. Erfgoed, al sinds de jaren 1970 geïnstitutionaliseerd door UNESCO en altijd onafscheidelijk verbonden aan nationalistische projecten, werd ingezet in onderhandelingen tussen staten en regio’s. Een koloniaal verleden is niet alleen van invloed op diplomatieke betrekkingen tussen de voormalig koloniale macht en haar voormalige koloniën, maar speelt ook een rol in binnenlandse conflicten die ontstaan als gevolg van het koloniaal verleden – bijvoorbeeld de aan- spraak van lokale bevolkingsgroepen, op grond van hun tradities, op land dat in bezit is genomen door kolonisten, of de etnische problematiek die kan ontstaan door migratie naar voormalige koloniale machten. Koloniale gebouwen en locaties, ooit gezien als representative examples of Japanese colonial heritage, have been recognized as burdens for different groups of Taiwanese, used as a part of a strategy of formation of local identity for the postcolonial society of Taiwan. The ambivalent nature of colonial sites, especially in importance, which lack a direct owner, is often seen as a major issue. Since the 1990s, UNESCO and other initiatives have aimed at protecting sites, which are seen as merchandise of nationalistic projects, but are also often considered an economic burden. This leads to a competition between economic and nationalistic interests. This is in line with the question of the representation of Japanese identity in Taiwan.
‘beschamend’, als plaatsen van ofwel de ‘glorie’ ofwel de ‘vernederiging’ van het verleden, zijn geherin-
terpreteerd binnen het nieuwe kader van werelderf-
goed en als deel van de projecten van wereldwijde
en nationale organisaties. Als gevolg daarvan zijn
sinds de jaren 1990 meer en meer Aziatische locaties
en sites met meervoudige waarden opgenomen in de
lijst van werelderfgoed, in de context van de nadruk
die UNESCO gelegd heeft op culturele diversiteit en
universele waarde. Dankzij intra-regionale en natio-
 nale samenwerking in erfgoedprojecten zijn er nu
ook ‘gedeelde’ erfgoedlocaties; tegelijkertijd is de
dreiging van wapengeweld tegen controversiële sites
niet verdwenen. Bovendien kunnen de ongelijke re-
laties tussen postkoloniale staten en de andere landen
gen gemeenschappen op het toneel van werelderfgoed
al te makkelijk vergelijkbaar worden met de machts-
hiërarchie van de koloniale periode. In deze context
valt de waarde van koloniaal erfgoed voor postkolo-
niale gemeenschappen te betwisten, en dit vraagstuk
wordt vaak opgelost met de retoriek van ontwikke-
lingsprojecten die een proces van eenrichtingsverkeer dat past in
het nieuwe kader van werelderfgoed.

Vanwege hun ligging buiten het diplomatieke terrein
afgebakend door de Verenigde Naties mogen sites in
Taiwan niet worden opgenomen in de Werelderf-
goedlijst en het daaraan gerelateerde erfgoednetwerk.
Het Taiwanese erfgoedbeleid en de omgang met erf-
goed volgen echter voornamelijk de conventies en
modellen die door internationale organisaties als
UNESCO en ICOMOS zijn opgesteld, ondanks het
feit dat Taiwan geen lid is van de Verenigde Naties.
Sinds het eerste decennium van deze eeuw heeft de
Taiwanese overheidsbeleid eigen ‘Potentiëel Werelderf-
goed’ genoemd, en heeft het in professionele en
financieel opzicht geïnvesteerd in de ondersteunen
van beschermende werkzaamheden aan werelderf-
goed-sites. Deze selectie van potentieel werelderf-
goed wordt gezien als een voorbereidende stap naar
toekomstig lidmaatschap van de VN en deelname
aan internationaal erfgoedbeleid onder leiding van
UNESCO. Het benadrukken van de localiteit van
Taiwan op het wereldtoneel is een belangrijk motief
voor de afdeling cultuur van de overheid, en het in
gang zetten van het beleid van potentieel werelderf-
goed. Dit stroomt met de zoektocht van Taiwan naar
een plaats op het wereldtoneel binnen het ontstaan
van een nieuwe politieke en economische wereldorde
sinds het eind van de Koude Oorlog.

Hoewel de overheidsactiviteiten met betrekking tot
erfgoed in Taiwan in politiek en diplomatiek opzicht
vergelijkbaar zijn met die van vele postkoloniale
nieuwe staten, biedt de kwestie van de beeldvorming
van Japanse koloniale erfgoed in Taiwan een uniek
perspectief op ‘gedeelde erfgoed’. In de context van
bloeiende lokale identiteitsvorming als gevolg van
verzet tegen de voormalige kolonisatie door de KMT
zijn Japanse koloniale overblijfselen een onderdeel
geworden van lokaal erfgoed – niet alleen door be-
leid van overheidswege, maar ook door autonome
initiatieven vanuit de samenleving. De groepen die
de site als erfgoed ‘delen’ vallen niet allemaal binnen
de netwerken van koloniale overheerse en onder-
daan, van staat en staat of van staat en lokale ge-
meenschap. In werkelijkheid heeft de nadruk van ge-
meenschapsvormende overheidsprojecten op de
lokale autonomie van kleine nederzettingen samen
met behoudsinitiatieven uit de bevolking zelf in Tai-
wan geleid tot een alternatieve manier om erfgoed te
delen. Hoewel er onvermijdelijk sprake is van con-
troverse, onderhandeling en onzekerheid in de pro-
ces van de vertegenwoordiging van het koloniale
verleden, kan het voorbeeld van de Taiwanese verte-
genwoordiging van Japans erfgoed bijdragen aan be-
grip van de waarde en invloed van koloniaal erfgoed
voor postkoloniale gemeenschappen, afgezien van de
effecten van toerisme en diplomatiek. Daarnaast
draagt het bij aan de verkenning van de vraag of lo-
kaal erfgoed bijdraagt aan de vertegenwoordiging van
Japans koloniaal erfgoed in Taiwan een uniek
perspectief op erfgoed in Taiwan in politiek en

Deze dissertatie toont het enorm ingewikkelde pro-
ces van het delen van het Japanse koloniale verleden
in de postkoloniale Taiwanse maatschappij, en ver-
kent de mogelijkheden van dekolonisatie door erf-
goedactiviteiten vanuit de gemeenschap. Vijf sites uit
de Japanse koloniale tijd zijn geselecteerd voor nader
onderzoek. Geen van deze sites toont een ideaal suc-
cesvol resultaat; allen vertegenwoordigen ze een
doorgaand proces. Problemen en ambiguïteit veroor-
zaakt door de geleidelijke overgang van kolonialisme
naar lokaliteit stimuleren verdere overdenking of
waarschuwen voor een ideologische valkuil: men
can niet zomaar aannemen dat het ‘delen’ van het
verleden een gedeeld proces is.

Dekolonisatie betekent hierdoor niet noodzakelijk
het ‘verwijderen van materiële overblijfselen van de
koloniale tijd’. Het behoud van koloniale sites door
erkenning van hun omstreden aard, actieve verken-
ning en betrekking bij het debat van controversiële
opinions, grondig onderzoek naar de historische ach-
tergrond van elke versie van herinnering die aan een
site verbonden is, en de transformatie van structurele
ongelijkheid door doorgezette vorming van lokale
gemeenschappen, zou meer bijdragen aan het in
gang zetten van een dekolonisatieproces. Dit is het
belang van koloniale sites als ‘erfgoed’ van de post-
koloniale maatschappij.
Memory Contested, Locality Transformed: Representing Japanese Colonial ‘Heritage’ in Taiwan

SUMMARY

Taiwan has been experiencing a ‘memory boom’ since the 1990s. This ‘memory boom’, represented by dramatically increasing numbers of museum and heritage sites, is closely related to a new pursuit of locality after the end of Martial Law in 1987. During the periods of Japanese colonial occupation and KMT (Kuomintang 國民黨; Chinese Nationalist Party) authoritarian rule, the sense of place and memory of Taiwan was intentionally erased by the ruling party. In the 1990s, the sense of place and memory of Taiwan was accentuated and became instrumental in creating a different eco-political narrative. Since 1994, a new policy has been promoted by the central government, namely the Integrated Community-Making Programme (社區總體營造). After the Taiwan-centred DPP (Democratic Progressive Party) candidate won the presidential elections in 2000 and 2004, the community-building programme was continued to an unprecedented scale by the DPP government. Amid this grand community-building scheme, cultural heritage projects received enormous attention and government resources. Interestingly, the Japanese colonial sites were largely designated as cultural heritage within this burgeoning memory boom, and together with many Taiwanese heritage sites they represent a new political, cultural and economic politics which differs from the previous political periods of Japanese and postwar KMT rule. In other words, the Japanese colonial sites became a constituent part of the new identity and cultural narrative of Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s. In the search for a Taiwanese identity rooted in the land of Taiwan the Japanese colonial past plays an ambiguous role.

Japanese colonial sites used to be regarded as the ‘poisonous leftovers of Japanese imperialism’ during the postwar KMT governance. The Chinese KMT government took over Taiwan after Japan’s defeat in the Second World War. In order to disconnect the Taiwanese link to Japan after 50 years of colonial rule (1895-1945), the KMT government strengthened the superior status of ‘orthodox’ Chinese culture and language with the assistance of Martial Law. Numerous Japanese sites, especially those representing rich religious or political symbolism, for instance Shinto shrines, were demolished, reconstructed or deserted. Within the hierarchy of the state heritage framework, Japanese sites were considered outside of the category of cultural heritage. Even Taiwanese vernacular architecture struggled to qualify as cultural heritage.

This situation changed in the 1990s. In 1991 the first two Japanese sites were designated as national ‘historic monuments’, protected by the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act implemented in 1982. In the 2000s, numerous Japanese buildings were reported by county or city governments as being ‘historic monuments’ or ‘historic buildings’ and were renovated with subsidies from the central government under the funding framework of ‘reutilising unused spaces’ (閒置空間再利用) which is closely related to the community-building programme. This shows a shift in the conception and value of what is ‘historic’. Japanese sites gradually ceased to be seen as poisonous residues and became legitimate sites of memory in Taiwan. However, it is noteworthy that the Japanese sites did not become sites of memory only after the official recognition; rather, the perception of Japanese sites has long been interwoven with the image of Japan produced by remaining colonial structures, KMT neo-colonialism, the Japan-Taiwan relationship under the cold-war framework, and the Japanese mass-media commoditization in Asia. For many Taiwanese people, Japanese sites in their hometowns represent their proud
past, and are their sites of memory. Thus, they can also be a place of hope for the revival of the local economy. For government officials in the 1990s and 2000s, the image of Japan was an advanced model which covered both global economic and cultural terrain. Conserving and reusing the Japanese sites not only shows the emerging multicultural narrative of a de-sinicized Taiwanese identity, but also expresses enthusiasm in building an advanced new country through utilizing heritage spaces to evoke civil awareness and a sense of community. This might even trigger local development, as in the successful machizukuri area regeneration model in Japan. Within this framework, Japanese colonial sites, which have long been sites of memory for different groups of Taiwanese people, are used as a locality reproduction strategy for postcolonial society in Taiwan. However, the contested nature of colonial sites, particularly salient when looking at controversial memories attached to the sites, often results in ambiguity during the process of heritage-making and interpretation.

This ambiguity of representing colonial ‘heritage’ lies in multiple layers. First of all, within the global heritage framework, the mechanism of colonial heritage is often analogous to the power hierarchy of the colonial period. Meanwhile, this power hierarchy is applied in the domestic sphere between the state authority and communities, since the nation-state has been the major actor in determining and participating in the international mechanism. Second, when we come back to the postcolonial society in perceiving the ‘colonial heritage’, ‘why’ and ‘for whom’ to conserve remains a issue. Despite the fact that some postcolonial nations are involved in projects of mutual heritage raised by former colonisers, the gap between the different concerns of both parties is notable. Three internal layers of ambiguity lie beneath heritage activities: the gap between the architectural fabric and cultural context, the absence of a direct memory owner, and the structural residue of colonialism. All these ambiguities indicate that a more nuanced operational model is required in representing colonial sites as heritage. Furthermore, the theme of economic development encompasses the global heritage sphere, including Taiwan. After the rescue of heritage sites is accomplished, this drive for development has been competing with grassroots concerns of locality in the civil, welfare and environmental dimensions. In the case of colonial heritage, the lack of a direct memory linkage between the site and postcolonial communities means that citizen initiatives based upon place-rooted affection may have less power in facing economy-centred initiatives. This is also relevant to the issue of representing Japanese-ness in Taiwan.

In the 1990s, the global order was reorganised after the dissolution of the Cold War structure. New nations and area leagues formed and competed for new political and economic terrain. Heritage, already institutionalised in the 1970s by UNESCO and always inseparable from nationalistic projects, was also implemented for negotiations between nations and areas. The issue of a colonial past not only relates to diplomatic affairs between the former colonizer and colonized nations, but also concerns domestic struggles resulting from the colonial past, for instance the land claim of indigenous groups on their traditional territory in settlers’ countries, or ethnic controversies resulting from migration in former colonizer societies. What were once seen as ‘embarrassing’ colonial sites, either sites of past ‘glories’ or of past ‘shame’, have been reinterpreted within the new world heritage framework and within the projects of global and national institutions. As a result, Asian sites and sites with multiple values have been increasingly designated as world heritage since the 1990s, following UNESCO’s emphasis on cultural diversity and universal value. Intra-regional and national cooperation on heritage projects includes ‘shared’ heritage sites; yet at the same time, armed threats to controversial sites have not disappeared. Moreover, the unbalanced relationships between postcolonial nations and the states and communities in the global heritage arena can easily become analogous to the power hierarchy of colonial periods. Within this framework, the value of colonial heritage to postcolonial communities is arguable, and this question is often answered with rhetoric of development and worked under a top-down mechanism.

Lying outside of the diplomatic sphere framed by the United Nations, sites in Taiwan are not allowed to be included in the World Heritage List and related heritage network. Yet Taiwan’s heritage policies and practice mostly refer to conventions and models le-
gitated by international institutions such as UNESCO and ICOMOS, even though Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations. Since the 2000s the government of Taiwan has nominated its own ‘Potential World Heritage Sites’, and has invested professionally and financially in supporting the conservation work of world heritage sites. This nomination of potential world heritage sites is seen as preparation for joining in with UN and UNESCO-based international heritage affairs in the future. Stressing the locality of Taiwan in the global arena has been a strong theme within the state cultural department in implementing potential world heritage policies. This is in line with Taiwan’s search for a position in the global arena within the remapping process of a new world order, politically and economically, after the Cold War.

Although the state heritage activities of Taiwan are politically and diplomatically similar to those of many postcolonial new nations, the issue of representing Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan provides a unique angle from which to approach ‘shared heritage’. Within the context of flourishing localism resulting from resistance to former colonization of KMT, Japanese colonial sites have been incorporated into local heritage not only through top-down policies but also by autonomous initiatives of social or community groups. The subjects who ‘share’ the site as heritage are not restricted within colonizer-colonized, state-state, state-local networks. Rather, an emphasis on the local autonomy of small-scale places by state community-building projects and privately initiated conservation movements in Taiwan has triggered an alternative means of sharing heritage. Although controversy, negotiation and ambivalence in the process of representing the colonial past are inevitable, Taiwan’s case of representing Japanese heritage may contribute to an understanding of the value or impact of colonial heritage for postcolonial communities aside from tourist and diplomatic effects. Further, it contributes to the exploration of whether local autonomy can change the meaning of colonial sites and can turn colonial sites into community heritage. In this regard, ‘sharing’ is not always a one-way process which fits in a power hierarchy in which the former colonizer shares the techniques of preserving their architectural remains with the former colonized by training programmes and subsidies. The active role that Taiwanese heritage workers play in engaging Japanese architects and related professionals in renovating Japanese sites is different from this one-way sharing. To some degree, this active role shows that postcolonial communities in Taiwan have been empowered to break from the colonial hierarchy by sharing what is now their heritage, no longer the heritage of the colonizer.

This thesis presents the extreme complexity of sharing the Japanese colonial past in postcolonial Taiwanese society, and examines possibilities of decolonization through community-based heritage activities. Five Japanese colonial sites were chosen for investigation. While none shows an ideal successful outcome, all represent an ongoing process. Problems and ambiguity stemming from the tentative transformation from colonialism to locality help to trigger further thinking or warn against the ideological trap of taking mutuality in ‘sharing’ the past for granted.

Hence, decolonization does not necessarily mean ‘removing colonial material traces’. Preserving colonial sites through recognising the contested nature, actively exploring and engaging controversial voices, insisting with finding out historical depth of every memory version attached to the site, and transforming structural inequality with persistent locality building would better contribute to trigger a decolonizing process. This is the significance of the colonial sites as ‘heritage’ for the postcolonial society.
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