

Macalester College

DigitalCommons@Macalester College

Environmental Studies Honors Projects

Environmental Studies Department

2022

Land is Life: Settler Colonial Governance of National Parks and Hunting in Taiwan

Wei-Chieh Jarita Chen

Macalester College, wchen3@macalester.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/envi_honors



Part of the [Environmental Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chen, Wei-Chieh Jarita, "Land is Life: Settler Colonial Governance of National Parks and Hunting in Taiwan" (2022). *Environmental Studies Honors Projects*. 17.
https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/envi_honors/17

This Honors Project - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Environmental Studies Department at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Environmental Studies Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

“Land is Life”: Settler Colonial Governance of National Parks and Hunting in Taiwan

Wei-Chieh (Jarita) Chen
Honors Thesis, Spring 2022
Environmental Studies Department, Macalester College
Co-chairs: Kiritina Saliata and Chris Wells

Jarita Chen can be reached at chen.jarita@gmail.com for comments and questions.

Abstract

This thesis situates Taiwan as a settler colonial state by examining the discourse around the governance of national parks and the criminalization of Indigenous hunting. Placed in the context of historical patterns of land dispossession and cultural genocide, these two issues represent the ongoing process of settler colonialism and the reproduction of settler colonial relations through environmentalism. I focus on the narratives around three case studies: the controversial and ultimately unsuccessful campaign for the Maqaw National Park, the Tumpu Daingaz buluo's struggle with the Yushan National Park, and the Tama Talum Indigenous hunting constitutional reinterpretation case. I argue that settler colonial framings of Indigenous/environmental issues enable the continued enactment of colonial relations and policies. Settler narratives and environmentalism perpetuate settler colonialism through what Métis scholar Max Liboiron explains as the assumption of access to Indigenous land, cultures, and knowledge. These cases are often framed as a progressive and benevolent government inclusion of Indigenous cultures and ecological knowledge. However, a settler colonial lens of analysis demonstrates that these moves of settler inclusivity serve to preserve settler legitimacy and futures in Taiwan while deeper contentions over Indigenous sovereignty remain unresolved. Indigenous voices within these stories reveal a throughline of ongoing resistance and resurgence, offering alternative understandings that center Indigenous land and life. While settler narratives portray and encourage limiting frameworks that prioritize settler interests, Indigenous narratives and activism expand the ways for Indigenous self-determination, futures, and land relations.

Acknowledgements

Projects like this one are never the work of an individual but built upon the knowledge and support of many. This is just a glimpse of all that have contributed to this project.

First and foremost, I want to thank my committee, Professors Kirisitina Sailiata, Chris Wells, and Roopali Phadke, for your support and feedback.

My two co-chairs of this committee, Chris and Kiri, have been incredible in guiding my research and writing process. I also want to thank you for all that you have taught me in the many courses I have taken with you both.

A special thank you to Kiri, for your mentorship in navigating research and beyond, for making spaces of care with such generosity in challenging times. Fa'afetai tele lava!

Many professors supported my research journey, including providing feedback on some earlier drafts. Thank you to Professors Althea Sircar, David Blaney, Paul Dosh, and Katrina Phillips. Special thanks to Althea for nurturing the beginnings of this project and my academic journey.

I also want to thank all the scholars, thinkers, and educators, academic and beyond, whose work inspired me to think deeply and critically. My footnote citations are a recognition of their influence on me and my work. This way of thinking is inspired by what Max Liboiron writes in the acknowledgement of their book: “Many are acknowledged here and throughout the text in footnotes so readers can see whose shoulders I stand on. I see these footnotes enacting an ethic of gratitude, acknowledgement, and reciprocity for their work.”¹

Two works have been particularly influential to this project, and I go back to them often: Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang’s “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” which pushed me to embark on this journey, and Max Liboiron’s *Pollution is Colonialism*. Gratitude to the authors, as well as Althea for introducing me to the first piece and Kiri for the second.

Thank you to my friends, especially Andrea, Yuka, Jiashu, and Rafa for being there for me. I could not have done this without the support of my family, especially my parents for always believing in me and having my back. 谢谢！

感謝在東華大學認識的所有人。

衷心感謝 Ptasan 的大家。認識你們真的很幸運，你們給予我的所有所有我都會好好珍惜。

I am indebted to all of your immeasurable generosity, knowledge, and passion. I am unbelievably lucky to have met you all, learning so much with and from you. Spending time with you has been a transformative experience, and I will cherish that deeply. Mhway! Ma'alo'!

感謝林素珍教授和陳張培倫教授，我在你們的課堂學到了很多。

感謝 Kualim!

Thank you to everyone and everything that nurtured my growth and learning.

¹ Max Liboiron, *Pollution Is Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2021), viii.

I dedicate my first footnote to Max Liboiron, whose work has influenced this project deeply and in so many ways, including the way I think about footnotes and citation... I still remember so clearly the time I first encountered their work when I listened to Media Indigena’s two episodes on *Pollution is Colonialism*... I was so absorbed and inspired. I hope my footnotes reflect the care and thoughtfulness that I have learned from their work.

Glossary

This is a list of terms that I use throughout my thesis. There are more detailed descriptions and discussions of some of the terms in the main body of the thesis.

Buluo	Roughly translates to tribal community, both place and a subunit of different peoples. See Chapter 2 page 22.
Bunun	One of 16 nationally recognized groups of Indigenous people in Taiwan. “Bunun” means person.
DPP	The Democratic Progressive Party was formed from Taiwan’s democratization era in 1987. The DPP and KMT are the two major political parties in Taiwan.
Han	The term “Han” broadly denotes settlers of Chinese descent. It is a contested term and used here similarly to how “white” is used in white settler colonial contexts.
Hoklo	Refers to the majority (over 60%) ethnic group in Taiwan that descends from southern Fujian, China.
KMT	Kuomintang, also known in Chinese pinyin as “Guomindang” or as the Chinese Nationalist Party, refers to the party that fled from mainland China to Taiwan after its defeat in the Chinese Civil War in 1945. The KMT ruled Taiwan as a one-party state until democratization.
Maqaw	The Tayal term for mountain pepper and the Tayal name for the “Chi-lan” Mountain. It can also refer to the proposed Maqaw National Park.
Tama Talum (Talum Suqluman)	“Tama” is the Bunun word for father and a respectful term for uncle. Tama Talum is the Bunun hunter at the center of the 2021 Indigenous hunting constitutional reinterpretation case. His full name is Tama Suqluman and his Mandarin name is Wang Guang-Lu (王光祿).
Tayal	One of 16 nationally recognized groups of Indigenous people in Taiwan. “Tayal” means person.
Tumpu Daingaz	Tumpu Daingaz is a Bunun buluo (tribal community). The Yushan National Park currently occupies the Tumpu Daingaz land.

Table of Contents

Part 1: Introduction	5
Chapter 1: Introduction	5
Chapter 2: Methods and Frameworks	9
Part 2: Background	25
Chapter 3: Literature Review	25
Chapter 4: The Democratization Era	38
Chapter 5: The History of National Parks in Taiwan	48
Pat 3: Case Studies	63
Chapter 6: The Maqaw National Park Controversy	65
Chapter 7: Tumpu Daingaz and the Yushan National Park	85
Chapter 8: Indigenous Hunting and the 2021 Constitutional Reinterpretation Case	107
Chapter 9: Conclusion	119
Bibliography	123

PART 1: Introduction

Chapter 1: Introduction

On August 1, 2016, Taiwan's Indigenous Peoples Day, President Tsai Ing-Wen apologized to Taiwan's Indigenous Peoples on behalf of the Taiwanese government. In Tsai's apology, she acknowledged the historical injustices wrought by successive colonial regimes: "every regime that has come to Taiwan has brutally violated the rights of indigenous peoples through armed invasion and land seizure."² Tsai announced the creation of the Indigenous Historical Justice and Transitional Justice Committee (IHJTJC).³ Invoking the wisdom from the Tayal word for reconciliation, "Sbalay," derived from the word for truth, "Balay," Tsai explains that facing the truth is necessary for reconciliation.⁴ This apology poses as a step towards progress and reconciliation and, more importantly, finally admits the long history of injustices and the role that the government has played in it. What Tsai's apology did not mention is the structure of settler colonialism, the root of the oppressions she named.

While the positioning of Taiwan as a settler colonial state is relatively new, settler colonialism's advance can be observed at every level of Taiwan's society. In fact, President Tsai described many expressions of settler colonialism in her apology. These included questions about Indigenous territories and wrongly prosecuted Indigenous hunters. Tsai announced several actions in response to the issues she named, including delineating Indigenous traditional territories and identifying cases where Indigenous hunters may have been unjustly indicted or

²"President Tsai Apologizes to Indigenous Peoples on Behalf of Government," News Releases, Office of the President Republic of China (Taiwan), August 1, 2016, <https://english.president.gov.tw/NEWS/4950>.

³ This committee was influenced by disapproval of Indigenous peoples when she set up a transitional justice committee addressing the historical injustices of the KMT authoritarian regime. President Tsai's transitional justice committee was seen by many as a political opportunity against the opposition KMT party. It was also evidence that the injustice experienced by the majority Han society was privileged against the longer and ongoing injustice experienced by Indigenous peoples. The IHJTJC also has very limited powers, another criticism. The IHJTJC is an important issue in discussing settler colonialism in Taiwan, but it is beyond the scope of my project.

⁴ While President Tsai is part Indigenous (her grandmother is Paiwan), her use of the Tayal term raises a question about the appropriation of an Indigenous concept for the benefit of settlers.

sentenced for traditional hunting practices. However, a historical investigation, like what Tsai set up, is insufficient without a critical analysis of systemic settler colonialism. To move beyond treating the symptoms requires the scrutiny of their settler colonial origins as well as the narratives that uphold the settler colonial system. It requires a recognition of both the roots of and ongoing land dispossession and cultural genocide.

In my investigation of settler colonialism in Taiwan, I began with the goal of challenging the Han-centric discourse around Taiwan by positioning it as a settler colonial state. Two broad questions guided my process. When looking at the discourse on Taiwan, whether it is on histories or ongoing debates, what can a critical view through the settler colonial framework tell us about Taiwan? How is settler colonialism perpetuated within Taiwan's contemporary political scene in relation to environmentalism? I choose to focus on two specific issues, national parks and the criminalization of Indigenous hunting, to conduct a closer analysis.

These questions come from a very specific place, most importantly my identity as a Taiwanese citizen and Han settler of Hoklo descent. Before I even begin to answer my questions, I must interrogate my position. In Chapter 2, I describe my research process and methods, discussing what approaches are appropriate for someone writing from my position. I explain my approach on discourse analysis and introduce the key concepts I am in conversation with. Because I work with multiple languages and cultural contexts, I also explain deliberate choices in translation and terminologies.

Part 2 provides the necessary context on settler colonialism in Taiwan to understand the issues of national parks and hunting. In Chapter 3, I examine the existing English literature that has analyzed settler colonialism in Taiwan. My thesis is part of this conversation, and I consider academia's narratives as part of the broader study of narratives too. Chapter 4 focuses on a specific period of Taiwan's history, the era of democratization. I argue that the events in this period reshaped Taiwan's settler colonial dynamics between the colonial government, settlers, and Indigenous peoples to set the stage for contemporary politics and a new phase of settler

colonialism in Taiwan, one of liberal multiculturalism. The shifting dynamics observed in this period explains today's mainstream discourse surrounding national parks and hunting. In Chapter 5, I trace the origins of national parks in Taiwan, which reveals the historical pattern of settler colonialism embedded within Taiwan's conservation structures and provides context to my case studies.

In Part 3, I dive into my three case studies surrounding the topics of national parks and Indigenous hunting. The first, the Maqaw National Park controversy, brought the tension between settler environmentalists and Indigenous peoples to the front of the political stage. I discuss this case in Chapter 6, exploring both the settler attempts to include Indigenous peoples into their environmental movement and how Indigenous leveraged the political opportunities to push for sovereignty and land rights. This case explains the emergence of the co-management ideology, a compromise between the environmentalists and Indigenous people.

In Chapter 7, I explore how Tumpu Daingaz, a Bunun buluo (tribal community), and its relationship with the Yushan National Park.⁵ Once resistant to the park, Tumpu Daingaz decided to accept the national park in their territories in the context of the Maqaw controversy, when environmentalists began to collaborate with Indigenous people through co-management. Looking at Tumpu Daingaz's complicated decision reveals Indigenous strategies of resistance and how settler colonial relations continue to undergird the tensions between national parks and Indigenous peoples.

Chapter 8 draws our attention to the recent 2021 constitutional reinterpretation case around Indigenous hunting and Bunun hunter Tama Talum (Tama Suqluman) This case has been framed as Indigenous hunting culture in opposition to environmentalism, revealing deeper tensions that the notion of "collaboration" from environmental issues around national parks failed to address. I focus on the cultural reactions to this legal case by examining both the colonial gaze

⁵ For a more detailed discussion of the term "buluo," see Chapter 2 page 22.

on Indigenous hunting through environmentalist narratives and Indigenous pushes against settler colonial framings of Indigenous cultural rights.

What does the discourse over two governance issues, national parks and Indigenous hunting, reveal about settler colonialism and environmentalism in Taiwan?

For settler colonialism, these two issues demonstrate continuations of historical patterns of land dispossession and cultural genocide, produced through inherited and mutating social systems throughout regime changes. I borrow the protest slogan, “Land is Life”(土地就是生命), from the Indigenous Peoples Movement to help us understand how land, or national parks, and life, hunting, are interconnected; as such, the settler colonial governance of Native land and lives are inseparable too.⁶ The framework of “Land is Life” reveals key differences between mainstream environmentalism and Indigenous land relations. Environmentalism can align with Indigenous rights and interests, but when driven by settler interests, it reproduces colonial relations to Indigenous people and land.

Settler narratives of the issues, whether national parks or hunting, are based on the presumption of the legitimacy of settler structures and devoid of the historical and political contexts of settler colonialism. Such narratives enforce limited frames of understanding and enable the enactment of settler colonial relations and policies. On the other hand, Indigenous narratives demonstrate the limitations of the mainstream discourse and intervene the conversation through counter-narratives. Indigenous activism and narratives offer expansive pathways forward.

⁶ Yang Zheng-Bin (楊正斌) and Cemelesai Ljaljegan (車牧勒撒以·拉勒格安), “土地就是生命：還我土地 [Land Is Life: Land Back],” in *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編 下)*, vol. 2, 2 vols. (Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008), 579–87.

Besides being in the title of this introduction piece on the Land Back Movement, this phrase “Land is Life” was also documented in various handbooks of the 1989 Land Back Forums (還我土地座談會). A similar slogan, “Land Our Life” (土地 我們的生命) was written on protest signs in the third Land Back March in 1993.

Chapter 2 Methods and Frameworks

Positionality, Relations, Methods

I write from a very specific place: my position and relations inform how and why I write. Throughout this thesis, I am intentional with why I write, how I write, what I write, and what I do not write. My approach is based on methods from cultural studies, specifically Indigenous studies. As Métis scholar Zoe Todd writes, “Before I am a scholar or a researcher, I am a citizen of the Métis Nation with duties and responsibilities to the many different nations/societies/peoples with whom I share territories. This relational approach means that my reciprocal duties to others guide every aspect of how I position myself and my work.”⁷ Like Todd, my identities also inform my actions. I am not writing in a vacuum space of objectivity but a reality where I am responsible for my choices. I choose to introduce myself in this section for the reasons Métis scholar Max Liboiron explains: “Introductions are important because they show where my knowledge comes from, to whom I am accountable, and how I was built.”⁸

Through my father’s side, I am a Taiwanese citizen and descendent of Hoklo settlers, originally from China’s Fujian province, who occupied Siraya territory in present-day Tainan. I was born and raised in Shanghai, China, where my mother’s family is from. I am also educated through the western schooling system. This research project began from my need to assess my obligations as a Taiwanese person, especially as a Han settler, in relation to Indigenous people and land.⁹ Beginning in September 2020, I spent half a year in Shou-Feng, Hualien—Pangcah land—at the National Dong Hwa University’s College of Indigenous Studies, taking two courses to learn about Indigenous histories and political issues. I also participated in Ptasan, a student

⁷ Zoe Todd, “An Indigenous Feminist’s Take On The Ontological Turn: ‘Ontology’ Is Just Another Word For Colonialism,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 29, no. 1 (March 2016): 19, <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12124>.

⁸ Liboiron, *Pollution Is Colonialism*.

⁹ More specifically, reading Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang’s “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor” prompted me to embark on this research journey.

organization that focuses on learning about Tayal, Truku, Seediq (the three being under a broader pan-Tayal categorization), and Say Siyat cultures. Ptasan has so generously included me within their own learning journeys. Despite my limited time in Taiwan, teachers, guest speakers, and friends, especially those from Ptasan, endowed upon me an incredible amount of knowledge. I am therefore writing in gratitude to Ptasan and the larger community's generosity. Ptasan invited me to their trip to Alang Skadang, home to a Ptasan hunter and a Truku buluo located in the Taroko National Park.¹⁰ This is why I choose to write about national parks and hunting policies.¹¹

My object of study is the settler colonial state and the public discourse around the governance of national parks and hunting. I am not writing to interpret or claim ownership over Indigenous knowledge. For a long time and continuously, non-Indigenous scholars have bastardized Indigenous histories, cultures, and knowledge. Taking the settler colonial studies approach, my focus is on “dehistoricizing colonialism” and understanding it as a continuation, ongoing process.¹² Within settler colonial studies, Macoun and Stakosch note that when (settler) scholars seek to disrupt colonial relations, they can re-enact them by positioning settler knowledge and analysis as neutral and authoritative. I recognize that I am only a part of the conversation, and settler colonialism is “only one way of understanding and framing a complex reality.”¹³ When I include Indigenous histories, cultures, and knowledge in this thesis, it is to challenge the settler colonial assumptions and universalism. Indigenous narratives, political choices, activism are discussed not for me to evaluate but to demonstrate expansive possibilities.

My approach to my case studies is through discourse analysis. I examine how the

¹⁰ Buluo roughly means tribal community. For a more detailed discussion of the term “buluo,” see Chapter 2 page 22.

The word “Taroko” is the Japanese pronunciation for the Truku people.

¹¹ I decided against writing about the community and people I met in Hualien. This experience and my relations with them inform my research, but contrary to western models of extractive research, I do not want to position them as “resources” for the advancement of my academic career. I turn to publicly accessible sources instead.

¹² Alissa Macoun and Elizabeth Strakosch, “The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3–04 (November 2013): 426–43, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.810695>.

¹³ Ibid.

different actors have framed the issues of national parks and hunting, especially the context and effects of the narrative production, knowing that narratives shape how people think and act. In other words, narratives have the power to both reproduce and challenge settler colonialism. I take the advice from Catherine Lutz's work, "Empire is in the details," by paying close attention to the specific ways people write and talk about different issues, reading public sources like newspapers, interviews, TV shows, and political art to understand how stories are interpreted, responded to, and retold.¹⁴ These narratives play a key role in both upholding and challenging the predominant settler colonial assumptions. At the same time, the details I examine include specific words and thus require a sensitivity to language, which I discuss in a later section of this chapter.

Key Frameworks

When using theoretical concepts, it is important to delineate their working definitions and how exactly they are being used. No one has a monopoly over the terms for these concepts, and terms can be up to different writer's interpretation, but I do not want to use these terms carelessly and conflate distinct concepts, as Tuck and Yang have emphasized in "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." Max Liboiron's work also drew attention to the relationship between colonialism and environmentalism. I take a look at settler colonialism and environmentalism, two concepts that are part of my main focus.

Settler Colonialism

What makes settler colonialism distinct from classical colonialism? Settler colonialism involves displacement, cultural genocide and erasure, and land dispossession, which is theorized by Patrick Wolfe as "the logic of elimination." Under settler colonialism, "settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure rather than an event," which "destroys to replace."¹⁵ Lorenzo

¹⁴ Catherine Lutz, "Empire Is in the Details," *American Ethnologist* 33, no. 4 (2006): 593–611.

¹⁵ Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8,

Veracini explains that “colonial, imperial and postcolonial studies have primarily focused on something else”—while these studies are closely related to settler colonialism, they do not identify the specific motive of settler colonialism, i.e. “you, go away.”¹⁶ By pinpointing that motive, Veracini argues that the crucial response against settler colonialism is Indigenous persistence and survival. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang make the point that “Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand).”¹⁷ This is why they argue, “decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically.”¹⁸

Taiwan has experienced waves of colonialism—the Dutch, Qing, Japanese, and KMT regimes—characterized by an influx of settlers, most of which are Han and now make up over 95% of the population. Several scholars have positioned Taiwan as a settler colonial state, which I discuss in the next chapter. My work will focus on how the settler colonial logics of elimination and replacement are carried on through the present-day issues of national parks and the criminalization of hunting. The two issues are ultimately contestation over land and land relations, drawing from Tuck and Yang’s assertion. The Indigenous protest slogan “Land is Life” grounds this reality.

The prominent scholars within the field of settler colonial studies, like Wolfe and Veracini, made important contributions, but they are western and non-Indigenous, meaning that there are often limits to their work. I point this out to make clear that settler colonialism is only

no. 4 (December 1, 2006): 388, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240>.

¹⁶ Lorenzo Veracini, “Introducing: Settler Colonial Studies,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 1 (January 2011): 1–5, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2011.10648799>.

¹⁷ Eve Tuck and K. Yang, “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (September 8, 2012): 5.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

one frame of analysis, as Macoun and Straskosch discuss.¹⁹ These scholars are not necessarily the first to ‘discover’ or theorize concepts about settler colonialism; Indigenous scholars have provided sharp analyses from different vantage points. In her article, “Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala,” Chickasaw scholar Shannon Speed provides some critique: “Wolfe did not, of course, coin the term [settler colonialism]. Native scholars and activists had been using it for some time, as Wolfe himself regularly points out. Further, a group of prominent feminist scholars published *Unsettling Settler Societies*, edited by Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval Davis, in 1995, three years before Wolfe published *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*.”²⁰ Wolfe’s writings on settler colonialism have been influential, so they “at times [undergird] a bit too rigidly” understandings about settler power.²¹ As a result, Speed points out that settler colonial states, like those in Latin America, have not received the same attention and analysis. Speed’s critique shows the need to have more expansive views about the settler colonial framework, as well as a need to see settler colonial theory in relation to the work of Indigenous scholars.

Environmentalism

When discussing “environmentalism,” I view it as a broad spectrum encompassing a variety of ideologies based on an interest in protecting the environment. Different ideologies usually vary on the purpose for protecting the environment, whether because of the environment’s inherent value, health, justice, recreation, aesthetics, or resources for development.

Environmentalism is a dynamic category of ideas that changes throughout time. Ideologies like conservationism and sustainable development can be more use-oriented and align closer to capitalist goals, but they are nonetheless concerned about protecting the environment. Depending

¹⁹ Macoun and Strakosch, “The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory.”

²⁰ Shannon Speed, “Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala,” *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 783, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0064>.

²¹ *Ibid.*

on the purpose, the means of environmental protection vary too. In Taiwan, environmentalism emerged in the 70s, influenced by western conservation ideologies, Global South/BIPOC led justice-oriented movements, as well as the internationalist conversations about sustainable development.²² Different orientations of environmentalism are expressed in different parts of Taiwan's society. I include both governmental/institutional actors like the as well as more progressive, grassroots movements under the category, noting that there are ideological conflicts that play an important role in the establishment and maintenance of national parks.

When I discuss environmentalism alongside Indigenous rights, I do not necessarily view them as directly conflicting, nor is environmentalism evil. As a matter of fact, environmentalist goals can be benevolent and overlap with Indigenous interests, and coalitions are possible. As Liboiron explains, environmentalism “is not monolithic or stale,” and there are expressions of environmentalism that are anticolonial by “*how* they do not reproduce settler and colonial entitlement to Land and Indigenous cultures, concepts, knowledges, and life.”²³ However, environmentalism is also fully capable of reproducing colonialism—including settler colonialism—with colonialism referring to “a system of domination that grants colonizer [settlers] access to [Indigenous] land for the colonizer's [settler's] goals.”²⁴

In Taiwan, environmentalism is mostly a settler driven ideology. In this way, there are fundamental differences in the “environment” in environmentalism and Indigenous understandings of land. As Liboiron explains, “[Land] is about relations between material aspects some people might think of as landscapes—water, soil, air, plants, stars—and histories, spirits,

²² I intentionally use the term “internationalist” instead of “international.” While organizations like the United Nations and IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) are international in nature and have dominant global influence, they are hardly representative of the world, especially the Global South. This choice is a resistance to the attempts of these internationalist organizations to portray themselves as *the* universally representative “international,” as well as a reminder to pay attention to global power dynamics/voice.

²³ Liboiron, *Pollution Is Colonialism*, 131–32.

²⁴ Max Liboiron, “How Plastic Is a Function of Colonialism,” *Teen Vogue*, December 21, 2018, <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/how-plastic-is-a-function-of-colonialism>.

events, kinships, accountabilities, and other people that aren't human."²⁵ Though Liboiron's description comes from their specific position as a Métis scholar, it helps to clarify how even when environmentalists and Indigenous people both care about the "environment," their sentiments have different meanings. In other words, even when settler environmental activists and Indigenous peoples share common surface goals, they often differ in the desired ends. In particular, "mainstream environmentalism foregrounds access to Indigenous land and its ability to produce settler desires and futures."²⁶ As a result, when collaborating with Indigenous activists, environmentalists can still (re)produce genocidal policies, like regulations around national parks and hunting, because they prioritize settler interests over Indigenous futures and self-determination.

The Imperial Origins of Environmentalism

The way environmentalism reproduces colonial relations should be traced back to the imperial origins of environmentalism. Richard Grove explains the importance of environmentalism in maintaining imperial domination: "ultimately, the long term economic security of the state, which any ecological crisis threatened to undermine, counted politically for far more than the short-term interests of private capital bent on ecologically destructive transformation."²⁷ Environmentalism can be practiced differently, but we must first recognize environmentalism's roots of serving colonizer futures to move towards alternative expressions of environmentalism.

Japanese sustainable forestry in the early 1900s, one of the first examples of environmentalism in Taiwan, demonstrates Grove's point. When the Japanese harvested

²⁵ Liboiron, *Pollution Is Colonialism*, 43.

²⁶ Max Liboiron, Q&A with Max Liboiron, Author of *Pollution is Colonialism*, May 14, 2021, <https://dukeupress.wordpress.com/2021/05/14/qa-with-max-liboiron-author-of-pollution-is-colonialism/>.

²⁷ Richard H. Grove, *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens, and The Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860*, Studies in Environment and History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/cam026/93028654.html>.

camphor, a valuable economic resource, they understood that there were limits to their extraction—they estimated that the forest would be depleted within 200 years. To ensure the longevity of their logging enterprise, they implemented reforestation programs. Even though reforestation was environmentally minded, the process was still enabling imperialism (supporting the Japanese empire), colonialism (access to Native lands for extraction), and settler colonialism (settlers were encouraged to move into the forests to support the project).²⁸

Examining the imperial origins of environmentalism also reveals a historical trend of western environmentalism's appropriation of Indigenous knowledge: "diffusion of indigenous, and in particular, Indian, environmental philosophy and knowledge into western thought and epistemology after the late 15th century has been largely dismissed."²⁹ Grove argues that the development of western environmental knowledge relied heavily on local, Indigenous knowledge on their environment. However, this type of environmentalism is not the same as Indigenous environmental knowledge and land relations; instead, it is an appropriation of Indigenous knowledge to suit the needs of imperial expansion. In a settler colonial context, this appropriation of Indigenous knowledge into western, settler environmentalism serves the settler colonial logic of replacement. When settlers appropriate Indigenous knowledge to serve their own ends, they often corrupt the foundations on which Indigenous knowledge originally developed, taking the knowledge out of its original cultural and historical contexts. The corrupted knowledge replaces Indigenous ways of knowing and serves settler desires to legitimize their presence and power over Indigenous lands. This trend is observable in Taiwan today when environmentalists work with Native people.

²⁸ Ray Wang (王學新), "日治前期桃園地區之製腦業與蕃地拓殖 (1895-1920) The Camphor Industry and Mountain Colonization of Taoyuan Area during the Japanese Rule(1895-1920)," *Taiwan Wen Xian* (台灣文獻) 63, no. 1 (March 2012).

²⁹ Grove, *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens, and The Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860*.

Notes on Translations and Terminologies

Paying attention to the details of translation and terminologies is a key part of my methodology. In this thesis where narratives and discourse are the focal point, it is imperative to consider the language this thesis itself talks in and talks with, including how our positions and assumptions affect the choice of language. Narratives on political issues shape people's thinking and actions; the words we use and the meaning we associate with them is part of the discourse and therefore a key site of study. Subjective ideas and worldviews are imprinted, consciously or not, on the words we choose.

Because I am working within multiple cultural and linguistic contexts, I deliberate over how I write different names and use and translate terms. Words help us traverse across realms of understanding, but sometimes the process is messy. Languages do not mirror each other perfectly. Within a single language, a single term can be used to denote different ideas and can translate to various terms in the other language; connotations and cultural references further complicate the issue. I am also writing in English, which means this work will have a particular audience. Instead of glossing over this process, I want to draw attention to some of the decisions I make. Words can easily become a vehicle of "settler unconsciousness."³⁰ I devote this section to words/terminologies, translation, and language because they affect how ideas are communicated and understood. Before we begin talking about settler colonialism in Taiwan, we have to first look at the language we use—the medium of this discussion.

Translation

As I am working with Taiwanese history and issues, Mandarin texts and sources from Taiwan are a substantial part of my research. Within the Mandarin texts, many other languages play important roles. Of course, this includes Indigenous languages. Because of the 50-year

³⁰ Hirano, Veracini, and Roy, "Vanishing Natives and Taiwan's Settler-Colonial Unconsciousness."

Japanese colonial era, the Japanese language also has heavy influence on terminology and policies. Sometimes, English terms like “conservationism” are interpreted and translated by Taiwanese scholars, and the concepts are then applied in a local context, creating some nuanced differences in meaning. Layers of translations occur for the final result in English that you read.

As a translator, I recognize the power I hold through my interpretation. Unless otherwise stated, all of the quotations from Mandarin texts are translated by me with the original text included, recognizing that my interpretation will not always be perfect. It’s also important to keep in mind that Mandarin is a second language for many Native people and does not always have the capacity to convey what they mean. With specific terms, including policy names, government agencies, and organization names, I will use official translations when available; when they are not, I will choose an existing translation by other scholars or translate the term myself with a translation note, with the intention of making tracing back to the source an easier process.

Names

Mandarin names begin with the surname, so when introducing a Mandarin full name (e.g. Tsai Ing-Wen), I will follow the original order. If the romanization of an author’s name or an English name is not provided within the source I use, I romanize Mandarin names with Chinese pinyin.³¹

Indigenous names are political and interconnected to people’s identities.³² I pay close attention to how I refer to the names of Indigenous peoples. In Taiwan, Indigenous names are usually presented/exist in two ways: two names, a Mandarin name and an Indigenous name (e.g. 浦忠勇 (Pu Jong-Yong) and Tibusung’u Poiconu), or one name, an Indigenous name

³¹ Chinese pinyin is more standardized, while with Taiwan’s system the same character may be spelled in many ways. Unless the Taiwan romanization is more commonly used and recognized, such as Kuomintang (KMT), I will use Chinese pinyin for consistency.

³² Name reclamation is an ongoing issue.

transliterated with Mandarin characters and the original Indigenous name (e.g. 夷將·拔路兒 and Icyang Parod). If an Indigenous person usually uses their Mandarin name (i.e. I have to look at other sources to find their Indigenous name), I will include their Indigenous name in the introduction but refer to them with their Mandarin name. If an Indigenous person uses both their Mandarin and Indigenous names, I prioritize using their Indigenous name. When referring to Indigenous names, instead of following western academic writing practice of using surnames, I will always use the full name because not all Indigenous peoples have a surname/family name.³³ If a Mandarin text references an Indigenous person with only their Mandarin transliterated Indigenous name, I will transliterate the Mandarin Indigenous name into English using Chinese pinyin, since I cannot know the Indigenous spelling. These decisions are imperfect, but I try to be as respectful as possible.

Indigenous Peoples

When I use “Indigenous peoples” or “Natives,” I mean all Indigenous Peoples of Taiwan, officially recognized or not.³⁴ In Taiwan, the term that would translate to “Indigenous” is “原住民族 *yuanzhuminzu*,” which usually refers to the 16 nationally recognized peoples, while Pingpu Indigenous peoples (平埔族群 *pingpuzuqun*, meaning plains peoples) are excluded and seen as a separate category. The Pingpu peoples experienced longer periods of colonialism and forced assimilation, are not included in the national census, and do not have their traditional territories

³³ This is especially important in certain cases. Pan-Tayal names usually consist of the person’s name (Losin) and a parent’s name (Watan) to make the full name (Losin Watan). Referencing Losin Watan as “Losin” is correct, but referencing him as “Watan” would be actually referencing his parent. In the Tao language, a person’s name changes when they have children and grandchildren. Syaman Rapongan, for example, means “father of Rapongan.” Referencing Syaman Rapongan as “Rapongan” would be actually referencing his child, while referencing him as “Syaman” would be calling him “father.” I use the full names to avoid such errors.

³⁴ Saying “peoples,” plural with an S, instead of “plural” is a recognition of the push during the Indigenous People’s Movement to add “zu (族)” and recognize that there are many groups of Indigenous people instead of a monolith.

nationally recognized. While the term *yuanzhuminzu* includes some nationally recognized Pingpu peoples, the majority of Pingpu peoples are not nationally recognized. These confusing terminologies are the result of colonial categorization. I clarify this term because erasure is a critical problem that Pingpu peoples face; to use the term “Indigenous” without including Pingpu peoples contributes to erasure. Additionally, I employ the transliteration “Pingpu” for English rather than using the translation “plains” for two reasons. First, it so happens that the colonial government further separates officially recognized Indigenous peoples into plains and mountains Indigenous people.³⁵ Second, “plains people,” (平地人 *pingdiren*) is a common euphemism for non-Natives or Han people (similar to how some people avoid saying “white” directly), and I want to avoid the confusion between the two.

I lay out these different terms that colonizers use to refer to Indigenous peoples to show the terms’ colonial, oversimplifying, and often contradictory nature and the necessity of critical thinking when using them. During the Qing and Japanese regime, colonizers used the terms “sheng 生” and “shu 熟” to differentiate the level of familiarity, “civilization,” and/or assimilation, a spectrum to identify Indigenous people in relation to themselves; the remnants of this type of categorization can be found with the categories of *pingpuzuqun/yuanzhuminzu*.³⁶ During the KMT era, the government called Indigenous peoples “Mountain Compatriots”

³⁵ Before Taiwan adopted the term “Indigenous (原住民),” the KMT regime called Native people “Mountain Compatriots,” and divided them between plains and mountains, resulting in the nonsensical categories of “Plains Mountain Compatriots” and “Mountain Mountain Compatriots.” For more on the evolution of the terms for Indigenous people in Taiwan, Tomonori Sugimoto’s “Settler Colonial Incorporation and Inheritance: Historical Sciences, Indigeneity, and Settler Narratives in Post-WWII Taiwan” provides a good discussion.

³⁶ In Mandarin, the two terms evokes the ideas of “familiar/unfamiliar” and are derived from the concepts of “raw” and “cooked.” “Raw” and “cooked” is the most common English translation, though this elicits connotations about food and civility/savagery in western contexts (think Claude Lévi-Strauss’s *The Raw and the Cooked*) that are not as prevalent in Mandarin contexts. For example, when I was in a history class in Taiwan, when discussing how colonial officials used these terms in different ways to categorize Natives, there was no discussion about food or who ate raw or cooked food. I will not elaborate on the two terms and translation choices, though it is a thought-provoking one. For more on this terminology, see Emma J. Teng’s *Taiwan’s Imagined Geography* and her chapter “The Raw and the Cooked.”

denoting their status as fellow Chinese people to assert legitimacy over Taiwan as Chinese land.³⁷ These all ignore the self-determination of Indigenous peoples and are exercises of domination. The present-day differentiation between *yuanzhumin* and *pingpuzuqun* is based on colonial recognition: the groups of people who fit under *pingpuzuqun* has shifted based on national recognition, and today *pingpuzuqun* denotes a status of recognition and consequently a political experience, rather than any significant cultural group.

While Indigenous peoples have organized against the settler colonial state together, they are not a monolith, with different histories, cultures, and relations with each other. The 16 officially recognized peoples follow: Pangcah (Amis), Tayal, Truku, Seediq, Say Siyat, Bunun, Thao, Tsou, Paiwan, Rukai, Puyuma, Tao (Yami), Kalavan, Sakizaya, Hla'alua, and Kanakanavu. The spelling I use is only one version of different variations. In my case studies, the Indigenous peoples involved are the Tayal and Bunun. There are smaller units within each group of peoples, conventionally referred to as “buluo” (部落) in Mandarin, which I will explain in a following section.

Han

The term “Han,” a contested notion itself, is used here similarly to how “white” is used in white settler colonial contexts. There are complex power dynamics within different groups of Han people. For example, there are ethnic groups like the Hoklo and the Hakka. There are also politicized categorizations, like *benshengren* (本省人), which translates literally to “original/this provincial people,” the province referring to the Taiwan province and term referring to the Han (mostly Hoklo and Hakka) settlers that arrived before KMT regime, and the corresponding *waishengren* (外省人), literally “extra-provincial people,” referring to Han settlers who came to

³⁷ Tomonori Sugimoto, “Settler Colonial Incorporation and Inheritance: Historical Sciences, Indigeneity, and Settler Narratives in Post-WWII Taiwan,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 8, no. 3 (March 21, 2017): 283–97, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2017.1303596>.

Taiwan with the KMT, usually not Hoklo or Hakka, and who do not speak their respective dialects. Different groups of Han people have different relations to each other and to Indigenous peoples. However, similar to “white,” “Han” is the generalizing term which many Indigenous people in Taiwan use to refer to the settlers who originally came from China. Using the term “Han” avoids the complexities that using “Chinese” would bring, since Chinese relates closer to a nation-state than ethnicity per se, and many Han settlers in Taiwan do not identify as Chinese.³⁸ There are other terms that refer to the non-Indigenous population, like “pingdiren” or people from the plains, a commonly used euphemistic term that might be confused with the Pingpu (plains) Indigenous peoples in the English context.

Spaces: Or why “buluo” is not translatable

I discuss the term “buluo” with terms around space because of contentions over land and place. The issue of translating spaces and using spacial terminologies reflects a problem of land and spaces that is directly caused by colonization: historical and ongoing displacement, as well as colonial concepts of categories and space imposed on Indigenous traditional territories and groups. I bring this issue up to consider different references of and overlapping claims over spaces.

Although there are many existing translations for buluo including tribe, village, and tribal community, I choose to use the transliteration because no English term can fully encapsulate the complexity of the original Mandarin term. In Mandarin, buluo usually refers to a subgroup of Indigenous peoples belonging in the same ethnic group (族群 zuqun): “A buluo is typically made up of tens or hundreds of people living in the same area and maintaining close relations and sharing of resources . . . The Mandarin Chinese terms for classifying indigenous peoples in

³⁸ See Shih Shu-Mei, “The Concept of the Sinophone.”

Taiwan are accurate, but they are often translated into English incorrectly.”³⁹ This idea is similar to the English term, “tribe.” Hsu troubles the term in her article, “Lost, Found and Troubled in Translation: Reconsidering Imagined Indigenous ‘Communities’ in Post-Disaster Taiwan Settings,” and explains her translation:

Acknowledging the flawed social theory and connotations that in the past have propagated the term “tribe” (Lowe, 2001), I have elected to use “tribal community” to refer to an Indigenous community (bùluò), to distinguish it from the externally derived and designated administrative “rural village” (cūn; henceforth referred to as “village”) unit, as well as the direct translation of the term “community” (社區, shèqū).

Hsu also explains that “bùluò (tribal community) is simultaneously about people in addition to land and space—the interrelatedness of people- environment-cosmos relationships.”⁴⁰ However, I don’t think the phrase “tribal community” captures the element of “land and space.”

Following Hsu’s discussion, buluo can also mean a place/settlement that people can return to, so it becomes complicated when used in relation to space. Forced relocation meant that sometimes, a buluo’s current location is different from its original or traditional territory. This is why when many Indigenous peoples embark on a “root-finding journey” (尋根之旅), they sometimes (re)visit the “old buluo” (舊部落). This suggests an understanding of two buluos, one denoting the current community, one denoting the traditional territories.

The term buluo can also be troubled because of the mixing of traditional buluos/communities, which is a result of relocation and artificial grouping by colonizers. This is reflected in an ongoing problem with “buluo conferences”, a new administrative unit that sometimes combines multiple buluos that identify differently into a single decision-making unit. Here again, the government attempts to group Indigenous peoples so they are legible and

³⁹ Minna Hsu, “Lost, Found and Troubled in Translation: Reconsidering Imagined Indigenous ‘Communities’ in Post-Disaster Taiwan Settings,” *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 12, no. 1 (March 2016): 71–85, <https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.1.6>. Quoting Reid, D. C. (2010). *Indigenous rights in Taiwan and the Smangus case* (Unpublished MA thesis). National Chengchi University, Taiwan.

⁴⁰ Ibid. Hsu’s discussion is centered on how post-disaster relocation affects categorizations of communities.

governable. With the complications of the Mandarin term, I just use the original word instead of translating, letting it represent all the ideas it does.

In Indigenous languages, sometimes people refer to a buluo simply with its name, like “Skadang,” but there are Native terms that overlap with buluo, like “Alang Skadang” to mean Skadang buluo. Tayal and Truku languages both use the term “alang.” In Bunun, the term “asang” or “acang” is used to denote buluo.⁴¹ However, these Indigenous terms for buluo can also mean “home” or “nation.” For example, when talking about people from one buluo building a house in another buluo, Pilin Yapu writes, “In Tayal society, a buluo (alang) is like a nation, so it is like when nation A wants to build a house in nation B, it involves national sovereignty.”⁴² While this suggests that buluo could mean nation, similar to the use of “Indigenous nations” in North America, I argue that the Mandarin concept of “buluo” has other connotations. Nation would be a better translation for the Indigenous terms rather than the Mandarin one.

There are other terms that denote Indigenous land beside buluo. For example, “traditional territory” (傳統領域) refers to the land that different tribes have historically lived on, regardless of the land’s status under the colonial system. Indigenous reserve lands (原住民保留地) are categories from a policy that originated in the Japanese colonial era, designating lands for Natives to live on, similar to reservations, but based on individual ownership. This policy exists today, and the reserve lands are protected from sales to non-Natives, though there are loopholes that contribute to continual land dispossession. Additionally, administrative units such as buluo conferences or villages are used to denote jurisdiction over spaces that can differ from how

⁴¹ I know that alang is used in Truku and Tayal, and I looked up the Bunun term from the governmental Council of Indigenous Peoples’ (CIP) online language platform.

⁴² Pilin Yapu (比令·亞布), *Yaba 的話: 一個當代泰雅人的傳統沈思 (Words from Yaba)* (Miaoli Dahu Xiang: Shue-pa National Park, 2009), 114.

Original text: “因為在泰雅的社會中，一個部落就好比一個國家，甲國家要到乙國建房子一般，牽涉到國家的主權問題”

communities group themselves and their land.⁴³ All of these are different concepts to describe overlapping spaces. Indigenous people have challenged colonial space categorization through the method of “buluo mapping,” which I discuss in Chapter 6. I flag these issues to challenge conventional ways of space categorization, especially the colonial assumptions embedded within different terms.

PART 2: Background

Chapter 3: Literature Review

Taiwan as a Settler Colonial Formation

When Taiwan is discussed within the global political context, it usually comes up as a topic of contentious statehood in relation to China or a proxy for the wider tensions between China and the US, a “Second Cold War.” This tendency to view Taiwan in these frames is based on western centric assumptions about international politics and statehood. It also privileges conversations around Han Taiwanese people and their interests. As Shih Shu-Mei argues, the “between [US and China] empires narrative” is “a construction that is itself also settler colonial: it makes invisible the reality of settler colonialism and displaces the claims of the indigenous peoples.”⁴⁴ One of my main goals when I began my research was to problematize this false dichotomy by analyzing Taiwan as a settler colonial state.

To understand Taiwan as a settler colonial state, consider Taiwan first as an imperial formation, “not [a] steady [state] but [a state] of becoming.”⁴⁵ A state currently ruled by Han settlers, Taiwan’s sovereignty and statehood remains ambiguous as it is situated within the

⁴³ For more about administration units, See Hsu’s “Lost, Found and Troubled in Translation: Reconsidering Imagined Indigenous ‘Communities’ in Post-Disaster Taiwan Settings.”

⁴⁴ Shu-Mei Shih, “Theory in a Relational World,” *Comparative Literature Studies* 53, no. 4 (December 1, 2016): 40, <https://doi.org/10.5325/complitstudies.53.4.0722>.

⁴⁵ Ann Laura Stoler and Carole McGranahan, “Introduction: Refiguring Imperial Terrains,” in *Imperial Formations* (Sante Fe: SAR Press, 2007), 8–9, <https://www.colorado.edu/anthropology/sites/default/files/attached-files/imperialformationsintroduction.pdf>.

convergence zone of the Chinese and US empires. Seeing Taiwan as an imperial formation allows us to understand mainstream discourse around Taiwan critically.⁴⁶ However, Taiwan is not an imperial formation in relation to just China and the US, as observed in the present, but one located within a web of imperial formations and the arena of global imperial competition. In this context, Taiwan's relations to other colonial experiences becomes more obvious, especially with other settler colonial formations.⁴⁷ Take the process of "cross-imperial knowledge acquisition and application[, which includes] a poaching of practices, a searching for new technologies, an invigorating of categories of exception and difference, and a competing for status."⁴⁸ By following how the concept of *terra nullius*, "those who cultivate land with their labor have the right to claim ownership," spread throughout imperial formations and to Qing China for its expansion into eastern Taiwan, we find clear connections between various settler colonial states across the globe.

Prior to 1874, though settlers encroached on Taiwan's Indigenous lands under lax governance, the Qing government maintained the line between Han settlers and Indigenous peoples in the eastern region. However, the proliferation of the concept of *terra nullius* between imperial states prompted the Qing empire to change its conduct in Taiwan. To understand what happened, we can look at Katsuya Hirano's narrative of how the Lockean idea moved between the Americans and Japanese governments:⁴⁹

A narrative of "wide open spaces" in the American west just waiting to be filled by enterprising white settlers underwrote U.S. homesteading policies and rendered westward expansion as "manifest destiny," a kind of nationalist moral imperative. The Meiji government implemented a similar version of manifest destiny or civilizing mission. In

⁴⁶ For an articulation that rejects both sides, see Funie Hsu, Brian Hioe, and Wen Liu, "Collective Statement on Taiwan Independence: Building Global Solidarity and Rejecting US Military Empire," *American Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (2017): 465–68, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0039>.

⁴⁷ The phrase "settler colonial formation" is used in Tomonori Sugimoto's "The Yellow Man's Burden: The Politics of Settler Colonialism in Hokkaidō and Taiwan." Sugimoto adopts the idea of "formations" as "states of becoming" to describe Taiwan and Hokkaido; I find that it is necessary to understand Taiwan both as imperial and settler colonial formations.

⁴⁸ Stoler and McGranahan, "Introduction: Refiguring Imperial Terrains," 5.

⁴⁹ Katsuya Hirano, "Hokkaidō 150: Settler Colonialism and Indigeneity in Modern Japan and Beyond," *Critical Asian Studies* 51, no. 4 (October 2, 2019): 601, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2019.1665291>.

1871, Kuroda Kiyotaka, concerned about Russia's push eastward, visited the United States looking for a leader in the initial exploration of Hokkaidō. On President Ulysses Grant's recommendation, Kuroda met with Horace Capron, a commissioner in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Capron previously had managed the forced removal of Native Americans from Texas after the Mexican-American War (1846-1848). In 1851, Capron had been appointed as the federal government's Indian agent in Texas by President Millard Fillmore. He oversaw the removal of Creeks, Delawares, Kickapoos, Shawnees, Tonkaways, and other Indigenous groups to Oklahoma Indian Territory. Kuroda persuaded Capron to accept an appointment as a special adviser to the Japanese government.⁵⁰

As the Japanese empire competed with the Russian empire in Asia, it employed the cross-imperial knowledge of *terra nullius* and other colonial strategies of the American empire to claim Ainu land in Hokkaido. The Qing empire also interacted and competed with these empires in this same period. After the Mudan Incident of 1874, also known as the Japanese invasion of Taiwan, the Qing government realized that if it did not actively govern and assert its claim on eastern Taiwan, Japan would take over. Based on the premise of *terra nullius*, a disregard to Indigenous sovereignty and presence in eastern Taiwan, the Qing government began its active conquest of the eastern regions to deter Japanese imperial expansion into its zones of influence. Another example of the cross-imperial knowledge exchange is the origins of national parks in Taiwan, based on both American and Japanese ideologies. I explain this in detail in Chapter 5.

Locating Taiwan within the context of global imperialism and in relation to other colonial histories, we can begin to see how Taiwan fits in and expands the evolving field of settler colonial studies. In this field predominated by a focus on white/Anglo settler colonial states, critical scholarship on settler colonialism in Taiwan has been slowly making an appearance in the past two decades. In this chapter, I examine this developing body of scholarship to see how Taiwan has been studied in relation to settler colonialism. I do not include Mandarin literature because the specific term, "settler colonialism" is not widely used in Mandarin. This does not mean that Indigenous people of Taiwan or some non-Native scholars are unaware of settler colonialism; there is plenty of Mandarin literature (especially by Indigenous authors) focusing Indigenous

⁵⁰ Ibid, 603.

issues, histories, etc. that offer critical analyses. However, the specific terminology of “settler colonialism” remains limited in use.⁵¹ Within Mandarin scholarship in Taiwan, Shih Cheng-Feng is the only scholar I found that has consistently used “settler colonial society” (墾殖社會) to describe Taiwan critically for at least two decades.⁵² For this reason, my analysis focuses on English settler colonial literature. However, within English language literature on Taiwan’s settler colonialism, there is a group of Taiwanese scholars that are connected to Taiwan’s (Sinophone/Mandarin) academic sphere, acting as a link between western theories on settler colonialism and conversations on the ground in Taiwan. There are different groups of conversations with varying degrees of connection. I also note the deep ties between Taiwan’s Indigenous Studies and scholars in American Indian Studies and global Indigenous studies.⁵³

Settler Colonial Studies

The first group of literature I discuss is more western-based and has closer ties with the field of settler colonial studies. In 2018, Katsuya Hirano, Lorenzo Veracini, and Toulouse-Antonin Roy published “Vanishing Natives and Taiwan’s Settler-Colonial Unconsciousness.” Katsuya Hirano also wrote about Japanese settler colonialism in Hokkaido, and Lorenzo Veracini is a key scholar in settler colonial studies. The majority of their article focuses on re-narrating Taiwan’s colonial history from the Dutch up to the post-WWII period through a settler colonial framework. While the authors mostly cite English language sources, their narrative corresponds with what I learned in an introductory Indigenous History and Geography course taught by Amis

⁵¹ For example, Ciwas Ali’s “醜惡的內部殖民·醜惡的國家公園遮羞布 [The Vile Internal Colonialism: The Vile National Park Loincloth]” discussion with the term “internal colonialism” is what we would associate with settler colonialism.

⁵² For example, Shih published “建構台灣政治史的嘗試——由 creole 到 mestizo 的墾殖社會 [An Attempt to Construct Taiwan’s Political History: A Settler Colonial Society From Creole to Mestizo]” in 2001.

⁵³ This conference between UCLA and NTNU is a demonstration of the connections between scholars from different fields. For a list of speakers, see ““Indigenous Knowledge, Taiwan: Comparative and Relational Perspectives (UCLA-NTNU Taiwan Studies Initiative Conference),” Events, UCLA Asia Pacific Center, May 2018, <https://www.international.ucla.edu/apc/event/13058>.

(Pangcah) Professor Lin Su-Chen (Wusay Lafin) at National Dong Hwa University's College of Indigenous studies. For English-speaking readers unfamiliar with Taiwan, this article is an accessible introductory overview of Taiwan's colonial history.

Hirano et al. trail off their narrative focus beginning with the post-WWII period, instead employing a historiographical lens. For the KMT authoritarian rule era, which marks the beginning of the post-war period, Hirano et al. writes in conversation with Tomonori Sugimoto about the change from the new government repression of both older settlers and Natives to a process of settler self-indigenization, through which settlers of different political positions move to “[construct] collective ‘self,’” which “demands the willful forgetting of the past”—or “unconsciousness.”⁵⁴ Neither Hirano et al. nor Sugimoto writes directly about the democratization era in the 1980s to 1990s, a period that defined today's political scene *and* how historical narratives are being reconstructed in the present. I attempt to bridge this gap in my next chapter.

The final section explains their work as a response to other scholar's calls to rethink historical narratives about Taiwan. First, Hirano et al. discuss Ann Heylen's problematization of Taiwan's traditional historiography and her analysis of Ts'ao Yong-Ho's work as a breakthrough. Unlike previous frameworks that locate Taiwan's history in relation to China, Ts'ao's Taiwan island framework dives into the multiethnic interactions within Taiwan and connects Taiwan to maritime regions.⁵⁵ Heylon pushes further, suggesting an analysis of Chinese migrants not simply as victims of oppression but also as colonizers, and Hirano et al. write in response with settler colonial analysis. They also write in response to Shih, who points out the limitations of post-colonial analyses in Taiwan and the necessity in identifying and critiquing settler colonial knowledge formation. I discuss Shih's work in the next section.

⁵⁴ Hirano, Roy, and Veracini, “Vanishing Natives and Taiwan's Settler Colonial Unconsciousness,” 213.

⁵⁵ Ts'ao's Taiwan island framework (台灣島史觀) was proposed in 1990. The historical and political context of Ts'ao's work itself is important: this narrative intervention occurred at the tail end of the democratization era, which encompasses both the Indigenous rights and settler nativist movements. I discuss this period in the next chapter.

Similar to Hirano et al., Tomonori Sugimoto's writings also contribute directly to the settler colonial studies field. His Master's thesis, "The Yellow Man's Burden: The Politics of Settler Colonialism in Hokkaidō and Taiwan" published in 2012, is one of the earlier English-language scholarship that provides a more comprehensive analysis of Taiwan through a settler colonial framework.⁵⁶ Like Hirano, Sugimoto also investigates Japanese settler colonialism in Hokkaido, and in this thesis Sugimoto connects the two locales through the common experience of Japanese imperialism. While the analysis by Hirano et al. is heavier on pre-KMT periods, Sugimoto's research leans toward post WWII time periods, such as his 2019 ethnographic research of the Amis (Pangcah) migration to Taipei in "Urban Settler Colonialism: Policing and Displacing Indigeneity in Taipei, Taiwan."⁵⁷ His other article, "Settler Colonial Incorporation and Inheritance: Historical Sciences, Indigeneity, and Settler Narratives in Post-WWII Taiwan," provides a critical analysis of Taiwan's postwar historical sciences and their selective incorporation and inheritance of Indigeneity into the national narratives as essential to settler colonialism. This work is an important intervention on Taiwan's "history-making and narrativization," which Sugimoto argues is central to settler colonial governance in Taiwan.⁵⁸ Sugimoto looks at how anthropologists and historians in the post-WWII era produced settler colonial narratives that incorporated Indigeneity only to the advantage of settler legitimacy over Taiwan. The liberal multiculturalist narratives of today's political scene in Taiwan have evolved from the processes of inheritance and incorporation within the narratives that Sugimoto discusses. Sugimoto's historiographical method of reading national narratives in this article is actually quite similar to Tsai Lin-Chin's 2019 dissertation, "Re-conceptualizing Taiwan: Settler Colonial

⁵⁶ Tomonori Sugimoto, "The Yellow Man's Burden: The Politics of Settler Colonialism in Hokkaidō and Taiwan" (2013).

⁵⁷ Tomonori Sugimoto, "Urban Settler Colonialism: Policing and Displacing Indigeneity in Taipei, Taiwan," *City & Society* 31, no. 2 (2019): 227–50, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ciso.12210>.

⁵⁸ Sugimoto, "Settler Colonial Incorporation and Inheritance," 3.

This article by Sugimoto was the first article I encountered that truly helped me understand settler colonialism in Taiwan at a point when I knew very little about Taiwan's political and historical contexts. I am very grateful for his work.

Criticism and Cultural Production,” though there appear no direct connections in the bibliographies, which is partially why I discuss Tsai’s writings separately.

Conversations Connecting back to Taiwan

In this section, I focus on three groups of Taiwanese scholars writing in English most of which are non-Native (some explicitly non-Native, some assumed based on the lack of identification). I group them apart from the scholars from the previous section because first, these scholars are writing from spaces that are more or less further away from the field of settler colonial studies ‘proper,’ and secondly, they all have connections back to Taiwanese institutions and conversations. I find this connection important because while the settler colonial framework is useful to understand Taiwan, “settler colonialism” as both a term and a concept remains in the peripheries of discourse in Taiwan.

The first group of Taiwanese scholars is actually less connected to settler colonial studies, focusing on Indigenous issues and lacking a distinct settler colonial framework. I choose to include them to consider both the increased recognition of Indigeneity in Taiwan and the limits of non-Native scholarship when writing about Indigeneity without consciousness about colonialism. In “The Production of Indigeneity: Contemporary Indigenous Literature in Taiwan and Trans-cultural Inheritance” (2009), Chiu Kuei-Fen examines contemporary Indigenous literature and culture, especially that of Syaman Rapongan, as an inheritance to Taiwanese identity. Her framing mirrors Sugimoto’s discussion of settler inheritance of Indigenous identity: “In post-authoritarian molecular anthropology, the indigeneity of indigenous peoples to the island of Taiwan is recognized. However... Descendants of Han Chinese settlers also claim belonging there, arguing that they have inherited indigenous genes, which makes them uniquely

‘Taiwanese.’”⁵⁹ A quote from Chiu bears striking resemblance to Sugimoto’s observation: “In the Qing dynasty, many migrants from China took indigenous women as their wives because very few Chinese women were allowed to come to Taiwan. Since the female ancestors of many Taiwanese were indigenous women, to designate Taiwanese as ethnic Chinese is, in a sense, a patriarchal practice that ignores the important indigenous constituent of Taiwanese identity. In other words, to reshape their Taiwanese identity, people need to acknowledge their matrilineal indigenous roots.”⁶⁰ Chiu demonstrates a problematic understanding of Indigenous identity and how ambiguous “Indigenous ancestors” can be claimed by non-Native Taiwanese people to justify their entitlement of Taiwan.⁶¹ At the same time, Chiu incorrectly refers to Syaman Rapongan as “Rapongan,” demonstrating a lack of knowledge about Indigenous culture and specifically Tao naming practices. As I noted in Chapter 2 on translations, in the Tao language, a person’s name changes when they have children and grandchildren. Syaman Rapongan means “father of Rapongan,” and referencing Syaman Rapongan as “Rapongan” would be actually referencing his child.

Similar to Chiu, Huang Hsinya also writes about Indigenous literature with a focus on Syaman Rapongan in her article, “Indigenous Taiwan as Location of Native American and Indigenous Studies” (2014). Through Syaman Rapongan’s literature, Huang positions Taiwan in relation to Native American studies and also with Pacific Islanders. While Huang is less brazen with the rhetoric of inheritance/nativism and focuses more on the literature and cultural connections to the Pacific, her positioning of Taiwan in relation to the Pacific Islands echoes efforts by a subset of settlers who wish to distance themselves from mainland China. While locating Taiwan in relation with other Pacific Islands is not problematic itself but actually

⁵⁹ Sugimoto, “Settler Colonial Incorporation and Inheritance.”

⁶⁰ Chiu, “The Production of Indigeneity,” 1082.

⁶¹ The Indigenous women Chiu talks about generally refers to groups of Pingpu peoples who are unrecognized by the government because what they claim as “few numbers” and “assimilation.” By framing the Pingpu groups as “ancestors” and markers of Indigeneity rather than real, living peoples and cultures, rhetoric like Chiu’s contributes to ongoing Pingpu erasure.

important in disrupting mainstream geopolitical narratives, the fact that a non-Indigenous person does it requires us to consider the modern day Taiwanese political contexts, especially when Huang, like Chiu, incorrectly refers Syaman Rapongan as “Rapongan.” While Chiu and Huang’s writings show increased recognition of Indigeneity in Taiwan, they fall short in many aspects, especially in their equivocation of Indigenous literature as “Taiwanese” when what constitutes as “Taiwanese” or who can claim “Taiwan” is an open-ended discussion.

The English scholarship of non-Native scholars reflect the shortfall of settlers writing about Indigeneity in Taiwan without contending with colonialism. Another example that is not from the literature discipline is Huang Shu-Min and Liu Shao-Hua’s article, “Discrimination and Incorporation of Taiwanese Indigenous Austronesian Peoples.”⁶² also focus on Indigenous issues, specifically policy, but write clearly from the “objective” perspective that views Indigenous peoples as the “other” and object of study. We can compare these non-Native works with the dissertation of Paiwan scholar Chang Hsin-Wen (Lengmengman of the Rovaniyaw family), “Wounded Land and Wounded Peoples: Attitudes of Paiwan People and Tao People toward Nuclear Waste” (2017). While Chang does not explicitly mention settler colonialism either, her writing as a Paiwan scholar offers a critical understanding of Indigenous issues and environmental justice in context of Indigeneity. Unlike Huang and Chiu, Chang also correctly references Syaman Rapongan name in her English dissertation, which suggests that the mistake by Huang and Chiu has more to do with lack of cultural knowledge than the issue referencing last names in English academic writing practices.

Besides Chang, there are numerous Indigenous scholars contributing Taiwan’s Indigenous Studies field, with the National Dong Hwa University as a key hub for Indigenous scholarship. Some have published in English, like Hsieh Jolan (Bavaragh Dagalomai), a Siraya

⁶² Shu-Min Huang and Shao-Hua Liu, “Discrimination and Incorporation of Taiwanese Indigenous Austronesian Peoples,” *Asian Ethnicity* 17, no. 2 (March 2016): 294–312, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2015.1112726>.

(Pingpu) scholar, and Awi Mona, a Seediq scholar. The field of Taiwan Indigenous Studies is robust, and I will not cover them as they are out of scope for my purposes of considering scholarship in relation to settler colonial studies. However, I introduce these Indigenous scholars of Indigenous Studies in comparison to this first group of non-Native English scholarship to spotlight the limitations in existing Taiwanese English literature about Taiwan's Indigenous people, i.e., the missing recognition of colonialism in relation to Indigenous issues.

The second group of literature employs a (settler) colonial lens to examine the issues it studies. Minna Hsu has authored many articles on disaster studies, especially in relation to Indigeneity in Taiwan. In her work co-authored with Richard Howitt and Fiona Miller, "Procedural Vulnerability and Institutional Capacity Deficits in Post-Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction: Insights from Wutai Rukai Experiences of Typhoon Morakot" (2015), they examine the post-disaster interventions in the Indigenous Rukai communities and how such interventions can "[reproduce] colonial patterns of displacement, dislocation, and disadvantage."⁶³ The authors only name Taiwan as having "settler-colonial history" and describe it as postcolonial, which is not accurate. However, this work is important in identifying colonialism as ongoing and reproduced in the present. Similarly, Hsu's 2016 article, "Lost, Found and Troubled in Translation: Reconsidering Imagined Indigenous 'Communities' in Post-Disaster Taiwan Settings" still employs a postcolonial framework, but it questions the postcoloniality in considering ongoing colonial practices in post-disaster settings. More importantly, it is one of the few works that interrogates the terminologies and translations when discussing Indigenous issues in Taiwan.⁶⁴ In discussing terminologies for Indigenous "community" and "place," especially after post-disaster relocation and displacement, Hsu makes note of the government's inscription

⁶³ Minna Hsu, Richard Howitt, and Fiona Miller, "Procedural Vulnerability and Institutional Capacity Deficits in Post-Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction: Insights from Wutai Rukai Experiences of Typhoon Morakot," *Human Organization* 74, no. 4 (January 1, 2015): 308–18, <https://doi.org/10.17730/0018-7259-74.4.308>.

⁶⁴ I noted the issue of terminology in Chapter 2 and quoted Hsu in my discussion on how to translate "buluo."

of Mandarin administrative terms: “similar to colonial impositions and categories, [post-disaster settlements/communities] are once again defined, delineated, and captured at a specific point in time, which is henceforth meant to represent the official and concrete reality.”⁶⁵ Hsu’s critique of the effects of post-disaster policies on Indigenous communities and interrogation of terminologies pushes the conversation about colonialism in Taiwan as a present rather than a distant past.

Wu Yi-Cheng’s 2019 article “Governing Indigenous Drinking: *Jiejiu* in Settler-Colonial Taiwan” explicitly names Taiwan as a settler colonial regime. As a practicing psychiatrist at Taiwan’s Hsinchu Mackay Memorial Hospital, Wu examines the “current health interventions that target indigenous people who drink under settler-colonial conditions.”⁶⁶ Wu critiques the existing interventions, complicating the issue by situating Indigenous drinking and drinking culture in settler colonial realities. While Wu writes less about settler colonial conditions in general than how they affect governance over Indigenous drinking, like Hsu, he partakes in the broader conversation about settler colonialism in Taiwan. Wu actually cites Taiwanese researchers that highlight settler colonialism: Shih Cheng-Feng, Shih Shu-Mei, and Minna Hsu.⁶⁷ This also explains why it makes sense to group the Taiwanese scholars together as connected conversations.

Tsai Lin-Chin’s dissertation “Re-conceptualizing Taiwan: Settler Colonial Criticism and Cultural Production” is in many ways similar to Tomonori Sugimoto’s work, “Settler Incorporation and Inheritance” in its historiographical analysis and its critical ideas about Indigeneity’s relation to Taiwan’s “national” identity, especially that of settlers (interestingly, Tsai does not reference Sugimoto).⁶⁸ While Sugimoto looks at anthropology, Tsai examines

⁶⁵ Hsu, “Lost, Found and Troubled in Translation,” 81.

⁶⁶ Yi-Cheng Wu, “Governing Indigenous Drinking: *Jiejiu* in Settler-Colonial Taiwan,” *Human Organization* 78, no. 3 (September 1, 2019): 230, <https://doi.org/10.17730/0018-7259.78.3.230>.

⁶⁷ Shih is a prolific academic writing about politics, Indigenous issues, and settler colonialism, though mostly in Mandarin. He is also a professor in the National Dong Hwa University

⁶⁸ Lin-chin Tsai, “Re-Conceptualizing Taiwan: Settler Colonial Criticism and Cultural Production” (UCLA, 2019), <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/30h7d8r5>.

cultural production by Han Taiwanese authors, naming the settler colonial consciousness embedded in such works. Tsai also pushes against the post-colonial framing of Taiwan and the Han-centric historical narratives through a settler colonial framework. Tsai's work is distinct in the way he parses through the complexity of Han Taiwanese cultures and identities in the context of multiple layers of colonial experiences.

Shih Shu-Mei is Tsai's advisor for his dissertation, and along with Tsai, she edited the Mandarin text *Keywords of Taiwan Theory* and the book *Indigenous Knowledge in Taiwan and Beyond*, which curates a collection of translated writings by prominent Taiwanese Indigenous studies scholars and English-language ones like Hirano et al. "Vanishing Natives and Taiwan's Settler Colonial Unconsciousness" (2017).⁶⁹ Shih Shu-Mei is best known for her work in Sinophone studies, through which she named Taiwan as a settler colonial state in her work, "The Concept of the Sinophone" as early as 2011 and theorized "Chinese-ness" in relation to settler and continental colonialisms.⁷⁰ Unlike Sugimoto's 2012 thesis, which is positioned closer to settler colonial studies and Indigenous studies, Shih's analysis of Taiwan's settler colonialism comes from her work in Sinophone and literature studies. From that entry point, Shih wrote more about Taiwan's settler colonialism in her 2016 article, "Theory in a Relational World." This work locates Taiwan in relation to other settler colonial states and notes Taiwan's settler colonial (un)consciousness, to borrow from Hirano et al., in its position "between empires," which I cite at the beginning of this chapter.

However, Shih's writing in this 2016 article also echoes Chiu in reproducing the myth—incorporation and inheritance, as Sugimoto characterizes—of the "nativeness" of the Han majority in Taiwan, through her description of the incorporation of Pingpu Indigenous peoples "into the majority Han Taiwanese" and "pervasive intermarriages between Han Taiwanese and Austronesian peoples over the centuries leading to a large mixed population which was also only

⁶⁹ Shu-mei Shih and Lin-chin Tsai, *Indigenous Knowledge in Taiwan and Beyond* (Springer Nature, 2021).

⁷⁰ Shu-Mei Shih, "The Concept of the Sinophone," *PMLA* 126, no. 3 (2011): 709–18.

counted as Han,” especially the line “the plains indigenous have been successfully incorporated into the Han Taiwanese body already.”⁷¹ Shih’s naming of Pingpu Indigenous peoples is important in the context of ongoing erasure, but like Huang and Chiu, this description simultaneously contributes erasure by then incorporating these distinct peoples into the broader Han Taiwanese population. Describing the Pingpu peoples as “already” and “successfully” incorporated are marks of erasure, echoing Macoun and Strakosch’s writing of how “the settler colonial project presents itself in a range of ways (as *completed*, as inevitable, as non-existent and so on)” (emphasis mine).⁷² I flag this issue not to discredit Shih’s contributions but as an example of how, in the ongoing process of increased recognition of Indigeneity in Taiwan—through nativism, politics of recognition, or an actual acknowledgement of settler colonialism—there is a continuous need for settlers to shed the lingering (un)consciousness and claims over Indigeneity.

Shih later branches into deeper conversation with settler colonial studies and Indigenous studies, which is exemplified in her more recent works like *Indigenous Knowledge in Taiwan and Beyond* (2021). Shih’s work on Taiwan’s settler colonialism is significant in its connections to Sinophone studies and colonialisms; through her, “Taiwan as settler colonial” is linked broadly to different spheres of study and languages.

⁷¹ Shih, “Theory in a Relational World,” 741.

⁷² Macoun and Strakosch, “The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory.”

Chapter 4: The Democratization Era

Hirano, Veracini, and Roy introduce the concept of a triangular system of relations to analyze Taiwan's colonial history. This triangular system disentangles the relations between colonial (or imperial) authorities, settlers, and Natives. This system helps explain that while colonial authorities and settlers had conflicts, they were also united in their interest in exploiting Native people and land; while settlers and Native people may both strive for independence, they ultimately seek two different kinds of sovereignty. Despite the various waves of colonial rule, this relation remained relatively intact, demonstrating settler structure as "impervious to regime change."⁷³

In Taiwan, the Han settlers and the colonial authorities are not always allied: perhaps except for the 22-year Zheng Dynasty (Kingdom of Tungning), with Han settlers overthrowing Dutch authorities and in control before the Qing regime took over, various colonial authorities employed oppressive strategies against Han settlers to assert control. This dynamic is an important context for settler political history, as it resulted in settlers holding anti-colonial sentiments and contributed to the "post-colonial" analysis of Taiwan.⁷⁴ However, while the oppression of Han settlers, in particular the older groups of Hoklo and Hakka settlers, by successive colonial authorities was brutal, their experiences are not the same as that of the Indigenous peoples, and such oppression does not make them native to the land they settled on. Most of the time, colonial authorities and settlers benefit jointly at the expense of Indigenous peoples. This way, the triangular system challenges settler historical narratives.

Hirano et al. provide a useful lens to understand settler colonial relations up until the

⁷³Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 402.

⁷⁴ Similar anti-colonial sentiments include the colonists in America fighting against the British (in the late 16th century) and Boer Wars in South Africa against the British (1880-1881, 1899-1902). Settlers often use this experience as a nationalistic origin story and equivocate their oppression with that of the Natives in order to claim innocence or even the status as "native," as described by Tuck and Yang in "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor."

KMT regime, but I argue that this relatively stable system of relations has shifted since then. In this chapter, I expand on their concept to explore how this system of relations underwent fundamental transformation during KMT rule and the subsequent democratization era, beginning in the 1980s. By leveraging their position within this triangular system through a strategic alliance with the settler social movements, the Indigenous Movement made important progress from the 1980s to early 2000s. However, the successes and institutionalization of the settler social movements within the colonial government ultimately uplifted the settlers to a similar level with the colonial authorities, shaping a colonial government dominated by the rivalry between progressive and conservative settler politics; these shifting relationships are key to understanding the settler-colonial system that Indigenous people contend with today.

Changing Settler Politics and Identities

Since the beginning of colonization, settlers, who roughly correspond to the *benshengren* category, were not consistently aligned with the colonial governments and held anti-colonial sentiments.⁷⁵ Such antagonism escalated during KMT rule. As the KMT arrived in Taiwan beginning in 1945, they brought another wave of Han settlers from mainland China and began ruling the island as an authoritarian one-party state, inheriting and continuing settler colonial strategies of assimilation and erasure.⁷⁶ To assert its legitimacy as a Chinese party, “[t]he regime had to reconfigure this island as a temporary station before claiming China back from the hands of the Communists, yet also as an authentic Chinese nation.”⁷⁷ This required enforcing Chinese nationalist policies that asserted everyone, including the previous *benshengren* settler population and the Indigenous peoples, belonged to the “Chinese” (imagi)nation.

⁷⁵ The history of conflicts in interest between the colonial authority and settlers will be laid out in a previous section.

⁷⁶ The newer wave of Han settlers, also known as *waishengren*, came with the KMT regime from various regions of China, where cultures and language are different from the Hoklo and Hakka *benshengren*. For more discussion of the two different groups, see Chapter 2.

⁷⁷ Sugimoto, “Settler Colonial Incorporation and Inheritance.”

Contrary to its intentions, the assimilationist policies were a catalyst for the solidification of a Taiwanese identity. For example, by imposing Mandarin as the official language and prohibiting Taiwanese Hokkien and Hakka (spoken by the *benshengren*) and Indigenous languages, the KMT created antagonism by privileging the *waishengren* and discriminating against the *benshengren*. The concentration of power within the *waishengren* hands and KMT's abuse of power and mismanagement created brewing tensions during the first two years, and the conflict finally erupted as the February 28 Massacre of 1947, which led to the declaration of martial law and the era of White Terror.⁷⁸ From the resistance to the imposed Chinese identity arose a strong sense of Taiwanese identity, mostly embraced by the *benshengren*, and this period also inflamed the desire for Taiwanese independence. Opposition movements against KMT authoritarian rule grew, pushing for democratization.

On the surface, this has little to do with Indigeneity, since the emerging Taiwanese identity remains highly Han-centric, and the proposed independent Taiwan state by *benshengren* settlers would still be a Han-dominant settler state.⁷⁹ Yet the antagonism and the burgeoning opposition movement provided leverage and collaboration opportunities for the Indigenous Movement. The opposition to the KMT and the Chinese identity united both *benshengren* and Indigenous peoples under the notion of "Taiwan," although they embraced different senses of belonging to the Taiwan island. Since the 1960s, the KMT regime pushed Taiwan through a period of rapid economic modernization and industrialization, which created more social issues and a new middle class of college-educated professionals that bolstered the settler opposition movement. The growing settler opposition movement, exemplified by the Tangwai Movement,

⁷⁸ The massacre on February 28, also widely known as the 228 Incident, is an anti-government uprising that was violently suppressed by the government, resulting in over 18,000 civilian deaths.

⁷⁹ In fact, the emerging (Han) Taiwanese identity required the claiming of nativeness to the island, as I discussed in Chapter 3. This led to appropriation of the Indigenous identity, including a disputed study by Lin Ma-Li that claimed that 80% of "Taiwanese" people had Indigenous blood/ancestry, hence they are Indigenous to Taiwan and different from Chinese people. For more about settler incorporation and inheritance, see Sugimoto, "Settler Incorporation and Inheritance."

provided momentum and set the stage for the boom of the Indigenous Movement in the 1980s.⁸⁰

The Indigenous Peoples Movement

Inspired by the Tangwai movement and the influence of their publications, Iban Nokan and three other Indigenous students from the National Taiwan University produced their own *Mountain Green* (Gaoshan Qing) publications in 1983, which many scholars identified as the start of the Indigenous movement. “We are a group of youth who experienced similar suffering under the Han-chauvinist society,” wrote Icyang Parod, referring to himself and the other founders. These Indigenous students wrote sharp critiques about colonization and the government and called for the “Gaoshan” (Mountain, meaning Indigenous) peoples to unite: “We have slept for three, four hundred years. It’s time to wake up!”⁸¹ The publication’s statements called for collective action, bringing individual issues and resistance to a pan-Indigenous level.

Their bold statements against the government, published when Taiwan was still under martial law, attracted attention from the Tangwai movement. In 1984, Tangwai formed an alliance with Indigenous Peoples by establishing a subcommittee within its Conference of Editing among Writers of non-KMT called the Committee of Minority, an organization that unites both “mountain people” (Indigenous people) and “plains people” (non-Natives) who care about Indigenous rights.⁸² Unlike the students behind *Mountain Green*, the Committee of Minority consisted of people with social resources and the ability to put the theories identified in *Mountain*

⁸⁰ Literally “outside of the (KMT) party,” which loosely corresponds to the opposition movement.

⁸¹ “《高山青》創刊號發刊辭 [(Mountain Green First Issue Release Statement)],” 《高山青》, May 1, 1983, Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編上), 27.

⁸² Icyang Parod, “原住民族運動的興起 [The Rise of the Indigenous Peoples Movement],” in *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan* (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編上), vol. 1, 2 vols. (Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008), 15–25.

Conference of Editing among Writers of non-KMT: 黨外編輯作家聯誼會

Translation from Hsieh Shih-Chung 謝世忠, *認同的污名: 台灣原住民族的族群變遷 [Ethnic Contacts, Stigmatized Identity, and Pan-Taiwan Aboriginalism: A Study on Ethnic Change of Taiwan Aborigines]* (Yushan She 玉山社, 2017).

Committee of Minority: 少數民族委員會

Green to practice.⁸³ The alliance with Tangwai increased resources and garnered attention beyond the Indigenous community, and though the Committee of Minority lasted only 9 months, they provided groundwork for the Alliance of Taiwan Aborigines (ATA), the leading organization behind the Indigenous Peoples Movement established in late 1984.⁸⁴

After the KMT repealed martial law in 1987, which began a period that Ho Ming-Sho termed “popular upsurge,” the opposition movement founded the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP).⁸⁵ The ATA approached the DPP early on in 1987 to clarify their stance on the Indigenous land policies, solidifying the alliance.⁸⁶ Leveraging the opposition to the colonial government and forming strategic alliances, the Indigenous movement propelled into the 1990s as a powerful force that made significant advances for Indigenous rights and sovereignty. The Indigenous Movement’s alliance with the opposition social movements demonstrates how Indigenous activists utilized the common interests with the settlers against the colonial government, but at this moment the three groups still stood in triangular relations with conflicting interests. The Indigenous movement was part of the opposition, not a subset of the settler opposition—Indigenous Peoples were their own leaders acting for Indigenous futures.

The different motives and experiences of colonialism between the settler and Indigenous activists were recognized by Indigenous leaders and even acknowledged by Tangwai. In an article calling for Tangwai’s self-reflection, published in a 1984 publication of Conference of Editing among Writers of non-KMT, Zhang Fu-Zhong wrote:

Some excellent and clear-minded Indigenous (“shandi”) leaders have publicly declared that they are not only against KMT but also Tangwai.⁸⁷ This isn’t because Tangwai’s

⁸³ Ibid, 21.

⁸⁴ The ATA, 台灣原住民族權利促進會, consists of members from *Mountain Green*, the Committee of Minority, Indigenous pastors from Taiwan’s Presbyterian Church, and other activists.

⁸⁵ Ming-sho Ho, “Understanding the Trajectory of Social Movements in Taiwan (1980–2010),” *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs* 39, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 3–22, <https://doi.org/10.1177/186810261003900301>.

⁸⁶ “原權會民進黨第一類接觸（會訊摘錄）[ATA and DPP First Contact],” 《原住民》, June 30, 1987, Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan, 179.

⁸⁷ Indigenous people were called “Shandi” or Mountain people at the time. In 1984 December, ATA decided to reclaim their identity as Indigenous, or *yuanzhumin* (原住民), and its use began popularize later

Indigenous policies are at fault of Han-chauvinism like KMT's are, but that Tangwai has little Indigenous policy demands. To [the Indigenous people], the conflict between Tangwai and KMT are simply problems within foreign peoples, as they have little difference.⁸⁸

Indeed, even though the framework of settler colonialism was not used in this period, Indigenous leaders understood how both KMT and Tangwai opposition were Han settlers that benefitted from Indigenous land dispossession and genocide. And while Zhang recognized how Indigenous people viewed Tangwai and KMT similarly as outsider/foreigners, his denial that Tangwai is not at fault of Han-chauvinism because it lacks Indigenous policies precisely reveals the Han-settler-centric nature of their movement. There is also stark contrast looking the demands of the Indigenous and settler movements: key demands of the Indigenous movement include reclaiming names and histories, land back, self-governance, and constitutional recognition of Indigenous rights, which were in tension with settler interests for a democratic but nonetheless Han-centric settler society.⁸⁹ The tensions between the two movements were less pronounced when they shared opposition against the KMT's authoritarian rule, but it surfaced as the settlers of the opposition movement gained holding within the democratizing government.

Changing Dynamics

in the movement.

⁸⁸ Zhang Fu-Zhong (張富忠), “黨外不要急!! 編聯會不要急!! [Don't Rush, Tangwai!! Don't Rush, Conference of Editing Among Writers of Non-KMT!!],” 《黨外編輯作家聯誼會會訊》 [*Conference of Editing Among Writers of Non-KMT Newsletter*], September 9, 1984, Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編上), 86-87.

Original text:

“我們缺乏前瞻性: 以少數民族的問題作為例子, 有些極為優秀, 頭腦清晰的山地知青公開宣稱, 他們除了反對國民黨, 也反對黨外。這並非黨外的山地政策要求和國民黨一樣犯了漢族沙文主義的弊端, 而是黨外根本沒有什麼山地政策的要求;就他們來說, 黨外和國民黨的鬥爭, 僅是外來民族內的紛爭罷了, 兩者沒有什麼不同。”

⁸⁹ “Land Back”: I acknowledge that the Land Back movement originates from North America (Turtle Island) and is not the same as the one in Taiwan. The Mandarin phrase of Taiwan's Land Back movement literally translates to “return the land back to me,” and I have seen many different English translations. I choose to use this translation to highlight how struggles in Turtle Island and Taiwan echo each other and to allude to the existing solidarity between different Indigenous groups globally.

During the third editorial symposium for the *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan*, which took place in 2003, several Indigenous activists reflected on the tensions between the Indigenous and opposition movements.⁹⁰ Their discussion reveals important insights about the tenuous dynamics between settlers and Indigenous peoples. Lin Ming-De is more critical of the relationship with the opposition movement:

At the time, the opposition movement was confronting the authority of the KMT, so they had to find legitimacy and focus points for their movement. The issue of marginalized ethnic groups was a key way to attack the policies of the ruling party, so at the time Tangwai influenced the [Indigenous] movement deeply, and I don't think the Indigenous people had that much independence/autonomy... from another angle, both sides took what they needed and used each other as leverages.⁹¹

By pointing out how the opposition took advantage of Indigenous issues for their own purpose, Lin expresses concern about settler co-optation of the Indigenous movement at the expense of Indigenous rights and independence. In response to Lin, Icyang Parod and Tong Chunqing (Djanav Zengror) emphasized the agency and independence of the Indigenous Movement as initiators of collaboration, not merely people taken advantage of by the opposition.⁹² Icyang Parod said, “Instead of saying that we were taken advantage of by party politics, I'd rather say that we had to collaborate with the opposition party at the time for the important issues we had.”⁹³ Tong agrees: “You are right. Actually, we did take the convenient ride along with the Tangwai movement. But we weren't taken away by car, we took the initiative to get on the ride. I think this

⁹⁰ The *Documentary Collection* is a collection of historical documents, such as news, meeting notes, and publication related to the Indigenous Peoples Movement.

⁹¹ Icyang Parod, ed., *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan* (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編上), vol. 1 (Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008), 1125–35.

Original Text: 當時反對運動要對抗國民黨的權威，它必須找尋運動的正當性和著力點，弱勢族群問題是反對運動攻擊執政黨政策的一個要害，所以當時黨外勢力介入運動非常深，我不認為原住民有那麼具有自主性。...從另一角度看，就是各取所需，相互借力使力。”

⁹² Tong Chunqing is the name given in the document, and his Paiwan name is Djanav Zengror. Djanav Zengror is also the producer of a Native TV show that I will discuss in Chapter 7 on Tumpu Daingaz.

⁹³ Icyang Parod, 1:1125–35.

Original text: 與其說我們被政黨利用，倒不如說有很多重要議題我們必須結合當時的在野黨。

subjectivity is important.”⁹⁴ Their perspectives revealed both the risks of co-optation when working with a more powerful settler opposition group as well as the strategic benefits in initiating collaborations.

Though this collaboration was effective under the triangular system of relations, this system reached a tipping point around 1990 when settlers gained more power. Between 1990 and 1992, activists (including Indigenous activists) from social movements obtained DPP membership, setting the stage for a period of what Ho calls the “institutionalization” of social movements from 1993-1999.⁹⁵ As the social movements institutionalized and the settler opposition forces rose and became part of the (colonial) government, the distinctions between settlers and colonial authority faded. This is exemplified by how the distinction between *benshengren* and *waishengren* also faded out of the general political discourse today, and what replaces the distinction is a more dominant Taiwanese (but nonetheless Han-centric) settler identity with differences in political ideologies.⁹⁶ Though the more progressive settler activists grew dissatisfied with the institutionalized DPP, settler issues took center stage in the new two-party political scene, sidelining Indigenous voices. With the newfound power of settlers within the government through democratization, the dynamic can no longer be viewed as triangular between colonial authority, settlers, and Indigenous people. Instead, the settlers *joined* the colonial authority in forming a settler colonial government.

Even as the Indigenous Movement institutionalized along with other social movements to secure rights and representation, they faced immediate setback. When some leaders of the Indigenous Peoples Movement asked for the establishment of the Council of Indigenous People (CIP) within the government in 1996, they found out that CIP was formed through the exchange

⁹⁴ Ibid. Original text: 沒錯，其實我們一開始是搭黨外運動便捷車，但我們不是被車子再走，而是主動去搭車子，我覺得這個主體性很重要。

⁹⁵ Ho, “Understanding the Trajectory of Social Movements in Taiwan (1980–2010).”

⁹⁶ There are pro-unification and pro-independence factions within settlers who hold different views about their relationship with China, but there is a general sense of a Taiwanese Han-centric identity.

of over 30,000 hectares of reserved traditional territories. Indigenous activists were furious, saying that had they known the loss of land was the price for creating the CIP, they would rather not have the CIP.⁹⁷ Various Indigenous Movement organizations published a collective statement, calling for the CIP to “maintain their stance for Indigenous autonomy and self-determination, and not become the accomplice of the domination machine of the state.”⁹⁸ While Indigenous people had always fought the settler colonial state, they used to have leverage when collaborating with the opposition settlers against the colonial authority. Now, the Indigenous Movement had to contend with a government that had incorporated the opposing settlers.

After a period of “incorporation,” when progressive ideas from the social movements became part of mainstream politics, Taiwan came to be dominated by a push-pull between progressive and conservative settler politics.⁹⁹ With the new dynamic with DPP and KMT on a level playing field, settlers could easily use Indigenous issues as fodder against one another without doing anything for Indigenous rights, as Lin worried, since Indigenous people are no longer critical for any side in gaining legitimacy or power. Even if the progressive settler politics of multiculturalism seemed friendlier to Indigenous people, just like conservative settler politics, “they are directed to achieving similar ends, by eliminating, absorbing or containing Indigenous challenges to the settler sovereign order.”¹⁰⁰ The inclusion and exclusion policies of the progressive and conservative politics “operate as twin strategies of settler colonialism ... trapping political resistance and energy in the continual movement between them.”¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ The CIP only provides representation to the (currently) 16 officially recognized Indigenous Peoples, while most of the Plains Indigenous Peoples from the western region that experienced colonialism and assimilation earlier are unrepresented and unrecognized.

⁹⁸ “原運各團體對行政院原住民委員會正式掛牌運作的共同聲明 [Collective Statement by Various Indigenous Peoples Movement Groups on the Official Establishment of the CIP],” December 11, 1996, Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編 下), 1095-1097.

Original text: “堅持原住民族自主·自決權立場、勿淪為國家統治機器幫兇”

⁹⁹ Ho, “Understanding the Trajectory of Social Movements in Taiwan (1980–2010).”

¹⁰⁰ Macoun and Strakosch, “The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory.”

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

Indigenous peoples now faced a different political scene. With settlers included in the colonial government and holding significantly more power, the deeper tensions between settlers and Indigenous peoples become more apparent. While the incorporation of liberal and progressive politics into the government led to increased multicultural inclusion and opened up limited opportunities, the solidification of settler colonial power created a different set of challenges, such as politics of recognition, and the government operates with a new iteration of settler colonial logic. This changing political context is key to understanding contemporary conflicts around settler colonial governance, both the Maqaw National Park controversy immediately following democratization as well as ongoing political issues like existing national parks and hunting regulations.

Chapter 5: The History of National Parks in Taiwan

In this chapter, I locate the history of national parks in context of land dispossession and in relation to the criminalization of Indigenous hunting. This context sheds light on how the use of land for settler interest plays a central part in the contentions around Indigenous/environmental issues today. Though the environmentalism discussed in this section is primarily concerned with the approach of the government, whose values differ with grassroots activists and other environmental factions, their ideas are embedded within the structures like laws, policies, and practices through which people engage with environmental issues. Moreover, discussions about national parks sometimes gloss over their role in regulating hunting. However, taking a look at the US origins of national parks, a key influence on Taiwan's development of national parks, as well as the prominent objection against the hunting restrictions during anti-national park protests, it becomes clear how settler colonial regulations around land and life are deeply connected.

Land Dispossession and Nationalization

National Parks in Taiwan are often discussed with little to no critical reflection on the context of land dispossession. Unlike in the US, the birthplace of national parks and where national parks were part of settler expansion and dispossession, national parks in Taiwan were built after the majority of land was dispossessed, either nationalized or allocated for private, settler use. The Japanese officially “conquered” all of Taiwan in 1933, and they began allocating land and creating reservation lands during the last decade of their rule.¹⁰² The Japanese first made plans for national parks in Taiwan in 1931, but the first national park was created as recently as 1984. This means that while national parks still contribute to ongoing land dispossession, the

¹⁰² “Conquer”: The Japanese claimed they conquered the Bunun “Dafen Incident,” and they called this group of Bunun the “last savage of this island to be submitted” (本島最後歸順蕃). The Bunun account is that they were not conquered but reconciled with the Japanese through negotiation.

“Reservation lands”: Not to be confused with North American reservations. These are lands reserved for Indigenous peoples to live on, but not based on treaties nor related to specific communities (e.g. buluo).

majority of the land was in the hands of the settlers, private or governmental, by the time national parks were built.¹⁰³ This is likely why contemporary academic discussions of national parks focus on relations with Indigenous peoples whose traditional territories the national parks stand on, but they rarely mention land dispossession that enabled the park's establishment. How did the land get in the hands of the settlers in the first place, so that national parks could be built? The land was not always in the hands of settlers. National parks should not be discussed within a vacuum where the premise is settler dominance and worldviews. Rather, we must locate national parks within the long historical continuum of dispossession and displacement.

The systematic dispossession of the aforementioned land began in the Japanese forestry investigations and land re-allocations. In 1930, the Japanese categorized land in three ways for management purposes: 1) “lands for retainment” for the state (要存置林野); 2) “quasi-lands for retainment” allocated for Indigenous peoples, and quasi because they were to be treated like the lands for retainment (準要存置林野); 3) “lands not for retainment,” which could be sold to interested parties.¹⁰⁴ In 1939, the Japanese designated only 17% of the “savage lands” (“蕃地”) they identified for Indigenous peoples as reservation land (“蕃人所要地” or “the necessary lands for the savages”) based on the idea that each Native needed roughly three hectares of land, rupturing Native land value systems and the sharing of common land.¹⁰⁵ The land dispossession not only disrupted traditional Indigenous agriculture but also restricted hunting. After the KMT

¹⁰³ Huang Yueh-Wen (黃躍雯), *Building a Dream in the Wilderness: The Institutionalization of National Parks in Taiwan* (築夢荒野: 台灣國家公園的建制過程) (Banqiao, Taipei: 稻鄉出版社 (Dao Xiang Publisher), 2001), 175.

¹⁰⁴ Koji Nakashima (中島弘二), “日本帝国における森林の開発と保全—台湾を事例に— (Development and Conservation of Forest in the Japanese Empire: a Case of Taiwan),” *Journal of Forest Economics* (林業経済研究) 67, no. 1 (Spring 2021): 3–15.

I used this source for translating the Japanese terms. While in Mandarin, these terms with Kanji were directly adopted with Han characters, the characters can mean many things. Going back to the Japanese source helped me understand the context these terms were used and what they mean.

¹⁰⁵ Zhan Su-Juan (詹素娟), “日治時代原住民的土地變遷 [Indigenous Land Changes During Japanese Rule],” *原住民族文獻 [Indigenous Peoples Literature]*, no. 31 (May 2017): 32–37. The source also notes how the “three hectares” was determined based on Japanese settlement in Hokkaido, linking settler colonialism in Taiwan with that in Hokkaido.

regime took over, they nationalized the lands for retainment and adopted the Native reservation land policies (as “山地保留地”). Broadly speaking, the KMT adopted many Japanese colonial policies and continued governance in a similar way.

Because of the dispossession and allocation by the colonial governments, by the time the KMT government was planning to create national parks in the 1980s, the contentions over land were concentrated between different governmental agencies and private land holders.¹⁰⁶ Within government decision-making, considerations related to Indigenous peoples only came up when decision-makers saw Indigenous peoples as “cultural resources” or as a potential nuisance. Otherwise, Indigenous peoples were largely forgotten or excluded from the conversation and any decision-making about land.¹⁰⁷ However, it is important to situate national parks within the history of land dispossession and keep that there was a time *before* national parks, when Indigenous land was in Indigenous hands.

The US Origins of National Parks

Beginning with the US Yellowstone National Park in 1872, the American national park system and conservation ideologies spread globally. These ideas played an important role within the establishment of national parks in Taiwan. While the Taiwanese people adopting the US national park concept tend to focus on incorporating the conservationist ideologies, the often neglected fact that national parks originated in the US as part of settler colonial expansion must also be kept in our frame of analysis. Narratives around the formations of US national parks played an important role in debates around the merits of national parks, especially during the Maqaw National Park controversy. The replication of the settler-centric histories and modes of

¹⁰⁶ Huang Yueh-Wen (黃躍雯), *Building a Dream in the Wilderness: The Institutionalization of National Parks in Taiwan* (築夢荒野：台灣國家公園的建制過程).

¹⁰⁷ Taiwan does not have treaties like ones in North America, so legislation in Taiwan tends to overlook the rights of Indigenous people.

narratives occurs through this process, and disrupting it is necessary.

Lin Yih-Ren, an environmentalist and scholar, was an active participant in the discourse around the Maqaw National Park in support of its establishment. In discussions he sought to complicate the public's understanding of environmentalism, especially as different evolving ideas and value systems under the broad category of environmentalism. However, when he discussed the development of the environmentalist values behind national parks, he also replicated some of the problematic American narratives about national parks.

In September 2002, Lin published a series of op-eds titled “Alternative Opinions on Maqaw: Environmental Values and National Park Reforms.. He recognized the criticism of the exclusive American park management that has excluded local residents from involvement, but he argued that the value system behind national parks cannot simply be summed up by the mode of “parks with no people.”¹⁰⁸ In an effort to complicate that narrative, Lin summarized a mainstream narrative about US environmental and national park history. Lin quoted US environmental historian, Alfred Runte, that “the establishment of US national parks is closely connected to the national identity of a young democratic country.” While I agree with both Lin and Runte that patriotism and national identity are key aspects in the founding of national parks, our understanding of that US national identity probably diverges. The preservation of America's “natural wonders” through national park helped craft the self-image of a young democratic United States, but that self-image also clearly portrayed and served the settler colonial logics of elimination and replacement: erasing Indigenous presence and land relations, replacing instead a white settler understanding and appreciation of “unspoiled nature.”¹⁰⁹ Perhaps unsurprisingly, the fostering of a similar sense of settler colonial patriotism was also important in the creation of

¹⁰⁸ Yih-ren Lin, “馬告的另類觀點 2: 環境價值與國家公園改革 (二) [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw 2: Environmental Values and National Park Reforms 2],” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), September 16, 2002, <https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm>. Original text: “無人公園”

¹⁰⁹ The language of “natural wonders” and “unspoiled nature” can be found in the 1872 Yellowstone Act.

national parks in Taiwan, which I talk about in the next section of this chapter.

In the next sections of Lin's piece, Lin narrated how concepts of spacial preservation extended from the original focus on nature and romanticism to culture and ultimately service to the public, arguing that values behind national parks has evolved and demonstrates the democratic process. Lin cites the Chattanooga and Chickamauga memorial parks established in 1890 to commemorate the American Civil War, demonstrating how the preservation of cultural spaces began to affect understanding of national parks.¹¹⁰ Lin also notes the Chaco Culture National Historical Park as part of how "mainstream US society has considered including Indigenous culture as a part of US history."¹¹¹ The way Lin uses these examples replicates how US settler society incorporates Indigenous histories and cultures, "inheriting" it—consciously, like with Chaco culture, or not, like using Indigenous words of Chattanooga and Chickamauga to commemorate settler histories—in order to bolster its legitimacy and cultural complexity in a way that corrupts Indigeneity to wipe out and replace Indigeneity with white settler culture. Lin concludes with the transition of US national parks in service of the public, arguing that the whole transformation is a process of "getting people back" within national parks, how despite starting with ideologies of government central control over land for conservation and recreation, national parks have grown to become inclusive of local involvement, development, and Indigenous ecological knowledge.

However, the question that must be asked is, who is the "public" or "people" that are going back to the national parks? The US history shows clearly that the public whom national parks serve are white settlers. When the first national park was created, the legislature considered

¹¹⁰ Chattanooga: Creek word meaning 'rock rising to a point'; Chickamauga Cherokees were an uncompromising faction against US settlers. The naming of US histories yet using Indigenous words without acknowledging Indigenous peoples is another prime example of Indigenous erasure and the settler colonial logic of replacement.

¹¹¹ Yih-ren Lin, "馬告的另類觀點 2: 環境價值與國家公園改革 (三) [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw 2: Environmental Values and National Park Reforms 3]," 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), September 17, 2002, 20, <https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm>. Original text: "這也是第一次美國的主流社會考慮將原住民文化列入美國歷史的一部分。"

Yellowstone as a “public park or pleasuring-ground” with explicit language against hunting, “against the wanton destruction of the fish and game found within said park,” as well as human inhabitation on the land—“all persons who shall locate or settle upon or occupy the same, or any part thereof, except as hereinafter provided, shall be considered trespassers and removed therefrom.”¹¹² This language suggests that land should be protected for tourist appreciation and recreation. This was not quite the “parks with no people” as discussed in Linn’s article, since it was designed for “public enjoyment” (an exclusive public, as best) where visitors were allowed; the “no people” would be better described as “no Indigenous people or any settlers living on the land.”¹¹³ Though the US government moved to make tourism and recreation at national parks more accessible, the process of “getting people back” is not getting Indigenous people “back”—the “back” is an illusion, demonstrating the settler colonial logic of replacement of Indigenous peoples by settlers.¹¹⁴

The settler colonial narratives of US national parks discussed by Lin were reproduced in the Taiwan context to serve Taiwan’s understanding of itself and inform its approach to environmental management. Lin viewed the complex US history of national parks as a valuable reference for a Taiwan that had recently shifted from authoritarianism to becoming a young democratic society.¹¹⁵ Whether intentionally or not, this sort of modeling of the US settler state demonstrates how settler colonial logics and understandings of land are replicated and developed in Taiwan.

When the Maqaw controversy resurfaced briefly in late 2008 to 2009, Zhong Cheng-Yu, an environmental humanities graduate student from the University of Utah, offered a more

¹¹² “Yellowstone Act, 1872,” America’s National Park System: The Critical Documents. Chapter 1: The Early Years, 1864-1918, October 25, 2000, https://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/anps/anps_1c.htm.

¹¹³ “Yellowstone Act, 1872.”

¹¹⁴ Yih-ren Lin, “馬告的另類觀點 2: 環境價值與國家公園改革 (四) [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw 2: Environmental Values and National Park Reforms 4],” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), September 18, 2002, <https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091801.htm>.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

truthful understanding of US national parks that acknowledges the US history of colonialism. In a op-ed submitted to the China Times newspaper, Zhong wrote,

When Taiwan blindly copy and pastes the American national park system and conservation policies, we also unconsciously replicate the historical fallacy surrounding early American national parks. Yellowstone National Park is the world's first national park, but there hides an unknown history of blood and tears. When the earlier national parks were established in America, the government had mobilized the military and used armed force to drive away local Indigenous people. Even though we have not used armed force to drive away Indigenous peoples from national parks, the government is using the same hostile attitude towards them.¹¹⁶

In this statement, Zhong recognizes that despite not knowing or acknowledging the colonial history of US national parks, the Taiwan national parks still replicated similar colonial dynamics. I would argue further that Taiwan replicated the similar colonial dynamics precisely *because* the architects of national parks in Taiwan did not care for the colonial history and political reality behind the US creation of national parks. Operating under similar colonial logics, there was no reason for them to question the US process. The (willful) ignorance of Indigenous existence by settlers in both cases is essential to produce a narrative that justifies the national parks by erasing Indigenous histories and land relations.

Additionally, Zhong recognized the hostility of the Taiwanese government towards Indigenous peoples, but his statement that “we have not used armed force to drive away Indigenous” is debatable. While it is true that the establishment of national parks in Taiwan did not directly involve militarized forced displacement by the current Republic of China regime brought by the KMT, the previous Japanese regime carried out such actions. Just like in the US, the land allocated for national parks was seized first through the violent dispossession of Indigenous peoples. At the same time, when the KMT regime took over in Taiwan, it maintained and continued the violent land possession through other means (such as creating economic

¹¹⁶ Zhong Cheng-Yu (鐘承育), “國家公園豈是遊樂場 [How Can National Parks Be Playgrounds],” 祖靈之邦, *Originally Published as an Op-Ed in China Times 中國時報* (blog), January 28, 2009, http://www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3367:2009-02-02-03-02-26&catid=36:record05&Itemid=235.

conditions that force Indigenous peoples to leave their homelands and participate within a settler, capitalist economy, or the burning of agricultural land). The land dispossession that led to the creation of national parks look different in US and Taiwan, but in essence they are both served by the same processes designed to serve settler society.

The Creation of National Parks

In 1912, the idea of national parks arrived in Japan, Taiwan's colonial ruler at the time, and Japan passed its National Park Laws in 1931 based on the American model. Through Japan's efforts toward its own national parks, local Japanese settlers in Taiwan advocated for national parks beginning in 1931; the Japanese colonial government in Taiwan started its official national park planning efforts in 1933.¹¹⁷

National parks were a continued part of Japanese colonial land policies. The Japanese led two organized efforts to investigate Taiwan's natural resources, one from 1910 to 1914 primarily focused on investigation (“林業調查”) and one from 1915 to 1925 on the consolidation and organization of forest resources (“林野整理事業”). In the 1910s and 1920s, the demand of the Japanese for amenity resources—nature and its scenery—has increased as a result of rapid industrialization and economic growth, so while the government plundered Indigenous lands, they also strategically conserved natural resources.¹¹⁸ As previously discussed, the conservation of natural resources is in service of perpetuating the Japanese empire, but with Taiwan's national parks, conservation also served purposes like developing the tourist economy and fostering patriotism.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ Huang Yueh-Wen (黃躍雯), *Building a Dream in the Wilderness: The Institutionalization of National Parks in Taiwan* (築夢荒野：台灣國家公園的建制過程).

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, 87.

Original text: “種種都是以說明殖民政府“國家”在台所指定的三個國家公園，主要以服務日本人為目的，而其保育主義最終依歸，係為觀光外匯利益，仍不脫髮展主義本質”

National parks would be useful for the Japanese in many ways. First, the Japanese saw the potential of national parks in generating tourist economic activities. In evaluating the potential national park sites and their sceneries, Japanese officials noted that there were “cultural scenery of Indigenous settlements,” which was a “cultural specialty” of the park.¹²⁰ Through the lens of national parks, both Indigenous cultures and land must be preserved for the ends of commodification in service to developing the tourism industry. National Parks also served the Japanese imperialization agenda: with Japanese imperial desires growing and the lead up to WWII, the Japanese wanted to make colonized peoples the citizens of the Japanese emperor.¹²¹ They saw national parks potentially galvanizing the colonized peoples in Taiwan, both Indigenous and Han, to feel a patriotism and allegiance to the Japanese empire.

While the Japanese were not successful in establishing any national parks in Taiwan—the Sino-Japanese war broke out in 1937—they set up three potential sites and a system of laws and standards, which provided a roadmap for Taiwan’s eventual creation of national parks. This early model illustrates how environmentalism can be deployed to serve colonial purposes. The national parks were meant to protect land from further exploitation and destruction, which is benevolent and beneficial for the environment in certain ways. However, the Japanese took Indigenous land for granted, and the conserved beauty and resources are for their gains and at the expense of Indigenous life. As Huang observed, the national parks were largely planned in service to the Japanese, especially the scenery. sLike the role environmentalism played in Japanese colonial rule, ideas around environmental conservation began in Taiwan also to preserve the colonial state.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, US trained ecological scholars (re)introduced national parks to Taiwan as a response to Taiwan’s industrialization and economic growth.¹²² As

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Imperialization is translated from the Japanese term 皇民化, Kou-min-ka, literally “transform into the emperor’s people.”

¹²² Yih-ren Lin, “Politicizing Nature: The Maqaw National Park Controversy in Taiwan,” *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 22, no. 2 (June 2011): 88–103, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10455752.2011.569358>.

influenced by the American system, Taiwan's national parks were also based on "separating people from nature."¹²³ Huang's discussion of this period of park establishment centered on the park system's relationship with Taiwan's political situation internationally and locally. With increasing international recognition of the Chinese Communist Party's People's Republic of China as the legitimate China, Taiwan's KMT government had to re-situate its legitimacy. National parks would both bolster the national identity and act as a mechanism to maintain international connections through tourism. The government also began considering conservation strategies, though they tend to orient towards economic longevity for resource use and tourism. Within Taiwan, grassroots social movements like the environmental movement were rising up. Their voices were limited under the authoritarian regime, but they made their own assertions about national parks and environmental protection. The grassroots movement was also grappling with Taiwan's national identity, taking a nativist approach to their connection with the land. The environmentalist ideas that influenced national parks were dynamic and varied, though they all centered around settler desires.

The first four national parks—Kenting, Yushan, Yangmingshan, and Taroko—were founded during the martial law period without significant community input. This meant that the government paid little attention to the needs of people who resided on the land that became part of the National Park, particularly Indigenous peoples, except when they needed the people to comply with their demands. As a result, there was significant resistance against national parks.

The Anti-National Park Movement

The following chart, listing notable anti-national park resistance events, is from Huang's book *Building a Dream in the Wilderness: The Institutionalization of National Parks in Taiwan*, which is based on Ji Jun-Jie and Wang Jun-Xiu's research. I translated, edited, and reorganized

¹²³ Ibid.

the chart. I added Indigenous groups and place names to situate these incidents in the realities of Indigenous lands and histories. The incidents with an asterisk include protests against the criminalization of hunting in national parks.

Time	Park	Indigenous Group(s)	Issue
May 1988	Taroko ¹²⁴ National Park	Bsuring (Truku for Xiulin township, Hualien)	Xiulin Township condemns the Taroko National Park for damaging Indigenous rights.
Oct. 1990	Taroko National Park	Bsuring's (Xiulin Township) three Truku villages: Fu-shi, Chong-de, Xiulin	Three Taroko villages harshly condemned the "bossy" way of acting by the national park and the lack of prioritization of the rights of local Indigenous rights.
Oct. 1990	Yushan National Park	Meishan village, Ngani (Bunun for Taoyuan District, Kaohsiung)	Bunun villagers from the Meishan Village went up north to the Legislative Yuan, protesting that being drawn into the Yushan National Park boundaries affected their livelihoods. This put the conflict between national parks and Indigenous traditional survival rights on the national political stage.
Oct. 1991	Shei-Pa National Park	Anti Shei-Pa Park Committee, consisting of Indigenous peoples across Taiwan	The committee held a meeting in Hsinchu City, opposing the establishment of the Shei-Pa Park. They note that Mount Dabajian (Tayal: Babo Papak, Say Siyat: Kapatalayan) is a Tayal sacred mountain and development would seriously intrude in the living spaces for tribespeople.

¹²⁴ This is the Japanese phonetization for the Truku people.

Apr. 1993*	N/a (National Park Law)	Truku people	Over fifty Truku people completed a petition on amending the National Park Law. In May, Truku people went to the Legislative Yuan to hold a public hearing, demanding the amendment of the National Park Law and assent to hunting rights within national parks for Indigenous peoples.
June 1993*	Yushan National Park	Meishan village, Ngani (Bunun for Taoyuan District, Kaohsiung)	Over a hundred Bunun representatives from Meishan Village went to the Legislative Yuan and the Ministry of the Interior once again, protesting their lands being drawn within the national park. They demand that the Indigenous Reserved Lands be drawn out of the national park, the National Park Law amended, and hunting be permitted.
June 1993*	Yushan, Taroko, Sheipa, Lanyu ¹²⁵ National Parks	Indigenous peoples from the regions of the respective National Parks	Indigenous peoples host public hearings in different regions successively. They plan on a joint demand to amend the National Park Law so that an appropriate level of hunting and land cultivation is permitted.
Oct. 1994	Taroko National Park	Truku people from the Taroko National Park	Over a thousand Truku people joined together at the Taroko National Park and resisted through the demands of “Anti-Oppression, Vie for Survival, Land Back.”
Mar. 1999	Nengdan ¹²⁶ National Park	Tayal and Bunun peoples	The nearly three hundred Tayal and Bunun people, who was drawn within Nengdan National Park boundaries, declared the establishment of the “Anti-Nengdan Park Committee to Save Ourselves” in front of the Yushan National Park Headquarters. They indicated that they do not rule out the option to close up the mountains and resist till the end.

As part of the Indigenous Peoples Movement during the era of democratization, the Indigenous peoples also protested against the national parks. The anti-park resistance is often seen as part of the Land Back Movement, as demonstrated by the demands of an anti-Park Truku group: “Anti-Oppression, Vie for Survival, Land Back.” While some anti-park resistance was on

¹²⁵ The Lanyu National Park was not established. “Lanyu” is Ponso no Tao, the island of the Tao people.

¹²⁶ The Nengdan National Park was not established.

existing national parks, others protested against establishing new parks, such as the Nengdan and Lanyu National Parks. The *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan* did not include documents related to the anti-park movement, so there are not a lot of readily available sources written by Indigenous peoples that could provide insight on how they understood the struggle at the time. However, the 1993 reporting by Peng Lin-song, titled “Series on National Parks and Indigenous Rights” highlighted some issues faced by Indigenous peoples in the midst of the anti-park movement.¹²⁷

In Peng’s reporting about the Taroko National Park, “Going Home Like a Thief, Officials and Civilians Irreconcilable,” he noted the criminalization and punishment of hunting and foraging by the National Park Laws, which are part of Truku traditional lifeways.¹²⁸ Peng wrote, “when traditional hunting and foraging began to commercialize, it reflects the transition of Indigenous economic life from one of subsistence to that of the market economy. It also reflects Indigenous people’s marginalization within Taiwan’s economic system.”¹²⁹ In his reporting, Gei-Mi (Tian Gui-bin)¹³⁰, a township representative, emphasizes that today’s conservation is not caused by Indigenous peoples but by the demand of Han people who sell game. The criminalization of hunting and foraging forced Indigenous peoples to lose their traditional lifeways and participate in the settler capitalist society. Within the settler capitalist society, Indigenous peoples are rendered surplus people; some have to participate within the capitalist economy through working, while some are forced to continue hunting and foraging, yet not for subsistence but for survival by providing the raw materials for the capitalist accumulation of

¹²⁷ The Mandarin series title is “國家公園與原住民權益系列報導.” The reporting I reference is from Tayal legislator Ciwas Ali’s Blog, “Ancestor’s Realm” (祖靈之邦) and may be incomplete, but it is the only readily available online source.

¹²⁸ Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “回老家像小偷, 官民水火難容 [Going Home Like a Thief, Officials and Civilians Irreconcilable],” *祖靈之邦 [Ancestor’s Realm]* (blog), 22 2001.

¹²⁹ Ibid. Original text: 當傳統狩獵及採集出現商業色彩, 本質上已反映了原住民的經濟生活已由生計經濟轉向市場經濟, 以及其在台灣整個經濟體系中的弱勢處境

¹³⁰ Gei-Mi: 給米 (田貴賓)

settler society.¹³¹

The article also highlights the question of the true cause of environmental destruction. Local clinic director Ge-Yao (Zheng Rong-Xiang) and Hualien Fenglin criminal squad director Gu-Hong (Tian Gui-Fang) both note the abundance of the land when they were younger.¹³² Ge-Yao points out how the increased deaths of animals and changes in the environment only happened after the arrival of the KMT; Gu-Hong argues that the intense logging by the Forestry Bureau was the real culprit. The Truku people understood that the national park's strict legislations do not address the real cause of environmental destruction and animal extinction. "Animals go extinct without forests, and people become extinct without land," Ge-Yao said.¹³³ His parallel statement reflects the notion of "Land is Life." The arrival of settlers on Native land led to the exploitation of the forests and the annihilation of animals, and they took land out of the hands of Indigenous peoples, which goes hand in hand with the extermination of Indigenous peoples.

It is important to note here the close ties between national parks and the regulation of hunting. Without going too deep into the details about the history and development of conservation laws in Taiwan, in 1972, Taiwan banned hunting completely, the same year that it passed its National Park Laws as part of environmental conservation efforts to protect precious and rare species. Eventually, the Wildlife Conservation Law replaced the Hunting Law, with the Wildlife Conservation Law currently a barrier to Indigenous hunting rights; Indigenous hunting rights were not protected until 2004. From both Peng's reporting and the anti-park protests, hunting was and continues to be an important but unresolved issue in relation to national parks and broader settler conservation efforts. The dispute around the Tama Talum 2021 Constitution Reinterpretation Case also mirrors how the discussion about hunting in Peng's reporting,

¹³¹ Laura Pulido, "Flint, Environmental Racism, and Racial Capitalism," *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 27, no. 3 (July 2, 2016): 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10455752.2016.1213013>.

¹³² Ge Yao: 哥藥 (鄭榮祥) Gu Hong: 古紅 (田貴芳)

¹³³ Ibid. Original text: "動物沒森林會滅種, 百姓沒土地則會滅絕。"

including how Truku people challenged the portrayal of Native hunting as the cause of environmental damage.

Beyond the land-centric dispute, the national parks were also part of Taiwan's recreation industry, which was geared towards the interests of settler tourists and international (western) tourists. Peng witnessed the commodification of Indigenous cultures in the Taroko National Park: commercialization of culture, like weaving and Indigenous face tattoos, as well as women, with Truku women wearing more “attractive” Pangcah clothing for tourist entertainment.¹³⁴ The tensions around the relationship between tourism (including ecological tourism) and exploitation of Indigenous people and knowledge is an ongoing issue.

All of the oppression experienced under the national park made the park system both a “symbol of oppression by state violence” and a “symbol of resistance” within the Indigenous movement.¹³⁵ The bottled up resentment led to protests that halted the creation of the Lanyu and Nengdan national parks, and it also spilled over in the Maqaw National Park dispute, eventually stopping its establishment too. However, the conversations around Maqaw were unlike those with existing national parks, since this park was proposed after democratization and in the context of a liberal DPP presidency. Neither the process of democratization nor the new DPP administration changed the fundamental settler colonial structures in Taiwan, but this new political context opened up some space for Indigenous people to intervene in mainstream environmental conversations.

¹³⁴ Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “喋血抗日, 賤賣傳統 [Die Xue Kang Ri, Jian Mai Chuan Tong],” *祖靈之邦 [Ancestor's Realm]* (blog), July 22, 2001, www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=582:replay-history-582&catid=51:history&Itemid=125.

¹³⁵ Sun Ming-Lin (孫銘燐), “誰的馬告國家公園----從抗爭符碼運用到在地參與認同? [Whose Maqaw National Park—From a Symbol of Resistance to Local Participation and Recognition]” (Abstract, National Tsing Hua University, 2002), <https://hdl.handle.net/11296/3ga226>. <https://hdl.handle.net/11296/3ga226>Sun Ming-Lin (孫銘燐).

Original text: 「國家公園」在原住民「還我土地」運動脈絡中, 和蘭嶼「核廢料」同屬於國家暴力的「壓迫象徵」, 並被援用為原運的「抗爭符碼」。

PART 3: Case Studies

In Part 3, I examine three case studies—two on national parks, one on hunting—to explore how a settler colonial analysis of the mainstream narratives of the three conflicts replicate colonial relations with land and Indigenous peoples.

Here, I emphasize the protest slogan from the Indigenous Peoples Movement, “Land is Life,” to disrupt the mainstream framings of these issues and serve as a lens to understand how settler colonialism functions. This slogan is based on Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies, which varies between different groups of peoples and tribal communities. I am not in the position to explain the phrase this way. Instead, I draw on this phrase to reframe the issues in understanding how settler society’s desires for control over land and life are interconnected. The notion of “Land is Life” also represents the inseparability of Indigenous Land from Indigenous Life. In that way, the Indigenous fight for land has fundamental differences from mainstream environmentalism that stems from different conceptualizations of “Land” and “environment.” As Tuck and Yang put it, “land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted.”¹³⁶

I start with the Maqaw case study because it was the controversy that brought the issue of national parks in relation to Indigenous Rights into public discussion. While the initial advocacy for the park itself was framed as an environmental issue surrounding the logging of the Chi-lan cypress forests, when environmentalists advocated for a national park as a strategy of conservation, Indigenous activists made key interventions that centered Indigenous land relations. Some Tayal activists supported a park that recognized Tayal culture and participation, others opposed the park, citing national parks as a colonial structure and advocated for self-governance. In this process, environmentalists reckoned with Indigenous rights, and an ideology of co-management and partnership with Native people was adopted.

¹³⁶ Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is not a metaphor,” 7.

While the advocacy for the Maqaw park was ultimately unsuccessful, the discussion that arose from this period shifted how the government and society saw the relations between Indigenous peoples and national parks. Tumpu Daingaz's struggle began before Maqaw, but the popularization of co-management began to change the buluo's relation with the Yushan National Park, whereby Tumpu Daingaz chose to collaborate with the park to deter the private tourism industry. Examining the Native narratives about the partnership with the park, we discover this choice as a strategy of resistance as well counter-narratives embedded within that resists the park's portrayal of a harmonious collaboration and benevolent, inclusive park governance.

The much more recent Indigenous hunting Constitutional Reinterpretation case with Bunun hunter Talum Suqluman (also known as Tama Talum) in 2021 illuminates ongoing challenges of Indigenous activism with environmentalism. Even though Indigenous activists raised questions about the criminalization of hunting in national parks, there was room for collaboration in the national parks cases because of shared interest in preserving the forests. On the other hand, hunting has been portrayed as a cultural issue with no direct common interests with environmentalists, so there was stronger support by environmentalists for the criminalization of hunting.¹³⁷ The cultural reactions to the legal case reveal how strongly settler colonial worldviews still undergirds Taiwanese society.

¹³⁷ Environmentalism is not a monolith, and there are environmentalists that recognize the ecological knowledge of Native hunters. Certain factions—in this case, animal rights activists—are more opposed to hunting than others. However, broadly speaking, the issue has been framed as a dichotomy between environmental protection and Indigenous cultural rights.

Chapter 6: The Maqaw National Park Controversy

The Maqaw National Park controversy surrounds a proposed yet ultimately shelved plan for a national park to protect the Chi-lan cypress forests located on Tayal territories. The conflict began over settler environmental ideological differences in the late 1990s, becoming an Indigenous issue only when Tayal people voiced their concerns about their land. This collision of the Han-led environmental movement and the Indigenous Peoples movement revealed how democratization left the root problems of settler colonialism unaddressed. In this new political context, Indigenous activists took advantage of the opportunities like the Maqaw National Park. Their advocacy brought Indigenous concerns into the broader public conversation and had important consequences: it forced settler environmentalists to reconsider their relationship with Indigenous people and land, bringing the idea of co-management on to the table.

However, settler environmentalists struggled to incorporate Indigenous people into their narratives and activism. Often, environmentalists acted in their own interests and worldviews, conflating Indigenous Land relations with environmentalism and overlooking the broader issue of Indigenous self-determination. It was easy for settlers on both sides of the park issue to use “marginalized ethnic groups... to attack the policies” of the other side.¹³⁸ Despite this, Indigenous activists leveraged the political momentum. They weren’t simply passively included or exploited by environmentalists but were active agents in shaping the conflict. As Paiwan activist Djanav Zengror put it, “we weren’t taken away by car, we took the initiative to get on the ride.”¹³⁹ Using that analogy, the national park proposal was the car that Tayal people took initiative and got involved in. In this process, the Indigenous activists expanded the conversation beyond the

¹³⁸ Icyang Parod, ed., *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan* (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編 下), vol. 2 (Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008), 1125–35.

This is Indigenous activist Lin Ming-De criticizing the Tangwai alliance with Indigenous people during the Indigenous Peoples Movement.

¹³⁹ Ibid. Like Lin, Djanav Zengror was talking about the broader Indigenous Movement, but his statement is applicable in this context too.

creation of a national park and towards deeper issues of Indigenous sovereignty and land rights. Though the Maqaw National Park was shelved indefinitely at the end of this conflict, the activism had long-lasting legacies.

How Chi-lan Became (was reclaimed as) Maqaw

The controversy began as a conflict between environmentalists and the Veteran's Affairs Commission (VAC), established by the KMT regime for its veterans beginning in 1998. At the time, the name "Maqaw" was not part of the picture; it was a fight between settler conservationists and preservationists about the Chi-lan cypress forest.¹⁴⁰ Opposing the excessive logging by the VAC, the environmentalists organized under the banner of the National Alliance to Save the Chi-lan Cypress Forest (NASCF) in 1998. This was a third wave of the forest movement, a subset of the broader Han-led environmental movement that developed during the democratization era, and the environmentalists saw the VAC logging of the cypress forest as prioritizing commercial use and an "authoritarian appropriation."¹⁴¹ In early 1999, environmentalists turned to the strategy of establishing a national park as a means to protect the forest, with a new organization, the Alliance for the Chi-lan Mountain National Park (ACMNP). This stage of the conflict was marked by ideological debates over environmental values and contentions between different government agencies over management of the forest.

How did this settler environmental debate become an Indigenous issue? It was not the intention of the settlers when they were debating about what to do with the Chi-lan forest. Lin Yih-Ren, both a scholar and a pro-park environmentalist, wrote in an op-ed in 2002: "The reason

¹⁴⁰ See Hetch Hetchy debate parallel—conservation for human use and preservation for nature's inherent value.

¹⁴¹ Lin, "Politicizing Nature."

Lin Yih-Ren worked closely with Indigenous people. His article provides a comprehensive overview of the Maqaw National Park controversy that centers the environmental ideological debates. Compared to Zhong Yi-Shih's thesis, "Exploring the Environmental Education of Indigenous Tribe" which pays closer attention to the work of the Tayal community, the article by Lin understated the importance of Indigenous activists in shaping the events. Zhong's thesis was advised by Lin.

that Indigenous issues got involved was an unexpected development from the establishment of the national park.”¹⁴² While it never occurred to environmentalists to consider Indigenous land rights, Tayal people got themselves involved.

In late 1999, ACMNP and other environmental organizations led the second “March for the Forest” demonstration. While the environmentalists called for the national park at the front of the March, a group of Tayal people, including the office of Tayal legislator Payen Talu, the Taiwan Indigenous Alliance for Self-Determination, the Indigenous Labor Alliance, and the Assembly of Tayal Nation (Tayal National Assembly), “brought their own protest signs and cloths, softly voicing at the back of the march, ‘Fight for Survival, Oppose Invasion,’ and ‘Oppose VAC, Defend the Maqaw (Chi-lan) Mountain.’”¹⁴³ This was the first time that “Maqaw” appeared in the discourse around this issue, and the reclamation of the name Maqaw “demonstrated different values Indigenous people held about the mountains and forest in comparison with outside groups (the Bureau of Forestry, VAC, national parks, environmental organizations etc.)”¹⁴⁴ The name reclamation, that “Chi-lan mountain is Maqaw Mountain,” is a reminder of both Taiwan’s colonial history and that the land is Tayal land, challenging the predominant narrative around the forest and the park. Environmentalists with closer ties with Tayal communities, like DPP politician Tian Chiu-Jin, eventually agreed to adopt “Maqaw,” the name that Tayal people proposed, and advocated for the national park as the “Maqaw National Park.” The government accepted the proposal of the new name, but Tayal people led the shift.

¹⁴² Yih-ren Lin, “馬告的另類觀點 3: 回應關曉榮先生 [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw 3: Responding to Mr. Guan Xiao-Rong],” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002, <https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm>.

¹⁴³ Zhong Yi-Shi (鐘頤時), “Exploring the Environmental Education of Indigenous Tribe: A Case Study of Smagus and Cinsbu Village under Maqaw Movement (探索原住民部落的環境教育—以馬告運動中的新光、鎮西堡部落為例)” (National Taiwan Normal University, 2003), 35.

“Taiwan Indigenous Alliance for Self-Determination” and “Indigenous Labor Alliance” are my translations for 台灣原住民自治聯盟 and 原住民勞工聯盟, respectively.

I want to acknowledge Zhong’s work. It not only provided me access to Tayal voices at the time through the interviews, but also demonstrated a more attentive approach to research done by non-Natives that center Native voices and agency.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, 35.

Of course, Tayal people were not so quick to go onboard with the national park plan. National parks have been a major symbol of resistance for Indigenous people in the past two decades due to their colonial nature, so the mistrust ran deep. Even though both the environmentalists and Tayal people were concerned about the logging, their motives came from different places. The first document that put “Maqaw” into public discussion, an op-ed by the Taiwan Indigenous Alliance for Self-Determination published in December 1999, “Please return the Maqaw (Chi-lan) Forest Area for us to look after—rescuing Taiwan’s forests and safeguarding forest culture,” explained their concerns:

Even if the VAC puts down its butcher’s knife, would the mountain region’s nature and human ecological balance be maintained? Would establishing a national park actually prevent inappropriate development? The state sends experts, officials, and other new and external operators into the mountain in the name of conservation and tourism, but wouldn’t this turn guest into host, isolating Indigenous people outside their own land yet again... from our past experiences, we have reason to doubt and fear.¹⁴⁵

While the writers mentioned that they were happy to collaborate with environmental organizations, they also made their demands clear: not only should the VAC leave the Maqaw forest area, the area should also be established as an Indigenous ecological park managed through the Executive Yuan’s Council of Indigenous People and by local Tayal people. Looking at the issue from the perspective of Indigenous sovereignty and in context of the history of oppression under national parks, skepticism of the effort to establish another national park was expected.

The reason that some Tayal people were willing to work with the park advocates was because of the changing political scene. Coming out of the democratization era, Indigenous activists had experience collaborating with more progressive settlers. When DPP politician Chen

¹⁴⁵ Zhong Yi-Shi (鐘頤時), “Exploring the Environmental Education of Indigenous Tribe: A Case Study of Smagus and Cinsbu Village under Maqaw Movement (探索原住民部落的環境教育—以馬告運動中的新光、鎮西堡部落為例),” 121–24.

Original text: 然而，退輔會放下屠刀，就能確保山區自然人文生態的平衡嗎？設立國家公園的構想，果真可以阻止不當開發嗎？國家以保育、觀光等事業的名義派專家、公務員等新的外來經營者進到山林來，是不是會反客為主，再次把原住民隔絕在自己的土地之外... 從過去的經驗看來，我們有理由產生懷疑和恐懼。

Shui-Bien was elected as President in 2000, people were hopeful for change. President Chen made promises to the Indigenous people in his campaign, and he signed a treaty-like document “New Partnership Policy with Indigenous People” once elected; the goals of this document included “recognize the traditional territories of Indigenous people” and largely responded to the past two decades of Native activism.¹⁴⁶ While democratization did not address the problems of settler colonialism, it certainly opened up opportunities. Zhong observed, “the Indigenous movement went along with the environmental movement’s push for the democratization of environmental management, which allowed [Indigenous people], long oppressed by environmental mechanisms, the opportunity to get involved.”¹⁴⁷

Pastor Atung Yupas from Cinsbu, a Tayal buluo, was a key activist who took advantage of the opportunities from the discussion around a new national park. While Atung Yupas was active in Indigenous Peoples Movement, characterized by street protests and direct resistance, he saw opportunities for dialogue and advocacy in this new moment, taking initiative to shape policies:

“On the land of my ancestors, as a Tayal person, as a host of the land, we must return and defend the land until the end, so we have to push for something, we are not just being passive, not just complaining. We must be careful. In the past and for so long, we have resisted and fought. [Now] we discuss the national park; we didn’t have the opportunity to express our ideas, in the past there wasn’t space. Now the whole thing is an opening, poking into this hole we can begin to understand, since they [environmentalists and the new DPP administration] also opened things up from the past relationships of wariness.”¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶Lin, “Politicizing Nature,” 96.

¹⁴⁷Zhong, “Exploring the Environmental Education of Indigenous Tribe: A Case Study of Smagus and Cinsbu Village under Maqaw Movement,” 40-41.

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

Original text:

在祖先的土地上，身為一個泰雅族，身為一個土地的主人，必須要回來死守這一塊土地，所以要開始推動怎麼樣，我們現在不是只有在被動，不是只有在埋怨，我們必須非常的謹慎，在過去這麼許多的時間，我們去抗爭，去跟國家公園去討論，因為你沒有機會去表達我們的意見，過去沒有這個空間，所以現在整個就是這一個戳洞，從這一個戳洞就開始去了解，因為他們41也是把這個過去的這些不信任的關係把他打開來。

I choose to translate “主人” as host rather than owner because I believe it better represents how Atung Yupas saw his relationship with the land.

Through collaborating with the environmentalists and the new DPP administration, including DPP politician Tien Chiu-Jin, who he had previous connections with, Atung Yupas actively voiced his concerns in planning sessions for the national park.¹⁴⁹ He led the pro-park Tayal faction and worked toward a co-managed Maqaw National Park as part of the Maqaw National Park Consultation Committee. In the third March for the Forests, Tayal people were no longer at the back of the line.¹⁵⁰ Atung Yupas led the community members of the Cinsbu and Smagus buluos in the front, representing the Indigenous leadership and inclusion in the park movement. Through this process, the debate shifted away from the original one over development versus conservation (preservation), the VAC was sidelined, and the contention now centered Indigenous issues like co-management and land rights.¹⁵¹

As the Maqaw National Park Consultation Committee embarked on the uncharted path of co-management, a prominent Rukai activist, Taiban Sasala published an op-ed, “Before establishing a national park, draw a buluo map [Indigenous community mapping] first” in 2001.¹⁵² Mapping is an important site of contention because, as Zhong put it, “in the modern nation state system, maps often represent the basis on which the state wields its power over space [land].”¹⁵³ Taiban Sasala’s concept of a buluo map challenges convention: it is based on the experiences of elders and Indigenous ecological knowledge, mapping out land through Indigenous epistemologies. Such documents allow Indigenous communities to shape the land use in their territories and provide a basis on which communities can negotiate land rights with the government, and more. This proposal influenced the approach of the committee, offering a strategy to put Indigenous self-determination in practice.

¹⁴⁹ Zhong, 41.

¹⁵⁰ This frame of analysis comes from Zhong’s thesis, with Zhong emphasizing Indigenous leadership and agency in the arguments.

¹⁵¹ Lin, “Politicizing Nature,” 97–98.

¹⁵² Taiban Sasala, “設國家公園前請先畫張部落地圖 [Before Establishing a National Park, Daw a Buluo Map First],” 中國時報, March 24, 2020. Originally published in 2001.

¹⁵³ Zhong, 29.

Original text: 在現代化的國家體制裡，地圖往往代表著國家行使空間掌控權力的依據。

Native activists like Atung Yupas and Taiban Sasala worked hard to ensure Indigenous involvement, finding new ways to make space for Indigenous futurity.¹⁵⁴ Unlike most mainstream narratives about the Maqaw controversy, which focus on the ideological aspects of national parks and co-management, Zhong's thesis about Atung Yupas's buluo Cinsbu and another pro-park community, Smagus, reminded readers of the agency of Native people in participating in the park movement and shaping the discourse: most obviously, Tayal people reclaimed Chi-lan as Maqaw.¹⁵⁵ Zhong also recognized that while the activists were pushing limits in certain areas, there remained systemic constraints on Indigenous participation in the park creation process. For example, despite the prospects of co-management in national parks, the question of how to actualize co-management remained a thorny issue. "No one knows what co-management is," Ji Jun-Jie wrote in an op-ed, quoting J. Willmott, a former chair of the board of joint-management of Australia's Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park.¹⁵⁶ Ji pointed out that many within the government conflated "co-management" with "consultation," and beyond the catchphrase of co-management there must be a review of what the management mechanisms would actually reflect the co-management.¹⁵⁷ Ji's article was published in September 2002, when the discussion around co-management had been happening for almost two years, revealing how deep the tensions were over the proposed co-managed national park.

To understand the systemic issues, we can look to independent Tayal politician and legislator Civas Ali (Kao Chin Su-Mei) and her anti-park faction. Atung Yupas and the pro-park Tayal faction fought and influenced the process of park and land management, bringing Indigenous rights and land relations into the conversation. Civas Ali and the anti-park faction

¹⁵⁴ For more on Indigenous futurity, see Harjo, "Introduction: Renegotiating Mvskoke Knowledge."

¹⁵⁵ Zhong, 51.

¹⁵⁶ Ji Jun-Jie (紀駿傑), "馬告的共管難題 [Maqaw's Co-management Difficulty]," 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002, <https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02091901.htm2002/yi02091701.htm>.

¹⁵⁷ Besides conflating co-management with consultation, park officials had also conflated it with quotas in government positions and employment, as anti-park activists pointed out.

took a different path, identifying and pushing against the systemic issues of settler colonialism.

Opposition to Maqaw

Democratization opened up some space for Indigenous inclusion, but it was still an iteration of settler colonialism. The newly proposed Maqaw National Park featured Indigenous co-management but still operated within the confines of a colonial reality, so many Tayal people remained skeptical. When KMT-aligned politicians, Tayal legislator Kao Yang-Sheng and Pangcah legislator Tsai Chung-Han (Safulo Kacaw Lalanges) hosted a public hearing in December 2000 titled “Do Indigenous People Approve of the Maqaw National Park,” many questions were raised. Though DPP politicians like Tien Chiu-Jin, who worked closely with Atung Yupas and his community, assured the Tayal people that the new administration will do things differently and the times have changed, her words did not convince everyone. Many Tayal people, including local politicians and leaders, were suspicious of the efforts for a new park on the basis of a long history of state oppression.¹⁵⁸ This deep-rooted oppression, which has not ended with democratization, is what Ciwas Ali’s anti-Maqaw faction contends with.

At the core of the opposition is the fact that settler colonialism persists. Tien says that the times have changed, but that is mostly for the settlers. Democratization made colonialism a past tense for settlers, but colonialism is ongoing for Indigenous people. This is perhaps the most important intervention in the discourse from the anti-Maqaw faction. In most of the back-and-forth between op-ed’s and online statements, environmentalists steered clear from discussions about settler colonialism—most of the debate focused on specific issues, such as whether changes in national park law were necessary.¹⁵⁹ However, from the upset that many environmentalists

¹⁵⁸ Lin, 98.

¹⁵⁹ Many of these debates were published online, and I was fortunate to access a lot of them through both Ciwas Ali’s blog and the Environmental Info Center archives. There are others I looked for but got lost on the internet during the past two decades, likely because of broken links. These documents also were spotty, with incomplete information, especially dates, so I had to use external sources to verify them. However, the online nature of the debate and all the records I can still find, two decades later, is testament to how

displayed in their responses, which I talk about in the next section, it is reasonable to suspect that Native arguments around colonialism had an impact.

Two anti-Maqaw opinion pieces point out the ongoing colonialism clearly. Neither of them used the specific term “settler colonialism,” but the colonialism they describe matches what we discuss in English as “settler colonialism.” Ciwas Ali’s blog published a post “The Vile Internal Colonialism: The Vile National Park Loincloth” in response to the existing Yushan National Park’s Director Zhang He-Ping’s offensive public statement on an Indigenous TV news show, which described the Bunun of Tumpu Daingaz as rat feces for demanding access to their Dahdah hot springs.¹⁶⁰ This incident occurred in February 2001, in the midst of the Maqaw park controversy, and only worsened already skeptical Tayal people’s expectations about a new park. The blog post asserts that Zhang revealed his deeper conscious, which was a “classic representation of Taiwanese society’s racism and colonial plunder against Indigenous people.”¹⁶¹ It also addresses grievances against the broader political situation post-democratization: “Ruling regimes past and present have failed to make amends to the colonial political economy structure—shaped by Taiwan’s modern history—that oppresses Indigenous peoples.”¹⁶² National parks were just a “loincloth” for covering the shameful issue of colonialism. National park advocates are not the only ones failing to contend with settler colonialism. The entire nation, even the more progressive DPP, still has work to do.

An op-ed responding to Lin Yih-Ren’s series, “Alternative Perspectives on Maqaw,” Guan Xiao-Rong, a non-Native member of the Ciwas Ali affiliated Buluo Working Group (部落

significant the Maqaw controversy was in the national discourse.

¹⁶⁰ This incident led to major outcry, and Director Zhang ultimately stepped down from the position. I elaborate a little more about this incident in the next chapter on Tumpu Daingaz.

¹⁶¹ Ciwas Ali, “醜惡的內部殖民·醜惡的國家公園遮羞布 [The Vile Internal Colonialism: The Vile National Park Loincloth],” February 23, 2001, http://www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=593:records-record16-593&catid=47:record15&Itemid=246.

Original text: “我們更關切的時張處長所坦白的深層意識，正式台灣社會的種族歧視及其對原住民族遂行殖民主義掠奪的典型意識形態”

¹⁶² Ibid.

工作隊) also raises the colonial issue. The piece, titled “What Kind of Alternative Perspective?” in Guan’s series, “Exposing the Pseudo-Democratic and Hypocritical Maqaw National Park,” argues, “the old colonialism’s violent destruction that Taiwan’s Indigenous peoples experienced have not ‘passed,’ and I am afraid that there are renewals of religious, political, economic, cultural, environmental, ecological etc. forms of ‘neocolonialism.’”¹⁶³ Guan also criticizes how the Native demand for “self-determination/self-governance” have been diluted in Lin’s argument as a lofty ideal in need of practical implementation.¹⁶⁴ Like the article on Ciwas Ali’s blog, Guan emphasized the broader colonial problems that the park exemplifies. In other words, the issue is not just the park, it is settler colonialism.

The anti-park faction also had criticisms more specific to the national park issue, especially the fact that existing national parks and national park laws remained unaddressed. Sun Ming-Lin, whose thesis argued that national parks are both symbols of oppression of state violence and resistance for the Indigenous Peoples movement, discussed this issue in an op-ed titled “Let’s Pause the Establishment of Maqaw National Park!” Sun approved of the co-management system, but he argued that “with the current national park laws not amended and the mechanisms for local Indigenous participation still absent in existing Yushan, Sheipa, and Taroko National Parks, the attempt to use the so-called “co-managed Maqaw National Park” as an example for Indigenous participation in other national parks seems to be flawed in the action logic.” In other words, Sun found it irrational to create another park with Indigenous governance when existing ones remained problematic. In the broader picture, the sequence of action is more

¹⁶³ Guan Xiao-Rong 關曉榮, “【南方】什麼樣的另類觀點? --摘自「揭發偽民主. 偽善的馬告國家公園」系列 (關曉榮) —智邦公益電子報—台灣最大公益電子報發行中心,” *南方電子報 [Nan Fang Dian Zi Bao]*, September 26, 2002, <https://enews.url.com.tw/enews/14263>.

Original text: “台灣原住民族所遭受的舊殖民主義的暴力摧殘不僅沒有「過去」, 恐怕還在翻新著宗教、政治、經濟、文化、環境、生態等等「新殖民主義」。”

Guan also problematically claims that Atung Yupas is being used by the pro-park faction against the Tayal people, an argument that the pro-park settler also uses against Ciwas Ali’s faction. This demonstrates how settlers (like me) have to check their biases even in arguments against colonialism.

¹⁶⁴ In Lin’s response to Guan, “馬告的另類觀點 3：回應關曉榮先生 [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw 3: Responding to Mr. Guan Xiao-Rong]” he did not mention the term “colonialism.”

related to the political process, but his reminder about the existing problems is important. If the existing system for national parks is flawed, the new national park is more than likely to produce the same colonial problems from a systemic point of view. Li Yu-Hui, mayor of the majority Tayal Datong Township (Tayal: Minnao), also wrote a piece, “Regardless of Maqaw, National Park Laws Must be Amended.” Li notes how the Taiwanese government imposes state and colonial violence through the national park laws. Li wrote, “History tells us that the National Park Law is an evil law for Indigenous people, it is a genocidal policy that kills without shedding blood. It is because of the national parks’ occupation of Taiwan Indigenous Peoples’ reasonable spaces for living that the Native people’s lives are withering away.”¹⁶⁵

Ciwas Ali also pointed out specific issues in the proposed Maqaw National Parks, questioning whether the Maqaw National Park would be as revolutionary as park advocates claimed. . First, the original debate around environmental values had not been fully settled, and within the existing government structure, agencies with conflicting interests of conservation and development.¹⁶⁶ Considering settler interests in the park’s resources, including developments for tourism, the anti-park faction questioned whether a national park would actually serve its purpose and be effective in protecting the environment. They argued that Native people are better positioned to care for the land.

Second, while Tayal people had input in the co-management scheme, the settlers still held more power in the existing network of government agencies that manage national parks. The proposed mechanism was set up so that there were only position quotas and many likely Native people only get to participate in lower tier jobs or getting certain position quotas, which meant

¹⁶⁵ Li Yu-Hui (李玉蕙), “不談馬告 國家公園法還是要修,” *祖靈之邦 [Ancestor’s Realm]* (blog), May 29, 2003, www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=766:records-record05-766&catid=36:record05&Itemid=235.

Original text: “歷史告訴我們「國家公園法」對原住民族發展來說，是惡法、是殺人不見血的民族滅絕政策，都是因為國家公園霸佔了台灣原住民族合理生存的空間，才讓民族生命日漸凋零”

¹⁶⁶ Ciwas Ali, “醜惡的內部殖民·醜惡的國家公園遮羞布 [The Vile Internal Colonialism: The Vile National Park Loincloth].”

that they had little influence over important decision making. The antipark faction published a statement, “Why are we firmly against the Maqaw National Park,” where they examined the specific mechanisms listed in Maqaw’s co-management plans. “In the proposal, we can only see the quotas for Indigenous people in government positions. We don’t see where Indigenous sovereignty is [specified] in the co-management mechanism? Can Indigenous people limit the number of tourists? Can Indigenous people veto tourist road developments that damage the environment?”¹⁶⁷ The proposed co-management did not challenge existing power dynamics within national parks and land management. Ciwas Ali’s blog published a post titled, “We want to be the hosts of our land, not sweep the floor and clean up the environment!” with snippets of conversations by key stakeholders around the process to amend the National Park Law so Indigenous co-management is accounted for.¹⁶⁸ Questions were raised about how much the government’s set up of co-management focused on Indigenous inclusion in employment.

All in all, the Native opposition did not want another national park, especially not when the existing colonial system where national parks operate still existed. Co-management was insufficient. They wanted sovereignty and self-governance, advocating for an Indigenous autonomous area instead. However, this opposition upset the environmentalists. They responded actively while ignoring most of the core issues the opposition raised about colonialism.

Why is it so upsetting to settlers? As Tuck and Yang describe, “Decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that

¹⁶⁷ Buluo Working Group (部落工作隊), “為什麼我們堅決反對設立「馬告國家公園」? [Why are we firmly against the Maqaw National Park?],” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002, <https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02053101.htm>.

¹⁶⁸ A similar sentiment was expressed in the United States, discussed in Katrina Phillip’s article, “When Grandma Went to Washington.” Wisconsin governor and environmentalist Gaylord Nelson attempted to seize the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore from the Bad River and Red Cliff bands of Ojibwe, claiming that there would be employment opportunities for Native people. Phillips writes that in response, “Sister Grace Ann, an Ojibwe nun and a leader in the opposition, derisively said, ‘Employment on the lake shore project will be restricted by qualification standards, and your job will be picking up the trash.’” Ultimately, Red Cliff created the first tribal national park in the US, the Frog Bay Tribal National Park, in 2011.

is, *all* of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity,” and they quote Fanon, “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed.”¹⁶⁹ Even though environmentalists stood in solidarity with Tayal people around protecting their forests, they were unwilling to relinquish their power and recognize the agency of the opposition Tayal faction. In their eyes, “self-governance” is too lofty and the Tayal opposition were asking for too much.

The Limits of Environmentalism

Environmentalists shared goals and collaborated with Tayal people like Atung Yupas, accepting the idea of co-management. While the Maqaw National Park was not created, co-management remained influential for changing the ways that existing national parks operated. For working with Tayal people to incorporate Native issues within the national park concerns, environmentalists have partial credit. This section focuses on the limits and ongoing colonial discourse of environmentalism, but it is important to recognize that the work of these environmentalists is not black and white. Environmentalists have done good things, demonstrated by the willingness of some Tayal people to collaborate and the progress they have made together. Yet the same group of environmentalists working with Tayal people for a benevolent cause to protect the forest through the Maqaw National Park were nevertheless able to speak so offensively when Indigenous people do not share their interest.¹⁷⁰ What seems like a contradiction suggests that the environmentalist’s willingness to collaborate with people like Atung Yupas stemmed from their shared goal of a national park rather than a full acknowledgement of Indigenous efforts for sovereignty and land reclamation.

As noted in the previous section, environmentalists often ignored the issue of colonialism

¹⁶⁹ Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is not a metaphor,” 7.

¹⁷⁰ For more on how environmentalism can be for benevolent causes *and* perpetuate settler colonialism, see Max Liboiron, *Pollution is Colonialism*.

when responding to criticisms about the park. For example, in responding to Guan's arguments about neocolonialism through environmentalism, Lin avoided mentioning colonialism. Instead, Lin wrote "The people's pent up resentment towards the state's historical hatred is being teased and provoked!"¹⁷¹ By claiming that the *people's* (as opposed to Indigenous people) resentment towards the state and experiences of hatred were "historical," Lin's framing disregarded how many Native people still felt about the state despite democratization. Perhaps *settler's* experiences of state oppression under KMT authoritarianism were historical, but the opposition pointed out clearly that the colonialism they experience is ongoing.

Similarly, Chen Yu-Feng's call against amending the National Park Law overlooked the reasons why the opposition called it an evil law. He argued for preserving the existing legal structure because it protects the environment and is based on international standards. However, this objective only serves settler interests; conforming to international (western) standards benefited the legitimacy of the settler colonial state but has little to do with the wellbeing of Native people whose lands are occupied. By questioning "Is the National Park Law really an evil law," Chen implied that he has read Li's criticism of the law as evil. Yet Chen did not address Li's concern of the law as a "genocidal policy" and national parks as occupying the living spaces of Native people. Rather addressing the structural issues of the law, he claimed that Indigenous rights could be protected through participating in the planning process.

Environmentalists also assumed that Native people would always align with settler environmental interests. Tien Chiu-Jin, the DPP politician and leader of the Maqaw National Park Movement spoke up the public hearing in December 2000, "Do Indigenous People Approve of the Maqaw National Park," saying:

We have initiated several demonstrations, but we have not seen many Tayal friends participate, so we are very sad. We thought that our Tayal friends were in support of VAC's continued logging of the Maqaw mountain. Thankfully some Indigenous friends told us that because people were busy and had to make a living, they were not able to

¹⁷¹ Lin, "馬告的另類觀點 3: 回應關曉榮先生 [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw 3: Responding to Mr. Guan Xiao-Rong]."

come. Friends, if the national park we want to establish today is the same as the ones established during KMT rule, I will be the first to stand up in opposition. But times have changed. Our National Park Law was issued in 1972 and hasn't changed for 28 years, but half a year after the new [DPP] government came into power it was immediately amended and has been sent to the Legislative Yuan through the Executive Yuan. Everyone, the legislators are absolutely in support [of the amendment], DPP legislators definitely have no problem.¹⁷²

Tien boldly assumed that simply because Tayal people did not show up at settler environmental demonstrations meant that they supported logging, which revealed her lack of comprehension of Indigenous land relations. Tien wanted Native people to support her cause based on common interests against logging, but the fact that Native people told Tien they were busy making a living suggests that under colonialism, Indigenous people had to struggle with survival first. Tien's claims that the DPP regime would be different also overlooked the fact that it was still a settler colonial government.

Like Tien, Fu Zhi-Nan, the Director of Kaohsiung City Teacher Association's Ecological Education Center (高雄市教師會生態教育中心) assumed that Tayal people would align with environmentalist interests. Fu published an op-ed, "Tayal People, Stand Up!" In response to the anti-Maqaw protestors' cries of "Tayal people, stand up!", writing how he thought, "You have finally stood up, my Tayal friends! Finally you are actively standing up for Maqaw's cypress forests!" but was disappointed when he found them opposing the park and "ruining their dreams of self-governance."¹⁷³ Even though Fu recognized that Native people were distrustful towards

¹⁷² 公共電視-我們的島, *我們的島* 第92集 棲蘭森林運動 (2001-01-29) [*Our Island Episode 92: The Chi-Lan Forest Movement*], 我們的島 [Our Island], 2012, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ie6tgWkMbBc>.

Original Text: 我們發起幾次的大遊行, 但是我們很少看到泰雅族的朋友參與, 我們非常傷心。我們以為泰雅族的朋友都支持退輔會繼續砍伐馬告山。還好有一些原住民的朋友告訴我們, 因為大家都很忙, 必須顧生活, 所以沒有辦法。各位朋友, 如果今天我們要成立的國家公園是跟過去國民黨政府時代成立的就國家公園一樣的話, 我第一個站出來反對。但是時代已經改變了, 我們國家公園法 61 年公佈, 28 年沒有修改, 新政府成立半年立刻修改, 已經通過行政院院會送到立法院。各位, 立法委員絕對支持, 民進黨的委員絕對沒有問題。

¹⁷³ Fu Zhi-Nan (傅志男), "泰雅爾族人站出來! [Stand up, Tayal People!]" 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002, <https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02082701.htm>. Original text:

the current government because of ongoing oppression, he still wanted them to stand up for the national park and hold the government accountable with the environmentalists because everyone shares the same goal of protecting the cypress forest.¹⁷⁴ It is somewhat perplexing how Fu knew why Indigenous people were skeptical and still expected them to work alongside environmentalists; perhaps it is because he conflated Indigenous advocacy for their land with environmentalist goals of protecting the forest.

In the same article, Fu also questioned, “are the Tayal people ready to self-govern?”¹⁷⁵ While it is true that, located in the existing colonial structure and with traditional Tayal societies disrupted, there are challenges with re-establishing Indigenous self-governance. However, this is not a question for settlers to ask but one for Tayal people to determine for themselves. By asking this question, Fu challenged the Tayal people’s self-determination. Similarly, another group of environmentalists—multiple environmental organizations—published a statement “Indigenous People Have Become the Tools of the VAC Against Conservation Organizations.”¹⁷⁶ Both articles fail to recognize Indigenous agency in determining their own futures, futures that are incommensurable with settler ones.

Finally, one environmentalist statement stood out for its disrespect towards Indigenous people. Li Gen-Zheng, representing multiple environmental organizations, wrote the piece “Who

“「終於站出來了，泰雅爾族的朋友！終於積極地為馬告這片檜木林挺身而出！」只是，現場「反馬告國家公園」的觀點，似乎會把泰雅爾族人的自治夢給戳破。”

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

Original text: “畢竟原住民受到外來政權壓迫、欺騙已久，無法相信政府這次的善意是否屬實，這很正常，也是現在的政府應接受的原罪。”

“就更需要你們站出來，我們絕對支持你們，一起監督政府，因為大家的目的都一樣，就是把這個擁有世界遺產價值的檜木林保留下來。”

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ “原住民已成退輔會對抗保育團體的工具—不要低估退輔會的反撲能量 [Indigenous People have become the tools of the VAC against Conservation Organizations],” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002, <https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02082201.htm>.

Let the Indigenous Rights Movement Get Stained with 'Blood.'"¹⁷⁷ This piece was in response to a group under Civas Ali's anti-park faction, the Buluo Working Group's statement for opposing Maqaw. The Buluo Working Group's article alluded to the history of Japanese colonialism and the violent land dispossession at the time, warning: "to protect our traditional territories, we have shed blood to fight against the Japanese army's guns; we will do so with the Maqaw National Park too!"¹⁷⁸ While the Buluo Working Group's statement was meant to assert that their fight for land is ongoing, Li saw them as violent, comparing them to terrorists and accusing Civas Ali of spreading hatred. Li's statement went further to position conservation organizations as the benevolent and generous in allowing Native people to participate, taking credit for the actions that Tayal people took to protect their lands:

If not for the societal pressure that the conservation organizations exerted against VAC's logging of the cypress forest and for the creation of a national park, Indigenous people would never have the chance to participate in the management of the Chi-lan mountain, let alone through co-management.

Indigenous people were invited back to be the shared owner of land, starting from nothing to now having the rights of management, how is there political predatory behavior? Is there anyone being sacrificed?¹⁷⁹

Li also urged for Tayal people to move on from the "historical" injustices and, instead of resisting the park with blood, participate in the building process of a national park that is "full of goodwill towards Indigenous people."¹⁸⁰ Even as the statement urged for the Tayal opposition to partner

¹⁷⁷ Li Gen-Zheng (李根政), "是誰讓原住民權益運動染上「鮮血」 [Who Let the Indigenous Rights Movement Get Stained with 'Blood']," Blog, 馬告國家公園催生 [The Push for the Maqaw National Park], August 22, 2002, <https://blog.xuite.net/weic430306/twblog/165002270>.

¹⁷⁸ Buluo Working Group (部落工作隊), "為什麼我們堅決反對設立「馬告國家公園」? [Why are we firmly against the Maqaw National Park?]"

Original text: "為了保衛我們的傳統領域，我們曾經用鮮血抵禦日軍的槍砲；為了馬告國家公園我們也會如此!"

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

Original text: "如果不是保育團體促成的社會壓力阻止退輔會砍伐檜木林，要求成立國家公園，原住民對棲蘭山根本沒有機會參與經營管理，遑論共管。原住民被邀請回來當土地共同的主人，經營管理權從無到有，何來政治上的弱肉強食？又有誰被犧牲了？"

Both Indigenous and Han people use the Mandarin phrase "主人," which usually means owner, when discussing land ownership. However, when I translate this term for Indigenous people, I choose the translation "host" versus "owner" because I think that better represents the way Native people use the term.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

with the environmentalists under the appearance of benevolence, it produced violent rhetoric against them. This statement exposed the settler-centric worldview that many environmentalists held, one that ignores environmentalist complicity within the ongoing settler colonial system.

Though environmentalists argue that Indigenous rights and environmentalism can co-exist, their narrative bypassed fundamental questions around colonialism and sovereignty. As long as environmentalists fail to reckon with ongoing colonialism and recognize how settler interests and Indigenous interests are incommensurable, their work will continue to reproduce violent, settler colonial relations with Indigenous people and land. Even when the environmentalist goal is to protect the forests, the process is still colonial as it assumes settler access to Native Land.¹⁸¹

Expansive Ways

Ciwas Ali's faction might be seen as anti-park and Atung Yupas might be pro-park on the surface, but both their narratives went far beyond the limits of national parks. They might seem to be in opposition, but they simply took different strategies. I like to think of them this way: Atung Yupas is building up Indigenous ways of land management from the cracks of the settler colonial structure. Ciwas Ali is tearing down the remaining settler colonial structure. Both of them had to leverage settler power, but they were not pawns as settlers on both sides have portrayed them. Instead, they found creative ways of subversion.

To see Atung Yupas only as a pro-park activist minimizes his flatten activism. Beyond Maqaw, he was an active participant of the broader Indigenous Peoples Movement. Though he worked within the environmentalist movement, he also pushed against the limits of the environmentalist concepts to open up spaces for Tayal participation. Within the environmental movement, Atung Yuaps carved out his own narratives in service to Tayal people. For example,

¹⁸¹ Liboiron, *Pollution is Colonialism*.

in response to the environmentalist idea of sustainability, he created the concept, “pslabang qenexan krryax,” which translates roughly as “forever life expansive,” based on Tayal cultures and land relations.¹⁸² Atung Yupas was not simply accepting the western idea but creating new Tayal cultural ways. While the colonial imagination sees Indigenous peoples and their culture in a frozen past detached from the present, his cultural creativity is an act of Indigenous futurity and resurgence. Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar Leanne Betasamosake Simpson writes about resurgence and Biskaabiiyang, a verb that means “to look back,” in the Nishnaabeg context:

“Within Nishnaabeg theoretical foundations, Biskaabiiyang does not literally mean returning to the past, but rather re-creating the cultural and political flourishing of the past to support the well-being of our contemporary citizens. It means reclaiming the fluidity around our traditions, not the rigidity of colonialism; it means encouraging the self-determination of individuals within our national and community-based contexts; and it means re-creating an artistic and intellectual renaissance within a larger political and cultural resurgence.”¹⁸³

Thinking alongside Simpson, we can see how Atung Yupas’s response to an environmentalist idea is generative and grounded in his own context. When the Maqaw controversy came to an end, Atung Yupas continued to apply his “sustainable development” concept to protect his buluo, Cinsbu.¹⁸⁴ He worked within the economic reality, fighting against land loss (sale) by centering the interconnectedness of land and culture and applying traditional knowledge in new ways.¹⁸⁵

As a politician, Civas Ali is entangled in the reality of political realms and cannot circumvent utilizing political means, including leveraging the KMT’s power, to achieve goals. However, like Atung Yupas, Civas Ali pushed against the limited ways that settler colonial society imagined Indigenous activism could look like. As a legislator, she played a key role in the

¹⁸² Zhong, 60.

¹⁸³ Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Dancing on Our Turtle’s Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence* (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Pub, 2011), 51.

¹⁸⁴ He Bo-Jun (何柏均), “泰雅族兄弟的接力奮戰：如何用永續精神守護鎮西堡 [Tayal Bother’s Relay Fight: How to use the spirit of sustainability to protect Cinsbu],” 報導者 The Reporter, August 16, 2021, <https://www.twreporter.org/a/aboriginal-reserve-hsinchu-cinsbu>.

I say “sustainable development” because this article does not use Atung Yupas’s Tayal phrase as documented in Zhong’s thesis.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

passing of the Indigenous Peoples Basic Law, which brought fundamental changes to Taiwan's existing legal system in protecting Indigenous rights in writing.

Both activists were determined for Indigenous futures and lands based on self-determination, and their work continued beyond Maqaw. The efforts they represent continue to create new pathways of Indigenous futures.

Chapter 7: Tumpu Daingaz and the Yushan National Park

Tumpu Daingaz is a Bunun buluo located within the Yushan National Park—or, a Bunun buluo whose traditional territory is occupied by the Yushan National Park. The story of Tumpu Daingaz began before the Maqaw National Park controversy, with the Yushan National Park established in 1985. Drawn into park boundaries and taken over without consent, Tumpu Daingaz was part of the anti-park movement in the 1980s and 1990s and protested the strict policing and difficult life under national park control.¹⁸⁶ These experiences led to sentiments of “leaving” the park, or being drawn outside of the National Park boundaries. The tipping point was the ordeal experienced by Ilausan, a Tumpu Bunun territory outside of the park that was developed into a hot spring tourist area by private settler capital. Despite suffering the consequences of ecological colonialism by the park, the Bunun of Tumpu Daingaz ultimately chose to “stay” within the park: witnessing the land dispossession in Ilausan, people in Tumpu Daingaz began to see Yushan as a form of “protection” against the incursion of private capital and voted overwhelmingly for “staying.”¹⁸⁷

This occurred alongside the Maqaw National Park controversy, so with the emergence of the co-management ideology, Tumpu Daingaz began establishing a partnership with the National Park to improve their livelihoods and care for their land. Indigenous narratives about Tumpu Daingaz’s relationship with the Yushan National Park, produced years after the vote, present positive attitudes towards this partnership. On the surface, it seems like the national park and environmentalism successfully protected Tumpu Daingaz. The result, what seems like Tumpu Daingaz’s support for the park, has served the National Park officials in painting a rosy picture of

¹⁸⁶ Consent: while the park residents initially agreed to the park’s establishment with promises of prosperity and protection, the reality suggests that the promises were deception. Therefore, despite initial agreements, I do not believe that the buluo has truly consented to what they received under the national park rule.

¹⁸⁷ The discussion of ecological colonialism of national parks by Ji Jun-Jie (紀駿傑) was referenced by Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), in his thesis, “Tumpu Daingaz.” I use it interchangeably with environmental colonialism to refer to the policing of Indigenous land relations.

their relationship with Indigenous peoples.

The truth is far more complicated. A closer comparison between the two Indigenous narratives and a publication by the park reveals that, despite a mutual recognition of their partnership, the Indigenous and national park's understandings of the situation diverge. Hunting is still outlawed, and at least till 2017, the Bunun residents of Tumpu Daingaz still lacked access to use the hot spring water sources: the choice to "stay" in the park did not bring fundamental changes to the issues first raised about national parks. The question of the legitimacy of the park to rule over Bunun life on their traditional territories remains unanswered. If so, why did Tumpu Daingaz make the decision to stay? Why do some Bunun retellings of their relationship with Yushan seem, at least on the surface, conciliatory towards the park?

In this chapter, I explore the seemingly contradictory observations about Tumpu Daingaz's relationship. When the tensions about "staying" or "leaving" were most strong, many Bunun people of Tumpu Daingaz asserted an alternative framing: "it is not us (Tumpu Daingaz) that are located within them (the Yushan National Park), it is they that are within our traditional territories," which Wang Kai-Hong argued "hit the nail on the head in differentiating who's the true host and visitor."¹⁸⁸ Accompanying this radical understanding was the acknowledgement that, under current circumstances, working with the park allowed for more possibilities than "leaving" and finding a foothold in the realms of private tourism capital. The choice to "stay" and the Indigenous narratives that appear conciliatory towards the park, they do not represent surrender to nor a complete acceptance of the park. Despite the park taking advantage of their partnership and appropriating their stories to bolster their image as positive and legitimate, Indigenous people tell their stories with a subversive throughline that counters settler attempts to

¹⁸⁸ Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), "Tumpu Daingaz: A resistance space of Bunun Aborigines of Taiwan (Tumpu Daingaz: 一個台灣原住民族布農族的抵抗空間)" (Masters, National Taiwan Normal University, 2005), 75, <http://rportal.lib.ntnu.edu.tw:80/handle/20.500.12235/94017>. Like Zhong, Wang's work was also provided me access to read Bunun voices directed. He too demonstrated some ways that non-Native writers write about Native issues in a considerate way.

dominate the narrative. Behind the surface issue of the national park is Tumpu Daingaz's fight for the integrity of Bunun land and life.

The Yushan National Park's Establishment

The Yushan National Park is located in Nantou County, central Taiwan, and was established under the KMT regime in 1985. Under the authoritarian regime, the government had much more leeway to establish the Yushan National Park in ways that served their own goals, as I discussed in Chapter 5. When drawing the boundaries of the park, Tumpu Daingaz was included for what the government saw as cultural and historical values: the Indigenous peoples who lived there, and the Batongguan Trail of 1875, which was built and maintained by the Qing and Japanese colonial regimes to control Indigenous peoples. In fact, the government initially considered including the land of Tumpu Daingaz for its cultural and historical features while relocating the Indigenous residents, but Bunun resistance prevented the relocation. The inclusion of the Tumpu Daingaz territory, and, more importantly, the commodification of culture and glorification of colonial history, was to serve the tourist industry and the nation-building agenda of the KMT government.

The government was effectively making decisions about the park on its own, but to actualize the park establishment, park officials still had to negotiate with the residents who lived on what was now designated as a national park. When park officials began stationing in the newly drawn park boundaries, they promised to residents that the Yushan National Parks would bring economic prosperity when the residents were taught about agricultural production and how to improve their lives.¹⁸⁹ Under the officials' rhetoric of "improvement" and "prosperity" laid a desire and effort to "civilize" Indigenous people by forcefully assimilating them into the settler

¹⁸⁹ Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), "文化重創, 獵人悲鳴 [Cultural Casualties, Hunter's Cry in Grief]," 祖靈之邦 [*Ancestor's Realm*] (blog), February 23, 2001, www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=595:records-record16-595&catid=47:record15&Itemid=246.

society and ways of being. Nonetheless, the promised prosperity and support from the government for development were appealing, and the political elites voiced their welcome to the park.¹⁹⁰ While some residents were caught off guard with the announcement of the park establishment due to a lack of outreach, there was a level of acceptance towards the park. A Tumpu Daingaz elder and a key figure in this case study, Pastor Alang Islituan, wrote: “Before Yushan National Park was established... when the experts and scholars came to research the wishes of the Tumpu Daingaz residents, I was extremely supportive of the park’s establishment. This is because I have accepted the Christianity faith and have deep love for the ecological environment and nature’s plants and animals, and I teach the residents of Tumpu Daingaz that believers should care for the plants and animals that God created. I was happy to become a resident within the National Park, believing that the presence of the national park has a favorable outlook.”¹⁹¹

Once they accepted the establishment of the park, the reality of living under the park system stood in stark contrast with the pictures painted by the officials. “The Bunun has agreed to the park’s establishment, but we did not expect it to turn out so differently,” a Bunun resident and activist (T8) noted.¹⁹² Without informing the residents about the new policies, the government implemented strict policing on Indigenous hunting and foraging. The policing was outwardly presented as part of the park’s conservation policies to preserve resources, natural scenery, and the land, but the implementation was a crude exercise of domination and control over the Native residents. The so-called improvements ended up being strict regulations and policing over Bunun ways of being, obviously worsening the lives of the Bunun residents. “The Neighborhood Chief broadcasted, ‘Good news, good news, our Neighborhood 1 [referring to Tumpu Daingaz] will be

¹⁹⁰ Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), “Tumpu Daingaz,” 53.

¹⁹¹ 101 年度玉山國家公園東埔地區部落巡查計畫：結案報告 [2012 Annual Yushan National Park Tumpu Area Buluo Inspection Plan: Concluding Report]

¹⁹² Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), “Tumpu Daingaz,” 54.
Wang denotes this individual as T8.

protected by the National Park. They will manage the Buluo.’ But then one by one people were arrested,” another Bunun resident and activist (T2) said.¹⁹³ Both residents express a betrayal by the park advocates, which implies deceit, a common settler strategy for seizing Indigenous land. In Wang’s thesis, he also characterized the promises of the national park as “a wolf in sheep’s skin.”

The drastic reveal of the national park’s true nature and subsequent struggles under the Yushan National Park were documented in Peng Lin-Song’s 1993 series of reporting, *National Parks and Indigenous Rights*.¹⁹⁴ Peng’s report on the Yushan National park included both the Tumpu Daingaz and Masuhuw buluos.¹⁹⁵ He described how Bunun residents of Yushan National Park faced strict policing and surveillance over their activities, from banning hunting to strict regulations over agricultural practices and building types.¹⁹⁶ Peng noted that the people of Tumpu Neighborhood 1, living in the national park, faced the National Park Police, who were armed with guns and enforcing strict laws on “estrepement” (waste or needless destruction of lands), hunting, and foraging.¹⁹⁷ Residents complained of excessive policing, when police enter homes and open refrigerators to check for “illegally hunted” prey. Under the national park’s restrictions and with Han people controlling the channels of production and the market, the Bunun residents faced economic hardship. Stripped of traditional livelihoods, many were forced to work elsewhere. Peng reported on Namu, who experienced the constraining life under the Yushan National Park.

¹⁹³ Ibid, 54.

¹⁹⁴ Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “繁華跳票，橫禍飛來 (Fan Hua Tiao Piao, Heng Huo Fei Lai),” *祖靈之邦 [Ancestor’s Realm]* (blog), February 23, 2001, www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=596:records-record16-596&catid=47:record15&Itemid=246.

¹⁹⁵ Masuhuw, also known as Masuhuz: Meishan buluo, another Bunun buluo previously located on the South edge of the National Park and now no longer within park boundaries. Tumpu Daingaz is located on the northern side of the park.

¹⁹⁶ Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “繁華跳票，橫禍飛來 (Fan Hua Tiao Piao, Heng Huo Fei Lai);” Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “文化重創，獵人悲鳴 [Cultural Casualties, Hunter’s Cry in Grief].”

¹⁹⁷ Tumpu Daingaz is a Bunun buluo, but in Taiwan administrative terms, it is also Tumpu Neighborhood 1 and one of six neighborhoods in the Tumpu Village. Peng never refers to the name of the buluo but uses the official administrative unit of Neighborhood 1. This illustrates the problems of the conceptualization and referencing of space, as I noted in Chapter 2.

Namu was on a three-year probation for estrepement, farming on a piece of forest compartment land which his father and grandfather had always farmed on. He worked on that piece of land because the aboriginal reserve lands of his family were sold during his father's generation.¹⁹⁸ Without land and prohibited from farming on traditional territories, Namu could only work for others on farms or construction projects, and sometimes he worked as a porter for hikers. The regulations over construction and buildings restricted Namu and his family to living in a small house that's around 6 Ping (20 square meters/213.5 square foot). Life under the Yushan National Park became full of restrictions.

As Namu's experience demonstrates, land dispossession does not always occur through violent direct displacement, which was experienced in the Japanese colonial era and initial KMT rule.¹⁹⁹ Based on settlers' assumed access to land and the subsequent enforcement of regulation, the national park system effectively occupied the Bunun territories through the control over life on their land. The park officials were also able to take liberties with the settler legal system around land to seize further control for the park. In the Meishan Village/Masuhw buluo, another Bunun community located in a different part of the Yushan National Park, government officials tricked and pressured elders and residents into signing away their land. Many lost their land and received insufficient compensation, which rendered the Bunun either living in poor housing

¹⁹⁸ Aboriginal reserve lands: Based on a land reservation system that now (not very successfully) protects Indigenous land from being sold to non-Natives.

Namu (Ke Jin-Ping): 那姆 (柯進平) Namu is the transliteration from the Mandarin transliteration of a Bunun name. This is likely not how his Indigenous name would be spelled.

Forest compartment land: 林班地

¹⁹⁹ In an "Walking TIT (Taiwan Indigenous Tribes)," a PTS (公視) TV program that tells the stories of the over 800 buluo's of Taiwan, episode 63, "My Home is in a National Park," focuses on Tumpu Daingaz. Wu Jinshui, a Bunun elder of Tumpu Daingaz, explains how they were driven away from their traditional lands. During the Japanese rule, the Japanese drove them away to use the eland for the Tokyo Imperial University's school of forestry, but when they left at the end of the Japanese regime, they told the Bunun that they can return to their traditional lands. However, when the KMT regime took over, the Forestry Bureau drove them away again for a similar purpose—creating an experimental forest for the National Taiwan University. Wu described his people being driven away by destroying their crops and threats of beating them up; he did not specify which group of colonial officials drove them away with this method, but other elders, Tama Dahu and Tama Ziman, said that KMT's Forestry Bureau employed the methods of destruction Wu described.

Settler environmental studies and academia's role in settler colonialism.

conditions or homeless on their own land.²⁰⁰

Land dispossession necessitates policies of cultural genocide and the destruction of Indigenous society and lifeways, since control over Indigenous people is the only way to ensure their control over the Indigenous lands. The creation of this national park was an enactment of environmental colonialism, the policing of Indigenous land relations for settler interests and control over land. It also exemplifies the inextricable relationship between land and life, or land dispossession and cultural genocide. With traditional life on traditional territories made grueling under the overelaborate regulations, Indigenous people are often forced to assimilate into settler capitalist economies and make a living away from their traditional territories. As more younger people leave the traditional territories for a better livelihood, it further reinforces land dispossession when Indigenous land is left vulnerable to further settler encroachment, which continues a problematic cycle. With the Yushan National Park crumbling Tumpu Daingaz's traditional society, many Bunun residents advocated for the separation of Neighborhood 1 from the park to reassert control over their lives.

Peng's report also shows a different set of challenges that Tumpu Daingaz would face if they left the park. These challenges were experienced by Neighborhoods 2-5, located outside park boundaries, which became a part of a hot spring tourist area and were taken over by Han settlers. This area is also known as Ilausan, as Wang noted in his thesis. Outside the park, Han capital has surged in since the KMT's policies to promote the tourism industry in 1968, controlling local economic life. Those opposing the leaving the national park feared that once they are no longer within national park boundaries, private consortiums will take over Tumpu Daingaz too, and Neighborhood 1 will repeat the path of Neighborhoods 2-5 with Han encroachment. The contrast

²⁰⁰Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “文化重創，獵人悲鳴 [Cultural Casualties, Hunter's Cry in Grief].” 梅山村: Meishan Village, also known as the Masuhw buluo, is a different community of Bunun people. Unlike Tumpu Daingaz, they decided to not be part of the Yushan National Park and were officially drawn outside of the park boundaries on November 20, 2012.

between Ilausan and Tumpu Daingaz later became important in how Tumpu Daingaz residents shifted their views on the national park.

In the first decade of the park's establishment, however, the predominant sentiment of residents in Tumpu Daingaz was to "leave the park." The Bunun of Tumpu Daingaz were focused on their day-to-day experience and suffering under the national park. In 1993, with the support of various Indigenous organizations, the Bunun of both Tumpu Daingaz and Masuhuw went up north to the Legislative Yuan to voice their demands through a public hearing, "National Parks and Indigenous Rights."²⁰¹ When talking to Peng, the Bunun pastor who initially welcomed the park, Alang Islituan understood the threat of private consortiums to Bunun land. Alang Islituan advocated for Tumpu Daingaz to leave the park while limiting the entry of private consortiums. Wang notes from interviews with Bunun elders of Tumpu Daingaz how much they hated the national park, to the extent that they resisted by calling national parks "national communist bandits."²⁰² This was a wordplay that, in the context of the KMT regime when communism was *the* symbol of evil and the enemy, directly challenged and provoked the government.²⁰³ These reactions demonstrate the resentment that the Bunun people of Tumpu Daingaz held against the Yushan National Park. After all, the Yushan National Park enabled the government to dispossess Bunun land and police life, playing a key role in the settler colonial logic of elimination. The national park was not a symbol and site of resistance for no reason.

Surface Story

Despite the strong antagonism towards the Yushan National Park in the early years, residents of Tumpu Daingaz voted overwhelmingly to remain inside the park. The result was, in large part, because the Bunun in Tumpu Daingaz compared their experiences under park

²⁰¹ Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), "Tumpu Daingaz," 56.

²⁰² Ibid, 57.

²⁰³ Ibid, 57–58.

restrictions with that of the land loss and private capital takeover in Ilausan. The comparison is reflected in the title of 2005 vote organized by an outside Indigenous rights organization, Buluo Working Group associated with Legislator Ciwas Ali, that sealed their decision about the park: “The dilemma of ‘be controlled’ or ‘be developed’: The Tumpu Bunun Buluo will stage a ‘decision of our own buluo’s fate.’” Tumpu Daingaz voted to “stay” in the park in a landslide vote of 141:1²⁰⁴, settling the differing opinions about the park. Based on how this dilemma has been framed by many—Buluo Working Group’s ‘be controlled’ or ‘be developed,’ or in Peng’s reporting, ‘stay’ or ‘leave’—this result appears to be a preference for the park. In fact, more recent Indigenous narratives about Tumpu Daingaz’s relationship with Yushan also give a first impression of positive attitudes toward the park. The Indigenous narratives I focus on include Pastor Alang Islituan’s reflections as a conservation inspector for the park (published in a Yushan National Park report in 2012), an Indigenous TV (“Buluo Influence”) interview with Alang Islituan on his activism career (2021), and an Indigenous TV production (“Walking TIT [Taiwan Indigenous Tribes]”) on the relations between Tumpu Daingaz and the National Park (2017). These are all at least 7 years since the 2005 vote, by which point the Bunun’s relationship with the park was broadly portrayed in a positive light. In comparison to Peng and Wang’s observations, which occurred while the situation was more tense, these sources focused much less on the buluo’s conflict with the park.

Alang Islituan’s recent statements were the most affirmative towards the park. Peng documented Alang Islituan’s opposition to being in the park in 1993, but since the 2005 vote, Alang Islituan expressed support for the national park both in his 2012 reflection and the 2021 Buluo Influence interview. The 2012 reflection was documented in an official park report titled “2012 Annual Yushan National Park Tumpu Area Buluo Inspection Plan: Concluding Report.” Alang Islituan wrote about the areas he inspected and thoughts about conservation in context of

²⁰⁴ Ibid, 63.

his cultural knowledge and other personal experiences. He expresses deep concern and care for the environment, and his support for the park conservation is evident throughout the text, especially the line, “I was extremely supportive of the park’s establishment.”²⁰⁵ In the text, Alang Islituan made no mention of his opposition to the park in 1993. If reading only this reflection, it is easy to leave with the false impression that Alang Islituan always supported the park. While it’s reasonable to speculate that, in the context of working and writing for the national park, Alang Islituan may have the tendency to speak more positively of the park, the sentiment he expressed reads as sincere.

The positive attitude was also apparent in Alang Islituan’s 2021 interview with *Buluo Influence*.²⁰⁶ The hour-long interview was conducted in Bunun with a Bunun host, Isuth Balincinan, and covered a substantial amount of his career as an Indigenous rights activist and land defender (warrior), including his activism at the height of the Indigenous Rights movement. In the 2021 interview, when asked about the national park, Alang said: “At first, we really did not want to be in the park and wanted to be drawn out of its boundary. Now rethinking everything, the park is a protection mechanism: it prevented Han people from coming in and building its houses and curbed the commercialization.” Then, Isuth Balincinan asks, “Because the National Park Law states that hunting is prohibited, has it [restriction] loosened much now?” to which Alang Islituan responds, “It has loosened some. Even though hunting is prohibited, based on respect, tribespeople can still practice traditional hunting at moderate levels. There has not been cases of punishment or jailing because of hunting.” He immediately added, “It’s not bad, because outsiders cannot come in and carelessly develop in our buluo, so it’s actually good to be in the

²⁰⁵ “101 年度玉山國家公園東埔地區部落巡查計畫：結案報告 (2012 Annual Yushan National Park Tumpu Area Buluo Inspection Plan: Concluding Report)” (Yushan National Park Headquarters, Mammalogical Society of Taiwan, December 2012).

²⁰⁶ 部落影響力 21：守護東埔部落土地鬥士-伍錐 *Bunun 上 [Buluo Influence 21: Tumpu Buluo Land Warrior and Protector Wu Wei (Alang Islituan), Bunun]*, Interview, vol. 1, 2 vols., 部落影響力, 2021, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D2CKnCR1ptE>; 部落影響力 21：守護東埔部落土地鬥士-伍錐 *Bunun 下 [Buluo Influence 21: Tumpu Buluo Land Warrior and Protector Wu Wei (Alang Islituan), Bunun]*, Interview, vol. 2, 2 vols., 部落影響力, 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hTL_aQhkKfW.

boundaries of the national park. The mountains and forests are taken care of, and so are the precious species and resources.” Instead of talking about how hunting is still prohibited, he switched to the upsides of being in the park. On the issue of the buluo, another key point of discussion was the development of the hot springs by outsiders for tourism, to which Alang Islituan expressed grief and discontent. In this interview, Alang reveals a framework of understanding the buluo’s relationship to the park: the park protects Tumpu Daingaz’s land from outside development, so it is good to be in the park.

Based on Alang’s two narratives about the Yushan National Park, a potential explanation to Tumpu Daingaz choice to remain in the park arises: perhaps, national parks and environmentalism are forces for good, since they protected Tumpu Daingaz from tourism development? This frame of thinking was documented in Wang’s thesis, too: a Bunun activist (T6) mentioned many were enlightened by the teachings of pastors who conceptualized the national park as a protective umbrella in contrast to what was happening in Ilausan—the pastors may well include Pastor Alang Islituan himself, since metaphor of “protective umbrella” is echoed in the interview, where he says “the park is a protective mechanism.”²⁰⁷ Maybe throughout time, the national park and environmentalism has evolved to be a force that protects the integrity of the Tumpu Daingaz community and land?

The Indigenous TV show Walking TIT’s episode, “My Home is in the National Park,” appears to corroborate this hypothesis if you look at how it explicitly talks about improving relationships between the park and the Buluo.²⁰⁸ Within the first five minutes, during the introduction of the episode, the Bunun narrator Vilian Takisvalainan says, “In 1988, the Yushan National Park was established, and the Tumpu Daingaz buluo was included into the park, which

²⁰⁷ Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), “Tumpu Daingaz,” 58.

Original text: “提到當時認為國家公園是保護傘，乃是受到教會牧師的啟示與教導。而思考的轉變主要是因為參照溫泉區裏的布農族人生活景況”

²⁰⁸ Vilian Takisvalainan (斐立安), 行走 TIT 第六十三集—我家住在國家公園 [Walking Tribes in Taiwan Episode 63: My Home Is in the National Park], 行走 TIT (公視戲劇 PTS Drama, 2017), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d2Q9Aw4f4ow>.

led to the buluo's disapproval. However, in the past thirty years, the Yushan National Park Headquarters have continued to find ways to improve relations with the tribespeople"—he does not mention the conflict about staying in or leaving the park. The show moves to an interview with the deputy director of the park, Lin Wen-He, who says, "The past ten years we have emphasized the so-called partner relationship, that us [the park] and them [Tumpu Daingaz] are partners in co-managing the national park." These statements draw attention to the park, rather than the Bunun residents of Tumpu Daingaz, as initiators of improving relationships. Vilian Takisvalainan highlights organic farming within the national park, how Indigenous farmers and the national park headquarters are working together to foster organic farming. It spent the second half of the episode with the ongoing process of restoring the old buluo relics in partnership with the park and the Taiwan National University's Experiment Forest Office, which has jurisdiction over parts of the Tumpu land. The title "My Home is in the National Park," intentionally or not, implies that the national park's existence takes precedence over Tumpu Daingaz—contrast it with an alternative title, "The National Park is in My Home," which is far more assertive on Tumpu Daingaz's sovereignty over the land. While there is no official explanation for the episode's title, in combination with the way this episode starts, ends, and mostly consists of positive partnership accounts, the title seems to express a conciliatory attitude towards the park.

The narratives by both Alang and "Walking TIT," at least on the surface, affirm the hypothesis that national parks and environmentalism are beneficial to Tumpu Daingaz and the partnership is working. However, I call this the "surface" story because there is a diverging story underneath, one that requires more thought and understanding about Indigenous narratives and experiences to fully appreciate. For example, besides some segments of interviews with non-Native environmentally aligned people (park official, an organic farming promotion organization, a group from NTU's experimental forest) in "My Home is in the National Park," the people who shaped the narratives are all Indigenous. Both Pastor Alang Islituan and the main producer of the Walking TIT show, Bjanav Zenror (Paiwan), were active in the Indigenous Peoples Movement,

during which activists advanced radical ideas for Indigenous sovereignty and tirelessly promoted Indigenous interests. “Land Back” was a key part of the movement, so it is difficult not to wonder, why do they seem to support the Yushan National Park? Indeed, in the next section, I examine how the Yushan National Park narrates their relationship with Tumpu Daingaz, where it becomes clear these Indigenous narratives actually do not align with the park—more often than not, they subtly disrupt the park’s preferred narrative.

Mismatch

To understand how the park portrays its relationship with the Indigenous residents, I examine “Documentaries of Individual Farmers at the Foot of Yushan,” a magazine-like publication by the Yuhuan National Park Headquarters, published in 2019.²⁰⁹ Zhong Ming-Shan, the park director, is the publisher; and Lin Wen-He, the deputy director, and Bagkall Haivangang, the first Indigenous (Bunun) section chief, planned this publication.²¹⁰ This is accessible as an online document, which is linked to an introduction web page of Tumpu Daingaz on the main Yushan National Park website. The document focuses on how the park has promoted and supported organic farmers within their jurisdiction. While it includes sections on two other Bunun buluo’s, Masuhuaz and Lamuan, I focus on the one on Tumpu Daingaz, specifically farmer Avali (referenced in this publication as his Mandarin namee “Si Sheng-Wei”)—an organic farmer in the episode “My Home is in a National Park.” While this publication features the stories Indigenous farmers, it centers the Yushan National Park to portray a beneficial relationship in ways that misrepresent the true histories and dynamics. It does not actually touch on how Tumpu Daingaz residents have shifted their perspective on national parks in the context of the outside tourist industry. This document demonstrates how the national park appropriates the present dynamic of

²⁰⁹ Yushan literally means jade (yu) mountain (shan); in Bunun, it is called “Usaviah/Saviah/Savih/Tongku Saveq.”

²¹⁰ The “chief” is the official English translation to a government position; it has no connotations of “Native leader” in the original language..

what they call “partnership” with the Bunun residents and the stories of Indigenous farmers to bolster its image.

In the opening section, the publication follows the common trend of reproducing the mainstream narrative about the national park’s US origins as a noble call for conservation without mentioning anything related to settler colonial expansion.²¹¹ Similar to Lin’s narrative, which I analyzed in Chapter 5, the publication describes a progression from a conservation ideology that excluded people to one that included people. It cites critical self-reflection by international conservation organizations, the international shift in environmental ideologies towards sustainable development in the 1960s, and a reconsideration of local environmental knowledge in service of sustainability as what brought us to the current popular idea of “co-management.” In context of Taiwan’s history of national parks, it claims that despite conflicts with local residents in the initial period, “under the influence of the changes of international conservation ideologies, in the 1990s, [Taiwan’s] national park management began trying to improve livelihoods of local residents as to reduce their negative impressions of national parks. In the 2000s, the park management actively established trusting partnership relations with locals, and in that partnership process, investing into the transition towards eco-friendly agriculture plays a key role.”²¹² Ending this section, they write, “In 2019, the Yushan National Park Headquarters brought together this group of optimistic, brave Bunun companions (partners) and showcase the stories of their transition to eco-friendly agriculture to the public.”

In this section, the YNPH center the conservationists as the agents of change and process, which serves the colonial narrative of their society as actively improving, almost as saviors, and therefore legitimate. Besides reproducing a settler-centric narrative of the US origins of national

²¹¹ “玉山山腳下的小農紀實 [Documentaries of Individual Farmers at the Foot of Yushan]” (Yushan National Park Headquarters, December 2019), https://issuu.com/natco.creative/docs/___issuu/12.
Original text: “國家公園的概念始於 19 世紀末的美國，當時的知識分子大聲疾呼應珍貴的自然奇觀予後代子孫”

²¹² Ibid, 6-7.

parks, this portrayal of the history misidentifies the true agents of change. Broadly speaking, colonial actors usually do not miraculously come to their senses and realize the wrongs of their past on their own; most of the time, they are reactionary, responding to the persistent resistance by the oppressed. In Taiwan, how did the discourse around national parks shift, especially towards embracing co-management? While ideas of improving relations with “local residents” (local Indigenous residents) and co-management may have been influenced by international shifts in ideologies, international organizations and park officials cannot take credit for the changes we observed. In Taiwan, Indigenous activists were the ones that demanded improvements. As demonstrated in the chart in Chapter 5, Indigenous activists organized to make demands from the governments and protest against national parks in the late 1980s and 1990s. Knowing the history of Indigenous anti-park movements, the park management did not seek to improve the livelihoods of local residents—the Indigenous people pushed for their rights.

The context of the Maqaw National Park controversy from Chapter 6 demonstrates that it is simplistic, even inaccurate to say the park management actively established partnership relations. The language of “partnership” echoes President Chen Shui-Bian’s “New Partnership Between the Indigenous Peoples and the Government of Taiwan” in 2000, but that too was in response to the Indigenous rights movement from the previous two decades. The language of partnership and co-management was the environmentalist response to the more radical demands, like sovereignty and Indigenous autonomous areas in replacement of national parks and other colonial environmental institutions. Worse, final line I quoted from this is a classic romanticization of Indigeneity: calling the Bunun “optimistic and brave” reproduces Taiwan’s existing stereotype of Natives, infantilizing them; putting the stories Indigenous agricultural and ecological practices as *within* mainstream environmentalism (rather than in relation to) also contributes the “Ecological Indian” stereotype²¹³. Through this introduction, the YNPH retells the

²¹³ While the ecological Indian stereotype originates in North American contexts, it has traveled and found its way in Taiwan, too. This was referenced in Zhong’s 2003 thesis on environmental education.

history of national parks in Taiwan in their favor, giving credit to themselves and mainstream environmentalism. This retelling reproduces colonial relations when the YNPH assumes access over Indigeneity, Indigenous stories, and the changes that Indigenous activism produced.

This publication does a similar, inaccurate retelling of the changes in agricultural practices in Tumpu Daingaz. It writes,

“The Chengyoulan River [Bunun: Kunhukan], originating from the Yushan, nurtures all kinds of lives and has always been the hunting grounds of the Tumpu Bunun. As times progressed, agriculture has replaced hunting, and conventional agriculture took advantage and broke in. It was not until the Yushan National Park Headquarters supported organic agriculture that there was a glimmer of hope. Organic farming helps farmers avoid the harms of pesticides and fertilizer and protects the health of consumers. It also protects the health of the land and lives here, and the ecological conditions have slowly improved.”

There are several problems with this paragraph. First, while the Bunun relied on hunting, they have also practiced agriculture prior to settler colonialism (hunting also remains an important practice and is not necessarily “backwards” in comparison to agriculture, as this statement suggests). In “My Home is in a National Park,” Bunun elders of Tumpu Daingaz have talked about what they traditionally planted, such as corn, millet, sweet potatoes, and plums.

Conventional agriculture wasn’t simply a production of “progress of time” but introduced by settlers. For example, Peng’s reporting in 1993 recorded that park officials promised to instruct the residents with agricultural practices; he also noted how the strict policing limited traditional agriculture and the phenomenon where crops favored in Taiwan’s economy replaced traditional crops like millet.²¹⁴

More importantly, “My Home is in the National Park” shows that Alavi, not the park officials, brought organic farming to the park. Avali decided to follow traditional agricultural practices, testing pesticide levels in the process, and when he talked to the park about getting his

²¹⁴ Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “文化重創，獵人悲鳴 [Cultural Casualties, Hunter’s Cry in Grief]”; Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞), “繁華跳票，橫禍飛來 (Fan Hua Tiao Piao, Heng Huo Fei Lai).”

products certified as non-toxic, the park introduced him to organic farming.²¹⁵ The park did bring the (admittedly western-originated) term and certification process of organic farming to the farmers in the national park, but the actual practice was clearly enacted by Indigenous farmers. Fortunately, in the actual section on Avali's story, the writer noted that the incoming "plains people" started spraying to improve production, which changed the habits of the local farmers—perhaps with the presence Indigenous folks in the publication, there was an intervention? Nonetheless, this publication was overall a representation of the park, and that representation is reflected in its narrative. While the TV episode was aired two years before the publication and not directly connected, comparing them is revealing: the Indigenous show presented Avali's organic farming initiative in context of traditional agriculture and as a resurgent practice; the park appropriated Avali's story and took credit for the changes Avali initiated.

If there is a clear mismatch between the Indigenous and park narratives, why do I spend time examining the incorrect hypothesis from the surface story? This somewhat confusing surface story is important to consider: it raises the question, despite ongoing issues with the national park and differing motivations from the park, why did both Pastor Alang Islituan and the TV show "My Home is in the National Park" choose to tell the story with a cover of conciliation? Wang's interviews with the Tumpu Daingaz activists around the time of the vote to stay in the park reveals the true rationale behind their choice and helps explain why the two Indigenous narratives are told in the cordial ways they are. Understanding the rationale at the time of the vote, the through-lines of resistance and resurgence in the two narratives become apparent. They show how these narratives, while appearing to be cordial with the national park, are subversive in their own ways.

Throughline

²¹⁵ Vilian Takisvalainan (斐立安), 行走 TIT 第六十三集—我家住在國家公園 [Walking Tribes in Taiwan Episode 63: My Home Is in the National Park].

To truly understand the two Indigenous narratives I examined, we have to focus on the motif of resistance and resurgence, and think of the narratives themselves as part of resistance. Looking closer at the discourse that Wang documented, especially what the Tumpu Daingaz activists had said, the decision to “stay” in the park was not an acceptance of the park but a strategy for resistance. This strategy of resistance undergirds the way that narratives are still framed today.

First, we have to understand how Ilausan influenced Tumpu Daingaz. With the growing tourist industry and the onset of private capital into Tumpu Daingaz, land that belonged to the Bunun was sold and taken through corruption. In the 1980s to 1990s, the strength of Indigenous resistance was concentrated in Ilausan. Wang describes, “The Tumpu Bunun from Ilausan bore with sorrow as they watched the capitalists suck away the hot spring resources, finally resulting in the tragic [1987] ‘Tumpu Grave Digging’ Incident.”²¹⁶ The rise of the grassroots movement in the Tumpu region was not only because of the loss of land and the source of the hot spring, it also implies a group of youth’s reaction to the different conditions and atmospheres within and outside the local society, demonstrating the conflicts from the interactions of different ethnic groups [settlers vs. Natives].”²¹⁷ Many Tumpu Daingaz activists/protectors that were active in the decision-making around the Yushan National Park were involved or influenced by the events in Ilausan; the opposition to settler invasion into Bunun life spaces was forefront in the local Tumpu movement. Drawing on Wang’s observation of a shifting resistance, we can understand the vote in the framework of resistance. Instead of seeing the vote to stay in the national park as an

²¹⁶ Ilausan is technically part of Tumpu. Refer to Chapter 2’s discussion of overlapping space names. The grave digging incident was when Bunun graves were dug up without notice for local tourist development purposes; the remains of ancestors and family members were exposed under the sun, and the Bunun cultural traditions greatly violated. This was a key event that sparked outrage and action in the broader national pan-Indigenous rights movement.

²¹⁷ Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), “Tumpu Daingaz,” 35.

Original text: Ilausan 的東埔族人隱忍地看待溫泉資源被資本家大口吸允，終致在隔年引發「東埔挖墳」的哀愁事件。東埔地區草根組織運動的崛起，不單是源於 Ilausan 喪失土地與溫泉源頭，更隱含一群青年人對於當時內、外部社會條件與氣氛的作為，顯示不同族群接觸之際的衝突應變。

approval to the national park, the vote was action one against settler capital and tourism industry's threat, one that prioritizes preserving Tumpu Daingaz's land and societal integrity.

Leading up to the vote, Tumpu Daingaz residents were aware of the power of narratives and how their issues are framed. The vote hosted by the Buluo Working Group, “‘be controlled’ or ‘be developed,’” was a narrow interpretation of the situation in Tumpu Daingaz, as it puts Tumpu Daingaz into a false dichotomy without considering the legitimacy of either tourist developers or national park's legitimacy to take over in the first place. Residents appreciated the support of the Buluo Working Group, but they also noted some tensions with that group. This tension is clear in how one Tumpu Daingaz activist responded to the Buluo Working Team's framing: “This is a maneuver! A maneuver, you know! You know, people's ideologies (perceptions) can be maneuvered! Political parties maneuver, movements maneuver, people in movements maneuver. Of course the Buluo Working Team is helping us, that's right, but I said then, why don't you change the question [of the vote]?! Right? Just say that you are drawing the national park out [of our boundaries]! If you draw [the park] out, it has to disappear! Disappear!”²¹⁸ This idea echoes the framing that Tumpu Daingaz is the host and the National Park is the visiting intruder, which means Tumpu Daingaz has the right to determine what happens on their land.

Despite the less-than-ideal vote title and options, the vote was an exercise of self-determination, deciding collectively that working with the park is the better path forward. While residents understand the park is better, it is important to not misconstrue their sentiment as “national parks are good.” Right before the vote, Bunun activist (T4) said it clearly: “It's not that staying in the park today means that national parks are good; it means that today, we choose to safeguard our traditional territory, our land. Our ancestors left us such good land, so we must

²¹⁸ Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘), “Tumpu Daingaz.” Wang denotes this individual as T1.

Original text: 政黨會操作，運動才會操作，就是搞運動的人會操作，當然部落工作隊是幫助我們，那是沒有錯，那是對的，只是我那時候講，你題目怎麼不改一下啊！對不對阿，你把國家公園劃出去阿，就好了啊！把他劃出去他就要消失勒！消失勒！

cherish it and use it with good care. [I] hope that the government officials coming this time will be concerned about our sovereignty.”²¹⁹ The decision to stay is less about the national park’s intrinsic value; it is motivated by the desire to preserve both land and community. As another Bunun (T3) says, “...If your family does not have proper support, your land will drain away, and so will people, like in Ilausan. Secondly, the benefit is that being in the national park can preserve the Indigenous buluo’s integrity, if [we] draw [the buluo] out [of the park], the buluo will disintegrate.”²²⁰ The idea of Bunun activist T6 also demonstrates that the decision is not a passive or outright concession but a conscious strategy: “When we don’t have the power yet, why not remain like this temporarily and let the national park limit the development of land and destruction of the environment.”²²¹

The national park itself is only a surface issue to the core question of the integrity of Indigenous land and life. Contrary to what the national park might mean for settler park advocates or environmentalists, to the people of Tumpu Daingaz, the national park is a means to survival and resurgence, not an end in itself. And since the park is part of the strategy to protect the Tumpu Daingaz buluo, especially with its money and jurisdiction within the settler colonial society, the expressions of collaboration in the narratives by Pastor Alang Islituan and Walking TIT makes more sense.

While Alang Islituan might seem to be defending or supporting the park, consider Alang’s true motive as defending land. In his reflection as a conservation inspector, he emphasized protecting the land and serving for the common good. In the interview, the host and Alang Islituan talked about his activism at the height of the Indigenous People’s Movement,

²¹⁹ Ibid, 76.

²²⁰ Ibid, 77.

Original text: 如果你一個家庭沒有支柱好，你的土地會流失，人也會流失，像 *Ilausan*，第二，好處是在國家公園裡面能保留原住民部落完整性，劃出的話，部落會解體

²²¹ Ibid, 75.

Original text: 當我們還沒有能力時候，何妨現在先暫時這樣子，國家公園去限定這些土地的開發、環境的破壞。

including as the president of the “Land Back Association (還我土地聯盟).” Alang Islituan also contrasted the Japanese colonial regime with the later KMT one, commending the Japanese because they prevented outside settlers from entering, allowing Tumpu Daingaz to preserve their land and people to hunt and farm anywhere. Understanding historical context, the Japanese were not inherently kinder rulers, but Alang Islituan spoke of them more positively because they stopped outsiders from intruding and dispossessing their land—similar to how he speaks of the national park positively, because the park too prevented outsiders from taking and using their land. When the host asked about developing or selling the land, Alang said that of the rules he wrote for the buluo’s billboard in the Bunun language, one is to not sell the land to outsiders. Most striking, however, was what Alang Islituan said when, at the end of the show, the host asked him to leave some words of encouragement to the audience: “I am happy to have the chance to share my experience. I want to declare again, Taiwan is the land of us Indigenous peoples, not other ethnic groups. I am glad we can still discuss Indigenous rights issues. Let us protect and cherish this Taiwanese land that belongs to us.”

Alang Islituan has and still defends land. The way he talks about the national park is more lenient, perhaps almost contradictory from his goal to protect Indigenous land. Yet Alang Islituan never drifted far from the theme of land. His collaboration with the park allowed room for him to push for space for Bunun futurities and assert territorial integrity. This is an act of leveraging, which we also observed with the activists during both the Indigenous Peoples Movement and the Maqaw controversy. Maintaining a positive stance allows the Bunun of Tumpu Daingaz to leverage their partnership with the park to make demands and preserve land and culture.

The show, “My Home is in the National Park,” is not only about Tumpu Daingaz’s partnership with the Yushan National Park. The show features resurgence, like farmer Avali’s practice of traditional agriculture in combination with organic farming, paving a new path

forward, as well as the ongoing effort to restore the old Tumpu Daingaz sites. It highlights elders retelling Bunun histories in connection with land and does not shy away from recounting how the land was violently dispossessed. It also calls attention to the ongoing issue of the Le-le-gu hot spring, or in Bunun, Dahdah. In the show, Bunun residents wanted to use the Dahdah hot spring water for basic needs but faced various bureaucratic and logistical hurdles. The Yushan National Park Headquarters agreed to their use in 2003 but no action followed. When asked about the hot spring, the deputy park supervisor portrayed the issue as work in progress. To someone unfamiliar with Tumpu Daingaz, this may read as the park is still in the process of working with the buluo about the hot spring. However, with “insider knowledge,” the fact that in 2017 access to Dahdah’s water is still an issue would be upsetting.

In 2001, in response to Bunun demands for Dahdah, the Yushan National Park Director Zhang He-Ping sparked outrage when he compared the Bunun of Tumpu Daingaz with rat feces: “[The hot spring] is shared by all 23,000,000 people in Taiwan, they should not have the wrong concept, ecological preservation. We really want to kick them out, so few people but they affect the National Park’s... image... (hand gestures) The Bunun of Tumpu Neighborhood 1 are like a piece of rat feces, just one piece of rat feces ruins the whole pot of porridge.” A decade and a half after this scandal, the national park system still impeded Tumpu Daingaz’s access to Dahdah’s water. While there are positive collaborations with national park entities and space for Indigenous resurgence, the show is evidence that fundamental struggles under the park system remain unresolved.

Like the Bunun of Tumpu Daingaz with the Yushan National Park, Indigenous people continue to navigate the complex relationship with a variety of national parks that continue to occupy their land. The tensions between Indigenous people and national parks continue today; so continues Indigenous advocacy, as Indigenous people utilize various strategies of resistance and resurgence to protect the integrity of their land and people.

Chapter 8: Indigenous Hunting and the 2021 Constitutional Reinterpretation Case

If the national park case studies are more symbolic of the limited opportunities created by Indigenous collaboration with and pushback against environmentalists, hunting is an issue area where environmentalism and Indigenous rights clash directly, exemplifying the limits of collaboration. Though environmentalists pushed a narrative in which environmentalism and Indigenous rights can be harmonized through the national park cases, juxtaposing the park cases against hunting suggests that environmentalism only embraces Native people and culture when it serves environmentalist interests and imaginations of what Indigenous land relations are like. The colonial gaze of Native hunting reveals that tokenization remains a problem with environmentalism, and narratives around this issue remain a vehicle for colonial relations. In this chapter, I focus on the cultural reaction to the legal case: the continued colonial gaze upon Native people, as well as Indigenous push backs that centered Indigenous hunting as a cultural right, an enactment of land relations, and Indigenous futurity.

Case Summary and Results²²²

Talum Suqluman, also known as Tama (Uncle) Talum, is a Bunun hunter. In 2013, when his elderly mother—92 at the time—missed having traditional wild game, he went up the mountains to hunt for her. However, for hunting a Taiwan serow (mountain goat) and a muntjac deer, he was charged by police for violating both the Wildlife Conservation Law and the Controlling Guns, Ammunition and Knives Act for not using a gun he made himself. He was convicted in 2015. Talum Suqluman's case stood out because of extraordinarily severe charges as well as his care for his mother, but arrests of Indigenous hunters are not unusual. Indigenous hunters continue their traditions in spite of colonial restrictions, from the bureaucratic hurdles

²²² This case was ongoing when research and drafting of this part of the thesis occurred.

around permits to limits on hunting animals and gun use. As a result, many face prosecution and prison time.

When the Prosecutor General Yen Da-ho filed an extraordinary appeal to the Supreme Court, the appeal noted how Talum Suqluman's sentencing around the gun use suggested that Indigenous people are not permitted to develop their hunting culture and use better tools, which could lead to discrimination and hinder Native cultural preservation. Talum Suqluman also pointed out similar concerns on how restrictions and arrests impede cultural rights during a media interview: "hunting is an Indigenous tradition. The government, wanting us to preserve our culture while always arresting us [hunters], is inconsistent."²²³ While the issue of animal conservation is part of this case with the violation of the Wildlife Conservation Law, the focus was on how hunting regulations, especially guns, obstructed Indigenous rights and culture. Along with the question of what guns Indigenous hunters can use, there was the problem with the lengthy procedure for hunters to get permits. The procedure, such as declaring what animal and how many the hunter plans to hunt, does not make sense under many Indigenous hunting customs and beliefs.

However, as this case gained prominence, some environmentalists, especially animal rights activists, began to raise concerns over conservation. They saw Indigenous hunting as the culprit of environmental damage and animal suffering, arguing that hunting rights should not be prioritized before environmental concerns and shifting the focus away from cultural rights. The debates in the Constitutional Court reflected this discourse centered around pitting environmental conservation and Indigenous rights against each other. This type of discourse legitimized the portrayal of Indigenous hunters as the enemy of animal rights and cause of environmental destruction. The resulting interpretation was a compromise between the supposedly opposing

²²³ Yang, Chengyu 羊正鈺, "「政府要我們傳承文化, 又要抓人」原住民打獵遭判刑, 最高法院首度聲請釋憲 - The News Lens 關鍵評論網," *The News Lense 關鍵評論*, September 29, 2017, <https://www.thenewslens.com/article/79963>.

values of cultural rights and environmental protection, as explained through Chief Justice Hsu Tzong-li's words: "The Constitution recognizes both the protection of Indigenous peoples' right to practice their hunting culture and the protection of the environment and ecology. Both fundamental values are equally important."²²⁴

In the end, some hunting restrictions, like the need for permits, were removed, many that incriminated Talum Suqluman were upheld. As a result, Talum Suqluman was still sentenced, which was a disappointment for Indigenous rights activists and his family. The case was ultimately resolved when President Tsai pardoned him, the first pardon that President Tsai has given in her presidency since 2016. Yet despite the return of Talum Suqluman's freedom, this exception to the rule was nowhere near the satisfactory result for Indigenous hunting rights.

Hunting as an Indigenous Culture, Land, and Legal Issue

Before discussing more about the case, it is necessary to understand how hunting plays a role in Native worldviews. Hunting is a foundation that links various aspects of Indigenous culture and life. Pu Jong-Cheng categorized some of these aspects:

- **Hunting in storytelling:** mythologies, legends, stories, sayings, and prayers that involve hunting
- **Land for hunting:** obtaining, allocating, managing, and regulating resource use on hunting grounds;
- **Religion and beliefs:** [customs and prohibitions] ...
- **Hunting organization:** familial, hunting group, and temporary relationships that hunting involves;
- **Ways of hunting:** individual, group (familial or communal); different tools and techniques
- **Food culture:** food preferences, restrictions, and special recipes related to hunting [and customs regarding allocating/sharing prey based on relationships]
- **Hunting handicrafts:** craftsmanship related to hunting, including buildings, clothing and accessories, and decorations
- **Hunting knowledge:** knowledge of land, seasons, animals and plants, [dissecting and preserving the prey]²²⁵

²²⁴ Chang Chien and Amy Qin, "Taiwan Court Upholds Laws Restricting Hunting."

²²⁵ Tibusungu'e Poicon (Pu, ZhongYong), *Study of Taiwanese Indigenous Peoples' Hunting and Fishing Cultures* (原蘊山海間：台灣原住民族狩獵暨漁撈文化研究), (New Taipei City: Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2018), 47-49.

Unlike how settlers may imagine Indigenous hunting to be like, hunting is not merely a practice for subsistence or profit. It is a way of relating to the community and nature, a method of passing down knowledge, a form of identity, and more. Hunting is often seen as a rite of passage for becoming a “real person.” It is an exercise of self-determination on Native Land.

Prior to the establishment of colonial government laws, Indigenous Peoples had developed their own sets of laws and customs that governed hunting practices. These can be found in various forms, including spiritual beliefs, customs and prohibitions, and the rights to hunt. A Bunun social media educator described, “Hunters are granted [hunting] rights under the tribal community’s collective political and ethics structures. It is not like anyone can casually take a gun and run around hunting in the mountains.”²²⁶ When the colonial legal structure attempts to regulate Indigenous hunting, it ignores existing customs, inevitably leading to clashes.

The disregard of traditional customs also contributed to environmentalists’ antagonism toward Native hunting. Had environmentalists understood and recognized Indigenous customs around land relations as Indigenous people’s own “environmental regulations,” it would have been clear that hunting is not the enemy but a vital part of relating to land. Hunters are carriers of cultural and environmental knowledge. Universities have begun recognizing Indigenous ecological knowledge of hunters, collaborating with hunters because they interact with the land directly and have first-hand information of the ecosystem. This budding recognition by some environmentalists suggests that mainstream settler society has a long way to go about learning from Indigenous traditions.

Because of how fundamental hunting is within Indigenous societies, the criminalization of hunting destroys Indigenous societies, operating under settler colonial logics of elimination

²²⁶ @Buanistalking, “狩獵在幹嘛? ——認識狩獵文化及規範, 你該知道的三件事 [Hunting: Three Things to Know to Understand Hunting Culture and Custom],” Instagram, *Buan 月亮說話 | 月亮曆* (blog), May 30, 2021, <https://www.instagram.com/p/CPgQBTxFHfC/>.

and replacement in order to seize the land for settlers. While Indigenous hunting is not entirely prohibited in Taiwan, current regulations criminalize hunting in various ways so that hunting can no longer play its foundational role in Indigenous societies. The stringent restriction around hunting destroys Indigenous social structures, renders them what Laura Pulido terms as “surplus people,” and forces them to participate in/assimilate into the settler capitalist economy.²²⁷ As Polanyi writes in *The Great Transformation*, “Thus, the colonists may decide to cut the breadfruit trees down in order to create an artificial food scarcity...to force [the native] to barter away his labor... The smashing up of social structures in order to extract the element of labor from them”.²²⁸ The destruction of Indigenous hunting is a key factor that devastates their traditional economies, turning Native people and land as mere commodities. The crucial role hunting plays in Indigenous society makes it a critical political issue.

Settler Legal Structures

The settler colonial legal structures and Indigenous customs are based on incommensurable worldviews, which makes it difficult for Indigenous hunters to practice their traditions simultaneous to abiding by the laws. Despite the importance of Indigenous customs, settler colonial legal structures continue to dictate Taiwan’s society. As a result, the legal sphere remains an important site of activism. This section is a brief overview of some legal issues surrounding Indigenous hunting.

In order to navigate this system, Native activists and legislators advocated for Indigenous rights through the Indigenous People’s Basic Law (IPBL), which was passed in 2005. Initially, IBPL faced resistance from Han legislators, but during an impasse between the KMT and DPP, a few legislators used their position as the key minority to work with the DPP and slipped the IBPL

²²⁷ Pulido, “Flint, Environmental Racism, and Racial Capitalism.”

²²⁸ Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, 2nd Beacon Paperback ed (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2001), 172.

into a compromised version of the legislation.²²⁹ By taking advantage of that impasse, many other legislators only realized the passing of the Law retrospectively.²³⁰ The IBPL is an important breakthrough, as it was comprehensive in protecting Indigenous rights, including hunting rights. In theory, IBPL is just below the constitution--in other words, when other laws conflict with the IPBL, IPBL should always take precedence. Yet problems arise in practice. In the case of Talum Suqluman, the Wildlife Conservation Law (野生動物保育法) and the Controlling Guns, Ammunition and Knives Act (槍炮彈藥管制法) stood in the way of protecting Indigenous hunting rights.

The IBPL protects Indigenous hunting rights, which “can only be conducted for traditional culture, ritual or self-consumption.”²³¹ However, the Wildlife Conservation Act limits it to traditional cultural and ritual use: “Wildlife may be hunted or killed for traditional cultural or ritual hunting, killing or utilization needs of Taiwan aborigines.”²³² Moreover, this act includes stringent requirements for hunters: “Hunting, killing or utilizing wildlife in the condition listed above shall be approved by authorities. The application process, hunting method, hunted species, bag limit, hunting season, location, and other regulations shall be announced by the [National Principal Authority: Council of Agriculture, Executive Yuan] and the national aborigine authority.”²³³ Hunters are not able to predict what species or how many animals they hunt, and as previously mentioned, doing so may violate traditional customs or beliefs.

²²⁹ Chung Ling-Min, “原住民族基本法立法過程之研究 A Study of Legislated Process on Indigenous Peoples Right Law” (National Taiwan Normal University, 2007), 45, <http://portal.lib.ntnu.edu.tw:80/handle/20.500.12235/85648>.

Original text: “原住民族基本法的提出到誕生，隨著蔡中涵委員當選與卸任之十八年歷史，少數幾名立委以杯葛幾項重大預算案的方式，扮演國會關鍵少數以小博大，因此吸引民近黨主動合作”

²³⁰ This narrative is from a Buluo Conference leader I talked to.

²³¹ “The Indigenous Peoples Basic Law,” Laws & Regulations Database of The Republic of China (Taiwan), June 20, 2018, <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=D0130003>.

²³² “Wildlife Conservation Act,” Laws & Regulations Database of The Republic of China (Taiwan), January 23, 2013, <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=M0120001>.

Official translation of the Wildlife Protection Act, Article 21-1; my translation would be “Taiwan Aborigines can hunt, kill, or utilize wildlife based on traditional culture and ritual needs,” i.e. excluding nonprofit personal use.

²³³ Ibid.

On the other hand, gun regulations dictate that Indigenous peoples are only allowed to use self-made guns.²³⁴ Many hunters object to this because these guns tend to be unsafe: many Native hunters suffer injuries from gun accidents. Many also object to this restriction because it is based on the idea that Indigenous peoples are of the past and should not be permitted to use modern technology. Despite the myth of Indigenous people as “primitive,” Indigenous hunters have used safer, modern manufactured guns generations ago. Guns are revered in certain cultures and thus have been long incorporated in many Indigenous festivals or rituals.²³⁵

These two types of legal restrictions reveal how settler society views Indigenous peoples in caricatures: juxtaposed to environmental protection (treating animals in an “uncivilized way”), and a figure of the past.

The Settler Colonial Gaze and Exercise of Power

The discourse around the issue, both by settler environmentalists and within the courtroom, represents an “objectifying” gaze towards Indigenous people.²³⁶ The settler gaze is violent, demanding that Indigenous Peoples shall not determine their path of progression/development and they must submit to the settler’s imagination. Dunbar-Otíz and Gilio-Whitaker points out settler misconceptions about authenticity: “If Indians do exist, they are seen as mere shadows of their former selves, making counterfeit identity claims or performing fraudulent acts of Indianness that are no longer authentic or even relevant. Non-Natives thus position themselves, either wittingly or unwittingly, as being the true experts about Indians and their histories.”²³⁷ Using this logic of the settler imagination about authenticity, if Natives do not

²³⁴ “Controlling Guns, Ammunition and Knives Act,” accessed April 27, 2022, <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=D0080047>.

²³⁵ I learned about these concerns in Professor Tunkan Tansikian’s (Chen Chang Pei-lun) course on contemporary Indigenous issues, as well as from the hunters I have encountered through Ptasan.

²³⁶ Glen Sean Coulthard and Taiaiake Alfred, “Conclusion: Lessons from Idle No More: The Future of Indigenous Activism,” in *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 151–80, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt9qh3cv.11>.

²³⁷ Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz and Dina Gilio-Whitaker, “Introduction,” in *“All the Real Indians Died off”*:

adhere to the caricatures (which settlers assume are authoritative), they are not truly Indigenous and must assimilate. This way, settlers force Natives to either perform to the pleasure of settlers or be erased through assimilation. This is demonstrated, as previously discussed, when settlers cannot accept Natives using more advanced, safer guns because they view Indigenous Peoples as frozen from the past and use of modern guns as “inauthentic.”

Environmental narratives employ the settler colonial gaze too. For example, an environmental protest sign, “the true disadvantaged ethnic group is the animals,” compared Native people with animals and juxtaposed their rights against each other.²³⁸ They also argued that Indigenous culture is not equal to Indigenous hunting rights, which assumes settler authority to interpret what Indigenous culture is. Indigenous activists intervene in the dichotomous portrayal of Indigenous cultural rights and environmentalism, but the dichotomous view remains widespread. By pushing for environmentalist ideas at the expense of Indigenous rights, the animal rights activists exert their colonial power to control Native worldviews and ways of living.

The results of the constitution reinterpretation case also upheld the false dichotomy. It also demonstrates environmental colonialism as a tool of control. This is part of the long-standing colonial patterns of using environmental colonialism as cover for the land grabs and preservation of nature as resources for settler use. Even if the environmental activists were well intentioned, they ignore the structural causes (like capitalism) of the environmental issues and instead target surface issues and disadvantaged communities. Doing so, they play into the settler colonial logic of sabotaging and replacing Indigenous land relations and cultures.

Justice Huang Horng-Shya’s opinion statement exemplified colonial gaze. It was the subject of a lot of Indigenous discussion (and ridicule), as well as a prime demonstration of the settler romanticization and misinterpretation of Indigeneity and Indigenous land relations. The

And 20 Other Myths about Native Americans (Boston: Beacon Press, 2016), 1–6.

²³⁸ Huang Si-Min, “關心王光祿釋憲案 57 個動保團體呼籲：任何狩獵行為都應受規範,” 環境資訊中心 Environmental Information Center, March 19, 2021, <https://e-info.org.tw/node/230107>.

following is my translation of a portion of her statement:

“Hunter ≠ using modern guns to kill wild animals! Mr. Zhang [Justice Huang’s husband’s uncle] liked to hunt birds when he was young, but when he was older, he worked with youth that specialized in nature conservation and protection, like Liu, Ma, Lee, and established Taiwan’s Society for Wildlife and Nature. He spent the rest of his life protecting nature. People like Mr. Zhang, who has hunting knowledge and is also willing to learn about environmental knowledge and reflect deeply on dedicating his life for the environment, are the cool cool cool hunters of the new era! Isn’t this concept familiar? Isn’t it a demonstration of the touching and fine hunting culture of Natives that was previously mentioned? I hope that the new generation of Natives do not limit yourselves to the shallow cause of hunting wildlife with modern guns. You should follow your Indigenous ancestors’ spirit of exploring the unknown and protecting nature, as this is the true cultural preservation to be proud of; this is cool!”²³⁹

In this statement, Huang positions herself as an authority to authentic Indigeneity, critiquing young Natives for hunting and imagining a baseless “Indigenous ancestors’ spirit.”



Fig. 1 *Cool Cool Hunter*²⁴⁰

In response to Justice Huang’s, Umav Ispalakan, a Bunun and Tayal artist, created a piece of political art, “Cool Cool Hunter” (Fig.1). In the picture, a person labeled “colonist”

²³⁹ Horng-Shya Huang, “釋字第 803 號解釋部分協同意見書 [Interpretation 803 Explaining Partial Agreement Opinion]” (Judicial Yuan, May 6, 2021), <https://www.judicial.gov.tw/FYDownload/FYDownload.asp?fileguid=001701-AE1UX>.

²⁴⁰ Umav Ispalakan, *Cool Cool Hunter*, May 9, 2021, Digital, May 9, 2021, Bunun Everyday Facebook Fan Page, <https://www.facebook.com/bununeveryday/photos/pcb.3649568891816433/3649520765154579/>. Deep appreciation for Umav’s artwork and education through social media, as well as allowing me to include her incredible work in my thesis.

kneels and poses on an Indigenous person, saying “Indigenous People! Let me teach you what is a ‘good hunter’” (a more literal translation of the highlighted words is “cool cool cool hunter,” mocking Justice Huang’s statement). The Indigenous person writes with their finger, “tragic” (慘). Her illustration shows the colonial attempt of the Justice to teach Natives how to be “authentic” done simultaneously while violently stepping over Indigenous peoples, demonstrating the violent nature of the colonial claim to Indigenous authenticity. Umav Ispalakan’s work both recognizes and resists the colonial gaze; her art disrupts the narrative by settlers, portraying the Indigenous reality and experiences in response to the disrespectful statement.

President Tsai’s pardon was also an exercise of settler colonial power and recognition. Despite good intentions, it was a symbolic charity move and reaffirmed the criminalization of Indigenous hunters. This is what Coulthard and Alfred explained as a “symbolic act of redress,” how “colonial recognition politics serves the imperatives of capitalist accumulation by *appearing* to address its colonial history through symbolic acts of redress while in actuality ‘further entrenching in law and practice the real bases of its control.’”²⁴¹ In response to the news of the pardon, Indigenous priest Bisazu Takiludun said, “We don’t want this type of pitying, conditional response. What we want is a true return to respecting Indigenous traditions, lifestyles, and cultures.”²⁴² He further emphasized that the legal system reinforced the criminality of Indigenous hunting and continues as a threat to the over 3,000 Indigenous hunters. Under the settler colonial gaze, whether it is how Indigenous hunting is portrayed or whether someone is guilty/can be pardoned, the power and judgment is in the hands of the settlers.

²⁴¹ Coulthard and Alfred. "Conclusion: Lessons from Idle No More: The Future of Indigenous Activism."

²⁴² Hong, Taiyang 洪泰陽, “總統特赦 Talum Suqluman 牧者籲仍要努力修法,” 台灣教會公報新聞網, May 20, 2021, <https://tcnn.org.tw/archives/87130>.

Original text: “我們不要這種可憐、條件式的回應，我們要的是真正回歸尊重原住民的傳統、生活及文化。”



Fig. 2 *I Can Forgive You*²⁴³

The art *I Can Forgive You* (Fig.2), also by Umav Ispalakan, depicts President Tsai’s pardon of Tama Talum. Like Bisazu Takiludun, Umav Ispalakan also sees through the President’s symbolic act of redress. She points out that President Tsai’s pardon of Tama Talum is performative (and perhaps even an act of saviorism). The person on the left, representing Tsai, says “you are guilty in my heart.” The quote demonstrates how the “pardon” does not change how the court confirmed the “illegality” of Talum Suqluman’s hunting, and the hunters will continue to be arrested and prosecuted as long as structural problems in the legal system remains unaddressed.

Hunting as Indigenous Futurity

Despite legal restrictions, Indigenous hunters continue their tradition, demonstrating the practice of Indigenous futurity: “living out the futures of our ancestor relatives. Maintaining continuity in practices and values and renovating them as necessary...are ways of enacting futurity right now.”²⁴⁴ Regardless of the settler colonial gaze—romanticization or

²⁴³ Umav Ispalakan, *I Can Forgive You*, May 20, 2021, Digital, May 20, 2021, Bunun Everyday Facebook Fan Page, <https://www.facebook.com/bununeveryday/photos/a.1189714701135210/3681405488632773/>.

²⁴⁴ Laura Harjo, “Introduction: Renegotiating Mvskoke Knowledge,” in *Spiral to the Stars: Mvskoke Tools of Futurity*, n.d., 3–47.

antagonization—on Indigenous land relations and hunting, Indigenous people continue to practice and advocate for hunting, pushing against settler environmental imaginations of what land relations should be. Rather than seeing Indigenous cultures and the wildlife/environment as separate, viewing hunting through the framework of “Land is Life” shows hunting as a node connecting land and life. And even though the legal domain continues to be a site of ongoing Native resistance against colonial rule, Indigenous hunting is not simply a topic of governance or legal disputes about guns and wildlife based on settler worldviews; the way hunters emphasize hunting as part of (everyday) life, traditions *and* living cultures, and land relations illustrates that it is a practice for survival and resurgence.

In response to the ruling, Talum Suqluman expressed resolutely: “Of course I will continue hunting!” He and other hunters have and will continue their traditional hunting practices as a firm refusal of colonial restrictions and a gesture to the younger generation that they should not give up traditional hunting practices. No matter what the colonial government demands or regulates, Indigenous will be a practice of futurity and resistance that carries on. Hunting is a collective right and issue for Indigenous people. Through hunting, the Indigenous community at large maintain community knowledge and practice community power.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

Looking at Taiwan's current political context of multiculturalist inclusion, narratives that center settler benevolence will likely continue. It is clear how multiculturalist inclusion serves settler interests, since inclusion is applicable only when benefitting settlers. This politics incorporates Indigenous cultures to serve Taiwanese settlers needs to both grapple with their own national identity and locate themselves internationally. However, Indigenous narratives and activism for sovereignty actively counter the settler claims. Indigenous practices and futurity show how there is a beyond, that beyond the limits of settler colonial structures exist pathways that center Indigenous futures.²⁴⁵

Within the environmental context in Taiwan, co-management is well recognized, but in practice there are many pitfalls in this concept. Co-management suggests a shared responsibility but not a recognition of Indigenous sovereignty. It also involves the incorporation of Indigenous ecological knowledge within environmentalism, yet when the power is in the hands of settlers to determine how the Indigenous knowledge is used, losing its original cultural context. This process also alludes to what Richard Grove observed with the development of environmental ideas in the context of imperialism, absorbing Native knowledge from the colonies to serve the empire.²⁴⁶ As long as settlers assume access to Indigenous ecological knowledge for their interests, taken out of the Indigenous context, the knowledge would no longer be Indigenous but an appropriation that serves the settler colonial logic of replacement. Leanne Simpson warned about the problems of co-management agreements in 2001, and these concerns are still relevant:

Aboriginal Peoples do not want to be just consulted or studied, we have a right to be at the table using the knowledge inside of ourselves to make decisions that impact our people, our communities, the plants, the animals and our lands. We do not want other people deciding which components of our knowledge are important and which are not. We do not want scientists interpreting our knowledge, when it has been removed from

²⁴⁵ Theresa Stewart-Ambo and K. Wayne Yang, "Beyond Land Acknowledgment in Settler Institutions," *Social Text* 39, no. 1 (March 1, 2021): 21–46, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-8750076>.

²⁴⁶ Grove, *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens, and The Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860*.

the values and spiritual foundations that give it meaning. The processes of documenting and integrating remove knowledge from the people. When the knowledge is removed from our people, the power of our knowledge is lost... When our knowledge becomes a commodity it can be used at will by the power structures of the dominant society to support existing doctrines and the status quo.²⁴⁷

Performative inclusion is also an ongoing issue under existing frameworks of “collaboration.”

With Canada’s Jasper National Park, Megan Youdelis wrote in her article title, “They could take you out for coffee and call it consultation!” in reference to the limitation of so-called Indigenous consultation. In Taiwan, Indigenous activists have been calling out insincere attempts to gain Indigenous “approval” for developmental projects like the “Zhi Ben Solar Electricity” case. In this case, the developers deceived some elderly members of the Puyuma buluo of Zhi Ben into signing agreements for the development of solar electricity on their land. The Puyuma people were not against solar energy, emphasizing their opposition is not about solar energy but how the developers trampled over the buluo’s sovereignty.²⁴⁸ This is yet another example of how benevolent environmental actions could still reproduce colonial relations when settlers do not respect Indigenous sovereignty.

Settler narratives are pervasive and in need of intervention. Recognizing both the coded settler narratives that perpetuate an ahistorical, apolitical, universal view of Taiwan that centers settler interests, is necessary so that they are intervened.²⁴⁹ Disrupting settler narratives is part of stopping the reproduction of settler colonial worldviews and opening spaces for others. At the same time, it is necessary to look to Indigenous counter-narratives, because they expand our understanding of possibilities beyond the settler colonial reality. Of course, this must be done with respect to the boundaries of Indigenous knowledge—settlers should not assume access to Indigenous knowledge.

²⁴⁷ Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, “Aboriginal Peoples and Knowledge: Decolonizing Our Processes,” *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* XXI, no. 1 (2001): 139.

²⁴⁸ <http://algo.nttu.edu.tw/1081ITWWW/10811244/index.html>

²⁴⁹ Macoun and Strakosch, “The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory.”

Finally, what lies ahead in terms of future work? In this thesis, I hope to make my own contribution to and intervention on Taiwan's settler colonial studies by both scrutinizing settler narratives and practicing ways of better research in settler colonial studies. For the former, thinking about expanding Taiwan's settler colonial studies, I see many more issues, environmental and beyond, that deserve closer analysis and critical thought. Locating Taiwan through global connections is important, but for non-Native Taiwanese scholars like myself, it should center solidarity, mutual support, and a building up of power rather than serving settler needs of international recognition. Of course, recognizing the limitations of a settler colonial framework and academic knowledge production is also important for continuing the work within this emerging field for moving beyond universalizing and discipline-centric tendencies.

For the latter, I continue to consider how to engage in better practices, following the footsteps of Max Liboiron and many other scholars. As a participant of discourse, what are ways to read and write respectfully, ways to refuse and counter the tendency of academic methods in reproducing colonial relations? How does our language and words shape the ways we engage in the world—including my use of English in this thesis to discuss a Taiwanese issue? Who do I continue to write to and write for? What does it mean to engage within conversations back in Taiwan?

I begin to answer these questions for myself by continuing the process of critical interrogation of my work and self-reflection on my relations and actions. I consider gratitude and accountability part of how I approach my work. I offer these questions understanding that there is no single universal answer. This project is just a beginning. Answering these questions will be an ongoing process, requiring continued probing beyond what I have done here.

I end with the words of Bunun writer Husluman Vava for reflection:

*“If you show up because you want to help me and educate me, then please return. If you will take my experiences as part of your survival, then perhaps we can work hard together.”*²⁵⁰

²⁵⁰ This quote is originally from Husluman Vava’s work, 《玉山魂》 (Yushan Hun). I read it in one of Umav Ispalakan’s posts.

Original text: “如果你的出現是認為要幫助我、教育我，那麼請你回去。如果你將把我的經驗看成你生存的一部分，那麼或許我們可以一起努力。

Bibliography

- “101 年度玉山國家公園東埔地區部落巡查計畫：結案報告 (2012 Annual Yushan National Park Tumpu Area Buluo Inspection Plan: Concluding Report).” Yushan National Park Headquarters, Mammalogical Society of Taiwan, December 2012.
- @Buanistalking. “狩獵在幹嘛？——認識狩獵文化及規範，你該知道的三件事 [Hunting: Three Things to Know to Understand Hunting Culture and Custom].” Instagram. *Buan 月亮說話 | 月亮曆* (blog), May 30, 2021. <https://www.instagram.com/p/CPgQBTxFHfC/>.
- Buluo Working Group (部落工作隊). “為什麼我們堅決反對設立「馬告國家公園」？ [Why are we firmly against the Maqaw National Park?].” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002. <https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02053101.htm>.
- Ciwas Ali. “醜惡的內部殖民·醜惡的國家公園遮羞布 [The Vile Internal Colonialism: The Vile National Park Loincloth],” February 23, 2001. http://www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=593:records-record16-593&catid=47:record15&Itemid=246.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean, and Taiaiake Alfred. “Conclusion: Lessons from Idle No More: The Future of Indigenous Activism.” In *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, 151–80. University of Minnesota Press, 2014. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt9qh3cv.11>.
- Laws & Regulations Database of The Republic of China (Taiwan). “Controlling Guns, Ammunition and Knives Act,” June 20, 2020. <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=D0080047>.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne, and Dina Gilio-Whitaker. “Introduction.” In *“All the Real Indians Died off”: And 20 Other Myths about Native Americans*, 1–6. Boston: Beacon Press, 2016.

- Fu Zhi-Nan (傅志男). “泰雅爾族人站出來! [Stand up, Tayal People!].” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002. <https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02082701.htm>.
- Grove, Richard H. *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens, and The Origins of Environmentalism, 1600-1860*. Studies in Environment and History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/cam026/93028654.html>.
- Guan Xiao-Rong 關曉榮. “【南方】什麼樣的另類觀點? --摘自「揭發偽民主. 偽善的馬告國家公園」系列 (關曉榮) —智邦公益電子報—台灣最大公益電子報發行中心.” 南方電子報 [Nan Fang Dian Zi Bao], September 26, 2002. <https://enews.url.com.tw/enews/14263>.
- Harjo, Laura. “Introduction: Renegotiating Mvskoke Knowledge.” In *Spiral to the Stars: Mvskoke Tools of Futurity*, 3–47, n.d.
- He Bo-Jun (何柏均). “泰雅族兄弟的接力奮戰: 如何用永續精神守護鎮西堡 [Tayal Bother’s Relay Fight: How to use the spirit of sustainability to protect Cinsbu].” 報導者 The Reporter, August 16, 2021. <https://www.twreporter.org/a/aboriginal-reserve-hsinchucinsbu>.
- Hirano, Katsuya. “Hokkaidō 150: Settler Colonialism and Indigeneity in Modern Japan and Beyond.” *Critical Asian Studies* 51, no. 4 (October 2, 2019): 597–636. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2019.1665291>.
- Ho, Ming-sho. “Understanding the Trajectory of Social Movements in Taiwan (1980–2010).” *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs* 39, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/186810261003900301>.
- Hong, Taiyang 洪泰陽. “總統特赦 Talum Suqluman 牧者籲仍要努力修法.” 台灣教會公報新聞網, May 20, 2021. <https://tcnn.org.tw/archives/87130>.

- Hsieh Shih-Chung 謝世忠. *認同的污名：台灣原住民的族群變遷 [Ethnic Contacts, Stigmatized Identity, and Pan-Taiwan Aboriginalism: A Study on Ethnic Change of Taiwan Aborigines]*. Yushan She 玉山社, 2017.
- Hsu, Funie, Brian Hioe, and Wen Liu. "Collective Statement on Taiwan Independence: Building Global Solidarity and Rejecting US Military Empire." *American Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (2017): 465–68. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0039>.
- Hsu, Minna. "Lost, Found and Troubled in Translation: Reconsidering Imagined Indigenous 'Communities' in Post-Disaster Taiwan Settings." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 12, no. 1 (March 2016): 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.1.6>.
- Hsu, Minna, Richard Howitt, and Fiona Miller. "Procedural Vulnerability and Institutional Capacity Deficits in Post-Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction: Insights from Wutai Rukai Experiences of Typhoon Morakot." *Human Organization* 74, no. 4 (January 1, 2015): 308–18. <https://doi.org/10.17730/0018-7259-74.4.308>.
- Huang, Horng-Shya. "釋字第 803 號解釋部分協同意見書 [Interpretation 803 Explaining Partial Agreement Opinion]." Judicial Yuan, May 6, 2021. <https://www.judicial.gov.tw/FYDownload/FYDownload.asp?fileguid=001701-AE1UX>.
- Huang, Shu-Min, and Shao-Hua Liu. "Discrimination and Incorporation of Taiwanese Indigenous Austronesian Peoples." *Asian Ethnicity* 17, no. 2 (March 2016): 294–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2015.1112726>.
- Huang Si-Min. "關心王光祿釋憲案 57 個動保團體呼籲：任何狩獵行為都應受規範。" 環境資訊中心 Environmental Information Center, March 19, 2021. <https://e-info.org.tw/node/230107>.
- Huang Yueh-Wen (黃躍雯). *Building a Dream in the Wilderness: The Institutionalization of National Parks in Taiwan (築夢荒野：台灣國家公園的建制過程)*. Banqiao, Taipei: 稻

鄉出版社 (Dao Xiang Publisher), 2001.

Icyang Parod, ed. *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan* (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編上). Vol. 1. 2 vols. Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008.

———, ed. *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan* (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編下). Vol. 2. 2 vols. Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008.

———. “原住民族運動的興起 [The Rise of the Indigenous Peoples Movement].” In *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan* (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編上), 1:15–25. Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008.

UCLA Asia Pacific Center. “Indigenous Knowledge, Taiwan: Comparative and Relational Perspectives (UCLA-NTNU Taiwan Studies Initiative Conference).” Events, May 2018. <https://www.international.ucla.edu/apc/event/13058>.

Ji Jun-Jie (紀駿傑). “馬告的共管難題 [Maqaw’s Co-management Difficulty].” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002. <https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02091901.htm2002/yi02091701.htm>.

Li Gen-Zheng (李根政). “是誰讓原住民權益運動染上「鮮血」 [Who Let the Indigenous Rights Movement Get Stained with 'Blood'].” Blog. 馬告國家公園催生 [The Push for the Maqaw National Park], August 22, 2002. <https://blog.xuite.net/wei430306/twblog/165002270>.

Li Yu-Hui (李玉蕙). “不談馬告 國家公園法還是要修.” *祖靈之邦* [*Ancestor's Realm*] (blog),

May 29, 2003.

www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=766:records-record05-766&catid=36:record05&Itemid=235.

Liboiron, Max. “How Plastic Is a Function of Colonialism.” *Teen Vogue*, December 21, 2018.

<https://www.teenvogue.com/story/how-plastic-is-a-function-of-colonialism>.

———. *Pollution Is Colonialism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2021.

———. Q&A with Max Liboiron, Author of *Pollution is Colonialism*, May 14, 2021.

<https://dukeupress.wordpress.com/2021/05/14/qa-with-max-liboiron-author-of-pollution-is-colonialism/>.

Lin, Yih-ren. “Politicizing Nature: The Maqaw National Park Controversy in Taiwan.”

Capitalism Nature Socialism 22, no. 2 (June 2011): 88–103.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10455752.2011.569358>.

———. “馬告的另類觀點 2: 環境價值與國家公園改革 (三) [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw

2: Environmental Values and National Park Reforms 3].” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental

Information Center), September 17, 2002. [https://e-](https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm)

[info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm](https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm).

———. “馬告的另類觀點 2: 環境價值與國家公園改革 (二) [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw

2: Environmental Values and National Park Reforms 2].” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental

Information Center), September 16, 2002. [https://e-](https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm)

[info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm](https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm).

———. “馬告的另類觀點 2: 環境價值與國家公園改革 (四) [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw

2: Environmental Values and National Park Reforms 4].” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental

Information Center), September 18, 2002. [https://e-](https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091801.htm)

[info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091801.htm](https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091801.htm).

- . “馬告的另類觀點 3：回應關曉榮先生 [Alternative Opinions on Maqaw 3: Responding to Mr. Guan Xiao-Rong].” 環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center), 2002.
<https://e-info.org.tw/reviewer/yihren/2002/yi02091701.htm>.
- Ling-Min, Chung. “原住民族基本法立法過程之研究 A Study of Legislated Process on Indigenous Peoples Right Law.” National Taiwan Normal University, 2007.
<http://rportal.lib.ntnu.edu.tw:80/handle/20.500.12235/85648>.
- Lutz, Catherine. “Empire Is in the Details.” *American Ethnologist* 33, no. 4 (2006): 593–611.
- Macoun, Alissa, and Elizabeth Strakosch. “The Ethical Demands of Settler Colonial Theory.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3–04 (November 2013): 426–43.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.810695>.
- Nakashima (中島弘二), Koji. “日本帝国における森林の開発と保全—台湾を事例に— (Development and Conservation of Forest in the Japanese Empire: a Case of Taiwan).” *Journal of Forest Economics (林業経済研究)* 67, no. 1 (Spring 2021): 3–15.
- Peng Lin-Song (彭琳淞). “喋血抗日，賤賣傳統 [Die Xue Kang Ri, Jian Mai Chuan Tong].” 祖靈之邦 [Ancestor's Realm] (blog), July 22, 2001.
www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=582:repay-history-582&catid=51:history&Itemid=125.
- . “回老家像小偷，官民水火難容 [Going Home Like a Thief, Officials and Civilians Irreconcilable].” 祖靈之邦 [Ancestor's Realm] (blog), 22 2001.
- . “文化重創，獵人悲鳴 [Cultural Casualties, Hunter's Cry in Grief].” 祖靈之邦 [Ancestor's Realm] (blog), February 23, 2001.
www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=595:records-record16-595&catid=47:record15&Itemid=246.

- . “繁華跳票，橫禍飛來 (Fan Hua Tiao Piao, Heng Huo Fei Lai).” *祖靈之邦 [Ancestor's Realm]* (blog), February 23, 2001.
www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=596:records-record16-596&catid=47:record15&Itemid=246.
- Pilin Yapu (比令·亞布). *Yaba 的話：一個當代泰雅人的傳統沈思 (Words from Yaba)*. Miaoli Dahu Xiang: Shue-pa National Park, 2009.
- Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. 2nd Beacon Paperback ed. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2001.
- Office of the President Republic of China (Taiwan). “President Tsai Apologizes to Indigenous Peoples on Behalf of Government.” News Releases, August 1, 2016.
<https://english.president.gov.tw/NEWS/4950>.
- Pulido, Laura. “Flint, Environmental Racism, and Racial Capitalism.” *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 27, no. 3 (July 2, 2016): 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10455752.2016.1213013>.
- Ray Wang (王學新). “日治前期桃園地區之製腦葉與蕃地拓殖 (1895-1920) The Camphor Industry and Mountain Colonization of Taoyuan Area during the Japanese Rule(1895-1920).” *Taiwan Wen Xian (台灣文獻)* 63, no. 1 (March 2012).
- Shih, Shu-Mei. “The Concept of the Sinophone.” *PMLA* 126, no. 3 (2011): 709–18.
- . “Theory in a Relational World.” *Comparative Literature Studies* 53, no. 4 (December 1, 2016): 722–46. <https://doi.org/10.5325/complitstudies.53.4.0722>.
- Shih, Shu-Mei, and Lin-Chin Tsai. *Indigenous Knowledge in Taiwan and Beyond*. Springer Nature, 2021.
- Stewart-Ambo, Theresa, and K. Wayne Yang. “Beyond Land Acknowledgment in Settler Institutions.” *Social Text* 39, no. 1 (March 1, 2021): 21–46.
<https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-8750076>.

- Tsai, Lin-Chin. “Re-Conceptualizing Taiwan: Settler Colonial Criticism and Cultural Production.” UCLA, 2019. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/30h7d8r5>.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. “Aboriginal Peoples and Knowledge: Decolonizing Our Processes.” *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* XXI, no. 1 (2001): 137–48.
- . *Dancing on Our Turtle’s Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Pub, 2011.
- Speed, Shannon. “Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala.” *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 783–90. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0064>.
- Stoler, Ann Laura, and Carole McGranahan. “Introduction: Refiguring Imperial Terrains.” In *Imperial Formations*. Sante Fe: SAR Press, 2007.
- <https://www.colorado.edu/anthropology/sites/default/files/attached-files/imperialformationsintroduction.pdf>.
- Sugimoto, Tomonori. “Settler Colonial Incorporation and Inheritance: Historical Sciences, Indigeneity, and Settler Narratives in Post-WWII Taiwan.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 8, no. 3 (March 21, 2017): 283–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2017.1303596>.
- . “The Yellow Man’s Burden: The Politics of Settler Colonialism in Hokkaidō and Taiwan,” 2013.
- . “Urban Settler Colonialism: Policing and Displacing Indigeneity in Taipei, Taiwan.” *City & Society* 31, no. 2 (2019): 227–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ciso.12210>.
- Sun Ming-Lin (孫銘燐). “誰的馬告國家公園----從抗爭符碼運用到在地參與認同? [Whose Maqaw National Park—From a Symbol of Resistance to Local Participation and Recognition].” Abstract, National Tsing Hua University, 2002.
- <https://hdl.handle.net/11296/3ga226>.
- Taiban Sasala. ““設國家公園前請先畫張部落地圖 [Before Establishing a National Park, Daw a Buluo Map First].” 中國時報, March 24, 2020.

- Laws & Regulations Database of The Republic of China (Taiwan). “The Indigenous Peoples Basic Law,” June 20, 2018.
<https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=D0130003>.
- Todd, Zoe. “An Indigenous Feminist’s Take On The Ontological Turn: ‘Ontology’ Is Just Another Word For Colonialism.” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 29, no. 1 (March 2016): 4–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12124>.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Yang. “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (September 8, 2012): 1–40.
- Umav Ispalakan. *Cool Cool Hunter*. May 9, 2021. Digital. Bunun Everyday Facebook Fan Page.
<https://www.facebook.com/bununeveryday/photos/pcb.3649568891816433/3649520765154579/>.
- . *I Can Forgive You*. May 20, 2021. Digital. Bunun Everyday Facebook Fan Page.
<https://www.facebook.com/bununeveryday/photos/a.1189714701135210/3681405488632773/>.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. “Introducing: Settler Colonial Studies.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 1 (January 2011): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2011.10648799>.
- Vilian Takisvalainan (斐立安). 行走 TIT 第六十三集—我家住在國家公園 [*Walking Tribes in Taiwan Episode 63: My Home Is in the National Park*]. 行走 TIT. 公視戲劇 PTS Drama, 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d2Q9Aw4f4ow>.
- Wang Kai-Hong (王凱弘). “Tumpu Daingaz: A resistance space of Bunun Aborigines of Taiwan (Tumpu Daingaz: 一個台灣原住民族布農族的抵抗空間).” Masters, National Taiwan Normal University, 2005. <http://portal.lib.ntnu.edu.tw:80/handle/20.500.12235/94017>.
- Laws & Regulations Database of The Republic of China (Taiwan). “Wildlife Conservation Act,” January 23, 2013.
<https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=M0120001>.

- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 1, 2006): 387–409.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240>.
- Wu, Yi-Cheng. "Governing Indigenous Drinking: Jiejiu in Settler-Colonial Taiwan." *Human Organization* 78, no. 3 (September 1, 2019): 230–40. <https://doi.org/10.17730/0018-7259.78.3.230>.
- Yang, Chengyu 羊正鈺. "「政府要我們傳承文化，又要抓人」原住民打獵遭判刑，最高法院首度聲請釋憲 - The News Lens 關鍵評論網." *The News Lense 關鍵評論*, September 29, 2017. <https://www.thenewslens.com/article/79963>.
- Yang Zheng-Bin (楊正斌) and Cemelesai Ljaljegan (車牧勒撒以·拉勒格安). "土地就是生命：還我土地 [Land Is Life: Land Back]." In *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編 下)*, 2:579–87. Xindian, Taipei: Academia Historica and Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2008.
- America's National Park System: The Critical Documents. Chapter 1: The Early Years, 1864-1918. "Yellowstone Act, 1872," October 25, 2000.
https://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/anps/anps_1c.htm.
- Zhan Su-Juan (詹素娟). "日治時代原住民的土地變遷 [Indigenous Land Changes During Japanese Rule]." *原住民族文獻 [Indigenous Peoples Literature]*, no. 31 (May 2017): 32–37.
- Zhang Fu-Zhong (張富忠). "黨外不要急！！編聯會不要急！！ [Don't Rush, Tangwai!! Don't Rush, Conference of Editing Among Writers of Non-KMT!!]." 《黨外編輯作家聯誼會會訊》 [*Conference of Editing Among Writers of Non-KMT Newsletter*], September 9, 1984. *Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編 上)*, 86-87.

Zhong Cheng-Yu (鐘承育). “國家公園豈是遊樂場 [How Can National Parks Be Playgrounds].”

祖靈之邦, Originally Published as an Op-Ed in China Times 中國時報 (blog), January 28, 2009.

http://www.abohome.org.tw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3367:2009-02-02-03-02-26&catid=36:record05&Itemid=235.

Zhong Yi-Shi (鐘頤時). “Exploring the Environmental Education of Indigenous Tribe: A Case

Study of Smagus and Cinsbu Village under Maqaw Movement (探索原住民部落的環境教育—以馬告運動中的新光、鎮西堡部落為例).” National Taiwan Normal University, 2003.

公共電視-我們的島. *我們的島 第92集 棲蘭森林運動 (2001-01-29) [Our Island Episode 92:*

The Chi-Lan Forest Movement]. 我們的島 [Our Island], 2012.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ie6tgWkMbBc>.

環境資訊中心 (Environmental Information Center). “原住民已成退輔會對抗保育團體的工具

—不要低估退輔會的反撲能量 [Indigenous People have become the tools of the VAC against Conservation Organizations],” 2002. <https://e-info.org.tw/reply/2002/re02082201.htm>.

《原住民》. “原權會民進黨第一類接觸 (會訊摘錄) [ATA and DPP First Contact],” June 30,

1987. Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan, 179.

“原運各團體對行政院原住民委員會正式掛牌運作的共同聲明 [Collective Statement by

Various Indigenous Peoples Movement Groups on the Official Establishment of the CIP],” December 11, 1996. Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民族運動史料彙編 下), 1095-1097.

“玉山山腳下的小農紀實 [Documentaries of Individual Farmers at the Foot of Yushan].”

Yushan National Park Headquarters, December 2019.

https://issuu.com/natco.creative/docs/___issuu/12.

部落影響力 21：守護東埔部落土地鬥士-伍錐 Bunun 上 [Buluo Influence 21: Tumpu Buluo Land Warrior and Protector Wu Wei (Alang Islituan), Bunun]. Interview. Vol. 1. 2 vols. 部落影響力, 2021. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D2CKnCR1ptE>.

部落影響力 21：守護東埔部落土地鬥士-伍錐 Bunun 下 [Buluo Influence 21: Tumpu Buluo Land Warrior and Protector Wu Wei (Alang Islituan), Bunun]. Interview. Vol. 2. 2 vols. 部落影響力, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hTL_aQhkKfw.

《高山青》. “《高山青》創刊號發刊辭 [(Mountain Green First Issue Release Statement),”

May 1, 1983. Documentary Collection on the Indigenous Movement in Taiwan (台灣原住民民族運動史料彙編 上), 27.