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Introduction

Taiwan lies far beyond the Eastern Ocean and has never, since the dawn of Creation, sent tribute to China. Now we have made ... Taiwan the ninth prefecture of Fujian. By nature I am addicted to distant travel and I am fearless of obstacles and danger. Ever since Taiwan was put on the map, I have said that I would not be satisfied until I could see the place for myself. - Yu Yonghe, Chinese traveler to Taiwan, 1697

In April of 2012, a news story broke in Taiwan about a tourist site in Southeastern Taiwan called Water Running Up, blaming groups of Mainland Chinese tourists for inscribing words onto large agave leaves around the site using sticks and rocks. A reporter found phrases such as, “Nanjing Xiao Su was here” and “Wang Gang from Henan” inscribed on leaves all over the site. The leaves became a message board of sorts for the tourists, with people leaving messages longer than just their signatures and hometowns. One inscriber left a short poem, “beautiful scenery of green hills and white clouds”. A custodian at the site claimed that the practice had been going on for years, continuing on even after park administrators put up signs in an attempt to stop the tourists from writing on the leaves. The story quickly went viral in Taiwan, and online commentators were furious. One commenter wrote, “Are mainlanders incapable of paying attention to their characters [behavior]? Leaving the mainland and embarrassing themselves throughout the world”. An online Taiwanese newspaper, Hexun, published a cartoon depicting a Mainland tourist inscribing his name on leaves.
This man, wearing a tour group hat, is shown writing the equivalent of, "(name) wuz here". His heart is missing; it is instead drawn outside of his body with the label *gongde* (public-mindedness). This image insinuates that the tourists defacing these leaves lack a certain form of public virtue or consciousness. In response to the Taiwanese online backlash, someone from a Mainland Chinese tour group rejected the idea that his fellow tourists would do such a thing, suggesting that “maybe someone is intentionally trying to frame us.” He argued that the tourists had been framed and that this whole incident
was a conspiratorial attempt to drum up anti-Mainland sentiment. This only further provoked the Taiwanese Internet community. A user responded, “Who would try to frame this on you!? Those bastard tourists who go traveling on public money are truly without character! Not long ago, several Anhui female civil servants even stole the life preservers from the flight they were on!”¹

This incident provoked an intense Internet discussion that doesn’t seem to align with the severity of the incident; messing with a few leaves became a digital attack on national virtue and character. The discussion, however, reflects the extent to which Mainland Chinese tourism in Taiwan occupies a particularly fraught space. In 2008, Taiwan and Mainland China made an historic agreement that would, for the first time in their relationship, formally allow tourists to travel between the two countries. Since then, the number of Mainland Chinese tourists to Taiwan has skyrocketed². While leaders promised that tourism would usher in an era of improving ties and ensure peace and reconciliation between the two countries³, incidents like this suggest that the influx of tourists into Taiwan has complicated ramifications.

---


² From a few hundred thousand tourists travelling to Taiwan just a decade ago, over four million Mainland Chinese tourists entered the country in 2015. Source: "Taiwan Tourism Revenue Grows Quickly on Peaceful Cross-Straits Relations." Hong Kong, Macao, Taiwan. China Daily, 20 Feb. 2016. Web. 09 Apr. 2016.

This thesis explores the consequences of rising Mainland Chinese tourism in Taiwan. I am interested in these sites of tourism encounter and I aim to illuminate the feelings that simmer underneath them. As a case study, I look at the struggle over hotel development on Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline and provide an ethnographic look into Oppose Miramar, the anti-hotel development opposition movement. Herein, I argue that Mainland Chinese tourism is a state-deployed project intent on diminishing Taiwanese and indigenous sovereignty, and that the most promising pathways in combatting unsustainable tourist-oriented development are through indigenous-led, and autonomously controlled structures of receiving tourists. This work further looks into mass tourist sites, the industries and people that support them, as well as those who have been fighting to resist mass tourism’s influence, to show that what’s at stake in this struggle is not just a few leaves, but the future of Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline.

Description of Fieldwork and Methods

Just a few kilometers down the road from the site of these controversial leaves, Water Running Up, there is a massive, several hundred-room hotel called the Miramar Resort. The proximity of these two disputed areas is merely coincidental, but reflects both the layers of tension between Mainland Chinese tourists and Taiwanese, and how they affect both the most niche of tourist sites and the largest hotels in the region. I first visited Miramar in 2012 while I was travelling around Taiwan. At the time, activism around ‘Oppose Miramar’ was
high. Several people in Dulan handed me fliers and told me that a group called Oppose Miramar was attempting to stop its construction. When I visited Miramar a second time while conducting fieldwork in the summer of 2015, I visited Water Running Up nearby. It was then that I realized that larger issues of tensions between Mainland Chinese Tourists and local Taiwanese stem from similar issues. I chose to focus this thesis on the larger developments in the region and their effects, while simultaneously understanding that these issues are permeating even the smallest of spaces.

The Miramar Resort 美麗灣 (Meiliwan in Chinese or Miramar in English) – meaning 'beautiful bay' - is the name of the massive hotel development complex that towers over Shanyuan beach on Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline, and serves as the primary inspiration for this thesis. The hotel was mired in controversy and legal battles almost immediately from when construction crews broke ground to build it over a decade ago. Miramar inspired the resistance movement Oppose Miramar, whose members have been protesting the building of Miramar on environmental and indigenous land-rights ground for over a decade. The decision to discontinue the hotel’s operations came about after years of intense protests and prolonged legal battles. However, during the ongoing lawsuits local authorities continued to grant developers permits for construction, which allowed for the hotel’s construction to be completed. Courts recently declared the structure illegal, and while it looks like Miramar will not be able to open, the issue of hotel development on Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline remains far from resolved. Developers and local officials are continuing to push
for the construction of new hotels, while opposition activists are attempting to resist them each and every step of the way.

My interest in Oppose Miramar took me to Taiwan in the summer of 2015 to conduct research. Originally I planned to write the entire thesis on Oppose Miramar as a sort of activist ethnography, in which I would write about my experiences with the Oppose Miramar movement. This interest did not fade (look to chapter 3), but fieldwork also pushed me in new directions. The fieldwork consisted primarily of interviews and participant observation methods and, below, I show how my research interests evolved.

I spent the first week of my fieldwork in Taipei, Taiwan meeting up with contacts and exploring relevant sites⁴. I then travelled to Dulan Village - located near the Miramar Hotel - on Taiwan’s Southeastern coast. I had arranged to work part-time at a hostel called The Good Nest. The owners of the hostel, Homi Ma and Dakanaw, were involved with the Oppose Miramar movement from its inception. Dakanaw is in his late 40’s, is a relatively well-known indigenous folk singer in Taiwan, and some of his songs have become protest anthems for the Oppose Miramar movement. Homi, also in her late 40’s, was one of the lead organizers of Oppose Miramar and made a point of introducing me, and my project⁵, to other members involved with the movement. I lived and worked at The Good Nest for about a month. Other than the few hours a day I spent

---

⁴ This includes the Shang Ye Museum of Formosan Aborigines and the Taiwan Indigenous Peoples Resource Center at National Taiwan University.
⁵ I described my intentions to conduct research for this thesis when I asked the owners about working at the hostel. One of the reasons that they gave me a job was because they said they were interested in supporting my research.
working in the garden, I spent my time interviewing people involved with the movement, getting to know other members of the community, and exploring the region. Many of people in Oppose Miramar's community spent a lot of time around The Good Nest, so working at the hostel provided the opportunity to get to know a lot of the activists. The Good Nest also often hosted concerts, art exhibitions, or other presentations, which put me in touch with a broader community Taiwanese of artists and activists. The time that I spent in Dulan was relatively quiet in terms of activity around the Miramar Hotel. However, towards the end of my fieldwork, I accompanied a group of activists to a protest in Taipei about the development of a different hotel complex (Chapter 3).

While much of this thesis still focuses on the ‘Oppose Miramar’ activism around hotel development in Southeastern Taiwan, towards the end of my fieldwork I started to get more interested in the phenomenon of Mainland Chinese group tourism and the tourist encounters that occurred between the tourist groups and members of the community I lived in. These interests lead me to spend more time at sites that tour groups frequented. I talked with members of the tour groups, guides, bus drivers, vendors, and other tourists (see Chapter 2). In lieu of going on a Mainland Chinese tour group trip in Taiwan – due to lack of time and funds - I rode along on a bus tour once I returned to my home in Shanghai, China in an attempt to get a feel for how this type of tourism operates in China (see chapter 1).
The Anthropology of Tourism

This thesis seeks to build on the bourgeoning field of the anthropology of tourism while also incorporating literature on development studies, decolonization, and resistance movements, among others. Tourism was traditionally an understudied field in anthropology and only with the reflexive turn did the tourist become more of an object of interest. This is, in part, because when anthropologists started seriously considering the position of the tourist, the line between the anthropologist and the tourist began to blur. Miriam Webster defines a tourist as, “a person who travels to a place for pleasure”. While anthropologists may have initially distanced themselves from the term tourist, a complete denial from the category of tourism disregards the potential pleasure-seeking, self-serving interests of ethnography. Some scholars (Redfoot 1984, Stronza 2001, Burns 2004) have even positioned anthropology as a form of tourism. While this thesis is not necessarily interested in the ambitious task of theoretically repositioning anthropology as a form of tourism, I recognize that the anthropologist studying tourism is a complicated endeavor, calling into question the lines between scholars, tourists, local subjects, and other actors. In this section, I give a brief background in the ethnographic literature on the anthropology of tourism and show how recent work is expanding the possibilities for more holistic approaches to the study and more thoughtful consideration of the various actors, and broader structures, at play involved in tourist encounters.

---

The anthropology of tourism, some argue, begins with Theron A. Nunez’s 1963 study into *weekenismo* in Mexico, which novelly positioned tourism as a process of acculturation. A more complete conceptual framework of tourism emerged a few years later, which drew from the work of Emile Durkheim, Victor Turner, and others. Emile Durkheim (*Elementary Forms of Religious Life*) and Marcel Mauss wrote a lot about the division of the profane and sacred in human life. For them, human life is composed of productive, working, mundane, and profane times and more sacred, religious, unproductive periods. Roger Callois, and others, discussed this in relation to festival. Callois argued that festival represents a sacred, communal release of energy built up during the profane periods of our lives. In *Tourism: The Sacred Journey* anthropologist Nelson H. H. Graburn applies this framework to tourism. He argues that tourism is a more modern, neo-liberal, individualistic means to release energy/resources built up during the profane periods of our lives. This work has been an access point for me to write about Mainland Chinese group tourism how these tourist structures are constructed and perpetuated in China. Dennison Nash, in *Tourism as a Form of Imperialism*, is more interested in the power relations inherent in the contact. For Nash, tourism entails socio-cultural change on the places that people travel to. He writes that tourism is an inherently imperialistic endeavor because it represents an expansion of societal interests abroad. I build off this theory towards an argument about the imperialistic, territorializing nature of Chinese tourism in Taiwan.

7 Ibid.
While keeping these broader theoretical threads in mind, this thesis also seeks to locate the specific nuances of how Mainland Chinese tourism operates and interacts with communities along Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline. A recent push in the anthropology of tourism seeks to conceptualize tourism in terms of its imaginaries. This push recognizes a broader diversity of tourist-host relations and more seriously incorporates the production and consumption of tourism in ‘dissimilar locales’. Anthropologist Noel Salazar, in the book *Tourism Imaginaries: A Conceptual Approach*, writes:

“tourism imaginaries come to occupy a central position among very diverse societies, very dissimilar locales, and very different kinds of production and consumption. They resonate most clearly in destinations, the physical and mental landscapes where the imaginaries of local residents, tourism intermediaries, and tourists meet and, occasionally, clash. As they are always grounded in relations of power, they can never be neutral” (Salazar 16).

This more recent conceptual approach to tourism opens up possibilities for more in-depth discussion of the specific dynamics at sites of tourist encounters and gives more weight to the nuances of various actors’ viewpoints. This thesis hopes to build off this work and approach tourism in terms of its imaginaries. I am interested in the broad range of perspectives, encounters, histories, and structural elements present in the of Mainland Chinese tourist industry in Southeastern Taiwan. This thesis is divided into very separate chapters (summarized below), each presenting vastly different perspectives of in an attempt to of understandings tourism in Southeastern Taiwan. The broad range of ethnographic experiences, historical contexts (evolution of tourist policy in China, an indigenous history of Taiwan, and others) and theoretical
frameworks (anti-development studies, Bourdieu’s *Distinction*, and tourist theory, among others), from which this thesis draws, highlights the extent to which Mainland Chinese tourism to Taiwan sits at a crossroads of a myriad of complicated interests, structures, and histories. This thesis hopes to illuminate at least some of them.

**Historical Overview and Contested Sovereignty**

Whether or not Mainland Chinese tourists are even exiting their country’s borders when they travel to Taiwan is a contested question. It gets even more complicated when you consider the position of Mainland Chinese tourists in Taiwan’s indigenous spaces. As this thesis primarily focuses on the interaction between Mainland Chinese tourism and a predominantly indigenous area in Taiwan, it’s important give a brief overview of the geopolitical context of this tourist encounter.

As the Chinese Civil War drew to a close in 1949, the Communist Party had taken control over the majority of China while their adversaries, the Nationalists, fled to Taiwan⁸. On October 1⁰, 1949, the Communist Party founded the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) in Beijing under the leadership of Mao Ze Dong⁹. Ten days later, on October 10⁰, 1949, the Nationalists, under Chian Kai-Shek, founded the Republic of China (ROC), in Taipei. This happened in spite of the two sides never formally making a peace agreement ending the civil war. In

the immediate months and years following, each side still had ambitions invade one another and unify China under their respective governments\textsuperscript{10}. Each country still officially has territorial claims over the other, and both claim to be the sole representative of China. At first, the United Nations (UN) recognized the ROC (Taiwan) as the sole representative of China, but in 1971 the UN gave the seat to the PRC (Mainland China). In 2008, China and Taiwan made a formal arrangement that would allow tourists to travel between the two countries\textsuperscript{11}. While Chinese tourists are now allowed to travel to Taiwan, the PRC (Mainland China) technically does not consider Chinese tourists to be leaving their borders when they do so. However, when Mainland Chinese tourists enter Taiwan, they are treated like any other foreign nationality, needing to obtain travel visas and clear customs.

Complicating the already mystifying position of the Mainland Chinese tourist in Taiwan is Taiwan’s history of settler-colonialism\textsuperscript{12}, and that indigenous groups also hold sovereignty claims\textsuperscript{13} over the island. In chapters 2 and 3, I will go into a more detailed history of the people indigenous to Taiwan and the settler-colonial project that gave birth to Taiwan’s nation-state. Here, however, I just want to add one more layer of complexity in what it means for a

\textsuperscript{11} Look to Chapter 1 for a more detailed history.
Chinese tourist to travel to a predominantly indigenous area of Taiwan. The PRC (Mainland China) officially classifies Taiwan's indigenous people as one of their own fifty-six minorities. Since Mainland China claims Taiwan as within its territorial control, the PRC's logic extends that Taiwan's indigenous minority should then also be incorporated into Mainland China's system for classifying ethnic groups. Thus, when Mainland Chinese tourists visit indigenous Taiwanese sites, they are technically (from the view of the PRC) involved in a form of ethnic domestic tourism. While Mainland China classifies Taiwan’s indigenous minorities as one group, the Taiwanese government officially recognizes sixteen separate indigenous groups. Mainland China’s incorporating of Taiwan’s indigenous people into their own ethnic minority system may only operate on a symbolic level, but Taiwan’s national government exercises legal and material control over Taiwan’s indigenous people. If indigenous sovereignty claims are to be taken seriously – thereby delegitimizing Taiwan’s control over indigenous groups – then in entering predominantly indigenous areas, Mainland Chinese tourists would be not only exiting the territorial bounds of their own country, they would also become visitors to sovereign indigenous land.

This background gives some immediate context in understanding that Mainland Chinese tourism to Taiwan brings up complicated and contested claims and ideas over territory and space. It is important to keep these

---

14 The PRC has a list of fifty-six officially recognized ethnic minorities that reside within their borders.
15 Chapter 3 gives a more comprehensive analysis of the legal standing of indigenous people in Taiwan.
competing perspectives in mind while studying the dynamics of Mainland Chinese tourism in Taiwan.

**Racial Dynamics, Privilege, and Positionality**

I now want to address some of the complicated race and power dynamics that were at play during the course of my fieldwork. I first want to discuss the forms of systemic racism that persist in China, especially in regards to indigenous people in Taiwan. I then try to situate my own positionality within Taiwan’s ethnic social system and localize it to the specific locations where I conducted fieldwork. I investigate the certain form of white privilege granted to Western, white, male bodies in China and Taiwan to situate my own subject position in this ethnography. Finally, I attempt to reflexively account for the ways in which my positionality may have impacted my fieldwork.

While systemic racism and structural oppression may operate in many of the same ways in China, as say it does in the United States, China has a unique history of ethnic discrimination and theorization. Tracing the roots of racism in China dates back a few thousand years. In *Discourse of Race in Modern China*, Frank Dikotter, an expert on Chinese racial history, argues that there is evidence that degrees of racial discrimination took place as far back as the fourth century BC. In imperial China, Dikotter argues, ‘barbarians’ were classified against the standard Han Chinese subjects. He writes, “degrees of remoteness from the imperial center corresponded to levels of cultural savagery and physical coarseness” (Dikotter 5), in terms of how Han Chinese distinguished themselves from outsiders. The barbarians were classified into *shengfan* (raw barbarians)
and *shufan* (cooked barbarians), to distinguish those who could be assimilated into Chinese culture and those who couldn’t. The raw barbarians weren’t ‘digestible, and hence were considered too “savage and restive” (Dikotter 5) to be brought into Chinese society. Cooked barbarians, on the other hand, were consumable; that is, they were “tame and submissive” (Dikotter 5) enough to be assimilated into Chinese society.

This social hierarchy also had an intensely racially coded focus. The Chinese mythological distinction of *yin*, “the negative fluid, associated with the earth: it was female, dark, cold, moist, and quiescent” (Dikotter 9) and *yang* “the positive fluid, related to heaven; it was male, active, warm, and light” (Dikotter 9), contain valued polarities of black and white. Dikotter argues that, “black and white, based on social hierarchy and a particular set of aesthetic values, was projected upon the outside world when China came into contact with outsiders” (Dikotter 9). Chinese skin complexion was conceived of as white from very early on, and whiteness was, and very much still is, an ideal standard of purity and beauty, which was set against a wild, uncontrolled black “which symbolized the most remote part of the geographically known world” (Dikotter 5). Throughout Chinese history, the “social significance of skin color” (Dikotter 12) increased and nuances of shade became more and more important in China’s social stratification. While I will refrain from delving too deeply into the details of racism in imperial China, it is important to understand some of Chinese racial thought’s theoretical foundations.
Though in different ways, the legacies of these socially constructed differences today persist in contemporary Taiwanese society. A study in 2007 of ‘aboriginal entrepreneurs in Taiwan’ demonstrates how indigenous Taiwanese citizens are racially discriminated against in Taiwanese business practices, and Han Taiwanese hegemonic interests continue to hold power\(^{16}\). In Chapters 2 and 3, I present a more in-depth discussion of how Taiwan’s indigenous people have suffered from racial discrimination and settler colonialism. Though attempts are being made to undo the brutal colonization, the fact remains that a main determinant of success is still further incorporation into Han Taiwanese society and intense barriers to entry - education, socio-economic, political, etc - continue to endure\(^{17}\). Some of the young people - of indigenous Amis descent - I talked to while I conducted fieldwork expressed that they had moved to Taipei but chose to come back to the countryside because they felt racially discriminated against by mainstream Taiwanese society.

I now turn to more of the localized racial dynamics in the village where I conducted the majority of my fieldwork. Dulan Village is located in Taitung County in Southeastern Taiwan. Geographically, Taiwan is shaped like an oval. The western portion of the island is closer to Mainland China, and is almost entirely made up of flat plains. This area proved ideal territory for Chinese settlers to set up farmland, and it continues to be where the majority of Taiwan’s population lives. This region is predominantly made up of the descendants of


Chinese settlers. Jutting down the Western coast of the island is a large mountain range. During the centuries of Chinese settler colonialism, Taiwan's indigenous groups that either refused to assimilate, or lived there anyway, were pushed into living in the mountains or to the Eastern coast of Taiwan. That is not to say that Chinese settlers didn’t make it to the Eastern coast, but rather that it happened later (the 19th century), there were less of them, and that the colonization wasn’t quite as all encompassing. Currently, Taiwan’s Southeastern region holds the highest concentration of indigenous people of anywhere in the country. I haven’t been able to acquire exact statistics, but Dulan Village, where I lived, seemed to be predominantly comprised of the Amis indigenous minority. The Amis people living in the Dulan area considered themselves as apart of the Amis Dulan buluo (tribe).

In doing fieldwork in Dulan in the summer of 2015, I endeavored to pursue my fieldwork and research without actively contributing to the inequalities that I perceived to be transpiring in the village. In order to situate my own position of privilege as a white American male in Dulan, I present a definition of white privilege and consider how it could relate to the context of conducting anthropological fieldwork in Dulan. In *White Privilege and Male Privilege*, Peggy McIntosh writes:

---

19 Whereas indigenous Taiwanese consist of about 5% of Taiwan’s total population, they make up about 35.5% of Taitung County’s population. "Amis Remains Taiwan’s Biggest Aboriginal Tribe." *Focus Taiwan*. The Central News Agency, 15 Feb. 2015. Web. 20 Mar. 2016.
I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets that I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was meant to remain oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps, codebooks, passports (McIntosh 95).

It is important to point out that McIntosh wrote this for an American context. And while whiteness is conceived of somewhat differently in China, being a white, Western male still provides you with many of the privileges McIntosh describes. Moreover, a number of scholars have confirmed how the power of whiteness, and white privilege, persists in an expatriate context. And this privilege was certainly evident in my experiences living in Dulan. One of the ways white-foreign privilege seemed to manifest in Dulan was in the backpacker tourism industry. Tourism – mostly independent backpackers - makes up a large portion of Dulan’s economy and helps support dozens of hostels, restaurants, and other businesses. While most residents in Dulan Village are of indigenous descent, foreigners (mostly white European males) and Han Taiwanese own and operate a disproportionately large percentage of Dulan's tourist-oriented profit-making businesses. As backpacker tourism is such an important industry in Dulan, being white and from a Western background is an advantage in and of itself. Many of the foreigners I met in Dulan made their living through catering to the interests of Western backpackers, whether it was giving surf lessons, cooking Western food, making craft beer, making foreign guests comfortable, or other similar tasks. Knowledge of Western culture, and being able to interact and cater to English speaking tourists, is a common factor linking these skills. Thus, even

---

in Dulan, a background in Western backpacker culture is a ticket to success that people who grew up in the village aren’t afforded to.

I found that learning to navigate the various racial dynamics and degrees of privilege in Dulan was challenging but ultimately necessary and rewarding. I grew up in Beijing, China as an expatriate\(^2\) of the United States. I attended elite international schools growing up and lived in comfortable gated communities\(^2\). And while my background in growing up in China is fairly problematic, it also allowed me to learn mandarin and, hopefully, a sense for when foreigners act inappropriately in China. Part of me wanting to take on this project was to confront the problematic ways in which foreigners occupy space in China and explore more appropriate and equitable ways of living abroad. In Dulan, I distanced myself from the foreign surfing hostel community in favor of spending time with Oppose Miramar activists. It is important to realize, however, that while I may have attempted to differentiate myself from other foreigners in the community and focus on my project, the fact remains that I was another white, male body in Dulan; and that people who look like me take up space and benefit from systematic privileges there in fairly problematic ways.

\(^2\) Even this term expatriate is loaded with connotations of Western privilege. The Latin roots of the term define it as ‘as person who lives outside their native country’, but the vast majority of people who fall under this definition are referred to as migrants. To be an expatriate, as opposed to a migrant, is “conventionally reserved for Westerners who have lived abroad” (Fechter 1), and who have the freedom of mobility; to fluidly work and travel where they see fit.

\(^2\) The hypocrisy of me studying displacement in China is very tangible. The schools I went to, and the houses I lived in, resulted in the forced displacement of migrant village communities.
Central Argument and Chapter Overviews

In the first chapter, I look into Mainland Chinese tour groups and the growing influence they are having in Taiwan. Based on ethnographic research and historical data, I conceptualize the Mainland Chinese tour groups as both a vehicle for democratization and dangerous weapon of ‘territorialization’. I examine this concept of territorializing (Rowen 2014) in terms of how it relates to the conversion of Taiwanese land into Mainland Chinese spaces, and the implications it has for a state sponsored project of Chinese tourism in Taiwan.

In the second chapter, I investigate a site where Mainland tourists often visit. I investigate how the site portrays the local indigenous population as both a profit-making enterprise and a means for political control. I am interested in how sites like this reinforce preexisting notions of ‘otherness’ and justify colonial tourist projects.

In the third chapter I turn to the people who have been actively resisting the consequences of Mainland Chinese tourism development. I trace the complicated history of the construction of the Miramar hotel and its opposition movement and situate it within Taiwan’s indigenous rights movement. I ponder whether ‘Oppose Miramar’ could be representing only a delay in mass tourist development of Taiwan’s Eastern coastline, or whether the movement might represent a new era for the struggle over Taiwan’s indigenous sovereignty and environmental protection.

Going on vacation is generally something we don’t think too much about while we’re doing it, but when we’re not on vacation, we make snap judgments
and generalizations of other tourists: we go to the beach to escape worries but
we get mad when groups of tourists overrun our favorite restaurants. In general,
there is a massive disconnect between the actions of the tourists, the spaces
tourists inhabit, and the people who live in the areas where tourists visit. This is
particularly evident in the case of groups of Mainland Chinese tourists travelling
to Taiwan. Mainland Chinese group tourism to Taiwan is at an all-time high, and
the numbers of tourists are only escalating. The Miramar Hotel is evidence of the
massive strain the growing tourism industry is placing on Taiwan, and the issues
surrounding it reflect that the stakes include not only minor inconvenience but
also indigenous sovereignty and environmental discussion. I aim to delve into
the intense feelings that bubble beneath the surface of this tourist encounter;
that help explain why tourists writing on leaves can become a nationwide
fixation. This thesis serves an attempt to bridge understandings: to seriously
consider the perspectives of the tourists, the activists, and the other parties
involved, alongside one another. I argue that the PRC’s (Mainland China) central
government is deploying mass tourism as a means to take over space and
influence over Taiwan and its indigenous people, however, autonomously
controlled indigenous tourism structures offer a hopeful path forward in
reimagining the future of Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline.
Chapter 1

The Mainland Chinese Group Tourism Industrial Complex (MCGTIC)

*Modern Chinese travel, like the modern Chinese state, is predicated on the fragile promise that it will impose order on a chaotic world, by shepherding its citizens and keeping them safe from threats that can include Western thieves and Western cuisine. In the flesh, the world our group encountered was, indeed, more Europe than “Europe”—unkempt and unglamorous in ways that Sissi never mentioned. And yet, behind Berlusconi’s opera buffa and the prosperity gospel about Chinese one-party efficiency, my busmates caught unredacted flickers of insight. On this first trip, there was much they would never see—a rowdy free press, a social safety net forged by political wrangling—but, mile by mile, (the tourists) were quietly discovering how to see it at all.* – Evan Osnos, *The Grand Tour, New Yorker*

On the morning of March 19th, 2015, the residents of Sizihwan Bay – a small island near the city of Kaohsiung, Taiwan – banded together and issued an ultimatum to the local government. They threatened that they would blockade the roads leading into the town if the government didn’t take immediate action in restricting the number of tourists being allowed to enter each day. At that point, over 4,000 tourists, mostly from Mainland Chinese bus tours, were entering the town each day. The tourists, apparently, had become such a strain that people living in town were struggling to go about even very basic day-to-day activities. In response, the local government said that they would work on improving public services and limiting the numbers of tourists. However, they also seemed somewhat befuddled that residents could be so angry about the tourist money flowing into the town. An article from about the incident states, “The city government in Kaoshiung has said that the planned action by residents...
of Sizihwan Bay could hurt the region’s travel industry. The locals, reportedly at
their wits end, say that that is exactly what they are trying to achieve”23.

This story demonstrates how overwhelming a force Mainland Chinese
tourism in Taiwan has become. The sheer numbers of Mainland Chinese tourists
entering Taiwan everyday are staggering. In 2015, Taiwan registered 4.18
million Mainland Chinese tourist arrivals24, up from only a few hundred
thousand before the 2008 agreement25. This story suggests how it is not only the
behavior of Chinese tourists that is infuriating some Taiwanese (as with the
leaves) but also growing amount of sheer physical space that these tourists are
starting to occupy in Taiwan. This chapter looks into the spatial politics and
potential consequences of the Mainland Chinese tourist industry’s rise in
Taiwan. I also

I argue that while it is important to recognize the classed-dynamics of
mass tourism, and its democratizing possibilities, Mainland China’s central
government is deploying mass tourism in Taiwan as a means to increase
economic and political influence over the island. To do so, I first look into the
historical conditions that created the conditions for this type of tourism in China
and its history in Taiwan. I then try to situate the Mainland tour group in Taiwan

23 Jackson, Dominic. "Town in Taiwan Threatens Blockade against Mainland
24 Republic of China. Ministry of Transportation and Communication. Tourism
"Tourism and Reconciliation between Mainland China and Taiwan." Tourism
within two of the main frameworks for how anthropologists have approached studies of tourism—the structural and the affective. I consider how Mainland Chinese group tourism operates through the lens of power relations and may be leading to a ‘territorializing’ space of Taiwanese space. Then, grounded in the works of Emile Durkheim and Roger Callois, I explore the motivations people have for going on these trips as well as how they are structured and experienced. The academic literature on the Mainland Chinese tour group experience, and its relation to Taiwan especially, isn’t especially expansive. However, through pulling together various threads of history and policy research, critical studies of tourism, and ethnographic data, I aim to provide a glimpse into the world of Chinese package tours.

**The Rise of Chinese Mass Tourism**

In order to situate and contextualize the contemporary Mainland Chinese group tourist industry, I trace the historical developments of mass group tourism and show its rise as a phenomenon in China. I demonstrate how specifically crafted Chinese state policies have prompted and shaped the massive influx of Mainland Chinese group tours to Taiwan in recent years.

While Chinese group tourism has been on the rise in recent years, we must look to Europe to understand the formation and evolution of the mass group tourist experience. In England, before the rise of the industrial revolution and the formation of large middle classes, tourism was primarily an enterprise of the elite. An emerging middle class in England at the end of the Industrial
Revolution changed this dynamic. In the mid-1800’s Thomas Cook began organizing the first packaged group tours to working and middle classes in England, first to domestic destinations and, once his business grew, around the world\(^\text{26}\). Scholars have argued that Cook, in opening up leisure travel to the masses, democratized the practice of tourism\(^\text{27}\). People no longer needed to be extremely wealthy to travel; however, when the working class travelled, it was mostly in groups. Adrian Franklin argues that Cook viewed tourism as a “route to enlightenment in a globalizing world” (Franklin 22). Packaged tourism was rooted in ideologies of democratizing an elitist form of leisure. It was thought of as an educational experience, a step in becoming a more worldly and globalized subject. A 19\(^\text{th}\) century English tourism magazine put it as such, “Since Thomas Cook’s first excursion train it is as if a magician’s wand has been passed over the face of the globe” (The Excursionist, June 1897\(^\text{28}\)). As middle class incomes around the world rose, travelling in tour groups closely followed. The British tour groups of the 1800’s became the American tour groups of the early and middle 20\(^\text{th}\) century, the Japanese tour groups in the 1980-90’s, and the Chinese tour groups of today.

From having just a handful of outbound tourists a few decades ago, China now sits atop the rankings international outbound tourists as the largest source

\(^{28}\) Ibid.
market for tourism in the world\textsuperscript{29}. In 2015, over 120 million Chinese tourists travelled abroad, and almost forty percent of these tourists travelled in packaged tour groups\textsuperscript{30}. Taiwan is currently the second most popular outbound destination among Mainland Chinese tourists\textsuperscript{31}. While this rise has coincided with an emerging middle class in China, specifically directed state policies in the 1990's have also played a large role in facilitating the rise of Chinese group tourism, and its appearance in Taiwan.

Tracing the foundations of contemporary Chinese tourism takes us to the end of the Chinese Civil War, in 1949, and the founding of the People’s Republic of China in Mainland China and The Republic of China in China. Under Mao Ze Dong’s reign over Mainland China, from 1949 - when the Nationalists (KMT) were expelled to Taiwan - through his death in 1976, leisure tourism remained nearly non-existent. Tourism was viewed as an elite, bourgeois activity, and it therefore didn’t fit in with the China’s communist values\textsuperscript{32}. However, in 1978 China opened itself up to foreign markets during the reform and opening period. The forces of capitalism and globalization brought a renewed interest in travel, to both domestic and foreign destinations\textsuperscript{33}. In 1985, the Chinese government created the National Tourism Administration, but tourism didn’t really take off in China until the institutionalization of 5-day workweeks and national holidays.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Source: China National Tourism Administration
\item \textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Nyíri, Pál. Scenic Spots: Chinese Tourism, the State, and Cultural Authority. Seattle: U of Washington, 2006. Print. Pg 3.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ibid. Pg 3.
\end{itemize}
in the mid 1990’s. This occurred along with the institution of other government directed tourism initiatives, such as promotion and advertising. While China’s independent tourists were given relatively free reign to travel, China crafted a much more restrictive policy regarding group tourism. In 1995, the Central Chinese Government formalized the Approved Destination Status (ADS) system in which other countries would have to reach a bilateral agreement with China in order to receive Chinese tour groups.

At first, the policy was probably motivated by economic interests - as China wanted to restrict how much money its citizens spent abroad opposed to at home– but this would quickly become less important as China’s foreign reserves grew. The policy would however become an important political tool, giving China both the power to direct the flow of its outbound travellers and to use them as economic assets and bargaining chips in negotiations with different countries. For example, Fiji apparently was only granted ADS status in return for not politically recognizing Taiwan. Canada didn’t receive ADS status until 2009 and this delay was also seen as strongly politically motivated. A Wall Street Journal article from the time states, “Many view the delay in Canada’s approved destination status as retaliation against its ruling party’s comments and policies.

---

36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
toward China in past few years”39. Through 2014, China has given 120 countries ADS status40.

Until 1988, Taiwan closed its doors to Mainland tourists and didn’t allow its own citizens to travel to China41. Though there were no direct China-Taiwan flights, the number of unofficial visitors between the two countries steadily rose after 198842. In 2008, China and Taiwan made a landmark agreement to finally allow direct flights between the countries. Though the countries placed restrictions on the number Chinese of tourists that could enter Taiwan each day, and how long the tourists could stay once they got there, the agreement officially registered Taiwan as an ADS country. Currently, 5,000 tour groups travellers and 3,000 Free Independent Travelers (FIT) are permitted to enter Taiwan each day from China43. Though official travel to Taiwan has only been happening for a few years, the amount of revenue created by Chinese tourists in Taiwan is more than double that of any other country, and this gap is only getting larger44.

41 At this time a Taiwanese person could travel to the Mainland by going through other countries like Hong Kong because Chinese immigration agents wouldn’t stamp Taiwanese passports. Mainland Chinese, however, were completely barred from travelling to Taiwan. Source: Guo, Yingzhi. "Tourism and Reconciliation between Mainland China and Taiwan." Tourism Management 27.5 (2006): 997-1005. Web.
The Sacred, Consumption, and Distinction

With this history in mind, I want to pivot to thinking about the theoretical and experiential aspects of group tours from China to Taiwan. In this section, I use Durkheim’s theorization of the sacred and profane and discuss how anthropologists have tied it to the motivations for travelling. I then relate this to the classed nature of group tourism. In drawing from the ethnographic vignette, I illustrate how Chinese group tourism interacts with Pierre Bourdieu’s theories of social capital. I want the reader to keep in mind these conceptions of tourism as a sacred experience.

Emile Durkheim, in *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, theorized the sacred and profane as a binary that divides religious life as set apart and sacred from our more logic driven profane lives. In *Festival*, Roger Caillois applied this framework to how we deal with excess, both temporally and materially. Our life, he writes, “is regular, busy with everyday work, peaceful, caught inside a system of prohibitions, taken up by precautions, where the maxim *quieta non movere* keeps order in the world” (Caillois 281). The festival serves as a contrasting period, wherein we release the excess built up during the profane periods of our lives. In festival the “rules” governing profane life “are suspended”, and, “license is approved” (Caillois 283) to transgress our normal boundaries. For Caillois, festival is “defined by dancing singing, excitement, excessive eating and drinking” and its “very law” is to “go all out, to the point of exhaustion, to the
point of sickness” (Caillois 281). In other words, we create surplus and rules during the profane periods of our lives in order destroy excess and transgress boundaries during festival. After festival, we begin the cycle anew.

Caillois considered vacation in the same sacred realm as festival - as a release from profane life - but he did not think that vacation shared the same cathartic qualities as a festival. He argued that vacation, “rather than communication with the group in its moment of exuberance”, only represents “further isolation (from the group)” (Caillois 302). He moreover says that “the happiness (vacation) brings is primarily a result of a distraction and distancing of worries” (Caillois 302). But I don’t think this wholly account for how the pent up energy built up during profane periods of life can be expressed or released on vacation. While vacation might not mark a sort of communal ‘exuberance’ in the same way that festival does, going on vacation is certainly motivated by similar impulses to transgress boundaries and expend excess.

Nelson Graburn, an anthropologist who specializes on theorizing tourism, directly linked the sacred/profane division to travelling: “Vacations involving travel ... are the modern equivalent for secular societies to the annual and lifelong sequences of festivals for more traditional, God-fearing societies” (Graburn 21). The intense motivations - consuming to the point of excess, going ‘all out’ – that characterize festival might be slightly diminished but do not disappear on vacation. Instead of singing, dancing or other communal rituals, people’s accumulated wealth is exhausted through acquiring exotic commodities, foods, and experiences. This tendency, Graburn writes, is
manifested in how “for most people the financial aspects of tourism parallel the symbolic. One accumulates enough money with which to vacation, much as one progressively acquires the worries and tedium of the workaday world” (Graburn 23).

It is through this lens that I approach thinking about Chinese group tourism: as a sacred activity motivated by deeply held impulses to transgress the boundaries that govern our day-to-day lives and expend our built up energy and resources. It is important to recognize that Graburn’s theorization comes from a distinctly Western mindset of work/vacation boundaries. However, as China’s becomes increasingly urbanized and industrialized, I see Graburn’s analysis as relevant to the context of Chinese tourism in Taiwan. Though dominant Chinese culture celebrates festivals in a similar vein to Callois’ theorization of festival (i.e. Chinese Lunar New Year), as is evidenced in this thesis travel and tourism is rapidly increasing as a means for Chinese citizens to release resources built-up during working, profane periods of life. In the ethnographic vignette below, I want the reader to think about how these trips are structured around these sacred impulses and how they are designed to profit as much from these desires (expend resources, acquire exotic materials/experiences, etc.) as possible.

The vignette below is about of an experience I had this summer with a group tourist trip in Hangzhou, China. Initially, I attempted to go on a packaged tourist trip from China to Taiwan, but the logistics turned out to be too complicated to arrange. However, when I was back at my parent’s apartment in Shanghai, I chose to go on a one-day bus tour to Hangzhou. I hoped, at the very
least, that this experience would shed some light on what it felt like to experience being on a budget, bus tour trip in China. Moreover, from my observations of tour groups in Taiwan, and through discussions and interviews with people, it seems fair to assume that tour group trips in Taiwan are structured fairly similarly to the bus tour I went on in China. I provide the vignette in full because part of my aim with this chapter is to get the reader closer to the experience of what going on these trips is actually like. My part-outsider, part-insider account, as an American who grew up in China, provides important insights into how these group package trips operate, both affectively and structurally. For the vignette, it is important to think of tourism as not only as leisure, but also as intensely rooted in our desires to break away from our profane worlds, transgress normal boundaries, and ‘consume to the point of excess’. I want to keep in mind the outlets that group tourism provides for these motivations as well as the structures that control and commoditize them.

**Hangzhou Bus Tour**

In the summer of 2015, I picked up a flier advertising tourist trips while I rode the subway home in Shanghai. The flier listed dozens of cheap, prepackaged

---

45 Some of the main differences include: 1. Outbound tour groups are applied for on a provincial level meaning that the people travelling to Taiwan together are generally from the same part of China. This was not true of my trip to Hangzhou. 2. Only approved travel agencies can take tourists abroad so outbound tour operators are likely held to higher standards for tour guides, safety measures, etc. 3. Each tour group in Taiwan would be together for the whole trip, generally 7-10 days. My trip was 1 day only but people have the option of staying on for longer, meaning that each day your group would be different. Source: Li, Xiang. *Chinese Outbound Tourism 2.0*. Boca Raton. FL: Taylor and Francis, 2015. Print.
tours to nearby tourist destinations, ranging anywhere from one to five day trips. I saw that it would only cost me about 10 USD to go to the nearby city of Hangzhou for a one-day trip. I called the tourist twenty-four hour hotline and asked if there were any spots open on the next day’s tour. There was, and they told me that I should be ready to go at promptly 6 AM the next day.

At approximately 5:45 am the next morning my phone rang and woke me up. Someone from the tourism agency was calling to alert me that a bus was on its way to pick me up. I groggily threw some things in a bag, got dressed, and hurried out the door. As I was walking to the bus, at roughly 6 am, a bus driver called and told me to “hurry up”. A minute or so later I received another call, so I started running. When I finally reached the correct intersection, a bus driver waved me down. He opened the backdoor of the mini-bus and I crowded in with the dozen or so other people in the back. We then set off in the empty, pre-bustling streets of Shanghai on our vacations with the Spring International Tourism Agency.

Our minibus arrived to a sea of people standing on the sidewalk in front of a line of large buses. I followed in line with my minibus group to the set of check-in tables where we each paid for our trips and were assigned bus numbers according to our destinations. Once we boarded the large bus – my bus carried roughly fifty people and didn’t have an empty seat – a man at the front of the bus started shouting our cell phone numbers to make sure everyone was there.

After he was a ways down the list, he shouted, “186101... Where is 186101?! 186101?”
I finally realized that it was my number, and said, “Sorry, that’s mine”.

“No wonder, it’s the Laowai (foreigner)”, he replied, drawing some laughs from the other passengers.

Hangzhou’s most famous feature is Xihu, or West Lake, and it was our first destination after the two-hour long bus ride. The quiet and sleepy bus-ride contrasted with the frantic and highly congested scene that greeted us as we got off the bus. There were dozens, possibly hundreds, of other tourist buses carrying tourists doing the exact same thing that we were doing.

As we got off the bus, we were each given yellow pins with the number three on them so that we could stick together as a group and be identifiable to our tour guide. Our guide spoke to us through a microphone headset and held a yellow flag that bobbed up and down ahead of us as we followed him through the crowds beside the lake. Eventually, we reached a line to board a boat designed to look like a dragon.

Our entire group managed, just barely, to fit on the same boat. As we sailed away from the dock, he started telling us about the history of the lake and some local mythology. Everyone had their phones and cameras out taking pictures. Every once in a while the guide stopped his fast-paced lectures and pointed out the ideal portions of West Lake to take pictures of, because, as he described, “It would be a shame if you came to Xihu and took all the wrong pictures”.

After we got off the boat, navigated through the crowds, and filed back on the bus, it was time for lunch. We were taken to a restaurant - where dozens of
other buses were also parked – which apparently served “the finest authentic Hangzhou cuisine”. We walked up a flight of stairs to a massive canteen style hall and were led to a group of round tables in the back. In the hall, there were several dozen tables, and each table looked to be completely full. In total, there seemed to be at least a few hundred people dining together in the hall.

Our group took up about five of the tables. Not long after we sat down a waitress stopped by and talked to our guide, who was sitting a different table than I was. Each table had ten seats but only seven people sat down at my table because I walked in towards the end of our group. This was important because the number of dishes they served at each table depended upon how many occupied seats you had. If your table was full, you were served ten dishes to share. But since our table only had seven people, we were served only seven dishes. This didn’t go over well at my table and people complained to each other and the wait staff about being slighted.

When we arrived at the lake we were asked to give 100 more RMB for the boat ride and entrance to the park, on top of the 70 RMB that we had paid in the morning. We were also asked to pay 40 RMB each for the meal. Although several people complained to the guide, they paid the money over and above what they had paid for the “package” tour and lake entry fees. In total, the money each of us had to spend for the trip, excluding personal expenses, came out to 210 RMB (about 33 USD). This is roughly three times the cost of what the trip originally advertised.
Our next stop was a famous “silk museum” where we were once again joined by dozens of other tour buses. When we entered the museum, our guide deferred his guiding-duties to an attendant at the museum. She first led us through a room of various forms of silk products on display while talking briefly about the history of silk making in Hangzhou. We then gathered around a bed in a smaller room where she talked about how the museum makes high-quality, authentic silk bedding that we could conveniently purchase at a special discounted rate. After the tour, we were led downstairs to more freely explore all of the silk products they produced. Roughly a third of the members on our trip purchased some sort of silk product. As I waited to board the bus, a college student on the trip commented that it was a joke to call this place a “museum,” given its shopping mall-like nature.

Next, we travelled to a traditional Hangzhou teahouse. We were led upstairs to a tearoom; where a tea expert gave us a presentation on the unique qualities of Hangzhou tea. We were all given samples of the tea and told that the tea could be ours for a special, low price of 100 RMB a can. A few people bought the tea, but they later expressed disappointment when vendors outside attempted to sell them what looked to be the same tea for a fraction of the price. Our guide insisted that the teahouse tea was a much higher quality and that we should stay away from the tea sold outside. Some members of the group chose not to heed his warnings and purchased the tea sold outdoors anyway.

Our last stop was Hangzhou’s Lingyin temple. Our guide led us through the temple while telling us about the various deities, mythologies, and artwork
along the way. With no shortage of information thrown at us, we passed through the temple complex efficiently. At the end of the tour, we took our final pictures and said our goodbyes – the majority of the tour group was signed on continue to other cities for two or three more days of travel. It was nearly seven pm when I finally boarded the bus back to Shanghai. When I sat down one of the company’s workers walked past and cheerfully asked, “What did you buy today?”

**Coding and Cultural Capital**

There is much to unpack in this story. First, I am interested how the sacred dimension of tourism interacts with group tourism’s class-based underpinnings. This sacred release of excess, especially in mass group tourism, does not occur outside of classed hierarchies. I also want to look into how the acquisition of social capital is embedded into the ‘democratized’ experience of tour group travelling. Mass tour groups democratize travel in how they provide an experience that was once only accessible to the top echelons of society to the masses. They are also sacred in that they facilitate the disposing of waste and excess built up in profane periods of life. Here, I want to argue that, while in addition to having a democratizing effect, the group tourism industry in China also reinforces, and is dependent upon, the construction of class hierarchies. Releasing the excesses of one’s productive output becomes about how much more you can spend in comparison with the ones around you than the other.

---

people on the trip and your friends and family at home. Everything on these trips is designed to provide this for the tourists. They are structured precisely to maximize profits from a tourist’s desire to spend and consume in the most advantageous way possible.

Mass group tourism is often regarded as the lowest and cheapest form of travel. While this form of tourism provides a democratizing experience – in that it gives more widespread access to travel – the tour I want went on also seemed to glorify elite culture and create internalized hierarchies. It is too simple to state that mass tourism democratizes travel, because providing access to travel doesn’t necessarily negate the cultural barriers between groups and classes of people. Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, among other things, helps illuminate the structures behind which class hierarchies are produced. Habitus, he writes is a,

“subjective but not individual system of internalized structures, schemes of perception, conception, and action common to all members of the same group or class and constituting the precondition for all objectification and apperception” (Bourdieu 1972).

48 In thinking about translating the acquisition of goods into increased social standing I look to Pierre Bourdieu’s conception of social capital. He writes, “Social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word.” Buying products on these tours is translated to a higher cultural and social standing. Source: Bourdieu, Pierre. "The forms of capital.(1986)." Cultural theory: An anthology(2011): 81-93.
Here, I want to think about how this habitus is produced and structured on tour groups in China. On the Hangzhou trip, one important ‘scheme of perception, conception, and action’ produced was a logic of the superiority of high, elite culture and the notion that tourists needed to purchase these goods as a means to access it. The tourist industry apparatus surrounding bus tour trips to Hangzhou – the shops, gifts, guides, museums, experts, etc. - seemed intent on instilling the notion that through purchasing these goods tourists could elevate their social standing. In *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Pierre Bourdieu, further ties the concept of taste to its how it produces and reproduces social structures, or habitus. This quote from Bourdies captures the sorts of logic imposed on our group on the tour:

“The denial of lower, coarse, vulgar, venal, servile—in a word, natural—enjoyment, which constitutes the sacred sphere of culture, implies an affirmation of the superiority of those who can be satisfied with the sublimated, refined, disinterested, gratuitous, distinguished pleasures forever closed to the profane. That is why art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not fulfill a social function of legitimating social differences” (Bourdieu 7)

The package tour I took to Hangzhou may have catered to the middle and working class, but, paradoxically, it also essentially served as an introduction to the culture of Hangzhou’s historical elite. The goods we were shown, expensive teas and silks, and the places we went, the lake and the temple, are products and spaces that were historically far more accessible to higher-ranking members of Chinese society. While it is not entirely surprising that the tour highlighted elite culture and history, it is interesting to think about how this class glorification is beneficial to tour guide operators and functions to ‘legitimate social differences.
For one, highlighting the elite aspects of Hangzhou’s culture is an effective means for these tours to induce tourists to spend the most amount of money. Moreover, the tour aimed to solidify a hierarchy of cultural capital, placing those willing to purchase the supposedly high-class goods, above the tourists who choose not to. Though everyone buys the same baseline experience, those who purchased the best things, took the best pictures, and, in effect, went all out on the experience could accrue the most social capital and distinguish themselves most from the rest of the group. The logic seemed to be that those on the tour could spend their way into the next class.

I also don’t want to underestimate the guides’ role as coding agents in how we experienced Hangzhou. Bourdieu argues that, “a beholder who lacks the specific code feels lost in a chaos of sounds and rhythms, colors and lines, without rhyme or reason” (Bourdieu 2). Our guides essentially coded the important from the unimportant, the “beautiful from the ugly”, and the “distinguished from the vulgar” (Bourdieu 6). Though the guides were not members of the elite culture themselves, they offered us an introduction to it and the keys for how to access it. In addition to a guide who held up a yellow flag we followed throughout the day and who gave us information about Hangzhou history and culture, we also had experts at each stop giving specific presentation. At the Tea Museum and Silk Museum, for example, local experts distinguished the qualities of the products they were selling. These guides could give us access to the intricate system of distinctions underlying the taste for these luxury commodities, and ensure that our tastes mirrored that of the elite. The trip was
structured around providing us with a distinct ‘taste’ for Hangzhou’s high culture. Consuming these distinguished products would thus allow us to accrue a higher social capital, or rank, amongst the members of our group and once we returned back to our profane lives.

This proposition, of course, was not universally taken at face value. The student who remarked at what a joke it was that the silk museum could call itself a ‘museum’ is just one example of how many members of the group were frustrated with the tour of Hangzhou we received. In compelling tourists to spend at every possible moment, the tour, it seemed, could only be so effective in satisfying tourists’ desires.

**Tourism and Territorializing**

While it is important to explore these motivations for travelling, and some of the classed and other dynamics at play in mass tourism, I now want to pivot to some of the power dynamics that occur between these tours and sites in Taiwan. Though the Chinese government still officially considers Taiwan as residing within its borders, when Chinese tourists travel to Taiwan they need to stamp their passports and go through immigration in the same way that would if they were travelling to any other sovereign country. China might still claim sovereignty over Taiwan, but when Chinese tourists travel to Taiwan, they are treated like any other international visitors. However, as more tourists arrive in Taiwan from China, more space in Taiwan is being developed for Chinese interests. In this section, I want to delve into how Mainland Chinese tourism to
Taiwan is changing power imbalances between the countries and impacting conceptions of statehood. I bring in anthropological insights that position the tourist as a vessel of imperialism and examine the power of the tourist gaze. Then I consider how tourism from China to Taiwan might be considered a state-territorializing project.

In the 1970’s Dennison Nash, in *Tourism as a Form of Imperialism*, provided a theoretical framework to study the power relations inherent in the tourist encounter. Nash defines imperialism simply as, “the expansion of a society’s interests abroad” (Nash 34). He argued that tourism is an inherently imperialistic endeavor because it involves changing the host society, on behalf of the tourists. His theory is based on the idea that tourism emanates from productive “metropolitan centers” that have “power over touristic and related developments abroad that makes a metropolitan center imperialistic and tourism a form of imperialism” (Nash 35). Nash’s argument highlights two things: first, tourists hold power over hosts in shaping the social relations and spaces in the context of tourism, and second, tourism should not be considered as an end in itself, but also as representative of the society’s interests from where it originates.

John Urry’s *The Tourist Gaze* (1990) provides us a means to deconstruct and localize the ‘imperialism’ that Nash identifies. *The Tourist Gaze* brings Michel Foucault’s panoptic gaze to the field of tourist studies. He writes, “When we go away we look at the environment with interest and curiosity. It speaks to us in ways we appreciate, or at least we anticipate that it will do so. In other words,
we gaze at what we encounter. And this gaze is as socially organized and systematized as is the gaze of (Foucault’s) medic” (Urry 1). Urry looks at the “processes by which the gaze is constructed or reinforced”, “who or what authorizes it’, its “consequences on place” and “how it interrelates with a variety of other social practices” (Urry 1). In a later chapter I will explore more how this gaze is perpetuated in Taiwan and what its consequences are, but here I am interested in the state’s authorization of this gaze.

As we know, tourism from China to Taiwan is strictly mediated and tightly regulated by the governments of both China and Taiwan. I want to focus not only on how tourism is being utilized as a means to diminish Taiwanese state sovereignty and power, but also how it presents a potential threat to the China’s central government. In Tourism as a Territorial Strategy, human geographer Ian Rowen argues that tourism from Mainland China to Taiwan, “should be viewed as a technology of state territorialization: that is as a mode of social and spatial ordering that produces tourists and state territory as effects of power” (Rowen 64). Rowen’s argument is based in the idea that, “the strategic deployment of tourism is part of China’s foreign policy apparatus” (Arlt, 2006; Richter, 1983). Nyíri (2006) has argued that PRC state agents use tourism and tourist sites to articulate hegemonic claims about cultural identity and state authority, even beyond China’s borders” (Rowen 2012). Rowen argues that Mainland Chinese tourism takes over spaces in Taiwan that Taiwanese people no longer consider
Taiwanese, and therefore, the PRC is spatially expanding its state power. But they are also ideologically entrenching state authority over Taiwan because:

The more that PRC group tourists engage with Taiwanese, the more they express a sense of cultural affinity, admiration, and crucially, identification with them as fellow Chinese nationals. Yet, the more Taiwanese engage with PRC group tourists, the more culturally, socially and politically alienated Taiwanese feel from China and PRC nationals. (Rowen 68).

There is reason to think that the Mainland Chinese government is getting more confident and explicit in using tourism to Taiwan towards political ends, but also that tourism to Taiwan might, in some respects, be making the PRC more anxious. In January of this year, Democratic Progressive (DPP) candidate Tsai Ing-Wen won the Taiwan's Presidency in a landslide election and Tsai has a much stronger stance against Mainland China than the previous administration. Ironically, the KMT party nowadays is far more pro-Mainland - in terms of trying to strengthen economic and political relations – than their DPP rival party. Earlier this year the PRC put out threats that it would cut the number of tourists to Taiwan if the DPP takes power because the DPP is more pro-independence than the KMT. Thus it seems like the PRC is using its power to influence elections in Taiwan. Moreover, during the election season China restricted the number of tourists to Taiwan.
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49 Rowen’s paper takes as a “starting point that these subjects and objects—tourists, states and nations, borders and territory—have no essential existence. They emerge discursively and are recognized, reconfigured, and reproduced through spatial practice” (Rowen 64).
tourists able to travel to Taiwan\textsuperscript{50}. This seems to signal a limit of ‘strategically deploying’ its tourists abroad. China is only happy to send tourists to Taiwan if they don’t become influenced by Taiwan’s democratic politics. Thus, while encouraging tourism to Taiwan can in some ways strengthen Mainland China’s influence over Taiwan, tourists travelling to Taiwan may also work to expose the tourists to democracy. One of Rowen’s main points is that Chinese tourists go back home thinking about the similarities they share with Taiwanese people and how this further entrenches the idea of a unified China. On the other hand, tourism also highlights Taiwan’s inescapable political differences. Furthermore, as Rowen points out, the influx of Chinese tourists is only making Taiwanese people more convinced of their independence from China. On a structural level, it seems, Mainland Chinese tourism is strengthening the Chinese state, while also undermining it in some ways: both in terms of the democratic desires it stokes among tourists and in terms of strengthening the idea of an independent Taiwanese state.

Conclusion

\textit{Daluren}, meaning person(s) from the Mainland, is a term used in Taiwan to distinguish citizens of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) – Mainland China - from Taiwanese people. Very few people I talked to in Dulan, Taiwan had anything good to say about \textit{Daluren}. I could understand why many of Dulan’s

residents held Mainland Chinese Tourists in such distain. Many of the people I was living with had been protesting the building of massive hotel development complexes for over a decade (2004-present), and they rightfully saw the onslaught of Mainland Chinese Tourists as the driving force behind such destructive development. Mainland tourists had a reputation for being “rude” and “uncivilized”.

As dozens of tour buses drove through town everyday, I sensed a palpable aversion to Chinese tourists among locals; for me this was understandable, but also uncomfortable. I grew up in Mainland China as a guest in that country. In a very similar way to how the building of hotels is displacing local residents in these places in Taiwan, the international school I went to in Beijing resulted in the literal demolition of migrant villages around it in the interest of making fancy gated communities for foreigners. I didn’t want to support the tourism development that was taking over land in Dulan; at the same time, however, it wasn’t my place to categorically judge or dismiss a group of people coming from a country that I grew up in.

As I spent more and more time in Dulan, I realized that I went in with a rather naïve conception of the tourism politics there. At first, I thought the problem was fairly simple: The big bad Chinese tourist industry was colonizing Taiwan’s southeast coast, and local residents were banding together to stop this injustice. The situation turned out to be far more complex. As I spent more time living in Dulan, I grew frustrated with how uncritically some of the Western foreigners seemed to be taking over local spaces and not considering how their
actions might be inappropriate or problematic. In many ways, it felt as if uniting against the development of the massive hotels provided an excuse to ignore local inequalities. Realizing that supporting Oppose Miramar had its own complicated implications - especially for me as a white-bodied, foreign male - motivated a further critical reflection of my own relationship with Oppose Miramar resistance movement. A reflexive attempt to examine my position in living Dulan, I felt, required that I engage with and more fully comprehend the forces that they are fighting against, which, I posit in this thesis is the Mainland Chinese group tourism industry. I hope that my investigation into Mainland Chinese group tourism, and its growing influence in Taiwan, prompts a more nuanced understanding of the tourism politics in the region.

In this chapter, I situate the Chinese tour group within the complicated web of economic, social, and political hierarchies and systems that surround it. I trace the history of mass tourism and its relation to China and Taiwan. I then write about the experience of going on one of these tours and explore some of the motivations people have for travelling and how these tours are structured. These trips try to inculcate the idea that guests need to consume conspicuously in order for them to become elite. While the elitist logic embedded in these tours is pervasive, some people seemed to object to this form of tourism, resisting its classed logic. On a broader socio-political level, I demonstrate that Mainland China is using tourism to Taiwan as a means for expanding its own state power. But at the same time it remains a dangerous opportunity for its citizens to rethink China’s authoritarian control. With this established, I now want to look
more specifically at how Taiwanese spaces can be constructed to serve the interests of Mainland Chinese tourists. I investigate how tourism as a territorial strategy plays out in minute, material ways at tourist sites around the country.
Chapter 2

Politics of Indigenous Representation in Southeastern Taiwan’s Mass Tourism Industry

God sent them a Prophet, which should declare a new Peace and Reconciliation between him and them, upon which account they called him Psalmanaazar, i.e. the Author of Peace. After he had Published this joyfull Message unto them, he commanded them to build a Temple, and in it an Alter, above that Alter to make a Tabernacle, and then to Sacrifice upon the Alter, 100 Oxen, 100 Rams and 100 Goats, and to Burn upon it 20000 Hearts of young Children under 9 Years of Age, and then God would appear to them.
– George Psalmanaazar, Description of Formosa

The Europeans have such obscure and various Notions of Japan, and especially of our Island Formosa, that they can believe nothing for Truth that has been said of it. But the prevailing Reason (that I wrote this book) was, because the Jesuits I found had impos’d so many Stories, and such gross Fallacies upon the Public, that they might the better excuse themselves from those base Actions, which deservedly brought upon them that fierce Persecution in Japan: I thought therefore it would not be unacceptable if I publish’d a short Description of the Island Formosa, and told the Reasons why this wicked Society, and at last all that profess’d Christianity, were, with them, expell’d that Country. – George Psalmanaazar, Description of Formosa

George Psalmanaazar arrived in London in 1704 and published the first document that could be described as an ethnography of Taiwan. As a self-described native of Taiwan, Psalmanazaar wrote a book called a Description of Formosa. The book was the first of its kind and, at the time, served as the most definitive and comprehensive account of Taiwan’s language and culture. In the
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51 The full book title is, An Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa, An Island Subject to the Emperor of Japan. Giving an account of the Religion, Customs, Manners etc. of the Inhabitant.
book, Psalmanaazar gives an in-depth description of Taiwanese society, including an impressive breakdown of Taiwan’s indigenous language (providing a full alphabet and grammar structure), which he argued was derived entirely from the Japanese language. Taiwan’s religion was also central focus of the work. He wrote that Formosans instituted a complex system of religious practices, rituals, priests, and temples to worship a prophet named ‘Psalmanaazaar’ (unrelated to the author). Every year, he wrote, eighteen thousand boys were ritually sacrificed for the prophet. The remaining men took on multiple wives in order to make up for the gender imbalance.

Psalmanaazar (the writer not the prophet) also wrote that Taiwanese people casually practiced cannibalism, eating raw human flesh as they would any other food.

Psalmanaazar devotes the second half of the book to recounting his escape from Taiwan, and his journey to Europe that ultimately landed him in London, England. The story begins in Taiwan where he came into contact with an underground Jesuit missionary, who introduced him to Catholicism. An instant convert, Psalmanaazar planned an escape from Taiwan with the missionary because Taiwanese society, apparently, persecuted Christians at the time. The missionary first took him to a convent in France. Psalmanaazar claims that he was forced to escape from the monastery after short while because he had theological disagreements with the Jesuits and couldn’t handle the intense
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53 Ibid. 172.
54 Ibid. 172.
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pressures of monastic life. After escaping he went on to wander through Germany, where he became a reformed adherent to Anglican Protestantism. At the end of the book, George Psalmanaazar, who started as an ordinary Taiwanese citizen, finds himself in London as an accomplished theological scholar of England’s dominant religion.

After his book came out, Psalmanaazar became a celebrity amongst England’s elite. His descriptions and illustrations of Taiwan’s savage culture captivated audiences across Western Europe. The cannablistic, savage picture of Taiwan that he presented fit neatly into prevailing European notions of a barbaric, savage Orient. Psalmanazaar, as someone who rejected both his savage roots and also the distained Jesuits, in favor of ascribing to England’s dominant religion and culture, was a perfect embodiment of a transformed ‘other’ and a testament to the British Empire’s glory and domination of less ‘civilized’ peoples. Psalmanaazar’s celebrity status would eventually fade, but he continued to live in England until his death 1763.

However, George Psalmanaazar was a complete fraud. When Psalmanaazar died, a work titled Memoirs of **** Commonly Known by the Name of George Psalmanaazar; A Reputed Native of Taiwan. Written By Himself In Order to be Published After His Death was found in his study. In it, he confessed that there was no George Psalmanaazar - his real name remains
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56 Ibid. Pg. 175.
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unknown - and he had never been to Taiwan. His memoir, published posthumously, is the only record we have of who the man who claimed to be Psalmanazaar may have actually been. In the memoir he writes that he was actually born in the south of France and received religious training as a child. He was a gifted student, but he ran away from home as a young man due to a troubled family situation. On the road, he found success in taking on different identities and impersonating various religious figures. Strange, exotic tales he heard about the orient fascinated him as a child, and this led him to doing a fairly intensive self-study into the Japanese language. This interest in the ‘orient’, combined with a penchant for cons, is what led to the creation of the character George Psalmanaazar and the Description of Formosa book. Taiwan was chosen simply because it was a country in the orient that British people didn’t seem to know much anything about. In sum, Psalmanazaar was an incredibly skilled con artist who spun a web of lies in a moment of desperation to support himself and gain entrance into England’s noble elite.

The story of George Psalmanaazar may have been made-up, but it wasn’t constructed out of thin air. It is important to remember that Psalmanaazar created this Taiwan entirely out of exotic tales of a homogenous Orient that was
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61 Ibid. Pg. 178.
62 In school, at different points in time, he studied with Franciscans, Jesuits, and Dominicans (Stagl 178).
63 Ibid. Pg. 179.
64 To construct his story, Psalmanazaar enlisted the help of a Scottish chaplain by the name of Mr. Alexander Innes. Innes knew that British people had at least some idea of Japanese culture, so recommended that they choose Taiwan as Psalmanazaar’s homeland, which is a smaller island that people in England knew much less about. Source: Ibid. Pg. 180.
already present in popular tales in English society. This construction of Taiwan was built exclusively to serve the interests of English noble audiences. The Taiwanese society he constructed was precisely the Taiwan that he thought people in England would be most receptive to. Thus, while his writings don't demonstrate anything about how Taiwanese society actually operated at the time, Psalmanazaar’s story does provide an extremely revealing window into how the exotic Orient was conceived of in England’s popular imagination.

In *Orientalism*, Edward Said wrote, “The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences” (1). While places in the Orient may have been ‘almost a European invention’ in European imaginations, Psalmanazaar’s depiction of Taiwan proves that places in the Orient could be constructed entirely from Orientalist fantasies. However, it is not only important that Psalmanazaar’s depiction of Taiwan was an invention of the Orientalist myth but also that Orientalism is representative of a “style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (Said 3). At the time of Psalmanazaar’s writings - the early 18th century - England was beginning to expand its territorial control and colonial project around the world. Orientalism was a crucial ideological structure through which England justified colonization and enslavement. It is important to think of Psalmanazaar’s writings as not only misguided notions of Taiwan, but also as reflective of the very structure through which England justified its various forms of colonization. As Said writes, “Orientalism, therefore, is not an airy European fantasy about the
Orient, but a created body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been considerable material investment” (Said 6).

Over 300 years later, the Orientalist framework that produced George Psalmanaazaar continues to echo in Taiwan’s contemporary tourist industry. Psalmanazaar constructed Taiwan purely out of a racist mythology of an ‘Oriental Other’ to please the interests of non-Taiwanese audiences. Today, the Mainland Chinese tourism industry continues to misrepresent Taiwan’s indigenous populations and craft indigeneity to please the interests of outsiders. Similar to how the Orientalist discourse that created Psalmanazaar’s character was also a means for the West to dominate and restructure the Orient, the tourism industry’s misrepresentations of Taiwan’s indigenous people is similarly intent on colonizing indigenous land. In this chapter, I work through issues of representation and appropriation because they are crucial to understanding how the politics operate in the context of Taiwan’s Southeastern tourist industry. First, in order to contextualize and situate these issues within Taiwan’s complicated colonial past, I give a brief history of Taiwan’s indigenous people and the rise of the indigenous rights movement. Then I look into depictions of the indigenous population local to the Dulan region of Southeastern Taiwan, in relation to how their culture is represented and commoditized for the purposes of tourism. Finally, I examine how these images are being co-opted and reproduced for certain political ends. While it might be an obvious point that the way in which indigenous peoples are represented at tourist sites do not accurately portray their lives, these depictions are nonetheless gravely
important as they may be partially responsible for justifying and legitimizing the tourist territorialization of indigenous spaces. In the previous chapter I attempted to establish the structure and feel of the Mainland Chinese group tourism industry and its encroachment into Taiwan. I now turn my focus from inside the buses to the sites the tourists visit once they step off.

**A History of Indigenous Taiwan**

Taiwan was originally settled roughly eight thousand years ago, but it is possible that people had actually been living there for thousands of years previous. Taiwan’s indigenous peoples are ethnically Austronesian and they share linguistic and genetic similarities with people all the way from Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines, to Madagascar and Oceania (Blundell 2000). They are by no means homogeneous – there are twenty-six distinct languages, though some are extinct – but they share certain genetic characteristics and lived histories, which differentiate them from the Western colonial powers and Han Chinese migrants who would arrive in the seventeenth century (Blundell 2000). As this thesis focuses on tourism and contact with outsiders, this history focuses primarily on the contact made between Taiwan’s indigenous people and outside forces, which includes the dealings with Taiwan’s contemporary government.

In 1544, a Portuguese ship passed by Taiwan and named the landmass *Ilha Formosa* (*Meilidao* in Chinese) meaning beautiful island. Spain and the
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Netherlands, however, were the first Western powers\textsuperscript{66} to establish trading posts on the islands\textsuperscript{67}. In the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, foreign powers such as the Spanish and Portuguese played an active role in facilitating the land-grabbing and hostile takeover\textsuperscript{68}, but China was the only country that moved their people en masse to settle it. From the 17\textsuperscript{th} to the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, Taiwan increasingly became drawn into the Chinese empire as Chinese migrants, mostly from the Fujian area of China, migrated to Taiwanese plains. Emma Jinhua Teng's book, *Taiwan's Imagined Geography: Chinese Colonial Travel Writing and Pictures, 1683-1895*, provides numerous examples of how racist depictions of Taiwan's indigenous people persisted through the end of the Qing Dynasty. In describing Taiwan's indigenous people this Chinese settler, Lin Dingyuan asserted in the early 1700s:

> Among the native savages of Taiwan there are two kinds: raw and cooked. Those who live deep in the mountains and who have not submitted to civilization are raw savages. All of them cover their bodies with deerskins, and they plant taro roots in the mountains. Their strength lies in their ability with bow and arrow, pike and spear ... Those who live on the plains, who obey the law and perform corvee are the cooked savages. They are contented at farming with plow and hoe, no different from the Chinese subjects. Their only difference lies in their hair, which is long in back and cropped at the front, their pierced ears and tattooed mouths, and their clothing and adornment. (Jinhua 130).

\textsuperscript{66} These Western powers left significant imprints on indigenous culture such as through bringing Christianity, which is the most popular religion amongst Taiwan's indigenous people. Source: \textsuperscript{66} Blundell, David. *Austronesian Taiwan: Linguistics, History, Ethnology, Prehistory*. Taipei, Taiwan: Shung Ye Museum of Formosan Aborigines, 2009. Print.


\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.
In the quote above, it is important to note the persistence of the ‘raw’ and ‘cooked’ classification of barbarians. The distinction between raw and cooked was not only the means through which Chinese settlers categorized Taiwan’s original inhabitants; it was also the very framework through which they justified colonialism and systematic oppression. The raw savages were those who couldn’t be digested, and thus couldn't be fully assimilated. On the other hand, the cooked savages were those whose indigenous, “barbaric” roots could be baked out of them and be assimilated into Chinese settler life. The same person, Lin Dingyuan, quoted above also said,

If the brambles and thorns are opened day by day, then all the troubles will subside of their own accord. There is nothing better than allowing the (Chinese) subjects to reclaim land. When the savages hear the sounds of guns and cannons, they run away frightened, and for days they do not dare to come out. By this means, we can subdue the savages with savagery and induce them to submit and be tamed. After they have been induced for a long time, then more and more of them will gradually be transformed, until all of the raw savages have become cooked (Jinhua 136).

By ‘brambles and thorns’, Lin is referring to the land on the Taiwanese plains that had yet to be converted into farmland. He is arguing that this land should be taken away from Taiwan’s indigenous people as swiftly and comprehensively as possible and given to Chinese settlers. He likens the taming of the land to the incorporation of Taiwan’s indigenous inhabitants into Chinese agrarian society. This sort of logic falls precisely in line with Patrick Wolfe’s theory of settler colonialism, even though the settlers are not of the same European origin that Wolfe describes. Wolfe, in ‘Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native’ writes,
The logic of elimination not only refers to the summary liquidation of Indigenous people, though it includes that... settler colonialism has both negative and positive dimensions. Negatively, it strives for the dissolution of native societies. Positively, it erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base—as I put it, settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event. In its positive aspect, elimination is an organizing principal of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superseded) occurrence (Wolfe 2).

It is through this lens of settler colonialism, based on socially constructed racial differences, that the present day situation of Taiwan’s indigenous people must be considered. This is because the construction of Taiwan’s dominant society had, as its project a logic and a view to eliminate native identity. In Taiwan, access to wealth, resources, power, etc., has always entailed a proximity to the Han Chinese ideal. Taiwan’s indigenous people have been historically and systematically marginalized through socially constructed ethnic differences. The oppression of Taiwan’s indigenous people would continue under the Japanese colonial regime of the early 1900’s.

The end of the Sino-Japanese war in 1895 placed Taiwan under colonial rule of Japan. Japan set up a nation-wide system of schools, healthcare, infrastructure, and governance. However, the Japanese viewed Taiwan’s indigenous communities as barbaric, and did not treat Taiwan’s indigenous communities with the same preferential treatment they gave Han immigrants. Frustrations with settler-colonial rule and forced assimilation policies in the Seediq minority came to a head in 1930, which culminated in the Wushe
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Incident. On October 27th, 1930 hundreds of Seediq warriors attacked the Japanese-occupied village Wushe, killing over 130 Japanese people. In response, the Japanese army sent thousands of soldiers to the area to eviscerate the Seediq army. Through a combination of raids, artillery, and even Mustard Gas, the Japanese massacred over 600 Seediq people.

This forced a reconsideration of policies against indigenous groups, but Japan would remain harsh colonizers through the duration of their rule. Japan did their best to stamp out undesirable parts of indigenous culture and assimilate them completely into Japanese society. Moreover, many indigenous women were taken as sex slaves for soldiers, while many of Taiwan’s indigenous men were enlisted to fight in World War II for Japan. In the area where I conducted fieldwork, many of the older generations’ parents had fought for Japan in World War II.

After the Japanese lost World War II, the Chinese Civil War once again raged on. In 1949, the Nationalist Party (KMT) retreated to Taiwan and took control of the island. For Taiwan’s indigenous groups, this transition of rule did
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75 For example, a prominent local Dulan artist, Siki Sufen, is featured in a documentary called, *How Long is the Road*, which follows his journey to find out where his father fought and died for the Japanese.
not bring significant change. Highlighting the extent of oppression is the fact that the KMT continued to ban indigenous languages from schools through the 1980’s. In 1987 martial law was lifted, marking the beginning of an era of democratization and increased indigenous rights advocacy. As it will be more directly relevant to grounding the contemporary indigenous rights activism that I study in Chapter 3, I will wait to give a more in-depth discussion of Taiwan’s contemporary indigenous rights movement. For now, however, I just hope to show that indigenous livelihood and identity has been under attack in Taiwan though the forces of settler-colonialism and by several waves of different colonizers.

Last summer, I lived on the section of Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline home to the Amis indigenous minority. Making up nearly forty percent of Taiwan’s indigenous population, the Amis are by far the biggest and most influential of Taiwan’s indigenous groups. In the village where I lived, Dulan, Amis language was the most commonly spoken language after Chinese. Though much of Dulan’s younger population has left the town for better job opportunities in bigger cities, Amis culture remains strong in Dulan. During the yearly harvest festival in July, community of the community poured into the
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76 Anthropologist DJ Hatfield (interview) described the incoming KMT as lazy colonizers because they essentially just utilized Japan’s preexisting infrastructures to carry out many of the same policies, though with KMT rhetoric and propaganda instead of Japanese.

village from all around the country and the entire village shut down for nearly a week. The community was predominantly involved with either agriculture or fishing. However, many people also worked in various jobs in Taitung city, or the local tourist industry, amongst other things.

Dulan Village is roughly 20 km north of Taitung, City on Taiwan’s Southeastern coast.

Indigenous Representation on Territorialized Land

With this background in Taiwan’s indigenous history, I pivot to indigenous representations in Taiwan’s contemporary tourist industry. I am
specifically interested in sites that cater primarily to Mainland Chinese tour groups. As a case study, I examine the representations of indigenous people at a site called Water Running Up. As discussed in the last chapter, Ian Rowen argues that tourism from Mainland China to Taiwan was leading to places being overrun by Chinese tourists and making them, in effect, more Chinese than Taiwanese; thus territorialized. I aim to tie this idea territorialization to settler colonialism. I am interested in how a ‘territorialized’ place, whose main function is to serve Mainland Chinese group tourists, represents and commodifies local indigenous culture. I want to keep in mind Said’s conceptualization of the discourse of ‘Orientalism’: that the representations of indigeneity are produced in the likeness of the tourists and that these representations display a power dynamic of appropriating the indigenous culture to serve tourists’ interests.

Generally in Dulan, the only interaction residents have with Chinese tourists is through seeing the endless stream of tour buses pass through town each day. During my stay in Dulan, I gradually grew more interested in this force of Mainland Chinese group tourism, and I started to go out of my way to go to places where I knew the buses stopped. The closest site happened to be Water Running Up, the same place that drew national attention when tourists were caught inscribing their names on leaves. In my last few weeks of doing fieldwork in Taiwan, I went to Water Running Up whenever I had time because I thought it was the best place to observe the interactions between Mainland Chinese tourists and the villagers who lived in the area. Using Mandarin Chinese. I talked to tourists, bus drivers, tour guides, vendors, shopkeepers, and anyone else who
happened to be at the site. I was interested in finding out how the various people who spent time there each day viewed the site, one another, and Taiwan in general, among other things. I was drawn to do so because the hostel I worked at was a center for activism against hotel development in the region. I viewed these hotels, and the overall mass tourist development of the region, as a direct product of a rise in Mainland group tourism, and I wanted to find out more about how group tourism actually functioned and interacted with the local culture.

In this section, I demonstrate based on my findings at Water Running Up how the site perpetuates problematic narratives of local indigenous culture. Here I show that these depictions are not only careless but also help foster a politically dangerous discourse. First, however, I want to clarify what I learned about Water Running Up is and why I consider it a territorialized space. The site is an extremely popular stop for Mainland Chinese tour buses. Vendors told me that at least several hundred buses passed through each day. As tours operate on similar schedules, Water Running Up reaches its busiest around ten am, however, tour buses can be seen at the site throughout each day. Taiwanese tourists (both independent and bus travelers), and tourists from other places, also visited Water Running Up but, from what I could tell, the Mainland Chinese tour groups far outnumbered any of the other travelers who visited the site.

Water Running Up is located on the side of a mountain and the main attraction is a small stream where it appears that the water is, indeed, flowing against gravity. Apparently the streams at Water Running Up were built to drain agricultural land, but now the site seems to serve primarily as a tourist
attraction. When I asked around town about whether the water was actually running up, most people would laugh and reply that it only appeared that way because of the angle of the mountain. At the base of the site, there is a large parking lot to the left. On the right is a set of stairs that leads to the stream. At the top of the stairs, the stream comes into view, which is man-made and carved from stone, with a footpath built next to it. The path follows the stream for roughly a dozen meters before it makes a sharp left turn and leads to an open area where a dozen or so vendors have set up shop selling various food items and local trinkets.

Water Running Up exists as territorialized space because its primary function is to serve Mainland Chinese tour groups and, in general, people living in the area do not visit the tourist site. At the hostel nearby that I worked at, I was told not to recommend guests to go to Water Running Up because it was already ‘taken over by Chinese tourists’. The fact that so many of the bus tours stopped there seemed to actively prevent even other tourists from visiting. I also heard that several years ago the site had far less vendors\textsuperscript{78}. Some of the vendors told me that Mainland Chinese tourists make up the largest portion of their customers. These large banners pictured below hang above a stretch of shopping stalls at Water Running Up.

\textsuperscript{78} In the time before the huge spike in Mainland Chinese tourism, which occurred after the 2008 agreement between China and Taiwan (refer to Chapter 1)
In the picture on the left, the top caption reads, “In the glittering sunshine beneath the coastal sun, every kind of color/flavor is filled to capacity”. The caption on the bottom right of the picture on the left reads, “The Amis minority group are an Ocean People. Their song and dance, culture, art, and lifestyle all align with the sea.” The caption on the right reads, “Splendidly dressed young Amis men and women. Young Amis warriors.” (My translation)
These advertisements help connect an ideological depiction and imagination of indigenous people to a material takeover of land and space. The therefore prove an important case study for the larger trend that I will discuss in the rest of this chapter, how the tourist industry of Southeastern Taiwan promotes certain images of indigeneity, which align with the interests of tourist-oriented development.

I first want to demonstrate theoretically that these pictures equating indigenous society with the natural world is problematic. In Tourism Imaginaries, Exoticization, Ambivalence, Dimitrios Theodossopoulos writes about ‘The Two Faces of Exoticization’ in relation to tourism and indigenous peoples. He argues that the,
“first (face of exoticization) involves conceptualization of the exotic subject in terms of primitiveness and lack of civilization, while the second idealizes – in Rousseauian fashion – the exotic subject as a noble savage, living in harmony with nature” (Theodossopoulos 60)

These photographs are evidence of these contradicting yet parallel descriptions of exoticization. The people in the photographs, or “warriors” as they are described, are shown in traditional clothing in a natural setting. While modern subjects are in the photos, only traditional elements of their culture, which emphasize their connection with the natural world, are shown. The people aren’t seen as having access to contemporary goods and services, yet these ‘Ocean People’ are seen as living happily – holding hands and smiling – and harmoniously living in nature. Moreover, the captions say that all of the facets of indigenous life here “align with the sea” and that “underneath the coastal sun” their lives are “filled to capacity”. These captions emphasize a fullness and richness of life that, along with an enhanced connection to nature, glorify and idealize these kinds of anti-modern, indigenous ways of life.

It is important to consider how the tourist industry deploys these images as advertisements to consume local products and foods. These banners indicate that if the tourists purchase the trinkets and other products below them, then they will be given some sort of access to the glorified indigenous culture from where they originate. While the idea of cultural commodification and consumption is obviously not restricted to tourism – anything from eating ‘ethnic’ cuisine or wearing clothes from a different country is, in a sense,
consuming another culture—tourism is especially intertwined with the logic of consuming culture as a means to attain cultural capital.

In chapter 1, I discussed the idea of cultural capital and how it relates to tourism in terms of habitus and Bourdieu's theorization of 'taste'. Building upon this, I want to consider how culture is advertised and represented to make the products attractive for the tourists. Thus, what is revealing about this banner is not so much what it says about the local indigenous culture as much as what it implies is missing from that of the tourists. The people in the picture are depicted as anti-modern, being in harmony with nature, wearing colorful clothing, etc. not because this is how this accurately depicts how they live, but because these are things that are assumed as lacking from the lives of the tourists, and this difference can be commodified. In *Orientalism*, Said wrote, “European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self” (3). Here, the context is not European, and the Orient refers to Taiwan's indigenous peoples, but the similarities in the sentiment are nonetheless striking. Consumption of these indigenous products supposedly works to strengthen the identity and cultural capital of the consumers, while the indigenous culture remains a surrogate to these desires. Through emphasizing difference and idealizing certain aspects of indigenous culture, this banner works to reinforce a logic of domination inherent to the Orientalist discourse. While 'Orientalizing', it is important to think about
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the ramifications of cultural consumption. bell hooks viewed the idea of consuming culture as inherently ‘cannablistic’ (1992). She viewed the "consumption of the ‘Other’ as a function of power and privilege". It is important to keep in mind the role of power and privilege that centers hooks' work. The power over these representations remains with the commodifiable ‘Orientalist’ fantasies of the tourist industry and the tourists that they cater to.

The anthropology of tourism has been highly concerned with the imperial dimensions of travelling. In 1977, Dennison Nash argued that tourism was an inherently imperial quest because it is unavoidably comprised of an “expansion of a society’s interests abroad”. These photographs can definitely be considered in line with this conception of tourism. In these pictures, the Amis people are depicted in the ‘tourist gaze’ to maximize difference and commoditize their culture. These depictions, moreover, contribute to the colonization from the outside because the people in the region are only considered in the image imposed on them from the outside. Moreover, outside logic insinuates that any tourism to the region is inherently positive because introducing more money and contemporary services would only work to help advance these so-called primitive peoples.

More recently, anthropologists interested in tourism have complicated and questioned fixed notions of the ‘good’ and ‘evils’ of the imperialist tourist industry. One of the strategies to do this has been through considering tourism
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in terms of its imaginaries, which I discussed in the introduction. Part of this push towards tourist imaginaries is Robert Stasch’s conceptualization of a ‘symmetric treatment’ of tourist imaginaries. Stasch’s framework turns the tourist gaze back on the tourist and considers how host populations classify and interact with tourist populations. Theodoussopolos writes, “Indigenous actors, such as the Embera, imagine and stereotype the tourists in their own terms – all the different varieties of outsiders” (Theodoussopolos 52). In chatting with one of the local fruit vendors at Water Running Up, I was instructed on how the Mainland Tourists were differentiated from other tourists. “You can just tell”, one vendor told me. When I asked how, they just remarked that you could tell from seeing them. When I asked about their impressions of these tourists, one vendor replied, “I like their Renminbi (Mainland Chinese currency), but nothing else about them”. It is important to keep in mind how these vendors classify and profit from these tourists and manipulate misguided representations of their culture in advantageous ways.
I Miramar and the Threat of Cultural Appropriation

This banner stretches across a wall in front of the Miramar Hotel Resort. They are easily visible from the highway that passes by the hotel.

This banner hangs on a fence outside of Miramar. As I described in the introduction – and will breakdown in more detail in Chapter 3 – Miramar is the hotel that has been at the center of legal battles and controversy for over a decade. I was surprised when I first saw that the banner pictured the Amis community considering the fact that members of the Amis community have been some of the most outspoken activists against the hotel, and have even challenged the hotel’s right to the land on indigenous legal grounds.

This led me to question: why would the hotel choose to picture the Amis minority in this advertisement? And, how would this particular Amis
representation be helpful for the hotel’s case to open? Here, I suggest that depictions of indigenous culture in Southeastern Taiwan’s tourist industry are utilized not only to sell products, but also as a political tool to take over land and justify the development of sites that cater to tourists, such as Miramar. This banner helps demonstrate how the tourist industry’s depictions of Amis indigeneity are being deployed as a strategy to control these areas and take over space.

These pictures show Amis people taking part in traditional ceremonies while the hotel looms over them in the background. These ceremonies are juxtaposed with the modern, imposing hotel, emphasizing the view of unchanged native societies in opposition to modern development. In Tourist Encounters: Alternative Readings of Nature and Development, Christine Walley examines the idea of tourism as a means for development. She does so through examining what eco-tourism means for the travellers and residents of Mafia Island Marine Park in Tanzania. She argues that the park promises “visitors an escape from the development of the modern world, at the same time that the park ironically promises Mafia residents its exact opposite” (Walley 224). The picture above captures this paradox. The banner displays the indigenous community and culture in the midst of a traditional ceremony, against a large imposing modern hotel in the background. While the banner indicates that this would be a mutually beneficial relationship—in that the local society would benefit from any development and progress brought by the hotel—Walley posits that these
notions are naturally contradictory: how can the local society remain unchanged and anti-modern if they are, at the same time, beneficiaries of development?

The hotel is presented as a form of development given to the local community – almost as a gift – so that they can have more access to modern life and services. This is the sort of logic that justifies building massive hotels on Taiwan’s Southeastern coast without seriously consulting the community or critical reflection. Very few people I talked to around Dulan - certainly not the anti-hotel activists - saw the hotel's presence as inherently positive. While hotel developers clearly tried to delineate between the modernity they would bring and an unchanged indigenous population, local actors clearly didn’t view things in these terms. There were no illusions that the hotel was an uncompromising force of good and mere proximity to it would help the area develop.

These images appropriate more benign elements of the indigenous culture to serve the interests of the developers. Before, on the Water Running Up banner, the description of them as ‘warriors’ gave them an element of danger because this edginess could be commoditized. However, the dangerous, warrior-like elements here are ignored in favor of showing older and more feminine bodies. The threat that indigenous resistance poses to the operation of this hotel is almost certainly a reason why Miramar Resort Company would want to portray the Amis in a friendlier, more accepting fashion at the hotel. The fact that this hotel actively displaced indigenous peoples, was built on traditional land, and has been most fiercely resisted against by the Amis, makes this depiction all the more offensive. This advertisement is indicative of the tourism industry’s
larger strategy of attempting to define an Amis community pro-hotel
development narrative. Thus, rather than ignoring Amis indigenous concerns
entirely, these banners demonstrate how –through representations - the mass
tourism industry imposes a representation of the Amis community that fits into
their project of mass tourism development.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I looked into contemporary issues of representation in
Southeastern Taiwan's tourist industry, using Water Running Up and the
Miramar Hotel as case studies. I traced the history of Taiwan's indigenous people
from the first contact they had with outsiders, through the Chinese settler-
colonization of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and their treatment
during the successive colonial regimes. I consider how the contemporary tourist
industry represents and commodifies indigenous culture. I argue that the
depictions of Amis in Southeastern Taiwan are being used to justify a further
colonization of land in service of Taiwan's tourist industry. I began this thesis by
examining what is happening inside Mainland Chinese tour buses, relying on
ethnographic, historical, and theoretical research. In this chapter I looked into
the physical spaces that these tourists are beginning to take over in Taiwan. Now
I want to look at the people committed to resisting the consequences of rising
mass tourism and their struggles over hotel development projects.
Chapter 3

Oppose Miramar and Tourist Development on Taiwan’s Southeast Coastline

The Coastline’s Dream (English Translation)

Yes! (Way Ha Hay)
The coastline has a dream, that the
Pacific Ocean will whisper, will whisper
As she faces the sky in her fluttering blue dresses

Yes! (Way Ha hay)
The coastline has a dream, that each
Wandering piece of driftwood can gaze, can gaze
From the beach where he daydreams and listens to waves

Yes! (Way Ha Hai)
The coastline has a dream, which is to let the coastline
Remain itself, as it was from the beginning!

Haya O Haya O Haiyan Haiyo Haiyan
Haya O Haya O Haiyan Haiyan
(traditional Amis tune)

To meet the coastline
Is to see that the ancient play has never changed
The wind blows and blows and blows
Returning to the world at its earliest beginnings
To meet the coastline
Is to see the romance of gale and ocean
In the rain the rain the rain
Returning to the first unguarded sentiments
Haiyan

The coastline has a dream
That underneath the skies
Waves can roll, break, and plunge
Advancing and retreating without pause
The coastline has a dream
That in the wind
The Pacific borne wind
Will flutter her sparkling blue dresses
Haiyan

Song written and recorded by Dakanow – Miramar Protest Song
“I can answer your questions, but you really should talk to Lin Shu-Ling”.

This was an answer I often got when I asked people affiliated with the Oppose Miramar protest movement if they could tell me more about their ongoing struggle with the Miramar hotel. Shu-ling isn’t necessarily the leader of Oppose Miramar - a label she adamantly refutes - but she was probably main instigator. After her family was evicted to make way for Miramar’s construction, she became dedicated to stopping its construction. She is now Oppose Miramar’s most prominent voice and has been at the center of nearly every lawsuit filed against the hotel. Shu-ling often came to the Good Nest hostel, where I worked, and one day, Wang, a young man who hangs around ‘The Good Nest’ hostel community when he gets time off from his military service, told me that she had invited the both of us up to her farm. I jumped at the opportunity.

Late one morning, Wang picked me up from the hostel on his motorized scooter and we set off towards Shu-lin’s farm. After stopping to buy some fresh sashimi and drinks to bring as gifts, we sped down the coastal highway towards her village. The mountains of Taiwan’s Eastern Rift Valley towered overhead to the west. The sun bounced brightly off the waves of the Pacific Ocean to the east. The highway we rode on winds in and out of repeating coastal inlets that make up much of Taiwan’s eastern coastline. Coming out of one inlet into the next, is especially striking. The inlets are several kilometers long, and seem to carve the letter C over and over again into the coast. When we rounded the top of one C, and turned into the bottom of another, the entire landscape of the next inlet
comes into view. The ends of each C are marked by rocky, jutting cliffs, which gradually descend into white sandy beaches in the middle of each C.

As we entered the final inlet before turning up the mountain, the massive Miramar Hotel Complex became instantly recognizable. The building easily rises above nearby cliffs and its multiple buildings stretch over a significant portion of the far end of the beach. While Miramar certainly isn’t the only structure on Taiwan’s southeastern coastline, it is by far the largest. This drive instills a sense of just how out-of-place and imposing Miramar’s presence feels. It also felt appropriate to pass by the building – and see its shuttered doors and empty rooms – before talking to the person probably most responsible for its closing.

Shortly after passing the complex, Wang took a right on a small road leading up the mountain. He drove for several minutes, skillfully navigating around the tight turns and the passing cars, before turning onto a dirt road, which cuts horizontally across the mountain leading to the farm. The land sloped around us, and the available space was used for farmland. Above us there were dozens of sheep living in an enclosed area and below us there was a large pigpen. When we arrived, Shu-Ling was sitting with her mother, and Hsu Ching, a friend of hers who I had previously met her at the hostel. After they greeted us, we sat down together on some plastic stools outside for lunch.

As I hadn’t been in Dulan for very long and was talking to one of the most important people in the movement, I was slightly nervous. To start the discussion, I asked her about Miramar and how the opposition movement started. Miramar’s developers evicted her and her mother from their home over
a decade ago. She did not intend to be an activist but the gravity of her circumstances forced her into the role. Then we started talking about the place that Miramar, and Shanyuan beach, used to be. She and her mother reminisced fondly over the small communal marketplace, where Lin Shu-ling used to have a stall that was located where Miramar now stands. They were frustrated at the nerve of the developers for taking this public space and closing it off to the local community. The space used to be communally accessible and utilized, but the hotel would ensure that the beach would predominantly be used by outside tourists. "Miramar even tried to take the beach for themselves!" Shu-ling exclaimed at one point, referring to Miramar’s unsuccessful attempt to privatize beach access.

Being surrounded by her farmland and animals made this strong connection to the land and the need to reclaim these stolen spaces seem extra palpable. Shu-ling and her mother told me that the farmland we were sitting on was only given back to the local community – after the land had been taken away from them decades before – through an indigenous land reclamation instituted in the 1990’s. Shu-ling’s desire to become a farmer, she said, was also an attempt to reclaim her community’s culture and ways of life. Hsu Ching had started working on the farm in the past year or so. Hsu recently graduated from National Taiwan University – the most prestigious university in Taiwan – and chose to move down to the Taitung County countryside to farm on this land. She was very bright and well-spoken recent graduate, who seemed as committed to studying
farming techniques as she was to devoting time and effort activist causes in Taiwan.

As Wang and I prepared to leave, I thanked Shu-ling, her mother, and Hsu Ching for being so hospitable and answering my questions. Wang and I got then got back on the scooter and wound back down the mountain. As we passed Miramar on the drive back I was reminded again of the hotel complex that has played such a prominent role in their lives. I came away feeling not so much that I knew the details of the hotel’s development or the resistance movement much better, but I gained a better perspective in which to view it. The communities of this region, or at least some members of the communities, have been working hard to reverse the effects of centuries of colonial rule in very intentional ways. But Miramar’s massive, imposing presence is an unmistakable reminder that the struggle against foreign and domestic forces to take their land and interrupt their ways of life is far from over.

In this chapter, I want to explore some of what it means to resist the forces of tourist-oriented development. In order to do so, I first give background to the Oppose Miramar movement; tracing the history of the development of the hotel, and the resistance movement it inspired, from the start of the construction of the hotel through the present day. I then describe my own experiences with the resistance movement in a vignette focused on a protest meeting and protest that I participated in last summer. Finally, I consider Miramar, and the protest movement it inspired, within the discourse of development. I aim to deconstruct the notion of tourist-oriented development as an inherently positive force. I look
to radical development discourse to help situate Oppose Miramar within a post-development framework. Here, I look at the ways in which Oppose Miramar articulates a space for creating new commons and providing for a more equitable future of tourism in Taiwan's indigenous spaces. To further elaborate on Oppose Miramar’s complications, I put the movement into context of its community and its surrounding tourist industry. I argue that while Oppose Miramar does offer a hopeful vision for the future of Taiwan’s Southeast coast, local inequalities - some of them tied to the pre-existing backpacker industry – continue to restrict and complicate the movement’s overall effectiveness. In this thesis, I first focused on Mainland Chinese group tours in Taiwan: the people - and the structures that support them - behind a rapidly growing mass tourist industry in Taiwan. In the second chapter I brought attention to the sites and spaces that are encountered once the tourists step off the busses. I argued that these spaces constructed and represented Amis indigenous identity in ways that supported the further takeover of land for tourists’ interests. Now I want to step further away from the tourist buses to focus on the people who have been actively resisting the onslaught of the group tourist industry.

**What is ‘Oppose Miramar’ and Where Did it Originate?**

The ‘Oppose Miramar’ activism marked an important moment in the progression of Taiwan’s indigenous rights movement, but it took significant groundwork to make the movement possible. I now trace the history of Taiwan’s indigenous rights movement from the late 1980’s – the beginning of Taiwan’s
democratization – through *Oppose Miramar* and today. I demonstrate that while indigenous rights have significantly improved in Taiwan in the last few decades, significant room remains to improve the laws pertaining to respecting the rights and claims of Taiwan’s indigenous people.

The contemporary indigenous rights movement can be traced to the 1980’s, when Taiwan’s government lifted martial law and the country began to democratize. In the progression of indigenous rights in Taiwan from late 1980’s through today, scholars have noted certain trends including a push from individual to collective rights (Ku Kun-hui 2005) and an increasing push towards indigenous autonomy and self-governance (Stainton 1999). Though martial law wouldn’t be lifted until 1987, the modern indigenous rights movement in Taiwan can be traced back to 1983 when the Alliance of Taiwan Aborigines (ATA) was founded and the *Kau Shan Ching (Mountain Blue)* magazine was published at National Taiwan University (Hsieh 1994, Chang 2004). These events began the process of Taiwan’s varied indigenous groups coming together to form a more cohesive, singular political unit. In 1987, the ATA released the “Manifesto of Taiwan Aborigines”, a seventeen-article document laying out the collective demands of Taiwan’s indigenous groups82. While the ATA had previously complained of Han colonization of indigenous land and territories, this document explicitly focused - six of the seventeen demands – on regaining indigenous territorial rights, calling for the stolen lands to be returned to the
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indigenous groups\textsuperscript{83}. This document also introduced *Yuanzhumin* (original inhabitants) as the preferred name for Taiwan’s indigenous people, rather than the more assimilationist\textsuperscript{84}, *Shandi Tongbao* (Mountain Compatriots), or inaccurate\textsuperscript{85} *Gaoshanzu* (High Mountain People). This change in terminology was not merely about syntax because it would have important ramifications in legal discourse. In 1988, the Return Our Land movement (an offshoot of the ATA) in Taiwan, issued the statement:

The Aboriginal People of Taiwan are the first peoples to have lived on this island of Taiwan. Because of this, our right to the land is absolute and a priori. Those lands which have been robbed by violence or deceit by the later occupying Han Chinese, or taken by successive governments by legal force, should by right be returned to us (Stainton 38-39).

This statement powerfully elucidates importance of the term *yuanzhumin* (original inhabitants), because this term sets forth, as a starting point, that *yuanzhumin* had their land illegally taken from them, and therefore should be the sole rightful proprietors of it. In the beginning of the early 1990’s the use of this term was contested by scholars and lawyers who feared potential legal consequences. *Xianzhumin* (first residents) and *Caozhumin* (early residents)


\textsuperscript{84} Kun Hui-Ku points out in *Rights to Recognition* that Tongbao literally means ‘from the same placenta’ and it the term was used during the 1950’s in attempts to “eliminate the difference in living standards between the mountain areas and plains areas”. However, this policy was not seen as entirely positive for indigenous groups, “on the one hand, critics blamed the government for failing to deliver on its promise to eliminate the gap in living standards between the mountain and plains areas. On the other hand, they criticized the government for not being sensitive to regional differences”.

\textsuperscript{85} Many of Taiwan’s indigenous groups also live, or have origins in, lower lying areas all around Taiwan, not only in the mountains.
were alternatives presented that would place the arrival of Taiwan’s indigenous
groups in a succession of various waves of immigrants on the island, therefore
disputing the claim that indigenous people were the original inhabitants of the
land that should therefore be granted special rights. However, in 1994, President
Lee Teng-Hui would use the term *Yuanzhumin* in a speech, and months later it
would be adopted into the constitution, thus solidifying its position as the
preferred term in Taiwan’s legal discourse\textsuperscript{86}.

Prior to 1996, the government recognized tribal rights on a group-to-
group basis, and the KMT governments’ policy still only recognized nine official
Taiwanese aboriginal tribes, dating back from the Japanese colonial
administration’s rule\textsuperscript{87}. However, this would change in 1996. The growing
activism and consciousness surrounding indigenous rights issues at this time
would pave the way for the founding of the Council of Indigenous Peoples
(CIP)\textsuperscript{88}. The CIP is a ministerial body under the Executive Yuan (executive
branch) in Taiwan’s government. The founding of the CIP has helped centralize
and collectivize the struggle to for indigenous rights, but it also continues to be
subservient to - and have its officials appointed by - Taiwan’s national
government. However, it has played a major role in expanding indigenous rights

\textsuperscript{86} Stainton, Michael A. “The Politics of Aboriginal Origins.” *Taiwan: A New
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid. 40.
\textsuperscript{88} The council was originally named the Council of Aboriginal Affairs, but in 2002
the name changed to the Council of Indigenous Peoples (CIP).
and the number of minority groups that have access to them, from nine in 1996 to sixteen today\(^89\).

Indigenous activists’ push towards the right to self-identify also resulted in the Indigenous Peoples Status Act (IPSA) being established in 2001. The IPSA granted the right for individuals to reclaim indigenous status if it had been taken away through marriage or adoption\(^90\). However, the most far-reaching advance in indigenous legislation would come in January of 2005 with the signing of Indigenous Peoples Basic Law (IPBL). The IPBL “sets out the aspirations for indigenous rights in areas including land and resources, education, media, employment and political autonomy” (Blundall 462). The effectiveness of this law, however, remains in question, as it has only been able to pass a few pieces of legislation and the process to pass legislation remains slow. However, this remains as the furthest reaching and most prominent piece of legislation regarding contemporary indigenous rights in Taiwan.

I give this brief history of the contemporary indigenous rights struggle in Taiwan not so much because indigenous rights laws have proved particularly effective in the anti-hotel development movement, but rather because almost all of the activists I got to know through ‘Oppose Miramar’ grew up in, and were strongly influenced by, this generation of indigenous activism. Many of them


Twelve minority groups (Babuza, Basay, Hoanya, Ketagalan, Luilang, Makatao, Pazeh/Kaxabu, Papora, Qauquat, Siraya, Taokas, Trobiawan) continue to be unrecognized by the Taiwan central government.

played very prominent roles in the ATA and the beginnings of the indigenous rights movement. Moreover, in the protest I attended (see below), and from what I gathered about the protests in the past, it was important that the struggle was represented as an inherently indigenous one. However, while the IPBL should provide viable legal means to combat Miramar and Shanyuan Villas’ openings (indigenous rights claims have been made about both properties) on indigenous rights grounds, thus far activists have only been able to make headway through relying on environmental legislation. This helps further demonstrate that while indigenous rights have progressed in the last few decades, significant room remains for improvement. With this background in some of the key events in Taiwan’s contemporary indigenous rights discourse, I want to pivot to the more specific details surrounding the construction of the Miramar Hotel Resort and the opposition movement it inspired.
This is the front side of the Miramar and a portion of Shanyuan beach. (I took this photograph.)
In 2004, Taitung County gave a fifty-year Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) contract to the Miramar Resort Hotel Company - a subsidiary of the Durban Development group based out of Taipei91 - for the land where Miramar now stands. Before the deal, the Taitung County government controlled the land and leased out stalls to local vendors92. As I described in the introduction, Lin Shuling was a proprietor of one of the stalls, and she and the other vendors were evicted from their businesses to make way for the construction of Miramar93. The fact that this was a BOT contract is important because it means that Taitung County officials decided to make a deal to give private access and rights to Miramar developers on public land. The fact that this the county government owned and controlled the land, and this fifty-year BOT contract that they awarded to Miramar Resort would allow developers to build and operate a hotel on a fifty-year lease, after which the property would be given back to the Taitung county government94.

At the time, Taiwan’s Environmental Protection Administration (EPA) required that any structure built on the coastline that would take up more than one hectare would have to undergo an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA),

92 Ibid.
93 Ibid.
to ensure that it could be built in a way that wouldn’t harm the environment. This is where the collusion between the Taitung County government and the hotel’s developers gets murky. In 2005, the county government allowed developers to divide the Shanyuan beach into different plots of land, each one slightly smaller than one hectare. Construction started shortly thereafter on all of the separate plots without first undergoing EIA’s. But the plots of land are all right next to each other, and the total area, not divvied up, where construction started consists of about six hectares of land. This means that Miramar Hotel Resort Co, through segmenting off the land, was able to begin construction on a structure six times larger than would normally be allowed without first passing an EIA. This blatant disregard for the law caught the attention of environmental and indigenous rights activists who pressured the County government to conduct EIA’s.

In 2006, four EIA’s were conducted and Miramar failed all of them. During this time, however, the Taitung County government continued issuing permits and licenses to Miramar so that construction on the hotel could smoothly continue. In July of 2007, the EPA ruled that the construction had to be
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98 Chen, Timothy. "Imaginative Geographies and State Reliance: Examining Taiwan’s Shanyuan Bay and Miramar Resort." *University of Oregon*(2016)
halted until Miramar passed an EIA\textsuperscript{99}. When Miramar failed four EIA’s, construction theoretically should have stopped. But it was up to the same local authorities that brokered the initial deal with developers to stop the construction\textsuperscript{100}. Instead, the county government rather than stopping construction, continued to issue building permits to the developers. It is important to remember that the EPA is a branch of Taiwan’s central government headquartered in Taipei. They were only forced to make this ruling because county officials were unlawfully allowing Miramar to continue building. Around this time, environmental groups also won a lawsuit stipulating that Miramar was illegally built because developers should have never been given building permits without passing an EIA. Miramar appealed this lawsuit, bringing it to Taiwan’s Supreme Court. In early 2008, Taiwan’s Supreme Court ruled in favor of the activists and forced construction to halt on Miramar\textsuperscript{101}. However, several months later, a fifth EIA was conducted to determine Miramar’s assess environmental impact. But this time Miramar passed, and construction on the hotel once again resumed.

To see how this happened it is important to understand how the EIA works. In Taiwan EIA’s are carried out by councils of local experts appointed by county governments, who determine whether construction could happen in a way that wouldn’t be detrimental to the surrounding environment.. EIA’s are

\footnotesize


supposed to be carried out before construction starts so that, if approved, the
classification would adhere the environmentally friendly plans set forth in the
proposal. In this case, construction had already started, so Miramar failing the
initial EIA’s meant that the construction was potentially already violating
Taiwan’s environmental standards and could be continuing to do so. Moreover,
activists claim that in the time between the four EIA’s that failed and the fifth EIA
that passed, people more friendly to the development of Miramar replaced
members on the EIA council who voted against the project. Due to this
supposed manipulation of the EIA Council, another lawsuit was filed in 2008 to
dispute the legitimacy of the new EIA. A High Court ruled against the hotel but
the case was appealed, again, to the Supreme Court. Construction on the hotel
meanwhile continued and a ruling wouldn’t be finalized until 2012.

In the meantime, activism around halting the construction of the project
started to grow and attract national attention. In the summer of 2011, hundreds
of activists participated in a month-long series of protests on the beach in front
of the Miramar Resort. The protests included sit-ins, speeches, concerts, and
performing traditional ceremonies. The owner of the hostel I worked at,
Dakanow, performed at many of these events, and many of the people who I got
to know in Dulan also participated. In October of 2011, the movement garnered
national attention when a group of popular artists gave a news conference in
Taipei where they presented the Taiwanese government with a petition
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condemning the actions of Miramar Hotel Co and calling on them to tear the structure down.

On January 19th, 2012, the Supreme Court ruled against the hotel, declaring an immediate end to all construction and business activities at the hotel. To quote a newspaper article from after the ruling, “The court found the review flawed because five out of the 15 members on the environmental impact assessment committee organized by the county government were government officials, including then county chief Kuang Li-chen and her deputy Peng Teh-cheng”\(^\text{104}\). This ruling provided tangible evidence of the county government collusion in trying to hasten the EIA process and open the hotel.

In 2012, for a third time, developers and the Taitung County government scrambled to put together an EIA. But by this point protesters knew just how flawed this process had been in the past, and their protests had grown and organized into a fully-fledged opposition movement. On June 2\(^\text{nd}\), 2012, hotel developers and County officials attempted to meet to conduct a new EIA, but protestors disrupting the meeting made it impossible. That summer also marked a high point in activism organized against the project. In late June, protesters built a traditional Amis fishing structure called a ‘Taluan’ as a material and symbolic gesture in reclaiming the land. In July, hundreds of protestors took part in a week-long camp-in that took place on the beach outside of Miramar. The

week ended with an all-night long rally filled with speeches and performances. Over 1,000 people attended the demonstration. 

At this point, the tide definitely seemed to be turning in favor of the ‘Oppose Miramar’ activists. In September of that year the head of Taiwan’s EPA even said that he “support(ed) tearing (Miramar) down”, in response to the Supreme Administrative Courts ruling that the previous EIA was invalid. In November, over 600 Taiwanese academics signed a petition calling for the hotel to be torn down. Activists also targeted some of Miramar Hotel Company’s other properties in Taiwan and staged protests at them. However, in December of that year (2012) developers managed to arrange a meeting on the 22nd to vote on a new EIA. With hundreds of protesters standing outside, the eight member committee unanimously approved the EIA and construction once again resumed. At this point, the construction was in its final stages and the structure of the hotel neared completion. Miramar Hotel Co announced a soft opening to take place in the summer of 2013.

In March of 2013, protesters organized a march from the Miramar resort to Taipei (over 200 miles) in yet another demonstration against the hotel. The
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107 A significant number of pro-Miramar Hotel demonstrators were also in attendance.
108 The EIA committee is generally fifteen members. But the seven members of the committee who were appointed specifically as environmental experts did not attend the meeting.
march took seventeen days and culminated in one of the largest indigenous protests in contemporary Taiwanese history\textsuperscript{110}. Several thousand protestors, many dressed in their indigenous garb, marched through Taipei’s streets chanting slogans such as, “tear down Miramar, protect the Eastern coastline”\textsuperscript{111}. The protest ended in front of the President’s office where demonstrators performed an Amis dance ritual\textsuperscript{112}. The people who I talked to that participated in the march spoke of it very fondly. They felt extremely encouraged by the support they received as they passed through each village on their way to Taipei. However, while this march marked a spiritual high for many of the protesters, the courts would once again determine Miramar’s fate.

In October of 2013, the Supreme Administrative Court ruled that the company needed to halt all construction and commercial activity at Miramar\textsuperscript{113}. This lawsuit, however, was a provisional disposition meaning that it only asked for Miramar not to continue building or start commercial operations while the validity of the previous EIA was still in question\textsuperscript{114}. The EIA remained in question because another lawsuit has been underway determining whether the previous EPA should be revoked. In September of 2015, a High Court ruled that


Taitung County must revoke the EIA. Taitung County appealed this decision to the Supreme Administrative Court. On April 1st 2016, the Supreme Court upheld the ruling to revoke Miramar’s EIA\textsuperscript{115} and this ruling cannot be overturned. Miramar seems to have run out of options and all signs point towards the hotel closing forever, and possibly being torn down.

Currently, Miramar stands on Shanyuan Beach almost completely built, but out of operation. Though it looks like the hotel will not open, the stakes remain high for the developers and for the Taitung County government due to the amount of money that has been invested into the project over the last dozen or so years. Miramar Resort Hotel Co allegedly invested the equivalent of roughly thirty million USD into the hotel\textsuperscript{116}. Moreover, if the Supreme Court rules that the last EIA was unlawfully attained and needs to be revoked, then the Taitung County government may be in danger of a lawsuit from Miramar. The argument of the lawsuit would be that since the Taitung County approved an unlawful EIA, they should then be accountable for the money spent on the project. Hsu Ching recently told me that the next step for ‘Oppose Miramar’ activists is similarly unclear. As shown in the protest poster a few pages ago, a common goal among the activists is to have the structure completely torn down. However, I also heard sentiments in the community that some people opposed to the hotel thought that they should just leave the hotel abandoned and let nature take its course.


One day, I went to Miramar to look around the site. When I started approaching one of the empty pools, a man with a walkie-talkie appeared in one of the windows a few stories up. I saw him speak into it, and a few minutes later a security guard came to escort me off the property. That day was no different than any other last summer, in that there were no events or decisions planned in regards to the hotel. To me this seemed to indicate that the hotel’s developers still seem to be holding out hope, and perhaps working towards, the possibility that the hotel might one day open. It’s also entirely possible that they might be trying to cut their losses and run. As of a week ago, I ended this section by saying that “all anyone can do with regards to the future of Miramar is speculate”. But after the Supreme Court ruling a few days ago this no longer seems to be the case. It seems that the activists have won and Miramar will never be allowed to open for business. However, a recent *Taipei Times* editorial warns that, “If there is one thing opponents of the beachfront development have learned over the course of the more than decade-long fight to stop the hotel, it is not to rush to celebrate apparent victories.”117 This article refers to the fact that, “the east coast is still threatened by oversized tourism development. Four hotel projects on the county’s coasts are under review, and another project has begun construction”. In other words, activists may have won the battle over Miramar, but the war against mass hotel development is not over.

---

The Struggle Continues

Oppose Miramar’s greatest success may prove that the struggle over the hotel has slowed the onslaught of tourist development on beaches up and down the coast. In the first chapter I demonstrated that the Mainland group tourist industry has grown at an extremely fast pace in Taiwan in the last several years and this growth shows no signs of slowing down. This means that Taiwan’s eastern coastline remains valuable to developers hoping to profit from the tourist industry. Last summer, I witnessed firsthand how activists are reacting to development in the region. Many of the people that lived in my area - who had taken part in ‘Oppose Miramar’ – were now organizing around stopping a separate hotel project planned to be built not far from the location of where Miramar now stands. Here, I present a vignette of my experience at a meeting that was called to prepare for a protest against this new hotel. In this section, I want to bring up some of the complications that arose during the meeting, and what this reflects about the movement and its impact in the region.

Protest Meeting

“When is the meeting starting”, I eagerly asked my boss Homi of The Good Nest Hostel. She laughed, and replied, “You should understand, there is American time, there is Taiwanese time, and then there is Dulan time”. Everyone around the table broke out in laughter.

My excitement at attending this meeting resulted from the fact that an emergency meeting had been called for that night among the ‘Oppose Miramar’
activists to prepare for a protest in Taipei that would take place two days later. Though I knew many of the activists, the summer that I was there had been a fairly dormant period for ‘Oppose Miramar’ activism because they were waiting on court decisions. So this emergency meeting would be the first and only time that I was present while they were all together in a political context.

That night, the sun was setting over the mountains above us as people filed in through the gates of The Good Nest. Each arrival was met with a warm welcome and a beer as they got off their scooters, or out of cars, and took their seats around the two main dining tables of the Good Nest hostel. In between fulfilling my duties as a worker and getting up to fill people’s glasses, I sat down and chatted with some of the activists. After about 20 people had arrived, Hsu Ching got up to give a PowerPoint presentation onto a wall in front of us, who were all seated around two large wooden tables in The Good Nests’ dining area.

She told us that developers purchased the land behind Miramar and were attempting to start construction on a new hotel called the Shanyuan Palms Holiday Villas. At 550 rooms, this new hotel was planned to exceed even the size of Miramar Resort, and many felt that it was being built primarily to serve tour groups from Mainland China. Members of the ‘Oppose Miramar’ movement had gotten word that a meeting was scheduled at the EPA – in two days – to determine whether developers could break ground on the project. She said that unlike Miramar, which was originally public land, Shanyuan Villas privately owned the land. Moreover, an EIA had been approved to build a hotel on the land over a decade ago. This meant that to resist the construction of Shanyuan Villas;
they would need to fight the developers on different legal grounds. Luckily, a new Coastal Zone Management Act had recently passed through Taiwan’s central Legislative Yuan\textsuperscript{118}, which enforced much stricter restrictions for new buildings on Taiwan’s coastlines. In the coastal areas that this new act protected, public infrastructure and coastal management agencies would be the only buildings allowed. This act would likely protect the area

Though the Coastal Zone Management Act passed through courts in February, it wouldn’t be implemented until later that summer. Hsu Ching said that in two days a meeting was set up at the EPA to decide if Shanyuan Villas could start with its construction. Under the old laws, Shanyuan Villas would most likely be allowed to go through with building the hotel. But under the new legislation, its fate would be much less certain. This is where Hsu Ching said that the developers’ behavior was particularly “revolting”. Hsu Ching argued that this meeting at the EPA was set up in two days so that a decision could be made on the hotel before the implementation of the new coastal protection act. It was up to us, she argued, to go and disrupt the meeting and demand that any decision on the hotel’s future be postponed until after the new environmental regulations were implemented.

People were drinking beer and cracking jokes throughout, though not in a way that detracted from what they were trying to accomplish. The meeting felt like a very comfortable and practiced routine. After all, many of the activists in

\footnote{118 I heard that the Oppose Miramar activism might have played a role in the crafting of this legislation and implementation of this new act. So this act may, in part, have been a product of the hours of activism members seated at the table had put-in over the years.}
attendance had been organizing against Miramar for the last several years, and
had been friends for much longer.

At the end of the evening, Hsu Ching asked us to come up with slogans for
the protest, which would both be written down on posters and loudly chanted
outside the EPA. “The shit (from the tourists) will be higher than the mountain
(the hotel) is built on!” someone shouted and everyone laughed. “And (the
tourists’) pee will be deeper than the sea!” someone responded, which made
people laugh even harder. The other slogans were less crude. One was simply,
“Why don't you ask the land's indigenous people first?”. Hsu Ching wrote out
all of the slogans on a large chalkboard at the head of the tables and asked us to
vote on each of them. “The shit will be higher than the mountain it’s built on”
passed, as did “why don’t you ask the indigenous people first”. At the end of
this, however, someone brought up the idea that all of the slogans should be
translated into Amis language because this was an indigenous rights issue.
Taking this even further, someone else said that all of the agreed upon slogans
should be scrapped in favor of new slogans written in Amis language, which
would then translated into Mandarin. After discussing this for a few minutes, the
group decided that though they agreed with the sentiment, ultimately the
logistics of making new Amis slogans and translating them to Mandarin would
be too time-intensive of a process.

119 This sentence sounds much smoother in Chinese.
120 The man who proposed this statement explained that this statement brings
up very real concerns about how a hotel with 550 rooms would deal with basic
systems like trash and sanitation in an environmentally friendly way.
At seven am on the morning of the protest, roughly a dozen of us met at the Taitung City train station. Homi was there, so was her husband Dakanaw, a silver-haired folk singer who has been a prominent voice in the indigenous rights movement since its inception. Hsu Ching also met us along with several other singers, artists, and community leaders who had been involved with the ‘Oppose Miramar’ movement. Before we got on the train, someone mentioned that we were lucky to even get tickets because Mainland Chinese tour groups have been buying up seats on these trains.

We arrived at Taipei Main Station around 11:30 and stopped for a quick lunch at a favorite restaurant nearby. We then made the twenty or so minute walk over to the headquarters of the EPA with our bags and protest posters in hand. When we arrived, there were already dozens of people - mostly environmental activists from Taipei and Hualian - setting up for the protest, along with some cameramen and reporters from Taipei media outlets preparing to report on the event. Shortly after we arrived, the protest swung into full gear.

With the EPA as a backdrop, and one of Taipei’s main boulevards barricading the crowd on the other side, the protestors and media formed a circular shape. On one side of the semi-circle, the protesters stood with their backs to the EPA, holding up signs and shouting chants. The group I traveled to Taipei with - many of them now changed into traditional Amis clothing - held posters with the slogans that they came up with a few nights ago at the hostel. Various Taiwanese environmental and political groups were also represented. The other side of the semi-circle was made up of members of the media, who the
protesters each thanked for their presence before giving speeches. After an hour or so of speeches, chanting, and performances, one of the lead organizers announced that the committee deciding on the future of Shanyuan Villas asked to meet several of the protests’ leaders and have a discussion. The pressure from the protest seemed to have infiltrated the meeting. Several members of the group went in, including Dakanaw, and about forty-five minutes later they emerged with a verdict: the meeting would be postponed until after the Coastal Management Zone Act’s implementation. The crowd broke out in cheers. To celebrate Nabu and Bannai – two folk singers who travelled with us – led a crowd of people in a traditional ceremony native to indigenous groups in Southeastern Taiwan. They gathered some straw and wood, placed it in a large metal bin in the center of a circle, and lit it on fire. They then led a line of several dozen people dancing in a circular progression around the bin. Smoke from the bin and chants of Ho-hai-yan rose above Taipei’s busy streets seeming to provide, at the very least, a momentary disruption in the development plans of those sitting in the offices above.

Complications of Oppose Miramar Activism and Envisioning Futures in Southeastern Taiwan

The Chinese word for development is 發展 (fazhan). And when I talked to anyone in Dulan, or its surrounding areas, who supported the opening of Miramar Resort Co, I would always hear this word fazhan given as a defense. I commonly heard phrases like, “The hotel will be good for fazhan” and, “this is a
poor area that needs *fazhan*. Through researching Miramar and Shanyuan Villas it became clear that hotel developers and the Taitung County government colluded to build these hotels in ways that were highly deceptive and illegal (shown above). The ‘Oppose Miramar’ movement worked very hard to exploit the unlawful shortcuts hotel developers attempted to make. While Miramar Resort and Shanyuan Villas projects have both been stalled due to efforts from opposition, the force that compelled their construction - namely the growth of Mainland Chinese tourism in Taiwan - remain stronger than ever. Therefore, the potential for hotels like them to be built on Taiwan’s eastern coastline also remains high. However, it became clear in my time spent with the ‘Oppose Miramar’ activists, that they sought to not only to police the missteps made by these developers, but, in a greater sense, block major development projects in the region in general. In this section, I want to explore ‘Oppose Miramar’s’ relationship with the logic of *fazhan* (development). I am interested in the extent to which ‘Oppose Miramar’ offers an alternative to development rather than a development alternative: does the movement articulate a means for the Dulan community to achieve greater autonomy and move forward as a whole, or does the movement merely privilege a different form of tourist-industry growth? In the end, I consider the case of indigenous tourism in Smangus and see how lessons from that community may or may not be applicable to the Dulan area.

Speaking to the context, in *Development*, Gustavo Esteva discusses the invention and power of the word development. He writes that, “there is nothing in modern mentality comparable to (development) as a force guiding thought
and behavior” (Esteva 8). This power of development is drawn from constructing the binaries of ‘developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’, where the values of a minority become the standards through which the rest of the world is compared. Esteva traces the invention of development to a speech made by US president Harry Truman in the late 1940’s. Truman argued that the US has the moral responsibility to launch a program of development for the world’s two billion underprivileged people. Esteva, saw this differently than Truman, and argues that on the day that Truman made the speech:

“two billion people became underdeveloped. In a real sense, from that time on, they ceased being what they were, in all their diversity, and were transmogrified into an inverted mirror of others’ reality. A mirror that belittles them and sends them off to the end of the queue, a mirror that defines their identity, which is really that of a heterogeneous and diverse majority, simply in the terms of a homogenizing and narrow minority.” (Esteva 8)

This concept of development is the logic that drives the construction of development projects like Miramar. Southeastern Taiwan is established as a region that is not yet in its fully-fledged form, and Miramar’s presence would be inherently beneficial to the region through bringing progress and modernity. The promises of development are strong, in that development endeavors to bring the rest of the world into the sphere of wealthy, industrialized societies. The logic of development also imposes the problems (a lack of jobs), and therefore the solutions (a tourist industry), for a given population (in this case communities along Taiwan’s southeastern coastline). Esteva’s book is a ‘call for political action’. He presses us to “confine the economy to its proper place, a marginal one. As the margins have done” (Esteva 22). He pleads the reader to,
“celebrate the appearance of new commons, creatively opened by common men and women after the failure of the developers' strategies to transform traditional men and women into economic men. These new commons are living proof of the ability and ingenuity of common people to react with sociological imagination, following their own path, within hostile environments” (Esteva 22).

Here, Esteva pushes us to envision new possibilities and forms of communal living as a means to combat inherently problematic structures of development. Esteva’s call to create new commons, in the face of ‘developers’ strategies’ is what initially drew me to the Oppose Miramar movement. In many ways, my experiences with members of the movement confirmed that Oppose Miramar was about far more than just ensuring developers stick to environmental code. Oppose Miramar provided a platform for supporters to create new commons and envision different possibilities for the region. The Good Nest hostel is a good example of this. While paying guests helped support The Good Nest hostel, its business activities often seemed secondary to providing a space for artists to perform and display their work, Oppose Miramar to conduct political action meetings, and giving visitors a free place to sleep and shower if they needed it. While I don’t want to overstate The Good Nests’ position as some sort of revolutionary model, the logic of its business practices runs directly antithetical to the profit making development model of a hotel like Miramar.

Moreover, the degree to which ‘Oppose Miramar’ inspired new ways of political thinking and processes cannot be understated. In an interview about ‘Oppose Miramar”, Shu-Ling said, “In the village, we didn’t know anything about protesting. But we learned as we participated in meetings and events held by the
environmentalists. Then artists from Taitung City joined this cause. From them, we learned how to make banners and use words and images to communicate our message. We learned how to give speeches and hold talks at schools and social organizations” (Smith - Cultural Survival). The meeting I attended seemed to show that the movement not only created a string of protests, but also formed a community who was well practiced in resistance, horizontal decision-making, and exploring new commons.

However, Oppose Miramar definitely wasn’t universally supported in the community amongst the various groups of people living in Dulan. Though, in general, I got the impression that the Pro-Miramar side consisted of more Han Taiwanese and the Anti-Miramar side consisted of more indigenous residents, Divisions in regards to the issue even ran deep amongst the local indigenous community. In a sense, this isn’t entirely surprising. Southeastern Taiwan is a fairly poor area in comparison to other parts of Taiwan. The hotel would have provided much sought after job opportunities, and, as stated earlier, the power of the development discourse cannot be underestimated.

Members of the ‘Oppose Miramar’ movement definitely felt the anxieties of not having full communal support. In the protest meeting, when someone brought up the challenge that the slogans should first be written in Amis and then translated into Chinese, he seemed to be alluding to a desire to have more universal support from the local Amis community. Perhaps part of the problem is that Oppose Miramar seemed to articulate more of a different means to develop, rather than presenting something else entirely. To understand some of
Oppose Miramar’s shortcomings, it is important to understand the context of the Dulan community. While Miramar Resort, and these other hotels have yet to open, Dulan Village is still highly dependent on the tourism industry. Many of the members involved with Oppose Miramar owned hostels or sold their art to visiting tourists, or worked with tourists in some way. The people involved with the activism seemed to be, in general, fairly financially secure and had the means to profit from the tourism industry in some way. In my discussions with many of the activists, they told me that while they opposed the construction of these hotels, they did support sustainable tourist-oriented development in the form of small shops and hostels. A protester was quoted in an article saying, “We want development here in Taitung, but we want it to be sustainable”. To members of the community who would benefit from the hotel’s opening (i.e. jobs at the hotel, more tourist money in the region), the differences between the backpacker tourism development, which some people already profit off of, and mass tourism development, that the hotel would serve, might not seem as significant. This is just to say that it is very different for members of the community with steady incomes to fight against a hotel like Miramar, than it is for people who would struggle to find work if the hotel doesn’t open.

Moreover, as I stated in the introduction, foreigners and outsiders from different areas in Taiwan control much of Dulan’s backpacker-tourist industry. In discussions with people around Dulan, it was clear that this industry – with its growing number of surf hostels, bars, loud/drunken foreigners – has not always been an entirely positive presence in the community. And many of the people
who run small-businesses catering to backpackers were also active participants in the Oppose Miramar movement. Towards the end of my time in Dulan, it became clear that while I supported the Oppose Miramar movement, this did not mean that I supported the backpacker industry as its natural alternative. It seemed hypocritical to be advocating against a certain form of tourist-oriented development (mass tourism), while supporting another form of tourism (backpacker) that perpetuated inequalities and occupied space in problematic ways.

This pushed me to consider that perhaps in order for Oppose Miramar to make a more widespread, collective push against the onslaught of mass tourism, new directions for how the entire community deals with and profits from the tourist industry could be explored and pursued. Merely opening new hostels doesn’t seem to be the answer in creating ‘new commons’ and combatting the forces of development that Esteva describes. However, there do seem to be ways in which the Dulan area can accept Mainland Chinese tourists, and other visitors, that will be beneficial to the community as a whole, rather than to just a few members. A village just a few hundred miles away from Dulan provides an interesting example of what that might look like.

High in the mountains of north-central Taiwan sits a village called Smangus, home to several hundred indigenous Atayal people. For much of its history, Smangus was too remote for most tourists to reach. But until 1995 county government renovated the road leading to the village and made it
accessible to motor vehicles\textsuperscript{121}. At this time, Smangus started accepting tourists but by the early 2000’s competition over profits and interest from outside developers, pushed several families to realize that their autonomy and land might be at risk if they didn’t collectivize\textsuperscript{122}. The families formed a cooperative, called the Smangus Tribal Labor Co-op, wherein the work and profits in taking on tourists - roughly 55,000 in 2015 - are shared\textsuperscript{123}. They also abide by more collective decision-making processes, based primarily in their traditional Atayal collective social structures. Smangus is not without its problems\textsuperscript{124} but some observers have described it as a model for hosting tourists\textsuperscript{125}.

The differences between Smangus and Dulan, along with other villages on Taiwan’s southeast coast, should not be discounted. Smangus is a much smaller, more remote, and more homogenous community than Dulan, or the other villages popular to tourists on Taiwan’s southeast coast. However, Smangus does provide an interesting example of how an indigenous community in Taiwan has taken autonomous control of accepting and dealing with tourists. Smangus has developed a system of dealing with tourists almost exclusively on their own


terms, and for the most part, seems to be putting tourism profits back into the community. As of 2015, The Smangus Tribal Labor Co-op employed forty-seven community members full-time and used its tourism profits to support welfare programs and education for the community. The co-op also strongly emphasizes that tourists learn as much as they can about the Smangus community and the importance of cultural and environmental preservation. In an effort to reduce the tourists' environmental impact, in June of 2015 the co-op even decided to cut the maximum number of tourists allowed to visit each day from 500 to 250126.

While the differences between Smangus and predominantly indigenous villages like Dulan cannot be understated, some of the lessons from Smangus – in terms of creating more collectively owned, autonomous tourism structures – can be applied elsewhere. Moreover, it seems like a push towards this kind of tourism may already be underway. While I was in Taiwan, many of the ‘Oppose Miramar’ activists campaigned for Mayaw Biho, a candidate for Taiwan’s Council of Indigenous Peoples. In his campaign, Biho, a former documentary filmmaker, emphasizes Smangus as a model127 for how indigenous villages across Taiwan can accept tourists while practicing cultural preservation, promoting indigenous autonomy, and putting tourist money towards communal use.

While Biho’s election may only be a small step in achieving more indigenous autonomy over the tourist industry, and it’s difficult to tell how much he would be able to accomplish if elected, the support he has amongst Oppose

Miramar activists signals that tourism to Taiwan’s predominantly indigenous communities might be moving in the direction of more communally oriented and autonomously controlled tourism structures. Oppose Miramar paved significant groundwork in resisting the onslaught of the Mainland Chinese tourist industry. However, continuing to resist the interests of outside developers might necessitate a more comprehensive restructuring of the tourist industries in Dulan and the surrounding communities. While communities along this coast might not have a choice in whether or not tourists visit, they can control the structures that support them. While Oppose Miramar has been fairly successful in stopping hotel development, it is difficult to tell how much these successes will translate into the future, as developers find more sophisticated ways of navigating Taiwan’s environmental laws. Rather than just trying to block the construction of these hotels, perhaps alternatives to the structures of the current tourist industry operates need to be seriously considered. As a start, the power over how Taiwan’s eastern coastal communities accept tourists should be given back to the communities themselves.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I first traced the evolution of the indigenous rights movement in Taiwan. I showed that while the movement has come along away since Taiwan’s initial democratization in the 1980’s, significant room for improvement remains before Taiwan’s indigenous people can depend on legislation to adequately defend their rights. While legislation regarding
indigenous rights might still be in some ways limited, the generation of activists who helped bring indigenous issues to the forefront of Taiwanese politics in the 1990’s and 2000’s continue to play a major role in the anti-hotel development movement that is taking place along Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline. I bring up the history of Taiwan’s burgeoning indigenous rights movement because, on the one hand, this generation of activism paved the way for Oppose Miramar – and the broader struggle against mass tourism development and also to demonstrate that even the most modern, farthest-reaching pieces of indigenous legislation have proved ineffective in combatting tourist oriented development of indigenous Taiwanese land. From here, I transition to a comprehensive history of the Oppose Miramar movement, which includes the significant legal decisions, as well as the important moments of Oppose Miramar activism, surrounding the case. From these experiences, I attempted to both extract some of the possibilities the movement presents and examine some of the challenges it faces. I argued that while the Oppose Miramar movement has played a major role in slowing the mass tourist-oriented development on Taiwan’s southeastern coastline, the work for activists might just be beginning. I exemplify the ongoing nature of this struggle with a vignette of my experiences at a protest meeting, and subsequent protest, which was committed to resisting the construction of a massive hotel complex which is planned to be built in Miramar’s immediate proximity. This, along with the analysis of the rise of Mainland Chinese tourism I presented in chapter one, led me to conclude that land on Taiwan’s southeastern coastline is becoming more valuable than ever. Moreover, evidence suggests that
dozens of other projects are currently being planned for construction along this coastline\textsuperscript{128}. In the end, I showed that though Taiwan’s tourist industry isn’t going away any time soon, there might be some ways in which it can be alternatively dealt with. Smangus, with its collectivized, autonomous, profit sharing tourist structure, provides a model, albeit imperfect, for rethinking about how communities in Taiwan are able to handle tourists. I argue that, rather than defaulting to the sort of backpacker-hostel culture, Smangus’ strategies for handling tourists provide some of the most exciting and viable methods for collective resistance against mass tourism available. The rise of Mayaw Biho, a local hopeful politician, suggests that the struggle against mass tourist development could be developing into a broader collectivized struggle for indigenous autonomy over how tourism operates in this region.

“To hell with good intentions. This is a theological statement. You will not help anybody by your good intentions. There is an Irish saying that the road to hell is paved with good intentions; this sums up the same theological insight” – Ivan Illich, To Hell With Good Intentions

Conclusion

On one of my first nights staying at The Good Nest hostel, I seriously questioned my role in being there. It was a Friday, and like most other Fridays, The Good Nest was hosting an unplugged concert. Once the set ended, as dozens of guests and other attendees were milling around, I started talking to a man named Kuo. He looked to be in his late-thirties, and was from a region to the south of Dulan. He was well known in the area as a poet and storyteller; a local figure that many people respected. At one point, Kuo asked me what I was doing in Taiwan. I told him that I was working at the hostel for the summer and that I was also pursuing a research project in the area. He asked me what I studied. When I told him that I studied anthropology, he scoffed and said something along the lines of, “Anthropology?! I’ve met a lot of anthropologists in Taiwan. What have they ever contributed to us?”

I told him that I agreed that anthropologists in Taiwan hadn’t contributed much, but that I was not in Taiwan just to study the people or the culture. I told Kuo that I was there to study the Oppose Miramar protest movement and part of my goal with the project was to raise awareness in the US aware of the political struggles happening in Taiwan. As we talked, I tried to convey that I understood how anthropology doesn’t have a great historical track record but that I hoped my work would play a role in reversing anthropology’s colonial traditions. He
told me about some not so positive interactions he had with anthropologists in various places around Taiwan. He said that he often saw anthropologists at indigenous ceremonies around Taiwan, and while they didn’t actively detract from proceedings, it was strange how they would show up at these gatherings every few months and then disappear back to their universities.

Though it was brief, this interaction I had with Kuo stuck with me more than any other I had while conducting fieldwork. I was surprised both by the simplicity and directedness of his questions, and my quickness to argue for my own exceptionalism. Though I claimed to be different from the other anthropologists that Kuo had met, I had no idea what theories they had been using to support their research, nor was I convinced fully that what I was doing would generate anything positive for his community. Despite advances in anthropology to depart from its colonial origins, I worry that its traces seem inevitable, despite even the best intentions. And though I managed to respond to Kuo’s statement, I still felt a sort of gut uncertainty and uneasiness about the entire conversation. As I wrote this conclusion, the following questions echoed in the back of my mind: Who was I to justify the need for ethnographic work to someone who already, for seemingly good reason, didn’t trust anthropologists? What was I really contributing to the communities that I was studying? Was I so different than the anthropologists who came before me in Taiwan? What was I really doing there?

These questions hung in my mind throughout the summer that I conducted field research and into my writing process. Though I have spent a
great deal of time thinking through them, I do not want to pretend like I have these questions fully resolved. In this conclusion, I hope to give a more extended answer to some of the issues that Kuo raised. I hope to demonstrate that my research could be beneficial to discourses surrounding tourism, development, and activism in China and Taiwan. I moreover situate the issues discussed in this thesis into the broader dynamics of the potential futures of this region. In the end, I also evaluate my own complicated, possibly hypocritical, investment in conducting fieldwork in Taiwan and China and writing this thesis.

Before reflecting on some of the broader implications of my project, I want to recap some of the arguments that I made in each chapter. In the first chapter, I attempted to find a framework for considering the position of the Mainland Chinese tour group in Taiwan. I trace the history of the China’s central government policies that control and structure the ways in which Chinese tourism in Taiwan operates. I consider how mass tourism is a form of democratization, granting an emerging Chinese middle class the access and mobility to travel, and how this intersects with Pierre Bordieu’s ideas of taste and distinction. I draw from my own experiences on a bus tour in Mainland China to help get at the affective feel of this form of tourism. However, while this form of tourism can be at once considered a democratizing practice, I also demonstrate how China deploys mass tourism as an imperialistic endeavor. I explore Ian Rowen’s ruminations of how Chinese tourism is leading to the ‘territorialization’ of Taiwanese spaces.
In the second chapter, I closely examine a ‘territorialized’ tourist site in Taiwan and the material and ideological ways in which the site is constructed. Here, I consider how problematic depictions of indigeneity are produced and sold to tourists. I try to situate these depictions within the broader history of the indigenous people of Taiwan. I start with a story about the mythical George Psalamanzaar, to demonstrate the power of the orientalist narrative in Taiwan. Then, I am interested in how the contemporary tourist industry crafts indigeneity in order to justify the further tourist-oriented development of the region. I argue that these representations are being actualized a material ways; the tourist industry is utilizing and deploying the representations of indigenous people as a means to justify taking over spaces like the Miramar Hotel.

In the third chapter, I focus on the ongoing anti-hotel development struggle on Taiwan’s southeastern coastline. I start with a discussion of Taiwan’s indigenous rights movement and argue that the laws in Taiwan aren’t mature enough to properly protect indigenous claims. From there, I detail the history of the ‘Oppose Miramar’ movement. I outline my experiences with ‘Oppose Miramar’s’ community of activists while protesting the construction of a new hotel. I examine its various successes and drawbacks and illustrate why the future of hotel development in the region remains uncertain.

This thesis is divided into three very distinct chapter topics, and I realize that each one of these chapters could have been expanded out into their own separate projects. However, I chose to present these different perspectives on this subject because I sensed such a massive disconnect between various actors
that I interacted with over the course of my fieldwork. One of my goals of this project was to help bridge some of these understandings. In presenting contrasting perspectives from the tourists, the tourist sites, and anti-hotel activists, and exploring the theoretical and historical frameworks that shape them, I aimed to present a more holistic understanding of the issues facing this region. In short, I start with the tourists on the busses, and then move to the sites where the busses stop, and end with an activist community who has been actively resisting their influence. These are perspectives that - to varying degrees - have been studied independently. They haven't, however, really been examined as a whole. This thesis serves as an attempt to break down some of the ideological barriers and misunderstandings that persist between the structures and communities I studied. Through taking into account the various, disparate individual perspectives, and competing broader structural forces, at play in Taiwan’s Southeastern tourist industry, I hope that this thesis will help produce more holistic understandings of this region and promising pathways for new research.

At the center of this thesis is a struggle between developers and activists over a piece of beach property on Taiwan’s Southeastern coastline. My main argument is that this struggle is not just about this land, but rather that this site serves as a proxy for a range of competing interests in the region and how it plays out will be a major determining factor for the future of this region. On the one hand, I demonstrate that Mainland Chinese group tourism is a structure that is being strategically controlled and deployed by China’s central government as a
means for China to diminish Taiwanese autonomy. Even if Miramar doesn’t open – and recent news strongly suggests that it won’t\(^{129}\) – tourist oriented on Taiwan’s eastern coastline continues to threaten a ‘territorialization’ of Taiwanese land and increase China’s growing influence over Taiwan. Meanwhile, the struggle against hotel development potentially also represents a new moment in Taiwan’s indigenous and environmental movements. If the activism succeeds in continuing to block the development of these hotels, this could mark a new era for indigenous autonomy and activism in Taiwan. I have come to understand that neither of the two opposing forces, Mainland Chinese tourism nor the anti-hotel development activism, show any signs of stopping. The tourism from China to Taiwan seems like it will continue growing exponentially\(^{130}\), but at the same time, a community of activists in Taiwan seem ready to fight the infiltration of coastal tourist development each and every step of the way. Through this enterprise of mass tourism, Mainland China might slowly be chipping away at the sovereignty of Taiwan and the autonomy of its indigenous people, but residents of these communities will not allow these massive development projects to go unchallenged. The political organizing

\(^{129}\) On April 1\(^{\text{st}},\) 2016, Taiwan’s Supreme Court revoked Miramar’s Impact Assessment, which would allow them to continue construction. The court also closed off any options to appeal the case. Miramar’s prospects for opening are dimmer than they every have been. Chen, Wei-han. "Ecologists Cheer Miramar Ruling." Ecologists Cheer Miramar Ruling. Taipei Times, 02 Apr. 2016. Web. 07 Apr. 2016.

happening around these issues, at the very least, is prompting a reimagining of the future of Taiwan’s eastern coastline.

On a personal level, the process of writing this thesis has pushed me to reflect on the problematic ways in which foreigners, like me, occupy space in China and Taiwan. There are strong parallels between some of the issues that I study in this thesis (i.e. outsiders occupying space in problematic ways) and my own upbringing as an outsider being raised in a privileged Beijing community. In a very similar way to how the tourist industry displaces local residents in Taiwan, the ex-pat community in Beijing that I grew up in was built only after the forced displacement of entire villages. The school that I went to created an entire gated-community, “ex-pat” world surrounding it. Like Mainland Chinese tourists who might not consider the impact their presence has in Taiwan, the foreign ex-pat community never seemed seriously concerned with evaluating how their presence might be taking over space in objectionable ways. I also observed a number of parallels between how foreigners conduct themselves in China, with little thought towards how their actions might be inappropriate or objectionable\textsuperscript{131}, and how tourists act on these vacations to Taiwan\textsuperscript{132}. In


researching this thesis, I spent time with people who have been actively resisting the influence of outsiders. I think I was motivated to do this research, in part, because I was seeking a way to lift the veil on my own childhood; to understand structures that take up space in problematic ways in China, and see the ways in which people are fighting the influence of colonizing outside forces. Writing this thesis provided an indirect – but reflexively important - mechanism for me out to unpack and come to terms with my own complicated upbringing in China.

In examining the impact of Mainland Chinese tourism to Taiwan, I could at the same time try and remedy a cultural error that I directly participated in growing up in Beijing. I realize that my privileged upbringing in China makes my interest in this project inherently hypocritical. How could I, as a person who obliviously and problematically took up space in China, become an authority on how Chinese citizens shouldn't be doing so? That fact that I can never completely divorce myself from the politics of my upbringing means that this project, in a sense, was always going to be flawed endeavor. However, I hope that through thinking and writing about issues of displacement and resistance in China and Taiwan, I will have a more solid platform to explore conscientious and constructive ways of living if I choose to spend time in these countries going forward.

Before boarding my flight to leave Taiwan, I approached the customs counter to get my passport stamped. I handed my passport to the border agent. When he asked me about the purpose of my visit to Taiwan. I thought about it for a second and replied, “我就是旅客”, (“I'm just a tourist”).
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