Playing the Race Card in Japanese-Governed Taiwan
Or, Anthropometric Photographs as “Shape-Shifting Jokers”

Race is... a word and notion that functions as a kind of talisman filled with magic, a power recognized in the vernacular expression ‘playing the race card’ as a kind of shape-shifting joker that can take the place of any card that has a fixed, legible identity.
—W. J. T. Mitchell, Seeing through Race

A century before the Internet era, anthropometric photographs of an Atayal woman named Paazech Naheh (ca. 1880–ca. 1910) went viral. From 1903 through the 1920s, her image was propagated via several forms of mass media, including picture postcards, international exposition displays, magic lantern slides, photo albums, geography textbooks, and newspaper file photos. Her image most commonly appeared in the form of “race cards”—picture postcards that feature anthropometric photographs. Figure 3.1 is typical.

Race cards were much more than the exemplars of asymmetrical power relations, mimetic imperialism, and ruthless essentialism they appear to be at first sight. The evidence discussed below suggests that, in early twentieth-century Taiwan, race cards functioned as what W. J. T. Mitchell has described as “shape-shifting jokers.” Through the artifices of captioning, cropping, and framing, publishers created race cards that indeed dehumanized their subjects, as the literature on anthropometric photography and imperialism would predict. Nonetheless, the original photographs were not an attempt at dehumanization. They were made by ethnographers and tourism-industry photographers to counter the idea that Taiwan indigenous peoples were savages who could be killed off with impunity. The state may have had genocidal intentions, but these race cards proposed an alternative vision of the place of indigenous peoples within Japan’s first formal colony.

To recuperate the ambivalent nature of these contested artifacts by reexamining the conditions surrounding their production and reception is not to soft-pedal the brutality of Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan. A number of postcolonial “exposes” of anthropology and photography have failed to go much beyond asserting the abject nature of the men and women who sat for such photos and the nefarious intentions of their producers. Yet such studies have done little to mitigate the continuing revival and recirculation of race cards in Taiwan, Japan, and elsewhere. Why, despite over a century of concerted intellectual effort to debunk race as a form of pseudoscientific false consciousness and lay the invention and construction of race at the feet of discredited colonial regimes, does “race” refuse to die?

Writing in the 1990s about the history of American slavery, Ira Berlin observed that the now widely held theory that race is socially constructed has done little to change behavior. The reason for this, he believes, is that race “is not simply a social construction; it is a particular kind of social construction—a historical construction. Indeed, like other historical constructions—the most famous of course being class—it cannot exist outside of time and place.” This argument counters the notion that “race” is essentially a scientific, systematically articulated, top-down construct that can be treated as a formal system of knowledge embedded in the “history of ideas.” Following Edward Thompson’s formulation of class as “a fluency which evades analysis if we attempt to stop it dead at any given moment and atomize its structure,” Berlin notes that race is subjectively experienced by racializers and the racialized in the event of its historical emergence. In this view, it is much more than an externally imposed category.

While formally trained ethnologists had a role to play in the popularization, operationalization, and conceptualization of race in colonial Taiwan, they shared...
the field with consumers, officials, colonized subjects, and myriad stakeholders who contested, modified, imperfectly understood, or rejected their learned pronouncements. As “shape-shifting jokers,” race cards gave these contests over the meaning of race a material form. In particular, a single set of anthropometric photographs taken in early 1903 assumed pride of place out of the hundreds of photographs that were available to publishers during the Meiji and Taisho eras (1868–1926).

One major reason for the impact of the 1903 photographs was timing. As armed conflict between Taiwan indigenous peoples and the Japanese state-backed camphor industry escalated at century’s turn, a historical conjuncture thrust a particular set of images into the national and international limelight. The 1903 Osaka National Industrial Exposition and the Russo-Japanese War postcard boom bookended an alliance between Atayal headmen and Japanese expeditionary forces near Wulai in northern Taiwan. These two foundational moments in metropolitan mass culture provided the platforms for exhibit designers and publishers to render a handful of photographic encounters, orchestrated under the fluid political conditions of frontier diplomacy in Taiwan, into enduring and widely disseminated racial icons. The meanings attached to these photographs were varied and often contradictory but had everything to do with the historical emergence of racial categories and sentiments in Taiwan that persist to the present day. Thus, colonial Taiwan’s most iconic anthropometric photographs, whose authority rested on the assumption of their timelessness and placelessness, were the very pictures of timeliness.

To capture the complexity and tenacity of race in contemporary political life, W. J. T. Mitchell has urged us to conceptualize race as a “medium,” akin to a language game, rather than as an abstraction that might have a referent. For Mitchell, the medium of race provides the iconography and language for the expression of any theory, ideal, or argument that asserts the internal homogeneity and “group-ness” of particular “kinds” of human beings and their distinctiveness from similarly configured groups (races). The racial medium is a field wherein the deployment of race is often inflected with the familiar metaphor of species difference. But “race-talk and race-thinking” can also adopt the imagery and discourse of sexuality and gender to configure difference as “natural.”

Mitchell’s analysis is salient here because, as we shall see, photographer-anthropologists, publishers, propagandists, and merchants rarely portrayed Taiwanese racial difference in strict, Linnaean terms or even in logically consistent language or iconography. Rather, race was the thread or mediating category that conjoined a mix of ethnonyms, slurs, stereotypes, and ideals into a language of difference and hierarchy.

Any analysis of race making in Japanese-governed Taiwan must make a clear distinction between racism and race. For Mitchell, racism is “what hurts.” It is the practice of discrimination, genocide, exclusion, isolation, or segregation implemented against a race. Indeed, Qing period resource wars (1700s–1895) along the frontier of the Han settlement on Taiwan produced a virulent racism whose institutionalization provided the terminology and raw materials for Japanese race scientists to contend with in the Meiji period and beyond.” That is to say, the use of imported foreign ideas involving somatological or linguistic criteria for racial classification did not produce racism in Taiwan but provided a new language game, or medium, for framing policy options that could exacerbate or mitigate preexisting forms of racism. The curious history of Paazeh’s portrait supports Mitchell’s contention that “race is the ambiguous medicine/poison, the pharmakon, for inflicting or alleviating the pain caused by racism.”

The formalistic, scientific model of race focuses our attention on the imperial centers where such discourses are distilled and attain their institutional inertia. To understand the genesis, meaning, and staying power of race cards in Taiwan, we must not only ask what men like Gotô Shinpei hoped to achieve by endorsing abstract notions of hierarchy and order but also identify and locate the dispersed interests, mechanisms, and micropolitical arrangements that allowed the medium of race to proliferate and sustain itself across vast social fields. One particular anthropometric portrait taken in 1903 went viral and has maintained its historical momentum to this day precisely because it accommodated multiple constituencies at the “capillary” extremities of power. That is to say, Paazeh’s photo recommended itself to commercially, academically, and officially inclined image makers for a number of reasons irrespective of the photographer’s original purposes. At the same time, its physical form as a high-resolution, large-format photo lent itself to serial reproduction by parties separated by several degrees from the photograph’s point of origin. In short, Paazeh’s anthropometric portrait took on a life of its own.

The Face of “Savage Taiwan”: Paazeh from Wulai

The portraits in figures 3.3 and 3.4 are arguably the most widely viewed set of photographs of an individual Taiwanese during the colonial period. The sitter’s name does not appear in any of the myriad reproductions of her photograph, but I have identified her as the woman referred to variously as Paazeh Naheh and Haazehe Watan in textual sources (hereafter Paazeh). Paazeh lived in or around Wulai and was known as a member of the Kushaku (Ch. Chichi) tribe or ethnicity when these shots were taken in February 1903. She was the daughter of Watan Yūra, a “headman” who reportedly held sway over some five different settlements in the mountainous area just south of the Taipei basin in the early 1900s.

Paazeh’s photographer Mori Ushinosuke (1877–1926) was an interpreter, museum curator, government ethnologist, and protégé of Torii Ryūzō (1870–1953). Mori is considered by his Taiwanese and Japanese biographers to have been an indefatigable trekker adept at the Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan’s interior. He was also considered a “friend” of the peoples now known as Taiwan Indigenous peoples. As Torii’s apprentice, Mori became an ardent race scientist, committed to the arts of taxonomy as they revolved around anthropometry, comparative linguistics, and holistic studies of “culture.”
Figure 3.2. Hand-colored postcard of Paazeh, ca. 1903-1907. East Asia Image Collection (Easton, PA: Lafayette College, 2012).

Figure 3.3. Postcard of Paazeh, ca. 1920, published by Suzuki Yushindo. Used with permission of the National Central Library (Taiwan).
Paazech and Mori first met to produce photographs in 1902. Mori then returned to Wulai to make more portraits of Paazech and her family for the Fifth National Industrial Exposition in Osaka. Soon after her famous portraits were shot in February 1903, a larger-than-life reproduction was displayed at the Osaka exposition’s Taiwan Pavilion, attended by over five million visitors from throughout Japan and abroad. The Japanese government sent a copy to the St. Louis Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904 for further display to an even larger audience.

As the national committee and the Taiwan Government-General put the wheels in motion to stage the Osaka expo, Japan’s leaders were preparing for war against Russia. In fact, the Osaka expo was organized in part to demonstrate Japan’s national strength in the face of the Russian menace. The famous attack on Fort Arthur in February 1904 was followed by a mass-media campaign to rally the Japanese public and secure international support. Between September 1904 and May 1906, millions of privately and officially produced picture postcards of Japanese war heroes, battleships, military triumphs, and patriotic gatherings touched off a national craze for the new medium.

Catching this wave, anthropometric portraits of Paazech appeared in at least seventeen different picture postcard designs between 1903 and the 1920s. At the time, the picture postcard was the most affordable and abundant medium for the dissemination of photographic images in Japan. But the expositions and the postcard boom were just the beginning. As a file photo in newspaper rooms, consular offices, and anthropology labs, Paazech’s portrait circulated throughout the empire and migrated across the Pacific Ocean.

In September 1905, her profile was reproduced in Takekoshi Yasaburô’s influential Taiwan tôchi shi. It reappeared in George Braithwaite’s 1907 English translation of Takekoshi’s book as a “savage type,” the same year that Osuha Kumaji, the director of police for the Taiwan Government-General, submitted her frontal portrait in a report to U.S. Consul Julian Arnold, who then had it published by the Smithsonian Institution. In 1908, Canadian travel writer Mary T. Schaffer picked up a print of Paazech’s photo in Wulai, which she promptly turned into a colorful glass-lantern slide to show in her lectures about travels in Asia. Around the same time, Paazech’s portrait was shipped to the Philadelphia Commercial Museum with the rest of the Formosan Exhibit from St. Louis, to again be displayed with other artifacts of Taiwanese material life. Through the offices of William P. Wilson, the Philadelphia Commercial Museum’s curator, the frontal shot of Paazech appeared in an April 4, 1909, Detroit Free Press feature titled “Hunting Head Hunters with Live Electric Wires.” The same portrait was published in the June 26, 1910, Washington Post. It was then picked up in syndication to appear in August 1910 issues of the Nashua Reporter in Iowa and the Star Gazette of Sallisaw, Oklahoma, and probably many other small-market newspapers in the United States. An etching of her profile can even be found in an article called “Surprising the Barbarians” in the magazine Popular Electricity in Plain English.

That same year a line drawing based on Paazech’s portrait illustrated the “Taiwan” section of the Japanese Ministry of Education’s elementary school geography textbook. In 1912 her profile was published in a coffee-table album titled Taiwan seiban shizoku shashinshû (Taiwan’s aborigine tribes) in Taipei. Finally, in 1915 and 1918, frontal and profile shots of Paazech appeared in the massive photographic collection Taiwan banzoku zuke (Taiwan indigenous tribes pictorial), published in Taipei and Tokyo, respectively, under the byline of Mori Ushinosuke. In sum, Paazech’s portrait, without an identifying name, contextualizing scenery, or clues to her social, political, and familial standing, was reproduced in Japanese- and English-language governmental, scholarly, and commercial media and displayed at expositions as a representative figure of Taiwan’s most “savage” headhunters, the Atayal tribe, for over two decades.

True to the anthropometric genre, the race cards of Paazech feature washed-out backgrounds, lack personal names in the captions, and pose their subject in frontal and profile views to facilitate comparison with other similarly posed specimens. Based on their resemblance to so many other anthropometric images from other colonial settings, one can surmise an intention to subordinate and distance Paazech by constructing her as a member of an inferior race, rhetorically buttressing a number of projects in imperial domination and segregation. Matsuda Kyôko’s pioneering book on the imperial gaze at the 1904 Osaka exposition, which mentions the anthropometric photographs analyzed in this chapter, follows this line of analysis. In Matsuda’s account, dioramas, photographs, handcrafts, and other Taiwan-related articles were selected and displayed according to a classificatory system designed to make Taiwan intelligible to both its own government and Japanese home islanders (matsukin). As such, the anthropometric photographs concretized a taxonomy of Taiwan’s ethnic groups into visually discernible races, thus enabling comparison between the Japanese Self and the Taiwanese Other along somatic lines. Matsuda refers to the objects and images gathered in the Taiwan Pavilion as “the Taiwan that could not represent itself.”

Hu Chia-yu argues that these displays functioned to dramatize the civilizational distance between Japan and its colonial wards while extolling the prowess of the ruling government. Ka F. Wong has concentrated on implicating anthropometric photographs themselves in the domination of Taiwan indigenous peoples. According to Ka, the anthropometric images in the photographs taken by Torii Ryûzô (Mori Ushinosuke’s mentor) mirrored a legitimized racial superiority in the name of scientific representation. The aboriginal people became “dehumanized” as ‘passive objects of study.’

Common to the analyses of Matsuda, Hu, and Wong is the assumption that consumers and producers interpreted anthropometric photographs in reference to the unmarked “Japanese self” and that these images were part of a distancing and denigrating project. In this narrative, race cards become agents in the domination of the colonial Other by means of typification, boundary-drawing, and invidious comparison. Christopher Pinney refers to this interpretive tradition.
as "the first history of photography," wherein photography "stands at the technological, semiotic and perceptual apex of vision," which itself serves as the emulative metaphor for all other ways of knowing . . . in the context of colonialism, the 'divine' power of photography comes to reflect a Western technological and epistemological prowess.36

Viewing these anthropometric photographs today, their racist intent and invidious effects seem obvious. With historical hindsight, we can see that the "flag followed the camera" in the areas that would come to be known as the Aborigine Territory in colonized Taiwan. But as Pinney points out, photography and cameras, while "globally disseminated," were always "locally appropriated."37 Julia Adeney Thomas has elaborated this point and has added a temporal vector to Pinney's spatial analysis. Thomas speaks of the temptation to assign meanings and values to imagery from the past based on our necessarily visceral reactions to photographs.38 Nonetheless, she argues, historians need to tread lightly when imputing motives and meanings to the photographers and photographs of the past, whose "ways of seeing" cannot be assumed to be similar to our own. The excavation of meaning in the historical study of photographs requires careful investigation into the discourses, debates, and institutions that gave particular photographs their impetus at the time of production.39 Taking a cue from Thomas' work, anthropometric photographs should be analyzed as temporally specific, locally planned and executed documents. On the one hand, these photographs were creatures of conditions in the Japanese-Han-indigenous frontier in Taiwan circa 1903, the site of their production. On the other hand, their design and reception was shaped by the specific agendas of Taiwan exhibit organizers at the major expositions of the early twentieth century.

Considered as products of a locally appropriated medium with historically specific meanings, the Japanese anthropometric photographs of Taiwan indigenous peoples that reached very large audiences in the early twentieth century were not primarily attempts to locate the Japanese Self by Othering the "savages." Rather, photographers and exhibitors were countering the image of the "savage" of Qing discourse. Though the trope of savagery continued to resonate with Japanese policy-makers and appeared in Japanese mass media well into the 1910s, photographs such as Paaezh's portrait were initially created as an element of a broader ethnological offensive against the dominant discourse on savagery.

The Contrastling Logics of Savagery and Ethnicity

It would have been consistent with prevailing political and discursive winds for early twentieth-century postcard owners to have viewed Paaezh and the Atayal peoples as "animal-like" beings—subhumans who could be slaughtered by the state with impunity.40 In December 1902, only a couple of months before Mori Ushinosuke took Paaezh's photos for the exposition, councilor Mochiji Rokusaburo, Gotō Shūpei's braintrust on "Aborigine Policy," issued his famous "opinion paper on the Aborigine problem (Bansei mondai ni kansuru ikensho)." In it, he argued that Taiwan's seiban (savage) population lacked recognizable organs of government and therefore stood outside the rules of civilized warfare and diplomacy. As Mochiji put it, "Sociologically speaking, they are indeed human beings (jinrin), but looked at from the viewpoint of international law, they resemble animals (dōbutsu no gotoki mono)."41

Based on Mochiji's recommendations, the Taiwan Government-General proceeded to streamline its "Aborigine Administration" under Police Bureau control and launch military assaults on tribes actively resisting the harvest of timber in their territories. As these campaigns got underway, in June 1904, parliamentarian Takekoshi Yasaburō arrived in Taiwan to write a progress report. Echoing Mochiji, Takekoshi considered the so-called seiban an existential threat to Japan's Empire. He wrote that the militarization of Japanese-Atayal relations "does not mean that we have no sympathy at all for the savages. It simply means that we have to think more about our 45,000,000 sons and daughters than about the 104,000 savages."42 Takekoshi thus embraced natōchijin Japanese as "sons and daughters" while banishing seiban from the national family. Indeed, from 1904 through the 1910s, thousands of Atayal people were indiscriminately slaughtered or impoverished by punitive trade embargoes and mechanized bombardments by combined Japanese forces of privaters, policemen, auxiliaries, and soldiers in operations that Mochiji's and Takekoshi's militant rhetoric justified.

In September 1905, Takekoshi published Taiwan tōchi shi, his encomium to Japanese rule based on his 1904 visit, and included a profile picture of Paaezh as a nameless Atayaru-zoku jo (Atayal tribe female) next to exemplars from other so-called "tribes." These portraits were interlaced with photos of Japanese military maneuvers and an imperial inspection tour of camphor forests. In this context, Paaezh's profile, as an emblem of recalcitrant Atayals, marked her and her tribe as an expendable race and as affronts to Japanese sovereignty. The rhetoric on savagery was amplified and reinforced by the captions for various contemporary postcards that identify Paaezh as a seiban, bellicose seiban, or (incorrectly) as a member of the Taroko seiban, the most militantly resistant subgroup of Atayal peoples.43

Captioning was essential for positioning anthropometric portraits within different narratives of colonial history. Elizabeth Edwards has argued that still photographs, as slices of time that freeze events, cannot narrate themselves without the help of external markers, such as text or juxtaposition with other photographs.44 Alternative captioning for Paaezh's card indeed reveals other possibilities and uses for her portrait. For example, the caption for figure 3.2 merely refers to Paaezh as "Shinkō [administrative district], Urai-sha [place name] Woman, Tāyāl Tribe," sans terminology for "savage." The ethnonym "Tāyāl" (also spelled "Atayal") was a Japanese innovation, embedded in a different logic of representation than the term seiban (raw barbarian) or banjin (barbarian peoples).

The competing logics can be illustrated by reference to contemporary maps. The first is a 1905 census map of Taiwan (fig. 3.4c). It shares one important trait with official Qing representations of the island: lands beyond areas of rice, sugar,
and tea cultivation were left blank as testament to the ability of Taiwanese high­landers to fend off tax collectors and census takers and remain “illegible” to the state. Men like Mochij Rokusaburō populated this white space with seibanjin who lacked a legal identity under international law. In the discourse on savagery, the Aborigine Territory was terra nullius.

The ethnographers, who were race scientists to a man, took the blank space as evidence of Qing latitude and a lack of scientific curiosity. To bring terra nullius within the field of international anthropology’s academic prestige system, they populated the white space with “culture zones” and “races” that were worthy of study, if not a certain kind of appreciation. Torii, Inō, and Mori shifted the ban (savage) category of Qing parlance over to the “Malay race” of Blumenbach’s racial taxonomy. Mixing the language of species and culture freely, the anthropologists’ aim was not so much to promote relativism as to put “Malays” on the map as human beings.

On April 23, 1898, Inō Kanori (1887–1925) unveiled the newly devised taxonomy with a photographic montage composed of representative “types.” For an audience of scholars and officials in Taiwan, Inō placed the montage on the cover of the first issue of the Banjō kenkyūkaishi (Journal of the Society for Research on Aborigine Conditions) on August 16, 1898. It was reproduced for a general metropolitan readership on August 5, 1899, in Taiwan meisho shashin cho (A photo album of Taiwan’s famous sites) (fig. 3.5).

The “Atayal type” in figure 3.5 is captioned as the “Tattooed Face Savage” (鼻マス) in kanji. The use of ban as part of the ethnic designator recalls the Qing taxonomy that put Atayals in the outer circle in hua-yfka-i ideology but could also connote the bottom rung on the social Darwinistic ladder. In either scheme, ban denoted the absence of civility, not the presence of “Atayal­ness.” In this same caption, however, the word for “Tattooed Face Savage” is glossed in furigana as “Atayal.” The new ethnonym redefined the “savage” in terms of unique attributes manifested in language and material culture; neither connected to nor dependent upon their relationship to a Japanese or Qing imperial center. In other words, the ethnonym “Atayal” asserted a presence.

Inō’s montage was composed to populate a map that asserted the Atayal’s ethnic presence cartographically. It configured Taiwan’s ethnic groups as commensurate units resembling nation states on a Mercator projection map (fig. 3.6), suggesting ontological parity for each unit.

In contrast to the ethnological map (fig. 3.6), the montage (fig. 3.5) could not provide visual consistency across ethnic groups. Some of the photos are studio portraits; others were apparently shot on the spot. Some displayed noted cultural markers, while others did little to distinguish their subjects from other Taiwanese. For example, the “Tattooed Face Savage/Atayal” (upper right corner in figure 3.5), in contrast to written ethnological descriptions that informed Inō’s map, wears no jewelry, has no visible tattoos, and is carrying an imported weapon. Mori’s Kusshaku photographs, as we shall see, would close this gap between the written and photographic ethnological record in the Japanese colonial archive.
Figure 3.5. Taiwan's Savage Tribes. Ino Kanori's montage illustrates his pioneering taxonomy of Taiwan indigenous peoples. By permission of the National Taiwan Library (Taipei).

Figure 3.6. Imperial Japan's first ethnic cartography of Taiwan. Based on Ino Kanori's map in Taiwan banjin hoppō (1900).
The Atayalization of the "Tattooed Face Savages"

A glass plate negative of Inö's Tattooed Face Savage is held at the U.S. Library of Congress as part of the Bain News Service photographs (fig. 3.7), along with a portrait of two well-armed "chiefs" (fig. 3.8), two photographs of headhunters with fresh heads, and a picture of a skull shelf.46 This negative (fig. 3.7) is captioned "Typical fighting man of the headhunters, Formosa." The Japanese word for "savage" is burned on the negative. The other "chiefs" in the Bain News Service set are also referred to as savages, while the other three Bain negatives provide graphic evidence of seiban barbarity by displaying severed heads or skulls.47 The term "Atayal" is not attached to any of these photographic negatives.

Other photos of the armed man from Inö’s 1898 montage have been reproduced in the 1999 book Images of Taiwan Indigenous Peoples from the Inö Kanori Archive. One shows him seated with a rifle and a Japanese flag; the other shows him directing soldiers with weapons, again carrying a Japanese flag. The editors of this volume argue, convincingly, that he probably fought on the side of the Japanese state against Han rebels in late 1895 and 1896, as an irregular in the employ of Japanese station chiefs stationed near Kusshaku (Pazeh’s home area).48 His image was also reproduced on cabinet cards, a popular photographic medium from the 1860s through the 1890s. The cabinet-card caption refers to him as an "armed Taiwan bandit who roams the mountains with food on his back," a description at complete odds with the photographic evidence of his service under the Japanese flag but consistent with the rhetoric of savagery that permeates the Bain News Service photos.49

For some reason, this particular Tattooed Face Savage’s portrait faded from view as picture postcards emerged on the scene during the Russo-Japanese War. Nonetheless, the generic "armed head-hunting savage" crossed over into the picture-postcard era with official help. The Taiwan Government-General issued a set of three commemorative postcards on October 15, 1905. One featured a studio portrait of armed "headhunters," labeled "Taiwan savages" (Taiwan banrin) in Japanese (fig. 3.9).50 They are pictured in front of thick draperies on a carpeted floor; the same setting that was cropped out of the Tattooed Face Savage photo in Inö’s montage.51

The officially sanctioned headhunter card was probably issued in a print run numbering in the tens of thousands, if not more.52 Studio portraits with chairs, draperies, and rugs may seem incongruent with photographs of the so-called seiban, a word whose very etymology suggests great distance from centers of civilization or refinement. This disconnect between the domestic settings of the portraits and the putative savagery of their human subjects was in part a function of photographic technology in colonial Taiwan circa 1900. As Ulrich Keller has pointed out regarding photographs of the Crimean War, cameras and their operators in the age of slow shutter speeds and bulky equipment were restricted to genres and compositions that could accommodate the limited mobility and agility of the apparatus.53 The studio portraits of seiban, then, had less to do with the artistic intent of the photographers than with their technical constraints, which were also shaped by political conditions in upland Taiwan. The travelogues of Inö Kanori, Mori Ushinosuke, and Torii Ryūzō suggest that in situ photography was a difficult proposition in Taiwan’s northern interior during the 1895–1905 period.54 The studio portraits of this early period are in fact testaments to the jealously guarded abodes of these assembled headmen and mercenaries. As men whose economic and political status partly rested on their ability to monopolize access to prestige goods from the lowlands vis-à-vis their fellow highlanders while simultaneously restricting access to timber stands and upland traders, chiefs and headmen had every reason to keep Japanese photographers (and others) away from their settlements.55 In fact, Inö Kanori coined the ethnonym "Atayal" based on his interpreter-assisted interviews with members of a twenty-seven-member party from the Wulai area in Taipei. The Tattooed Face Savage himself was probably among them, and Pazeh’s father, Watan, was certainly present.56

The female Atayal in Inö’s 1898 montage (fig. 3.9) also contains elements of savage imagery. Ethnic markers appear irrelevant, and evidence of borderland provenance appears prominent. She is wearing Chinese-style upper garments, not local weaves. In early Japanese photography of Atayal peoples, this type of clothing was predominant for females because anthropologists depended upon bicultural, Sino-Atayal hybrid informants, usually represented by female interpreters.58

---

Figure 3.7. (Left) Typical Fighting Man of the Headhunters, Formosa. From the George Grantham Bain Collection, Library of Congress.

Figure 3.8. (Right) Savage Chiefs, Formosa. From the George Grantham Bain Collection, Library of Congress.
In contrast to the ethnically ambiguous Atayal photographs in the 1898 montage (fig. 3.5), Inō's canonical 1900 textual description of the Atayal describes them as face-tattooed peoples, richly adorned in geometrically carved earrings and accessories that included buttons, brass, shiny metal, and colored threads. To harmonize the discordance between Inō's textual and cartographic representations of clear-cut, unambiguous ethnic diversity among Taiwan's non-Han population (fig. 3.6) and the motley assemblage of photographs in the 1898 montage (fig. 3.5), Inō commissioned a color painting for the Paris Universal Exposition in 1900 (fig. 3.10).

The 1900 painting (fig. 3.10) adds head feathers, necklaces, hats, and earrings to each representative "savage type" to accentuate cultural differences among them, as can be seen in the comparison of figures 3.10 and 3.5. The process of fabrication is even more evident in the similarly augmented illustration for the 1907 Tokyo Industrial Exhibition, also curated by Inō (fig. 3.11). In figures 3.10 and 3.11, the gun has been airbrushed out of the Atayal man's hand, large bamboo earrings have been painted in, and forehead and chin tattoos have been darkened or added. In the 1898 montage (fig. 3.5), the Bain News Service photograph (fig. 3.7), and the cabinet card, the facial tattoo on his forehead is invisible or barely visible, and the chin tattoo is obscured by shadow. The high-resolution negative stored in the Library of Congress reveals a very faint forehead tattoo with high magnification but also rules out a chest tattoo. The photos of alternative poses from the same session show no evidence of visible facial or chest tattoos. Yet the reproduction in James Davidson's 1903 book (for which Inō Kanori was the ethnological advisor) exhibits pronounced forehead, chin, and chest tattoos, apparently the result of doctoring.

In the "ethnicized" 1900 and 1907 paintings (figs. 10 and 11), the female Atayal type shed her Chinese-style upper garment for an Atayal sleeveless vest, decorative chest embroidery, and a striped handwoven cape. The reornamented Atayal woman wears ethnologically correct earrings and necklaces as well. Whereas the ethnicized male Atayal model was transformed with a paintbrush or pencil, his female counterpart was removed from the 1898 photomontage and replaced by a more appropriate model in the 1900 and 1907 composite portraits.

As curator for the 1900, 1903, 1904, and 1907 expositions, Inō Kanori was charged with educating the public about the non-Chinese population of Taiwan. In the course of preparing the visual component of his exhibits, Inō turned "sages" into Atayal and nondescript males into Yami and Paiwan by embellishing visual documents. As part of a larger project in census taking, mapmaking, and museum curation, it would be accurate to view these fabrications as an exercise in top-down ethnogenesis.

Making Photographs in a Qing Hinterland

James C. Scott's characterization of a parallel project in British Burma suggests that Inō's difficulties were not unique. As was the case with British officials,
Japanese agents in upland Taiwan found even the act of naming tribes to be fraught with problems because of the hybridity they regularly encountered (as depicted in the photographs in the 1898 montage). Of these turn-of-the-century classificatory schemes, Scott writes that "a major reason why trait-based designations of ethnic or tribal identity fail utterly to make sense of actual affiliations is precisely that hill groups themselves, as manpower systems, absorbed whomever they could. This absorptive capacity led to great cultural diversity within hill societies." These multiformal, ethnically diverse "manpower absorbing" societies were precisely the kind of formations Japanese officials encountered on the "savage border" circa 1900. In his study of the Nanzhuang incident of July 1902, Antonio C. Tavares observes that Saisiyat "tribes" under "chieftains" in the late Qing period were conglomerates of Han, non-Han, and hybrid actors, with hierarchies of power and wealth that ran counter to hua yi norms. Morii's 1902 description of Paazech's family portrait (fig. 3.12) illustrates how, like the Nanzhuang operators, Wulai headmen adopted and absorbed outsiders to create hybrid formations to the chagrin of ethnic cartographers like Inō:
first Governor-General Kabayama Sukenori, Jiku made his way to Kusshaku to "pacify the locals." 81 Subsequently, he married into a leading Kusshaku family to establish a beachhead for Japanese logging concerns in conjunction with camphor entrepreneur Dogura Ryōjiro. As an adopted outsider who in many respects resembled Ri Aguai, Jiku took the title Watan Karaho to reckon himself a true local chief (taouni). 82

At century’s turn, as image makers were depicting Taiwan’s indigenous peoples alternately as savages in studio photographs and as Atayals in embellished drawings and paintings, northern Taiwan was wrecked by a wave of attacks on camphor workers. This generalized resistance all but halted production by 1902, except for in a few cooperative areas near Kusshaku and in Yilan. 83 In November of that year, a contract between the Taiwan Camphor Harvesting and Development Group and the “Kusshaku tribes” was renewed. The agreement gave the acting Kusshaku headman a fifty-sen-per-day stipend for liaising with Japanese officials to arrange for Kusshaku guards to protect camphor workers from attacks. 84 A Japanese journalist spent the first ten days of 1903 tramping around the Kusshaku settlements. In his serialized account, he credited Mori Ushinosuke with introducing him to a coterie of figures who managed Japanese-Kusshaku relations. 85

The networks that emerged through intermarriage, business dealings, armed conflict, and research among Japanese officials, ethnologists, merchants, and leading families from Kusshaku provided the setting for the production of Paazeh’s portrait. In contrast to our earliest examples of ideal typical “head-hunting chiefs” photographed in Taipeh studios, the photographs made in Kusshaku during the establishment of the guardline were shot at or near the residences of the subjects. The increased number of poses and more intricate stagecraft evident in the Kusshaku photographs suggest a heightened degree of familiarity between photographers and subjects. Rimogan (of Kusshaku) resident Marai Watan was the other Atayal exemplar to appear in the Osaka and St. Louis expositions, as portrait number 1. Marai was paired with Paazeh, who appeared as portrait number 2. Marai was in his early twenties in 1903 and was the Rimogan headman’s heir apparent. The woman to his left in figure 3.13 86 was Marai’s wife, Yugai Watan. 87

On January 28, 1903, Mori Ushinosuke himself brought Marai and Yugai to Taipei to view a local theater production of Ishiyama Gunki, meet the staff of the Taiwan Daily News, and see the sights. According to the short write-up, the Rimogan couple “came down from the mountains to visit Kusshaku-town once or twice a year, but had never been to Taipei.” 88 Since Marai’s portrait from a different pose made it to the Osaka exposition, which opened on March 1, 1903, it is reasonable to assume that Mori photographed this couple just before or after their visit to the capital city in January. The portrait shown here (fig. 3.13) was shot in April 1903. It was included in a number of official publications as well as formed the basis for at least two picture postcard designs. 89 Postcards were also generated from different poses of the same couple, indicating the ideological and commercial appeal of their likenesses as rendered by Mori’s camera.

Yugai’s image, in tandem with Paazeh’s, underwent further transformations before becoming commodified as a race card. Her published anthropometric
portrait shows her Chinese-style upper garments clearly, as indicated in figure 3.13. In figure 3.14 it is more "authentic" Yügai dons a cape of local design, concealing her Chinese clothing. This de-Sinicized version of Yügai's portrait showed up in various picture postcards, in a 1932 book by ethnographer Koizumi Tetsu, in a collection of government statistics, and on the sleeve for a set of Taiwan indigenous peoples picture postcards.

Due to the prominence accorded the Taiwan Pavilion, the Osaka National Industrial Exposition of 1903 has rightly been referred to as Japan's first imperial exposition. During the more than 150 days that it remained open, it drew over five million visitors. The Taiwan Government-General, in anticipation of this massive undertaking, lobbied intensively for exposition space under the energetic leadership of Goto Shintei. For Goto, the Osaka expo presented an opportunity to educate Japanese on the home islands about Taiwan's strategic importance, its potential economic benefits, and its cultural and culinary attractions. A prevailing home-islander image of Taiwan, which Goto hoped to dispel, was that of a savage place where demonic tribes practiced cannibalism. Against this backdrop, the photos of men with tattooed faces and large guns glaring at cameras in studio settings were hardly appropriate. Goto's opportunistic aversion to savagery dovetailed with Ino Kanori's preference for "cultural" themes in evidence on the 1900 Paris Exposition painting (fig. 3.10). Thanks to Mori's new photographs from Kusshaku, Ino was able to accommodate both desiderata without recourse to another commissioned painting.
The "savage" (left) and "ethnized" (right) portraits in figure 3.15 were taken near Wulai in February 1903. The "savage" portrait is an enlarged and cropped detail from figure 3.12. This group portrait shows Paazeh seated in the midst of an extended "absorptive manpower system" complete with Han interpreters wearing Atayal clothing and Atayal women wearing Chinese clothing. It appeared in a Taiwan Government-General publication of 1911, the general circulation magazine Tairyo in 1917, and in Mori's 1915 and 1918 ethnological picture albums, as well as in Showa-period picture postcards. It was also picked up for syndication in the United States. Also in February 1903, quite likely on the same day, Paazeh put on bamboo earrings, locally woven fabrics, necklaces, and a diamond-shaped breast cover festooned with white buttons for her anthropometric portrait (see figs. 2, 3, and 15). The differences in Paazeh's dress and ornamentation in the two portraits from February 1903 recall Inō's alterations of the 1898 montage (figs. 5, 10, and 11) discussed above.

Paazeh's Portrait as Shape-Shifting Joker

Let us imagine the blank white space in the center of the Japanese 1905 census map of Taiwan (fig. 3.4) as the screen upon which a variety of colonial ambitions, fantasies, fears, and visions were projected. If all went well, according to Mochiji's plan, the "white space" would eventually become the abode of tax-paying, imperial subjects, while recalcitrant seibanjin were either killed, assimilated, or scattered among the rest of the population. Takekoshi's gloss on Mochiji's policy, which presented "them" as an existential threat to "us," coupled with Mochiji's declaration that "seiban" had the status of "animals" under the law of nations, provides us with a frank statement of species differentiation. The captions in some picture postcards of Paazeh reproduce Mochiji's language of savagery by framing Paazeh's portrait with terms like "raw barbarian" and "bellicose barbarian." Newspaper and magazine drawings of fierce Atayal warriors in the 1895–1905 period used facial tattoos as shorthand for "seibanjin," so Paazeh's portrait, so captioned, would have been associated with this reservoir of epithets.

The caption in figure 3.2, "Shinkō-chō, Wulai Atayal-zoku," resembles the placards Inō used to exhibit Marai and Paazeh as exemplary "culture-bearers" in Osaka and St. Louis. This softer portrait, with pastel tints and a clinical caption, replicates the "cultural" discourse on difference as understood by its photographer and his cohort, who considered bamboo earrings with geometric patterns, facial tattoos, hair binding, and sleeveless vests to be the distinctive features of the Atayal. Inō's, Torii's, and Mori's writings present many examples, though scattered and oblique, that suggest they lobbed for a gradualist policy that would accommodate difference within a framework of racially graded imperial hierarchy.

Moving from "species" and "culture" on Mitchell's compass of race to the "sex-gender" quadrant, we note that Paazeh's portrait also eroticized Atayal women as "maidsens," "beauties," or "colonial nudes." At least two picture postcards explicitly sexualize Paazeh. She is a "barbaric beauty" in one Meiji-period card, while another postcard with Paazeh's profile and Yūgai's frontal portrait is more florid, describing them in captions as: "A Southern Savage . . . and a Kusshaku woman. [They] have just come of age; they embody the renown allure and voluptuousness [of the Atayal]."

From the early years of Japanese rule in Taiwan, liaisons between Japanese policemen, district officials, or interpreters and Atayal women were the subject of news stories in the Japanese press, often with a Pocahontas flavor. As Faye Yuan Kleeman and Robert Tierney have noted, the figure of the sexually available Atayal woman was commonplace in Japanese literature in the colonial period. For Chief of Aborigine Affairs Ōtsu Rinpei, the assumption of sexual availability underwrote his policy of encouraging Japanese policemen to "marry" Atayal women solely for the purposes of political expedience.

While picture postcards portrayed Korean, Manchu, northern Chinese, and Han Taiwanese males as belonging to a race, or races, of "coolies" with superhuman endurance and strength, such motifs do not predominate in depictions of Taiwan indigenous males. Women are frequently posed as beasts of burden, in accordance with a common imperialist trope on how "savages treat their women." However, a preponderance of Japanese picture postcards of indigenous males directly captioned them as headmen or chiefs or posed them in regal poses that suggest anything but abduction or objectification. This preference may indicate that actual chiefs, as the link between the colonial government and
local society, were available or wanted to be photographed. Mori Ushinosu­
se himself noted that, unlike other “ primitives,” Taiwan indigenous peoples were unafraid of cameras.93 Borrowing from Patricia Albers’ analysis of Native American picture postcards, this motif might be referred to as the “Noble Vanquished Warrior.”94 Paazech’s portrait falls squarely within this genre.

During Mori’s photo shoots in Wulai, Japanese observers remarked upon the alternating nature of the paramount chief’s position. Moreover, the fifty-sen stipend that was proposed for the Kusshaku headman included the proviso that it would shift in accordance with alternating leadership. The documentation associated with these portraits suggests that Marai and Yagai were from the Rimonog family that rivaled Paazech’s Wulai clan for Kusshaku paramountcy in 1903. If there was no outright competition among Kusshaku’s hereditary leaders to secure access to Japanese money, job opportunities, and protection against other Atayal groups, certainly there were assertions of rank involved to obtain Japanese backing. In late 1902 and early 1903, alliance with, or strategic subordination to, Japan’s local agents offered material benefits and a leg up in intra-Atayal competition.

In a sort of comic but illustrative coda to Japanese colonial representational practices vis-à-vis Taiwanese, the American newspaper feature “Ripley’s Believe It or Not” commented upon the political significance of the Atayal diamond-shaped, button-studded chest ornament in a 1945 feature titled “Button Man.” This same item was the distinguishing feature of Paazech’s and Marai’s famous portraits. Ostensibly, the point of the illustration was to teach American invading forces how to identify Aborigine chieftains when they occupied Taiwan. Although this cartoon makes the dubious claim that its wearer will die if a single button is removed, its assertion that the breast covering signifies political power is consonant with dozens of Japanese photographs. This design was worn by Atayal males who were either labeled as headmen or who at least struck the up-right, almost defiant pose of headmen.

Anthropologist Hu Chia-yu has pointed out that this design and its buttons, in contrast to larger shell or ceramic disks, did not signify paramount rank. Nonetheless, these ornaments were considered to be precious items and consequently items of formal male Atayal dress. Was it Paazech’s or Watan Yura’s decision to display these precious items, usually found only on males, for this photograph (figs. 3 and 15)? Or did Mori fasten on to this item of material culture and request its presence in the photo? It is plausible, though conjectural, that there existed a temporary community of interests between Ino the government expert, Mori the up-and-coming protegé, and Paazech the contender for patronage in the construction of this portrait.

In May 1903, two months after the opening of the Osaka exposition, Japanese authorities imprisoned nine Kusshaku men as hostages to secure the cooperation of Kusshaku leaders in building a cordon sanitaire to separate camp­lor fields and taxpaying settlers from marauding Atayal who resisted the new order. This stratagem was successful. During the years 1904 and 1905, the local knowledge, military prowess, and political agility of Kusshaku resi-

dents turned the tide for Japanese forces. Thereafter, from their Kusshaku base, the Taiwan Government-General built several hundred miles of guard­line across northern Taiwan, tightening its embargo and forcing hundreds of Atayal settlements to surrender their weapons until the last Taroko tribes submitted in 1914.148

In December 1908, travel writer and explorer Mary T. S. Schaffer and three Canadian companions visited Wulai to get a glimpse of the world-renowned “head-hunters of Formosa.” As many a visitor after her, Schaffer wrote excitedly about the prospects of meeting a savage head-taker and even purchased a post­card of a freshly taken head held by its exultant killers. But when she actually met Atayal people on the trail, she found them to be friendly and too happy to pose for photographs in exchange for silver coins. While travelers would not be found in other parts of Atayal country until well into the 1910s, Wulai had already become a place the Government-General could send foreign tourists under light escort. Included in Schaffer’s collection of magic lantern slides was a color­tinted profile of Paazech.151

In early 1908 the Japanese government built its first school for Atayal children in Kusshaku. Paazech and Marai passed away around 1910, just before the Atayal school was moved to Wulai in 1911. The bulk of instruction was dedicated to field cultivation, tree felling, and other “regular employments” designed to turn the Kusshaku tribes into taxpaying subjects. Japanese-language training was the second most important pursuit.150 By the end of Meiji, then, the people of Kusshaku and its environs were well on the road to becoming peoples who would little resemble the photographs that Mori Ushinosu­ke created in 1903 (see fig. 3.151). Nonetheless, their portraits lived on in official publications, picture postcards, textbooks, newspapers, exposition exhibits, and museum displays as shape­shifting jokes that satisfied a variety of market niches, political positions, and local aspirations.

Conclusions

In 1903 Paazech’s portrait and the ethnological discourse that initially gave it meaning asserted an Atayal ethnic presence in the opaque interior of Taiwan as a counterweight to Qing and Japanese terminology that marked indigenous peoples as expendable fauren/bejin (savages). In the bargain the Japanese anthropologists who devised a substitute nomenclature based on the canons of modern race science achieved a modicum of fame and recompense as pioneers in an unexplored ethnographic treasure trove. In the face of metropolitan pres­sure to increase the efficiency of the camp­lor industry, however, the discourse on indigenous ethnic integrity proved a weak defense against guardline policies justified by the necropolitical calculus of “us or them.” As military operations and trade embargoes against Atayal peoples intensified in the years leading up to World War I, publishers recaptioned Mori Ushinosu­ke’s antiseptic portrait of the “Shinko, Urai-sha Woman, Taiyal Tribe” with a variety of denigrating epit­hetes to connote savage menace and exotic forbidden fruit.
and culturally intact to highlight the non-Chinese status of Taiwan, to bolster Japan's credentials as a steward of indigenous peoples, and to nurture a budding ethnic tourism industry. With the defeat of the Japanese military in World War II, however, the reproduction of race cards for general consumption seems to have come to a halt. Nationalist Party (KMT) legitimacy was based on the notion that Taiwan is part of China. The KMT stigmatized indigenous peoples as "mountain compatriots" and "savages" and pressed assimilation in the name of official, state-directed Han chauvinism. They also demonized the Japanese as the invaders of mainland China and suppressed research into colonial history and its large documentary record. It would be surprising, therefore, if a cache of Japanese-era race cards were to be located among the publications, exhibits, or ephemera from martial-law period Taiwan (1949–1987), though it is quite possible that they circulated beneath the state's radar.

After the lifting of martial law in 1987, the administrations of Li Denghui and Chen Shui-bian abandoned the KMT rhetoric of Taiwan as a Chinese space and indigenous peoples as "not-yet-Chinese." As part of a "homeland-ization" movement (bentulhuito), leading Taiwanese politicians and their local followers mobilized state resources and the bully pulpit to support an indigenous cultural renaissance. Han intellectuals called for Nationalists to accentuate the indigenous element of Taiwan's composite identity to signal the island's distinctiveness from the mainland and to reconfigure indigenous claims to prior occupation of the island into a source of Taiwanese "subjectivity." The founding of the Alliance of Taiwan Aborigines in 1984 is a commonly cited starting point for indigenous activism, which was initially concerned with issues surrounding poverty, discrimination against individual indigenous persons, and other social problems. In the late 1980s, the focus shifted toward collective rights and identity politics.

A confluence of interests and coordinated political action between Han Nationalists and indigenous activists produced a number of reforms. The Wu-feng myth that characterized indigenous peoples as both savage headhunters and grateful Qing lackeys was expunged from textbooks in 1988. The official name "mountain compatriot" was changed to yuanzhhumin (indigenous people) in 1994 and then yuanzhhuminnu (indigenous ethnos/race). Registration laws were changed to allow indigenous peoples to use their non Han names and reckon descent bilaterally. In 1996, the Council of Aboriginal Affairs was established at the cabinet level, greatly raising the status of indigenous issues in official and popular domains.

In the wake of these changes, Paazeh's likeness has reappeared. Along with several other Mori Ushinosuke photographs, her portrait has shown up in books on Taiwan indigenous history, material culture, and society since the late 1980s. In our own century, her frontal portrait (fig. 3.3) graces the covers of three successive printings of Yang Nanjun's Chinese translation of Mori's travelogues. Her profile (fig. 3.3) also illustrates the covers of two successive printings of a collection of indigenous-themed picture postcards aimed at the

---

**Figure 3.16** The Walai School for Indigenous Children, opened in 1911. The standing adults wear the trademark embroidered upper garments with decorative buttons, as immortalized by Mori Ushinosuke's Kashaku portraits. The male children sport Japanese-style haircuts and imported clothing while the girls wear Atayal leggings with "Chinese-style upper garments." East Asia Image Collection (Easton, PA: Lafayette College, 2012).

At the same time, the continued reproduction of race cards like Paazeh's into the Showa period provided a visually consistent image of Taiwan indigenous peoples that belied the rapid changes fomented by Japanese policies. While it would be incorrect to assert that Mori's anthropometric portraits were unmediated visual documents of social life, other records of the period suggest that numerous women in northern Taiwan adorned themselves in rough conformity to Paazeh's famous portrait. In the 1910s and the 1920s, however, Japanese race cards became less and less representative of living conditions along the Xindian River and the wider Atayal culture area. During the Taisho period, the Taiwan Government-General proscribed face tattooing and head-tattooing while ringing the Atayal territories with trading posts for the import of Japanese-manufactured kimonos, skirts, and trousers. During the kominka period of the 1930s and the 1940s, an energetic police force, with the aid of indigenous youth groups, mobilized Atayal and other indigenous peoples to speak Japanese, worship at Shinto shrines, and wear Japanese clothing in ever-greater numbers. Consequently, imported clothing was the norm, and by the late 1930s, facial tattoos were no longer ubiquitous among young Atayal women in Taiwan.

Despite these changes in material conditions on the ground, the Japanese government continued to propagate the image of Atayal peoples as "traditional"
youth market. Paazeh models earrings on a wall of the Shung Ye Museum of Formosan Aborigines in Taipei while her wall-sized likeness fills the main stairwell in the museum of Atayal culture in Wulai, not far from the site of its creation (see fig. 3.17).

In all of the above instances, Paazeh remains anonymous. She has no name, family, or political status and remains a vehicle for Atayal facial tattoos, clothing, and bamboo earrings. In the year 2015, the gap between everyday life in Taiwan and Atayal race cards is even wider than in the 1940s. Facial tattoos are very much a thing of the past; the few remaining women who have them are considered cultural treasures. And yet, conventionalized images of face-tattooed women have become de rigueur in indigenous-area public art. The examples in figure 3.18 from the Nanshan Township Elementary School and figure 3.19 from the Xiulin Township Middle School are typical.

The existential threat posed to Atayal peoples by Taiwan Government-General (1895-1945) and KMT (1949-1987) official racism has subsided. Today, the notion that indigenous peoples are distinct from Han Taiwanese and that Taiwan's multiracial composition should be celebrated rather than overcome are mainstream political positions—for the first time in the island's history. In light of these sea changes, race cards would appear to have outlived their usefulness. So what should we make of their rediscovery and continued proliferation?

In one guise, race cards and the icons they inspire are assertions of long-suppressed or denied ethnic pride, both homegrown and government supported. Since the late 1980s, nongovernmental organizations, the central government, and county offices have dispersed funding for indigenous-language school curricula; the revival of dormant public rituals; and the manufacture of indigenous textiles, sculptures, and other items of material culture. As a result, the post-1990 affirmations of face tattooing and head-taking and the rediscovery of Atayal textiles and traditional music and dance have erased much of the public and private stigma that the Japanese and the Han have attached to Atayal culture over the past century. The consultation of colonial-era ethnological writings, illustrations, and photographs has been a crucial component in many, if not all, of these revivalist projects. The Japanese-period documentary record has been critical to the authentication of "native" traditions in Taiwan partly due to the deracinating effects of Japanese and KMT policies. Perhaps more significantly, under KMT rule, 80-90 percent of Taiwan's indigenous population converted to Christianity while roughly 50 percent of Taiwan's indigenous population migrated to urban environments antithetical to the maintenance of early twentieth-century markers of ethnic distinction.

Recent ethnographic research suggests that top-down cultural politics are integral to the indigenous renaissance in Taiwan. Anthropologist Michael Rudolph has noted that, as Christians, many Taiwan indigenous peoples did not
often “play the race card” to fulfill their own political ambitions and are viewed with derision by their rank-and-file constituents. Mitsuda Yayoi corroborates the general pattern: educated elites formulate and promote particular versions of indigenous ethnic identity and subsequently mobilize followers to achieve state recognition for a given interpretation of “tradition.”

Can the indigenous renaissance in Taiwan, therefore, be likened to top-down cultural revitalization projects in other postcolonial situations? Critical scholarship of the Indian case has suggested that cultural elites have invoked unifying symbols of Indian, Hindu, or Maharashtra continuity, cohesion, and distinctiveness to quash internal dissent in the name of national survival. In Taiwan, on a much smaller scale, energized groups of indigenous activists have won official recognition for their ethnic groups to become eligible for the office holding, public funding, and political patronage that accrue with state recognition. Since 2001, the number of recognized indigenous groups in Taiwan has climbed from nine to sixteen. While the motives of such leaders and their followers are mixed and complicated, these battles have occurred in an institutional framework that incentivizes the homogenization of particular ethnic identities and the accentuation of differences among them. And it was precisely these two processes that Mori Ushinosuke sought to consolidate with his Kusshaku photographs of 1903.

Some would consider it irresponsible to put the Taiwan indigenous renaissance on a par with postcolonial Indian nationalism. The move to historicize putatively timeless entities such as the Atayal can undermine “indigenous claims to identity,” according to this line of thought. James Clifford’s classic study of the courtroom travails of the Mashpee Indians, whose legal claims to rights and resources hinged on their ability to document the autochthony and continuity of their community by recourse to visible markers of culture, is a case in point. To suggest that any indigenous identity has been “staged,” as I have done in this chapter, can be considered an attack upon the claims to collective redress that are part and parcel of First Nations rights recovery movements.

But not all effective proponents of preservationism are indigenous peoples laboring against staggering odds to regain stolen rights or establish a modicum of dignity. In post-martial law Taiwan, Han intellectuals who have invoked indigenous “otherness” as a tool for revitalizing Taiwanese national culture or for pulling Taiwan out of China’s cultural orbit are primarily interested in indigenous peoples as symbols. The symbolism of authentic, timeless, and non-Han indigenous peoples secures Taiwan’s Austronesian heritage in this discourse. The problem here is that the preservationist ethos encoded in PaaZe’s race card can backfire by creating unreasonable expectations that have grave real-world consequences. The notion that indigenous peoples are inauthentic, or not truly indigenous, if they do not wear traditional clothing or bear other markers of ethnic difference easily recognized by outsiders is in fact a common one. This fixation on authenticity shades into the political view that visibly “assimilated” indigenous peoples should ipso facto lose rights or privileges (such as access to waterways, hunting grounds, or preferential treatment on university-entrance
or civil-service exams). The specter of the inauthentic (and undeserving) indigenous person is never far from the surface.

As was the case in the period of Japanese colonial rule, there are scholars today who find certain elements of indigenous cultures intrinsically valuable and of high aesthetic worth. Han anthropologists have worked in recent years to reinstate reconstructed forms of indigenous dance and song into the fabric of everyday life by promoting public performance-as-education. One critic of this movement has asked:

Shall those young Aborigines who have been in contact with Han society for a long time identify with an image of Aborigines that has stagnated for several decades or centuries? Or shall they identify with a culture that has—as a result of inevitable historical development—interacted with other ethnic groups? And what kind of “Aborigines” shall non-Aborigines identify with? Is it possible that [Han preservationists]—in order to redress the Han’s former hegemony or for reasons of political correctness—unconsciously bring all possibility for the Aborigines’ pluralist cultural development to an end?

In this view, the interests of curators, ethnologists, neo-primitivists, and progressive Han activists are pitted against the majority of indigenous peoples who have lived among the Han for many decades and who do not wish to turn back the clock.

Wulai-area residents Paazeh Naheh (1880s–1910s); her father, Watan Yura; and their neighbors upstream in Rimogan—Yugai and Marai—were historical figures who became and remain racial mascots. Yet they were not victims of imperial photographers who wielded cameras as figurative guns. In the 1870s Kusskhu was known to travelers as a contact zone for the exchange of goods and services between Han, indigenous, and foreign agents. The political, economic, and linguistic skills they acquired in this late nineteenth-century milieu positioned Kusskhu residents to take advantage of new opportunities that came with the Japanese occupation while their position on the old Qing border area exposed them to new risks. In the course of mediating the claims of upriver Atayal natives with the demands of downriver Japanese newcomers, they sat for multiple sessions with photographer Mori Ushinosuke to create Meiji Japan’s most well-known photographs of Taiwan indigenous peoples.

Perhaps because their strategy of alliance with agents of the new state backfired or because political leadership in Atayal societies is carried rather than inherited, their names have been lost to time. Moreover, Mori himself, and those who followed him, found nothing particularly noteworthy about these individuals. Nonetheless, generations of publishers, anthropologists, curators, historians, and consumers have found their portraits worthy of reproduction and repurposing. The continued dissemination of Paazeh’s, Watan’s, Yugai’s, and Marai’s portraits as nameless avatars of the Atayal—as race cards—is a complex operation conducted by a host of agents with varied agendas. The point of this chapter is to suggest that the various iterations of these storied photographs make arguments about Taiwan’s future and past—some benign, some hopeful, and others mendacious. With the digitization of the Taiwan Government-General archive and many other sources of colonial history, it is now possible, though still difficult, to identify and learn more about the people on the other side of Mori Ushinosuke’s camera. When the multiple other sources of indigenous Taiwanese identity are taken into account, it would seem that bringing these stories to light will increase, rather than diminish, the capacity of these old photographs to further the interests of Paazeh’s descendents in and around Wulai.
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