Routledge Studies in the Modern History of Asia

1 The Police in Occupation Japan
Control, corruption and resistance to reform
Christopher Aldous

2 Chinese Workers
A new history
Jackie Sheehan

3 The Aftermath of Partition in South Africa
Tan Tai Yong and Gyanesh Kudaisya

4 The Australia–Japan Political Alignment
1952 to the present
Alan Rix

5 Japan and Singapore in the World Economy
Japan's economic advance into Singapore, 1870–1965
Shimizu Hiroshi and Hirakawa Hitoshi

6 Triads as Business
Yiu Kong Chu

7 Contemporary Taiwanese Cultural Nationalism
A-chin Hsiau

8 Religion and Nationalism in India
The case of the Punjab
Harnik Deol

Contemporary Taiwanese Cultural Nationalism

A-chin Hsiau

London and New York

First published 2000
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

Typeset in Baskerville by
HWA Text and Data Management, Tunbridge Wells
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Hsiau, A-chin
Contemporary Taiwanese cultural nationalism / A-chin Hsiau
p. cm. – (Routledge studies in the modern history of Asia)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Chinese literature – Tawian – History and criticism. 2. Chinese literature – 20th century – History and criticism. 3. Nationalism and literature – Taiwan – History – 20th century. 4. Language and culture – Taiwan – History – 20th century. 5. Chinese language – Dialects – Taiwan – History – 20th century. I. Title. II. Series.

PL3031.T32 H725 2000
320.54'0951249 dc21 99-053813

ISBN 0-415-22648-1

To my mother, wife, and son:
Li Yen, Yang Jin-shi, and Yün-chung

Contents

Abbreviations

CCP	Chinese Communist Party
CNP	Chinese New Party (*Hsin-tang*)
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party (*Min-chu Chin-pu Tang*)
KMT	*Kuomintang* (Chinese Nationalist Party)
PRC	People's Republic of China
ROC	Republic of China
TAIP	Taiwanese Independence Party (*Chien-kuo-tang*)
TWWI	*T'ai-wan Wen-i (Taiwan Literature)*
UN	United Nations

origin, namely, its cultural-psychological elements. See Smith (1991: vii, 69). I accept Smith's view on this point but argue that it is equally important to distinguish between the different effects of ethnicity and nationalism on the justification of political claims and actions. Ethnic elements may play a different role in justifying political claims and actions when incorporated into a nationalist discourse. Cf. Breuilly's criticism of Smith's approach (Breuilly [1994]1996: 150–3). Breuilly argues that a most striking thing about national phenomena is the discontinuities between pre-modern ethnicity and modern national identity.

15 Some studies focusing on this issue are Hutchinson, 1987; Yoshino, 1992; Royce, 1993; Hann, 1995; Aberbach, 1997.

16 The major parts of Hroch's two books on this issue are translated into English and combined into one. See Hroch (1985).

17 It has to be noted that Hroch uses the term "national movement," instead of "nationalism," to denote the process of national formations of small, opposed ethnic groups – namely, a sequence of actions to develop a national culture, to achieve civil rights and political self-administration, and to create their own ruling class and a complete structure of social class – in Central and Eastern Europe in the nineteenth or early twentieth century. The reason, Hroch argues, is that it was far from being the case that all the patriots in these national movements voiced the demand for an independent state, which the term "nationalism" implies by definition. See Hroch ([1993] 1996: 80–1). For the purpose of my analysis, however, the distinction between "national movement" and "nationalism" in Hroch's works is relatively unimportant because some of the cases which he studies did develop the goal of creating an independent state.

18 See also Hroch (1985: 22–4).

2 Japanese colonialism and literary and linguistic reforms in colonial Taiwan

Taiwanese intellectuals' articulation of Taiwanese cultural particularity dates back to the pre-Second World War colonial period. The Japanese colonial administration (1895–1945) tried hard to sever Taiwanese ties with China and to assimilate the colonized. It was precisely this alien rule that stimulated serious reflection on local cultural distinctiveness. Concern over Taiwanese cultural uniqueness formed the foundation of the cultural elite's concepts of linguistic and literary reforms – especially the advocacy of "*hsiang-t'u* literature" and a "*tai-oan-oe* writing system."

The focus of this chapter is on two attempts to effect linguistic and literary reforms that were made in the early 1920s and early 1930s respectively. At issue were the advocates' views on colonial Taiwan's relationship with China. These views involved cultural identity as shaped by socio-political changes. The chapter begins with a discussion of the Taiwanese anti-colonial movement. The failure of both "reformist" and "radical" resistances prompted the advocacy of a literature dealing with particular realities of colonial life and the promotion of the writing system of a major local language. The national identity of the political anti-colonialists is examined and compared with that of cultural elites involved in linguistic and literary debates. In general the advocates of *hsiang-t'u* literature and *tai-oan-oe* script recognized that the island had little hope of liberation from colonial rule, let alone reinstating close connections with China. Their concern over local cultural distinctiveness showed that a new sense of identification with the island was emerging.

Japanese colonialism and Taiwanese resistance in the 1920s

Japan ruled Taiwan from 1895 to 1945. Military rule and armed resistance characterized the first two decades of Japanese colonialism. However, the suppression of the last large-scale uprising on the southern part of the island in August 1915 marked the end of armed struggle. In 1920, a different type of resistance was prompted by modern political ideology, and the 1920s saw the heyday of non-violent anti-colonialism. The young generation that received a modern education played a pivotal role.[1] Taiwanese who were educated on

the island or studied abroad (primarily in Japan or China) constituted the first generation of the elite influenced by Western trends of political, social, and cultural thought. From them emerged the leaders and followers of anti-colonialism (Wakabayashi 1987: 40). Generally speaking, the participants in the anti-colonial movement in this decade can be categorized into two groups in terms of their different political ideologies and mobilization strategies: "reformist" and "radical." For the purpose of the study, I am especially concerned with their conceptions of Taiwanese identity.

Both groups started their activities in Tokyo.[2] Before the end of the World War I, Taiwanese students in Tokyo were relatively indifferent to socio-political issues, but eager to adjust themselves to Japanese culture. However, the development of democracy, liberalism, and socialism in Japan, Japan's government reforms, Woodrow Wilson's promotion of national self-determination, and nationalist struggles in China and Korea awakened Taiwanese students to anti-colonial consciousness (Chen 1972: 481).

Reformist anti-colonialism

It was under the influence of these factors that the notion of "Taiwan for the Taiwanese" emerged among Taiwanese students and that the New People's Society (*Shinminkai*) was established in early 1920. With several wealthy supporters, such as Lin Hsien-t'ang and Ts'ai Hui-ju, the Society was organized by a group of Taiwanese college students in Tokyo. The Society set itself three major tasks: 1) to launch a political movement to press for reforms in Taiwan; 2) to publish a society organ in order to promote their ideas and enlighten Taiwanese; and 3) to effect closer liaison with Chinese friends (TGGPA [1939] 1989a: 20–4; Ts'ai *et al.* 1971: 81–2). As for the third task, the major goal was to solicit support from the KMT, which was based in Canton at that time. However, the Society achieved little in this regard (Chen 1972: 482). Before it was banned in 1937, the year when Japan and China went to war again, *Taiwan Common Daily* (*T'ai-wan min-pao*) was the successor to the Society's organ and remained the chief medium giving voice to the suffering of the colonized.

The political campaign by the New People's Society pioneered Taiwanese anti-colonialism in the 1920s. It first aimed at repealing "Law No. 63," from which many discriminatory regulations derived and demanded equal citizenship under the Japanese constitution. When the Imperial Diet made it clear that Law No. 63 would be retained with only minor revisions, the Society called for the establishment of a parliament in Taiwan. The Taiwan parliament would consist of publicly elected members who would have the power to participate in the making of special laws and the enactment of a budget (Ts'ai *et al.* 1971: 107–9; Chen 1972: 482–3; Tsurumi 1977: 180–7). The Society's new effort in pressing for a local legislature marked the turn toward a home rule movement, which became the motif for the reformist group for the next decade and a half.[3] From 1921 to 1934, the reformists submitted to the Imperial Diet a total of fifteen petitions requesting the creation of a parliament in Taiwan without success.

What the reformists intended throughout their campaign was open to debate as far as political identity is concerned. Writing about their political activities under the Japanese after nearly half a century, several leading members of the home rule movement defined it as the mainstream of the "Taiwanese modern nationalist movement," which "had been led by bourgeoisie and intellectuals." The importance of the post-1927 radical, leftist anti-colonialism on the island was played down. Moreover, they claimed that "to escape the yoke of the Japanese and return to the embrace of the motherland [China] had definitely remained the consistent aim of the movement" (Ts'ai *et al.* 1971: 1). For some, however, such a retrospective overview was only an apology for their relatively moderate anti-colonialism. For instance, E. Patricia Tsurumi argues that the leaders of the home rule movement wanted Taiwan to remain in the Japanese Empire and that what they sought was full acceptance as Japanese (Tsurumi 1980: 9). The business and other connections of the reformists with Japan, as well as their willing embrace of Japanese education, Tsurumi notes, showed that the changes they asked for were limited reforms not intended to topple the political, economic, and social *status quo* (Tsurumi 1977: 193–5; 1980: 4–5).

Masahiro Wakabayashi classifies the reformists as a "reform-reunification" group in his oft-cited typology of Taiwanese anti-colonialism. Recognizing that the reformists' ultimate goal was to "return to the motherland," Wakabayashi argues that they were "biding their time" in a long, moderate struggle against the colonial regime (Wakabayashi 1987: 41–6). It might be politically naive to suppose that the reformists would have shown any commitment to the goal of reunifying the island with China under the efficient censorship of the Japanese police. The reformists' vision of a future relationship between China and a liberated Taiwan, however, was quite unclear when compared with radical, leftist anti-colonialism.[4] It is safe to say that it was precisely the reformists' "biding-their-time" tendency that underlay their ambiguous attitude toward the relationship between Taiwan and China.

The reformists' concept of "Taiwan for the Taiwanese" was one shaped by contemporary ideological trends, particularly Wilsonian idealism for liberal democracy and self-determination, and the biological-evolutionary notion of "survival of the fittest" in the "struggle for existence." Influenced by such ideological trends, the reformists viewed the Taiwanese as a "backward" branch of the "Han nation" (*Han min-tsu*), incapable of surviving bitter racial competition. Concepts of racial hierarchy and survival-of-the-fittest had prevailed in many places of the world since the late nineteenth century (Bowler 1993: 59). When Taiwanese students in Tokyo were awakened to political consciousness by Wilsonian principles, they grew anxious over the apparent "backwardness" of the Taiwanese. For the reformists, China, as the home of the Han nation, had confronted the challenges to political and cultural problems in Sun Yat-sen's Nationalist Revolution of 1912, overthrowing the Manchurian Ch'ing Empire. In the May Fourth Movement of 1919, university students and intellectuals challenged the country's traditional moral and social order and called for the creation of a "scientific" and "democratic" new culture.[5] The reformists typically believed that as part of the Han nation, the Taiwanese

culturally lagged far behind the "progressive" Chinese. "Cultural enlightenment" was regarded as the most effective means of promoting the political consciousness of the colonized and mobilizing support for the home rule movement. Hence, reformists organized various civil activities, such as speeches, seminars, theater productions and numerous women and youth societies with a view toward enlightening the masses. From the viewpoint of the reformists the particularity of Taiwanese culture consisted of its "backwardness," especially when compared with cultural development in China.

Radical anti-colonialism

Generally speaking, radical, left-leaning anti-colonial activists were influenced by socialism to a different degree, which had prevailed throughout the world in the early twentieth century. The reformists were primarily concerned with the home rule of the Taiwanese, whom they considered an "unenlightened" part of the Han nation under the Japanese. By contrast, the radical activists viewed the Taiwanese as "a weak and small nation" – a concept typical of socialist discourse on colonized peoples – and sought their complete emancipation from colonialism. They opposed the home rule movement, attacking it as a humiliating action and futile effort under a harsh colonial regime. In general, the political independence of the island was the chief aim of radical anti-colonialism.

Political activities of the radical group are in general much less traceable than those of the reformists. Radicals typically acted clandestinely in order to avoid Japanese police harassment. Socialism attracted some Taiwanese students in Tokyo as early as the beginning of the 1920s. However, leftist organizations were not developed until early 1927, when a cohort of young activists formed a socialist study group within the Taiwan Youth Association (*Taiwan seinen kai*), which was founded shortly after the formation of the New People's Society and functioned as its affiliate. Influenced by Lenin's concepts of world communist revolution and anti-imperialist struggles in colonies, left-leaning Taiwanese activists in Tokyo viewed the anti-colonial movement as a part of "the global liberation movement of oppressed peoples," believing that it was essential for these peoples to form a "united front" against imperialism (TGGPA [1939]1989a: 45). While the socialist study group attempted to "liaise with the KMT and Korean proletariat," they, like the reformist New People's Society, had achieved very little in this regard (TGGPA [1939]1989a: 40).

In China at that time, the intellectual and political atmosphere appeared encouraging for the Taiwanese students who studied there. The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia inspired young radical Chinese intellectuals who had been vexed by their country's moral degeneration, political instability, and economic deterioration. Before the momentous May Fourth Movement of 1919, several magazines and newspapers introduced Marxism and reported on the Bolshevik Revolution. As a result of the 1921 organization of the CCP and the KMT-CCP alliance made in 1924, the years between 1924 and 1927 were marked

by the spectacular spread of Marxism among urban intellectuals. The Leninist concept of imperialism and that image of the Western world was to gain wide acceptance not only among those close to the CCP but even among intellectuals and politicians connected with the KMT (Schwartz 1983: 445–6).

It was the post-1919 intellectual and political climate that stimulated and shaped the anti-colonial movement of Taiwanese students in China.[6] From 1922 on, numerous anti-Japanese Taiwanese student organizations formed in Peking, Nanking, Shanghai, Amoy, and Canton. While it is hard to say that all of their members believed in communism, Leninist tenets about world communist revolution and anti-imperialist struggles in colonies strongly influenced their views of the relationship between the Chinese Nationalist revolution and the Taiwanese anti-colonial movement.

The major common aim shared by these organizations was to enlist Chinese help, especially the support of the KMT government in Canton. Generally speaking, they opposed the home rule movement in Taiwan, maintaining that the campaign for the establishment of a parliament in Taiwan was a temporary expedient for mitigating the harshness of colonial rule. Taiwan, as a weak and small nation, the radical students claimed, must be completely liberated from Japanese control. To achieve this goal, Chinese aid was deemed particularly important for two major reasons. First, Japan was the common enemy of Taiwan and China, for Japan had been encroaching on China territory since their victory over the Ch'ing Empire in the 1894–95 Sino-Japanese War. The Taiwanese student anti-colonial organizations tried to capitalize on strong anti-Japanese sentiment in China to draw their support. It was assumed that a powerful China would facilitate the emancipation of the Taiwanese.

The second aspect of the Taiwanese activists' appeal to the Chinese concerned national identity. On the one hand, they represented the Taiwanese as a part of the Han nation or "Chinese people" (*Chung-hua min-tsu*) that were suffering from colonial control and were longing for emancipation. On the other hand, the Chinese nation was also juxtaposed with the "Taiwanese nation" (*T'ai-wan min-tsu*), which was in turn lumped with colonized oriental peoples such as the Koreans, the Filipinos, and the Indians. It seemed that the Taiwanese and the Chinese were conceptualized as two distinct nations despite their common racial and cultural backgrounds. Understandably, the radical activists' identification with the Han nation or the Chinese people served to enlist Chinese support, while the juxtaposition of the Taiwanese nation and the Chinese nation showed the influence of Leninist Marxism and the Wilsonian concept of self-determination. In general, conceptualizing the Taiwanese and the Chinese as two separate "nations" was prevalent among anti-colonial Taiwanese student organizations in China. Partly for this reason most of the organizations emphasized the future political autonomy of the island while calling on China to support the anti-Japanese movement.[7]

In fact, the radical activists' view of the Taiwanese as a distinct nation and their notion of a national liberation movement was congruent with the KMT's and CCP's views of colonized "weak and small nations" and their policies

toward Korea and Taiwan. According to Hsiao and Sullivan's study, it was only after the Cairo Conference of 1943 that the CCP viewed Taiwan *a priori* as an integral part of Chinese territory and thus denied any potential political sovereignty to the Taiwanese people. In the Conference, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill endorsed China's demand for the retrocession of Taiwan and Manchuria to China, and the independence, "in due course," of Korea.[8] Before 1943, Hsiao and Sullivan note, the CCP leaders consistently recognized the Taiwanese as a distinct "nation" or "nationality." The leaders also regarded the national liberation movement on Taiwan as a struggle of a "weak and small nation" separate from the Chinese revolution and potentially sovereign. Moreover, prior to 1943 even Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek treated Taiwan as a peripheral area of China which was culturally and politically different than other parts of China and thus deserved some kind of political independence (Hsiao and Sullivan 1979: 446, 462–4).

The radical anti-colonial organization that above all advocated the political autonomy of the island was the Taiwanese Communist Party, which was established in Shanghai in April 1928 by a group of Taiwanese intellectuals. The party was founded as a "Nationality Branch of the Japanese Communist Party" by order of the Communist International and also supported by the CCP. Such slogans as "Down with Japanese Imperialism!", "Establish the Republic of Taiwan!", and "Long live the Independence of the Taiwanese Nation!" coined in the Party's 1928 "Political Thesis" had clearly voiced its political commitment (Hsiao and Sullivan 1979: 455; 1983: 270–1; Lu 1989: 67–70; TGGPA [1939]1989c: 35).

In brief, as far as national identity is concerned, the reformists viewed the Taiwanese as a part of the Han nation. For them, Taiwanese culture differed from Han/Chinese culture mainly in its "backwardness;" the former was not unlike the latter in nature despite its local flavor. By contrast, most radical activists saw the Taiwanese as a weak and small nation separate from the Chinese nation. Despite the differences, neither the reformists nor the radical activists addressed the issue of the uniqueness of Taiwanese culture, nor did they use cultural particularity as a justification for political action. The distinctiveness of Taiwanese culture, however, became a major concern in the debates on literary development and linguistic reform that arose in the early 1930s, when anti-colonial resistance on the island had been suppressed by the colonial government. The two debates were two sides of the same coin. One concerned literature as a primary intellectual activity to represent the distinctiveness of Taiwanese culture and the other was focused on the linguistic tool for such a process of literary representation. Both spoke to the difficult identity dilemmas in which the Taiwanese cultural elite was put under alien rule. To examine the debates, however, it is essential to understand the general linguistic situation during the colonial period.

Japanese linguistic assimilationism

Education played a central role in the colonial administration's policy of assimilation. For the administration, education meant Japanizing the colonized primarily through the teaching of Japanese as the "national language." The use of Japanese was regarded by the colonial government as the foundation of assimilation. In 1898, three years after Japan had annexed Taiwan, sixteen Japanese language institutes and thirty-six branch institutes were in operation. A formal type of elementary school established exclusively for Taiwanese children, the common school (*kōgakkō*), soon replaced these institutes. The first article of the 1898 Common School Regulations stated that the system had two aims: 1) to give Taiwanese children a good command of the national language and 2) to teach them ethics and practical knowledge in order to cultivate in them qualities of Japanese citizenship. In fact, the courses in Japanese language were 70 per cent of the total of weekly teaching hours. The common school served as the most important institution to popularize Japanese (Tsurumi 1977: 18; Wu Wen-hsing 1992: 310).

Nevertheless, the colonial government's language policy achieved less than expected. In addition to the serious problem of absenteeism, the percentage of the Taiwanese school-age population enrolled remained quite low for a long period. In 1919, those who had completed a common school education were only 1.51 per cent of the population (Wu Wen-hsing 1992: 317). In 1920 only 2.86 per cent of Taiwanese could in everyday use comprehend and speak Japanese (Chou 1995: 119). Although the colonial government encouraged the Taiwanese to organize a variety of civil Japanese-learning societies during the 1910s and 1920s, linguistic assimilation was still limited (Wu Wen-hsing 1992: 323–30).

By the end of the 1920s, the colonial administration began to actively promote Japanese language education. This was closely related to political changes on and off the island. On the one hand, the liberal reforms of the Japanese Empire that had relaxed control over the colonies did not outlast the 1920s. Since the turn of the decade, domestic socio-economic dislocations and instabilities abroad, especially in East Asia, contributed to a shift in Japan and in the colonies toward authoritarianism and the resurgent power of the military to shape policy (Peattie 1984: 21–2).

On the other hand, as a result of resurgent militarism, the Taiwanese anti-colonial movement on the island, particularly the radical leftist, was completely suppressed by the end of 1931. Since the early 1920s, a number of young Taiwanese intellectuals converted to communism or anarchism under the influence of counterparts in Japan and China. During the second half of the 1920s, several radical anti-colonial organizations appeared. By the end of 1931 all these organizations had disintegrated.[9] By contrast, the League for the Attainment of Local Autonomy, led by the reformists, remained active until 1937, the year when the Sino-Japanese War broke. However, the League was devoted mainly to pressing for the establishment of a Taiwan parliament and

the reform of the system of local autonomy in a legal, low-key way (Chen 1972: 493).

As part of the policy of tightening control after the end of the 1920s, the further promotion of Japanese language education progressed. Local colonial governments created Japanese language study groups of different types and launched various Japanese learning campaigns. In addition, a rule was enforced to ban the use of Taiwanese languages in such public places as government offices, banks, and companies, and to require these institutions to employ only those who acquired command of Japanese. More important was the fact that in 1931, the colonial government officially ordered the establishment of Japanese language institutes at different local administration levels. These institutes functioned as a supplement to the formal school education system, targeting those aged between 12 and 25 who did not go to school.[10] According to the record of the colonial government, in 1937 the number of the Taiwanese who could "comprehend" Japanese was 1,934,000 or 37.86 per cent of the population (Wu Wen-hsing 1992: 353–9).[11] Compared with the percentage in 1920 (2.86), the increase was impressive. This was mainly attributable to the establishment of language institutes after 1931.

The achievement in Japanese language education, nevertheless, should not be overestimated. On the one hand, many Taiwanese counted among those who could "comprehend" Japanese – especially those who studied at the language institutes – could not actually speak it (Chou 1994: 131; 1995: 121). On the other hand, Japanese never replaced Taiwanese languages as the major vehicle of communication in daily life. For the colonized, Japanese primarily remained a language of public domain. At best, colonial language education before the *kōminka* movement changed a proportion of Taiwanese into bilinguals (Chou 1995: 122–4).

Literary and linguistic reforms in colonial Taiwan

Debates on literary development and linguistic reform rose among the Taiwanese cultural elite in the early 1930s, when the Japanese were tightening control of the colony. Prospects for the resistance movement, whether reformist or radical, were quite dim. Meanwhile the colonial administration made more efforts to impose the Japanese language on the Taiwanese than ever before. The Han identity represented by the reformists' "biding-their-time" tendency appeared in jeopardy. The attraction of "progressive" China became less and less relevant. The concept of a Taiwanese nation gradually disappeared at the same time as the communists. For Taiwanese intellectuals who still embraced anti-colonial consciousness and were involved in the debates, the particular social, political, and cultural reality on the island increasingly stood out in clear relief. As a result of the oppressive political climate, grave concern over the uniqueness of Taiwanese culture – especially when contrasted to the cultural life in China – was aroused. This concern represents a distinct sense of identity that distinguished these two debates from earlier discussions of literary and linguistic reforms in Taiwan in the early 1920s.

Literary and linguistic reforms in the 1920s: vernacular literature and Mandarin Chinese

Taiwanese intellectuals concerned themselves with the linguistic and literary problems as early as anti-colonial political activities started in Tokyo. In the first issue of the organ of the New People's Society, *Taiwan Youth* (*Taiwan Seinen*), appeared an article under the title of "Literature and its Function" (1920) by Ch'en Hsin (1893–1947).[12] His argument can be summarized as follows. First of all, literature was "the vanguard of a culture;" literary development provided the index to the rise or fall of a nation. The function of literature was to "further the advance of national culture and facilitate the revival of a nation," – that is, to "disseminate enlightened ideas, awaken the masses, and promote humane feeling and social reform." Second, contemporary literary works written in difficult classical Chinese (*wen-yen*) had lost the noble spirit and function of literature. Third, Taiwanese writers should seek identification between the written and spoken language, as the vernacular literature movement in China had done. Obviously Ch'en's idea of the proper function of literature was relatively consistent with the reformists' concept of the Taiwanese as a "backward" part of the Han nation under colonial rule. His interest in literature – or to be precise, a vernacular literature – as an instrument to popular enlightenment and social reformation was also closely related to the reformists' concern over the promotion of Taiwanese culture.

Moreover, Ch'en's attack on literary works written in classical Chinese style and advocacy of vernacular literature was inspired by the new literature movement carried on in China. In early 1917, China's new intellectual leaders, particularly Hu Shih and Ch'en Tu-hsiu, launched a "literary revolution." Their chief goal was to replace the classical style of writing with a vernacular style (*pai-hua*) based upon Mandarin, which was gradually accepted as the Chinese "national language" (*kuo-yü*). Hu Shih proclaimed the death of classical literature and advocated creating "a literature in the national language and a national language suitable for literature." After the May Fourth Movement of 1919, the new literature movement rapidly spread to wider circles, and the use of the vernacular in writing became far more popular than before all over China. As a result, by 1921, the Ministry of Education decreed that the vernacular would henceforth be used in primary school texts. This policy was also adopted by an increasing number of middle and higher schools. The vernacular was officially and popularly recognized as the "national language" (Chow 1960: 271–9). The achievement of the new literature movement in China greatly impressed Ch'en Hsin. As to the principle of identification between the written and spoken language, however, Ch'en noted a difficult situation in Taiwan: the major local language, Hoklo, lacked its own writing system and the language could not be completely signified by traditional Chinese characters.

Generally speaking, Ch'en Hsin's argument indicated the direction of the public discussion about literary reform in Taiwan in the early 1920s, though his pioneering article drew little attention. The discussion going on during this period focused on linguistic issues. For those involved in the discussion, literary

reform was primarily a reform of the language tools used for literary expression. Enlightening the masses by means of a written vernacular became the major issue in Taiwan's social reforms. As Ch'en Hsin pointed out the difficulty in writing in Hoklo, those involved encountered the problem of "which vernacular should be written" and "how to write." As to this issue, reformist Taiwanese intellectuals, such as Huang Ch'eng-ts'ung (1886–1963) and Huang Ch'ao-ch'in (1897–1972), argued that Mandarin vernacular, not any Taiwanese language, was the choice, though they would accept a "compromised" version of Mandarin which incorporated components of local languages (Huang Ch'ao-ch'in [1923]1979; Huang Ch'eng-ts'ung [1923]1979). Such a perspective says much for their strong identification with Han/Chinese culture on the one hand and represented their protest against Japanese linguistic assimilationism on the other. The fact that the reformists' *Taiwan Common Daily* had used Mandarin vernacular rather than classical Chinese or Japanese since it started publication in 1923 demonstrated their view on Taiwan's linguistic reform and popular enlightenment. As a single medium giving voice to the distress of the colonized, the publication soon became a forum for promoting literary and linguistic reforms.

The advocacy for Mandarin reached its zenith when Chang Wo-chün promoted literary reform in Taiwan. In April 1924, when he was studying in Peking, Chang started a series of attacks on Taiwan's literature in classical Chinese forms, especially poetry. A 22-year-old fervent admirer of Hu Shih, he introduced Hu's idea of literary reform and listed the impressive achievements of the vernacular movement in China in a series of articles in the *Taiwan Common Daily*. For Chang, Taiwan's literature was an offshoot of Chinese literature, and the former should follow the direction in which the latter developed. Compared with the new literature in China, Taiwan's literature was regarded as an "evil residue" of traditional Chinese literature. Inspired by Hu Shih's slogan – "a literature in the national language and a national language suitable for literature," Chang set two tasks for the new literature movement in Taiwan: "to develop a vernacular literature and to reform *tai-oan-oe*." Chang made it clear that what he meant by "the vernacular" was Chinese national language. He believed that it was easy for the educated people who could not even speak Mandarin to read and write it, for "all other Chinese dialects resembled Mandarin." Chang thus explained his concept of linguistic reform:

> Some people who claim to be radical argue: "Classical Chinese no longer works. We must use the vernacular. We must utilize the *tai-oan-oe* we have used everyday." ... In fact, ninety per cent of *tai-oan-oe* that we use everyday cannot be signified. The reason is that our language is a *patois*, an inferior language without a writing system, and a language whose most components are defective. No doubt it is of no literary worth. So our new literature movement has a task to perform: to reform *tai-oan-oe*. We plan to change our *patois* into a decent language that can be written down. We decide to draw on Chinese national language to reform the Taiwanese *patois*. In other words, we plan to make *tai-oan-oe* correspond to Chinese national language .... If we can achieve this goal, our culture would not be separated from Chinese culture, the foundation of vernacular literature can be built up, and *tai-oan-oe* can be changed into a reasonable one ....
>
> (Chang [1925]1979: 102–3)

Chang's concept of a new literature movement evoked opposition from traditional Taiwanese literati, who believed that this kind of literary revolution would put traditional Han culture as represented by classical Chinese in jeopardy. The opposition, however, was relatively weak. By contrast, young intellectuals supported the literary reform by creating more and more literary works in a colloquial style based on Mandarin, while their writing inevitably included components of local languages. Under the Japanese, Chang Wo-chün and other major literary reformers did not hide their keen Han/Chinese cultural identity. Their enthusiasm for the literary revolution in Taiwan was stimulated by progressive cultural trends in China represented by the May Fourth Movement of 1919. It was also encouraged by the relatively liberal political climate in the colony during the early 1920s. In general, Taiwanese intellectuals who supported literary reform shared this sort of cultural identity.

The literary and linguistic reforms in the 1930s: **hsiang-t'u** *literature and* **tai-oan-oe** *writing system*

Compared to the embracing of Chinese national language in the early 1920s, the promotion of "*hsiang-t'u* literature" (*hsiang* literally means "village," "rural area," or "hometown," and *t'u*, "soil," "local," or "native") and a writing system of *tai-oan-oe* (*T'ai-wan hua-wen*) in the early 1930s occurred in a more oppressive political situation. As mentioned above, the Japanese were tightening the control of the colony in this period. By the end of 1931, anti-colonial resistance, except for the moderate League for the Attainment of Local Autonomy, had been crushed. Meanwhile the further promotion of Japanese education as a major aspect of the colonial assimilation policy was in progress. Under the circumstances, many young Taiwanese intellectuals abandoned politics for cultural activities, especially literature. Moreover, although anti-colonial resistance was completely suppressed, the influence of socialism on literature remained powerful. As a result of the rapid development of anti-colonial movements after 1927, socialism became prevalent in literary circles. The concept of "proletarian literature" inspired a special concern over the laboring masses in young intellectuals (Huang Ch'i-ch'un 1995: 56–7).

It was the article, "Why Not Promote *Hsiang-t'u* Literature?" by Huang Shih-hui – a major leader of the radicalized Taiwan Cultural Association, which was originally established by the reformists (TGGPA [1939] 1989a: 337, 422) – that provoked the debate on "*hsiang-t'u* literature" and a Hoklo writing system that lasted the following two years. Huang wrote in August 1930:

> You are Taiwanese. Over your head is the Taiwanese sky. Your feet walk on Taiwanese soil. All you see are the conditions of Taiwan. Everything your ears hear is Taiwanese news. What you undergo is Taiwanese experience. That which you speak is also a Taiwanese language. Therefore, that powerful, gifted pen of yours, that productive, brilliant pen should also write Taiwanese literature.
>
> ...
>
> Do you want to create literature that will touch and excite the masses? Do you want the masses to feel your emotions in their hearts? If you don't, nothing more need to be said. If you do, then whether you are a defender of the ruling class or a leader of the laboring masses, you must create literature whose readers are the laboring masses. Thus you should also stand up for *hsiang-t'u* literature and create *hsiang-t'u* literature.[13]

To be sure, Huang's concept of creating a sort of popular literature, especially for the laboring masses, was hardly new. Since vernacular literature and Mandarin was promoted in the early 1920s, enlightening the masses by creating a new literature that would be more popular and social in both content and form had been a major concern of young intellectuals. Under the influence of socialist tenets of proletarian literature, however, Huang demanded more radical "localization" of literature. On the one hand, the subject matter must be about the realities of life in Taiwan. It was the representation of the realities of life that Huang believed could attract the laboring masses to literature. On the other hand, however, the popularization of literature concerned not only literary content but also literary tools – the language a writer used. Both classical Chinese and modern Mandarin Chinese, Huang noted, were difficult to understand for the laboring masses whose native tongue was *tai-oan-oe*. A vernacular literature based on Mandarin might become popular in China. Nevertheless, Huang argued, in Taiwan it would remain an "aristocratic" literature developed and enjoyed exclusively by a small intellectual elite. To promote *hsiang-t'u* literature, he claimed, was "to write an essay in *tai-oan-oe*, compose a poem in *tai-oan-oe*, create a novel in *tai-oan-oe*, produce a folk song in *tai-oan-oe*, and deal with things that happened on Taiwan."[14]

The debate on *hsiang-t'u* literature did not become heated until July 1931, one year after Huang's article appeared. The change was attributable to the publication of an article, "A Proposal for Developing a '*Tai-oan-oe* Writing System'," by Kuo Ch'iu-sheng (1904–80) and Huang Shih-hui's article, "On *Hsiang-t'u* Literature Once Again." Kuo claimed that "none of the assimilation policies of the colonial powers would achieve ultimate success." The discriminatory education and suppression of traditional private schools, Kuo noted, had created the serious problem of illiteracy among the Taiwanese. Like Huang's article published one year before, Kuo's article pointed to the fact that for the Taiwanese, not only the writing style of classical Chinese but also that of Mandarin Chinese – not to mention Japanese writing – violated the principle of identification between written language and spoken language. To acquire

command of any of these languages required tremendous effort; and the overwhelming majority of Taiwanese were isolated from modern knowledge because they could read neither Japanese nor Mandarin. A *tai-oan-oe* writing form, Kuo believed, was the most effective instrument for solving the problem of illiteracy.[15] Compared with his last essay, Huang Shih-hui's new article focused exclusively on the linguistic tool of *hsiang-t'u* literature. He reiterated his argument, contending that "we must have *hsiang-t'u* literature because *hsiang-t'u* literature represents speaking and each place has its own language." Huang emphasized once again that Taiwanese writers should use a native language to deal with things happening in Taiwan, for they did not write for people who lived in any remote land.[16]

The articles by Kuo and Huang provoked a heated discussion on the *hsiang-t'u* literature and *tai-oan-oe* script among the Taiwanese cultural elite. *Hsiang-t'u* literature was now identified with a *tai-oan-oe* literature. Like the discussion on literary reform in the early 1920s, the debate over *hsiang-t'u* literature focused on the linguistic aspect. The difference was that the conflict in the early 1920s was primarily between younger intellectuals who promoted a vernacular literature written in Mandarin and the traditional literati who stuck to the literature written in classical Chinese. By contrast, now the clash was mainly between one group of young intellectuals who advocated a *tai-oan-oe* literature and the other who endorsed a Mandarin literature. Generally speaking, both sides agreed on the need to create a literature more sensitive to local realities. However, they disagreed on the linguistic tools necessary for representing that reality. In fact, the controversy was not confined to the realm of literature. More often than not the debaters concerned themselves with an effective written language for promoting popular education.

The arguments of the opponents of a *tai-oan-oe* writing system did not differ materially from the views embraced by the advocates of Mandarin in the early 1920s who were represented by Chang Wo-chün. Their contentions could be summarized as follows. First, *tai-oan-oe* was coarse and unformed. It was not qualified to fill the role of a literary tool. Second, there existed such dialects as Hoklo and Hakka in Taiwan. Even the Changchou and Chüanchou accents were still discernible within Hoklo – that is, *tai-oan-oe* had not yet been standardized. A literature based on Hoklo might not be appreciated by a Hakka speaker. Third, Chinese people could not understand written *tai-oan-oe*. The island would be alienated from China (Liao [1954,1955]1979: 493–4). This group of debaters, like their forerunners in the early 1920s, advocated the popularization of spoken and written Mandarin in order to retain connections with China. The opponents' views obviously testified to their distinct Han/Chinese cultural identity.

Colonialism and the uniqueness of Taiwanese culture

In a sense the opponents of *tai-oan-oe* vernacular literature missed the proponents' point – if not evading the problem altogether. For supporters it was

essential to create a *tai-oan-oe* script because of the particular situation on the island under the colonial rule. As a major champion, Kuo Ch'iu-sheng thus stated:

> I love Mandarin Chinese very much. In fact, I have never alienated myself from Mandarin, but I am not satisfied with it. To be sure, it is the current situation that does not allow me to use Mandarin! Can Mandarin be freely popularized in Taiwan? Because the identification between written language and spoken language is the principle of vernacular writing, naturally dialectal elements of local literature should be acceptable. Then theoretically the place occupied by Taiwanese literature in the Mandarin-speaking world would be compared to the place occupied by any local [literature] in China. However, now in reality [*tai-oan-oe*] cannot play the role of a dialect in the Mandarin-speaking world as any dialect in China does, can it?
>
> (Kuo 1931: 11)

Kuo learned classical Chinese from a private tutor while attending a common school. Then he went to China and received his high school education in Amoy (Huang Wu-chung 1980: 62), where he acquired a command of Mandarin. He committed himself to the support of the *tai-oan-oe* script because he believed that Taiwan had been trapped in colonialism. It appeared impossible for the Taiwanese to escape from alien rule. The heyday of anti-colonial resistance was gone. All challenges issued to the colonial regime had proved futile. The idea of reunifying Taiwan with China now sounded like a dream. The hope of an independent country, which was once cherished by the Taiwanese Communist Party, was no more realistic than the possibility of reunification. Hence it can be said that the opponents of *hsiang-t'u* literature written in *tai-oan-oe* had missed the advocates' point - the fact that Taiwan was a particular, colonized area. For those who promoted Mandarin, Taiwan was still a part of the Han Chinese world and would maintain links with China forever. They felt uneasy about the idea of developing a distinctive culture by means of a *tai-oan-oe* writing system (Liao [1954,1955]1979: 495). For an advocate of *hsiang-t'u* literature and *tai-oan-oe* script such as Kuo Ch'iu-sheng, the essential task at the moment was to secure the integrity of Taiwanese identity. The kind of view was clearly expressed by Huang Shih-hui:

> Taiwan is a peculiar world. Politically, Chinese common language is not allowable. Nationally (in terms of historical experience), Japanese common language is not desirable. Therefore I suggest that we create an independent Taiwanese culture in order to adjust ourselves to the reality in Taiwan.[17]

The most effective, fundamental means of developing a distinctive culture, the advocates believed, was a *tai-oan-oe* script. For them it was Taiwanese cultural particularity that marked the identity of the colonized and functioned as an antidote to the assimilationism of the Japanese. The deep concern over the distinctiveness of the reality in Taiwan indicated the emerging of a novel sense of identity on the island.

For the advocates, *hsiang-t'u* literature played a major role in representing a particular reality. In the first place, writers' constant experiments in writing *tai-oan-oe* could facilitate the improvement of the writing form. To promote *tai-oan-oe* writing, Kuo Ch'iu-sheng argued, was not simply to create a *tai-oan-oe* script. Kuo, like Chang Wo-chün, who had advocated Mandarin for a decade, was inspired by Hu Shih's slogan, contending that the true aim of the advocacy of *tai-oan-oe* writing was to produce not only "a literature in *tai-oan-oe*" but also "a *tai-oan-oe* suitable for literature" (Kuo 1932: 25). That is, *hsiang-t'u* literature could make an important contribution to the refinement of *tai-oan-oe* script, which was deemed the optimal linguistic tool for representing local reality.

Yeh Jung-chung (1900–78), an editor of the literary bimonthly, *Voice of the South* (*Nan-yin*), articulated the distinctive nature of Taiwan reality in a typical fashion. The Taiwanese as "a social collective," Yeh believed, had developed a sort of common character because of specific race, history, geography, and customs. Such a shared character had been shaped primarily by two factors. Yeh explained:

> The first factor is Taiwan's particular culture. ... Taiwanese maintained a Han cultural tradition that has developed for four thousand years, but such a heritage has been carried forward in a special region and remolded by Japanese culture. Thus Taiwan must have her own distinctive culture. This is our destiny. We have no choice but to follow this direction of development. Only by doing so can we say that we are loyal to our own vocation and make a contribution to world civilization. The second factor is our social condition. Our special political, economic, and social life and the particular education we receive have formed a unique social environment and have bred our social consciousness.
>
> (Yeh 1932a: preface page)

Yeh attributed the common, distinct character that distinguished the Taiwanese from the Han Chinese on the Mainland mainly to colonial rule. Like Kuo Ch'iu-sheng and Huang Shih-hui, he accepted that the island was trapped in colonialism and envisioned little hope of liberation. In fact, the major purpose of Yeh's essay was to criticize the concept of proletarian literature, which had inspired young intellectuals such as Huang Shih-hui to promote *hsiang-t'u* literature written in *tai-oan-oe*. Yeh believed that collective character was shaped by particular cultural and social conditions and was shared by the members of every social class. It took priority over class consciousness. Therefore Yeh advocated "the third literature" as an alternative to "aristocratic" and "proletarian" literature. Future "Taiwanese literature", he argued, should be the third literature based on collective character. The third literature must deal with everyday life, feelings, demands, and the thirst for liberation (Yeh

1932b: preface page). As it turned out, Yeh's critique on proletarian literature was not quite at odds with Huang Shih-hui's notion of *hsiang-t'u* literature. In terms of the concern over representing reality, Yeh's idea of the third literature had many similarities with Huang's concept of *hsiang-t'u* literature. When Yeh delineated what the collective shared and explained how the common character had evolved historically, he described a unique culture and consciousness. In short, Yeh had developed a notion of Taiwaneseness distinguished from Chineseness (Fix 1993: 264).

In fact the journal Yeh was editing, *Voice of the South*, played a major role in the promotion of *tai-oan-oe* literature. From the publication of its first issue in January 1932, the journal had devoted pages for intellectual debate on *tai-oan-oe* literature. It also had the "*Tai-oan-oe* Writing Experiment Column" to solicit contributions – especially "folk literature" recorded in *tai-oan-oe*, such as riddles, folk songs, children's ballads, and the like. Moreover, the journal remained consistent in calling on writers to create "Taiwanese popular literature" that dealt with local history, customs, and social life.[18]

The maintenance of Han cultural identity

However, the sense of Han/Chinese cultural identity possessed by the proponents of *tai-oan-oe* vernacular literature should not be underestimated. Almost without exception the proponents in the early 1930s advocated writing *tai-oan-oe* in Chinese characters, though they might differ over which was the "correct" or "better" character to signify a *tai-oan-oe* morpheme. They also coined new characters to represent a specific morpheme. Such technical issues became an important concern and aroused much discussion. Nevertheless, almost all the advocates promoted a writing system that consisted of Chinese characters with a view to maintaining Taiwanese connections with China and Han culture. This kind of *tai-oan-oe* script, they assumed, would also be easy to read for Chinese. For example, Kuo Ch'iu-sheng argued that the writing form was just "a Chinese character system with strong local, dialectal color," while *tai-oan-oe* would probably develop beyond the status of a dialect in the Mandarin-speaking world. Therefore written *tai-oan-oe* would be easy to understand for those who already had a command of classical or Mandarin Chinese.[19] Kuo's view was shared by other important advocates, such as Huang Shih-hui, Fu Jen (Chuang Ch'ui-sheng), Huang Ch'un-ch'ing, and Li Hsien-chang.[20]

It was precisely because of this kind of Han cultural identity that these advocates opposed the alphabetization of *tai-oan-oe*, particularly the romanization project proposed by the reformist anti-colonial veteran, Ts'ai P'ei-huo (1899–1983).[21] In the late nineteenth century, English and Canadian Presbyterian evangelists introduced alphabetic writing on the island. They romanized *tai-oan-oe* and published a *tai-oan-oe* version of the Bible. As a Christian, Ts'ai learned to write *tai-oan-oe* in the Roman alphabet when he was young. The Japanese rule, Ts'ai argued, had alienated the colonized from the Chinese character system, which might have been used to signify *tai-oan-oe*. He believed that the

phonetic writing form based on twenty-four letters was the most effective instrument for promoting mass literacy and enlightening the masses. Since 1914, Ts'ai devoted himself to advocating the romanization system. He conducted seminars, published a series of articles and pamphlets, and traveled around the island and to Tokyo to enlist support from both the Taiwanese and the Japanese elite. Although the Taiwan Cultural Association once listed the promotion of alphabetic writing as part of its project of cultural enlightenment, it achieved little in practice. Few Taiwanese intellectuals showed interest in Ts'ai's proposal, and many felt uneasy about its foreign origin. In addition, the colonial administration suppressed Ts'ai's activities because it believed that the distribution of a *tai-oan-oe* romanization system would undermine the policy of linguistic assimilation. Thus by 1935 the promotion of the romanization form had come to a halt.[22]

While advocates of *tai-oan-oe* script based on Chinese characters encountered little harassment by the Japanese, they accomplished only a little more than Ts'ai in terms of their ambition to create a *tai-oan-oe* literature, improve mass literacy, and enlighten the masses. The lack of a standardized *tai-oan-oe* script had frustrated most authors. To write *tai-oan-oe* an author usually had to look for appropriate Chinese characters or create new ones. For all one's pains, there was no guarantee that the reader would accept or understand them. This obstacle even discouraged such brilliant authors as Lai Ho (1894–1943) and Yang K'uei (1905–85) from continuing their experiments with composing in *tai-oan-oe* (Fix 1993: 293). By 1933 the interest in *tai-oan-oe* literature had died down.

Since Chang Wo-chün launched violent attacks on literature written in classical Chinese and advocated using Mandarin in 1924, the majority of Taiwanese authors of modern literature had written in a form of Mandarin with strong local flavor. However, an increasing number of young authors who wrote in Japanese began to gain ground in the early 1930s. Japan had ruled the island for more than three decades at that time. These young writers were products of the colonial formal education as well as education in the metropole (Yeh 1987: 50; Fix 1993: 292). After the radical Japanization campaign, namely, the *kōminka* movement, which started in 1937, Mandarin authors were forced to stop writing (Yeh 1987: 65). A major task of the *kōminka* movement as part of wartime mobilization during the Sino-Japanese War (1937–45) was to change the island into a monolingual society. In April of that year the classical Chinese course in the common school, which had been reduced to a peripheral elective since 1922, was officially abolished. Then the colonial government ordered that all Chinese sections of local bilingual newspapers be removed by June 1937. The use of local languages, Hoklo in particular, encountered much more suppression than before, though the colonial administration never completely banned them. As a result of the radical Japanese-language campaign, the number of Taiwanese who could "comprehend" Japanese reached 80 per cent of the total population in 1943, though the official record was obviously exaggerated. Nevertheless, the fact was that those who had mastered the language,

especially young Japanese speakers, were increasing. This was attributed primarily to the growth of elementary education. In 1944 the percentage of the Taiwanese school-age population enrolled in elementary schools had reached 71.31 (Chou 1995: 124–5, 134, 140).[23] Japanese hence became a dominant language, particularly in the public domain.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, mass enlightenment was a major concern shared by anti-colonial intellectuals in Taiwan. During this period, for the first time the Taiwanese experienced the rule of a modern state apparatus. The effect of social integration caused by the colonial administration and the confrontation between the colonizer and the colonized contributed greatly to the waning of traditional ethnic identity and to the formation of a "Taiwanese people" identity. For anti-colonial intellectuals, enlightenment primarily meant awakening the colonized to political consciousness and heightening their will to counter Japanese assimilation. Enlightenment involved "cultural reformation", such as reforming traditional customs and manners, encouraging people to take part in public affairs, and diffusing modern knowledge among the masses. The success of the anti-Japanese movement depended heavily on whether or not the Taiwanese could become an "enlightened" people capable of competing with other peoples, including the Japanese, in the racial "struggle for existence." After the 1920s, the campaign for linguistic and literary reforms was motivated by a concern over cultural reformation as well as anti-colonial consciousness. Linguistic reform became an important issue because the serious problem of the illiteracy of the colonized constituted the chief obstacle to mass enlightenment. What was at issue was which language should be adopted as a vehicle for a writing system that would facilitate the introduction of modern knowledge among the Taiwanese and be used as an effective means of countering Japanese linguistic assimilation. The pioneering campaign for literary revolution in the early 1920s was precisely focused on the issue of linguistic reform, while it also attacked the indifference to socio-political realities – especially the sufferings of the colonized – displayed in literature composed in classical Chinese forms. Since then literature was regarded by anti-colonial intellectuals as an important means toward representing the reality of the island, giving voice to the distress of the colonized, and achieving mass enlightenment. The new literature conceived by anti-colonial intellectuals was characterized by a spirit of "social realism."

However, linguistic reform was not a merely technical problem. Rather, it involved Taiwanese intellectuals' cultural identity, which was shaped and reshaped by socio-political conjunctions. Compared with political anti-colonial resistances, the campaign for linguistic reform – particularly the promotion of a *tai-oan-oe* script in the early 1930s – reflected more clearly the cultural identity dilemma in which the Taiwanese elite was placed. As they believed that there was little hope of escaping from alien rule and reinstating close connections

with China, a group of young intellectuals shifted toward identifying themselves with the island and advocated a *tai-oan-oe* writing form. The concept of *hsiang-t'u* literature, which they argued would deal primarily with the peculiar conditions of the colony, was presented. The essence of the new form of identity was a deep concern over the distinctiveness of local culture shaped especially by colonialism. Obviously it was primarily the colonial rule, which had greatly alienated the island from China, that led to the formation of a new identity. Moreover, both the advocacy of Mandarin in the early 1920s and the promotion of a *tai-oan-oe* script in the early 1930s were inspired by the concept of a national language as an essential part of modern nation-state ideology – the concept that a common linguistic vehicle was indispensable to national collective life.

Still, this transition of identity should not be seen in black-and-white terms. The insistence on using Chinese characters to signify *tai-oan-oe* testified to the advocates' Han Chinese cultural identity. However, a great difficulty lay in the fact that it became increasingly impossible for the Taiwanese to learn Chinese characters because of the decline of traditional private schools and the cancellation of classical Chinese classes in common schools. Moreover, the colonial administration tried to sever Taiwanese connections with China by controlling travel to the Chinese Mainland. Similarly, Chinese were discouraged from journeying to the island (Shih [1962]1980: 336–7; Tai 1985: 250–5). Still, advocates of *tai-oan-oe* writing tried to use Chinese characters in order to maintain cultural ties with China, while they claimed that writers should deal with particular realities on the island. It was precisely because of their Han/Chinese cultural identity that Taiwanese intellectuals in general welcomed the return of the island to China when the Second World War ended. The linguistic and literary reforms presented in the colonial period would shed some definitive light on similar issues during the postwar period, which the following chapters focus on.

Notes

1 Some scholars trace Taiwanese non-violent resistance back to the formation of the Taiwan Assimilation Society (*Taiwan dōkakai*) in late 1914. The stated purpose of the society was to promote harmonious Japanese-Taiwanese relations based on the idea of racial equality. Moreover, it advocated cooperation between Japan and China to counter the domination of white races and that the "complete assimilation" of the Taiwanese would facilitate this cooperation. However, the organization of the society was initiated by a liberal Japanese politician, Itagaki Taisuke, though only 44 members were Japanese, out of a total of 3,178 members. Besides, with the exception of a small group, those Taiwanese who supported this movement were traditionally educated literati. The Society was forced to disband by the colonial administration in January 1915. See TGGPA ([1939]1989a: 2–17); Ts'ai P'ei-huo *et al.* (1971: 15–35).

2 Shortly after the Japanese takeover of the island, middle- and upper-class Taiwanese families began sending their children to study in major Japanese cities, especially Tokyo. In 1915 there were about 300 Taiwanese studying in the capital city; and by 1922 the number had increased to 2,400, with more than half enrolled in colleges and universities. See TGGPA ([1939]1989a: 18–19); Chen Ching-chih (1988: 35).

3 The campaign for a parliament in Taiwan was initiated by the New People's Society. It was led by such organizations as the pre-1927 Taiwan Cultural Association (*Taiwan bunka kyōkai*, founded in

Taiwan in 1921), the Japanese-based League for the Establishment of a Taiwanese Parliament (*Taiwan gikai kisei dōmeikai*, established in 1923), the pre-1928 Taiwan Popular Party (*Taiwan minshūtō*, established in Taiwan in 1927), and the League for the Attainment of Local Autonomy (*Taiwan chihōjichi renmei*, founded in Taiwan in 1930). These organizations can be regarded as successors to the New People's Society in the sense that their membership overlapped to a significant degree and that in general, they were under the leadership of Lin Hsien-t'ang, Ts'ai P'ei-huo, and their followers. See Ts'ai *et al.* (1971: 196–9); Shih ([1962]1980: 491–2).

4 A Japanese police report on the political positions of the advocates of the parliament in Taiwan might serve as an explanation of their "biding-their-time" attitude:

> It can be said that the leading members of this campaign are relatively moderate and have no immediate intention to pursue Taiwan's independence or reunification with China, though they are discontented with the colonial government and claim that the essential reforms must be carried out by Taiwanese themselves. At least they are constant to the demand for the home rule. However, we must pay attention to the fact that most of them act according to their views of China; their ideas and actions vary with such views. … One faction places their ardent hope on future China, believing that China will revive, hold sway over the world, and recover Taiwan. They emphasize that before such an opportunity arises, they would maintain their national character, conserve their strength, and bide their time. … By contrast, another faction expresses slight hope for future China but attach greater importance to the autonomy and viability of the island, maintaining that it is worthless if worse misgovernment is imposed on the island when reunified with China. … However, it is because they are disappointed with the current situation in China that they embrace such a view. It is thus understandable that they may return to the former faction's idea in case China is regarded as being powerful.
>
> (TGGPA [1939]1989b: 13–14)

5 For a brief explanation of the nature of the May Fourth Movement, see Chapter 3 of this book, Note 11.

6 After 1919, China attracted more and more Taiwanese who hoped to study abroad because of the low fees and easy entrance procedures of the new schools and universities that were springing up. According to the Japanese Government-General records, only nine Taiwanese studied in China during 1919. However, in 1921 the number increased to 273. See Tsurumi (1980: 6)

7 A pamphlet issued in 1926 by the Sino-Taiwanese Comradeship Association (*Chung-t'ai t'ung-chih hui*) in Nanking can be regarded as an epitome of the anti-colonial Taiwanese student organizations' general view of the future Taiwan-China relationship. The pamphlet said:

> In history, Taiwan has had close connections with the Chinese Mainland. The economy, politics, and culture of these two places all naturally form a system that cannot be separated. This is the natural relationship between Taiwan and China.
>
> We establish a principle regarding the future China-Taiwan relationship: "China must not adopt an imperialist policy and treat Taiwan as a colony." The future China-Taiwan relationship should be based on this principle. One of the rights liberated Taiwan should have is the right to self-determination, which means that, economically and politically, Taiwan becomes a free and autonomous country. That is, in reality it is the same as Taiwan independence. If by any chance and for some reason the peoples of the two places judge that it is better to form a federation, or to unite, the final decision must be made by the entire Taiwanese by their own free choice. It is this principle that we maintain.
>
> When the Taiwan liberation movement is pushed forward, China should provide full support because of her special position. Also to seek the freedom and glory of Taiwan, the Taiwanese must insist on self-determination, which in turn, however, should be based on the voluntariness of the Taiwanese. In other words, although China should be the chief support of Taiwanese liberation movement, the Taiwanese must remove the dependent mentality. First of all, there must be a voluntary mass movement. Also we should pay attention to the Chinese Nationalist revolution, for it directly or indirectly has remarkable influence on the emancipation of weak and small nations in East Asia. Thus we hope that the Taiwanese see the Chinese Nationalist revolution not only as a Chinese issue but also as a matter closely related with us. Therefore we also call on the Taiwanese to lend aid to Chinese Nationalist revolution as soon as they possibly can.
>
> (TGGPA [1939]1989a: 150).

An organization that embraced a political position different from the above was the Taiwan Revolutionary Youth League in Canton (*Kuang-tung t'ai-wan ke-ming ch'ing-nien t'uan*), which espoused Sun Yat-sen's *Three Principles of the People*, claiming that the "Taiwanese Nation Is Chinese Nation! The Land of Taiwan Is the Land of China!" and calling on "the motherland to recover Taiwan." See TGGPA ([1939]1989a: 163,167).

8 See Chapter 1, Note 7.

9 In 1927, a group of young communists even took over the leadership of the Taiwan Cultural Association, which was originally founded and led by the reformist anti-colonialists. Meanwhile the communists also established close connections with developing peasant and labor movements or dominated the organization of these movements. However, after early 1929, Japanese suppression of the resistance movement became increasingly vigorous. In February of that year hundreds of members of the island wide Taiwanese farmer organization, the Peasant Union, were arrested (TGGPA [1939]1989c: 279). In February 1931, the colonial regime ordered the radicalized Taiwan People's Party to disband. See TGGPA ([1939]1989b: 262–3). Then after June nearly all of the members of the Taiwanese Communist Party were arrested. See TGGPA ([1939]1989c: 192–5). As a result, the Taiwan Cultural Association, which had been affiliated with the Party, also collapsed. See TGGPA ([1939]1989a: 392–3).

10 This generation of Taiwanese young people could study Japanese at the institutes for free, and the length of learning varied from one to four years. In April 1937, right before the colonial regime launched a more radical Japanization campaign, the *kōminka* movement, as a key component of the wartime mobilization during the Sino-Japanese conflict, the Japanese language institutes had numbered 2,812, and the students, 185,590. A simplified version of the institutes that recruited common Taiwanese and required a much shorter length of learning numbered 1,555, and the students, 77,781. See Wu Wen-hsing (1992: 353–9).

11 These Taiwanese consisted of those who had received a common school education, those who had studied at the language institutes, and those who were currently studying at common schools and language institutes.

12 For a biography of Ch'en Hsin, see Li (1996).

13 Cited in Liao ([1954,1955]1979: 488–9). The English translation is based largely on Fix, 1993: 260–261.

14 Cited in Liao ([1954, 1955]1979: 488).

15 Cited in Liao ([1954, 1955]1979: 490).

16 Cited in Liao ([1954, 1955]1979: 489).

17 Cited in Liao ([1954, 1955]1979: 495).

18 Compared with other literary journals in colonial Taiwan, *Voice of the South*'s relatively long life – nine months – was impressive. Besides, a circulation of 3,000 rivaled the best of the journals published earlier. See Fix (1993: 259). In fact, scholars have argued that the publication of the journal represented a high development of Taiwanese modern literature in the colonial period. See Huang ([1954, 1955]1979: 299–304); Wang (1978: 5–6); Yeh (1987: 38). Cf. Liao (1990: 88).

19 Cited in Liao ([1954, 1955]1979: 491).

20 See *Voice of the South*, vol.1, no.1: 13, no.4: 15, no.5: 8–9 (1932). Cf. Masayoshi (1989: 80).

21 See Fu-Jen (1932: 13); Liao ([1954, 1955]1979: 491).

22 See Liao ([1954, 1955]1979: 470–82); Liao (1990: 32–9).

23 In the wartime atmosphere of 1942 the colony's common schools and primary schools (*shōgakkō*, exclusively for Japanese children) were renamed "national schools" (*kokumin gakkō*) as were the primary schools of Japan. However, they remained essentially two separate types of elementary school – one for Japanese and a few Taiwanese, and the other for the bulk of Taiwanese children. It was still very difficult for Taiwanese to enter the original primary schools. See Tsurumi (1977: 112–13).