



Graduate School of Development Studies

**The Justifications and Dilemmas of Indigenous
Community-Based Conservation:
A Case Study of Sazasa Village in Taiwan**

A Research Paper presented by:

Woan-Ling Hsu

TAIWAN

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTERS OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Specialization:

**Environment and Sustainable Development
(ESD)**

Members of the examining committee:

Dr Bram Büscher [Supervisor]

Dr Lorenzo Pellegrini [Reader]

The Hague, The Netherlands
November, 2009

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Research papers are not made available for circulation outside of the Institute.

Inquiries:

Postal address: Institute of Social Studies
 P.O. Box 29776
 2502 LT The Hague
 The Netherlands

Location: Kortenaerkade 12
 2518 AX The Hague
 The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460

Fax: +31 70 426 0799

Contents

List of Tables	v
List of Maps	v
List of Acronyms	v
Abstract	vi
Keywords	vi
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Problem Statement	1
1.2 Justification of the Research	1
1.3 Research Questions	3
1.4 Background and Site of Study	3
1.4.1 <i>Natural Environment and People of Sazasa village</i>	4
1.4.2 <i>The Potential Development Projects and the Protectors Movement</i>	4
1.4.3 <i>Five Important Elements in this Case</i>	5
1.5 Research Methods and Limitations	5
1.6 Chapter Organization	6
Chapter 2 Conceptual and Theoretical Framework	7
2.1 Conceptual Framework	7
2.1.1 <i>Definition of 'Indigenous' People</i>	7
2.1.2 <i>The Assumed 'Ecologically Noble Savage' Image of Indigenous People</i>	8
2.2 Theoretical Framework	9
2.2.1 <i>Conservation Paradigms</i>	9
2.2.2 <i>Eco-tourism</i>	13
2.3 Conclusion	15
Chapter 3 The Historical Transformation of Indigenous Institutions and Their Current Economic Condition in Taiwan	16
3.1 Introduction	16
3.2 Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan	16
3.3 The Japanese Colonial Period in Taiwan	17
3.4 The Impacts of the Colonial Exploitative Use of Resources on Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan	18
3.5 The Impact of Fortress Conservation on Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan	21
3.5.1 <i>National Parks Establishment in Taiwan</i>	22
3.5.2 <i>The Conflict between National Parks and Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan</i>	22
3.6 General Current Economic Condition of Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan	23

3.7	The Rise of ICBC in Taiwan	25
3.8	Conclusion	25
Chapter 4 The Justifications and Dilemmas of Indigenous Community-Based Conservation in Sazasa Village in Taiwan		26
4.1	Introduction	26
4.2	The Assumed Justifications of Ecotourism with the Revived Bunun Culture for Conservation and Development Objectives	26
4.3	The Dilemmas: ICBC in Sazasa Village	29
	4.3.1 <i>The Dilemmas of Reviving Bunun Culture in the Sazasa Village Case</i>	29
	4.3.2 <i>The Dilemmas of Ecotourism in the Sazasa Village Case</i>	31
	4.3.3 <i>The Dilemma of Community Dynamics in Sazasa Village</i>	31
4.4	Discussion	33
4.5	Conclusion	34
Conclusion		35
References		36

List of Tables

Table 1: Population Proportion.....	24
Table 2 : Economic condition.....	24
Table 3 : Education level.....	24

List of Maps

Map 1: Topography of the main island of Taiwan.....	3
---	---

List of Acronyms

BNL	Barbarian Necessary Land (translated from 番人所要地)
CC	Community Conservation
CEFATR	Cultural and Education Foundation of Aboriginal Tribe Reestablishment (translated from 原鄉部落重建文教基金會)
CIP	Council of Indigenous Peoples
CM	Clan Migration (translated from 集團移住)
ICBC	Indigenous Community-Based Conservation
IPRL	Indigenous Peoples Reservation Land (translated from 原住民 保留地)

Abstract

The serious global environmental problems have drawn much attention on conservation paradigms under the name of 'sustainable development'. Among various conservation paradigms, indigenous community-based conservation (ICBC) is discussed in this research paper, due to its assumed justifications and dilemmas. In this specific case in Sazasa village in Taiwan, the ICBC experiment presents indigenous ways of using resources, which suggests an alternative and more environmentally friendly resource use regime. However, this case is also analyzed as being controversial, due to the transformation of indigenous institutions since 100 years ago and its tight connection with the market economy and the modern society. The controversy of this case provide an example of the 'process' of conservation learning—to modify social and political institutions which influence resource use regimes and to develop local institutions for conservation objective.

Keywords

Indigenous people, conservation paradigms, ICBC, ecotourism, community dynamics, Taiwan

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Problem Statement

Due to the serious global problems of environmental degradation and climate change, conservation under the name of ‘sustainable development’ has been in vogue in the international development arena since the 1980s (Leach et al. 1999: 225). Among various forms of conservation, however, according to Brockington et al. (2008: 21) “strictly protected areas remain the principal goal for a substantial community of conservationists.” This conservation strategy is often seen as part of a broader conservation paradigm called ‘fortress conservation’—which implies the separation of humans and nature (Dowie 2006: 32). This strategy has been quite controversial, which can be explained in two points. The first revolves around its social impact on indigenous people. There have been many cases of displacing people out of protected areas, forcing them to abandon their land and culture, driving them into the lowest reaches of the money economy as ‘conservation refugee’ or making them to serve tourism (Ibid: 34). Second, this paradigm does not directly deal with the ‘roots’ of global environmental degradation and climate change problems. According to Grove (1995: 12), the ‘roots’ of current global environmental problems have been caused by colonization and capitalism from the mid-17th century. Since, conservation awareness has been born from the reflection of the above environmental impacts, more attention should be paid to the dominant resource use regimes under the logic of colonization and capitalism (Holt 2005: 204). Although, in the 1980s, the conservation paradigm had switched to community conservation¹ (CC) to deal with the negative social impacts of fortress conservation, the problems of the dominant resource use regimes had still been ignored. Besides this, according to critiques from resurgent protectionists in the 1990s, the implements of CC are also controversial. In this research paper, I focus on one specific type of CC, indigenous community-based conservation (ICBC), by a case study in Sazasa village in South-east Taiwan. I investigate its assumed justifications of ICBC as developing local economy and that of presenting indigenous ways of using resource, which are also analyzed as dilemmas by using the resurgent protectionist narrative.

1.2 Justification of the Research

This research can be justified in the following three points. The first one is about its contribution to ICBC narrative. Usually, cases of CC are operated or deeply involved with national programs, donor agencies, or non-governmental

¹ According to Barrow and Murphree (2001: 37), new ‘community conservation’ initiatives includes community-based conservation, community wildlife management, collaborative or co-management, community-based natural resource management, state/community co-management and integrated conservation and development programmes.

organizations after the awareness of conservation grew in the international arena, as happened with co-managed protect areas (Adams and Hutton 2007: 163). There are still few cases of ICBC. The 'indigenous' community-based conservation I refer to is mainly initiated by 'indigenous' people themselves, in which 'indigenous' people have their 'indigenous' way of conserving nature, and they are the main organizers and beneficiaries. This case study of Sazasa village meets some conditions of ICBC, since the location of Sazasa village does not fall into a protected area, such as a national park. Conservation in the village is mainly managed and participated by indigenous people living there, in ways that incorporate elements from the villager's traditional ways of managing resource. From this perspective, investigation on the Sazasa village case is justified due to the contribution it may have on the existing ICBC narrative. Second, this research can contribute to the field of conservation in Taiwan, where there is lack of consideration regarding local (indigenous) people. The conservation administrations in Taiwan are still considered authoritative and exclusive, like administration of national parks, which has hardly moved toward 'co-managed' protected areas (Lu 2001). There have been three cases of postponed national park establishment due to the disagreement of local (indigenous) people since the 1990s, and some council committees have been formed within conservation administrations as 'communication platform' for creating more participation of local stakeholders. However, this shift toward co-management has still not yet been legitimized and been considered as 'passive' and 'unstable' (Yeh 2007). Therefore, local (indigenous) peoples have not yet been seriously taken into account by the conservation administrations in Taiwan. The existence of such a trend justifies this research for its potential to provide specific ICBC case in Taiwan that gives additional understandings to indigenous administrations and the relations between indigenous people and conservation. Third, among few ICBC cases in Taiwan, the Sazasa village case is distinctive. There have been two other cases of ICBC operation, Danayigu and Smangus village, (Lu 2001; Tsai 2005), which have become famous ecotourism spots from the 1990s. However, the features of these two emphasize on a 'cooperative system' of ecotourism operation for improving social welfare of the community as a whole. This feature is different from that of the Sazasa village case. In this research paper, the Sazasa village case is emphasized for its combination of operating ecotourism and indigenous ways of resource management. This provides a reflection on dominant exploitative use of resources and conservation paradigms, but has also created its own dilemmas. Based on the above argument, an investigation on the Sazasa village case is justified due to its distinctiveness from the other two well known and highly studied ICBC cases in Taiwan.

To sum up, the investigation of ICBC case in Sazasa village is worthy and important, due to its contribution to the existing ICBC narrative, its potential to provide additional understandings regarding the relation of conservation, indigenous people, and indigenous conservation administrations in Taiwan. I hope this will contribute to the raising discussion on global environmental problems that mainly resulting from the dominant exploitative use of resources.

1.3 Research Questions

Research Question

What are the justifications and dilemmas of indigenous community-based conservation in Taiwan, with special reference to the case of the Sazasa village in South-east Taiwan?

Sub-Questions:

1. What concepts and theories help understand the current dilemmas, with regard to ICBC case in Sazasa village?
2. Historically, what are the causes of these dilemmas (if any) of reviving indigenous culture in the case of ICBC in Sazasa village?
3. What are the dilemmas of operating community-based ecotourism? What are its environmental impact and the reflection it has on community dynamics?
4. What are the lessons that can be drawn from the experiences of ICBC case in Sazasa village?

1.4 Background and Site of Study

In this section, I provide background information of the ICBC case in Sazasa village in three parts. This is done to highlight the proximate causes of the conservation movement, and their later effect on ICBC operation with indigenous features. Due to space and time, I emphasize on five important elements of this case.



Map 1: Topography of the main island of Taiwan

1.4.1 Natural Environment and People of Sazasa village

Geographically, Sazasa village is located in the south-east Taiwan and South of the Tropic of Cancer, which belongs to a sub-tropic monsoon climate. Sazasa village is at an altitude of 500~700 meters, in a mountain area in Taitung County, inhabited by an indigenous community called 'Bunun'. According to Kao (2009), 'Sazasa' is named by the Bunun, meaning 'a land flowing with milk and honey'. It implies the soil is fertile, with particularly profuse vegetation. At a higher altitude of the same mountain area, there is a banyan forest near Sazasa village. With the sub-tropic monsoon climate, the area has exceptionally fertile soil and mountainous surroundings protecting the inhabitants from threats of typhoons. This environmental setting is characterized by rich ecosystem and hosts a landscape of around 2000 huge banyan (Kuang 2006). According to the interview with the main initiator of the conservation movement, Aliman², the importance of the forest to the Bunun can be explained in two points. First, the forest is metaphorically taken as a 'refrigerator' by them, which provides the main source of water and foods, including wild boars and herbs. Second, the Bunun traditionally believe that there is a spiritual connection between their ancestors' spirit and nature. The loss of their land is considered as a loss of connection with the spirits of their ancestors and nature. Since the forest has utilitarian and spiritual connection to the Bunun living there, it influences their reaction to the potential encroachment of outside development projects.

1.4.2 The Potential Development Projects and the Protectors Movement

According to Kao (2009), since 2003, there had been several development projects established through buying lands from villagers. One of these projects is building towers for storing ashes niches³, due to the lands provision of good Chinese Feng-Shui⁴. Aliman and others, who share his view, worried that they might lose their ancestral land and its intertwined culture as a result of the developments' continuous encroachment of Sazasa land. This led to a collective decision to protect the ancestral land. The initiators of this decision persuaded villagers, spent significant amount of money; even used loans from banks, relatives and friends to buy lands back from the villagers. Although the economic condition was unbearable, with available financial support and ideas from Aliman's friends, in 2004, the protectors' of ancestral land established a 'Forest Museum'⁵ as an ecotourism site and a foundation with the name

² Aliman is the English spelling of his Bunun name. His Han name is Tu Shui Wang.

³ Tower for placing ashes niches, Lin Ku Ta (靈骨塔), is used for placing ashes of dead people.

⁴ Feng-Shui (風水) is an ancient art and science developed over 3,000 years ago in China. It is a complex body of knowledge that reveals how to balance the energies of any given space to assure the health and good fortune for people inhabiting it. (Tchi)

⁵ Hence forth, the Forest Museum is referred as the museum.

‘Cultural and Education Foundation of Aboriginal Tribe Reestablishment (CEFATR)’ to govern those lands. Accordingly, the protectors have begun to operate ecotourism since 2006.

1.4.3 Five Important Elements in this Case

From the above background information of the ICBC case in Sazasa village, there are five important elements needs to be emphasized. First, the location of this case is in a mountainous area in eastern Taiwan, where, according to Yen and Yang (2004: 8), implies conditions of inconvenient transportation and relatively less contact with outsiders. With this geographic condition, the Bunun in Sazasa village relatively keep their traditions more than other indigenous peoples living in plains, hills, basins, or those in the western part of Taiwan. This element may contribute to their reviving indigenous institutions in this ICBC case. Second, the timing of this case which is in the early 21st century implies a large contrast between the emphasized traditional indigenous features and the mainstream modern living style in Taiwan. This large contrast contributes to the ‘different consciousness’ of indigenous people, mentioned in chapter 2, which might be used politically for economic gain. Third, starting from the beginning of the initiative of ancestral land protection, we can see the main initiator and founder of the museum, Aliman, plays a very important role. He is not only the core figure in this initiative, but also as the narrator. Therefore, Aliman is introduced again in the next section both as a helpful contact person in the field and also as one of my limitations for the dangers it poses. He provides the assumed justifications of this ICBC case which are also analyzed as controversial. Fourth, the museum, being operated as ecotourism with indigenous features, presents the assumed justifications and dilemmas of ecotourism and reviving indigenous institutions. Fifth, the composition of the foundation that organizes the museum, CEFATR, presents community dynamics, local power relations and unequal distribution of benefits of ecotourism of this case.

1.5 Research Methods and Limitations

In this research paper, I use both primary and secondary data. The primary data is collected through two weeks fieldwork in Sazasa village from Jul. 20th until Aug. 3rd, 2009. During my staying in Sazasa village, I mainly relied on Aliman for my data collection. He was the only contact I had in Sazasa village before arriving. He also provided me with hostel and interviewee suggestion lists, etc. Furthermore, he, most of time, accompanied me when doing individual interviews, even from the list he had provided. He also had a Master thesis regarding history of Sazasa village, which I refer to in this research paper in chapter 3. As for secondary data, I spent another two weeks for collection. After coming back to the Netherlands, I could only rely on the internet to search for electronic files of Chinese related data.

There are four limitations regarding my research paper. First, I had already set up my assumption before getting into the field that ‘indigenous culture is environmentally friendly’, which made me tend to get a pre-assumed answer

during my fieldwork. Second, as the main founder and organizer of the museum, the data and interviewees Aliman provided to me are all in support of his view. This source had blocked me from getting other perspectives regarding this case. Fortunately, I also encountered one of Aliman's friends, Miss Chen, who provided me two interviewees⁶, who sometimes disagree with Aliman. Although she supports Aliman's ideas regarding the museum, she also has contact with other villagers and holds more objective opinions about it. These interviews are used as tools to be analysed in this research paper to present the community dynamics. The third limitation emanates from the time limit I had in the field. Due to my short stay in Sazasa village and in Taiwan in general, I lost the opportunity to widely interact with villagers, observe things while they happened and cross check their consistency with Aliman's story. Besides, the last two weeks I spent on collecting secondary data was not enough. Frankly, this was partly the case, because, I did not really have time to reconsider what needed to be added up. The fourth limitation is that after leaving Taiwan, I could only search Chinese data through internet, which could not provide me other sources such as books or paper thesis.

Regarding to the second limitation, although I have the dominant use of Aliman in this research paper, he provides the assumed justifications of ICBC operation, which contributes to the discussion of its dilemmas and ICBC narrative in Taiwan. Furthermore, I mainly built up my analyses according to my secondary data collection (including Chinese one) after coming back to the Netherlands. This data I collected online had still contributed to my analyses of the historical background and the dilemmas of this case. Therefore, to some extent, this research paper can still be valid, based on the contribution of the secondary data collection.

1.6 Chapter Organization

This case study will be analyzed in three chapters. The second chapter provides conceptual and theoretical framework to understand the definition of 'indigenous people', the history of resource use and conservation paradigms, and theories to analyze and discuss the CC implementation. The third chapter introduces the impact of colonial and capitalist market economy and fortress conservation on indigenous peoples in Taiwan, especially on the Bunun in Sazasa village. The impacts on indigenous people are the great transformation of their traditional institutions and their current disadvantaged economic condition in Taiwan. In chapter 4, based on the background provided in chapter 3, the assumed justifications and dilemmas of the Sazasa village case are analyzed and discussed. In chapter 5, I give a summary of this research paper and conclude with the contribution it has to the existing narratives of ICBC and conservation in Taiwan.

⁶ In order to protect two other interviewees, I do not provide their names in this research paper.

Chapter 2 Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Conceptual Framework

In this section, first, I define the concept of ‘indigenous people’ by distinguishing their institutions from that of colonizers and national community, and the political struggle of indigenous people being suppressed. Second, the varied ways of resource management resulted from indigenous economic and cultural institutions present their relation to the environment that help zoom the discussion towards their assumed ‘ecologically noble savage’ image.

2.1.1 Definition of ‘Indigenous’ People

In this section, I introduce the definition of indigenous people from International Labour Organization to identify them with their political struggle. According to Convention No. 169, published by the General Conference of International Labour Organisation in 1989, there are two definitions of indigenous and tribal peoples and one fundamental criterion. The two definitions of indigenous and tribal people (International Labour Organization 1989) are as follows:

- “(a) tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations;
- (b) peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonisation or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions”

These two definitions emphasize on the difference between this two groups—indigenous and tribal people versus colonizers and national community. These definitions can be understood by the following two points. First, the ‘difference’ of the two groups implies ‘power relations’ whereby indigenous and tribal peoples are colonized or marginalized by the dominant national community. Since the fundamental criteria of the above two definitions from International Labour Organization is ‘self-identification’, this “differential consciousness” can be achieved by many colonized people “as a matter of survival in response to the contradictions forced upon them over generations by colonialism” (Brockington et al. 2008: 120). Therefore, the label of being ‘indigenous’ can be used for political “space-making” (Ibid: 120). This point can help explain one of the dilemmas of representing indigenous institutions in the way of justifying the ICBC case in Sazasa village in chapter 4. Second, the ‘differences’ between these two groups, including social, economic,

cultural and political institutions, will be used to identify indigenous people in Taiwan in chapter 3.

In this research paper, in order to explore indigenous peoples' relation to environment, Redford's argument regarding their assumed 'ecologically noble savage' image and definitions and concepts around their economic and cultural institutions are presented in the next section.

2.1.2 The Assumed 'Ecologically Noble Savage' Image of Indigenous People

According to Redford (1991), the 'ecologically noble savage' image of indigenous people is based on the "idealized European vision of the inhabitant of the New World." For example, the Indians were living "in harmony with their surroundings [...] and in conformity with the laws of nature" (Ibid). This idea had been further developed in the 1980s, providing a clear divide between 'indigenous' and 'western': the Indians are "human[s] respectful of nature and wise" and the westerners are "destructive and [the] enemy of nature" (Ibid). It is true that the magnitude of global environmental degradation resulted from the current dominant habits of resource consumption, based on the success of industrialization from the West. In this way of using resources, machines are excessively involved in the process of production, by which raw materials are overexploited and products are processed for a big market far away. This way of using resources has caused a 'global' ecological crisis (White 1967). Although Redford concurs with the 'global' ecological crisis argument, he, however, does not agree with the belief of the harmonious relationship between indigenous people and their environment. He provides some evidences from the Amazonia forest before 1500 to argue that indigenous people's living patterns could also result in serious environmental destruction (Ibid). Similarly, among many economic activities of indigenous people, shifting agriculture is included (McNeely and Pitt 1985: 17), which causes serious environmental degradation. However, comparing to the western market economic system, indigenous people's economic institutions are for subsistence, relatively small scale and the environmental degradation caused by that is relatively 'local'. Thus, we can conclude that, although a generalized agreement is difficult to reach on indigenous peoples' 'ecological noble' image, regardless of resource use that may cause local degradation, their economic institutions for subsistence are still remain relatively environmentally friendly.

Furthermore, the cultural institutions of indigenous peoples, according to Wang and White, are considered more environmentally friendly. Wang (2001: 102) emphasizes on one of their ecological wisdoms—the animism⁷ belief. According to White (1967), indigenous peoples do not take nature as merely resource, but a spirit to be respected or feared. Such respect for nature (i.e.

⁷ According to Tylor's definition of animism, "all natural objects and phenomena have souls" (Pedersen 2001: 414).

animism) can relatively protect nature from being misused by humans. Therefore, indigenous people's economic activities are further restricted by their animistic belief, which gives greater insight to their image of being relatively environmentally friendly. The above two institutions of indigenous people, presented as a more environmentally friendly way of managing resource are represented by the Bunun in the Sazasa village case.

However, according to Redford (1991), even though indigenous people possess sustainable pattern of ways of living, this process remains intact only "under conditions of low population density, abundant land, and [their] limited involvement with a market economy" (Ibid). However, in the 21st century, local institutions (including those of indigenous people) in most parts of the world have been overwhelmed by the trend of population growth, limited access to land, and intrusions of elements of the capitalist market economy. Based on this, the previous definitions of 'indigenous' people and their assumed more environmentally friendly image and institutions have become difficult to retain. In chapter 3, I use the argument of intrusions of colonization and the capitalist market economy to explain how historically the institutions of indigenous peoples in Taiwan, especially the Bunun in Sazasa village, had been transformed into serving the market economy. And, in chapter 4, we can also see how the Bunun justify their selectively revived indigenous institutions in the name of ICBC but commercialize them at the same time, which brought a dilemma to this case.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

In this section, I introduce three conservation paradigms, fortress conservation, community conservation (CC) and resurgent protectionism. The reason to begin with fortress conservation is to analyze 'conservation' as a 'colonial legacy' (Adam 2003), which is taken as a strategy to deal with the global environmental problems resulting from exploitative use of resources. However, both the exploitative use of resources and fortress conservation brought institutional transformation and associated social impacts on indigenous people. The conservation paradigm later on had shifted to CC in the 1980s, providing a space for indigenous communities to practice their capacities of conserving nature, presented as the ICBC case in Sazasa village. The assumed justifications of this case are analyzed as dilemmas by using part of resurgent protectionist's critiques and narrative regarding ecotourism. After presenting the dilemmas, argument of 'catch-22 of conservation' is used to discuss with that of resurgent protectionist about the value of ICBC experiment.

2.2.1 Conservation Paradigms

2.2.1.2 Fortress Conservation

Fortress conservation is taken as an awareness of the global environmental impact resulting from the exploitative use of resources. Therefore, in the first

part, exploitative use of resources is introduced as a product of colonization, which has significant impacts on not only natural resources and the environment, but also on indigenous peoples living there. In the second part, fortress conservation is introduced as 'colonial conservation' and its negative impact on indigenous peoples is discussed.

The ideology behind colonization can be traced back to the Enlightenment. Cartesian dualism separates humans and nature, suggesting that "reasons have enabled humanity to escape from nature and remake it" (Adams 2003: 22). The idea of human power over nature, therefore, leads the subsequent development of colonization, capitalism, modernization, and also conservation. The pattern of the colonization of nature, according to Adams (Ibid: 24), is defined as "a destructive, utilitarian and cornucopian view of the feasibility of yoking nature to economic gain." Accompanied with capitalism, the purpose of colonization is to bring nature under control to serve the grand purposes of colonial development (Ibid: 18). This purpose implies a colonial mind that "inventing a single discourse without geography or history as a logical source of a hegemonic colonial gaze." Such a hegemonic gaze, "with capitalist market rationality, had transformed diverse indigenous understandings of, and social engagements with, nature" (Ibid: 23). Things happened in colonies then reflect nature being restructured and re-ordered to serve metropolitan needs and desires (Ibid: 24) For example, according to Adams (Ibid: 27), agriculture would be the best way to [re]organize nature's government, since it helps to reclaim wasteland and make barbarian people civilized. This way of managing nature and the colonized was justified in the name of modernization and development (Ibid: 22). In order to achieve their purposes, colonizers established bureaucratic rationalization, including formal hierarchical organization and legal system, with the use of science and technology to understand and further manipulate nature (Ibid: 33). These characteristics of colonialism and capitalism are used again in chapter 3, to explain the policies of the Japanese and Taiwanese authorities regarding resource management and its impact on indigenous peoples.

Since nature resources are exploited as means to achieve colonial development, the global environmental impacts that were caused during the mid-17th century and stimulated the awareness of conservation. According to Grove (Ibid: 12), conservation is also part of colonial legacy, which is called 'colonial conservation'. It includes the ideas of separation of humans and nature and the romanticised 'wilderness' (Adams 2003: 33), which later on becomes the idea of 'fortress conservation'. The romantic idea of wilderness can be traced back to the 16th and 17th century—a time of intensive exploitation of nature by capitalism and colonialism and tropical regions akin to Eden (Ibid: 29). Therefore, 'wilderness' becomes "a place where all other species could thrive in our absence" (Dowie 2006: 34). In 1872, the idea of fortress conservation was realized in the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in America, which later became the model of mainstream conservation (Brockington et al. 2008: 21) in the 20th century (Hutton et al. 2005). As mentioned before, in the problem statement, fortress conservation has resulted in social impact on

indigenous people. I give examples of conflicts between national parks and indigenous peoples in Taiwan in chapter 3, in order to show that under this conservation paradigm, the inhabitation of indigenous peoples and their original institutions have also been denied.

However, in the 1980s, the emergence of CC narrative within international policy had influenced the dominant 'fortress conservation' approach. In the next section, I introduce reasons of the rise of CC.

2.2.1.3. Community Conservation

According to Hutton et al. (2005: 345), there are four reasons to explain the rapid acceptance of the CC narrative. First, it tied conservation to "political and policy commitment to sustainable development", "arising from the Brundtland Report in 1987 and the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio in 1992." (Ibid: 345). The second is the "rediscovery of idealist and romantic ideas about the 'community' as an alternative to the state as a means of achieving positive social change" (Ibid: 345). This reason can be influenced by the negative social impact of 'fortress conservation' on local people. Third, in the 1970s, there are "significant shifts in the development discourses of development from the 'top-down', 'technocratic' models to 'bottom-up', 'decentralized', and also 'participatory' planning" (Turner and Hulme 1997), which benefit CC narrative. Forth, in the 1980s, the 'market' was also taken as "an alternative to the state as a means of delivering policy change", by which "[c]ommunities, and rural individuals and households, should become micro-entrepreneurs, using the economic values of conservation resources (such as tourism) to deliver both sustainable livelihoods and conservation" (Hutton et al. 2005: 345). Therefore, in the implement of CC, the means of the market "plays a significant role in poverty reduction and provides economic incentives for conservation" (Ibid: 346). This 'communitarian development' had become "popular in the West during the 1980s" (Ibid: 345). Among the above four reasons, the second and the forth reasons are used to justify ICBC case in Sazasa village in chapter 4, which also cause dilemmas to it. In the next section, critiques around CC provided by resurgent protectionists help analyze the dilemmas.

2.2.1.4 The Resurgence of the Protectionist Paradigm

In this section, resurgent protectionist arguments are introduced as critiques of community conservation and discussed with the argument of 'catch-22 of conservation' by Holt (2005).

In the 1990s, CC has been criticized by resurgent protectionist that it should be replaced by "strictest possible protection of protected areas" (Hutton et al. 2005: 348). According to Wilshusen et al. (2002), there are five elements of the protectionist paradigm.

1. "[P]rotected areas require strict protection.
2. [B]iodiversity conservation is a moral imperative.

3. [C]onservation linked to development does not protect biodiversity.
4. [H]armonious, ecologically friendly local communities are myths.
5. [E]mergency situations require extreme measures.”

Among the above five elements, in chapter 4, I use the third and the fourth to examine the Sazasa village case, which are presented as dilemmas of ecotourism for conservation objective, reviving Bunun culture and community-based ecotourism. However, regarding argument of getting back to “strictest possible protection of protected areas”, which takes strict protection as the only solution of problems of CC, is criticized by the theory of ‘catch-22 of conservation’ by Holt (2005).

In Holt’s (2005) article: ‘The Catch-22 of Conservation: Indigenous Peoples, Biologists, and Cultural Change,’ critical arguments of resurgent protectionists and definitions to conservation are given. First, she agrees with part of the argument of resurgent protectionists that the assumed ecologically friendly characteristics of indigenous peoples have been changed by their contact with the intrusion of Western culture, population growth, adoption of technologies, and with increasing involvement in the market economy (Ibid: 200). But, she does not agree with the argument that indigenous peoples have been ‘corrupted’ by Western culture that they “do not supposedly possess the ability to steward nature to the same degree” (Ibid: 201). For Holt (Ibid: 207), indigenous people in the above argument are trapped in a ‘catch-22 of conservation’. She criticizes it by presenting two controversies associated with it. First, there is a “double-standard” in the argument that ‘Western culture’ is taken as the origin of environmental problems but also the solution of it (Ibid: 210), which gives those inside protected areas “wisdom to know better” but “only corrupts those on the outside” (Ibid: 213). The second controversy is the assumption of two states of indigenous people’s being—either “pristine and untouched” or “contacted and corrupted” (Ibid: 210). This assumption “denies agency to indigenous people, making a deterministic prediction” about their presumed ‘corrupted’ consequences and “not allowing for the possibility” of another outcome (Ibid: 210).

According to Holt (2005: 201), since conservation awareness comes from the recognition of negative global environmental impacts of the Western ‘culture’, conservation “inextricably link[s] to social and political institutions which influence resource management” (Ibid: 204). Instead of giving the “static perception of ‘natural conservationists’”, more attention should be paid to an “accurate understanding of resource use regimes” (Ibid: 204). Therefore, conservation in this sense presents a ‘process’, a “response to people’s perceptions about the state of their environment and their resources and a willingness to modify their behaviours to adjust to new realities” (Vickers 1994: 331). It is a “social process”, emphasized by Holt (2005: 213), which “involves experience and learning [that] leads to the development of institutions and arrangements.” Accordingly, regarding indigenous people, we should consider that “concomitant with any introduction of [a] new item into a culture, there is a dynamic process of learning and reconfiguring” (Ibid: 210). Instead of denying “other groups the same process of learning” as in protectionist

argument, indigenous people shall be given room and time to “learn for themselves and develop their own conservation institutions” (Ibid: 211).

After discussing three conservation paradigms, I introduce ecotourism narrative to help specifically analyze the Sazasa village case, especially critiques of its assumed win-win purpose of conservation and local development objectives.

2.2.2 Eco-tourism

2.2.2.1 Definition of Eco-tourism

This section introduces the definition and the origin of ecotourism. According to Nelson (1994), the concept of ecotourism has been developed around the 1960s and 1970s, and deals with the environmentally damaging effects of tourism, especially in some national parks of the U.S. According to Lu (2000 cited in Chen 2003: 16), the differences between ‘conventional’ tourism and ecotourism can be seen in the following comparison. Conventional tourism is more tourist-oriented. The purposes of tourists are to have recreation and relaxing space. Therefore, in order to maximize profits, tourism businesses promote mass tourism and highly concentrated activities, which results in the increase of garbage, traffic jam, overconsumption of resources, and the disturbance of local inhabitants. As a reflection of that, ecotourism can be understood by the following three features. First, natural resources are the centre of ecotourism planning. The profit of ecotourism is used for maintaining the value of natural resources. Instead of over consumption, the use of natural resources in ecotourism is sustainable. Moreover, according to Brockington et al. (2008: 135), contrary to conventional tourists, ecotourists “desire vacations that provide an opportunity to learn about the host culture, society or environment.” Likewise, he further defines ‘community-based ecotourism’ as in general being “associated with basic accommodation and facilities, and it has been marketed at independent and low-budget travellers who do not expect (or want) high-end tourism facilities” (Ibid: 139). This feature of ecotourism shows that specific visitors are targeted by ecotourism business. Third, according to Weaver (2001), one advantage of ecotourism is to increase the understanding of people from different cultures. However, according to Nelson (1994: 255) “the meaning of ecotourism may vary among different people, projects, and places.” Therefore, with a specific context in Sazasa village, we can see how the Bunun define the ecotourism they are operating now in chapter 4.

From the above comparison between ‘conventional’ tourism and ecotourism, although ecotourism differs from conventional one in some of its aspects, it still is one form of tourism, which “happily co-exists with and is dependent on the neoliberal global system” (Brockington et al. 2008: 147). Therefore, “the most alternative forms of tourism can end up repeating the same problems as other forms of development” (Ibid: 147). This argument can be explored more as a dilemma of ecotourism in the next section.

2.2.2.2 Dilemmas of Ecotourism

In this section, I present four dilemmas of ecotourism by discussing its assumed win-win purpose of conservation and development objectives and the critiques around it.

The win-win purpose of ecotourism is to promote conservation and economic development based on the connection between conservation, ecotourism, and economic development. According to Brockington et al. (2008: 131), tourism is taken as “one of the most important ways in which conservation is justified and legitimated,” that “conservation will ‘pay its way’ via the development of tourism.” Since tourism can economically serve conservation objective and ecotourism defined in the previous section is relatively environmentally friendly, ecotourism “should satisfy conservation and development objective” (Lindberg et al. 1996: 543). Especially in “poorer and more marginalized areas,” ecotourism is often very hard to be resisted (Brockington et al. 2008: 132), since it “has been identified as a strategy” to “diversify economies and produce environmentally sustainable development” (King and Stewart 1996 cited in Brockington et al. 2008: 132).

However, if we look closer to how ecotourism generates economic growth, there come the four dilemmas. First, according to Brockington et al. (2008: 135), ecotourism usually “relies on the idea that places and cultures are pristine, unspoiled, and untouched by westernization, industrialization and even mass tourism.” Therefore, these features become the ecotourist attractions that local natural environment and even culture can be “lucrative resource” (Ibid: 132), as “commodity” (Carrier and Macleod 2005: 329). Second, ecotourism experiences are often “packaged” that present “the environment in simplified terms, which obscure the socio-ecological implications of the global infrastructure and economic relationships that make ecotourism possible in the first place” (Brockington et al. 2008: 145). For example, Carrier and Macleod (2005: 317) emphasize ecotourism relies on air transportation factors that imply an “environmental cost.” Bulbeck (2005 cited in Brockington et al. 2008: 136) also says that ecotourism can “in fact be ecologically damaging” due to the disturbance of the “desired tactile and emotional forms of engagement with animals.” Third, within ecotourism, there is an assumption that “tourists are doing something good by coming to a particular country and spending their money there.” Therefore, the expected “friendly and positive” interaction between tourist and local people and animals makes the locals and their nature “emotional labourers” (Ibid: 147). The fourth dilemma of ecotourism is its reflection of community dynamics. According to Leach et al. (1999: 230), “social difference and its implications have been remarkably absent from the recent wave of ‘community’ concern in environmental policy debates,” that the assumption of community’s being “homogeneous entity” should be examined by looking at its ‘heterogeneity’ (Ibid: 229). Therefore, we can apply this critique to examine community-based ecotourism in the Sazasa village case. According to Brockington et al. (2008: 138), “ecotourism projects intersect with existing community dynamics.” As Southgate (2006: 80) argues “it can

also exacerbate existing resource management conflicts that are rooted in the historical context of local power relations.” These four dilemmas of ecotourism indicated above will later be applied to analyze the ecotourism in Sazasa village case in chapter 4.

2.3 Conclusion

The above conceptual and theoretical framework helps analyze this specific ICBC case in Sazasa village in the following three ways. First, three conservation paradigms are introduced to explain the origins of CC and critiques of it. The definition of indigenous people and concept of their assumed ecologically friendly image are applied to analyze the dynamic of indigenous people in this case. The ecotourism narrative is used to analyze its assumed win-win purpose of conservation and development objectives and also community dynamics in this case. Therefore, with this framework, the historical transformation of indigenous institutions in Taiwan, the assumed justifications and dilemmas of the Sazasa village case and the discussion of conservation development in Taiwan can be analyzed.

Chapter 3

The Historical Transformation of Indigenous Institutions and Their Current Economic Condition in Taiwan

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the historical background of the rise of ICBC is introduced to understand the assumed justifications and dilemmas of the Sazasa village case. First, I identify ‘indigenous peoples’ and their institutions in Taiwan before the 17th century in order to explain the transformation later on, after the intrusion of the market economy. Second, by looking at the ways the authorities have used and managed resources from Japanese colonial period to current Taiwanese governance, we can see how indigenous institutions have been affected in the last 100 years. Third, beyond the transformation of indigenous institutions, the consequence of the disadvantaged economic condition of indigenous peoples in the Han-dominant modern society is also introduced as one factor of ICBC operation. Based on the results of institutional transformation and poor economic condition of indigenous peoples in Taiwan, ICBC operation in Sazasa village has been dynamic and is analyzed in chapter 4 with its assumed justifications and dilemmas.

3.2 Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan

In this section, I identify the indigenous peoples in the Taiwanese context based on the definition indicated in chapter 2 together with their early settlement history. According to the Council of Indigenous Peoples (CIP 2008)⁸, there are fourteen different tribes⁹ of indigenous peoples being officially recognized up to 2009. These tribes of indigenous peoples include Amis, Atayal, Peiwan, Bunun, Puyuma, Rukai, Tsou, Saisiyat, Tao, Thao, Kavalan, Truku, Sakizaya, and Sediq. This classification of indigenous peoples has been gradually settled by anthropologists from the Japanese colonial period (W.-H. Chen 2004: 11). Since, according to International Labour Organization (1989), ‘self-identification’ is the fundamental criteria of defining ‘indigenous’ people, currently there are more indigenous peoples applying for being recognized by the Taiwanese authority. As for the settlement history of the indigenous peoples in Taiwan, according to W.H. Chen (2004: 11), the

⁸CIP: Council of Indigenous Peoples, Executive Yuan

⁹According to Yen and Yang (2004: 8), indigenous peoples in Taiwan are divided into two categories— Pingpu (平埔) and Gaoshan (高山). Indigenous peoples in Pingpu category inhabit in plains at seashore, hills or basins, whose ‘indigenous’ institutions had been almost completely assimilated by Chinese settlers. Therefore, the current ‘officially’ recognized indigenous peoples are only those in Gaoshan category, inhabiting in Central Mountain Range, east coast and Orchid Island.

indigenous peoples mentioned above settled in Taiwan at least 5000 years ago, much earlier than the settlers from and the authorities of Ancient China, Holland, Spain, Japan and Taiwan. Generally speaking, these indigenous peoples are also tribal peoples. They have their own distinct languages, cultural features, traditional customs and social structure (Y.-L. Chen 2004), which had been practiced for thousands of years, until the occupation and governance of Dutch colonizers and Chinese Ming Zheng in the 17th century (Yen and Yang 2004: 16). Therefore, historically, these indigenous peoples have met one of the criteria of indigeneity according to article 1 of Convention No. 169 (International Labour Organization 1989), that they have their own institutions, developed a long time ago and different from recent settlers and colonizers. Among those different institutions, the economic and cultural institutions should be emphasized due to their consequences to the environment. Generally, regarding economic activities of these indigenous peoples, they are hunter-gatherers, shifting agriculturalists and fisher folks for subsistence (Yen and Yang 2004: 17), which are considered low-energy and more environment-dependent. As for their religion, they can collectively be referred to animists (Y.-L. Chen 2004: 55). According to White (1967), animism helps protect nature from being overexploited on a spiritual basis. The above identification of indigenous peoples in Taiwan, considered as having more environmentally friendly ways of managing resource, had been changed gradually after the intrusion of modernization and market economy since the 17th century. However, after more than 300 years of intrusion, the Bunun in Sazasa village try to revive part of their indigenous institutions to meet the conservation objective. This assumed justification is analyzed as dilemmas of this ICBC case in chapter 4.

As for the intrusion of modernization and the market economy since the 17th century, I choose to start from Japanese colonial period in the early 20th century. The reason is that this colonial period best represents a colonial power with its own ways of using and managing resources and consequential influence on the environment, indigenous peoples and their institutions. In the next section, I provide historical background of Japan in the late 19th century, and its vital role in modernizing Taiwan.

3.3 The Japanese Colonial Period in Taiwan

In order to explain why I start investigating the history in Taiwan from the Japanese colonial period, I present the influence of the Japanese colonial governance into two parts. One is the historical background of Japan as it becomes one of the world big powers in the late 19th century, and second is its vital role in modernizing Taiwan.

After the Meiji Restoration in 1868, Japan started its full-scale modernization in the next 100 years, compressing the experience of the West from the 18th century (Lin 2003: 15). Based on the success of industrialization, Japan had been assumed as the only 'advanced' country in East Asia (Ibid: 3), and had been mature to exercise its colonial and capitalistic expansion to compete with

other big powers in Europe (Su 2002: 5). In 1894, the Empire of Japan¹⁰ defeated Chinese Qing Dynasty in the First Sino-Japanese War, and signed the Treaty of Maguan in which Taiwan was ceded to Japan in 1895. After occupation, besides resources being extracted for metropolitan Japan, Taiwan was further developed to support Japan's Southern Plan during WWII (Lin 2003: 14). Therefore, from agriculture to forestry and industry, the full-scale development was implemented by the Japanese colonial authority, which, according to Ye (1995 cited in Lin 2003: 3), had actually established the foundation for Taiwan Economic Miracle later on. According to Landes (1998), comparing to other authorities which once governed Taiwan (from different dynasties of Ancient China to Dutch and Spanish colonizers in the 17th century) Japan has been recognized as a relatively 'better' governor, due to its contribution to the industrialization of its colonies. Since Japan is justified as one of the big powers in the late 19th century and a 'successful' contributor to the modernization and industrialization of Taiwan, exploitative ways of using resources and the fortress conservation paradigm as colonial legacy in Taiwan can be best represented starting from the Japanese colonial period.

After identifying indigenous peoples in Taiwan with their traditional institutions and the important role the Japanese colonial authority played in Taiwan from 1895, the next two sections discuss how the exploitative use of resource and the fortress conservation paradigm presented in policies of both Japanese and Taiwanese authorities, which had weakened and transformed indigenous institutions.

3.4 The Impacts of the Colonial Exploitative Use of Resources on Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan

In this section, I introduce the exploitative use of resources of the Japanese colonial government that on the way resulted in managing indigenous peoples in Taiwan. Similarly, the Taiwanese government had also followed the same way as the Japanese did, which actually shows no difference in their view of natural resources and indigenous peoples. Therefore, by introducing the Japanese policies regarding using resources and managing indigenous peoples, I explain the origin of the Taiwanese approach.

After the success of industrialization, Japan had become one of the big powers in the late 19th century and been ready to expand its colonial and capitalist economy. After occupying Taiwan, in order to maximize economic growth, the Japanese authority planned to develop agriculture and forestry by planting cash crops, such tea, sugarcane (T.-H. Chen and Su 2004: 102) and lumbering of substantial camphor woods (Yang). This intention matches the statement of Adams (2003: 22) that, for colonial government, nature has only the function of being a resource to be extracted for economic gain, which should also be restructured and re-ordered. Therefore, since most indigenous peoples at that

¹⁰ This was the name of Japan at that time. Hence forth, I will use the general name as 'Japan'.

time living in the areas around recourses, the next step for the Japanese colonial government was to obtain and manage lands from them. There were two strategies chosen to undertake the scheme. First, the Japanese authority legally discriminated against indigenous peoples. They called indigenous peoples as the ‘uncivilized’ (Hsu 2006: 11) and denied their informal institutions, including property and the ownership of land (Yang). Furthermore, they established laws that all lands belonged to national land of the Empire of Japan (T.-H. Chen and Su 2004: 108). This again fits to the bureaucratic rationalization of colonial government, using formal legal system to legitimize their policies in colonies with a “hegemonic colonial gaze” which “had transformed diverse indigenous understanding of, and social engagements of, nature.” (Adams 2003: 23). The implementation of the above idea is presented as the second strategy—to subdue indigenous peoples and place them into the Japanese colony production chain by policies of ‘Clan Migration (CM)’ since 1925 (T.-H. Chen and Su 2004: 6) and ‘Barbarian Necessary Land (BNL)’ (Yang). CM policy was a radical measure of the Japanese authority, pushed by many conflicts and serious wars with indigenous peoples, such as the Ooshen Event in 1930 (Hsu 2006) and the Isdaza Event in 1939 (Aliman 2006: 3). Here, I use the example of Isdaza Event and the implements of CM and BNL policies, in order to not only discuss how the Japanese authorities used these policies to manage natural resources and indigenous peoples, but also to introduce the background of the gradual loss of Bunun culture in Sazasa village.

Isdaza, meaning ‘a high and cold place’ in Bunun language (Aliman 2006: 3), is located in the south-eastern Central Mountain Range of Taiwan, opposite to Sazasa village. Before the penetration of the Japanese colonial powers, this place was inhabited by the Bunun with their hunter-gatherers and shifting agricultural economic activities (Lee 1997), which consumed little energy and were more dependent on the environment. According to Aliman’s (2006: 66) interviews with the Bunun in Sazasa village, the Japanese authority had begun to persuade the Bunun in Isdaza to migrate to the foot of the mountain since 1937. Just like that of San-Ho village (T.-H. Chen and Su 2004: 6), the Japanese authorities drew the Bunun by promoting the advantage of education and the prosperity in downtown further encouraged the people to migrate. In 1938, part of the Bunun formally held a migration ceremony with the Japanese police station and moved 353 people to settle down in the current location of Sazasa village (Aliman 2006: 66). However, during this migration period, one Bunun man, Haisul, lost two of his children on their way of leaving Isdaza. He then thought the migration was not right and people should not listen to the Japanese. He rebelled against the Japanese with some Bunun who remained in Isdaza in 1939. The rebellion was called the Isdaza Event (BununBlog 2008), resulting in further destructive measures by the Japanese authorities. According to the interview with Aliman (as the elders told him), after suppressing the event, the Japanese authorities burned all the houses and domestic animals in Isdaza, both to force all the Bunun to leave and to deny them the chance to go back again. Life after migrating was very harsh for the Bunun as that they did not know how to live in this new and much warmer environment, which is the current location of Sazasa village. One-third of the Bunun died within the first

five years, because, some were infected with unknown disease and some committed suicide. The Bunun lost their original capacity to survive by themselves and were supplied foods by the Japanese. This shows the importance of traditional land to indigenous peoples that not only supports them economically but also depend on it for the sake of their emotional and spiritual attachment.

The new environment provided by the Japanese was accompanied by a set of new institutions and policy of the 'Barbarian Necessary Land (BNL)' (Yang). Legally, this place was only for indigenous peoples, but under the management of the Japanese authorities. For example, according to Aliman, each family of the Bunun in Sazasa village was distributed a plot of arable land and forced to plant paddy rice as supply for the Japanese, instead of their traditional millet planting. At this point, we can see three elements changing in their institutions, which contribute to the Japanese governance. First, the Bunun in Isdaza used to be hunter-gatherers and shifting agriculturalists (Lee 1997) that usually required larger land for their economic activities. However, after migration, they were limited on relatively smaller pieces of land, only enough for planting paddy rice. The Japanese authorities then could exploit the forest up in the mountain as they wished without any resistance from indigenous peoples (T.-H. Chen and Su 2004: 108). Second, the ceremonies around millet planting (Tien 1992) from seeding to harvest throughout the year had become meaningless, which had greatly shaken their cultural institutions. According to the interview with Aliman, millet planting was the core of the Bunun culture which symbolized their respect and appreciation to their ancestors and nature. Once this element was taken away, their cultural institution easily collapsed which contributed to the 'civilization' agenda of the Empire of Japan. This intension can be explained by Adams' (2003: 27) analysis of colonial way of reorganizing nature's government, which helps reclaim wasteland and make the barbarian 'civilized.' Third, their economy is now being switched to serve the Japanese outside of Sazasa village, not for their own subsistence anymore. According to T.-H. Chen and Su (2004: 116), indigenous ways of living were therefore transformed into the system of capitalist market economy. This transformation of the Bunun economic and cultural institutions had resulted in a gradual loss of their relatively environmentally friendly characteristics, which had been replaced by limited land and market economy. According to Redford's (1991) critiques on 'ecologically noble savage' image of indigenous people, at this stage, the Bunun in Sazasa village had become part of the colonial production system which had resulted in global environmental problems.

After Japan was defeated in WWII, Taiwan was given back to the authority of the Republic of China¹¹ in 1945. Similarly, the Taiwanese authorities had

¹¹ Republic of China is the official name of Taiwan. After WWII, the ruling party of Republic of China, Kuomintang, lost the war with Communist Party of China in Mainland China and withdrew to Taiwan in 1949. After 1949, with threats from Mainland China and social-economical dilemmas within Taiwan, the priority of the Taiwanese authority was therefore to maximize economic growth (Yeh 2007: 2).

inherited the existing ways of governing natural resources and indigenous peoples of the Japanese colonial authority mentioned above. There were four legacies of the previous colonial period. First, the Taiwanese authority inherited capitalist expansion for economic growth, which constitutes managed extraction of natural resource through the establishment of the Forestry Bureau and the Bureau of Mine (Yang). Therefore, the remaining indigenous people who had not yet been resettled were forced again to apply to the policy of the 'Migration Plan' (Liu 2008: 2). This policy is the second legacy from the CM policy of the Japanese (Ibid: 1). The third one is copied from BNL policy—the regulations on 'Indigenous Peoples Reservation Land (IPRL)' (Yang). According to T.-H. Chen and Su (2004: 103), under the IPRL policy, those lands are still national land and indigenous peoples inhabiting there are requested to plant paddy rice and afforest timber woods. This policy inherits the logic of placing indigenous peoples into production chain of developing economic value of natural resource. The capitalist market economic system is therefore continues to penetrate economic institution of indigenous peoples so that they depend more and more on the government and capitalists (Sun 2008). Furthermore, since the implementation of these policies requires the cooperation of indigenous peoples, the Taiwanese government carried out another policy— 'Movement for Improving Indigenous Peoples' Living Condition' in 1953—in order to 'make the mountains like the plains' (Ibid: 103). This purpose of assimilating indigenous peoples was the forth legacy inherited from the Japanese period—"a hegemonic colonial gaze" —by which indigenous peoples' cultural institutions had been weakened again (Adams 2003: 23).

To conclude, according to Liu (2008: 1), with the purpose of exacting natural resource for economic gain, policies of both Japanese and Taiwanese authorities, including migration policy, land privatization, settled agriculture, and assimilation brought fundamental changes to indigenous peoples' economic and cultural institutions and made them available to be easily swallowed by the broader market economy. Therefore, the relatively environmental friendly institutions of indigenous peoples had gradually been washed away under the colonial and capitalist ways of using resources in Taiwan. Although the rise of a fortress conservation paradigm provides a different way of managing natural resource in Taiwan, it still imposed another set of regulations which elbows out the original institutions of indigenous peoples.

3.5 The Impact of Fortress Conservation on Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan

The fortress conservation paradigm is realized in national park establishment in Taiwan. The idea of fortress conservation had been formed in the late Japanese colonial period and been realized by the Taiwanese authorities. By introducing the idea of national park of the Japanese and Taiwanese authorities, we can see how natural resource has been viewed currently and its impact on indigenous peoples.

3.5.1 National Parks Establishment in Taiwan

Since Japan had been recognized as the ‘advanced’ country in East Asia in the late 19th century, besides copying the exploitative use of resources from the West, Japan had also followed the awareness of conservation as a reflection of environmental impacts resulted from colonization and capitalism (National Parks of Taiwan). This is another example of ‘colonial conservation’ defined by Grove (1995: 12), in which the ideas of fortress conservation, including separation of human and nature and the romantic idea of wilderness, had been inherited and realized by establishing national parks. In 1931, the National Park Law was published in Japan. The Japanese authorities then began their investigation of natural resource and scenic areas in Taiwan for deciding the locations of and conditions for national parks. Due to WWII, the plans for establishing three national parks were not put into effect. However, these initiatives by Japanese authorities had contributed to laws, systems, and boundaries regarding national parks for the later Taiwanese authorities (National Parks of Taiwan).

In the 1960’s, there had been an argument within the Taiwanese government with regard to national park establishment because at that time, development and economic growth were still the priorities of the authority (National Parks of Taiwan). However, due to the proposal from the Tourism Department for increasing foreign exchange income and the growing pressure from international society¹² concerning conservation, the National Park Law was finally published in 1972 (Yeh 2007: 2). The first national park was established in 1984 and later followed by six more national parks. These parks are: Kenting National Park, Yangmingshan National Park, Yushan National Park, Taroko National Park, Shei-Pa National Park, Kinmen National Park and Marine National Park. Following this establishment trend, there had been three national parks postponed from being established due to protests of indigenous peoples from the 1990s. The conflicts between existing national parks and indigenous peoples in Taiwan and its consequences can be understood by looking at the confrontation between the ideas and regulations of National Park Law and indigenous peoples’ economic activities.

3.5.2 The Conflict between National Parks and Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan

First, let us take a look at two articles in the National Park Law (1972). In Article 1, it explains that the purpose of establishing national parks is to protect nature and provide public recreation and scientific research. It presents the romantic definition of nature that human activities should be excluded from it in order to protect it and to make it scenery for human recreation. This

¹² After WWII, Taiwan (i.e. Republic of China) used to be one of the original members of the United Nations till 1971. During that time, the Taiwanese authority had great pressure from United Nations, International Union for Conservation of Nature, and the United States concerning conservation (Yeh 2007: 3).

idea of fortress conservation has confronted with the interests of indigenous peoples. Their economic activities, such as hunting-gathering and shifting agriculture, are not allowed in national parks. For example, in Article 13, it lists some activities prohibited within national parks—burning of vegetation or setting fires to clear land; hunting animals or catching fish; picking or removing flower or any other vegetation, etc. Unfortunately, national park areas partly overlap with areas where indigenous peoples reside. According to Huang (1999), there had been 3.676 hectares of IPRL covered by three national parks, which threatened the existing indigenous economic activities. There were even cases of indigenous peoples' being asked to migrate out of Taroko National Park (Yang and Huang 2002). The social impacts of national parks on indigenous peoples, as Dowie (2006: 34) said, have either made them 'conservation refugees' or made them to serve tourism. From the conflicts between national parks and indigenous peoples in Taiwan, we can see that in the name of conservation, the Taiwanese authorities again imposes another 'new' institution on indigenous peoples, which still denies their right to land and economic institution.

Under the management of the authorities in Taiwan, no matter if it is an exploitative use of resources or fortress conservation, historically, institutions of indigenous peoples had not been accepted for more than 100 years and largely transformed into the service of the modern market economy. In the next section, the consequences of the market economy dominated by Han 'modern' society is introduced, with the current disadvantaged economic situation of indigenous peoples, as one factor of the rise of ICBC in Taiwan.

3.6 General Current Economic Condition of Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan

According to Hsu (2004), indigenous peoples in Taiwan are not only a minority (Ibid: 22), but also one of the "disadvantaged groups" (Ibid: 1), who are in a 'disadvantaged' economic position within the society (Giddens 1997: 288). According to the statistics from the Ministry of the Interior in 2004, the total population of indigenous peoples is less than 2% of the total population in Taiwan (Hsu 2004: 22). Besides being a minority, their disadvantaged economic position in the society can be seen by the following statistic from the Report of Indigenous Peoples' Employment Condition made by CIP in 2003 (Ibid: 25). There were 64, 9% of indigenous peoples having labour jobs, which was much higher than 57, 1% of the national average. It means having labour jobs among indigenous peoples in Taiwan is more common. Moreover, most of the labour jobs they had can be categorized as 'bad jobs', associated with lower socio-economic position and require lower skill level (Ibid: 2). Second, the unemployment rate of indigenous peoples was 9, 64%, much worse than that of the national average, 4, 98%. 'Bad jobs' with unstable employment had resulted in indigenous people having lower average income—only 70% of that of the national average (Ibid: 26). And, persistent lower income indirectly resulted in lower education level (Ibid: 26). According to the Report of

Indigenous Peoples' Employment Condition made in 2008 by CIP, among indigenous peoples, people having a bachelor degree or even higher are 8, 14%, which is much lower comparing to that of national average, 22, 48%. The level of education of most indigenous peoples is junior high school or lower, which accounts to 49, 83% comparing to that of the national average, 32, 16%, is much higher. From the statistic provided above, we can draw a conclusion that, currently, indigenous peoples in Taiwan have worse conditions and opportunities to compete in the Han-dominant modern society, which reveals the serious problem of being economically 'disadvantaged' (Hsu 2004: 3). The following three tables indicate the statistical comparisons between indigenous peoples and the general population in Taiwan.

Table 1: Population Proportion

	Indigenous peoples	Total population
Population	Less than 2%	100%

(Source: Ministry of the Interior 2004 cited in Hsu 2004: 22)

Table 2 : Economic condition

	Indigenous peoples	National average
Rate of labour job	64, 9%	57, 1%
Unemployment rate	9, 64%	4, 98%
Average income	70%	100%

(Source: Report of Indigenous Peoples' Employment Condition (CIP 2003 cited in Hsu 2004: 25))

Table 3 : Education level

	Indigenous peoples	National average
Bachelor degree or higher	8, 14%	22, 48%
Junior high school or lower	49, 83%	32, 16%

(Source: Report of Indigenous Peoples' Employment Condition (CIP 2008))

Why are there 64, 9% of indigenous peoples having labour jobs, especially 'bad jobs' in the first place? This consequence relates to their original way of managing resource, the rearrangement of the Japanese and Taiwanese authorities, and the power of the market economy. As mentioned in chapter 3, generally speaking, the main economic activities of indigenous peoples in Taiwan are hunter-gatherers, shifting agriculturalists and fisher folk for subsistence. They are 'qualified' for being rearranged by the authorities of Japan and Taiwan to serve labour jobs, such as agriculture and afforestation, dominated by and exploited for national capitalist market economy. Furthermore, indigenous peoples have been taken as the 'uncivilized' barbarians that they were left behind in the process of modernization which has been realized by the above two authorities. The need for skilled capital and specialization for industrialization has made indigenous peoples 'less qualified' to meet the standards of 'better' jobs (Hsu 2004: 2). Their original way of managing resource under the dominances of the market economy and the modern society have been discriminated and driven to be qualified only to the 'bad' labour jobs. The current poor economic situation of indigenous peoples then becomes one factor of the rise of ICBC to achieve development objective.

In the next section, the second factor—the national trend of ‘indigenous consciousness’—is introduced.

3.7 The Rise of ICBC in Taiwan

Indigenous peoples in Taiwan have been suppressed by colonization and national mechanism for more than 100 years, thus they have become economically disadvantaged. However, from the 1980s onward, some indigenous elites had started to adapt the mainstream ways of life and social transition (Sun 2008). Besides, there had been several indigenous movements initiated under the banner of ‘pan-indigenous consciousness raising’, including movements of ‘return our languages’, ‘return our land’, ‘rectification of names’, ‘cultural revivalism’, etc (Chen 2002: 5). Simultaneously, on the international arena of conservation, CC discourses had been the centre of discussion in the 1980s that the rights of local communities (especially ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples) should be respected and their traditional skills and knowledge recognized by the academies, etc (Lu 2001). Accordingly, such international opportunities also pave ways for indigenous peoples in Taiwan. There have cases of postponed national park establishment due to the protests of indigenous peoples and also some ICBC cases, such as Danayigu Ecological Park initiated by Tsou (Yeh 2007; Chen 2002: 5). Under this background, ICBC operating by the Bunun in Sazasa village is one of the cases which is located in areas of IPRL and is not covered by any other form of protected areas, that they have ‘legitimized’ space and right to define and operate their own ICBC with the revived Bunun culture and ecotourism.

3.8 Conclusion

After more than 100 years of being suppressed by colonial and national authorities, indigenous peoples in the early 21st century enjoy relatively more space and rights to make their own claim regarding conservation. However, due to the transformation of their previous more environmentally friendly institutions and the current poor economic situation, the assumed justifications of operating ICBC has also faced its own dilemmas. In the next chapter, by looking at the Sazasa village case, we can see how the Bunun try to justify their way of conserving forest by representing their traditional environmentally friendly institutions and also the dilemmas of it.

Chapter 4 The Justifications and Dilemmas of Indigenous Community-Based Conservation in Sazasa Village in Taiwan

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I first introduce the assumed justifications of the Sazasa village case from the perspective of the main organizer, Aliman—operating ecotourism with the revived Bunun culture to meet the goals of conservation and local development—and then its associated dilemmas.

4.2 The Assumed Justifications of Ecotourism with the Revived Bunun Culture for Conservation and Development Objectives

Although conservation is taken as one of the colonial legacies (Grove 1995: 12), the awareness of the environmental impacts of colonialism and capitalism and the rise of CC have made a space for indigenous people to participate in conservation objectives and justified the romantic ideas of their more environmentally friendly institutions (Hutton et al. 2005: 345). The main organizer of this ICBC case in Sazasa village, Aliman, provides the assumed justifications of ecotourism with revivalism of Bunun culture to meet conservation and development objectives. I introduce the justifications from Aliman's perspective into two parts. The first part is the assumed connection between the revived Bunun culture, conservation and ecotourism. The second part is the assumed contribution of community-based ecotourism with the revived Bunun culture to generate alternative income for local people.

Since, as mentioned in chapter 1, the location of Sazasa village is characterised by its little contacts with outsiders, the Bunun living there have kept relatively keep more indigenous features until now. Based on the geographical conditions, part of traditional Bunun institutions can still be passed down and revived with the ecotourism operation in the Forest Museum. According to Aliman and what I observed in the field, I introduce the revived Bunun economic institutions in the museum by the following two features. First, there are traditional Bunun houses made of bamboo, which are easily accessible materials from their surroundings. Visitors are requested to spend a night there at the fire side. Visitors are also requested to collect woods and wild herbs for making fires and preparing their own meals of the day. Second, there is no electricity available in the museum and using mobiles is not allowed. Aliman said that the purpose of refusing modern technology is to effectively represent original Bunun ways of living with nature and their relation with the surroundings. As for the cultural institution, their belief in animism is symbolized by a house to worship their ancestors and mountain spirit at the entrance of the forest. According to Aliman, every visitor, including a Bunun,

has to participate in the ceremony before entering deep into the forest. The house is built by bamboo with a string of wild boar teeth decorated at the back. They put millet wine and betel nut on the platform situated in front of the house to worship and ask their ancestors and mountain spirit for permission and blessings for entering the forest. Aliman said that if they successfully hunt a wild boar and go back home safely, they take it as a blessing from ancestors and the mountain spirit. Therefore, the visitors, who want to get into the forest with blessings, are also expected to practice such tradition. According to Aliman, the Bunun believe that the spirits of their ancestors stay with them together with the mountain spirit. Each signal from nature, good or bad, is symbolized as a message from their ancestors and the mountain spirit. The spiritual connection of the Bunun with their ancestors, the mountain spirit and nature, represents a belief in animism, just as the way Y.-L. Chen (2004) identifies indigenous peoples in Taiwan. This animism belief contributes to humans respectful and more careful use natural resource (White 1976).

In Bunun culture as I have learnt it from the field, nature has utilitarian and spiritual values. This resembles the identification of indigenous peoples before colonial intervention since the 17th century. Comparing to colonial and capital ways of exploiting resources or forbidding humans' use of nature, the above features of Bunun ways of managing resource suggests one possibility of using natural resources without overexploitation. Therefore, the features of the revived Bunun culture in the museum present the idealistic ideas about more environmentally friendly indigenous institutions, which meet the conservation objective. These features are also used in ecotourism operation in the museum, presented in the next paragraph.

According to what I observed in the field, the way they operate community-based ecotourism with features of the revived Bunun culture also have environmental friendly characteristics. I introduce them into three parts. The first is about the natural resource-centred feature (Lu 2000), which can be seen in the following four examples. First, the requests to visitors to participate and follow the traditional Bunun way of living is based on resources they can use from the surroundings for subsistence, rather than resource from 'outside'. For example, visitors are requested to live in bamboo houses, use no electricity, collect wild herbs, and make fire for cooking, etc. Using resources from the surroundings for subsistence consumes less energy and is more natural resource-centred, which meets the first feature of ecotourism identified in chapter 2. Second, visitors are requested to wash dishes and keep their surrounding clean after use with a particular emphasis on responsibility for nature. Third, according to Aliman, regarding tours in the forest, they seasonally change routes in order to give those frequently used routes time to recover. Forth, Aliman said that tour guides do not use microphones in order to reduce noise pollution produced by humans in the forest. The last two examples show consideration of reducing human disturbance to nature, which are also natural resource-centred features. As for the second feature of ecotourism—targeted tourists (Brockington et al. 2008)—this can be see in the following two visitor-control regulations in the museum provided by Aliman.

First, the administration regulates the quality and quantity of visitors by not providing a road sign, which makes it difficult for uninvited guests to visit. Aliman said that all visitors should make reservations through E-mail or telephone beforehand with him. Then, there will be communication between the locals and visitors in advance, so that visitors will be asked to consent to certain regulations. According to Aliman, One of these regulations includes that the museum is for learning local Bunun experience and their interaction with nature, not for recreation. Aliman provided another example to regulate the quality and quantity of visitors—to deny cooperation with the big nearby tourism business. They could expand the museum’s market by absorbing more visitors from an enterprise nearby called ‘Luminous Hot Spring Resort and Spa’, which of course may not have the same ‘logic’ of running ecotourism. The administration of the museum denies the cooperation with them and prefers to have more control over its ecotourism and visitors. The strategy of controlled-visitors emphasizes the subjectivity of local people and culture, which not only avoids the potential of locals’ from being ‘emotional labour’, as Brockington et al.(2008: 149) mentioned, but also increases the opportunities of understanding local culture for visitors, which is considered as the third feature of ecotourism (Weaver 2001). From the three features provided above, ecotourism based on Bunun culture implements various regulations meets the expectations for ecotourism which is more environmentally friendly, involves local cultural learning, and bring reflection on human-nature relation for visitors from dominant modern society.

As for community-based ecotourism’s contribution to the local economy in Sazasa village, it can be understood by the Bunun’s current economic situation and the employment provided by ecotourism operation. Currently, according to data I collected from the field, the main economic activities in Sazasa village are planting plums and labour jobs in cities, which are considered as ‘bad’ jobs with lower socio-economic positions. Therefore, the employment opportunities provided by community-based ecotourism are relatively important to villagers. According to Aliman, there are three examples. First, the museum requires elders to contribute their memories of old times and techniques of building traditional Bunun houses to represent their culture. For this input, the elders obtain income, and so do the youngsters who learn and help them. Second, being familiar with hunting culture and experience, the Bunun are qualified tour guides, which provides them a means to earn income. They provide their conceptualization of nature from the Bunun perspective, protect visitors, and also supervise their adherence to regulations. In the hot season, the museum requires four to five tour guides. Third, several villagers work as truck drivers to pick up visitors from the train station and provide supplies. From my point of view, community-based ecotourism provides other sources of income for villagers by conserving the forest and reviving Bunun culture. This meets one of the expected purposes of CC—to use the “economic values of conservation resources to deliver both sustainable livelihoods and conservation” (Hutton et al. 2005: 345).

Though, the justifications of community-based ecotourism with the revived Bunun culture looks convincing, there still exist dilemmas in it. I use critiques mentioned in chapter 2 regarding ‘political’ aim of ‘indigenous’ culture, CC and ecotourism to analyze these dilemmas.

4.3 The Dilemmas: ICBC in Sazasa Village

In this section, three dilemmas with regard to the Sazasa village case that I observed during my field work are discussed. Inevitably, the operation of ICBC still cannot escape from the impacts of modernization and the market economy. First, historically, the more environmental friendly indigenous economic institutions have been weakened and transformed greatly, especially by the market economy. This is not only difficult to be ‘revived’ again by the current generation of indigenous peoples, but may also be used for economic gain under the hegemony of Han-dominant society and the market economy. Second, ecotourism that operates under the name of ICBC and local development can also bring the environmental impact, just like problems of any other development projects. Third, the institution organizing ecotourism in this case, Cultural and Education Foundation of Aboriginal Tribe Reestablishment (CEFATR), presents community dynamics and the problem of distribution of benefits, which can be understood in relation to the background of the leader, Aliman.

4.3.1 The Dilemmas of Reviving Bunun Culture in the Sazasa Village Case

The dilemmas of reviving Bunun culture in this case can be understood by the following two points—the generation gap for reviving Bunun culture and the controversy of representing it. First, based on the conclusion from chapter 3, the assumed environmentally friendly Bunun institutions have been weakened and transformed greatly. Inevitably, this results in a challenge to the current generation to revive Bunun culture. There are three reasons to explain that. First, the Bunun elders who enjoyed the culture before Japanese colonial involvement have gradually passed away. There has been a generation gap that contributed for the fading of culture. Within two weeks of my stay in the museum in Sazasa village this summer, I only encountered one elder, at the age of 70, who teaches and passes down his experiences regarding the Bunun culture, such as the traditional Bunun houses building and the in-house arrangements. The rest were at the age in their 40s to 50s, and they learn and help the elder to realize his impression from the past. Furthermore, the elder I am mentioning here was born in 1939, after the implementation of Clan Migration policy in the Japanese colonial period. His impression or experience from the past had been probably not qualified to represent the complete Bunun culture as it existed before the implementation of CM policy, needless to mention the qualifications of generations next to him. As for hunting in the Bunun culture, according to my interview with some of the villagers in their 40s to 50s in the museum, it is relatively well represented since most of them

still have had the experiences of hunting with their elders in forests. Therefore, hunting-related experiences or ceremonies can be represented or passed down by this generation to the next one. However, the second and most important reason for explaining the difficulties is that there is no current generation participating. The generation gap of passing down the Bunun culture can be seen by their way of living in reality, which is relatively 'modern'. They live in houses made from cement, use electricity for lights, televisions, computers, and air-conditioners, etc. The main economic activities they have are planting plums and being labourers in cities to earn money. Hunting is no more economically profitable. The revived Bunun culture actually only exists in the museum, not outside of it. Furthermore, being a minority in Taiwan with disadvantaged economic conditions, most indigenous people identify better education and city job opportunities as an ideal way of catching up with the Han-dominated modern society, as do the Bunun in Sazasa village. Through long processes and aspirations for a better 'modern-life', the reality has changed to a point where reviving culture and full adoption of the traditional way of life has become extremely difficult. The last reason is that since the revived Bunun culture in the museum has only existed for three years from 2006, it is hard to see its replicate effects on other Bunun, especially the current generation. Since, at this time, the revived Bunun culture is not exercised in their daily life, what does it mean to them, then?

The second reason of the dilemma of reviving Bunun culture is that the representation can be used for economic gain. Since, indigenous peoples in Taiwan are generally economically disadvantaged, the Bunun in Sazasa village have the same problem that an alternative income, such as ecotourism, is "hard to be resisted" (Brockington et al. 2008: 132). Furthermore, since the way the museum represents the Bunun culture is so different to that of Han-dominant modern society, this 'difference' can be used for ecotourism in two ways. First, according to Brockington et al. (2008: 135), ecotourism usually "relies on the idea that places and cultures are pristine, unspoiled, and untouched by westernization, industrialization and even mass tourism." The revived Bunun culture in the museum is emphasized on its 'pristine' feature, which can be turned into a "commodity" (Carrier and Macleod 2005: 329). If most Bunun do not live that way, it is clear that the revived culture is taken as a "differential consciousness" to be used politically for economic "space-making" from the domination of Han modern society (Brockington et al. 2008: 120), which loses its value and the justification as a 'Bunun culture'. Second, the revived Bunun culture in the museum does not present the element of shifting agriculture economic activity, which can cause local environmental impact. Therefore, there is another manipulation of the revived Bunun culture to present its assumed 'environmentally friendly' features in order to justify its ecotourism operation and conservation objective, contrast with the mainstream destructive modern lifestyle.

To conclude, to revive Bunun culture in the modern time encounters dilemmas that emanate from the generation gap, economic problems, and manipulation of the representation of local culture, which possibly not only results in the

crisis of Bunun culture itself but also in being misinterpreted for economic gain. After introducing the dilemma of reviving Bunun culture in the Sazasa village case, community-based ecotourism has other two dilemmas presented in the next two sections.

4.3.2 The Dilemmas of Ecotourism in the Sazasa Village Case

Ecotourism was born through the comparison with tourism (Nelson 1994). It is identified as relatively environmentally friendly and still is one form of tourism, “happily co-exist[ing] with and dependent on the neoliberal global system” and may “end up repeating the same problems as other forms of development” (Brockington et al. 2008: 147). As I observed during my fieldwork in the museum, the environmental impact of ecotourism can be seen by the following three examples. First, visitors walk through traditional hunting routes in the forest, which inevitably bring more human pressure and lead to erosion and soil paving. Second, the animal observation activity of ecotourism has disturbed animals or influenced their behaviours. For instance, watching frogs around ponds using flashlights at night is a common activity. This has an effect on frogs’ sensitivity. Formosan Monkeys close to the museum get used to having visitors in a certain distance and show no intimidation. This new type of interaction between humans and animals developed by ecotourism has resulted in impacts on the ecosystem. Just as Bulbeck (2005 cited in Brockington et al. 2008: 136) argues, the way ecotourists want to have “tactile and emotional forms of engagement with animals” can “in fact be “ecologically damaging.” The third one is about the “socio-ecological implications of the global infrastructure and economic relationships that makes ecotourism possible in the first place” (Brockington et al. 2008: 145). This can be seen by the ‘ecological footprints’ made by ecotourists while transporting from other places in Taiwan by cars, or even from different parts of the world by air travel to Sazasa village, which implies an “environmental cost.” (Carrier and Macleod 2005: 317). From the operation of ecotourism inside the museum to the ecological footprints it brings from outside, the ‘environmentally friendly’ features of ecotourism in Sazasa village still needs to be questioned.

4.3.3 The Dilemma of Community Dynamics in Sazasa Village

According to Brockington et al. (2008: 138) and Southgate (2006: 80), ecotourism projects not only “intersect with existing community dynamics but even “exacerbate” it, which is “rooted in the historical context of local power relations.” In order to examine the ‘community dynamics’ and the ‘rooted local power relations’ in this case of community-based ecotourism in Sazasa village, I present the institution organizing ecotourism, Cultural and Education Foundation of Aboriginal Tribe Reestablishment (CEFATR), some villagers’ disagreements with the leader, Aliman, and his personal background.

CEFATR is currently composed of eleven members, including Aliman and his friends, who share his idea of the museum. Surprisingly, except the founder

(Aliman), there is actually only one member from Sazasa village. Others locals have no say in the foundation. Therefore, most of the members of CEFATR, who control and supervise the operation of the museum, do not live in Sazasa village. The museum most of time is handled by Aliman. According to him, CEFATR used to cooperate with the Sazasa Community Development Committee¹³. However, due to some distrust between them, these two institutions had grown further apart from each other. The decision-making process of ecotourism in Sazasa village, until now, did not involve other villagers. There has been a rumour among villagers that the cooperation between Aliman and his Han friends are probably a conspiracy of profit making, covered by arguments of nature and love for culture, while it really was a scheme to lure people to sell their lands. I would like to provide another grievance from villagers that show villagers' disagreement with Aliman. According to one interviewee, "some villagers still want to be involved in the decision-making process of the museum and/or get more benefits from it, which, in a sense should not be solely owned by Aliman and the other villager". For example, while discussing the distribution of benefit from ecotourism, the interviewee suggests that other villagers could provide boarding houses for visitors, but this is not happening. This can be understood by the following two points. First, the ecotourism defined by Aliman, cannot provide enough employment for Sazasa village as a whole. It actually fails to have a larger scale of economic development. In principle, Aliman likes to ask visitors to spend a night in the traditional bamboo houses, rather than in modern houses of villagers, which could not provide a traditional Bunun experience. The small economic scale of the museum cannot, therefore, meet the economic demands of villagers. Second, Aliman assumed that he is the one who invested a 'staggering' amount of money to buy those lands back from villagers and established the museum. He argued, therefore, "There is no obligation for me to share the benefits equally with other villagers." The composition of CEFATR and doubts and disagreement between other villagers and Aliman can be investigated more by looking at Aliman's background.

As an indigenous elite in Sazasa village, Aliman had rich experience in Han-dominant society. He studied for his bachelor degree and worked as a businessman, congressional assistant and journalist in Taipei¹⁴. He also earned his master degree from Graduate Institute of Ethnic Relations and Cultures in National Dong Hwa University in 2006. Aliman has fit himself well into Han-dominated society, which provides him enough resources when establishing the museum, but also hamper his cooperation with other Sazasa villagers. During his study and work in Taipei, Aliman seldom visited Sazasa village. Being an elite in his village, Aliman's background makes him different from most of his villagers who are struggling in the lower class of the society, which had created a big gap between them. This 'difference' makes the assumed 'community' no longer 'homogeneous', but rather 'heterogeneous'

¹³ According to Aliman, Community Development Committee has bad reputation that it has been used by Kuomintang (one of the leading parties in Taiwan) as vote brokers during election.

¹⁴ Taipei City is the capital and the biggest city of Taiwan.

(Leach et al. 1999). Furthermore, it is Aliman's personal friends, who he had made during his studies and works now helping him establish and participating in the CEFATR. From establishing the CEFATR to realizing his ideals of ecotourism with the revived Bunun culture, we can see that Aliman has depended lot on resources 'outside' his village, including capital and personal network. We can also see how the "social difference" (Ibid: 230) between Aliman and other villagers has been 'exacerbated' in the process of operating ecotourism. There had been no equal distribution of benefits from the ecotourism site, since Aliman also gets his own financial problems. He currently lives by running the museum in order to support his family of three children's life and to pay the debt he incurred buying the lands. His family members all participate in this business. In the name of community-based ecotourism, this personal consideration has become sensitive and unfair to the other villagers.

The community dynamics behind the community-based ecotourism of this case shows the 'heterogeneity' of this indigenous community, which has been developed long time ago through the interaction with the market economy and the Han-dominant modern society. This dilemma of community-based ecotourism decreases the justification of it and should be carefully dealt with.

4.4 Discussion

Based on the history of the transformation of indigenous institutions in Taiwan and dilemmas of the Sazasa village case presented above, in this section, I use arguments of resurgent protectionist and Holt to discuss the experiment of ICBC.

The Bunun in the Sazasa village case have aimed to revive indigenous culture by using ecotourism to achieve conservation and development objectives for three years. This operation, however, faces dilemmas in the generation gap, commodification of culture, controversy of being environmental friendly, and community dynamics. These dilemmas of ICBC turn out to support the suggestion of resurgent protectionist. According to them, CC is problematic and inefficient for ecosystem protection and should be replaced by the "strictest possible protection of protected areas" (Hutton et al. 2005: 348). The argument of resurgent protectionist creates a space for discussion on which direction should conservation go? And, also a new chance to redefine 'conservation.'

According to Holt (2005), the dilemmas of this ICBC case can be taken as a process of indigenous people's trying to 'learn and reconfigure' the introduction (or intrusion) of the Western culture with their traditional institutions. This is another process of conservation awareness learning, like the experience from the West. Therefore, the Bunun in the Sazasa village case should also be given time and space to have the same process of learning, which may have different outcomes from what resurgent protectionists predict.

Besides, Holt's (2005) definition of 'conservation' gives more value to ICBC experiments. She assumes that global problems of environmental degradation resulting from the misuse of resources, therefore conservation should focus more on the "accurate understanding of resource use regimes" (Ibid: 204). The indigenous ways of using resources presented in the Sazasa village case is an example of conservation defined by Holt, which is more environmentally friendly than the dominant one. Therefore, in order to change the dominant 'resource use regimes', the modification of "social and political institutions which influence resource management" should also be implemented (Ibid: 204). In this case, when the Bunun in Sazasa village are putting efforts to combine the ideals of reviving indigenous institutions, conservation and taking care of their life in 'modern' reality, the struggles and dilemmas within shows the 'political and social process' of conservation, in which it takes space and time to "develop their own conservation institutions"(Ibid: 211).

4.5 Conclusion

From the three dilemmas of this case analyzed above, its tight connection with the capitalist market economy and the Han-dominant modern society makes the process of ICBC more difficult and complicated. "[A]ny project/initiative" that does not challenge the "existing neoliberal framework", is "filled with complexities, contradictions, costs, benefits, problems and challenges" (Brockington et al. 2008: 138). However, Holt's arguments regarding CC implementations and conservation give value to this ICBC case that conservation is justified as a process of dealing with the social and political institutions behind the misuse of resources. Since the Sazasa village case has begun with relatively an 'accurate' focus on resource use regimes, it inevitably also has to face dilemmas of developing their own conservation institutions. The dilemmas analyzed above help understand the controversies behind the assumed justifications and provide suggestions for improving ICBC implementations.

Conclusion

Referring back to my main research question, I would like to present the justifications and dilemmas of ICBC, with special reference to the case in Sazasa village in Taiean. There are two points in justification of this case. First, the Bunun present part of their traditional ways of managing resource, which are for subsistence, more environmental friendly than the dominant one. Among various conservation paradigms, indigenous ways of managing resource in ICBC operation are also more directly related to the roots of global environmental problems. This discussion, thus, matches to Holt's (2005) definition of conservation that it shall be a strategy and a process to deal with the roots of global environmental problems resulting from resource use regimes. Second, based on the first one, ecotourism operation causes less impact on the environment and at the same time provides more employment opportunities for local people. However, this form of conservation also has various dilemmas since the definitions of 'indigenous' people and 'community' in the ICBC case are not homogeneous and static, rather heterogeneous and dynamic. There are three dilemmas in this case of Sazasa village. First, the institutions of current 'indigenous' people operating ICBC now have been influenced and transformed a lot by colonialism, the market economy and the modern society. These people have a modern way of living and, at the same time, economically disadvantaged. Once they are hailed as the ones to realize the 'revivalism' of indigenous culture and ways of managing resource, they have to face dilemmas of generation gap, interpretation of culture, and commodification of culture. Second, the current condition of Sazasa village is not a homogeneous community, but a heterogeneous one resulting from the differentiation of local power relations. Once ecotourism is operated based on a heterogeneous community, it will be mainly controlled by powerful elite, resulting in unequal distribution of labour and benefits. Third, ecotourism operation is only 'relatively' environmentally friendly, not absolutely. It has the potential to create more human pressure on local environment and raise the ecological footprint at global level. By presenting the justifications and dilemmas of the Sazasa village case, this research paper provides an ICBC example in Taiwan which contributes to the existing ICBC narrative and provides additional understandings regarding the relation of conservation, indigenous people, and indigenous conservation administrations in Taiwan. However, this case only indicates one particular direction regarding ICBC in Taiwan. More cases are needed to be investigated in order to have more complete picture of ICBC implementations in Taiwan.

References

- Adams, W.M. (2003) 'Nature and the Colonial Mind', in W.M. Adams et al. (eds), *Decolonizing Nature: strategies for conservation in postcolonial era* (pp. 16-50). London: Earthscan.
- Adams, W.M. and J. Hutton (2007) 'People, Parks and Poverty: Political Ecology and Biodiversity Conservation', *Conservation and Society* 5(2): 147-183.
- Aliman (2006) 'Bunun History of Isdaza from a Local Perspective'. MA thesis, National Dong Hwa University, Taitung.
- Barrow, E. and M. Murphree (2001) 'Community Conservation: From Concept to Practice', in D. Hulme et al. (eds), *African Wildlife and Livelihoods: The Promise and Performance of Community Conservation* (pp. 24-37). Oxford: James Currey Ltd.
- Brockington, D., R. Duffy and J. Igoe (2008) *Nature Unbound: Conservation, Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas*. London: Earthscan.
- Bulbeck, C. (2005) *Facing the Wild Ecotourism Conservation and Animal Encounters*. London: Earthscan.
- BununBlog (2008, Nov. 19th, 2008) Isdaza Event. Retrieved Sep. 6th, 2009, from http://www.bununblog.org.tw/page_01-p.php?id=200811191527432985&page=1.
- Carrier, J. G. and Macleod, D. V. L. (2005) 'Bursting the bubble: The socio-cultural context of eco-tourism'. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11: 315-334.
- Chen, M.-C. (2003) 'A Study on Residents' Impact Cognition and Attitude Toward Ecotourism Development--A Case Study of Saviki Village, Chiayu County, Taiwan'. MA thesis, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung.
- Chen, S.-L. (2002) 'The Dilemma of Legalizing Rights in Indigenous Movement'. MA thesis, National Taiwan University, Taipei.
- Chen, T.-H. and S.-J. Su (2004) 'The Creation of a New Aboriginal Spatial Mosaic--A Study of the Aboriginal Re-settlement as San-Ho Village, Ping-Tung County', *Journal of Geographical Science*(37): 99-122.
- Chen, W.-H. (2004) 'A Study on the Aboriginal Self-Governance Policy in Taiwan: From a Planning Evaluation Perspective'. MA thesis, National Taipei University, Taipei.
- Chen, Y.-L. (2004) *Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan--their social life and custom*. Sindian: Yuan Zhu Wen Hua (遠足文化).

- CIP (2008) The Bunun. Retrieved Nov. 5th, 2009, from
http://www.apc.gov.tw/main/docDetail/detail_ethnic.jsp?cateID=A000196&rootCateID=A000193
- CIP (2008) Report of Indigenous Peoples' Employment Condition Retrieved Nov. 1, 2009, from
<http://www.apc.gov.tw/main/docList/docList.jsp?cateID=A001114&linkParent=49&linkSelf=339&linkRoot=4>.
- CIP (2009) Statistical Data of Indigenous Population. Retrieved Oct. 20, 2009, from
http://www.apc.gov.tw/main/docDetail/detail_TCA.jsp?isSearch=&docid=PA000000003578&cateID=A000297&linkSelf=161&linkRoot=4&linkParent=49&url=.
- CIP (2008) The Indigenous Tribes in Taiwan. Retrieved Oct. 22nd, 2009, from
http://www.apc.gov.tw/main/docDetail/detail_ethnic.jsp?cateID=A000427&linkSelf=147&linkRoot=101.
- Dowie, M. (2006) 'The Hidden Cost of Paradise: Indigenous people are being displaced to create wilderness areas, to the detriment of all', *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 4(1): 30-38.
- Giddens, A. (1997) *Sociology* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Grove, R.H. (1995) *Green Imperialism: colonial expansion, tropical island Edens and the origins of environmentalism, 1600-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holt, F.L. (2005) 'The Catch-22 of Conservation: Indigenous Peoples, Biologists, and Cultural Change', *Human Ecology* 33(2): 199-215.
- Hsu, C.-S. (2006) 'Textual Memory and Identifications in Ooshen Event'. MA thesis, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan.
- Hsu, Y.-J. (2004) 'The Research of Gating Promotional Employment for Indigenous People in Taiwan'. MA thesis, Chinese Culture University, Taipei.
- Huang, Y.-W. (1999) 'Policies Regarding Indigenous Peoples Reservation Land in National Parks in Taiwan—a Review of its system and spacial perspective', *Journal of National Park* 9(2): 159-186.
- Hutton, J., W.M. Adams and J.C. Murombedzi (2005) 'Back to the barriers? Changing narratives in biodiversity conservation', *Forum for Development Studies* 32: 341-370.
- International Labour Organization (1989) Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) Retrieved Oct. 5th, 2009, from
http://www.ilo.org/indigenous/Resources/Publications/lang--en/docName--WCMS_100897/index.htm.
- Kao, Y.-C. (2009) 'A Bunun Man Got Loans for Protecting Forest'. *China Times*, p. 6. Feb. 16, 2009.

- King, D. A. and Stewart, W. P. (1996) 'Ecotourism and commodification: Protecting people and places'. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 5(3): 293-305.
- Kuang, M. (2006) *Bountiful and Beautiful as the Fragrant Earth--Vision for Reconstructing Aboriginal Homelands*. Paper presented at the conference 'Immersion Camp at Tribal Villages'.
- Landes, D.S. (1998) *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are So Rich and Some So Poor*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company
- Leach, M., R. Mearns and I. Scoones (1999) 'Environmental Entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-Based Natural Resources Management', *World Development* 17(2): 225-247.
- Lee, M.-H. (1997) 'Tribes Migration and Social Reconstruction of Taiwan Aborigines in Japan Colonial Period : the Case Study of the Bunun of Be-nan River'. MA thesis, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.
- Lin, L.-F. (2003) 'The Maker of Industrialization--the electric utility in Taiwan in Japanese colonial period '. PhD thesis, National Chengchi University, Taipei.
- Lindberg, K., Enriquez, J. and Sproule, K. (1996) 'Ecotourism questioned: Case studies from Belize' *Annals of Tourism Research* 23(3): 543-562.
- Liu, Y.-C. (2008) *Clan Migration and Social Cultural Changes: A Case Study of Hsinyuan Tribe in East Taiwan* Institute of Austronesian Studies, National Taitung University.
- Lu, D.-J. (2001) *Participation, Co-management, and Natural Resource Management* Paper presented at the conference 'Strategies for Biodiversity Conservation in National Parks'.
- Lu, S.-C. (2000) *A Study on Ecotourism Development in terms of Recreation Value Assessment in Wu-Lin Recreation Area of Shei-Pa National Park*. Master thesis, Tunghai University, Taichung.
- McNeely, J.A. and D. Pitt (1985) 'Introduction--Culture: the Missing Element in Conservation and Development', in J.A. Mcneely et al. (eds), *Culture and Conservation: the Human Dimension in Environmental Planning* (pp. 1-9). London: The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.
- Nelson, J. G. (1994) *The Spread of Ecotourism: some planning implications*. *Environmental Conservation* 21: 255-258
- National Parks of Taiwan. National Parks Development History. Retrieved Oct. 27th, 2009, from http://np.cpami.gov.tw/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogsection&id=47&Itemid=10007.
- National Park Law (1972) Retrieved Oct. 25th, 2009, from <http://db.lawbank.com.tw/Eng/FLAW/FLAWDAT0202.asp>.
- Pedersen, M.A. (2001) 'Totemism, Animism and North Asian Indigenous

- Ontologies', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7(3): 411-427.
- Redford, K.H. (1991) 'The Ecologically Noble Savage', *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 15: 46-48.
- Southgate, C. (2006) 'Ecotourism in Kenya: The vulnerability of communities'. *Journal of Ecotourism* 5(1, 2): 80-96.
- Su, N.-J. (2002) 'Analysis of Taiwanese Revolution in the Japanese Colonial Period--A case study of Xi Lai An revolution'. MA thesis, Chinese Culture University, Taipei.
- Sun, D.-C. (2008) *Subjectivity Kidnapped--A Review of Current Legal and Political Development of Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan* Paper presented at the conference 'Ta-Ri-Tsi Forum--discussing Taiwan from perspectives of different provincial origins'.
- Tchi, R. What is Feng Shui - Feng Shui Theory and Feng Shui Tools. Retrieved Oct. 18th, 2009, from <http://fengshui.about.com/od/thebasics/qt/fengshui.htm>.
- Tien, T.-I. (1992) *Life Ceremonies of the Bunun in Taiwan*. Taipei: Tai-Yuan.
- Tsai, H.-C. (2005) 'Research of the cooperative system of the village Smangus'. MA thesis, Providence University, Taichung.
- Turner, M. and D. Hulme, 1997, *Governance, Administration and Development*, London: Macmillan.
- Vickers, W. T. (1994). From opportunism to nascent conservation. *Human Nature* 5: 307-337.
- Wang, C.-S. (2001) *The Imagination of Environmental Sociology (環境社會學的想像)*. Taipei: Liwen.
- Weaver, D. (2001) *Ecotourism* John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd. 96-126.
- White, L. (1967) 'The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis', *Science* 155: 1203-1207.
- Wilshusen, P.R., S.R. Brechin, C.L. Fortwangler and P.C. West (2002) 'Reinventing a SquareWheel: Critique of a Resurgent "Protection Paradigm" in International Biodiversity Conservation', *Society and Natural Resources* 15: 17-40.
- Yang, C.-C. Land and Colonization--Resource Exploitation, Ecological Changes and Ownership of Land. Retrieved Oct. 15, 2009, from <http://wildmic.npust.edu.tw/sasala/land.htm>
- Yang, U.-G. and Y.-L. Huang (2002) 'National Parks and Indigenous Peoples', *Journal of Dahan Institute of Technology* 17: 149-159.
- Yeh, M.-H. (2007) 'Research of the Deficiency of Taiwan's National Park Law and Management--A Perspective from the Treating Process of Aboriginal Affairs of Taroko National Park Headquarters'. MA thesis, National Dong Hwa University, Hualien.
- Yen, A.-C. and K.-C. Yang (2004) *Land Institutions and Economic Development of*

Indigenous Peoples Banciao: Daw Shiang Publishing Co., Ltd

