

THE EMERGENCE OF DE-EXILE: CULTURAL POLITICS AND THE POSTWAR GENERATION IN TAIWAN*

HSIAU A-CHIN

Taiwan was under Japanese colonial rule from 1895 to 1945. Taken over in 1945 by the government of the Republic of China (ROC), which was controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT), the island was turned into a province of the ROC. Four years later, in 1949, the KMT lost the civil war that was raging on the Chinese mainland to the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and relocated the ROC central government to Taiwan. The island of Taiwan, with a population of about six million inhabitants at that time, harbored more than one million refugees (hereafter: “Mainlanders”) and began to go through a long period of minority rule. Before the transition to democracy began in the late 1980s, Taiwan witnessed the so-called White Terror and brutal political repression against dissidents, especially those of local Taiwanese background, during what was to become the second longest period of rule under martial law in the world (38 years).

The history of the world has witnessed ample examples of exile, which, as Thomas Pavel succinctly defines it, involves individual or collective forced displacement from one’s native land, typically for political or religious reasons rather than economic ones.¹ While the consequences of exile may not be completely negative (for example, finding refuge in another country), it usually brings about intense, continued mental suffering characterized by an unpleasant sense of living in a “median” state, that is, a state of being caught between adjusting oneself to a new home and retaining one’s faith in the possibility of returning to one’s old home.² The Mainlanders dominated Taiwan’s politics for more than half a century. Politics and culture under KMT rule was infused with the above-mentioned exile mentality.³ The KMT government led by Chiang Kai-shek claimed that

* Acknowledgement: This article was made possible by a Fellowship of the International Consortium for Research in the Humanities “Fate, Freedom and Prognostication. Strategies of Coping with the Future in East Asia and Europe” supported by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany. I also thank Professors Thomas Fröhlich and Brigit Knüsel Adamec for their valuable comments and suggestions on this article..

1 Pavel 1996, 306.

2 Said 1994b, 48–49.

3 For a further detailed discussion on the exile mentality and its influence on the KMT’s rule in Taiwan and the postwar generation, see Hsiau 2010.

Taiwan was “Free China,” the “sole legitimate representative of all China”. As a fervently anti-communist regime in the Cold War era, the KMT government repeated its determination to retake the mainland and rebuild a rich and powerful China, a desire that was however never realized. By the late 1950s, there were an increasing number of Mainlander intellectuals who no longer believed in the KMT propaganda of recovering the Mainland.⁴ However, the propaganda remained as strong as ever. For the KMT government and many Mainlanders, Taiwan served merely as a temporary shelter and a base of anti-communist counter-attack.⁵

Under the highly centralized, authoritarian party state system of the KMT, the relationship between the local Taiwanese and the Mainlanders in exile remained strained over a long period of time. The nostalgic cultural politics of the exiles held sway over Taiwanese society. In addition to the language of Mandarin Chinese, the Mainlanders’ collective memory, cultural values, symbols, art, music, theater, handicrafts, and the like, which were defined as belonging to “orthodox” Chinese tradition, were officially pro-

-
- 4 A significant example is the doubt voiced by the political magazine, *Free China (Ziyou Zhongguo 自由中國)*, established by a group of liberal Mainlanders, including Hu Shih 胡適 (1891–1962), Lei Zhen 雷震 (1897–1979), and Yin Haiguang 殷海光 (1919–1969), in November 1949. One of the two editorials entitled “The Issue of Counter-attack on the Mainland” (*Fanggong dalu wenti 反攻大陸問題*), published in the August number of the magazine in 1957, asserted the necessity to tell the truth about the reality of Taiwan. It argued that in terms of the international situation and the essential conditions of modern war mobilization, there was little opportunity for launching a counter-attack on the Communist Mainland in the near future. See *Ziyou Zhongguo bianji weiyuanhui 1957*. In 1960, Lei Zhen was arrested under the charge of sedition and sheltering communists and the magazine was eventually closed down.
- 5 In this regard, Lung Kwanhai 龍冠海 (1906–1983), a Mainlander exile and one of the major founders of sociology in postwar Taiwan, was representative. Lung served as the first chairman of the “Chinese Sociological Association” (*Zhongguo shehui xueshe 中國社會學社*) when it was restored in Taiwan in 1951. He also became the founding director of the Department of Sociology, National Taiwan University (NTU) in 1960. In his article “The Status and Duties of Sociology in China” (*Shehuixue zai Zhongguo de diwei yu zhiwu 社會學在中國的地位與職務*) written for the inaugural issue of the NTU Journal of Sociology in 1963, Lung emphasized that “[i]n any case, the prospects of our country’s sociology depend entirely on those of our country, and our country’s prospects depend entirely on retaking the mainland and eliminating the communist regime ... If we guard this treasure island [Taiwan] exclusively, we all definitely will have few prospects ...” (無論如何，我國社會學的前途完全有賴乎我們國家的前途，而我們國家的前途又完全有賴乎收復大陸，剷除共黨政權...如果我們孤守在這個寶島上，我們大家一定是沒有什麼前途的 ...) See Lung Kwanhai 1963, 16–17.

moted at the expense of their local counterparts. The landscapes of the Chinese mainland were highly praised. Also, all government propaganda and school education were invested with a strong sense of national humiliation caused by the foreign oppression of China since the late nineteenth century. Under KMT rule, the particular collective memory embraced by the local Taiwanese, especially that concerning the complicated history of Japanese colonial rule, was suppressed.

The purpose of this article is to investigate the relationship between the emergence of “de-exile” cultural politics in the 1970s in Taiwan and the rising of the postwar generation as a significant force that challenged the political and cultural establishments shaped by the KMT. The main object of my analysis are three groups of young intellectuals who played a leading role in creating an alternative understanding of Taiwan’s past based on the ideas of “return-to-reality” (*huigui xianshi* 回歸現實) or “return-to-native-soil” (*huigui xiangtu* 回歸鄉土). These groups included 1) cultural activists who devoted themselves to rediscovering modern literature written by Taiwanese authors in the Japanese colonial era, 2) writers and advocates of “Nativist literature” (*xiangtu wenxue* 鄉土文學), and 3) political dissidents who endeavored to promote the history of the Taiwanese anti-colonial movement under the Japanese. Focusing on the close relationship between their generational identity, historical narrative, and social action, this article will analyze how they contributed to the development of a cultural politics intended to cast off the exile mentality prevailing in postwar Taiwan.

1 An Overview: Political-Cultural Changes and the Rising of the Return-to-Reality Generation

It was not until the 1970s that the authoritarian rule of the KMT met significant challenges and major political and cultural change occurred. The change was striking at the time and broadly based. Its influence is still felt in contemporary Taiwanese society. This decade can be regarded as the “Axial Age” in the formation of a general sense of identification with Taiwan, which later developed into the “Taiwanese consciousness” (*Taiwan yishi* 台灣意識) and Taiwanese nationalism in the 1980s and beyond.⁶ Many

6 The term, “Axial Age” was coined by German philosopher Karl Jaspers. He used it to describe the critical period from 800 to 200 B.C., when great thinkers emerged in India, China, and the Occident and laid the foundations for world civilization. It is a period in world history that gave rise to “a common frame of historical self-comprehension for all peoples ...” Jaspers argues: “In this age were born the fundamental categories within which we still think today, and the beginnings of the world religions, by which human beings still live, were created ... As a result of this process, hitherto unconsciously accepted ideas, customs and conditions were

factors contributed to the change, the most significant of which were the serious diplomatic failures of the KMT government at the beginning of the 1970s. These included the failure to claim sovereignty over the Diaoyutai Islands 釣魚台列嶼 (1969–1971), Taiwan's loss – under the name of the ROC – of the position as the legitimate representative of China in the United Nations (1971), Nixon's visit to the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the ensuing conclusion of the Shanghai Joint Communiqué (1972), and Japan's recognition of the PRC as the sole legal government of China, followed by the severing of diplomatic relations between Japan and Taiwan (1972). The dispute with Japan about the sovereignty over the Diaoyutais also sparked off an open student protest that was unprecedented since the KMT government's relocation. The "Defending Diaoyutai Movement" (*Baowei diaoyutai yundong* 保衛釣魚台運動) launched by college students in northern Taiwan in the spring of 1971 was originally started by Taiwanese students in the U.S. After America and Japan signed the transfer of sovereignty over the Ryukyus (including the Diaoyutais) in the summer of the same year, however, the movement quickly vanished.

It was during the turmoil of the early 1970s that an increasing number of intellectuals of the "postwar generation" began to emerge as a new social force that challenged the existing political system and cultural tradition. At the time they were between twenty and forty years of age. Some of them were local Taiwanese, while others were Mainlanders. Whether they were born in Taiwan or not, they had all grown up in postwar Taiwan, had gone through the KMT's educational system and had thus in general developed a strong sense of identification with "China" (which either referred to Taiwan as "Free China" or an imagined united China in the future). Furthermore, most of them were strongly influenced by the "modernization" school of thought prevailing at the time and hoped that "China" could become a rich and powerful nation through political, social, and cultural modernization. Shocked by the diplomatic failures of the early 1970s, these numerous young intellectuals underwent a process of "awakening". By "awakening" I mean what Molly Andrews describes as a process of "conscientization" (a concept she borrows from Paulo Freire) in which people overcome the fatalistic belief that they cannot change the conditions of their lives and achieve a critical consciousness. Thus they begin to feel they can actively reflect on the status quo and take action accordingly. They can now under-

subjected to examination, questioned and liquidated. Everything was swept into the vortex. In so far as the traditional substance still possessed vitality and reality, its manifestations were clarified and thereby transmuted." See Jaspers 1953 (1949), 1–2. In terms of these characteristics of the Axial Age, I would argue, as the period from 800 to 200 B.C. was to the world history, so were the 1970s to the postwar history of Taiwan, as the analysis below in this article shows.

stand the status quo in terms of the broader context of power relations and social structure.⁷ As a result of this awakening, the young intellectuals reflected on and denounced the “exile mentality” that had imbued postwar Taiwanese society and explicitly expressed itself in the nostalgic overemphasis on everything related to the past on the Chinese mainland. At the same time, realizing the importance of a deeper understanding of Taiwanese society and of the ties between themselves and the larger external reality, they were eager to call for social reform, political democratization, and a return to the culture of “native soil” (*xiangtu* 鄉土). Thus, the vast number of young people who excoriated and rejected the expatriate mentality, especially those who engaged in cultural reconstruction and recreation and challenged the political system, can be termed as the “return-to-reality generation” (*huigui xianshi shidai* 回歸現實世代). Because of their prominent role in political and cultural change, they also deserve to be identified as the “Axial Generation” of the postwar period of Taiwan.

The memory of Japanese colonialism in Taiwan played a particular role in the trend of the return to reality and native soil in the 1970s. Like many post-colonial societies, postwar Taiwan was confronted with the thorny problem of how to deal with the legacy of colonialism. For the KMT government and the Mainlanders, who had suffered greatly from the Japanese invasion of the mainland and the protracted Anti-Japanese War, the legacy was a political-cultural virus left by a national enemy that had to be rooted out. The KMT government and many Mainlanders tended to believe that the local Taiwanese had become degraded into a state of “servitude” (*nubua* 奴化) by Japanese colonialism. Over the course of the postwar decades in the government propaganda and school education based on Chinese nationalism, the complicated history of the Japanese colonial rule was almost without exception simplified into an episode of Japanese oppression and the resistance of “Taiwanese compatriots” (*Taiwan tongbao* 台灣同胞). Any open discussion of the Japanese colonial rule that was suspected of challenging the KMT ideology constituted a political taboo.

Among the return-to-reality generation, young intellectuals of local Taiwanese background were typically concerned with Taiwan’s particular history and culture and thus paid special attention to the politically sensitive history of Japanese colonialism. Due to their local origin, they were eager to know the previous generation’s real experience of colonization and resistance. During the half-century period of Japanese colonialism, Taiwan was ruled by a modern state for the very first time, and the modernization project of the colonial government changed Taiwan significantly. Taiwanese intellectuals gained access to modern Western political and cultural ideas through their introduction by the

7 Andrews 2002, 78–80.

metropolitan state. The Chinese revolution of 1911 and the May Fourth Movement in 1919 with its ensuing development of “new culture” inspired them, especially those who still embraced a strong Chinese consciousness and regarded China as their “ancestral land” (*zuguo* 祖國). In 1920, starting with their activities in Tokyo, a group of Taiwanese students and intellectuals organized to promote consciousness of the autonomy of the colonized people and to pursue equality and rights for them. Thus the New People’s Society (*Shinminkai* 新民會) was established in early 1920 with the support of such wealthy businessmen as Cai Huiru 蔡惠如 (1881–1929) and Lin Xiantang 林獻堂 (1881–1956). Their society’s organ, *Taiwan Youth* (*Taiwan Seinen* 台灣青年) later developed into the *Taiwan Common Daily* (*Taiwan minbao* 台灣民報, renamed *Taiwan xin minbao* 台灣新民報 in 1929), which became the chief medium giving voice to the sufferings and demands of the colonized.⁸ The founding of the New People’s Society and their political activities marked the start of the Taiwanese nonviolent political and social movements in the latter part of the colonial period, which included the Petition Movement for The Establishment of the Taiwan Council (*Taiwan yihui shezhi qingyuan yundong* 台灣議會設置請願運動) (1921–1934), the Taiwan Cultural Association (*Taiwan wenhua xiehui* 台灣文化協會) (1921–1931), the Taiwan People’s Party (*Taiwan minzhongdang* 台灣民眾黨) (1927–1931), the Taiwan Local Self-Government League (*Taiwan difang zizhi lianmeng* 台灣地方自治聯盟) (1930–1937), the Taiwan Farmers Union (*Taiwan nongmin zuhe* 台灣農民組合) (1926–1931), the Taiwan Labor General Union (*Taiwan gongyou zonglianmeng* 台灣工友總聯盟) (1928–1931), the Taiwanese Communist Party (*Taiwan gongchandang* 台灣共產黨), and the like. These political and social movements were quite distinct from the previous violent resistance characterized by guerrilla attacks and traditional appeals to a divine mandate. However, these anti-colonial activities, either reformist or radical, were almost completely suppressed by the Japanese colonial government in the early 1930s.⁹

Since the beginning of the 1920s, alongside the emergence of the Taiwanese anti-colonial political and social movements, many Taiwanese intellectuals, such as Chen Xin 陳焮 (1893–1947), Huang Chengcong 黃呈聰 (1886–1963), Chen Duanming 陳端明 (?–?), Huang Chaoqin 黃朝琴 (1897–1972), and Zhang Wojun 張我軍 (1902–1955), started to address the problems of language and literature under the Japanese.

8 Chen 1972.

9 Xu Shikai 2006 (1972); Wong Jiayin 2007 (1986); Yang Bichuan 1988; *Taiwansheng wenxian weiyuanhui* 1990, 656–694; Mukooyama 1999 (1987); Wakabayashi 2007 (2001); Chen Cuilian 2008. For research on Jiang Weishui 蔣渭水, one of the important leaders of the nonviolent anti-colonial political and social movements, see Fröhlich and Liu 2011.

Stimulated by the new literature movement in China, they became concerned with how literature could help enlighten their fellow Taiwanese and advance Taiwanese culture. They were further concerned about which language could function as the best tool for this goal. In the early 1920s, an increasing number of Taiwanese young intellectuals criticized the literary works written in classical Chinese style (*wenyanwen* 文言文) by traditional gentry intellectuals for having lost touch with the “masses” and abandoned the role of literature in spreading enlightened ideas, awakening the “masses,” and facilitating national revival. They called on Taiwanese writers to write in a vernacular style (*baihua* 白話) based upon Mandarin, which became increasingly popular in post-May Fourth China, and in turn to create a “vernacular literature” (*baihua wenxue* 白話文學).¹⁰ In the early 1930s, when the political resistance was ruthlessly suppressed, another literary trend began to rise. A group of young intellectuals who saw little possibility of terminating the colonial rule and had a growing sense of identification with Taiwan, including Huang Shihui 黃石輝 (1900–1945) and Guo Qiusheng 郭秋生 (1904–1980), embarked on the advocacy of a “Nativist literature” (*xiangtu wenxue* 鄉土文學) expressed in an experimental writing system for local Taiwanese (*Taiwan huawen* 台灣話文).¹¹ Because of the promotional efforts beginning in the early 1920s, the “New Literature” (*Xin wenxue* 新文學), that is, modern literature created by Taiwanese writers, developed significantly. By the time that the Sino-Japanese War erupted in 1937, most Taiwanese writers of modern literature wrote in a form of Mandarin imbued with local elements. The achievement of those who promoted the Taiwanese writing system and Nativist literature, however, was limited.¹² Moreover, an increasing number of young authors like Yang Kui 楊逵 (1905–1985), Lü Heruo 呂赫若 (1914–1951), Long Yingzong 龍瑛宗 (1911–1999), and Wu Yongfu 巫永福 (1913–2008), who wrote in Japanese instead of Mandarin began to establish their careers in literary circles from the early 1930s on.¹³

Among the return-to-reality generation, those who devoted themselves to rediscovering the history of the New Literature under the Japanese were mainly young cultural activists of local Taiwanese background. The efforts to revisit the history of Taiwanese anti-colonial political and social movements were made primarily by local Taiwanese dissidents involved in the newly emerging opposition movement. For more than two decades, from the “February 28th Incident” (*Ereerba shijian* 二二八事件), a 1947 island-

10 Ye Shitao 1987, 19–24; Hsiao 2000, 36–39; Chen Fangming 2011: Chapters 2 and 3.

11 Ye Shitao 1987, 25–28; Hsiao 2000, 39–41; Chen Fangming 2011: Chapter 4; Zhao Xunda 2011.

12 Hsiao 2000, 45.

13 Chen Fangming 2011: Chapters 7 and 8; Kleeman 2003: Chapters 7 and 8.

wide revolt against the misgoverning of the Taiwan Provincial Administration (*Taiwansheng xingzheng zhangguan gongshu* 臺灣省行政長官公署), through the political purges during the White Terror of the early 1950s under Chiang Kai-shek to the end of the 1960s, any attempts to challenge the KMT's authoritarianism and cultural ideology were foiled. However, the situation started to change in the early 1970s. At the end of 1969, two local-born intellectuals, Huang Xinjie 黃信介 (1928–1999) and Kang Ningxiang 康寧祥 (1938–), were elected as a city counselor of Taipei and a legislator respectively. It was the beginning of the anti-KMT opposition movement supported by the younger generation of local Taiwanese. Led by Huang and Kang, the political dissidents were named “Dangwai” (黨外, literally, “outside the party” [i. e. KMT]) and their political activities were called the “Dangwai movement”.¹⁴ The Dangwai opposition movement gradually gathered momentum beginning in the early 1970s. The vast majority of Huang's and Kang's followers were members of the return-to-reality generation who typically had undergone the process of “awakening” stimulated by Taiwan's diplomatic failures. These young, well-educated intellectuals were usually termed the “Dangwai new generation” (*Dangwai xinshengdai* 黨外新生代) by themselves and others.

The common goal of both the young cultural activists who strove to unearth the New Literature written by Taiwanese authors in the colonial era and the members of the Dangwai new generation who revisited the history of the Taiwanese anti-colonial movement was to make sense of the present and plan the future by reassessing the past. All their activities involved an attempt to develop an alternative historical narrative and collective identity. In addition, another important literary phenomenon at the time was the growth of a new type of Nativist literature. While almost all of the active writers of Nativist literature were of local Taiwanese background, this literary genre gained favor with both local Taiwanese and Mainlander intellectuals. Also, many who showed support for the literary genre belonged to the older generation, but the writers, advocates, and readers consisted primarily of those of the younger generation who were influenced by the idea of returning to reality and native soil. As the analysis below will show, the writers and advocates criticized the pervasive exile mentality in Taiwan society, demanding that literature should have national character instead of simply blindly following Western trends and address itself to social reality instead of nostalgically indulging in memories and reminiscences about the Chinese mainland. Their literary ideas, as well as the reconstruction of Taiwan's

14 Li Xiaofong's book remains a very useful account of Dangwai's opposition movement. See Li Xiaofong 1987, Chapters 4, 5, and 6. A recent account is Hu Huiling 2013. See also Tien 1989, 95–104; Hsiau 2000, 87–90; Shelley 2001, Chapter 2; Roy 2003, Chapter 6; Jacobs 2012, 49–68.

history of the colonial period by the young cultural activists and the Dangwai new generation, revealed a sharp Chinese national consciousness. Like other young intellectuals of the return-to-reality generation, they drew on a collective memory based on Chinese nationalism to make sense of Taiwan's contemporary political, economic, and cultural issues and the history of the colonial era. In this kind of collective memory, which, like many other collective memories, manifested itself in the form of a particular mode of narrative about the past, Taiwan's colonial experience history and contemporary issues became a part of the plot of the Chinese nationalist narration.

The historical master narrative on which the return-to-reality generation kept drawing prevailed in a variety of socialization institutions, including government propaganda, school education, and military training in postwar Taiwan. The theme of this narrative was how, starting in the mid-nineteenth century, China had suffered from foreign bullying, resisting foreign powers, and striving for independence, democracy, and prosperity. The narrative went like this: "Once a great empire, China from the mid-nineteenth century was humiliated by Western forces, becoming a quasi-colony divided into spheres of influence. Poor and weak, China had suffered domestic conflict and foreign invasion. The period from the late Qing to the Republic was the time of aspiring to become rich, strong, and autonomous but it was also a period when the country was overwhelmed by setbacks and helplessness."¹⁵ In the late Qing Dynasty and early Republican period, this historical narrative was gradually fabricated by Chinese intellectuals into a collective memory of Chinese "national humiliation" (*guochi* 國恥), which in turn has had a powerful influence on many generations of Chinese. The historical narrative has been appropriated by both the KMT and the CCP. It has been the meta-narrative of modern Chinese nationalism and has become the archetypal understanding of Chinese national fate and destiny that has prevailed among Chinese intellectuals in general. As William A. Callahan indicates, "[n]ational humiliation is one of the few discourses that transcended the Communist/nationalist ideological divide to describe modern Chinese subjectivity more generally." The "Century of National Humiliation" (*bainian guochi* 百年國恥) is not only "a recurring theme in both pre-1949 Republican writings and post-1949 Taiwanese discourse as well" but also the official view of modern Chinese history in the PRC.¹⁶

15 For a detailed discussion on this form of collective memory embodied in the Chinese nationalist historical narrative and the elements of this narrative, see Hsiao 2010, 7.

16 Callahan 2004, 206, 209. Callahan also notes that "while Beijing sees the PRC's joining the United Nations in 1971 as 'cleansing of national humiliation,' Taipei saw it as another horrible humiliation ..." He continues to point out that Taiwanese discussion of national humilia-

As already mentioned, the main object of my analysis is the three groups of young intellectuals whose presentation of an alternative view of Taiwan's past and present constituted the kernel of their endeavors and informed their generational identity, historical narrative, and social action. The following analysis shows that while they embraced Chinese nationalism to a significant degree, they gradually disengaged from the ideology that called for the construction of a "modern China" (*xiandai Zhongguo* 現代中國). They became increasingly concerned with the past, present, and future of "native Taiwan" (*xiangtu Taiwan* 鄉土台灣). Their de-exile efforts not only deeply affected Taiwan's cultural and political changes in the 1970s, but laid a basis for the historical narrative and cultural development of Taiwanese nationalism since the 1980s. Thus, an examination of their literary activities and historical re-construction is crucial for understanding both the de-exile cultural politics in Taiwan in the 1970s and the later development of "indigenization" (*bentubua* 本土化) or "Taiwanization" (*Taiwanhua* 台灣化) of politics and culture.¹⁷

2 The "Nationalization" of the New Literature of the Colonial Period

As pointed out earlier, any open discussion of the Japanese colonial rule that challenged the KMT's ideology was forbidden, especially after the February 28th Incident. As far as the New Literature or the modern literature of the colonial era is concerned, there did exist such descriptions of its development as the articles in August and December of 1954 in the two "New Literature and New Drama Movement in Northern Taiwan" special issues (*Beibu xinwenxue, xinju yundong zhuanhao* 北部新文學, 新劇運動專號) of the *Taipei Historical Documents Quarterly* (*Taipei wenwu* 台北文物), the official organ of the Taipei City Archives Committee (*Taipeishi wenxian weiyuanhui* 台北市文獻委員會). These retrospective articles were written by authors of the older generation who once participated in the literary development of the colonial period. However, the December issue was banned before distribution. In addition, only several similar essays by several other older writers, including Wang Shilang 王詩琅 (1908–1984), Ye Shitao 葉石濤 (1925–2008), Wu Yingtao 吳瀛濤 (1916–1971), and Huang Deshi 黃得時 (1909–1999), were available to the public at that time.¹⁸

tion reappeared in the 1970s just as the Republic of China faced its most serious crisis of sovereignty and identity. See *ibid.*, 209–210.

17 For the indigenization or Taiwanization of politics and culture, see Hsiao 2000, Makeham and Hsiao 2005, and Hsiao A-chin 2012.

18 Wang Jinjiang 1964; Ye Shitao 1965; Wu Yingtao 1971, 1972; Huang Deshi 1972.

It was not until the early 1970s, as the Nativist cultural trend burgeoned, that the New Literature of the colonial era was again rediscovered, this time by young cultural activists of the postwar generation who were inspired by the ideas of return-to-reality and return-to-native-soil. Generally speaking, they viewed this modern-style literary creation as part of the New Culture Movement launched by anti-colonial Taiwanese intellectuals in the 1920s under the influence of the May Fourth Movement in China. In other words, they saw it as a branch of Chinese literature. More important is the fact that the Taiwanese writers of the colonial period were widely hailed by these cultural activists as resolute anti-colonialists who strongly identified themselves with China. The basic motivation behind their literary creation was believed to be anti-Japanese resistance, and their final objective was Taiwan's reunification with China. In terms of these interpretations prevailing among the young cultural activists, represented by Chen Shaoting's 陳少廷 (1932–2012) pioneering essay and book and many articles in the magazine, *Literary Season* (*Wenji* 文季) (see discussion below), it can be said that the New Literature was “nationalized,” in the sense that it was characterized as a part of the national tradition of Chinese literature by incorporating it into the historical narrative of Chinese nationalism and endowing it with certain national traits. In fact, this well serves as an instance of what Eric Hobsbawm and others have called the “invention of tradition” motivated by nationalism.¹⁹

2.1 New Literature as Chinese Nationalist Resistance

At the end of 1970, when Taiwan was feuding with Japan about the sovereignty over Diaoyutai, *The Intellectual* (*Daxue zazhi* 大學雜誌), which was already in its third year of publication, was reorganized. As a result, over sixty young reform-minded individuals from academia, politics, and commerce were admitted to the magazine committee. In January 1971, this public magazine showed the world a new face and began actively calling for social and political reforms. During the early 1970s, when Taiwanese society was plagued with doubt and uncertainty caused by the series of major diplomatic setbacks, *The Intellectual* became the creative center of sociopolitical critique.

In May 1972, Chen Shaoting published an essay, “May Fourth and the New Literature Movement in Taiwan,” (*Wusi yu Taiwan xinwenxue yundong* 五四與台灣新文學運動), in *The Intellectual*. This heralded the beginning of a general review of the New Literature by the postwar generation in the 1970s. In the year leading up to May 1972, a number of articles demanding political and social reforms were published both individually and jointly in *The Intellectual*. A local Taiwanese, Chen Shaoting was president of the

19 Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983.

magazine. When “May Fourth and the New Literature Movement in Taiwan” was published, he was one of the leading intellectuals who openly called for the reelection of all representatives of the three parliamentary organizations – the National Assembly (*Guomin dahui* 國民大會), the Legislative Yuan (*Lifayuan* 立法院), and the Control Yuan (*Jianchayuan* 監察院) – which had been elected in the late 1940s on the mainland.

In “May Fourth and the New Literature Movement in Taiwan,” Chen Shaoting explicitly defined the nature of the New Literature as Chinese nationalist resistance. He thus argued:

In Taiwan’s literary arena in the latter part of the Japanese period, there was a spectacular New Literature movement. This movement began under the influence of the May Fourth new cultural movement of the ancestral land.

This New Literature movement made a huge contribution to the enlightenment movement and the national anti-Japanese movement of this [Taiwan] province. Taiwan’s New Literature movement was part of Taiwan’s new culture movement. It was also a branch of the national anti-Japanese movement launched by Taiwanese compatriots. What we should also understand is that the national anti-Japanese movement in Taiwan was a Chinese nationalist movement that identified itself with the ancestral homeland of China. Therefore, in larger context, the New Literature movement in Taiwan can be described as part of the New Culture movement in China and thus a branch of the literary revolution of the May Fourth era.²⁰

Chen Shaoting further indicated that “during the long period of half a century, the Taiwanese compatriots were continually engaging in a national struggle with the Japanese rulers.”²¹ This resistance occurred not just in the first part of the colonial period, when “there was constant violent resistance to Japanese alien rule by Taiwanese compatriots,” who “wrote an awful yet glorious page in the history of the descendants of the Yan Emperor and the Yellow Emperor (*Yanhuang zisun* 炎黃子孫).”²² It also included the nonviolent resistance of the latter part of the period, during which time “intellectual

20 Chen Shaoting 1972a, 18: 台灣的文壇，在日據的後半期，也曾有過轟轟烈烈的新文學運動。這個運動是受到祖國五四新文化運動的浪潮之影響而產生的。台灣新文學運動，在本省的啟蒙運動和抗日民族運動上，均有過重大的貢獻。台灣新文學運動是台灣新文化運動的一環，也是台灣同胞抗日民族運動的一個支流。同時，我們還應該了解的是，台灣的抗日民族運動，是認同祖國的中國民族主義運動。所以，從大處著眼，台灣新文學運動可以說是中國新文化運動的一環，也是五四前後的文學革命的一個支流。

21 Ibid., 18: 漫長的半個世紀中，台灣同胞無時不在跟日本統治者作民族鬥爭。

22 Ibid., 18: 台灣同胞不斷地以武力抵抗日本異族的統治 ... 為炎黃子孫寫下一頁悲壯而光榮的歷史。

youth groups formed one after another in Tokyo, Taiwan, and the mainland ... with the same founding aim: to liberate their compatriots and return to the ancestral homeland of China.”²³

In Chen Shaoting’s account, the New Literature was part of the new culture or enlightenment movement as a form of the nonviolent resistance emerging in the latter half of the colonial period. The development of the New Literature began in Taiwan around 1922 and 1923, when Chen Duanming published “On Promoting the Use of Everyday Language (*Riyongwen guchui lun* 日用文鼓吹論),” Huang Chengcong published “On the New Mission to Popularize Vernacular (*Lun puji baihuawen de xinshiming* 論普及白話文的新使命),” and Huang Chaoqin published “On Reforming the Chinese Language (*Hanwen gaige lun* 漢文改革論)”. This development continued in 1924, when Zhang Wojun began attacking Taiwan’s traditional literature. In his conclusion, Chen Shaoting summed up the “historical meaning” of the New Literature thus:

Clearly, Taiwan’s New Literature ended forever with the retrocession of Taiwan, which was a return to the ancestral land. Since Taiwan’s literature was Chinese literature, there was no more “Taiwanese literature” to speak of. (“Nativist literature” is another question.) This is to say that our forefathers who devoted themselves to the New Literature movement had proudly completed their historical mission.²⁴

Drawing on the paradigmatic historical narrative of Chinese nationalism to assign meaning to the modern literature written by the Taiwanese in the colonial period, Chen’s article expressed a strong sense of Chinese identity. The pioneering article later developed into *A Brief History of the New Literature Movement in Taiwan* (*Taiwan xinwenxue yundong jianshi* 台灣新文學運動簡史), published in 1977, which became the first monograph in book form on the development of modern literature written by Taiwanese authors under colonial rule.²⁵ The series of diplomatic setbacks constituted a major threat to the legitimacy of the KMT government as a displaced regime, which was based primarily on its claim to represent all of China. This was compounded by the conspicuous development of the overseas “Taiwan Independence Movement” (*Taiwan duli yundong* 台灣獨立運動), which aimed to restructure the country according to Taiwanese nationalism.

23 Ibid., 19: 陸續在東京、台灣、大陸所組成的知識青年的團體 ... 宗旨是一致的——解救同胞，歸回祖國 ...。

24 Ibid., 24: 顯然，台灣新文學運動也因台灣光復，重歸祖國而永遠結束了。因為台灣的文學就是中國的文學，所以再也沒有所謂「台灣文學」可言了。（「鄉土文學」應當別論）這也就是說，獻身於台灣新文學運動的先輩，已經光榮地完成了他們的歷史使命。

25 Chen Shaoting 1977.

The demand for political reforms at this critical moment, especially the criticism that the old members of the three parliamentary organizations no longer represented the citizens in Taiwan, could not but broach sensitive issues such as the political inequality between Mainlanders and local Taiwanese and the lack of trust between them ever since the February 28th Incident. Chen Shaoting's main objective in stressing the anti-Japanese character of the New Literature by placing it in the Chinese nationalist historical narrative served on the one hand to affirm the "Chineseness" of the Taiwanese people. By "nationalizing" the New Literature into a part of the collective memory of "us Chinese people," Chen contended that "local Taiwanese compatriots were the most patriotic and excellent of the sons and daughters of China" and that they therefore deserved the full trust of the KMT government and the same civil status and political power as Mainlanders.²⁶ On the other hand, in spite of his acute Chinese consciousness, Chen's remarks amounted to a criticism of the prevalent exile mentality under which the particular historical experiences and cultural orientations of local Taiwanese were being stigmatized and suppressed. Emphasizing the importance of appreciating these experiences and orientations, he was suggesting that Taiwan, the land the exiles were treading on, should be given priority over the Chinese mainland where they could only dream of returning.

2.2 The Trend of Rediscovering the New Literature

After "May Fourth and the New Literature Movement in Taiwan" appeared, many young intellectuals who cherished the ideal of returning to reality and native soil followed in Chen's footsteps and began exploring the New Literature. Generally speaking, the frame of reference by which they interpreted and understood the colonial literary legacy remained roughly the same as the one Chen Shaoting assumed in his 1972 pioneering article. He thus set the tone for or anticipated the general direction of the ensuing explorations carried out by the return-to-reality generation.

The exploration of the New Literature that followed up Chen Shaoting's attempt was just one of the manifestations of the general return-to-native-soil cultural trend in the literary field, which also included the critique of "modernist literature" and the creation of a socially conscious Nativist literature. At the time of Chen's article, an intense critique had already been initiated in Taiwan's literary circles against the highly influential literary modernism, particularly against modern poetry, which had been popular since the late 1950s. In the "Modern Poetry Debate" (*Xiandai shi lunzhan* 現代詩論戰) that took place from 1972 to 1973, a group of critics accused mainstream modernist literature of being "colonized" by western modernism and individualism.

26 Chen Shaoting 1972b, 97: 本省同胞是最愛國的、最優秀的中華兒女。

With obscure language, they asserted, its expression and content were a muddle forsaking tradition and evading reality.²⁷

In August 1973, Yu Tiancong 尉天驄 (1935–), a Mainlander professor of Chinese literature in his thirties, and his several literary colleagues established a magazine called the *Literary Season*. The editor was a local Taiwanese, Wang Tuo 王拓 (1944–), who later became one of the major Nativist writer.²⁸ Although it lasted for a brief period and only three issues were published, this magazine exemplified the three manifestations of the return-to-native-soil cultural trend found in the literary field: criticism of modernist literature, socially critical Nativist fiction, and exploration of the New Literature of the colonial period. Therefore the magazine is worth being discussed in detail. The inaugural statement in the first issue clearly showed Yu's and his colleagues' discontent with modernist literature and their determination to convert to "realist" literature as a result of the impact of the political and social changes at the beginning of the 1970s. The first issue of *Literary Season* included articles highly critical of Ouyang Zi's 歐陽子 (1939–) modernist stories authored by Yu Tiancong, Wang Hongjiu 王紘久 (the real name of Wang Tuo), and He Xin 何欣 (1922–1998) as well as Tang Wenbiao's 唐文標 (1936–1985) well-known attack on modern poetry in Taiwan and Hong Kong.²⁹ This marked the fact that the criticism of modern poetry had been expanded to include critiques of modernist fiction. The issue also published "Sayonara, Goodbye" (莎啞娜拉·再見), a landmark story by one of the major postwar Nativist authors, Huang Chunming 黃春明 (1939–), that represented a clear change in his style. In the late 1960s, Huang depicted the miseries of common people in impoverished rural villages with great affection; now, with a strong critical awareness, he portrayed urban life with irony.³⁰

The second number of *Literary Season*, published in November 1973, was a special "Examination of Modern Chinese Writers" issue. Zhang Liangze 張良澤 (1939–), Shi Junmei 史君美 (the pen name of Tang Wenbiao), and Liu Ruojun 劉若君 (?–?) wrote separate articles on local Taiwanese author Zhong Lihe 鍾理和 (1919–1960), who grew up in the colonial era, traveled to northeast China, and then died in Taiwan in 1960. As a tribute to Zhong, a short story of his was reprinted in the second issue.³¹ In addition, this issue also reprinted works by Yang Kui, a noted local Taiwanese author

27 Zhao Zhiti 1976b, 1; Gao Shangqin 1976 (1973), 164, 168–169.

28 Ye Shitao 1987, 156.

29 Yu Tiancong 1973, 61–75; Wang Hongjiu 1973, 76–82; He Xin 1973, 46–60; Tang Wenbiao 1973.

30 Huang Chunming 1973, 97–131.

31 Zhang Liangze 1973, 48–59; Shi Junmei 1973, 60–76; Liu Ruojun 1973, 77–81; Zhong Lihe 1973 (1959), 82–90.

ten years older than Zhong Lihe and yet still strong and healthy.³² These two authors were the representatives of the New Literature of the colonial period most discussed in the 1970s, and *Literary Season* led the rediscovery of them and their works by the return-to-reality generation. The third issue of *Literary Season*, published in August 1974, printed Lin Zaijue's 林載爵 (1951–) “A Retrospective Review of Taiwanese Literature in the Japanese Occupation Era” (*Riju shidai Taiwan wenxue de huigu* 日據時代台灣文學的回顧). Compared with Chen Shaoting's short piece from the previous year, this article by Lin was a much more comprehensive attempt to examine the colonial literary legacy.³³ In sum, following the publication of the second issue of *Literary Season* at the end of 1973, the rediscovery of the New Literature entered a period of heated scrutiny. From then to the end of the decade, a steady stream of articles on deceased or still living senior local Taiwanese authors from the colonial era appeared in newspaper literary sections and journals of literary or general orientation. These articles included introductions, criticisms, special features, reprinted works, and so on. Publishers brought out dedicated commemorative collections and complete works. There were treatments of specific authors and general treatises. In addition, reprints of many of the major magazines and newspapers relating to the New Literature appeared. In 1979, two comprehensive collections of New Literature works were published, including fiction, poetry, and prose from the colonial era as well as criticism.³⁴

As pointed out above, the young cultural activists who explored the New Literature in the wake of Chen Shaoting mostly followed in his footsteps. The frame of reference they used to make sense of the colonial literary legacy did not go beyond Chen's, that is, a Chinese nationalist historical narrative that provided a framework for the development of the collective memory of the Chinese people and that lent meaning to this legacy by emphasizing its Chinese identity and positing anti-Japanese resistance as its defining character. The intense rediscovery of the New Literature represented a process of “nationalizing” Taiwanese colonial literature. It can be said that by doing this, many cultural activists of the return-to-reality generation affirmed their own Chineseness while affirming the Chineseness of the literary legacy bequeathed by their previous

32 Yang Kui 1973 (1937), 105–142.

33 Lin Zaijue 1974, 133–165.

34 The compendia *Taiwan's New Literature in the Japanese Occupation Era, Ming Volume* (*Riju xia Taiwan xinwenxue, mingji* 日據下台灣新文學, 明集) in five volumes and *Complete Pre-Retrocession Taiwanese Literature* (*Guangfu qian Taiwan wenxue quanji* 光復前台灣文學全集) in eight volumes were edited by Li Nanheng 李南衡 and by Zhong Zhaozheng 鍾肇政 and Ye Shitao respectively. Four more volumes, edited by Yang Ziqiao 羊子喬 and Chen Qianwu 陳千武, were added to the latter compendium in 1982.

generation. This intense rediscovery, however, was also one of their primary approaches to achieving the ideal of returning to Taiwanese social reality. As indicated at the beginning of this article, the exile mentality consists mainly of an uneasy sense of living in a “median” state of being caught between adjusting oneself to a new home and retaining one’s belief in the prospect of returning to one’s old home. While the KMT government propagated officially and vehemently that Taiwan was part of the ROC and “Free China,” and not to be considered as a place of “exile,” the island was, in fact, treated merely as a “temporary home,” a base to recover the mainland. Pursuing a closer connection with the land (*tudi* 土地) and people (*renmin* 人民) through the act of rediscovering Taiwan’s particular past, the young cultural activists showed their discontent with the exile mentality shaped by the KMT government and cast a critical eye on their own implicit nostalgia for the Chinese mainland cultivated by the political propaganda and school education.

3 Social Reality, Native Soil, and Nativist Writers

As noted above, in the field of literature, the return-to-reality cultural trend manifested itself mainly in the criticism of modernist literature, the exploration of the New Literature of the colonial period, and the appearance of socially conscious Nativist fiction, as displayed by the *Literary Season*. All these developments were stimulated by the return-to-native-soil consciousness, an engaged concern with both land and people that was informed by Chinese nationalism. That is, as pointed out already, the idea of returning to reality and native soil crystallized into the demand that literature should be “national” and “social”.

The *Literary Season* and its former incarnations nurtured the emergence of Nativist literature by promoting the works of Chen Yingzhen 陳映真 (1937–), Huang Chunming, and Wang Zhenhe 王禎和 (1940–90), the leading Nativist writers of the 1970s, all of whom were local Taiwanese.³⁵ As mentioned earlier, in its founding issue, the *Literary Quarterly* printed criticisms of modernist literature by local Taiwanese writer Wang Tuo and others, as well as Huang Chunming’s “Sayonara, Goodbye”. Although the *Literary Season* shut down in May 1974, there was already a noticeable change in the literary atmosphere, as “*xiangtu* (native soil) 鄉土” and “*xianshi* (reality)

35 These former incarnations of the *Literary Season* included the *Literary Quarterly* (*Wenxue jikan* 文學季刊, 1966–70) and *Literary Bimonthly* (*Wenxue shuangyuekan* 文學雙月刊, 1971), both were directed by Yu Tiancong and his colleagues.

現實” became popular in discussions of literature. Over the next several years, up to the “Debate on Nativist Literature” (*Xiangtu wenxue lunzhan* 鄉土文學論戰) in 1977, which was caused by attacks on this literary genre by Mainlander critics who supported the KMT ideology, a stream of essays endorsing Nativist literature appeared in newspapers and magazines. Native writers Wang Tuo and Yang Qingchu 楊青矗 (1940–) added their names to the roster of major Nativist writers.³⁶ Wang Tuo joined Yu Tiancong and Chen Yingzhen as one of the key architects of Nativist literary theory. The common, central feature shared by Nativist writers was their realist spirit, and Nativist literature consisted mainly of short stories. According to Joseph Lau (劉紹銘), the major themes in Nativist literature were: 1) criticism of Japanese and American “imperialism,” especially economic and cultural imperialism; 2) demands for a more equitable distribution of wealth and for social welfare reform; 3) eulogizing the basic virtues of “the little guy” or the common man from small towns or rural villages; 4) the idea that Chinese people should uphold national pride rather than emulate the shameless and coarse behavior of “ugly Americans” or “greedy and lustful Japanese”.³⁷

3.1 Generational and National Identity of Nativist Writers

As noted at the beginning of this paper, the return-to-reality generation ranged from twenty to forty years old in the 1970s. Whether they were Mainlanders or local Taiwanese, they had all grown up in postwar Taiwan and went through the educational system dominated by the KMT ideology. Their common characteristics could be easily seen in the field of literature. In an article discussing typical young writers who belonged to the generation of the Nativist writers, a literary researcher commented that none of them had “ever seen what the mainland is like, and all have received the same education,” in spite of the difference between their local Taiwanese and Mainlander backgrounds.³⁸ Yang Qingchu, in an interview at the end of 1974, was asked, “given that people of your generation, Taiwanese people in their thirties and forties, live in a time of great social change, as an author, what do you feel has influenced you the most, China, the West, or Japan?” Yang’s reply deserves to be quoted at length and discussed in detail:

I was born in 1940. I was five years old at the time of the retrocession of Taiwan, young and ignorant of the true countenance of the Japanese people, of whose deeds I had only heard. I’ve written a few stories set in the Japanese occupation period based on what I’ve learned from my elders. Zheng Qingwen 鄭清文 and Li Qiao 李喬 are both older

36 Lü Zhenghui 1995 (1992): 57.

37 Lau 1983, 147.

38 Hou Jian 1978, 169–170: 同樣沒見過大陸是什麼樣子，同樣在台灣接受同樣的教育。

than me by six or seven years. They went to school in Japanese and can read Japanese literary works. They have, I imagine, absorbed something from the Japanese directly.³⁹ I've met a lot of people in their mid-40s who got a Japanese education. These people think like Japanese people. They understand Japanese people as well as Chinese people. The change in era has given them a keen sensibility. They're always comparing the Chinese and Japanese ways of doing things and making moral judgments based on their views of the Japanese spirit. They hate how the Japanese oppressed their compatriots, but in certain respects they admire the Japanese. They are fluent in Japanese and can't use Chinese to write formal documents and drafts or even to express their views of things. Their linguistic incompetence leaves them at a loss for words and makes them depressed. Faced with corruption in society or anything else they don't like the looks of, they follow their Japanese spirit and vent their views in conversation. I've heard enough to know. Before I was an adult I felt these people, these "slaves of the powerful country [Japan]" were bad to the bone; but now that I'm older I can think and judge for myself. I can understand them now. They may talk about the Japanese spirit, but what they're really doing is rather pathetically trying to protect their own rice bowls. I've taken them as a contrast mirror in which to see my own true Chinese countenance. As for the Chinese translations of Japanese literary works, most of them are light, soft. I don't think much of these works. They have had little influence on me.

I've never been abroad to drink the ink of the western ocean. I read Chinese books. Among the three [China, the West, and Japan] China has had the greatest influence on me. Yet I am not able to read Chinese literary works of the 1930s, and have read many world classics [in translation], so that in terms of writing techniques of fiction and certain conceptions I've been influenced quite a bit by the West.

But what's influenced me the most is not books but the Taiwan folk sentiment. I've gotten sustenance from the people. My works are written out of the folk way of life, out of the folk way of thinking, out of what ordinary people want in this life, and out of my own "basic instincts".⁴⁰

39 Zheng Qingwen (1932-) and Li Qiao (1934-) are two eminent writers of local Taiwanese background.

40 For this conversation, see Li Ang 1975, 84: 我在民國廿九年〔1940年〕出生，台灣光復時我才五歲，童幼無知，沒有見過日本人的真面目，對日本人的行為都是聽來的。我寫過幾篇日據時代的小說，也是聽老一輩的人閒談從中取材寫成的。鄭清文、李喬等人大我六、七歲，讀過日本書，看懂日文的文學作品，我想他們多少能從中直接吸取日本人的東西。在四十四、五歲左右受日本教育的人，我接觸的不少，這些人日本思想相當濃厚，他們瞭解日本人，也瞭解中國人；時代的嬗變使他們感性敏銳，凡事都會拿中國人的作法和日本人的作法對比，對是非的判斷往往依據他們那一套日本精神的看法。他們厭惡日本人欺壓我們同胞的行為，但也佩服日本人的好處，他們精通日文，卻無法用中文寫簽呈或公文，更無法以中文來寫出他們對事情

In July of 1971 *The Intellectual* published a long article “An Analysis of Taiwan’s Social Forces” (*Taiwan shehui li fenxi* 台灣社會力分析), which showed the magazine committee’s general position. It discussed in depth the characteristics of different social strata in Taiwan and called on the KMT government to properly exploit the potential in different social strata to carry out social and political reform. In fact, this article may be the first open discussion of the mentality of the older local Taiwanese generation under KMT rule. This article gave the authorities and the intellectual strata a jolt. This is how it described local Taiwanese intellectuals of the previous generation:

They are mostly older than fifty-five. They received a complete education in Japanese. With few roles for them to play in actual society, they spend their days in memory. Although they occasionally look on admiringly at Japan’s contemporary prosperity, they know their place and obey the law, becoming an “apathetic audience” of the government. Only when they occasionally hear someone criticize them for receiving “a slave’s education” [under the Japanese] do they feel a nameless anger, only to return to a helpless silence. They possess fairly good Japanese language [facility], but cannot use Japanese to speak out. Because they for the most part remain silent, society has forgotten them. (emphasis original)⁴¹

Yang Qingchu’s impression of the previous generation was very similar to the analysis in this seminal article in *The Intellectual*.

的看法：對這他們很納悶，社會上貪污，或其他他們看不順眼的事情，他們會以他們的日本精神藉聊天來發洩他們的看法。這些，我聽得太多了，我未成年時對這些人覺得他們「強國奴」的劣根性難改，慢慢年歲漸長，自己能夠獨立思考和判斷，我能瞭解他們，他們嘴說的是日本精神，身作的是保住飯碗的可憐相，我藉他們這面對比的鏡子透視了我身為中國人的真面目。至於日本文學中譯的作品，大多是軟性的東西，我不重視這些東西，所受影響甚少。我沒有出國喝過洋墨水，讀的是中國書，三者之中當然以中國的影響較大。但以文學作品來講，我無法讀到三十年代的中國作品，翻譯的世界名著倒看不少，小說的寫作技巧和某些觀念受西方不少影響。影響我最大的不是書本，而是台灣的民情，我從民間吸收養分，我的作品是民間的生活、思想和他們對人間煙火的欲求加上我自己的「本性」寫成的。This conversation can also be found in Li Ang 1976, 63–64. See also Yang Qingchu 1978, 161–162.

41 Bao Qingtian et al. 1971, 33–34: 他們的年齡大致在五十五歲以上，受過完整的日式教育，由於現實社會少有他們可以扮演的角色，使他們終日生活在回憶之中，雖然偶而也嘗嚮慕日本今日的繁華，然而他們安份而守法，成為政府一群「冷漠的觀眾」，只有當偶而聽到有人批評他們接受「奴化教育」時，他們才會激起無名的怒火，然後迅速又歸於無可奈何的沈默。他們有相當良好的日本語言做為工具，但又不能用它來作他們發言的工具，由於始終默默無言，他們又成了被整個社會遺忘的一群。(emphasis originally written in bold)

Yang Qingchu's self-depiction epitomized the effectiveness of Chinese nationalist cultural edification or identity indoctrination on the intellectual formation of local Taiwanese of the postwar generation. Yang Qingchu felt that China had influenced him the most, which is, to be sure, a matter of fact; yet the Chinese influence to which he referred had been tightly controlled and filtered by the KMT. For one thing, the works of leftist writers from the 1930s were unavailable to Yang Qingchu because such works were forbidden, as part of the KMT's attempt to stifle or purge dissent. Chen Yingzhen once summarized the situation in this way: "This generation of Chinese writers who have grown up on Taiwan, regardless of provincial background, have been cut off from the 'May Fourth' tradition."⁴² Growing up under the censored historical education and suppression of free speech, young intellectuals like Yang Qingchu typically had access only to the official version of events. It naturally became the only way for them to understand Chinese or Taiwanese history.

Like most, if not all, members of his generation, Yang Qingchu had a keen Chinese national consciousness. The Chinese nationalist education obviously opened a significant generation gap between his generation and their parents, to the extent that the younger generation felt no qualms about criticizing the older generation as no better than lackeys of imperialist Japan.⁴³ Yang's enjoyment of reading Western novels in translation was also a typical experience for those growing up in the 1960s and reflected the attraction Western culture held for young people. Yet Yang Qingchu also pointed out clearly that what influenced him the most was "Taiwan folk sentiment". This is precisely what set him and other Nativist writers, such as Chen Yingzhen, Huang Chunming, Wang Zhenhe, and Wang Tuo, apart from young Mainlanders. That is, their local Taiwanese background was crucial to making them different. When dealing with the factors contributing to the development of the Nativist literature, the senior Mainlander literary critic He Xin indicated that "the reflection on the reality of this time and place" had been expressed in the works of "young writers who grew up in Taiwan's farming areas". He continued to point out:

... the education these writers received enables them to use Mandarin to aptly express their thoughts and feelings. They have deep-seated feelings about farming villages,

42 Chen Yingzhen 1978, 175: 這一代在台灣成長起來的中國作家，不分省籍，都與「五四」的傳統斷絕了。

43 An autobiographic film, *A Borrowed Life* (*Duosang* 多桑), released in 1994, is about this historical experience. By telling a story of controversy among the father and his children, director Wu Nianzhen 吳念真, who was born in 1952, presents the inter-generational relations associated with the conflict of national identity vividly and touchingly.

about farmers and their way of life. If they have met more workers, then they have a deep love for workers and understand everything about them – their misery, hope, and happiness. Emotionally, writers who still see Taiwan as a place where they just reside as visitors cannot really understand these things.⁴⁴

Moreover, although the major Nativist writers embraced a clear Chinese national consciousness, their works addressing Taiwan's social reality had contributed substantially to the rejection of the exile mentality prevailing in the Taiwanese society in general and among intellectuals in particular. They enlightened not only local Taiwanese readers but also readers of Mainlander background, especially those of the younger generation. As He Xin also put it, "Young readers, no matter what home province is listed on their household registration, all grew up here. Their hearts are naturally here. As for their homelands, whether they are along the Great Wall or in the hilly country around Guilin [of the Guangxi province], they've only heard about them or read about them in their textbooks. That they no longer have the older generation's 'intense homesickness' has helped the reception of literary works about the here and now."⁴⁵

3.2 Nativist awakening and social engagement

As my previous study has noted, in contrast to the prevalence of Chinese nationalist education and propaganda that urged party and state led public engagement and sacrifice, the 1960s in Taiwan were characterized by a mixture of a sense of rootlessness, loss, and historical detachment that was very common among young intellectuals. In general, the yearning of the intellectuals of the postwar generation for Western learning together with the powerful influence of Western – especially American – culture on them produced a feeling of separation from their own national history and fate. They tended to know little about China's – let alone Taiwan's – history, except what they learned from school textbooks, and the Western influence intensified the young intellectuals'

44 He Xin 1979 (1977): 37–38: ... 這些作家所受的教育使他們能運用普通國語恰當地表達他們的思想情感，他們對於台灣農村和農民和他們的生活方式有深厚的感情，如果他們接觸多的是工人，就對工人有厚愛，他們深切了解這些人的一切——他們的辛酸，他們的希望，他們的歡樂。在感情上仍以台灣為客居之地的作家們對這些是不能澈底了解的。

45 Ibid., 38: 年輕的讀者，不管戶籍謄本上的籍貫為何處，他們生長在這裡，他們自然關懷這裡；對他們自己的故鄉，無論有萬里長城也好，有桂林山水也好，只是聽說或從教科書上讀到的，他們不會再有上一代的「濃濃鄉愁」。這些都促成了寫此時此地的文學作品的受到重視與歡迎。

sense of alienation and historical isolation.⁴⁶ In the 1970s, in their awakening to the political crises and cultural problems of the country, the return-to-reality generation began to be self-critical of their tendencies toward idolization of the West and individualism under the influence of Western culture, tendencies that they developed growing up in the 1960s. They believed that these tendencies compounded the problems derived from the exile mentality. Yu Tiancong and Chen Yingzhen once reflected that it was due to the impact of such major political changes as the Diaoyutai incident and the loss of the UN seat that inspired them to make a clear turn towards “concern about the various social problems happening around the land of our country”. They gradually, “step by step, went down the road of Nativist literature” and focused on literature’s national character and its social concern.⁴⁷

Wang Tuo published his first story only a few months before the Diaoyutai incident. Throughout this period, up until Japan established relations with the PRC, Wang Tuo was still a graduate student. When Taiwan was forced to leave the UN, Wang Tuo and a group of students and recent graduates, including student leaders at the National Taiwan University such as Wang Xingqing 王杏慶 (1944–, better known by his later pen name, *Nanfangsuo* 南方朔), Wang Fusu 王復蘇 (1952–), Hong Sanxiong 洪三雄 (1949–), Qian Yongxiang 錢永祥 (1949–), Wang Xiaobo 王曉波 (1943–), and so on, published a manifesto in *The Intellectual* entitled “This Is the Time for Awakening!” (*Zheshi juexing de shihou le!* 這是覺醒的時候了!) They appealed to their countrymen to “put every ounce of energy into protecting Taiwan and unifying China”.⁴⁸ In summer 1975, Wang Tuo submitted his criticism of sociopolitical problems to the first issue of the *Taiwan Political Review* (*Taiwan zhenlun* 台灣政論) (August 1975 to December 1975), the journal founded by Huang Xinjie, Kang Ningxiang, and Zhang Junhong 張俊宏 (1938–), all major figures in the Dangwai opposition movement. Since that point in time, Wang Tuo began getting involved, noting that “a lot of my friends and I were those who got their education during this movement [Defending Diaoyutai Movement], and the national consciousness which is surging through society was inspired by the Defending Diaoyutai Movement in those days.”⁴⁹

46 Hsiao 2010, 15.

47 Yu Tiancong 1978a, 163, 165: 關心國土上所發生的社會問題... 一步步便發展到鄉土文學的道路。See also Chen Yingzhen 1978, 174–176.

48 Wang Xingqing et al. 1971, 23.

49 Wang Tuo 1978 (1977), 102: 我和我的許多朋友們都是在這個〔保釣〕運動中被教育過來的人，而今天社會上普遍高漲的民族意識，也正是當年的這個保釣運動所激發起來的。

Another major Nativist writer, Huang Chunming, in a speech in early 1978, looked back on the way his writing had changed, how he went from sympathetic depictions of the sufferings of ordinary people in impoverished villages in the late 1960s to highly critical and analytical representations of urban life in the early 1970s. He also reflected on how his new works addressed themselves especially to the difficult life situations of ordinary people as a repercussion of the politically and economically dependent relationships that Taiwan had with the United States and Japan. Huang Chunming confessed that it was not until the early 1970s that he “saw [his] own past clearly and understood the relationship between [his] own individual self and the whole society.” Only then did he “experience a gradual spiritual development and think more deeply.”⁵⁰ After this transformation, his stories were filled with a strong “character of social engagement” (*shehuixing* 社會性). Huang Chunming went on:

If we take the trunk of a sacred tree as a metaphor for our nation and our society, then we are leaves; and the time we spend on the branch is only for photosynthesis. When we fall to the ground we are fertilizer. Our individual lives are short, but the trunk of the tree represents the striving and conscientiousness of every leaf. A tree five thousand years of age [that is, the Chinese nation] has had five thousand seasons of budding and falling leaves. My writing experiences may be a total failure, but I still hope to become a writer, to be a leaf together with all the other leaves on the wondrous tree, sacrificing myself for the sake of our society, our country, and our nation.⁵¹

As we can see, traumatic events such as Taiwan’s diplomatic setbacks had led young intellectuals to a desire to understand their present situation in terms of larger power networks and structures, and thus to a combination of their generational and national identity, and eventually to a critical consciousness and various forms of action. This process was clearly shown in the recollections by Yu Tiancong, Chen Yingzhen, Wang Tuo, Huang Chunming, and others that demonstrated a clear turn towards the people, society, and nation. They saw themselves as part of a larger historical process, namely in a temporal framework in which a nation was moving through its past and present and

50 Huang Chunming 1978, 61: 看清自己的過去，認識了自己與整個社會的關係... 心靈才有一路成長，也開始會多做思想。

51 Ibid., 62: 把我們的民族，把我們的社會，比喻做一棵神木的軀幹的話，做為一片樹葉子的我們，在枝頭上的時光，我們只有努力經營光合作用，當我飄落地的時辰，我們即是肥料。我們個人的生命雖然短暫，但是神木的軀幹，即是每一片葉子的努力和盡職。五千年的神木，就意味著有五千梯次的發芽與落葉。我的寫作經驗是徹底的失敗了，我仍然希望成為一個作者，做為神木的一片葉子，和大家一起來為我們的社會，為我們的國家，為我們的民族獻身。

into its future. They actively defined their position and the existential meaning of the generation to which they belonged under this kind of national historical narrative. In so doing, they linked their own lives wholeheartedly to the fate of the nation. The distinctive fusion of generational consciousness and national sentiment drove them to practice the ideal of returning to their social reality and native soil through writing, which in turn facilitated their rejection of the exile mentality.

4 The Historical Construction of the Dangwai New Generation

Members of the Dangwai opposition movement in the 1970s generally had a strong historical consciousness, a powerful sense of history. Their particular sense of history had two main aspects: a heightened awareness of their generational identity and a keen concern for Taiwanese history, with a special interest in the history of the Taiwanese anti-colonial resistance.⁵² While these two elements obviously resulted from their local Taiwanese background, they were also embedded in a larger historical narrative that was the embodiment of Chinese national identity.

4.1 A Beginning: Kang Ningxiang and the History of the Taiwanese Anti-Japanese Resistance

The two aspects of the Dangwai dissidents' special sense of history first appeared in the person of Kang Ningxiang. In June 1972, Jiang Jingguo (Chiang Ching-Kuo) 蔣經國 (1910–1988) took over as Prime Minister, the first stage in the transfer of power from his father Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai-shek) 蔣介石 (1887–1975). At the end of the same year, Kang was elected as a legislator in Taipei City. In February 1975, in his "Policy Report" (*shizheng baogao* 施政報告) addressed to the Legislative Yuan, Jiang Jingguo stressed that although many things had changed in the thirty years since the Second World War, the ROC would maintain, no matter what, its basic national policy of "oppose-communism-and-restore-the-country" (*fangong fuguo* 反共復國).⁵³ In March, Kang Ningxiang criticized the Jiang report in the Legislative Yuan. First, he pointed out that Taiwan faced a changing geopolitical situation and that the withdrawal from the UN, the severance of diplomatic relations with Japan, and the prospect of the U.S.

52 For analyses of how the history of Taiwanese anti-colonialism is dealt with, how the collective memory of this past, especially that of Jiang Weishui, is constructed and reconstructed in postwar Taiwan, including how the interest in anti-colonial history and Jiang Weishui was rekindled in the 1970s, see Fröhlich 2011a, 2011b, and Hsiau 2011.

53 See *Official Gazette of the Legislative Yuan* 64 (16) (February 22, 1975), 6.

establishing relations with the PRC had already diminished the ROC's international recognition. Taiwan's position as the legitimate representative of China, he emphasized, was thereby threatened. Next, in discussing domestic change, Kang attacked the government as a gerontocracy in which 3.2% of the population – people over sixty-five – dominated the leadership levels of government. He demanded that the government should pay more attention to the younger generation because 87.8% of the population was composed of people under forty-nine years of age who “in the past twenty-odd years have grown up in the era of a global explosion of knowledge and rapid technological progress.”⁵⁴ Therefore, Kang proposed four major political reforms: 1) adjust the national budget to meet the actual needs of Taiwan society, 2) draft a “Political Party Law” (*Zhengdang fa* 政黨法) to catalyze the formation of opposition parties, 3) “reaffirm the value and position of Taiwan's ‘history and culture’” (*congxin queren Taiwan “lishi wenhua” de jiazhi han diwei* 重新確認台灣「歷史文化」的價值和地位), and 4) normalize local governance according to the principle of rule of law.⁵⁵ He placed particular stress on this final point and emphasized especially the Taiwanese political struggle against colonial rule in the latter part of the colonial period, which was influenced by modern Western sociopolitical thought. At this point, Kang introduced the history of the Petition Movement for The Establishment of the Taiwan Council, the Taiwan Cultural Association, the Taiwan People's Party, and the Taiwan Local Self-Government League. Kang highlighted that “in fifty years of Japanese rule, the Taiwanese people, insulted, oppressed and killed by the Japanese, suffered pain and sacrifice no less than their compatriots on the mainland during the eight-year-long Anti-Japanese War.”⁵⁶ Also, he emphasized that the Taiwanese who participated in the brutal resistance against Japan were driven by their resolute national consciousness and “longing for the ancestral land” (*simu zuguo* 思慕祖國). Therefore, he argued that this history is “a vein of riches in the history and culture of the Republic of China” (*Zhonghua minguo lishi wenhua de zhengui caifu* 中華民國歷史文化的珍貴財富).⁵⁷

As a leader of the Dangwai opposition movement in the 1970s, Kang's questioning of Prime Minister Jiang Jingguo at the supreme national legislature was profoundly significant. It represented an awareness of postwar generational identity in Dangwai and her-

54 See *Official Gazette of the Legislative Yuan* 64 (19) (March 5, 1975), 8: 二十幾年來，在全世界智識爆發和科技突飛猛進的環境下長大成人。

55 See *Official Gazette of the Legislative Yuan* 64 (19) (March 5, 1975), 9–14.

56 *Ibid.*, 12: 在日本人統治的五十年間，台灣人受日人欺辱、壓迫、殺害而受的痛苦和犧牲，並不下於大陸同胞八年抗戰之苦。

57 *Ibid.*, 13.

added the increasing interest in the history of the Taiwanese anti-colonial political and social movements. Retrospectively, in this regard, Kang's symbolic position in Dangwai in this decade resembles that of Chen Shaoting in the cultural circles of the postwar generation. As discussed above, Chen published his seminal article, "May Fourth and the New Literature Movement in Taiwan," in *The Intellectual* in May 1972 and thus pioneered the rediscovery of the New Literature of the colonial period. And like Chen, Kang Ningxiang was a trendsetter. They opened an era of popular exploration of the history of the political and literary activities of the Taiwanese during the Japanese colonial period.⁵⁸

For Chen Shaoting, to understand the historical meaning of the New Literature was to turn it into an episode of the historical narrative of Chinese nationalism. Likewise, Kang Ningxiang considered Taiwan's past, especially the colonial period, as an act in the historical drama of the Chinese nation. Both of their historical re-constructions were intended not only to highlight the particularity of Taiwan's local historical experience; they also attempted to seek recognition in the public sphere for the particular experience of local Taiwanese by affirming its "Chineseness". This approach represented a reformist reaction to KMT authoritarianism and went along with their political appeals and demands made from within the ROC framework.

Political dissidents in Taiwan in the 1970s were in general relatively moderate. Dangwai members defined themselves mainly as "loyal dissidents" (*zhongcheng de fan-duizhe* 忠誠的反對者), whose main demand was "democratization" instead of a radical structuring of the country. In terms of the issue of inequality between Mainlanders and local Taiwanese, what members of *The Intellectual* magazine or the Dangwai dissidents were calling for was equal civil status and political power to be enjoyed by local Taiwanese. Kang Ningxiang's emphasis upon the national loyalty of local Taiwanese and Taiwanese anti-colonialism as a valuable part of the history and culture of the ROC represented, we can say, a reformist reconstruction of collective memory under the established Chinese national framework. However, Kang's speech was the first time in post-

58 In fact, in July 1971, that is, less than one year before his "May Fourth and the New Literature Movement in Taiwan" came out, Chen Shaoting had published "Mr. Lin Xiantang and the 'Ancestral Land Incident': On the Historical Meaning of the Anti-Japanese Movement of Taiwanese Intellectuals" ("Lin Xiantang xiansheng yu 'zuguo shijian': jianlun Taiwan zhishi fenzi kang Ri yundong de lishi yiyi" 林獻堂先生與「祖國事件」——兼論台灣智識份子抗日運動的歷史意義). See Chen Shaoting 1971. As for the rediscovery of the history of the Taiwanese anti-colonial political and social movements, Chen's article appeared much earlier than Kang's 1975 questioning speech at the Legislative Yuan. Chen's 1971 article was arguably the earliest open discussion among the return-to-reality generation of the nonviolent social and political resistance movements in the latter part of the Japanese colonial period.

war Taiwan that a political dissident stood in a national parliamentary organization to make this kind of appeal to the upper echelons of the KMT administration.

Huang Xinjie, Kang Ningxiang, Zhang Junhong, and others founded the very first Dangwai publication in the 1970s, the *Taiwan Political Review*, in August 1975. The KMT government forced it to shut down at the end of the year, with only five issues having been published. In four of the issues, each had an article on the history of the Japanese colonial period, as displayed in Table 1. What these four articles covered were the anti-colonial political and social activities beginning in the early 1920s and their leaders like Cai Huiru 蔡惠如 (1881–1929) and Lin Xiantang 林獻堂 (1881–1956), who were influenced by trends in Western thought and political developments in China. All the positions of these articles paralleled the moderate reformism adopted by the *Taiwan Political Review* on sociopolitical issues.

Table 1 Articles on the Japanese colonial period in the *Taiwan Political Review*

No	Author	Public. Time	Title	Vol	Page
1	Ye Rongzhong 葉榮鐘	Aug. 1975	Cai Huiru, the Man who Paved the Way for the Taiwanese National Movement (<i>Taiwan minzu yundong de puluren Cai Huiru</i> 台灣民族運動的鋪路人蔡惠如)	1	56–58
2	Fan Fu 凡夫	Oct. 1975	Taiwan's National Poet Lin Youchun (<i>Taiwan minzu shiren Lin Youchun</i> 台灣民族詩人林幼春)	3	66–69
3	Zheng Hong 正宏 trans.	Nov. 1975	The Taiwanese Anti-Japanese Movement Seen through Japanese Eyes (<i>Ribenren yanzhong de Taiwan kang Ri yundong</i> 日本人眼中的台灣抗日運動)	4	48–52
4	Fan Fu 凡夫	Dec. 1975	Revolutionary Jiang Weishui (<i>Gemingjia Jiang Weishui</i> 革命家蔣渭水)	5	76–79

4.2 The Dangwai new generation and Taiwanese history

In 1973 and 1974, the KMT government suppressed the demand for political and social reform by *The Intellectual*. However, instead of being demoralized, the awakened youth became more actively engaged in the opposition movement. One of their main approaches was to join the Dangwai movement led by two young native legislators, namely Huang Xinjie and Kang Ningxiang. Roughly during the period from 1975 to 1978 especially, many of them got involved in Dangwai activism and seized upon the colonial resistance as a way of finding a historical context for their contemporary actions. They tried to make sense of the present and envision the future by turning to the

past. This development became widespread and constituted an important part of the return-to-native-soil cultural trend in this decade.

As noted already, since the beginning of the 1970s, young reform-minded intellectuals had become increasingly aware of their postwar generational status. This awareness was expressed most directly in the term “new generation” (*xinshengdai* 新生代) which generally was used to describe the distinctive situation and nature of the postwar generation to which they belonged. The primary elements of this awareness were a stress on the differences between their own generation and the older generation as well as high expectations for the role they might play in society and politics. This was particularly true for the “Dangwai new generation”. Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄 (1944–), a native Taiwanese who held a Master’s degree in Political Science from the National Taiwan University and was in his thirties at the time, thus declared after joining Dangwai – in a way similar both to the aforementioned article, “An Analysis of Taiwan’s Social Forces,” in *The Intellectual*, and Yang Qingchu’s view:

I am used to dividing modern Taiwanese compatriots into three generations, my grandfather’s, my father’s, and my own. The two earlier generations experienced Japanese rule and KMT rule. And what we see now is that my grandfathers’ generation has been forgotten over the past thirty years. They lived through dark times and don’t want to talk about the past, and they have reached old age and no longer have any expectations. After the restoration of Taiwan, my fathers’ generation witnessed a sea change [the February 28th Incident], and overwhelmingly most of them, especially those who were smart, stayed far away from politics and refused to discuss it – this was the lesson of their era. The reality of the lives of these two generations over the past few decades speaks for itself.⁵⁹

While the awakened young intellectuals, like Huang Huangxiong, were highly critical of KMT rule and the educational system, they generally felt, unlike their parents and grandparents, lucky to have grown up and received their education in an environment of social stability and economic prosperity over the past twenty-odd years. Typically, they did not

59 Huang Huangxiong 1978a: 16–17: 我習慣性的喜歡將近代史上的台灣同胞分為三輩：我的祖父輩、父親輩，和我們這一輩。上兩輩都經過日本人的統治以及國民黨的統治。而我們現在所看到的現象是，老祖父輩三十年來已經成為被遺忘的一代，他們活在暗淡的歲月裏，不想再重提往事；他們已經是垂暮之年，不再有任何期待。父親輩在光復後目睹了一場大變局 [二二八事件]，絕大多數，特別是聰明人，開始遠離政治，閉口不談政治，這是他們基於時代性的教訓所造成的。他們這兩輩幾十年來生活事實的本身，就是很好的表白。

hesitate to proudly proclaim that the new generation had open minds, lofty goals, esteem for the truth, fearlessness before authority, a strong sense of justice, and the like.⁶⁰

The young Dangwai dissidents' strong generational consciousness was accompanied by a deep concern for Taiwanese history, with a special interest in the history of anti-colonial activism during the latter part of the Japanese colonial period. They were the two sides of the same coin of the Dangwai new generation's particular sense of history, and both were expressed under the framework of the Chinese nationalist historical narrative. Their conceptions of the past, present, and future were interrelated and influenced one another reciprocally. Their historical re-construction was also closely connected to their political action. For the Dangwai dissidents, colonial and KMT rule were both oligarchic – the few unfairly overriding the many. The non-violent resistance against the Japanese had set a historical example for them to redeem local Taiwanese from inequality and oppression. Zhang Junhong once indicated that by incorporating Taiwanese history – especially that of the anti-colonial political and social movements – into his campaign speeches, Kang Ningxiang “gave the Dangwai movement a noble sense of inheriting a historical mission.” Zhang Junhong explained: “... intellectuals used to think that elections were for scoundrels and Robin Hood types and couldn't be bothered. Kang Ningxiang has changed their minds. Intellectuals are now eager to join the mass movement that is Dangwai.”⁶¹

The Dangwai dissidents' keen historical concern focused on the colonial period, especially the history of anti-Japanese political and social movements. This tendency is apparent in all four main Dangwai publications which appeared in the 1970s – the *Taiwan Political Review, New Generation* (*Zheyidai zazhi* 這一代雜誌) (July 1977 to December 1978), *The Eighties* (*Bashi niandai* 八十年代) (June 1979 to December 1979), and *Formosa* (*Meilidao* 美麗島) (August 1979 to November 1979). As indicated already, the earliest of these publications, the *Taiwan Political Review*, had four articles on Taiwanese history, all on the anti-colonial movements and leaders. *New Generation*, *The Eighties*, and *Formosa* had three, five, and three articles respectively on Taiwanese history of the non-colonial periods (see Tables 2, 3, and 4). By comparison, each journal had eight, six, and four articles respectively on the Japanese colonial period (see

60 See, for instance, Huang Huangxiong 1980 (1977), 8; Wu Jiabang 1978, 13; *Bashi niandai bianjibu* 1979, 7; Zhang Junhong 1978a, 17. Cf. Yao Jiawen 1978, 13; Zhuang Junqing 1977, 60.

61 Zhang Junhong 1977, 192–193: 使黨外群眾運動加入了承繼歷史使命的高貴感 ... 以前的智識份子總以為選舉就是流氓或草莽英雄的運動，不屑一顧，康寧祥扭轉了智識份子的觀念，使他們熱誠地開始投身於黨外群眾運動之中。

Tables 5, 6, and 7). In total, there were eighteen articles on the colonial period, all but three or four of which investigated Taiwanese resistance to colonial rule in the 1920s.

During the 1970s, the historical interpretations represented by the above-mentioned articles in the Dangwai political magazines, which served as major vehicles for popularizing dissident views, contributed much to the “de-exile” understanding of Taiwan’s history and culture, in the sense that they increasingly emphasized local perspectives. This tendency was also well demonstrated by the historical works by two major Dangwai members, Huang Huangxiong’s series of volumes on Taiwanese non-violent anti-colonialism under the Japanese during the 1920s and Lü Xiulian’s 呂秀蓮 book, *Taiwan’s Past and Future* (*Taiwan de guoqu yu weilai* 台灣的過去與未來), which attempted to “boldly transcend the traditional Sinocentric position by adopting the standpoint of Taiwan *per se* and the people who live in Taiwan.”⁶²

Table 2 Articles on Taiwanese history (excluding the Japanese colonial period) in *New Generation*

No	Author	Public. Time	Title	Vol	Page
1	He Wenzhen 何文振	Oct. 1977	A Historical Outlet for Taiwan (“Taiwan de lishi chulu” 台灣的歷史出路)	4	11–16
2	Zai Shizheng 載市政	Oct. 1977	Record of the Historical Image of the Retrocession of Taiwan (“Ji Taiwan guangfu de lishi jingtou” 記台灣光復的歷史鏡頭)	4	40–42
3	Zhong Xiaoshang 鍾孝上	Nov. 1978	A Reading Report on Taiwanese History (“Du Taiwan lishi yougan” 讀台灣歷史有感)	15	45–46

62 Lü Xiulian 1979, 59: 大膽地超越傳統中國本位主義的立場，只單純地站在台灣本土以及居住在台灣本土的人民的立場。For Huang Huangxiong’s works, see Huang Huangxiong 1976, 1977, 1978b, 1978c.

Table 3 Articles on Taiwanese history (excluding the Japanese colonial period) in *The Eighties*

No	Author	Public. Time	Title	Vol	Page
1	Lin Zhuoshui 林濁水	Sept. 1979	Taiwan is a Beautiful Island (“Taiwan shi meili dao” 台灣是美麗島)	1.4	20–24
2	Wang Shilang 王詩琅	Sep. 1979	The Process of Developing and Settling Taiwan (“Taiwan tuozhi de guocheng” 台灣拓殖的過程)	1.4	84–87
3	Li Qinxian 李欽賢	Oct. 1979	Preliminary Discussion of the Epochal Meaning of the Taiwanese Fine Arts over the Past Three Centuries (“Qiantan sanbainian lai Taiwan meishu de shidai yiyi” 淺探三百年來台灣美術的時代意義)	1.5	82–87
4	Zhang Xucheng 張旭成 (Hu Yifeng 胡倚風 trans.)	Dec. 1979	A Beautiful Island (“Meili zhi dao” 美麗之島)	2.1	7–10
5	Yang Zujun 楊祖珺	Dec. 1979	Tribulations of the Tragic Female Lead in Traditional Taiwanese Opera (“Kudan gezi de cangsang” 苦旦歌仔的滄桑)	2.1	91–94

Table 4 Articles on Taiwanese history (excluding the Japanese colonial period) in *Formosa*

No	Author	Public. Time	Title	Vol	Page
1	Wei Tingchao 魏廷朝	Sept. 1979	Ceremony at the Righteous Citizen Temple in Xinzhu: The Biggest Hakka Festival (“Xinzhu yiminmiao de jidian: kejiaren zuida de baibai” 新竹義民廟的祭典——客家人最大的拜拜)	1.2	77–78
2	Liu Fengsong 劉峰松	Oct. 1979	A Taiwan’s History for Eighteen Million People (“Yiqian babai wan ren de Taiwan shi” 一千八百萬人的台灣史)	1.3	69–76
3	Xie Taixin 謝苔心	Nov. 1979	Revolutionary? Or Bandit? (Part One): Observations Concerning the “Lin Shuangwen Revolt” (“Geming jia ne? Haishi liukou? (shang): ‘Lin Shuangwen qiyi’ de yixie guancha” 革命家呢? 還是流寇? (上) ——「林爽文起義」的一些觀察)	1.4	99–104

Table 5 Articles on the Japanese colonial period in *New Generation*

No	Author	Public. Time	Title	Vol	Page
1	Staff	Aug. 1977	Symposium Commemorating the 46th Anniversary of the Death of the Revolutionary Sage Jiang Weishui (“Jinian geming xianxian Jiang Weishui xiansheng shishi 46 zhounian zuotanhui” 紀念革命先賢蔣渭水先生逝世 46 週年座談會)	2	54–63, 46
2	Staff	Sept. 1977	Symposium on the Spiritual Legacy of Modern Taiwanese “Visionaries” (“Taiwan jindai ‘xianjue zhe’ de jingshen yichan zuotanhui” 台灣近代「先覺者」的精神遺產座談會)	3	17–24
3	Jiang Weishui 蔣渭水	Oct. 1977	What Are We Going to Do This Year? (“Jinnian yao zuo shenmo?” 今年要做什麼?)	4	36–37
4	Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄	Nov. 1977	The Nationalist Sentiment of Modern Taiwanese “Visionaries” (“Taiwan jindai ‘xianjue zhe’ de minzu qingcao” 台灣近代「先覺者」的民族情操)	5	27–29
5	TaiwanMinbao 台灣民報	Dec. 1977	The Mission of Taiwanese Youth (“Taiwan qingnian de shiming” 台灣青年的使命)	6	52–53
6	Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄	Dec. 1977	Evaluation of Japanese Individuals who Sponsored the Modern Taiwanese Nationalist Movement (“Zanzhu Taiwan jindai minzu yundong de riben renshi de pingjia” 贊助台灣近代民族運動的日本人士的評價)	6	57–63
7	Lin Xixiong 林熹雄	Aug. 1978	A Discussion of the “Revolutionary Sage” Jiang Weishui by Mr. Huang Shiqiao (“Huang Shiqiao xiansheng tan ‘geming xianxian’ Jiang Weishui” 黃師樵先生談「革命先賢」蔣渭水)	12	12–13
8	Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄	Aug. 1978	A Solemn Recommendation: Commemorate the 40th Anniversary of Jiang Weishui’s Death (“Yixiang zhuangyan de jianyi: jinian Jiang Weishui xiansheng shishi sishiqi zhounian” 一項莊嚴的建議——紀念蔣渭水先生逝世四十七週年)	12	19–21
9	Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄	Dec. 1978	A Discussion Beginning with Jiang Weishui Spirit: also on Taiwan’s Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow (“Cong Jiang Weishui jingshen tanqi: Jianlun Taiwan de zuotian jintian yu mingtian” 從蔣渭水精神談起——兼論台灣的昨天今天與明天)	16	44–45

Table 6 Articles on the Japanese colonial period in *The Eighties*

No	Author	Public. Time	Title	Vol	Page
1	Li Nanheng 李南衡	July 1979	Freedom of Speech in the Japanese Occupation Era (“Riju shidai Taiwan de yanlun ziyou” 日據時代台灣的言論自由)	1.2	15–18
2	Editors 本刊編輯	Sept. 1979	Jiang Weishui, Alive in Our Hearts (“Jiang Weishui huozai women xinzhong” 蔣渭水活在我們心中)	1.4	79–80
3	Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄	Sept. 1979	Jiang Weishui’s Teachings (“Jiang Weishui xiansheng yixun” 蔣渭水先生遺訓)	1.4	80–82
4	Li Xiaofeng 李筱峰	Sept. 1979	Freedom of Religion in Taiwan under Japanese Colonialism: Two Cases from Fifty Years Ago about How Members of the Economically Privileged Class Sought to Appropriate Temple Assets and Religious Authority (“Ribenzhimin xia Taiwan de zongjiao ziyou: kan wushinian qian jinquan jieji mouduo jiaochan, jiaoquan de liangge ge’an” 日本殖民下台灣的宗教自由——看五十年前金權階級謀奪教產、教權的兩個個案)	1.4	83–84
5	Editors 本報編輯	Nov. 1979	Great Healers: A Special Report on the Anniversary of Sun Yat-sen’s Birthday: Outstanding Taiwanese Doctors in History (“Weida de yizhe: Sun Zhongshan xiansheng danchen jinian tebie baodao: xiri Taiwan shehui zhongjiechu de yishi” 偉大的醫者——孫中山先生誕辰紀念特別報導——昔日台灣社會中傑出的醫師) 1. Dr. Wu Haishui: A True Taiwanese Youth and a Visionary in the Culture Movement (“Wu Haishui yishi: Taiwan zhenqingnian, wenhua yundong xianjuezhe” 吳海水醫師——台灣真青年，文化運動先覺者) 2. Dr. Lai He: Humanitarian Father of Taiwanese Literature (“Lai He yishi: beitian minren huaibao cangsheng de Taiwan wenxue zhi fu” 賴和醫師——悲天憫人懷抱蒼生的台灣文學之父) 3. Dr. Han Shiquan: A Great Man who Cannot Become a Virtuous Minister Should Be a Good Doctor (“Han Shiquan yisheng: tachangfu pu wei liangxiang tang wei liangyi” 韓石泉醫生——大丈夫不為良相當為良醫)	1.6	77–83

			<p>4. Dr. Xie Wei: Taiwan's Albert Schweitzer, who Cured Bodies and Saved Souls ("Xie Wei yishi: yi ren routi jiu ren linghun de Taiwan shihuaizhe" 謝緯醫師—醫人肉體救人靈魂的台灣史懷哲)</p> <p>5. Dr. Wu Xinrong: Poet who Loved his Compatriots, Native Land, and Nation ("Wu Xinrong yishi: ai tongbao, ai xiangtu ai minzu de shiren zuojia" 吳新榮醫師—愛同胞、愛鄉土愛民族的詩人作家)</p> <p>6. Dr. Chen Xinbin: A Man of Indomitable and Fearless Character ("Chen Xinbin yishi: weiwu buqu, shisi rugui de rengzhe" 陳新彬醫師—威武不屈, 視死如歸的人格者)</p>		
6	Zhuo Guohao 卓國豪	Sept. 1979	Not Allowed to Commemorate Jiang Weishui? ("Buzhun jinian Jiang Weishui?" 不准紀念蔣渭水?)	1.4	73-74

Table 7 Articles on the Japanese colonial period in *Formosa*

No	Author	Publ. Time	Title	Vol	Page
1	Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄	Oct. 1979	Everyone Should Commemorate Dr. Jiang Weishui ("Dajia lai jinian Jiang Weishui xiansheng" 大家來紀念蔣渭水先生)	1.1	93
2	Wang Shilang 王詩琅	Aug. 1979	Japanese who Laid the Foundation for Colonialism in Taiwan: In Remembrance of my Uncle Liao Jintai ("Riren zai tai zhimindi tizhi zhi dianding: wei jinian jiufu Liao Jintai xiansheng er zuo" 日人在台殖民地體制之奠定—為紀念舅父廖金泰先生而作)	1.1	94-95
3	Wen Chaogong 文抄公	Oct. 1979	Taiwanese People Are Sanitary but Illiterate!?: A Discussion with Mr. Lin Yanggang about the Most Common Sense regarding Taiwanese Educational History ("Taiwan ren you weisheng, bu shizi!?: yu Lin Yanggang xiansheng tan Taiwan jiaoyu shishang zui qima de changshi" 台灣人有衛生, 不識字!?: 與林洋港先生談台灣教育史上最起碼的常識)	1.3	87-92
4	Wen Chaogong 文抄公	Nov. 1979	Please Correctly Understand the Facts of History: A Word for Mayor Su Nancheng ("Qing zhengque renshi lishi de shishi: xiang Su Nancheng shizhang jinyan" 請正確認識歷史的事實—向蘇南成市長進言)	1.4	91-98

During the latter half of the 1970s, the historical articles in the Dangwai political magazines, together with Huang's and Lü's works, encouraged the embryonic development of an "indigenized" or "Taiwanized" collective identity by shaping an alternative collective memory, which in turn helped to mobilize increasing support for Dangwai's challenge to KMT domination. Their historical narrative, especially Lü's, anticipated the later radicalized developments of the opposition movement in the 1980s due to the heightened suppression by the KMT government following the "Kaohsiung Incident" (*Kaohsiung shijian* 高雄事件) of 1979. These later developments included the rejection of Chinese national consciousness, the emergence of a "Taiwanese outlook on history" (*Taiwan shiguan* 台灣史觀) as the kernel of the discourse of Taiwanese consciousness, and the call for the founding of an independent nation.⁶³ Retrospectively, it can be said that the New Literature uncovered by the cultural activists of the return-to-reality generation and the exploration of Taiwanese history by the Dangwai dissidents in the 1970s offered local experience from a local perspective, which had been ignored, rejected, and suppressed. Despite their lingering Chinese orientation, both of them provided perspectives and materials for the new narrative of Taiwan based on the particular "Taiwanese outlook on history".

Conclusion

The last four decades have seen the dramatic democratization and indigenization of politics and culture in Taiwan. Seen from another angle, the spectacular political and cultural changes have been a long and difficult process of de-exile challenge whose origins go back to the 1970s, when many young intellectuals of the postwar generation awakened to the political crises and cultural problems faced by the country. The return-to-reality generation that openly challenged the status quo, especially those members of local Taiwanese background, was the main agent of de-exile cultural politics and thus became an early driving force for democratization and indigenization. The cultural

63 On December 10, 1979, the Dangwai dissidents held a demonstration in Kaohsiung city in southern Taiwan to celebrate "Human Rights Day" intended to honor the UN General Assembly's adoption and proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Interrupted and suppressed by the KMT, the celebration turned out to be a bloody conflict between Dangwai supporters and the police. Soon after, many major Dangwai leaders, such as Huang Xinjie, Zhang Junhong, Lü Xiulian, Wang To, Yang Chingchu, and the like, were caught and sentenced to prison. This event was later known as the "Kaohsiung Incident" or the "Formosa Incident" (*Meilidao shijian* 美麗島事件), because the march was organized by *Formosa* magazine staffed by Huang Xinjie and other co-activists.

activists who celebrated Taiwan's modern literature from the Japanese colonial period, the Nativist novelists and their proponents, and the "new generation" of Dangwai dissidents played the leading roles in the de-exile cultural politics. While they demonstrated a sense of Chinese identification, their political activism, explorations of Taiwan's past, and literary representations of Taiwan's present paved the way for political and cultural indigenization or Taiwanization in the 1980s and ensuing decades.

As the long history of the world testifies, ethnic and national identity politics usually, if not always, spawns humiliation, hatred, and conflict, which in turn almost inevitably involves the tendency to slight other people's stories, react with apathy or contempt to the historical narratives that others use to express their identity, or even reject these alternative narratives entirely. The thrust of the de-exile cultural politics was to redeem local Taiwanese from humiliation, inequality, and oppression. Yet the KMT's reactions, represented by the brutal suppression following the Kaohsiung Incident, only stimulated a deeper sense of humiliation and inequality and a stronger desire for liberation and autonomy – and thus invited further resistance. This has been well demonstrated by the fact that the de-exile cultural transformation and pursuit of democracy and equality of local Taiwanese under the framework of the ROC in the 1970s foreshadowed the Taiwanese nationalism in politics and culture and the demand for restructuring Taiwan into a sovereign independent state in the 1980s and beyond.⁶⁴

References

- Andrews, Molly. 2002. "Generational Consciousness, Dialogue, and Political Engagement," in Edmunds and Turner 2002, 75–87.
- Bashi niandai bianjibu 八十年代編輯部. 1979. "Xu Xinliang zhuanfang" 許信良專訪, *Bashi niandai* 八十年代 1979.1 (3), 6–16.
- Bao Qingtian 包青天 (Bao Yihong 包奕洪) (et al.). 1971. "Taiwan shehuili de fenxi (shang)" 台灣社會力的分析(上), *Daxue zazhi* 大學雜誌 1971. 43, 32–35.
- Callahan, William A. 2004. "National Insecurities: Humiliation, Salvation, and Chinese Nationalism," *Alternatives*, 2004. 29, 199–218.
- Chen Cuilian 陳翠蓮. 2008. *Taiwanren de dikang yu renting, 1920–1950* 台灣人的抵抗與認同, 一九二〇—一九五〇. Taipei: Yuanliu.

64 For detailed analyses on how the de-exile, return-to-reality, and return-to-native-soil cultural politics in the 1970s transformed into the political and cultural indigenization or Taiwanization informed by Taiwanese nationalism in the 1980s and after, see Hsiao 2000, Makeham and Hsiao 2005 and Hsiao A-chin 2010, 2012.

- Chen, Edward I-te. 1972. "Formosan Political Movements under Japanese Colonial Rule, 1914–37," *Journal of Asian Studies*, 1972. 31 (3), 477–497.
- Chen Fangming 陳芳明. 2011. *Taiwan xinwenxue shi (shang)* 台灣新文學史(上). Taipei: Lianjing.
- Chen Shaoting 陳少廷. 1971. "Lin Xiantang xiansheng yu 'zuguo shijian': jianlun Taiwan zhishi fenzi kang Ri yundong de lishi yiyi" 林獻堂先生與「祖國事件」——兼論台灣智識份子抗日運動的歷史意義, *Daxue zazhi* 大學雜誌 1970. 43, 4–8.
- . 1972a. "Wusi yu Taiwan xin wenxue yundong" 五四與台灣新文學運動, *Daxue zazhi* 大學雜誌 1972. 53, 18–24.
- . 1972b. "Zai lun zhongyang minyi daibiao de gaixuan wenti" 再論中央民意代表的改選問題, *Daxue zazhi* 大學雜誌 1972. 49, 93–98.
- . 1977. *Taiwan xinwenxue yundong jianshi* 台灣新文學運動簡史. Taipei: Lianjing.
- Chen Yingzhen 陳映真. 1978. "Cong 'xihua wenxue' dao 'xiangtu wenxue'" 從「西化文學」到「鄉土文學」, in Qiu Weijun and Chen Lianshun 1978, 172–178.
- Edmunds, June and Bryan S. Turner (eds.). 2002. *Generational Consciousness, Narrative, and Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Fröhlich, Thomas. 2011a. "Einführung," in Thomas Fröhlich and Yishan Liu 2011, 13–39.
- . 2011b. "Identität und Widerstand: Jiang Weishuis Antikolonialismus und seine Nachwirkungen," in Thomas Fröhlich and Yishan Liu 2011, 43–92.
- Fröhlich, Thomas and Yishan Liu (eds.). 2011. *Taiwans unvergänglicher Antikolonialismus: Jiang Weishui und der Widerstand gegen die japanische Kolonialherrschaft. Mit einer Übersetzung von Schriften Jiang Weishuis aus dem Chinesischen und Japanischen*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Gao Shangqin 高上秦. 1976 (1973). "Tansuo yu huigu: xie zai 'longzu pinglun zhuanhao' qianmian" 探索與回顧 —— 寫在「龍族評論專號」前面, in Zhao Zhiti 1976a, 162–171.
- He Wenzhen 何文振. 1978. *Gei guomindang de zhengyan* 給國民黨的諍言. Taipei: Chunfeng.
- He Xin 何欣. 1973. "Ouyang Zi shou le xie sheme" 歐陽子說了些什麼, *Wenji* 文季 1973. 1, 43–60.
- . 1979. *Zhongguo xiandai xiaoshuo de zhuchao* 中國現代小說的主潮. Taipei: Yuanjing.
- . 1979 (1977). "Zhongguo xiandai xiaoshuo dechuantong: yige shi de kaocha" 中國現代小說的傳統——一個史的考察, in He Xin 1979, 1–42.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger (ed.). 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

- Hou Jian 侯健. 1978. "Junzhong wenyi" yu 'xueyuanpai wenyi'"「軍中文藝」與「學院派文藝」, in Qiu Weijun and Chen Lianshun 1978, 168–171.
- Hsiao, A-chin. 2000. *Contemporary Taiwanese Cultural Nationalism*. London: Routledge.
- . 2010. "A 'Generation in-Itself': The Authoritarian Rule, Exilic Mentality, and the Postwar Generation of Intellectuals in 1960s Taiwan," *The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics and Culture*, 2010.3 (1), 1–31.
- . 2011. "Wer erinnert sich an Jiang Weishui? Kollektive Erinnerung an den japanischen Kolonialismus im Taiwan der Nachkriegszeit," in Thomas Fröhlich and Yishan Liu 2011, 93–127.
- Hsiao, A-chin 蕭阿勤. 2010. *Huigui xianshi: Taiwan yijiu qiling niandai de zhanhou shidai yu wenhua zhengzhi bianqian (dierban)* 回歸現實——臺灣一九七〇年代的戰後世代與文化政治變遷 (第二版). Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan shehuixue yanjiusuo.
- . 2012. *Chonggou Taiwan: dangdai minzu zhuyi de wenhua zhengzhi* 重構台灣：當代民族主義的文化政治. Taipei: Lianjing.
- Huang Chunming 黃春明. 1973. "Sha yao nuo la, zaijian" 莎啞娜啦。再見, *Wenji* 文季 1973. 1, 97–131.
- . 1978. "Yige zuozhe de beibi xinling" 一個作者的卑鄙心靈, *Xiachao* 夏潮 1978. 23, 57–62.
- Huang Deshi 黃得時. 1972. "Taiwan guangfu qianhou de wenyi huodong yu minzu-xing" 台灣光復前後的文藝活動與民族性, *Xin wenyi* 新文藝 1972. 190, 37–47.
- Huang Huangxiong 黃煌雄. 1976. *Taiwan de xianzhi xianjue zhe: Jiang Weishi xiansheng* 台灣的先知先覺者——蔣渭水先生. Taipei: Self-published.
- . 1977. *Taibao kang Ri shihua* 台胞抗日史話. Taipei: Self-published.
- . 1978a. *Guomindang wang hechu qu?* 國民黨往何處去? Taipei: Changqiao.
- (ed.). 1978b. *Bei yapo zhe de nuhou: Jiang Weishui xiansheng xuanji* 被壓迫者的怒吼——蔣渭水先生選集. Taipei: Changqiao.
- . 1978c. *Geming jia: Jiang Weishui* 革命家——蔣渭水. Taipei: Changqiao.
- . 1980. *Dao Minzhu zhi lu* 到民主之路. Taipei: Self-published.
- . 1980 (1977). "Jinnian wuxiang gongzhi xuanju de lishi yiyi" 今年五項公職選舉的歷史意義, in Huang Huangxiong 1980, 7–13.
- Hu, Huiling. 2013. *Bainian zhuiqiu: Taiwan minzhu yundong de gushi* 百年追求——台灣民主運動的故事, *juan san* 卷三: "Minzhu de langchao" 民主的浪潮. Taipei: Weicheng.
- Jacobs, J. Bruce. 2012. *Democratizing Taiwan*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jaspers, Karl T. 1953 (1949) *The Origin and Goal of History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

- Kleeman, Faye Yuan. 2003. *Under an Imperial Sun: Japanese Colonial Literature of Taiwan and the South*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i.
- Lau, Joseph Shaoming. 1983. "Echoes of the May Fourth Movement in *Hsiang-t'u Fiction*," in Tien Hung-mao 1983, 135–150.
- Li Ang 李昂. 1975. "Xiyue de beimin: Yang Qingchu fangwen" 喜悅的悲憫——楊青矗訪問, *Shuping shumu* 書評書目 1975. 24, 74–87.
- . 1976. *Qunxiang: Zhongguo dangdai yishujia fangwen* 群像——中國當代藝術家訪問. Taipei: Dahan.
- Li Nanheng 李南衡 (ed.). 1979. *Riju xia Taiwan xin wenxue, mingji* 日據下台灣新文學, 明集. Taipei: Mingtan.
- Li Xiaofeng 李筱峰. 1987. *Taiwan minzhu yundong sishinian* 台灣民主運動 40 年. Taipei: Zili wanbao.
- Lin Zaijue 林載爵. 1974. "Riju shidai Taiwan wenxue de huigu" 日據時代台灣文學的回顧. *Wenji* 文季 1974. 3, 133–165.
- Lin Zhengjie 林正杰. 1978. "Wode zhengzhi jianjie: Huang Huangxiong fangwen ji" 我的政治見解——黃煌雄訪問記, *Zheyidai zazhi* 這一代雜誌 1978. 15, 53–57.
- Liu Ruojun 劉若君. 1973. "Zhong Lihe duanpian xiaoxhuo duhou" 鍾理和短篇小說讀後, *Wenji* 文季 1973. 2, 77–81.
- Lü Xiulian 呂秀蓮. 1979. *Taiwan de guoqu yu weilai* 台灣的過去與未來. Taipei: Tuohuang zhe.
- Lü Zhenghui 呂正惠. 1995. *Zhanhou Taiwan wenxue jingyan* 戰後台灣文學經驗. Taipei: Xindi.
- . 1995 (1992). "Qi, baling niandai Taiwan xianshi zhuyi wenxue de daolu" 七、八〇年代台灣現實主義文學的道路, in Lü Zhenghui 1995, 49–73.
- Lung, Kwan-hai. 1963. "Shehuixue zai Zhongguo de diwei yu zhiwu" 社會學在中國的地位與職務, *Guoli Taiwan daxue shehui xuekan* 國立臺灣大學社會學刊 1963.1, 1–19.
- Makeham, John, and A-chin Hsiau (eds.). 2005. *Cultural, Ethnic, and Political Nationalism in Contemporary Taiwan: Bentubua*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mukooyama, Hiroo. 1999 (1987). *Riben tongzhi xia de Taiwan minzu yundong shi* 日本統治下的台灣民族運動史. Translated by Yang Hongru 楊鴻儒 et al. Taipei: Fulushou.
- Pavel, Thomas. 1996. "Exile as Romance and as Tragedy," *Poetics Today* 1996.17 (3), 305–315.
- Qiu Weijun 丘為君 and Chen Lianshun 陳連順 (eds.). 1978. *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue huigu* 中國現代文學回顧. Taipei: Longtian.
- Rigger, Shelley. 2001. *From Opposition to Power: Taiwan's Democratic Progressive Party*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Roy, Denny. 2003. *Taiwan: A Political History*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

- Said, Edward W. 1994a. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1994b. “Intellectual Exile: Expatriates and Marginals,” in Said 1994a, 47–64.
- Shi Junmei 史君美 (Tang Wenbiao 唐文標). 1973. “Lai xiai Zhong Lihe” 來喜愛鍾理和, *Wenji* 文季 1973. 2, 60–76.
- Taiwansheng wenxian weiyuanhui 台灣省文獻委員會 (ed.). 1990. *Taiwanshi* 台灣史. Taipei: Zhongwen.
- Tang Wenbiao 唐文標. 1973. “Shi de moluo: Xianggang Taiwan xinshi de lishi pipan” 詩的沒落—香港台灣新詩的歷史批判, *Wenji* 文季 1973. 1, 12–42.
- Tien Hung-mao. 1983. *Mainland China, Taiwan, and U.S. Policy*. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.
- . 1989. *The Great Transition: Political and Social Change in the Republic of China*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Wakabayashi, Masahiro 若林正文. 2007 (2001). *Taiwan kang Ri yundongshi yanjiu* 台灣抗日運動史研究. Taipei: Xinziran zhuyi.
- Wang Jinjiang 王錦江 (Wang Shilang 王詩琅). 1964. “Riju shiqi de Taiwan xinwenxue” 日據時期的台灣新文學, *Taiwan wenyi* 台灣文藝 1964.1 (3), 49–58.
- Wang Hongjiu 王紘久 (Wang Tuo 王拓). 1973. “Yixie youlu: tan Ouyang Zi de ‘qiuye’” 一些憂慮—談歐陽子的「秋葉」, *Wenji* 文季 1973.1, 76–82.
- Wang Tuo 王拓. 1978 (1977). “Shi ‘xianshi zhuyi’ wenxue, bushi ‘xiangtu wenxue’” 是「現實主義」文學, 不是「鄉土文學」, in Yu Tiancong 1978b, 100–119.
- Wang Xingqing 王杏慶 et al. 1971. “Zhe shi juexing de shihou le” 這是覺醒的時候了. *Daxue zazhi* 大學雜誌 1971.47, 23.
- Wong Jiayin 翁佳音. 2007 (1986). *Taiwanren wuzhuang kang Ri shi yanjiu* 台灣漢人武裝抗日史研究. Taipei: Daoxiang.
- Wu Jiabang 吳嘉邦. 1978. “Yougan liangci danren jingxuan zongganshi” 有感兩次擔任競選總幹事, *Zheyidai zazhi* 這一代雜誌 1978.13, 11–13.
- Wu Yingtao 吳瀛濤. 1971. “Gaishu guangfu qian de Taiwan wenxue (I)” 概述光復前的台灣文學 (一), *Youshi wenyi* 幼獅文藝 1971. 216, 274–282.
- . 1972. “Gaishu guangfu qian de Taiwan wenxue (II)” 概述光復前的台灣文學 (二), *Youshi wenyi* 幼獅文藝 1972. 221, 54–60.
- Xu Shikai 許世楷. 2006 (1972). *Riben tongzhi xia de Taiwan* 日本統治下的台灣. Taipei: Yushanshe.
- Yang Bichuan 楊碧川. 1988. *Riju shidai Taiwanren fankangshi* 日據時代台灣人反抗史. Taipei: Daoxiang.
- Yang Kui 楊逵. 1973 (1937). “Mofan cun” 模範村, *Wenju* 文季 1973. 2, 105–142.
- Yang Qingchu 楊青矗. 1978. *Bisheng de huixiang* 筆聲的迴響. Kaohsiung: Dunli.
- Yang Ziqiao 羊子喬 and Chen Qianwu 陳千武 (eds.). 1982. *Guangfu qian Taiwan wanxue quanji*, 9–12 juan 光復前台灣文學全集, 9–12 卷. Taipei: Yuanjing.

- Yao Jiawen 姚嘉文. 1978. "Meigeren douyou quanli shuohua" 每個人都有權利說話, in He Wenzhen 1978, 13-15.
- Ye Shitao 葉石濤. 1965. "Taiwan de xiangtu wenxue" 台灣的鄉土文學, *Wenxing* 文星 1965. 97, 70-73.
- . 1987. *Taiwan wenxue shigang* 台灣文學史綱. Kaoshiung: Wenxuejie.
- Yu Tiancong 尉天驄. 1973. "Manmu yanshi bu liao wugou: dui xiandai zhuyi de kaocha, jianping Ouyang Zi de 'qiu ye'" 幔幕掩飾不了污垢——對現代主義的考察, 兼評歐陽子的「秋葉」, *Wenji* 文季 1979. 1, 61-75.
- . 1978a. "Xihua de wenxue" 西化的文學, in Qiu Weijun and Chen Lianshun 1978, 155-166.
- . 1978b. *Xiangtu wenxue taolun ji* 鄉土文學討論集. Taipei: Yuanliu.
- Zhang Junhong 張俊宏. 1977. *Wo de chensi yu fendou: liangqian ge jianao de rizi* 我的沈思與奮鬥——兩千個煎熬的日子. Taipei: Shelf-published.
- . 1978a. "Xinshengdai de tiaozhan" 新生代的挑戰, *Zheyidai zazhi* 這一代雜誌 1978. 9, 17-18.
- . 1978b. "Guomindang wang hechu qu xuwen: zhipeizhe yi shi jingzhengzhe?" 國民黨往何處去序文——支配者亦是競爭者?, *Zheyidai zazhi* 這一代雜誌 1978. 14, 51-52.
- Zhang Liangze 張良澤. 1973. "Zhong Lihe de wenxue guan" 鍾理和的文學觀, *Wenji* 文季 1973. 2, 48-59.
- Zhao, Xunda 趙勳達. 2011. *Kuangbiao shike: Rizhi shidai Taiwan xinwenxue de gaofengqi (1930-1937)* 狂飆時刻——日治時代台灣新文學的高峰期 (1930-1937). Tainan: Guoli Taiwan wenxueguan.
- Zhao Zhiti 趙知悌 (ed.). 1976a. *Wenxue xiuzou: xiandai wenxue de kaocha* 文學行走——現代文學的考察. Taipei: Yuanxing.
- Zhao Zhiti 趙知悌. 1976b. "Xu" 序, in Zhao Zhiti 1976a, 1-13.
- Zheng Nanrong 鄭南榕. 1982. "'Zhen youli' de zhengzhi sixiangjia: Huang Huangxiong: fangwen Huang Huangxiong" 「真有力」的政治思想家——黃煌雄: 訪問黃煌雄, *Zhengzhi jia* 政治家 1982. 26, 6-12.
- Zhong Lihe 鍾理和. 1973 (1959). "Pinjian fuqi" 貧賤夫妻, *Wenji* 文季 1973. 2, 82-90.
- Zhong Zhaozheng 鍾肇政 and Ye Shitao 葉石濤 (eds.). 1979. *Guangfu qian Taiwan wenxue quanji* 光復前台灣文學全集. Taipei: Yuanjing.
- Zhuang Junqing 莊俊清. 1977. "Yige dangyuan han minxuan yiyuan de zhenxinhua: Xu Xinliang 'Fengyu zhibeng' shujie 一個黨員和民選議員的真心話——許信良「風雨之聲」書介, *Xiachao* 夏潮 1977.2 (6), 59-62.
- Ziyou Zhongguo bianji weiyuanhui 自由中國編輯委員會. 1957. "Jiri de wenti (er): Fanggong dalu wenti" 今日的問題 (二)——反攻大陸問題, *Ziyou Zhongguo* 自由中國 1957.17 (3), 69-71.