

Taiwan and its Self-Images: The Case of Osaka Exhibition in 1903*

Sae-bong Ha**

ABSTRACT

In the 1903 Osaka Exhibition, imperial Japan established a Taiwan Pavilion to show off her accomplishments in colonial enterprise. Like those reports of Japanese colonial bureaucrats from Taiwan to the homeland, the primary goal of the exhibits in the Taiwan Pavilion was to boast of Japan's successful colonial rule. However, there were several bureaucrats of the Taiwan Government-general who felt marginalized by the metropolitan authorities. And such peculiar mentality was reflected in some of the exhibitions in the Taiwan Pavilion. For instance, the Japanese colonial officials took pains to minimize the display of opium-smoking and foot-binding because they were concerned that such uncivilized habits might cause the Japanese to misconstrue that Taiwan was a land of savages. Despite their well-intentioned efforts, the Taiwan Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition generated little or no interests among the Japanese people at large. The exhibition failed to change Japanese negligence toward and contempt for Taiwan. It was due to such disappointment and malcontent that ironically led the Japanese who lived in Taiwan to identify with the Taiwanese people. This "common identity" later developed into what was known as the "Taiwan-oriented Regionalism" in the 1930s.

Keywords: 1903 Osaka Exhibition, the Taiwan Pavilion, Japanese colonial bureaucrats, image of Taiwan, Taiwan-oriented Regionalism

* This work was supported by Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation Grant.

** Research Professor, Pusan National University, Korea

1. Introduction
 2. The Mentality of Those Who Constructed the Taiwan Pavilion
 3. Spatial layout of the Taiwan Pavilion
 4. Symbols of the Taiwan Pavilion
 5. Displays of Taiwanese Traditions and Customs
 6. Conclusion
-

1. Introduction

The Fifth National Industrial Exhibition held in 1903 at Osaka (lately known as the Osaka Exhibition) is tremendously meaningful in the history of exhibition of modern East Asia. Japan is the first Asian country simulating Western exhibitions. The Osaka Exhibition was the fifth exhibition in a series of exhibitions started in 1877 the first industrial Exhibition and including exhibitions in 1881, 1890, as well as 1895. The Osaka Exhibition was the biggest exhibition in the Meiji period. The opening of the Osaka Exhibition was under the slogan, “fukoku kyōhei” (富國強兵), meaning “rich country, strong army.” The exhibition was thus held on an even greater scale compared to the previous exhibitions in terms of landscape size and the numbers of display items and visitors. In addition, it was the last exhibition held by the central government; afterwards, exhibitions were held by local governments or organs of the mass medias. More importantly, it was the first exhibition held since Japan has claimed a colonial empire. The Osaka Exhibition was the model for other exhibitions held in East Asia, and several countries in East Asia lately hosted their very own exhibitions.

Taiwan regularly appeared in the exhibitions since the Osaka Exhibition. After becoming a colony of Japan, Taiwan sporadically showed its tea products in many Western exhibitions but it was first displayed as a whole for a culture body in the Osaka Exhibition. Taiwan’s image in the Osaka Exhibition became the prototype for colonies of Japan as well as a model for exhibitions held in Japan since that time. Also, the exhibition experience inspired the foundation for Taiwan Fair (臺灣共進會) in 1915 and the Taiwan Exhibition (臺灣博覽會) in

1935. In short, the Osaka Exhibition was inspiring to exhibitions later in Japan and Taiwan.

The basic purpose of exhibitions in modern Japan was the promotion of industry (殖産興業). The exhibition's focus would be showing the variety of industrial products. Furthermore, the images of participating nations or locals were also created in exhibitions through pavilions and the other accompanying events on displays. Those images were massively circulated to millions of visitors. Within such process, an important question raises: what was the image of Taiwan in the Taiwan Pavilion in the Osaka Exhibition as well as in the Japanese exhibitions afterwards? The historians Shao-li Lu and Rong Liu have responded to similar question in critical views. By Lu's main points, the Si he yuan (四合院) type of the Taiwan Pavilion represented the impression of Taiwan that the Japanese understood and imagined. In addition, Taiwan's images were also fulfilled with industrial indications by every kinds of statistics, photos, pictures, and samples. The way of demonstration clearly showed that Taiwan was a prototypical colony for Japan in terms of political propaganda. The Taiwan Pavilion as political propaganda in subsequent exhibitions was reproduced and transformed into Taiwan as commercial advertising.⁽¹⁾ Liu also included all kinds of foreign exhibitions displayed and analyzed Taiwan's various cultural and political aspects. He concluded that an authentic "Taiwan of China," with its exotic mood, was produced in the Osaka Exhibition, but after that, it was transformed by the Japanese into the image "Taiwan of Japan."⁽²⁾ Summary of these two scholars is extremely simplified. As the Osaka Exhibition has a lot of various aspects, these scholars have to deal with a variety of facets of the meaning of that exhibition.

However, previous studies on Taiwan in the Osaka Exhibition sometimes overlooked the Taiwanese historical context. As the Osaka Exhibition stands for the transformation of the Japanese as well as Taiwanese historical contexts, the Taiwan's show-case in the Osaka Exhibition cannot be understood as a whole unless the Japanese context is fully taking into consideration. Only one study did such job, Matsuda mentioned the native culture in the Taiwan Pavilion

(1) Shao-li Lu, *Zhan shi Taiwan* [Exhibiting Taiwan] (Taipei: Maitian chu ban, 2005), pp. 113-151.

(2) Rong Liu, "Ri zhi shi ji Taiwan can zhan dao wai bo lan hui zhi yanjiu [Study on the Abroad Exhibition at Colonial Taiwan]" (MA thesis, Graduate Institute of History, National Chi Nan University, 2003).

was appreciated by the Japanese and felt please to them. She however made no distinction between the Japanese in Taiwan and the visitors in Japan. The author treated all Japanese visitors as a homogeneous group.⁽³⁾

Taiwan was a Japanese colony at that time. Therefore, it is necessary to examine those who portrayed Taiwan for the Osaka Exhibition, for their historical and cultural backgrounds as well as biases. Their mentality of depicting Taiwan would affect various aspects overtime. By looking into their mind, this study will focus on several issues: on what position Taiwan stood for the exhibition scope; what kind of architectural style was selected as the symbol of Taiwan at the pavilion; and how the characteristics were selected to demonstrate Taiwanese public cultures and folk tradition. It was imperative to pay attention to designers' mentality of the exhibition and its result. Through the sense and perception in their designs as well as decorations, the exhibitions were more than a place showing Taiwanese images. It was a process to form the mentality of the Japanese in Taiwan and mutually enhanced it. Moreover, by the case of the Taiwan Pavilion in the Osaka Exhibition and in the light of how the Taiwan Pavilion was changed since the 1920s and 30s, this study will properly place the Taiwan Pavilion in the Osaka Exhibition in a more adequate historical context.

2. The Mentality of Those Who Constructed the Taiwan Pavilion

The central government had promoted exhibitions in Japan from the first to the fifth exhibition. As soon as the decision was made to open the Osaka Exhibition, the process of construction of exhibition buildings and displays was soon on work. To the central government, the setting of the Taiwan Pavilion was essential for its people to realize the power of empire and the fact that Japan is already ranked as an empire due to its first colonial acquisition. In an exhibition pamphlet about the Taiwan Pavilion, it was stated that "it has already been 10 years since Taiwan was recognized in our territory, but only a few people who knows Taiwan belongs to Japan. The nation-state notion doesn't seem to include Taiwan yet, especially at this moment. While we set up this (Taiwanese) pavil-

(3) Kyōko Matsuda, *Teikoku no shisen* [Eyes of Empire] (Tokyo: Yoshikawakoubunkan, 2003), p. 72.

ion, gathering its productions into one place, and let people understand the conditions of that land, we intend to make people the notion about Taiwan's richness."⁽⁴⁾ It may consider the intention of the central government which publicly and strongly stated the fact that Taiwan is a Japanese territory as "the nation-state notion." Since Japan was an empire ruling Taiwan as a colony, it was necessary to expand the previous nation-state identity and form a new empire identity. The Taiwanese pavilion was second to none as material for figuring this new identity.

In addition, the Taiwanese Governor-general aggressively set up a Taiwanese pavilion before the central government asked for participation to exhibitions. The colonial government tried to "set up an independent Taiwanese pavilion, to show all of the general new-land status quo, to be marked at home and abroad." To the colonial government in Taiwan, its main purpose was to wipe out negative images about Taiwan. The Japanese in Taiwan thought that "since it was ruled by Japan, it has been subjugated several times and enlightened, so there were no further traces of thieves and gangs, aborigines also followed the guidance and modern industry gradually improved as well. Also, the waste-land of endemic diseases has entirely been changed to a safe paradise." They felt disagree that "people in the homeland don't know about the real situation in detail and they considered Taiwan as a place where ghost tribes and cannibals lived."⁽⁵⁾

This was the atmosphere at the Colonial Exhibition (拓植博覽會) in Tokyo from October to November of 1912. "The colonization thought of our country's people is immature and they imagine Taiwan as a very hot place crowded with many endemic diseases, and even don't know how much its industries have changed."⁽⁶⁾ Setting up a Taiwanese pavilion in the Colonial Exposition obviously meant to change the negative image of Taiwan within the Japanese. In addition, such efforts also intended to emphasize the importance of Taiwan among Japa-

(4) Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Yōran Hensansho, *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai yōran* [Hand Book of Fifth National Industrial Exhibition] (Osaka: Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Yōran Hensansho, 1903), p. 264.

(5) Akira Tsukide, ed., *Taiwankan* [Taiwan Pavilion] (Taipei: Taiwan supporting association for Fifth National Industrial Exhibition, 1903), p. 1.

(6) Takushoku Hakurankai Zammu Toriatzukaijo, ed., *Takushoku hakurankai hōkoku* [Report of Development Exhibition] (Tokyo: Takushoku Hakurankai, 1913), p. 4.

nese colonies. Looking into *Taiwan Association Newsletter* (臺灣協會會報), there were many cases for deploring the image of Taiwan, especially to those well circulated in Japan, by pointing out the importance of Taiwan. The attempt remained lasted to the setting of the Taiwan Pavilion in the Osaka Exhibition. In general, there was a common emotion of the Japanese in colonial Taiwan to against the negative images about Taiwan in Japan.

The colonial authorities of Taiwan organized the exhibition committee of the Taiwanese pavilion. The Taiwan Customs Research Society (臺灣慣習研究會) and the Taiwan Association (臺灣協會) played key roles in the administrative work for displays. The Taiwan Customs Research Society was founded to study Taiwanese folk habits and customs, citing references for administrative law and other works in November, 1900. The society had more than 1,500 members in 1903. While the Taiwan Customs Research Society remained a private body, the Taiwan Association, in charge of similar research as the Taiwan Customs Research Society, was founded in 1901 as a governmental organization.⁽⁷⁾ Although the Taiwan Customs Research Society had many members, scholastic groups carried out essential research and only a few scholars had the privilege to prepare for exhibitions. The Taiwan Association was the organization actually had political power and sited at the center for the promotion of Taiwan and recruiting manpower. The Taiwan Association was mainly composed by military personals, politicians, scholars, businessmen and newspaper reporters those who had been involved in the early stages of Japan's invasion and colonization of Taiwan. After it was organized in April, 1897, the Taiwanese branch of the Taiwan Association was formed in Taipei in February, 1898. The association had about 300 members including Gentaro Kodama (兒玉源太郎) current Governor-general, the Chief of Civil Administration (民政長官), the Taipei Province Governor (臺北縣知事), and the Chief of Staff of the Army (陸軍參謀長) and so forth. Almost all of the influential Japanese in Taiwan participated. The member of the Taiwan Association was the same people took over the task of ruling Taiwan. For the Taiwanese pavilion, the displays were planned and the setting-up of the pavilion was embodied under the supervision of senior bureaucrats. The professional group and the group which was directly related to ruling

(7) Yukio Yamane, *Kindai chōgoku to nihon* [Modern China and Japan] (Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1976), pp. 82-85.

Taiwan were involved in the Taiwanese displays.

These men were eager to change images of Taiwan among the Japanese in homeland. If that hypothesis sustained, it should be the reflection of the mentality of senior colonial bureaucrats in Taiwan by possessing positive images in exhibitions. That mentality was a collective consciousness, that is, the Japanese in Taiwan were non-central and non-mainstream. To date, a few researchers have intermittently made short mention of non-central and non-mainstream characteristics of the Japanese in Taiwan in the early occupation period.⁽⁸⁾

Referring the historical documents on the Japanese in Taiwan in the 1930s, the senior bureaucrats of the colonial authority of Taiwan, such as directors, heads of departments, and mayors had various local origins but most of them graduated from Tokyo Imperial University. For example, 8 out of 9 directors, 6 out of 10 heads of departments, and 5 out of 15 mayors were from Tokyo Imperial University.⁽⁹⁾ Therefore it is hard to say that the senior bureaucrats of the colonial authority of Taiwan were non-mainstream in the Japanese bureaucratic society in the 1930s. However, this was not the case in the period just before or after 1900. During the early occupation period, the rule in Taiwan was still unstable and Taiwan remained a mysterious world to the Japanese. The bureaucrats to Taiwan around 1900 were very different from the Japanese bureaucrats in Taiwan in the 1930s.

The Official List of the Civil Administration of Taiwan Sōtokufu (臺灣總督府民政局職員錄) in 1897 records 319 bureaucrats in the civil administration. This information includes their hometowns and social status. Most of them were high-ranking officials, directors or managers of bureaus. After counting their hometowns except those who held two or more positions concurrently, Tokyo (東京) ranked first with 74 bureaucrats, followed by Kagoshima (鹿兒島) 24, Kumamoto (熊本) and Nagano (長野) both 15; Miyagi (宮城) the 7th of 11 bureau-

(8) Mi-cha Wu, "Li shi' de chu xian [Emergence of the History]," in Fu-san Huang etc., eds., *Taiwan shi yan jiu yi bai nian* [An Anthology Commemorating a Century of Taiwan Historical Research] (Taipei: Preparatory Office, Institute of Taiwan History, 1997), p. 16; Mei-rong Lin, "Zhiminzhe dui zhimindi de fengsu jilu-'taifengzaji' weili [Report on Colony by Colonialist—the Case of 'Miscellaneous for Taiwan Customs']," *Japanese Colonialism and East Asian Anthropology; The 2nd Conference at Seoul, 2003.11*, p. 194, introduction of Zhiwan Liu (劉枝萬)'s study; Tōru Yano, *Nanshin no keihu* [Genealogy of Southing] (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1975), p. 65.

(9) Tonan Sumiya, *Taiwan jinshi no hyōbanki* [Reputation of Tawanese] (Taipei: Nanbukōronsha, 1937), pp. 1-34.

crats, Iwate (岩手) the 17th of 5, and Fukushima (福島) ranked the 18th with only 4 bureaucrats. In modern Japan, Tohoku (東北) comprising Miyagi, Iwate and Fukushima, is considered an underdeveloped area. It is also necessary to pay attention to that 14 bureaucrats from Hokkaido (北海道), placed it's the 5th position overall with 14 personals.⁽¹⁰⁾ It is revealing to compare these statistics to the number of university students in these respective prefectures in 1898. It was after 1887 that the graduates from Tokyo Imperial University were hired in massive amounts. Since the appointment system for high civil servants (高等文官任用制度) was begun in 1887, it is considered that the era of academic clique (學閥) started around this period.⁽¹¹⁾ Examining the rank of the number of university students in respective prefectures based on the statistics in 1898, Miyagi in Tohoku ranked the 15th, Fukushima the 19th, and Iwate ranked the 30th. The number of university students from 10 different universities, such as Imperial Universities and military academies, also shows that Miyagi ranked the 17th, Fukushima the 24th, and Iwate ranked the 36th. Fukuoka (福岡) and Yamaguchi (山口) occupied the 1st and the 2nd places next to Tokyo. Fukuoka, Yamaguchi, and Tokyo all were leading regions during the Meiji restoration.⁽¹²⁾

Comparing the number of bureaucrats of the civil administration of Taiwan Sōtokufu (臺灣總督府) to the number of university students based on their hometown, excluding Tokyo, bureaucrats in the civil administration from Kagoshima ranked the first and Yamaguchi the second, and the total numbers of university students followed the same pattern. Therefore, it is hard to determine that people from Tohoku among the senior bureaucrats of Taiwan Sōtokufu were the majority, but many bureaucrats from the leading of the Meiji Restoration were obvious. Though, the geographic distribution as shows the number of university students that Miyagi ranked the 7th, Iwate the 17th, and Fukushima the 18th. The analysis suggests that many from these prefectures lately became bureaucrats in Taiwan. To this point, the fact that 14 people from Hokkaido suggests

(10) Taiwan Sōtokufu Minseikyoku Sōmubu, *Taiwan Sōtokufu minseikyoku shokuinroku: Meiji 30 nen 7 gatsu genzai* [The Official List of the Civil Administration of Taiwan Sōtokufu] (Taipei: Taiwan Sōtokufu, 1897), pp. 14-38.

(11) Ikuo Amano, *Gakureki no shakaishi—kyōiku to nihon no kindai* [Social History of Diplomatism] (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1992), p. 19.

(12) Kazu Masayama, *Hanbatsu no shōrai* [Future of Bakuhu Nobles] (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1899), pp. 39-40, 65-66.

that there were comparatively many high-ranking Taiwan officials from alienated areas from the center of political power. These analyses point that the Japanese in Taiwan were non-central and non-mainstream Japanese from their counterparts in Japan.⁽¹³⁾

Why were these bureaucrats sent out to Taiwan? Or, why did they apply for positions in Taiwan? A newspaper holding critical views on the Taiwan Governor-general Gentaro Kodama and the Civil Governor Shimpei Gotō (後藤新平) at that time, criticized them for acting like feudal lords in the era of feudalism by example of decorating their houses like palaces. The headline of the critique was “Paradise in the Southern Sea; Taiwan Officials’ Arrogance and Extravagance.”⁽¹⁴⁾ This article was impressively critical, and the privileges for Taiwan officers were written as follows: “first, there are special bonuses in addition to regular wages. Secondly, they can use a house free, and thirdly the pension terms are reduced 50% and so they can receive the pension after only 10 years of service. Next, high-ranking officers go out to the West at government expense, and they take half the morning’s off 150 days every year in order to rest.” Besides, there was other corruption as well. Describing it as a paradise surely goes too far, but it is possible to guess that special treats above and beyond their regular economical benefits were the factors to make them work in Taiwan. Actually, it was regulated that the bureaucrats of Taiwan Sōtokufu received more 3% of monthly wages.⁽¹⁵⁾

The episode related to Shimpei Gotō who picked out a capable man, partially reveals the psychology of bureaucrats to Taiwan. The story of how Hanbei Nakao (長尾半平) was scouted and hired to build Jilong harbor (基隆港) is interesting. Gotō’s friendship with Nakao started at his duty in Saitama prefecture (埼玉縣) as an engineering manager, and he offered him such position in Taiwan. Yet the Saitama Governor (埼玉縣知事) would not let him leave. Such decision very resented Gotō, he was pounding the desk and shouting “Taiwan is about to be paid attention from the world as a new land, and so it is inevitable to cleanly achieve its management and development. Therefore, most of all, we

(13) If include lower bureaucrats, Kagoshima ranked first. Shao-li Lu, *Zhan shi Taiwan*, p. 105.

(14) Kintarō Itō, *Shinryōdo kaihatsu to gotōshimpei* [Development New Territory and Gotō Shimpei] (Tokyo: Showashobō, 1937), pp. 24-26.

(15) Taiwan Sōtokufu Minseikyoku Sōmubu, *Taiwan Sōtokufu minseikyoku shokuinroku*, p. 5.

need superior talented men. However, it is quite sure that he doesn't understand the Japanese mission clearly because a mere homeland-prefecture put up its difficult conditions like this. For building up Great Taiwan, the condition of Saitama prefecture may be sacrificed. I will teach that governor a lesson such as a man who doesn't catch that mission."⁽¹⁶⁾ With this case, we can infer that a bureaucrat consciousness fed up with contribution to the expansion of Japanese empire, and it might not be limited to one person Gotō, but more spread over high-ranking bureaucrats in Taiwan Sōtokufu.

Moreover, high-ranking bureaucrats in Taiwan Sōtokufu were young. Kodama was appointed to the Government-general when he was 47 years old, Gotō only 42, and the Chief Councilor (參事官長) Eizō Ishizuka (石塚英藏) 33—he was responsible for major legislation. Worrying the damage of the dignity of Japan, Gotō and Ishizuka headed up a successful dismissal of advisors against the decision of the central government which tried to call in Kirkwood as a special advisor for the rule in Taiwan.⁽¹⁷⁾ This incident shows how much pride they had of themselves as elite young bureaucrats with ambition and capabilities. High-ranking bureaucrats full of consciousness of royal summons could not tolerate easygoingness and idleness of low-ranking bureaucrats. “The people who came over to Taiwan in the early years and became officers by chance didn't hold any leadership as administrators. Most of them thought there was some way to make money, and it was prevailed that these chances were stepping stones for administrators to succeed.” It was thus said, “there wasn't anyone among Taiwanese bureaucrats who investigated every place in Taiwan and were knowledgeable about its geographical conditions.”⁽¹⁸⁾ Kodama and Gotō undertook to immerse themselves in the curtailment of discharging even 1,080 bureaucrats after their inauguration to Taiwan, and that was considered reformatory execution based on their sense of duty and ambition.

As mentioned above, *The Official List of Civil Administration of Taiwan Sōtokufu* recorded the original statuses for 319 bureaucrats as Samurai (士) or Commoner (平民), with those of Samurai origin account for 205 men and Com-

(16) Kintarō Itō, *Shinryōdo kaihatsu to gotōshimpei*, pp. 364-365.

(17) Shiromizu Hashimoto, *Taiwan tōji to sono kōrōsha* [Govern Taiwan and the Contributor] (Taipei: Nangoku Shuppan Kyōkai, 1930), pp. 170-172.

(18) Masayoshi Hukuda, *Gotō Shimpei* (Tokyo: Manshō Nichinichi Shimbunsha Tokyoshisha Shuppanbu, 1943), pp. 149-150.

moners account for 114. Origin status was classified into Aristocrat (華), Samurai, and Commoner. In 1879, 0.01% of aristocrats, 5.2% of Samurai and 94.8% of Commoners accounted for the total population in Japan. In 1882, 0.2% of aristocrat, 51.6% of samurai and 48.2% of commoners accounted for total high school students.⁽¹⁹⁾ Comparing the status rate of the Civil Administration in Taiwan Sōtokufu to that of high school students, samurai ranked comparatively high, with 64% of the total bureaucrats. It is said that samurai identity was continued until the 1910s. For a very long time, it was common for samurai to be described in literary works as “lost deprivation” with their dominant positions of feudal age taken away. By the way, although samurai privileges based on their social status was deprived by a series of reforms in the early Meiji Restoration, “samurai spirit,” the so-called self-pride as a political elite, continued to exist even after the reform.⁽²⁰⁾ It can be said that elite identity of the young, high-ranking bureaucrats in Taiwan Sōtokufu was enhanced more on an extended string of samurai identity as they held a strong sense of obligation toward their nation or society.

3. Spatial layout of the Taiwan Pavilion

It does not mean that the image of Taiwan displayed through the Taiwan Pavilion is created and completed by the spatial layout itself. The Taiwan Pavilion composed a very small part of an enormous display in the Osaka Exhibition. Planning the Taiwan Pavilion spatial layout was affected a lot by the whole planning, spatial contents, and decorating style of the Osaka Exhibition. Also The Taiwan Pavilion planner referred to the spatial layout in style and in contents of the whole exhibition when designing the Taiwan Pavilion. Besides, spectators finally reached the Taiwan Pavilion after wandering over other places with enormous displays. Therefore, the image of Taiwan was defined as a part of the whole exhibition.

A guide for exhibitions recommended touring courses depending on days of visiting such as a one-day, 3-day, and 5-day tour. A one-day tour was: after

(19) Hiroshi Takeuchi, *Nihon no kindai 12: gakureki kizoku no eikō to zasetsu* [Modern Japan 12: Glory and Despair of Educated Nobles] (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha, 1999), p. 171; p. 173, table 26.

(20) Junji Sakano, *Taikei nihon no rekishi 13: kindai nihon no shuppatzu* [Grand History of Japan 13: Setout of Modern Japan] (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1989), pp. 91-92.

passing the main gate, it suggested an order following the Agriculture Pavilion→Forestry Pavilion, Fishery Pavilion→Transportation Pavilion→Machinery Pavilion→Reference Pavilion→Canada Pavilion→Art Pavilion→Taiwan Pavilion→Education Pavilion→Manufacturing Industry Pavilion→Musical Performance Pavilion→Mysterious Pavilion, Trademark Pavilion, etc. The respective 3-day and 5-day tours were similar and basically followed the one-day course as well.⁽²¹⁾ These tours were followed by the order: first Agriculture Pavilion, next Forestry Pavilion and Fishery Pavilion proceeded with calmness. Agriculture Pavilion displayed many agricultural products mainly focused on rice, bean and barley. Forestry Pavilion and Fishery Pavilion were displayed the same way as the Agriculture Pavilion but the products were traditional handcrafts. By the way, proceeding to Transportation Pavilion, Machinery Pavilion, Reference Pavilion, and Canada Pavilion, the scenes of the exhibition changed. When reaching the Transportation Pavilion, transportation facilities such as ships, sailing routes, locomotive engines, and so forth were displayed. The spectators were educated about civilization that usually appeared on the streets of large cities. After that, steam engines and chemical industry were displayed in the Machinery Pavilion. Spectators encountered boilers or dredging machines with a weight of up to 21 tons and taller than a human.⁽²²⁾ In the Reference Pavilion, joined by 14 nations, “Anyone entering the main pavilion was attracted by the gramophone of the Gramophone Typewriter Company.”⁽²³⁾ After passing the Reference Pavilion, the Art Pavilion led to the Taiwan Pavilion. The touring course recommended by another pamphlet was in the following order: Manufacturing Industry Pavilion→Agriculture Pavilion→Forestry Pavilion→Fishery Pavilion→Education Pavilion→Reference Pavilion→Machinery Pavilion→Transportation Pavilion→Art Pavilion→Taiwan Pavilion→Trademark Pavilion.⁽²⁴⁾ The Manufacturing Industry Pavilion was the greatest building among other pavilions, and displayed every manufacturing industry product classified by region silk, cotton goods, dyed and weaved goods, cement such as and pottery. Also, Tokyo Artil-

(21) Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Yōran Hensansho, *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai yōran*, pp. 150-160.

(22) *Ibid.*, pp. 238-239.

(23) “Rinjizōkan daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai zukai jyōhen [Picture of Fifth National Industrial Exhibition],” *Fōzoku gahō* [Genre Pictorial] 269 (Sep., 1903), p. 27.

(24) *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

lery Factory and Osaka Artillery Factory exhibited giant cannons and every kind of weapons around the Manufacturing Industry Pavilion. This tour finally led to the Taiwan Pavilion after touring everything “civilized.”

Regarding to “Taiwan Pavilion” one commentator described the Taiwan Pavilion in great details, “It is located on the northeast high hill from the exhibiting place and is brilliant, so it looks like a palace where an immortal lives and that’s the very essence of the Taiwan Pavilion.”⁽²⁵⁾ However, this description is merely rhetorical. Except for special cases, reports or news concerned about exhibitions hardly describe or evaluate them critically. That is because an exhibition itself has a motto to enhance friendship and friendly relations through competition and it goes without saying that its host country is concerned about maintaining good relations with its guests. The location of the Taiwan Pavilion was not satisfactory even to Japanese in Taiwan. As a contemporary newspaper reported,

Comparing the Taiwan Pavilion to a great and magnificent building, and to galactic and dizzy facilities in each pavilion, as a matter of fact, it was only assigned to a humble and narrow section located at a corner of exhibitions. Also it was inevitable for facilities in the pavilion to be considered to be very coarse. If evaluated by floor space, the Taiwan Pavilion was worse than foreign private pavilions and in terms of expenses, it is not the same as even the advertising tower.⁽²⁶⁾

The author of this article emphasized cheer and praise from spectators. However, compared to the tower of the tobacco company, that is, a tool in order to direct exhibition moods to be splendid, the Taiwan Pavilion looked shabby. Murai (村井) Tobacco Company put up a 70-meter-high tower and installed 15,000 watts floodlights on top of the advertising tower. It was said that the lights could be seen 50 kilometers away. In terms of illumination, the whole main pavilion was decorated with lights except the advertising tower, and the strong red lights were shot toward the fountain tower to make the water turn red.⁽²⁷⁾ The description revealing the pitiful Taiwan Pavilion as being in a narrow cor-

(25) Akira Tsukide, ed., *Taiwankan*, p. 2.

(26) Kunio Kimura, “Hakurankai bekkenki 5 [Sightsee Expo 5],” *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō* [Taiwan Daily News], 1903. 3. 11 (1).

(27) Mitsukuni Yoshida, *Kaiteiban mankoku hakurankai* [Revised Edition—World Fair] (Tokyo: NHK books, 1985), p. 142.

ner, and as being coarse, is close to the fact. The discontent that was generated by the Taiwan Pavilion being pushed to a corner was like being treated as a child by a concubine.⁽²⁸⁾

In the memory of visitors to the Taiwan Pavilion, strong aftershocks were left by seeing the new products of modern civilization at the Machinery Pavilion and Reference Pavilion. After entering the Taiwan Pavilion, spectators toured it with a view of modern civilization. Although the industrial technology in Taiwan had improved a lot since the colonial era began, there was no surprise to the people who had seen the splendid and enormous modern civilization on display in other exhibitions. An article about the Taiwan Pavilion in a Japanese homeland newspaper was regarded by Taiwan newspaper: “it didn’t report anything about most agricultural and industrial products, but praised in detail the wax models copying its customs or red and blue paintings of houses.”⁽²⁹⁾ The eyes of spectators were the same as mass media and there was little chance to learn about the successful colonial achievements in Taiwan. In addition to the merrymaking and amusement spaces were the last of the tours, spectators arrived at the Taiwan Pavilion at last, could be tired and lost their curiosity already. Finally, only wax models copying its customs or red and blue paintings of houses could catch their eyes.

The position of the Taiwan Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition was sitting on a remote corner. Such situation clearly showed the spatial structure of power—a place the first colony should be at. However, exhibitions in Japan changed quite a lot after the Osaka Exhibition. Thereafter, the colonies of Japan expanded to include Kwantōshū (關東州), Korea (朝鮮) and Taiwan, while Manchuria finally emerged as a occupied territory. At Tokyo Industrial Exhibition between March and July, 1907, the Taiwan Pavilion was no longer in a corner. This was quite different from the spatial layout at the Osaka Exhibition. However the Taiwan Pavilion was placed aside the pavilions for foreign products. It reflected the consciousness that Taiwan was still an outer territory (外地) opposed to Japanese homeland (內地).⁽³⁰⁾ At the Tokyo Exhibition for Honoring Peace in 1922,

(28) Inagaki, “Taiwankan 1 [Taiwan Pavilion 1],” *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.6.7 (1).

(29) HokushūShō, “Taiwankan no kachi [Virtue of Taiwan Pavilion],” *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.4.24 (2).

(30) Tokyo city, ed., *Tokyo yōran annai* [Guide for Tokyo Tour] (Tokyo: Tokyo city, 1907), pp. 286–289.

the Taiwan Pavilion was placed next to the Korea Pavilion and the Manchuria-Mongolia Pavilion. It clearly showed where colony must be located.

Interestingly, changes of the spatial layout in exhibitions had continued since the mid 1920s. The Nagoya Exhibition and Tokyo Exhibition in 1928 placed the Korea, Taiwan, Manchuria, and Mongolia Pavilions on the same roll. It means that the main stream was to place colony pavilions in discriminating spaces at Japanese exhibitions even in the 1920s. However, looking into the Great Osaka Exhibition (大大阪記念博覽會) in 1925, the Korea and Taiwan Pavilions were located in the west. Taiwan shops were just next to Bargain-sale Pavilion, and Taiwan-style tea shops were located at the eastern. The Panorama Pavilion and the Machinery Pavilion were the core spaces in this exhibition, and the difference in space disposition was great for these spacious displays in comparison to the Korea Pavilion and Machinery Pavilion.

This tendency clearly appeared when holding exhibitions in colonies. Examining the plot plan of the Korea Exhibition (朝鮮博覽會) in 1929, the Manchuria Exhibition in 1933, and the Taiwan Exhibition in 1935 as colony exhibitions, the Korea Pavilion, the Manchuria Pavilion, or the Taiwan Pavilion was mixed with Japanese-homeland City Pavilion. Considered from the standpoint of Imperial Japan, colonies were outer lands contrasted to homeland. However, from the viewpoint of a Japanese colony, the distinction between a homeland and a outer land turns out to be discrimination purposed on itself. Even though the subjects holding exhibitions were Japanese bureaucrats in colonies, the distinction between a homeland and a outer land results in discrimination. It is a situation far from desirable. The Japanese bureaucrats in colonies turned out to be the discriminated objects. At exhibitions in colonies, the Taiwan Pavilion or Korean Pavilion was assigned to a space as one area within the Empire of Japan, and also arranged and mixed with the Tokyo (東京館) and Osaka Pavilions (大阪館). This showed that as a local pavilion for expanding a market simultaneously together with the territory expansion of the Japanese Empire, the meaning of setting up a local pavilion changed to a more economical meaning.⁽³¹⁾

(31) Sae-bong Ha, "Mohyeongui Jeguk [Miniature of Japan Empire on Taiwan Expo at 1935]," *Dongyang sahak yengu* [Journal of Asian Historical Studies] 78 (2002), pp. 169-174.

4. Symbols of the Taiwan Pavilion⁽³²⁾

A square-shaped 5,300m space was assigned to Taiwan in the Osaka Exhibition. A pavilion is designed to its contents and to draw attention from spectators. In particular, the building for a special pavilion of a nation played a key role by its image as a nation. It thus needs to make the most strenuous efforts for plans and designs. The request from the Exhibition Bureau was to strike spectators with wonder. Of course, on the colonial authority of Taiwan as mentioned before, they had to consider how to symbolize Taiwan with particular buildings in order to change images of Taiwan in homeland Japan. Establishment of the Taiwan Pavilion was negotiated between Taiwan Sōtokufu and the Department of Agriculture and Commerce in Japan. They sought to build up a great building which could be preserved for a long time even after closing the exhibition and for future commemorations. However, due to the budget problems, the Taiwan Association came forward with support and rebuild Du qing tang (篤慶堂) for the exhibition. Du qing tang was chosen by the Taiwan Association for the reason: “a good building for representing Taiwan Island” and “the sculptures are elaborate.”⁽³³⁾ They decided to move and rebuild it in the Osaka Exhibition. The association’s request was rejected by Taiwan Sōtokufu because of budget problems and built an annex instead. The Taiwan Association persisted the original plan by sponsoring expenditures needs and finally received permission from the colonial government.⁽³⁴⁾ What image was created by Du qing tang? According to an article by *Taiwan Association Newsletter*, two images can be expressed.

They put up the Taiwan-style tower gate in the center, used this gate as an entrance, from here the corridor is branched and divided into right and left and then, appropriate this for item showcases and shops. There is a gate on the each side of the tower gate. There is a southern gate which is used as an entrance as well. For this, Taiwanese technical experts took every material necessary from

(32) Chapter 4 & 5 were reconstructed and written again on the basis of my following paper. Sae-bong Ha, “Sikminji imageui hyeongsungkwa mentality [The Making of Colonial Image and Mentality],” *Yeoksa hakbo* [The Korean Historical Review] 186 (2005), pp. 177-196.

(33) “Taiwankan [Taiwan Pavilion],” *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* [Taiwan Association Newsletter] 45 (June, 1902), pp. 47, 61.

(34) “Daigokai taiwan kyōkaitaikai [The Fifth Meeting of Taiwan Association],” *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 58 (July, 1903), p. 43.

Taiwan and built all of these. Accordingly, this structure was decorated with everything to the southern Chinese styles and became quite different from Japanese buildings. Also, since it was painted with various colors such as Prussian blue, dark green, black, red, and brown and flowers, birds, or figures were drawn on the walls or doors, most of all, it is enough to catch spectators' attention.⁽³⁵⁾

This article by *Taiwan Association Newsletter* accurately connected every facets of the Taiwan Pavilion with "southern China." It mentioned the entrance as "a Taiwan-style tower gate," but showcases and shops were all decorated in "southern Chinese styles." Obviously, the structure was expected different from Japanese buildings. Also, even in the next description about *Xi zi ting* (惜字亭) said, "Chinese traditionally respect every character very much, if the thing with a character written is thrown away on a street, Chinese consider the reason of sages to be despised and thus, they pick it out and put it into *Xi zi ting*." Description like this is well connected to Chinese customs. Also, it was said that wooden floors and rooms in original forms vividly show "appearances of Chinese (or Taiwanese) houses." Taiwanese culture is expressed by adding to Chinese in the parentheses. When entering wooden floors, all of the desks and coloring make the "feeling they are in China." It depicted that pictures of dragons and tigers drawn in Taiwan restaurants are also "purely Chinese style."⁽³⁶⁾ It is clear that the Taiwan Pavilion was different from Japan, and the different characteristics were Chinese in origin.

The expressions above were written in the Japanese Newspaper columns. However, in the Chinese columns about similar contents, "China" was altered to "Taiwan." In the Chinese columns, the Taiwan Pavilion is described as being all in a Taiwanese style and described in this way: "the buildings all copied Taiwanese styles. A tower gate was put up in front of the Taiwan district, and it imitated little south gate of Taipei castle."⁽³⁷⁾ This is not simple or the difference of accidental marks. In another Chinese column, there were some descriptions of the buildings of the Taiwan Pavilion or vegetation such as bananas and areca as being drawn as "surely a Taiwanese landscape."⁽³⁸⁾ Words expressed that "a lit-

(35) "Hakurankai kaikaigo no taiwankan [Taiwan Pavilion in the Expo]," *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 54 (March, 1903), p. 47.

(36) *Ibid.*, p. 47.

(37) *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 54, p. 52.

(38) *Ibid.*, p. 55.

tle Taiwan is reproduced vividly,”⁽³⁹⁾ or “there isn’t any difference from Taiwan houses, looking into the Taiwan Pavilion.”⁽⁴⁰⁾

While it was described that the Taiwan Pavilion symbolized Taiwanese styles, Taiwanese mood, and Taiwanese scenery, in the Chinese columns which Han Taiwanese read, they described the way that the Taiwan Pavilion showed Chinese styles, Southern Chinese styles, and customs of China in the Japanese columns. The visual representation was converted to Chinese or Taiwanese depending on who was looking at it. In other words, the Taiwan Pavilion appealed to Han Taiwanese not for Chinese styles but for Taiwanese styles, trying to wipe out their past memories that Taiwan was a territory of the Qing Dynasty. However, it appealed to Japanese for Chinese styles rather than Taiwanese-styles, satisfying their vanity that Japan acquired a part of China.

Kanori Ino (伊能嘉矩) who was a pioneer of Taiwan anthropology, didn’t think that Du qing tang is a good representative of Taiwanese architecture. Ino was a core member of the Taiwan Customs Research Society in 1900. He took orders from the Taiwan Sōtokufu, went on a business trip to Osaka, and stayed there for 3 months as an exhibiting committee member of the Osaka Exhibition. Ino had criticisms of Du qing tang. He thought that Du qing tang had no beauty of magnificence in size, and because it was just for a personal ancestral shrine, both its external appearance and contents never represented Taiwan architecture. Also, he sharply stated that “I don’t understand at all why they moved and rebuilt such a meaningless building.”⁽⁴¹⁾

As a matter of fact, compared to the gorgeous moods of the Osaka Exhibition and comparing the Taiwan Pavilion to later ones at exhibitions, Du qing tang was somewhat small-scaled and unadorned. The space for exhibitions itself competed with exhibitors and each other for display and design in order to draw spectators’ interest. Nevertheless the Taiwan Association choose this unadorned Du qing tang because of the political symbolism that Du qing tang held. As the Taiwan Association explained its decision to move and rebuild Du qing tang, it additionally provided the political background as follows:

(39) *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 58, p. 53.

(40) *Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 55 (April, 1903), p. 46.

(41) Kanori Ino, “Fuzokujō yori mitaru taiwankan 1 [Taiwan Pavilion View from Customs 1],” *Taiwan kanshū kiji* (Chō yaku hon) [Articles of Taiwan Custom: translated to Chinese] 3: 6 (June, 1903), pp. 316-317.

We made up our mind to move and rebuild Du qing tang to the Osaka Exhibition and obtained permission from Taiwan Sōtokufu. This Du qing tang was originally founded by one gentry in the Ming Dynasty and it turned out to be the government-owned later. When Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya (北白川宮) came to conquer Taiwan, Du qing tang was the ruins and place where he took some rest.⁽⁴²⁾

This additional explanation ultimately reasoned that this building was the political signs of an Empire.

The criticism of Ino showed the conflict or difference between the Taiwan Association and the Taiwan Customs Research Society. Differed from a pure scholar like Ino, the political ruins of the Empire gave a very powerful impression to the members of the Taiwan Association, which included many parties directly concerned about seizing and ruling Taiwan. It was the symbol of their sacrifice and the thorn they conquered Taiwan. Du qing tang and the history of Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya have been made as symbolic signs here and there, because of its status as a signs of an Empire. *Exhibition Outlines* (博覽會要覽) emphasized its political implications. For example, its stated that “Du qing tang brought in from Taiwan was used for a resting place, when the late lamented Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya with such a dignified status entered the war for conquering Taiwan. Du qing tang shows the great signs reflecting his majestic grandness,”⁽⁴³⁾ and “Du qing tang is a place for his funeral where the late lamented Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya passed away during the war, and thus our people cannot stop recalling its meaning every time.”⁽⁴⁴⁾ At last, this was changed into a myth in textbooks. A contemporary Japanese national language textbook (國文教科書) contains an essay called “Taiwan diary.” There is a phrase: “bed chamber of Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya” in this essay. In a reference book for teachers about this phrase, it explained that “here, Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya, with such a dignified status, slept on open-air fields, defied such a sweltering heat, experienced every kinds of pain, and finally rounded off his war resulting in putting down Taiwan with a great achievement.” It was also noted that “in 1895, Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya fought against thieves, tough cli-

(42) “Daigokai taiwankyōkai taikai,” p. 43.

(43) Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Yōran Hensansho, *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai yōran*, p. 265.

(44) Kokkosha, ed., *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakuran kai jyōyou bussan annai* [Guide for Important Exhibits in Fifth National Industrial Exhibition] (Tokyo: Kokkosha, 1903), p. 690.

mates, endemic diseases, and so, in the end, he mostly subjugated Taiwan.” Even though he was infected with malaria and suffered a high fever since landing in Taiwan, he declared that “This is only my private disease and I have a responsibility for this war for my country as a commander.” He thus made up a temporary bed, took some rest for a while, and finally subjugated Taiwan.⁽⁴⁵⁾

Meiji Emperor’s tour at the exhibition became a magnificent event. During a two-week tour the Emperor first attended “Splendid Pageantry.” The appearance just like what Takashi Fujitani mentioned, with court trains crossing the national flags on the front of each locomotive and court coaches following mounted parties, army lined up on the streets and students representing each school.⁽⁴⁶⁾ While Meiji Emperor looked around each pavilion, the person in charge of displays briefed him on the displays at each corner. This was an honorable moment for those high-ranking bureaucrats those who could meet the emperor face to face and it was a chance to promote their sense of duty to the state. Shimpei Gotō was a good example of this moment. He explained the conditions about Taiwan as a chief of the Screening Committee, when Meiji Emperor visited and looked around the Taiwan Pavilion. He remembered that it was an honorable moment.⁽⁴⁷⁾ While this pageantry aimed to show off its nation’s modernity, progress, wealth, and armaments, there was an event with the same characteristic, that is, an exhibition. Therefore it was natural for the emperor to show up there. Du qing tang was a historical ruin which could be connected to the family of emperors in Taiwan. Therefore it seems to be a political asset on the part of the Japan Empire’s rule in Taiwan.

However, Du qing tang no longer played its role after the Osaka Exhibition. After the exhibition, a pavilion such as Du qing tang, was disassembled and had no chance for reconstruction. The Taiwan Pavilion at the Tokyo Industrial Exhibition in 1907, the Taiwan Pavilion at the Nagoya Exhibition in 1908, and the Taiwan Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition in 1914 were built hugely in the

(45) Koufūkan Henshūsho, ed., *Shihangakkou kokubun kyōkasho san kou* [Reference of National Language Textbook for Normal School] (Tokyo: Koufūkan, 1904), pp. 70–71.

(46) “Rinjizōkan daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai zukai gehen [Picture of Fifth National Industrial Exhibition],” *Fūzoku gahō* 275 (Sep., 1903), pp. 13–15; Nōshōmushō, *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai jimu hōkoku (gekan)* [Report of Fifth National Industrial Exhibition] (Tokyo: Nōshōmushō, 1903); Takashi Fujitani, *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

(47) Kintarō Itō, *Shinryōdo kaihatsu to gotōshimpei*, pp. 28–29.

Taiwanese style. This change stems not only from excessive expenditures in order to move and rebuild, but also from the fact that it was too small and unadorned as a pavilion to represent the improvements of Taiwan. After the Osaka exhibition, the emphasis was not on the intact and traditional Taiwan, but on the improving and industrial Taiwan. For the purpose, Taiwan needed to be represented on a more magnificent scale. Interestingly the design of the pavilion had to be in the Taiwanese style, because Taiwan was a colony in all aspects. Even if addressing industry and improvements, it was still necessary to emphasize its local characteristics. Since the first decade of the twentieth century, the necessity for Taiwan to represent China had disappeared. Since Kwantōshu or South Manchuria Railroad Company (南滿洲鐵道會社) participated in exhibitions, they have represented the things concerned about Chinese customs or traditions there.

5. Displays of Taiwanese Traditions and Customs

Industrial Exhibitions basically aim to industrial improvements. Following the main goals of Industrial Exhibition, displays about Taiwan had to focus on the products reflecting the levels of industry and technology as well. However, being the first colony, Taiwan did not totally fit in the picture. “When the authority concerned discussed the establishment of the Taiwan Pavilion, it was planned to understand not only products related to the promotion of industry but also the conditions of the new domain, to make it able to comprehend the real truth of the new territory, and contain all into one pavilion from customs and tradition to its geographical features, history, specific animals and vegetation.”⁽⁴⁸⁾ In other words, the essential emphases were placed on the real conditions of Taiwan’s customs and traditions. The real question was that they would show the real conditions of Taiwan. The Taiwanese costumes worn on ten wax models, made in life size, attracted the most popularity. The popularity was attributed to the fact that those models were the same size as humans, wore vivid looks on their faces, and the Taiwanese costumes were harmonized very well.⁽⁴⁹⁾

(48) Kanori Ino, “Fuzokujō yori mitaru taiwankan 1,” p. 314.

(49) “Taiwankan,” p. 55.

The displays of opium smoking, foot-binding of women, and Chinese queue also deserved attention. Generally speaking, the space of exhibitions makes an appeal to spectators with its customs or traditions through individuality, particularity, and uniqueness. The opium smoking, foot-binding, and Chinese queue were excellent materials to show the particularity of Taiwan's traditions. In the early period of Japanese rule in Taiwan, almost all accounts of Taiwanese guidebooks mentioned these three phenomena (現象). Thus, it is important to understand how these Taiwanese traditions were displayed in the Taiwan Pavilion of the Osaka Exhibition. However, contrasted to general expectations, the displays related to opium smoking, foot-binding, and Chinese queue within Du qing tang which introduced Taiwanese traditions, only had a few pictures on the walls. Ino expressed strong complaints about these displays.

Two obnoxious practices of the current Taiwan customs are superstitious beliefs and the conditions about opium smoking and foot-binding of women. We were already ready to draw pictures or present actual objects concerned about these. However, since the snobbish officers worried about making a laughing-stock of themselves through exposing those customs and thought it would make them look shameful and deteriorate their dignity, they finally stopped the display. Current customs are all true and there is nothing distorted by intention, but they considered these to be shameful and so tried to conceal them. How much is their thinking close and ridiculous? Now it's already work passed by beyond our control. However, in introducing Taiwan sincerely, if this introduction is based upon the bias of these snobbish officers and so some parts of the truth is erased, we cannot help feeling sorry about that.⁽⁵⁰⁾

According to the quotation above, original pictures and models related to opium were prepared for display, but the display related to topic such as opium and foot-binding came to an end at the minimum extent such as a few posters. The viewpoint concerned about the displays of topics such as opium smoking and foot-binding are divided into three. The first is the scholar's viewpoint, represented by Ino. As mentioned above, he insisted that opium and foot-binding was needed to show the reality as it is, and should not be concealed or considered as a disgrace. His standpoint reflected the cognition of professional research centers such as the Taiwan Customs Research Society. Nevertheless, it did not mean that they agreed to tolerate the foot-binding because it was a Taiwanese

(50) Kanori Ino, "Fuzokujō yori mitaru taiwankan 1," p. 315.

tradition. In *Articles of Taiwan Customs* (臺灣慣習記事) published by the Taiwan Customs Research Society, it was often found that they pointed out the obnoxious practices of foot-binding or opium and urged that these bad customs be discarded. According to a census taken in 1905, the numbers of women who suffered from foot-binding were 800,000 and 57% out of all women suffered from the practice.⁽⁵¹⁾ More than half of Taiwanese female population forced to undergo foot-binding. Foot-binding was obviously a very important aspect of the Taiwanese lifestyle. Professional researchers considered it a vicious practice to be discarded away, and also a unique traditional custom that they should not deny or hide under academic scope. Such viewpoint considered Taiwanese traditions as an research object. Also, the writing of Ino about the wax models could be understood under the similar viewpoint. He pointed out the merits of the wax models of Taiwanese costumes that they were useful to study in an anthropological sense, because of their real-figure size. In addition, their realistic design could help to avoid the misunderstanding in studying folklore.⁽⁵²⁾

The second viewpoint stems from the collective consciousness of the Taiwan Sōtokufu bureaucrats. It was not clear who the characters were in the writings Ino mentioned before as “snobbish officers.” However, the viewpoint of these snobbish officers could represent a large number of Japanese bureaucrats in Taiwan. In fact it could mean the Taiwanese Society. While Ino held a standpoint that Taiwanese customs themselves should be open to the public, from an anthropologist viewpoint on objective grounds, these snobbish officers were the parties directly concerned with Taiwan. Their psychology was well revealed in the following article.

Examining the reports of newspapers about the Taiwan Pavilion published in homeland, they didn't deliver anything about most agricultural and industrial products, but praised in detail about wax models copying its customs or red and blue paintings of houses. Since these tendencies already appeared in newspaper articles, it is natural for many spectators to pay attention only to external conditions when entering the Taiwan Pavilion. Thus, we can guess that they haven't felt the new territory of Taiwan very much, except small wax models copying

(51) Rinji Taiwan Kokō Chōsahu, *Rinji Taiwan kokō chōsa kekkahyō (Meiji 38 nen)* [Provisional Census of Taiwan in 1908] (Taipei: Taiwan Sōtokufu, 1908), pp. 388-389.

(52) Kanori Ino, “Fuzokujō yori mitaru taiwankan 2 [Taiwan Pavilion View from Customs 2],” *Taiwan kanshō kiji (Chō yaku hon)* 3: 7 (July, 1903), p. 81.

beauty and house of its grandness. . . . Taiwan has long been misunderstood from Japanese in the homeland (naichijin, 內地人), and, to tell the truth, it has been in a situation of being considered as a nuisance . . . the homeland-Japanese neglect to watch Taiwan, so it looks as if Taiwan is going to fall into much deeper misunderstanding.⁽⁵³⁾

Taiwan Sōtokufu devoted to display the image of improvement in Taiwan including agricultural and industrial products. HokushūShō (北州生), a reporter expressed his disappointment that the display lacked to show the improvements and the civilization of Taiwan. Moreover, the press in Japan did not even mention the progress a lot. His disappointment may be attributed to similar feeling of the Taiwan Association's members as well as Taiwan Sōtokufu's bureaucrats. He concluded that many spectators visited the Taiwan Pavilion and gave favorable comments, but merely showed their curiosity about small wax models, blue paintings of houses and beautiful women. As he introduced the conversation with an intellectual who visited the Taiwan Pavilion, his curiosity was unsurprisingly limited to beautiful women in Taiwan restaurants or aborigines. When a intellectual acted like this, not to mention the general spectators. He thought that no one showed any interest in many items exhibited except the beautiful waitresses at Taiwanese restaurants. The base of his disappointment was the common consciousness of Japanese in Taiwan. Taiwan was treated as a nuisance by the Japanese homeland. Therefore, on the part of the Taiwan Sōtokufu's bureaucrats, it was reasonable to avoid the displays related to opium, foot-binding, or Chinese queue because those could link to the images more barbarous and only satisfy their exotic imagination. As a matter of fact, foot-binding and Chinese queue were symbols of savageness and backwardness to foreigners. Thinking about pictures shown on the pamphlets cover of the London Exhibition in 1851, there were grotesque figures, almond-shaped eyes, exaggerated beards, Chinese queues, and pigs on it.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Or, thinking about opium smoking, foot-binding, and Chinese queue to be used as materials for pictures and postcards in modern Eu-

(53) HokushūShō, "Taiwankan no kachi."

(54) Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 175-179.

rope,⁽⁵⁵⁾ it was understandable that the Taiwan Sōtokufu's bureaucrats or Taiwan Association's members concerned to try and avoid displaying foot-binding or Chinese queues. Sudo analyzed about this point on the view of feminism and China.⁽⁵⁶⁾

More interesting were the responses of the Chinese press to Taiwanese foot-binding showcases at the Osaka Exhibition. In an article of a newspaper published in China at that time, it introduced the contents of the Taiwan Pavilion. It pointed out that the Taiwan Pavilion could be easily called the "China Pavilion," saying "in addition to this, two Taiwan persons are going around with Chinese queues. Also, there are Taiwanese women in tea rooms and bars, all wearing foot-binding, but they don't feel any shame even when teased by men. The spectators thought that they all looked Chinese, and even for us, we cannot deny that they are Chinese." It also reported that "unless we get rid of Chinese queue and foot-binding and draw a line for distinction, Japanese will consider us to be the same as Taiwan."⁽⁵⁷⁾ To the extent that Chinese worried about being despised due to foot-binding and Chinese queues of Taiwanese people, foot-binding and Chinese queue were shameful, so even Chinese that time perceived them as vicious customs to be thrown away.

However, the collective consciousness of Japanese residing in Taiwan caused to concede to foot-binding and opium, because of the feeling of being disregarded by their homeland. While these vicious customs discontinued, the belief that they should understand the local customs as much as possible. The reporter of the above article found out there were displays with various kinds of liquor in the introduction of the Manufacturing Industry Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition. Regarding to this, the reporter said, "there are a lot of displayed liquors, and liquor is consumed by Japanese in the homeland just as our Taiwanese people smoke opium."⁽⁵⁸⁾ He considered Taiwanese affinity for opium to be

(55) Rui-de Zhang, "Xiangxiang Zhongguo-lundunsuojian gudongmingxinian de tuxiang fenxi [Imaging China]," in Qi-xiong Zhang, ed., *Ershishiji zongguo yu shijie lunwenzuanji* [China and the World in the Twentieth Century] (Taipei: Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinaica, 2001), pp. 824-829.

(56) Mizuyo Sudo, "Kieteiku Libaou: 1903 nen'jinruikan'ziken ni miru shinkyō joseizō no dōzikeisei [Li baoyu who Faded out]," *Chōgoku joseishi kenkyū* [The Journal of Historical Studies on Chinese Women] 12 (2003), pp. 1-14.

(57) *Zong wai ri bao* [China Foreign Daily], 1903.4.25.

(58) HokushūShō, "Hontoujin no hakurankai kan [Expo View by Taiwanese]," *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.4.30 (1).

equal to Japanese affinity for liquor.

Magomitsu Sakura (佐倉孫三) shared the similar viewpoint. In *Miscellanies for Taiwan Customs* (臺風雜記), he pointed out foot-binding as the first difference between Japan and Taiwan in terms of customs, and sympathized with the general perception of it being considered as bizarre. After that, he quoted the logical refutation as follows, “someone once said, damages from foot-binding were serious. However, dyeing Japanese ladies teeth black and the Western brassieres are similar to this. Why do they criticize foot-binding?” Although he didn’t agree with this refutation, it reflects his intention. Introduction of logical refutation was not necessarily consider foot-binding a bizarre practice. According to his evaluation, “any country might have strange customs, and anyone might have an eccentricity. It is merely desirable for evil influences not to reach the extent of hurting bodies and destroying good culture. Foot-binding is a seriously vicious practice, resulting in harming bodies. In the eyes foreigners, the meaning cannot be understood. By the way, Chinese considered it to be joyful and proud. How stick-in-the-mud are they? However, every country has their own manners and outsiders don’t need to have a quarrel with this.” Also, even for opium, “someone said that Taiwanese people shouldn’t smoke opium. Yet Japanese like liquor. If Someone got drunk, they fight and stagger along the streets, so they get warning from police officers. Even if they become insolvent for drinking, yet they don’t regard this at all. It is very sorry to see as well.”⁽⁵⁹⁾ Therefore he placed Taiwanese opium on the same level as Japanese liquor. *Miscellanies for Taiwan Customs* written in Chinese characters, and thus it could have been written in order to be more sensitive to Taiwanese customs and beliefs. Anyway, writing about Taiwan culture in Chinese characters itself reflects intimacy toward Taiwan and its people, not a sense of conquerors’ superiority.⁽⁶⁰⁾

As far as I examined, HokuShūShō (北州生) used the phrase “we Taiwanese (我等臺灣人)” for the first time in the history of colonial Taiwan. In his article on the Taiwan Pavilion, he said the following:

We little appreciate the favor that spectators from the homeland feel a special feeling about the Taiwan Pavilion, because we face the items displayed within

(59) Magomitsu Sakura, *Taiwō sakki* [Miscellanies for Taiwan Customs] (Nantou: Historical Research Commission of Taiwan Province, 1903), pp. 1-2.

(60) Mei-rong Lin, “Zhiminzhe dui zhimindi de fengsu jilu—‘taifengzaji’ weili—,” pp. 190, 194.

the pavilion and those customs every morning and night. Just as our Taiwanese people do, we feel and consider the Taiwan Pavilion to be somewhat poor. But it fortunately draws popularity from the spectators and obtains a good reputation; thus, the feeling of the Taiwan people is a little bit warm-hearted.⁽⁶¹⁾

There is a clear distinction between Japanese in the homeland and the Taiwanese people in this article. In the other parts not quoted here, there is also an expression “we, felt sorry for persons in Taiwan,” so it is possible to include the native Taiwanese (hontojin, 本島人) into the phrase “the Taiwanese people.” However, since the reporter was a Japanese living in Taiwan, its meaning would probably be weighted on Japanese residing in Taiwan. Since this article, the terminology “our Taiwan” had frequently appeared in newspapers or magazines, but it mainly meant Japanese residing in Taiwan rather than the native Taiwanese. As a similar case, thinking about the Korea colony, the marks of “our Korea” are sometimes noticed, but very rare compared to the case of Taiwan. The terminology “our Taiwan” is the expression of the collective consciousness of the Japanese residing in Taiwan. The Taiwan image, treated poorly by the homeland, didn’t make a big difference even in the 1930’s. The Taiwan Exhibition in 1935 was the most magnificent event in the colonial history of Taiwan, but few visits of high-ranking officers from the homeland were recorded, an example disappointed the people of Taiwan. Like this, unchanging poor treatment from the homeland caused Taiwanese centralism to be strengthened. In the 1930s, the Taiwanese centralism found its symbolic expression in the phrase “Taiwan first (臺灣本位).”⁽⁶²⁾

The third viewpoint related to displayed tradition for commercial reasons. Such viewpoint showed the exhibition space should draw eyes and attention from spectators as much as possible. For example, the following article put it well:

There was nothing such as a model or explanations about foot-binding of ladies, and merely a pair of shoes was presented. It can’t help being a shortcoming in explaining that Taiwanese people are of Chinese descent . . . The reason why the Taiwanese tea shops are crowded with people stems from seeing Taiwanese

(61) HokushūShō, “Hontoujin no hakurankai kan.”

(62) Sae-bong Ha, “Sikminji geonryeonui du gaji eolgul [Two Faces of the Colonial Power: A Comparison between Chosun Exposition (1929) and Taiwan Exposition (1935)],” *Yeoksa wa Gyeonggae* [History and Boundaries] 51 (2004), pp. 122-129.

ladies rather than architectural decorations. The purpose to see those ladies is placed on pointed foot-binding. I feel frustrate how careless the colonial authorities are, because they don't make any endeavors to explain foot-binding which draws attention of so many people.⁽⁶³⁾

While Du qing tang was an official space even within the Taiwan Pavilion, Taiwanese tea shops or Taiwanese restaurants were commercial spaces. It was inevitable to maximize the spacial function for relaxation and amusement and to make a commercial success. In the Taiwanese tea shops, they prepared many tables and bamboo-made chairs, and pictures of Taiwanese tea fields, showing how to make tea, while old paintings and works of calligraphy were hung on the wall. Chinese poetry for adoring Taiwan tea was on the pillars. The clerks with Chinese queues distributed tickets of tea at the entrance, and several girls from Taiwan serving in Japanese. The reason why the Taiwanese tea shops were crowded only because people wanted “to see beautiful ladies of Taiwan, especially to see the Taiwanese ladies foot-bound and walking gracefully.”⁽⁶⁴⁾ Taiwanese restaurants were built and copied Taiwanese bars from interiors to dishes. Taiwanese natives were hired as chefs and ladies served as waitresses in order to light up the Taiwanese mood. Persons concerned with exhibitions knew very well that Chinese queues and foot-binding could be factors to arise popular attention, and it fell in with their expectations.

At the Taiwan Pavilion of the Osaka Exhibition in 1903, foot-binding, Chinese queues, and opium were maximized in commercial space while being minimized in official space. Yet it couldn't become a characteristic tradition of Taiwan any more after this. Since that exhibition, the displays of Taiwanese customs and traditions within official displaying spaces of Taiwan had disappeared. Instead, Taiwanese character was exclusively exaggerated in commercial spaces such as Taiwan tea shops. However, the space of exhibitions should not only exhibit industry and technology but also create characteristic images of a country, city or locals. It was essential to go back to history and tradition in order to create a character of Taiwanese culture. “Two generals of Fan & Xie (范謝兩將軍),” which were pageant, emerged in seeking new traditions. As far as it can be determined the “Two generals of Fan & Xie” showed at

(63) Inagaki, “Taiwankan 3 [Taiwan Pavilion 3],” *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.6.11 (1).

(64) Akira Tsukide, ed., *Taiwankan*, pp. 11-14.

the Tokyo Peace Exhibition (東京平和博覽會) in 1922. The “Two generals of Fan & Xie” appeared at an event, the so-called “Taiwan Day,” which was one of the various events held by the exhibition bureau. The “Two generals of Fan & Xie” contributed by Taiwan Daily Newspaper (臺灣日日新報社) marched every nook and corner and drew the attention of spectators, so a lot of people gathered. The pageant of “Two generals of Fan & Xie” got an unexpected hailing, and even when returning to Taiwan, there was a boisterous reception held and a street parade with up to about 1,000 people in total, including the “Two generals of Fan & Xie” and Yigao (藝閣) bands etc. This parade marched to the official residence of the Governor-general.⁽⁶⁵⁾ The “Two general of Fan & Xie” have often emerged as a symbol representing the Taiwan tradition ever since. The “Two generals of Fan & Xie” also appeared at the Korea Exhibition in 1929 following the Sendai Exhibition (仙台博覽會) in 1928.

Yigao weared make-up and marched in a festival for greeting gods (迎神賽會), and it matched well with modern festival styles such as a parade. The “Two generals of Fan & Xie” were considered to judge virtue and vice in the folk custom. It reflected Taiwanese traditions very well and simultaneously applied a good event for a festival. Even in the Taiwan Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition, worshiped objects in the folk religion were displayed. For example, Wu gu xian di (五谷先帝) which is a god for abundant harvests; Tian hou (天后) a goddess for safe voyage as well as Guan sheng da di (關聖大帝) and Cheng huang ye (城隍爺).⁽⁶⁶⁾ However, gods of folk religion displayed here were small wax models and usually sit still. On the other side the Two generals of Fan & Xie was material used to revitalize traditions and vividized festivals.

6. Conclusion

The Taiwan Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition was a symbolic device which allowed Japanese to expand its identity and transformed itself from a nation-state into an Empire. The magazine articles connected to the traditions, described the Taiwan Pavilion as “China,” by emphasizing their “Chinese style”

(65) *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1922.5.22 (5), 1922.6.1 (7), 1922.5.22 (5), 1922.6.1 (7).

(66) Inagaki, “Taiwankan 4 [Taiwan Pavilion 4],” *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.6.13 (1); Akira Tsukide, ed., *Taiwankan*, pp. 53-54.

and made readers “feel as if they are in China.” The Taiwan Pavilion was a tool for Japanese tasting the feeling of an empire. The space disposed for the Taiwan Pavilion was a corner that suited a colony. However, Japanese who had direct relationship with Taiwan thought differently from those who worked for the Japanese central government. The Taiwanese images which homelander had, was never satisfied to those who in Taiwan. They did not like the images of Taiwan that Japanese homelander had; the images that Taiwan is a barbarous country with widespread endemic diseases. Those Japanese in Taiwan at that time were active agents during the Japanese occupation of Taiwan. They occupied Taiwan by force. Many of them were sacrificed in the process of their possession and ruled Taiwan self-devotionally.

The high-ranking bureaucrats of Taiwan Sōtokufu were rulers over Taiwan on behalf of the Empire of Japan. In addition, they represented the local Taiwanese against their motherland, Japan. The high-ranking bureaucrats of Taiwan Sōtokufu had strong desire, ambition, and even ability to manage the colony. If Taiwan they managed was perceived as being rife with endemic diseases and barbarity, this meant that their dignity would be degraded. A Taiwan rife with endemic diseases and barbarity could make their tour of duty in Taiwan disparaged as a form of “relegation.” If their duty in Taiwan was not relegation but a mission, Taiwan’s image of being full of endemic diseases and barbarity should be changed, and the exhibition held in Osaka was the very good chance to do this.

As a matter of fact, many displays in the Taiwan Pavilion were the score-card of Taiwan Sōtokufu. On the model of Taiwan Island installed at the entrance of Du qing tang in the Taiwan Pavilion, there were marks to show not only place-names but also land marks including roads, railroads and telegraphs. Every report with statistics, including all kinds of mail service facilities, floor plans and pictures of hospitals, medical schools, and exports and imports, were hung on the walls. In addition, the entire map of Taiwan was marked with roads, railroads, and train stations as well as lighthouses, harbors, hospitals, spars, reefs, and government and public offices such as the customs, courts, and meteorological observatory. The 44 items including granite, gold ore, and sulfur were also marked on the geology mine map. These pictures, map, and statistics tables reflected the intention of Taiwan Sōtokufu to show the enormous information for ruling Taiwan that they had secured as their assets. The members of the

Exhibition Committee of Taiwan Sōtokufu had little expect that these displays could attract attention from spectators. The Chairman of the Exhibition Committee, Yanagimoto (柳本通義), joined the Hanoi Exhibition in 1902 and emphasized the importance of the displaying styles with exhibited items and decorations. This reflected how well he understood the nature of exhibitions.⁽⁶⁷⁾ Thus, this display could be considered not only as a scorecard for reporting to the motherland about the ruling abilities and achievements of Taiwan Sōtokufu, but also as the opportunity for taste self-satisfaction.

The high-ranking bureaucrats of Taiwan Sōtokufu were young descendents of samurai. They had a sense of mission to manage Taiwan and were proud of their abilities. Among the bureaucrats of Taiwan Sōtokufu in Taiwan, non-central and non-mainstream officers from the Northeast regions of Japan accounted for a relatively majority. They often thought of themselves as non-mainstream in the Japanese political and bureaucratic society. Their desire to increase their self-confidence regarding the rule of Taiwan led to disappointment since the Taiwan Pavilion was assigned to a dreary corner in the Osaka Exhibition. Although the feelings of disappointment were considerably controlled, they sometimes burst out their discontent as their motherland treated Taiwan as “a concubinary offspring” or “a nuisance.”

This mentality affected the design selection for the Taiwan Pavilion and the styles in displaying their customs as well. The important point to choose an architectural model was political. It was politically for the representative symbols of Taiwan. The reason why Du qing tang was selected at the pavilion meant to present Taiwan the very signs of the Empire families: Prince Kitashirakawa Nomiya had taken rest when he invaded Taiwan. In addition, the bureaucrats of Taiwan Sōtokufu kept the display of opium and foot-binding to a minimum and simply hung some pictures of such practices. These displays caused the scholars to complain because they insisted on reflecting Taiwanese symbols and revealing the bare reality of Taiwan itself. Reduced displays of opium, foot-binding and Chinese queue were planned out because the bureaucrats of Sōtokufu were concerned Taiwan “was misunderstood” as the land of savageness. These displays could make such misconceptions worse. Considering that the West regard-

(67) Rong Liu, “Ri zhi shi ji Taiwan can zhan dao wai bo lan hui zhi yanjiu,” p. 67.

ed foot-binding and Chinese queue as symbols of Chinese savageness and backwardness, their concerns made sense to some extent. The collective consciousness gave them the feeling of generosity to equally place the opium smoking of the Taiwan people with the drinking habits of Japanese, and Taiwan foot-binding with the practice of dyeing teeth in Japan or ladies wearing bras in the West.

However, the motherland's little interests and neglect on Taiwan did not significantly change after the Taiwan Pavilion at the Osaka Exhibition. For example, in the 1910s, there was a mention that "the press in the motherland still didn't think Taiwan important, like the central government treated Taiwan as a stepchild, and so we can't stop grieving at all times"⁽⁶⁸⁾ and these complaints often appeared. This dissatisfaction eventually made the Japanese in Taiwan converged into "our Taiwan people," and expanding it to the localism of "Taiwan First" in the 1930s.

In terms of spatial layout, the Taiwan Pavilion after the Osaka Exhibition changed from the outer territory to a place among colony in the early 20th Century exhibitions at Tokyo. Interestingly the border or the distinction of the space disposition disappeared at every exhibition held in the colonies between the late 1920s and 1930s. Also, displaying the traditional culture of Taiwan has vanished since the Osaka Exhibition. This was because the Manchuria—Mongolia Pavilion took a role for displaying the Chinese traditional culture, so the Taiwan Pavilion didn't need to display Chinese traditional culture. Instead, it was enough to exhibit Taiwan with its industry and improvement. The Pavilion merely kept the Taiwanese style of design in order to show its local characteristics. At the same time, the tradition of Taiwan was recreated as two generals of Fan & Xie (范謝兩將軍), which was suitable for parade-like events.

The discussions above focused on the Japanese in Taiwan. The movements of the native Taiwanese (本島人) developed to against them. The native Taiwanese played three important roles in exhibitions, as exhibitors, spectators, and managers of Taiwan tea shops and so on. As Shao-li Lu carefully examined, the native Taiwanese as exhibitors was organized by the Peasant Association (農會) and Hoko System (保甲制) and the native Taiwanese as managers acted for

(68) Shō Mizuki, "Naichi no shimbun zasshi ni arawareshi Taiwan [Taiwan Reported by Newspaper and Bulletin in Japan]," in *ShinTaiwan* [New Taiwan] 1915-7 (Kobe: ShinTaiwansha, 1915), p. 8.

expanding tea sales overseas.⁽⁶⁹⁾

The native Taiwanese as spectators at the Osaka Exhibition in 1903 visited the Taiwan Pavilion first. It meant that they ignored the political space created by the Exhibition Committee and suggested tour courses. In the same way, refusing the frame work prepared by others extended later into denying the recreation of the traditions by Taiwan Sōtokufu. When the two generals of Fan & Xie as a suitable tradition for parade-like events was discovered, the native Taiwanese significantly expressed strong rejection. The Taiwan Exhibition in Tokyo in 1929 also displayed the two generals of Fan & Xie, but the article in *Taiwan-minbao* (臺灣民報) which was owned by the native Taiwanese showed its rage as follows.

The Taiwan Exhibition was held in Tokyo Kokugikan (國技館) first. The purpose is the introduction of Taiwan's culture. However, it really revealed the savageness of the colony to the world, and proved that Taiwan people only have superficial knowledge. Generally speaking, the two generals of Fan & Xie are only petty ghosts, and just copied and painted as monsters of the society, and so their existence is not admitted in the civilized Taiwan any more . . . Alas! Is the Taiwan culture the same as this? The savageness of Taiwan is only shown. How sad!⁽⁷⁰⁾

While the exhibition host or spectators thought that the two generals of Fan & Xie were examples of interesting and characteristic traditions of Taiwan, the native Taiwanese considered them a shameful symbol to display their "savageness." Besides, among the editorials which raised objection to the plans to holding exhibitions by Taiwan Sōtokufu, one expressed its dissatisfaction at the displaying of items of Taiwan by, "in the name of promoting Taiwan, the colonial authority already advertised aborigines everywhere in the Japanese homeland by using motion pictures. And, pro-government gentries exhibited items at a Fair (共進會) such as dolls made of clay or wood which were used in their superstitious ceremonies."⁽⁷¹⁾ While the exhibition host displayed dolls made of clay or wood as the interesting folk customs of Taiwan, the native Taiwanese felt it

(69) Shao-li Lu, *Zhan shi Taiwan*, pp. 197-202.

(70) Tang Ya, "Taiwan boranhui zhi guaiwu [Monster in Taiwan Exhibition]," *Taiwan minbao* [Taiwan News Report], 1929.3.3 (5).

(71) "Sheshuo: meiyou yiyide taiwan daboranhui xuzun minyizhongzhi [Stop Meaningless Taiwan Expo]," *Taiwan minbao*, 1928.8.5 (2).

advertised the existence of widely-spread superstitions in Taiwanese society. This meant that they opposed and denied the one-side viewpoint as well as the interpretation of their traditions by the Japanese in Taiwan. The response was revealed when Taiwanese self-consciousness appeared. Also, it coincided the question about what Taiwan culture was emerged in the late 1920s and the early 1930s.

Accepted: 2007.8.16

References

- Fōzoku gahō* 《風俗畫報》 [Genre Pictorial]
- Taiwan kyōkai kaihō* 《臺灣協會會報》 [Taiwan Association Newsletter]
- Taiwan minbao* 《臺灣民報》 [Taiwan News Report]
- Zong wai ri bao* 《中外日報》 [China Foreign Daily]
- Amano, Ikuo 天野郁夫
 1992 *Gakureki no shakaishi—kyōiku to nihon no kindai* 《學歴の社會史——教育と日本の近代》 [Social History of Diplomatism]. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.
- Auerbach, Jeffrey A.
 1999 *The Great Exhibition of 1851; A Nation on Display*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Yōran Hensansho 第五回内國勸業博覽會要覽編纂所
 1903 *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai yōran* 《第五回内國勸業博覽會要覽》 [Hand Book of Fifth National Industrial Exhibition]. Osaka: Daigokai Naikoku Kangyō Hakurankai Yōran Hensansho.
- Fujitani, Takashi
 1996 *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ha, Saebong 河世鳳
 2002 “Mohyeongui Jeguk” 〈模型의帝國：1935年臺灣博覽會에表象된아시아〉 [Miniature of Japan Empire on Taiwan Expo at 1935]. *Dongyang sahak yengu* 《東洋史學研究》 [Journal of Asian Historical Studies] 78: 169-174.
 2004 “Sikminji geonryeonui du gaji eolgul” 〈植民地權力の두가지얼굴：朝鮮博覽會(1929)와臺灣博覽會(1935)의比較〉 [Two Faces of the Colonial Power: A Comparison between Chosun Exposition (1929) and Taiwan Exposition (1935)]. *Yeoksa wa Gyeonggae* 《歷史와境界》 [History and Boundaries] 51: 122-129.
 2005 “Sikminji imageui hyeongsung kwa mentality” 〈植民地이미지의形成과멘탈리티〉 [The Making of Colonial Image and Mentality]. *Yeoksa hakbo* 《歷史學報》 [The Korean Historical Review] 186: 177-196.
- Hashimoto, Shiromizu 橋本白水
 1930 *Taiwan tōji to sono kōrōsha* 《臺灣統治と其功勞者》 [Govern Taiwan and the Contributor]. Taipei: Nangoku Shuppan Kyōkai.
- HokushūShō 北州生
 1903 “Taiwankan no kachi” 〈臺灣館の價値〉 [Virtue of Taiwan Pavilion], *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.4.24 (2).
 1903 “Hontoujin no hakurankai kan” 〈本島人の博覽會觀〉 [Expo View by Taiwanese], *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.4.30 (1).
- Hukuda, Masayoshi 福田正義
 1943 *Gotō shimpei* 《後藤新平》. Tokyo: Manshō Nichinichi Shimbunsha Tokyoshisha Shuppanbu.
- Inagaki 稻垣
 1903 “Taiwankan 1” 〈臺灣館(1)〉 [Taiwan Pavilion 1], *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.6.7 (1).
 1903 “Taiwankan 3” 〈臺灣館(3)〉 [Taiwan Pavilion 3], *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.6.11 (1).

- 1903 “Taiwankan 4”〈臺灣館(4)〉[Taiwan Pavilion 4], *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*, 1903.6.13 (1).
- Ino, Kanori 梅陰子
- 1903 “Fuzokujō yori mitaru taiwankan 1”〈風俗上より見たる臺灣館(1)〉[Taiwan Pavilion View from Customs 1], *Taiwan kanshū kiji (Chū yaku hon)*《臺灣慣習記事(中譯本)》[Articles of Taiwan Customs: translated to Chinese] 3(6): 316-317.
- 1903 “Fuzokujō yori mitaru taiwankan 2”〈風俗上より見たる臺灣館(2)〉[Taiwan Pavilion View from Customs 2], *Taiwan kanshū kiji (Chū yaku hon)*《臺灣慣習記事(中譯本)》[Articles of Taiwan Customs: translated to Chinese] 3(7): 81.
- Itō, Kintarō 伊藤金次郎
- 1937 *Shinryōdo kaihatsu to gotōshimpei*《新領土開發と後藤新平》[Development New Territory and Gotō Shimpei]. Tokyo: Showashobō.
- Kimura, Kunio 木村地夫
- 1993 “Hakurankai bekkenki 5”〈博覽會瞥見記5〉[Sightsee Expo 5], *Taiwan nichinichi shimpō*《臺灣日日新報》[Taiwan Daily News], 1903.3.11 (1).
- Kokkosha 國光社 (ed.)
- 1903 *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakuran kai jiyūyō bussan annai*《第五回內國勸業博覽會重要物產案内》[Guide for Important Exhibits in Fifth National Industrial Exhibition]. Tokyo: Kokkosha.
- Koufūkan Henshūsho 光風館編輯所 (ed.)
- 1904 *Shihangakkou kokubun kyōukasho san kou*《師範學校國文教科書參考》[Reference of National Language Textbook for Normal School]. Tokyo: Koufūkan.
- Lin, Mei-rong 林美蓉
- 2003 “Zhiminzhe dui zhimindi de fengsu jilu—‘taifengzaji’ weili—”〈殖民者對殖民地的風俗記錄—‘臺風雜記’爲例—〉[Report on Colony by Colonialist—the Case of ‘Miscellanies for Taiwan Customs’]. Japanese Colonialism and East Asian Anthropology; The 2nd Conference at Seoul, 2003.11.
- Liu, Rong 劉融
- 2003 “Ri zhi shi ji Taiwan can zhan dao wai bo lan hui zhi yanjiu”〈日治時期臺灣參展島外博覽會之研究〉[Study on the Abroad Exhibition at Colonial Taiwan]. MA thesis, Graduate Institute of History, National Chi Nan University.
- Lu, Shao-li 呂紹理
- 2005 *Zhan shi Taiwan*《展示臺灣》[Exhibiting Taiwan]. Taipei: Maitian chu ban.
- Masayama, Kazu 外山正一
- 1899 *Hanbatsu no shōrai*《藩閥之將來》[Future of Bakuhu Nobles]. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.
- Matsuda, Kyōko 松田京子
- 2003 *Teikoku no shisen*《帝國の視線》[Eyes of Empire]. Tokyo: Yoshikawakoubunkan.
- Mizuki, Shō 瑞城生
- 1915 “Naichi no shimbun zasshi ni arawareshi Taiwan”〈内地の新聞雜誌に現れし臺灣〉[Taiwan Reported by Newspaper and Bulletin in Japan]. In *ShinTaiwan*《新臺灣》[New Taiwan] 1915-7, p. 8. Kobe: ShinTaiwansha.
- Nōshōmushō 農商務省
- 1903 *Daigokai naikoku kangyō hakurankai jimu hōkoku (gekan)*《第五回內國勸業博覽會事務報告(下卷)》[Report of Fifth National Industrial Exhibition]. Tokyo: Nōshōmushō.

Rinji Taiwan Kokō Chōsahu 臨時臺灣戶口調査部

1908 *Rinji Taiwan kokō chōsa kekkahyō (Meiji 38 nen)* 《臨時臺灣戶口調査結果表(明治38年)》
[Provisional Census of Taiwan in 1908]. Taipei: Taiwan Sōtokufu.

Sakano, Junji 坂野潤治

1989 *Taiei nihon no rekishi 13: kindai nihon no shuppatzu* 《大系日本の歴史13：近代日本の出發》
[Grand History of Japan 13: Setout of Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Shōgakukan.

Sakura, Magomitsu 佐倉孫三

1903 *Taifō sakki* 《臺風雜記》[Miscellanies for Taiwan Customs]. Nantou: Historical Research
Commission of Taiwan Province.

Sudo, Mizuyo 須藤瑞代

2003 “Kieteiku Libaou: 1903 nen ‘jinruikan’ ziken ni miru shinkyō joseizō no dōzikeisei” 〈消えて
いく李寶玉：1903年‘人類館’事件にみる新舊女性像の同時形成〉 [Li baoyu who Faded
out], *Chōgoku joseishi kenkyū* 《中國女性史研究》 [The Journal of Historical Studies on
Chinese Women] 12: 1-14.

Sumiya, Tonan 住屋圖南

1937 *Taiwan jinshi no hyōbanki* 《臺灣人士の評判記》 [Reputation of Taiwanese]. Taipei: Nan-
bukōronsha.

Taiwan Sōtokufu Minseikyoku Sōmubu 臺灣總督府民政局總務部

1897 *Taiwan Sōtokufu minseikyoku shokuinroku: Meiji 30 nen 7 gatsu genzai* 《臺灣總督府民政局
職員錄：明治30年7月現在》 [The Official List of the Civil Administration of Taiwan
Sōtokufu]. Taipei: Taiwan Sōtokufu.

Takeuchi, Hiroshi 竹内洋

1999 *Nihon no kindai 12: gakureki kizoku no eikō to zasetsu* 《日本の近代12：學歷貴族の榮光と
挫折》 [Modern Japan 12: Glory and Despair of Educated Nobles]. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha.

Takushoku Hakurankai Zammu Toriatzukaijo 拓殖博覽會殘務取扱所 (ed.)

1913 *Takushoku hakurankai hōkoku* 《拓殖博覽會報告》 [Report of Development Exhibition].
Tokyo: Takushoku Hakurankai.

Tokyo city 東京市 (ed.)

1907 *Tokyo yōran annai* 《東京遊覽案内》 [Guide for Tokyo Tour]. Tokyo: Tokyo city.

Tsukide, Akira 月出皓 (ed.)

1903 *Taiwankan* 《臺灣館》 [Taiwan pavilion]. Taipei: Taiwan supporting association for Fifth
National Industrial Exhibition.

Wu, Mi-cha 吳密察

1997 “‘Li shi’ de chu xian” 〈「歷史」的出現〉 [Emergence of the History]. In Fu-san Huang etc.,
eds., *Taiwan shi yan jiu yi bai nian* 《臺灣史研究一百年》 [An Anthology Commemorating a
Century of Taiwan Historical Research], pp. 1-21. Taipei: Preparatory Office, Institute of
Taiwan History.

Ya, Tang 雅棠

1929 “Taiwan boranhui zhi guaiwu” 〈臺灣博覽會之怪物〉 [Monster in Taiwan Exhibition], *Tai-
wan minbao* 《臺灣民報》 [Taiwan News Report], 1929.3.3 (5).

Yamane, Yukio 山根幸夫

1976 *Kindai chōgoku to nihon* 《近代中國と日本》 [Modern China and Japan]. Tokyo: Yama-
kawa Shuppansha.

Yano, Tōru 矢野暢

1975 *Nanshin no keihu* 《南進の系譜》 [Genealogy of Southing]. Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha.

Yoshida, Mitsukuni 吉田光邦

1985 *Kaiteiban mankoku hakurankai* 《改訂版 萬國博覽會》 [Revised Edition—World Fair]. Tokyo: NHK books.

Zhang, Rui-de 張瑞德

2001 “Xiangxiang Zhongguo-lundunsuojian gudongmingxin pian de tuxiang fenxi” 〈想像中國——倫敦所見古董明信片的圖像分析〉 [Imaging China]. In Qixiong Zhang 張啓雄, ed., *Ershishiji zongguo yu shijie lunwenxuanji* 《二十世紀的中國與世界論文選集》 [China and the World in the Twentieth Century], pp. 824-829. Taipei: Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinaica.

臺灣與自我形象 ——以 1903 年大阪博覽會爲中心

河世鳳

摘要

1903 年大阪博覽會上臺灣館的設置是日本帝國首次炫耀殖民臺灣成果的象徵。臺灣館所展示的內容主要是臺灣官僚們向母國（日本）彙報他們的統治能力與政績，其中充滿了臺灣官僚們的自我滿足心理。不過，在臺灣總督府中也有不少非中央、非主流傾向的官僚，他們對來自日本中央政府的輕視而產生的心態也在臺灣館的展示中反映出來。

他們儘量迴避展示鴉片和纏足，因為他們擔心這些可能會進一步加深日本人將臺灣視為野蠻之地的誤解。然而在大阪博覽會上積極興建臺灣館，並未能改變日本國民對臺灣的冷淡和鄙視。對此的失望和不滿導致居住在臺灣的日本人產生了同類意識，這種同類意識及至 1930 年乃擴展為「臺灣本位」的地區主義。

關鍵詞：1903 年大阪博覽會、臺灣館、非主流傾向的官僚、心態、臺灣本位