



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Japan as "Self" or "the Other"? - The Turmoil over Yoshinori Kobayashi's On Taiwan.

Hwang, Yih-Jye

Citation

Hwang, Y. -J. (2010). Japan as "Self" or "the Other"? - The Turmoil over Yoshinori Kobayashi's On Taiwan. *China Information*, 24(1), 75-98. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15138>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15138>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Japan as “Self” or “the Other” in Yoshinori Kobayashi’s *On Taiwan*

Yih-Jye Hwang*

Modern East Asia Research Centre, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Abstract

This article is an attempt to demonstrate how and through which social practices Taiwan’s past colonial experiences have been discursively produced in a certain way and what other alternatives have been excluded from this process. The article scrutinizes the controversy surrounding a Japanese manga *On Taiwan*, a book that provides a very positive evaluation of the legacy of Japanese colonialism in Taiwan. Through analyzing statements, utterances, and conducts concerning this manga that were produced by those who have various positions, this article aims to comprehend how the discourses of Japanese colonialism and Sino-chauvinism reciprocally conflict and compete with each other in ways that affect people’s self-identification, producing a particular form of subjectivity of Taiwan, while excluding, repressing, and silencing other alternatives.

Keywords

comfort women, discourse analysis, Japanese colonialism, Taiwanese national identity, Yoshinori Kobayashi

The aim of this article is to investigate how, through the publication of a Japanese manga *On Taiwan* (臺灣論),¹ the memory of the historical era of Japanese colonization has emerged as an ongoing structuring force in the creation of a certain form of identity for some segments of the population in contemporary Taiwanese society.

It is widely accepted that people in Taiwan hold ambivalent, conflicting, and divergent opinions and feelings concerning Japan.² A straightforward explanation for this phenomenon is that people do not have a common collective historical memory about Japan due to differences in ethnic, class, or gender identity. The most obvious division, suggested by Chen Kuan-Hsing,³ can be found in terms of what might be viewed as Taiwan’s most salient ethnic divide: that between native Taiwanese (

* Corresponding author:
Yih-Jye Hwang, Modern East Asia Research Centre, Leiden University,
PO Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
Email: jayhwang@live.co.uk

本省人) versus Mainlanders (外省人).⁴ Nevertheless, despite discordant views about history, whether among native Taiwanese or Mainlanders, “Japan” equally plays a considerable and indispensable role as a [76] very important ingredient of identity formation among people in Taiwan. For many native Taiwanese, Japanese colonialism and its concomitants have become imbedded in their psychodynamics, constituting some of the most significant historical layers of subject

identity.⁵ For Mainlanders, on the other hand, war experiences with the Japanese army that ultimately caused them to be exiled from their motherland also had profound impacts on their bodies and minds. Moreover, Sino-chauvinism and the anti-Japanese style of education imposed by the Kuomintang regime during the authoritarian period (1949–87) further sharpened and intensified the already ambivalent and divergent feelings about Japan among the population of Taiwan. Those various historical forces (or discourses) have become profoundly inscribed onto the minds and bodies of the population of Taiwan, individually and collectively.

Furthermore, the abrupt dissolution of the Japanese empire and the emergence of a new world order after World War II contributed in impeding or at least deferring a critical examination of the colonial experience and, during the later part of it, the concurrent Sino-Japanese war. Many scholars have indicated that a problem of the Cold War era was that the handling of the problems of colonialism and war was frozen in order to avoid internal opposition within the Western camp.⁶ Hence, various emotions and sentiments towards Japan were suppressed both among native Taiwanese and Mainlanders. Yet, those complex and ambivalent sentiments would not disappear through this repression, particularly when those sentiments were intimately associated with people’s self-identification.

Consequently, the explicit reemergence of those sentiments was inevitable following the end of the Cold War era and the decline of the Kuomintang’s authoritarian rule. Contemporary Taiwanese society is directly facing the legacies of the 50-year Japanese colonization (1895–1945) and of the Sino-Japanese war, after a nearly 50-yearlong absence (1945–1990s) of openly discussing colonial and war-related issues.

These divergent, undeniable but hidden mentalities revolving around the image of Japan should be understood as the essence (if any) of an immanent contradiction within the so-called “Taiwanese national identity.” In other words, although the current identity conflict in contemporary Taiwan is a post-Japanese phenomenon, Japanese colonization and the Sino-Japanese War in the early 20th century remain powerful subtexts in which the questions of “Taiwanese national identity” are placed and contested. “The Taiwanese” as a subject are produced in those conflicting, contradicting, and competing historical forces/discourses, layer upon layer. And the axis of those historical forces/discourses in subject identity formulation is “Japan.”

Many scholars have indicated the profound influences of Japanese colonial rule on Taiwan in stimulating the surge of Taiwanese consciousness. Some contended that Japanese colonization continuously and spontaneously led to the solidification of current Taiwanese con-

sciousness.⁷ Juxtaposing with those historical studies, Joyce Liu and Leo Ching devoted themselves to investigating the psychological ramifications of Japanese rule during the colonial period.⁸ Nevertheless, as Hayden White has argued,⁹ the present does not directly derive from what actually happened in the past, but from how the past is narrated, represented, and interpreted in the present. We should therefore be more attentive to the *politics* of narrations, representations, and interpretations. Consequently, there is a need for further investigation of the conflictual and competitive interrelationships between different interpretations/narrative productions, as opposed to discovering a “true” [77] account of the past. Hence, this article asks how and through which practices the past is (re)produced in a certain way and what other alternatives are excluded from this process.

This article scrutinizes the controversy surrounding the Japanese manga *On Taiwan* in 2001. *On Taiwan* is a book about Taiwan’s history and politics, presented in a lively and somewhat exaggerated manga style. The author himself, the Japanese cartoonist Yoshinori Kobayashi (小林 よしのり), appears in the manga as a reporter, visiting many places in Taiwan and interviewing various Taiwanese people. The manga was first published in Japan in 2000 as part of the author’s serialized comic, *New Arrogantist Manifesto* (新ゴーマニズム宣言). In February 2001, a Chinese translation was brought out in Taiwan, which immediately aroused strong reactions and touched on some very sensitive nerves, inspiring serious debate about the topic of Japan and identity-related conflict in Taiwanese society. The controversy lasted for months in early 2001. During this period, politicians fiercely debated this manga in the parliament of Taiwan. Numerous reports, comments, and essays on the topic appeared in newspapers and on the Web, and two volumes collecting these debates have been published.¹⁰ The affair also attracted attention in academic circles.¹¹ The publication of this manga as an event evolved into a discursive equivalent of a political battle in which different discourses interacted, intersected, and competed with each other. Through analyzing texts of people taking various positions, the present article attempts to comprehend how the event of the publication of *On Taiwan* has enabled or disabled certain ways in which people make sense of their past revolving around “Japan” as a discursive topic and thus come to terms with their self-identification; and how people’s self-identification, in turn, rearticulates and redefines the event. The article focuses on how the manga has been discussed in Taiwanese society: which issues were raised and omitted; what statements and utterances were made and who spoke; whose voices and what statements were repressed and therefore disappeared?

In what follows, the article will first introduce Kobayashi’s historiographical perspective manifested in the manga—a modernization discourse. Second, it will draw on the dispute over this manga due to the publication of the Chinese translation in Taiwan—consisting of criticisms and defenses of the manga’s interpretation/narration of Taiwan’s colonial history, in particular in relation to the history of Taiwan’s former comfort women. Third, the article will argue that an intense discussion of the issue of comfort women paradoxically turned

to intentionally overlooking it. Finally, the article will show how the debates at later stages of the controversy about the manga transformed the comfort women issue into freedom of expression concerns in Taiwan, and how the term human rights eventually came to function as an identity marker.

Yoshinori Kobayashi's historiographical perspective in *On Taiwan: a modernization discourse*

The book cover of the Chinese edition is dominated by an image of a peanut, a symbol of the Taiwanese spirit, mounted by a Japanese samurai. On the back cover is a peanut that has been split and filled with white rice, a red plum in the center, readily invoking the image of the Japanese national flag. The political message hinted at in the design of the book covers is, as Tetsushi Marukawa suggested, that “when you crack open Taiwan, there is ‘Japan’ inside.”¹² It is however noted that this “Japan” is not the contemporary [78] Japan of the 21st century but the Japan during the prewar era of the early 20th century, which Kobayashi conceptualizes as a Taiwanese notion—the so-called “Japanese spirit.”

The notion of “Japanese spirit” in Taiwan is originally related to nostalgia for the Japanese colonial period. According to Jin Meiling and Zhou Yingming, it has general connotations of “the qualities of cleanliness, justice, honesty, diligence, politeness, trustworthiness,

responsibility, lawfulness”¹³—all attributes of modernity that a good modern citizen of the nation should possess. However, in the manga a “deeper” meaning of Japanese spirit is emphasized, that is, an implementation of a Japanese slogan, *Messhihoko* (滅私奉公), literally “the annihilation of self and commitment to the public good.”¹⁴ Every member of a collective Self should forsake his/her own selfish/private interests for the sake of the public good. Kobayashi painstakingly illustrates this aspect of Japanese spirit, albeit not directly through his own words but through the mouths of Taiwanese. Borrowing from Taiwan's former president Lee Teng-Hui, Kobayashi says promoting the public good means the “death of self.”¹⁵

If one wants to lead a meaningful life, one has to consider the question of death constantly. It is not physical death but absolute negation of the self. One needs to totally negate oneself, thereby devoting oneself to the public good.¹⁶

It is worth noting that the public good in this context is directly and exclusively regarded as identical to the “state,” “country,” or “nation”—a collective Self.¹⁷

Having conducted several interviews with former president Lee, a member of the Taiwanese intelligentsia that grew up and were educated during the Japanese occupation, Kobayashi finds that such Japanese virtues, which had been lost in postwar Japan, are preserved in Taiwan, particularly among the Japanese-educated generation (or Japanese-language generation, as they are termed). Kobayashi, on various occasions, praises Lee for demonstrating the perfect spirit of “self-sacrifice for the

sake of the country,” forsaking his own happiness and self interests, and struggling to secure the interests of his nation.¹⁸ He compliments Lee as the best inheritor of the Japanese spirit, an authentic samurai.¹⁹ In contrast to Taiwan, Chinese society, including those Mainlanders in Taiwan who did not experience Japanese colonial rule, is incapable of cultivating the concept of “public good,” according to Kobayashi.²⁰ They are aware only of themselves but not of the public.

Notwithstanding his comments on Taiwan, Kobayashi actually addresses his Japanese compatriots. As many critiques indicated,²¹ Kobayashi wants to represent Taiwan as the perfect embodiment of the Japanese spirit that he would like his Japanese contemporaries to revive. The primary societal ill of Japan today, according to Kobayashi, is its lack of patriotism—the abundance of selfish interests with a dearth of consideration for the public good.²² He intends to introduce Taiwan to his compatriots in order to enlighten the Japanese youth about what “authentic” Japanese spirit is. From the viewpoint of many critiques in Japan, this task is, however, problematic. As Yoshihiko Honda noted, the attributes of the so-called Japanese spirit are those values fitting Taiwanese traditional moralities—which all Asian agricultural societies once adhered to.²³

Alongside the Japanese spirit, another prominent inheritance of Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan is the island’s modernization. In the manga, Kobayashi repeatedly alludes to modern development under Japanese colonial administration: building infrastructure in [79] agriculture, transportation, and so on. As Kobayashi tries to convince his readers, the course of modernization that the Japanese embarked on transformed Taiwan into a modern, civilized society. The Taiwanese people under his pen are grateful for Japanese colonial rule. He goes to some lengths to find supporting evidence for this typifying. For instance, Kobayashi quotes Xu Wenlong, a pro-independence Taiwanese tycoon who spent the first 17 years of his life under Japanese colonial rule, saying that Japanese rule in Taiwan actually helped people in Taiwan to experience the “taste of happiness.”²⁴ According to Xu, the people in Taiwan were not concerned about who their rulers were. Their true concern was whether rulers would protect their economic interests and improve their livelihoods and living conditions. By virtue of this perspective, in Xu’s view, Taiwanese people “certainly need to appreciate the Japanese colonization and grant them a positive appraisal.”²⁵ The former president Lee in the manga echoed this line of thought.²⁶

Kobayashi therefore contends that Japan should be remembered as a benevolent colonizing country that “brought greater well-being” to its subjects—the Asian people.²⁷ The Japanese people today do not need to feel ashamed of their fathers or grandfathers. The conception of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere was just. Here, Kobayashi reiterates his argument in his earlier work *On War* (戦争論) that modern Japan’s inability to take pride in its wartime history has led to a crisis of national consciousness.²⁸ A thorny problem with this rhetoric is that, as Tetsushi Marukawa noted, Kobayashi “selectively uses so-called pro-Japanese opinion in Taiwan to legitimize past Japanese colonial rule.”²⁹

In addition, in the manga Kobayashi frequently emphasizes the imperative for the modern subject to consider the issues of self-belongingness and self-identification. He keeps asking himself the following questions—“where do I belong?,” “who am I?,” and “what is my existence?”³⁰ For him, such questions are different formulations of the self-identification problem. Only by assuring one’s self-belongingness is one capable of interacting with others, thereby establishing an ethical relationship with the society as a whole.³¹ This line of thinking apparently echoes within modern political ideas of communitarianism.³² Nevertheless, what makes Kobayashi’s line of thinking particularly striking is that he makes self-belongingness interchangeable with national identity. The meaning of one’s existence is therefore solely defined by one’s nation.

On this basis, Kobayashi further elaborates the notion of nation. He opposes efforts to define nationalities by consanguinity; rather, they should be defined by language and territory.³³ Kobayashi suggests that nationalism is nurtured from a joint history, thereby fashioning a shared spirit and a common language on the same plot of land. As Joyce Liu analyzed, Kobayashi’s understanding of the nature of nationality requires that “the spiritual essence that constitutes the nation is the spiritual inheritance said to be shared by everyone in the community, and that the partaking of such abstract spirituality demands the voiding of the interior of an individual so that it can be replaced by the abstract spirit.”³⁴ This is how Kobayashi considers the essence of the Taiwanese nation. Since the spiritual inheritance,

national language, and common history take precedence over blood ties and racial homogeneity in determining the boundary of a nation, people in Taiwan should not embrace “consanguineous nationalism” as Kobayashi terms it, identifying themselves as Chinese; instead, they should be unified by their common history (Japanese colonial experience), shared spirit (Japanese spirit), and distinctive language (Minnan dialect), upholding their self-identification as Taiwanese. Moreover, in order to become a subject [80] defined by the nation, the people in Taiwan have to renounce their Chinese descent, so that they can enter the domain guarded by the constitution of the Taiwanese nation.

After all, Kobayashi’s political rhetoric manifested in the manga demonstrates a specific form of modernization discourse. This discourse is threefold. First, Taiwan under Japanese colonization had reformed “premodern/backward” Chinese culture, transforming it into a “modernized” Taiwanese culture. The people in Taiwan accordingly evolved from “uncivilized Chinese” to “civilized Taiwanese.” The accommodation of Japanese spirit was the symbol of this transformation. Chinese cultural “contaminants” in this respect must be purged. Second, for Kobayashi, the modernization project under Japanese rule helped to form a shared identity. This line of argument in fact recapitulates a scholarly modernist argument of nationalism, which argues that the course of modernization created the possibility for a new form of imagined community.³⁵ Following this line of argument, it is not difficult to appreciate Kobayashi’s remarks that the different aspects of Taiwan’s modernization under Japan’s colonization, such as the building of an islandwide transportation

network, the free flow of information, and the spread of Japanese as a common language, all made significant contributions to the formation of a Taiwanese identity. Third, the modernization discourse exemplified by Kobayashi suggests that the only way to achieve modernization is to comply with the regime of the nation-state. National belonging or national identity is imperative for the modern subject to define the meaning of Self, in order to exist. Everyone in the modern era should therefore possess a nationality; and only with a nationality would a group of people achieve progress and modernization. In this regard, nationalism is not merely engaged in the modernization project; rather, nationalism is in fact part and parcel of the modernization project itself.

Under this modernization discourse, the positive image of, and even nostalgia towards, Japanese colonialism held by many native Taiwanese becomes intelligible. Unlike Koreans, who fiercely detested Japanese colonial rule, the Taiwanese are said to reminisce about their colonial past and approvingly recollect the virtues of Japanese occupation.³⁶ As Leo Ching noted, “If the Koreans speak of oppression and resistance, the Taiwanese speak of modernization and development.”³⁷ Japan’s colonization over Taiwan in this discourse is interpreted as an impulse to help forge a collective and shared identity among the people of Taiwan, transforming Taiwan into a nation-state in the modern sense. Moreover, this modernization discourse in fact profoundly shapes, if anything, boundaries and connotations

of a “Taiwan nation.” A series of dichotomies is created to mark the striking difference

between the people in China and the people in Taiwan. The “China-man” is perceived as feudalistic, reactionary, and lacking any sense of the public good, while the Taiwanese, who benefited greatly from Japan’s colonization, is modern, progressive, and full of the public good. No matter how ill-defined these descriptive terms are, this set of dichotomies helps to serve the practice of marking “us”—the Taiwanese—from “them”—the Chinese.

In summary, *On Taiwan* is a comic text in which Kobayashi introduces and comments on Taiwan, with the intention of legitimizing Japan’s past imperial history and to reignite the prewar Japanese spirit among young people in contemporary Japanese society. Taiwan under his pen is more or less like “Jurassic Park.”³⁸ The dinosaur (Japanese spirit) that is considered to be extinct is now “rediscovered” living on an island (Taiwan). The major problem with his attempt is that its image of Taiwan is in fact to a great extent partial, if not distorted. The representation of Taiwan under his pen is incomplete and limited. [81]

First, Kobayashi purposefully overembellishes or overbeautifies the image of Taiwan in order to manifest the glory of the Japanese spirit. Japanese people might be disappointed when they see the real Taiwan. As Yoshihiko Honda commented, Kobayashi’s illustration of Taiwan regarding Japanese spirit is a self-deception.³⁹ In the end, Japanese readers would have a biased understanding of contemporary Taiwan and, quite possibly, Japan itself.

Second, Kobayashi ignores all other experiences and opinions of Japan that are particular to ethnic groups, classes, genders, and so on in

Taiwan. The historiographical perspective presented in the manga is solely enjoyed by the so-called Japanese-language generation, or more precisely speaking, a small group of Minnan-based (as opposed to Hakka, Aborigines, Mainlanders, etc.), masculinist-oriented (as opposed to feminine, homosexual, etc.), and aristocratic-centered (as opposed to proletarian, tenant farmer, etc.) people who were once Japanese. Many essays in both Japan and Taiwan have identified Kobayashi's failure to recognize the complex and widely divergent attitudes towards Japan in Taiwanese society⁴⁰ and criticized Kobayashi's simplistic reading of Taiwanese politics as designed simply to serve his anti-China, anticommunist sentiments, and his purpose of obscuring many injustices of Japanese colonialism in the past.⁴¹ Takeshi Komagome further accused Kobayashi of "systematically erasing" certain groups of Taiwanese.⁴² As a result, it is not surprising that the publication of the Chinese translation of *On Taiwan* prompted strong outrage among different peoples in Taiwanese society, something this article will deal with in the following section.

Disputes over the issue of comfort women

After the Chinese version of *On Taiwan* was published in Taiwan in early 2001, several women's rights groups—most notably, the Taipei Women's Rescue Foundation, a nongovernmental

organization long dedicated to fact-finding on Taiwanese comfort women—launched a campaign against Kobayashi, calling on the public to boycott the manga because of its sketch of the history of Taiwanese comfort women.

In the manga, Kobayashi quotes Taiwanese tycoon Xu Wenlong as contending that the Japanese government could not possibly have forced comfort women to work against their will. As Xu says in the manga, according to his personal investigation, working in a Japanese military brothel was the best possible thing for many Taiwanese women. He continues (in the manga) that the Japanese military at that time was very concerned about human rights. Hygiene standards there could not have been better, and the job of comfort woman was a lucrative one. Therefore, all women entertained a hope to enter the military in this way, and used it as a way of raising their social status—far from being coerced to join it.⁴³ Xu's comments are illustrated with a drawing of Taiwanese women cheerfully lining up to be recruited by a seated Japanese officer.

The aforementioned illustration of comfort women sparked strong anger in Taiwan. On 21 February 2001, women's rights groups held a press conference in Taipei, refuting the twisted representation of Taiwanese comfort women in the manga. They argued that the majority of comfort women were recruited against their will.⁴⁴ The protest quickly spread across the political arena of Taiwan. Over the following days, a series of press conferences was held by opposition legislators in the Legislative Yuan (the parliament), expressing their profound disapproval of Kobayashi's and Xu's remarks. One of the [82] legislators even dramatically tore the manga in half.⁴⁵ The demands made by those legislators were twofold. First, they called on Xu to apologize for his comments on

the comfort women and urged the then-President Chen Shui-Bian to remove Xu from his position as a presidential advisor. Xu had earlier been invited to be a senior advisor to the president. Second, the opposition legislators requested that the Executive Yuan (the cabinet) start a probe to see if any government officials had been involved in what they called “practices disgracing the nation.”⁴⁶ Along with those press conferences, two 80-year-old former comfort women were brought together to have an informal meeting with the then-premier during a break in an interpellation session at the legislature. The two elderly ex-comfort women presented their case to the premier, condemning Xu for his distortion of the history of the comfort women. The public resentment towards the manga not only appeared in parliament but also in the streets. Protests occurred in a number of cities in Taiwan; a book-burning ceremony took place outside Taipei’s biggest bookstore.

Xu initially refused to comment on the issue. Yet, after public discontent increased, Xu responded for the first time to the controversy on 25 February 2001. At the conference he denied ever having said that comfort women had willingly accepted their work as sex slaves for the Japanese. Yet, he reiteratively stressed that “the Japanese military did not force those women to become comfort women, rather it was their own parents that forced those women.”⁴⁷ Moreover, Xu suggested that Taiwan should not jeopardize its relationship with Japan due to this manga since Japan, as an important business partner of Taiwan, actually contributes greatly to the development of Taiwan’s economy.

Xu’s responses to the public did not calm the public fury but only triggered another fiercer wave of protest. While some people publicly castigated Xu as a businessman who “runs after the cash by discarding his dignity” and “earns money from his compatriots to flatter the Japanese,” others condemned Xu as undeserving of being Taiwanese.⁴⁸ Derogatory terms such as “Japanese dog,” “slaver of the Japanese,” “Han-Chinese traitor,” and “aged imperial subject” were widely used to label Xu and the former president Lee—members of the Japanese-language generation.⁴⁹ Some prosecutors even expressed the idea of putting Xu on trial for his libel of the comfort women.⁵⁰ Under such pressure, Xu was then forced to issue another statement.⁵¹ In the statement, Xu insisted that, in accordance with what he had heard and seen during Taiwan’s colonization by Japan, comfort women had indeed not been coerced. The statement contended that people today are unable to fully understand the life of people in Taiwan in the early part of the last century. Xu wrote:

Modern people are clueless about the historic background of that era; neither do [people today] understand the thoughts and concepts of the Taiwanese who were once governed by the Japanese. These factors all triggered a gap of historic interpretation between Taiwan’s older and younger generations.⁵²

Xu’s statement cited in the preceding paragraph stressed the cognitive gaps between those who once were Japanese and those who were brought up under the Kuomintang’s education. In addition, he implicitly indicated that the voices of his generation were repressed in Tai-

wanese society. However, this explanation did not receive much sympathy. [83] Xu finally released a written apology on 27 February 2001, in which he admitted his remarks on the manga were “biased” because of his “limited experience.”⁵³

Amid the debate revolving around the “comfort women” issue, hundreds of articles were widely published in Taiwan. The mainstream press, such as the *China Times* (中國時報), found it hard to accept the fact that Kobayashi’s arguments found sympathy in Taiwan. A large number of articles blamed pro-Japan attitudes upheld by the Japanese-language generation for such sympathy. For instance, a senior journalist, Xia Zhen, argued that a subconscious nostalgia for Japanese colonial rule among the older generation could have twisted the understanding about the history of Taiwan, such as the history of comfort women. She noted that the older generation who had been educated under Japan’s rule had little experience of Japanese atrocities and tended to side with Japan.⁵⁴ The former president Lee was singled out for criticism in Peng Huixian’s commentary. Peng wrote that it was “absurd,” “pitiful,” “lamentable,” and “dangerous” to hear what Lee had said in the manga, especially when he frequently advocates constructing Taiwan’s subjectivity.⁵⁵ Likewise, Chen Shichang described Lee as an “aged Japan-junky,” a “guardian of the Japanese spirit,” who, being mentally disordered, tends to seek imaginary roots, thereby misplacing his self-identification.⁵⁶

Meanwhile, the commentators also dwelled upon the linkage between Taiwan’s independence corps and Japan’s right-wing forces. Zeng Jianmin,⁵⁷ for instance, argued that the publication of *On Taiwan* in Japan is not a coincidence but reveals cooperation between Taiwanese independence advocates and Japan’s right-wing forces. Zheng Xiujuan,⁵⁸ likewise,

suggested that the publishing is in fact the consequence of the mobilization by some pro-independence native Taiwanese who reside in Japan, with the aim of bringing the attention of the Japanese populace to Taiwan. Zheng admitted that such an effort indeed successfully “advertises” Taiwan in Japan, as the manga praises Japan’s role played in East Asia prior to World War II thereby creating a warm reception in Japan. Nevertheless, Zheng reprimanded those trying to build a distinctive Taiwanese consciousness upon the basis of the legacy of Japanese colonialism (i.e., the Japanese spirit) as being “too shallow and dangerous.” Peng Huixian also disagreed with the idea that Taiwan should, while facing China’s military intimidation, act jointly with Japanese right-wingers and approve of Japanese colonization in Taiwan, since by doing so the people in Taiwan would internalize Japanese colonialism and fail to take the opportunity to reflect on the complex and ambivalent impacts of Japanese colonialism in Taiwan.⁵⁹

The image of “Japan” in Taiwan during this period was widely represented as right-wing, nationalistic, and somewhat militaristic.⁶⁰ Ironically, this image was simultaneously produced by both pro-independence and pro-unification advocates. While independence proponents appealed only to Japan’s right-wing arguments in order to get public support from Japanese society and to differentiate Taiwanese-ness from Chinese-ness, unification proponents in return used the same depic-

tions to attack independence advocates' remarks. "Japan," as a result, was limited to those reactionary voices of Japanese society. Other voices were simply left out. It is precisely for this reason that some political commentators in both Taiwan and Japan called for creating more comprehensive communication between the two countries, rather than solely relying on the interaction between Taiwan's Japanese-language generation and Japan's right-wingers.⁶¹ [84]

In actuality, the promotion and maintenance of relations between Taiwan and Japan have indeed relied heavily on personal connections.⁶² It is easier for the old Taiwanese intelligentsia such as former president Lee to interact with Japan on the basis of their personal relationships. Undeniably, Lee has appealed to many Japanese. His goodwill towards the Japanese culture has satisfied the Japanese conservatives' nostalgia for the old days. Also, while Japan has constantly been reproached by the world for its wartime invasions, Lee has been the only foreign leader who praises Japan and calls for Japan to play a leading political and economic role in Asia.⁶³ In addition, many Japanese are deeply attracted by Lee's personal charm, his erudition in Japanese culture, and his fluent Japanese.⁶⁴ As Peng-Er Lam noted, "Lee is ... the best propagandist in the Taiwanese cause of wooing the Japanese."⁶⁵

Yet, the risks of this manner of interaction are, first, that the Taiwan-Japan relationship will possibly come under severe threat as this intelligentsia ages;⁶⁶ second, it causes the mutual understanding of both societies to become unbalanced, since the Japanese-language generation only constitutes a small part of Taiwanese society and its members enter into dialogue with only one of the two poles of Japan's political spectrum; third and more importantly, this incomplete and unbalanced dialogue not only affects the relationship between Taiwan and Japan but, more significantly, it profoundly fashions the characteristics of the so-called Taiwanese national identity. The constitution of Taiwanese national identity is somewhat regarded as intimately associated with Japan's right-wing forces or militarism. As shown previously, the linkage between Taiwan's independence corps and Japan's right-wing forces was highlighted amid the controversy over Kobayashi's *On Taiwan*. This linkage is also manifested in the controversies over Yasukuni issues, a symbol of Japanese militarism. Phil Deans's study demonstrates that for those who support the independence of Taiwan, "the shrine offers an alternative ... reading of Taiwanese history that separates it from the Chinese mainland, and offers a special relationship with Japan."⁶⁷ It is in this context that Ichiyo Muto, a Japanese scholar, speaking to an international forum organized by the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan (known for its pro-independence stance), warned the audience to beware of their "friends" in Japan. He noted, "It is extremely dangerous for the Taiwanese people to ally with them [Japan's right-wing forces]. They are rekindling nostalgia for the imperial past, regarding Taiwan as still part of the Japanese empire."⁶⁸

This method of identity formation, which is intimately associated with Japan's right-wing forces, is totally distasteful for those who do not approve of Japanese colonialism/militarism. The latter therefore tended, as found in aforementioned articles that blamed pro-Japan attitudes

upheld by the Japanese-language generation, not only to refute the colonial intelligentsia's Japanese experiences, as well as their interpretations of Taiwan's history stressing the momentousness of Japanese colonization, but also to attack their elaborations of the connotation of Taiwanese-ness that insist upon Japanese-ness existing significantly within it. In consequence, the Japanese-language generation's interpretations of history as well as their elaborations of Taiwanese-ness are refuted in the mainstream of Taiwanese society. This refutation is paradoxical and ironic because their voices have in fact been dominant in discourses on Taiwanese identity construction and have played a significant role in Taiwan's political discourse. In fact, there is always a collective anxiety circulating in the pro-independence community, agonizing that the voices of native Taiwanese would be suppressed by the Mainlanders,⁶⁹ though the latter are actually even [85] more marginalized. This collective anxiety is clearly manifested in the pro-independence proponents' opinions over the "comfort women" issue.

Amid this wave of debate, voices from the pro-Kobayashi camp including some Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) politicians and Taiwanese independence advocates were very restrained and low-key. They barely made public verbal comments on the controversy surrounding the manga. Instead, they published articles, responding against those who condemned Kobayashi and the figures cited in the manga in a few pro-independence

newspapers such as *The Liberty Times* (自由時報) and the *Taiwan Daily News* (臺灣日報). Some of those articles were collected and edited in the book *The Storm of "On Taiwan"* (臺灣論風暴). The pro-Kobayashi camp's viewpoints can be summarized as follows.

First of all, they referred to the so-called "military paradises"—institutions for prostitution in the Kuomintang's army—operating during the authoritarian period, questioning the "double standards" held by the then-opposition parties and human rights groups. According to those articles,⁷⁰ after the Kuomintang regime and its army of about 600,000 soldiers retreated to Taiwan in the late 1940s, the government set up military paradises on frontline islands such as Kinmen and Matsu to fulfill the sexual needs of its soldiers, who were mostly Mainlanders. Such operations gradually ended as the generation of Mainlander soldiers aged in the 1960s and 1970s. The articles highlighted that while those opposition politicians and women's rights groups criticized Kobayashi and Xu, they simply overlooked the existence of the Kuomintang's military paradises as well as other violations of human rights such as the 2-28 Incident and the White Terror.

Meanwhile, many commentaries also expressed suspicions,⁷¹ suggesting that while the comfort women issue had been in the news for quite a few years since 1992, this issue only became a hot topic after the row over *On Taiwan* put a political gloss on it. Consequently they concluded that those who were condemning Kobayashi and Xu were not sincere in their concerns; opposition politicians only tried to exploit the comfort women issue to embarrass then-incumbent president Chen. For them, issues such as comfort women or Japanese colonialism were used by pro-unification parties to incite public resentment toward the

government and Taiwanese independence advocates such as Xu. Under this rhetoric, the comfort women issue turned from a women's rights issue into a political one. Thus, from the viewpoint of those pro-independence proponents, the emergence of the comfort women issue was a conspiracy initiated by opposition parties and pro-unification forces.

A renowned pro-independence writer, Song Zelai, backed this line of thought. He published a series of articles in the *Taiwan Daily News*. One of them contended that the furor over *On Taiwan* was a stratagem launched by the Mainlander-led media (where he referred to the *China Times* and the *United Daily News* [聯合報]),⁷² intending to prohibit the "age-old native Taiwanese" from telling the truth about Taiwan's history, and proposing to demolish the historiographical perspective of the native Taiwanese. According to Song, the old generation of native Taiwanese who experienced Japanese colonial rule would agree with the former president Lee and entrepreneur Xu's remarks quoted in Kobayashi's manga. In another article,⁷³ Song challenged the justification of the criticisms of Kobayashi made by the Mainlanders. He wrote that those ill-fated native Taiwanese women (the comfort women) were used as a political instrument against the native [86] Taiwanese, stirring up the internal conflict within the native Taiwanese community. From this point of view, the issue of the comfort women turned out to be exclusively a matter for the native Taiwanese community. Mainlanders, as outsiders, should not engage in this affair. This line of thinking, surprisingly, found sympathy in contemporary Taiwanese society. Hu Changsong,⁷⁴ for instance, suggested that the ethnic group of the Mainlanders is not entitled to comment upon Taiwan's national affairs such as the comfort women issue because Taiwan was ceded to Japan by their (the Mainlanders') ancestors 100 years ago.

The confabulation of comfort women

In respect to the turmoil over comfort women issues during this period, the nature of the debate owes very little to women's rights but more to national/ethnic identity. When women's groups first went public with their complaints against the manga, they presumably addressed a worthwhile and serious issue. However, since comfort women were a product of Japanese colonization, the subject immediately became a sensitive subject of national identity in the eyes of many Taiwanese people. In this respect, the pro-independence proponents were fairly right to interpret the turmoil over comfort women as an ethnic or identity conflict. Nevertheless, this transformation of the nature of the turmoil does not come innately; rather, it is what both sides—pro-independence advocates/Taiwanese sympathizers and pro-unification advocates/Chinese sympathizers—made of it, since they are all mired in a masculinism-based nationalist way of thinking.

The gender aspects of nationalism have been increasingly addressed in the scholarly literature on nation and nationalism recently.⁷⁵ Most of them agree that nations and nationalisms are themselves gender formations. Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias summarize women's roles in the nation and nationalism as follows:

(1) as biological reproducers of members of ethnic collectivities; (2) as reproducers of the boundaries of ethnic/national groups; (3) as participating centrally in the ideological reproduction of the collectivity and as the transmitters of its culture; (4) as signifiers of ethnic/national differences; (5) as participants in national, economic, political and military struggles.⁷⁶

On this account, the implications of masculinism-based nationalism are twofold. First, women are urged to carry out their duties as mothers more seriously for the good of the nation. If women's roles as public citizens are defined by their ability to produce children, those women who use sex for other ends of necessity threaten this assumed role. Second, for a long time the concept of "nation" has commonly been expressed in terms of maternal imagery and the virginity of the female sex has been perceived as the purity and integrity of the nation. Therefore, invasions of a nation by foreign forces are analogized as violations of a woman's body, thereby contaminating her purity and violating her virginity.

Under this masculinist-nationalist discourse, some Chinese sympathizers regarded the mentality behind Kobayashi's illustrations of the comfort women as a variant of Japanese jingoism and called the manga an insult to the dignity of the Chinese people. It was even more unacceptable for the Chinese sympathizers when they found some native Taiwanese siding with Kobayashi in such disputes. Many Chinese sympathizers had long [87] held suspicions that the native Taiwanese had betrayed their Chinese "motherhood" during Japanese colonization. As for the pro-independence camp, their responses to the furor over comfort women also manifested its masculinist-nationalist way of thinking. Bringing the military paradise matters forward to the public not only showed their anti-Chinese/Kuomintang/Mainlander sentiments but more importantly, it also demonstrated different subject positions (as opposed to "the Chinese") associated with "Japan" when considering their self-identification. For those native Taiwanese who were once Japanese, "Japan" is the object that the Self intends to be, thereby being part of the Self. This sort of mentality of the colonized is depicted vividly by Albert Memmi:

The first attempt of the colonized is to change his condition by changing his skin. There is a tempting model very close at hand—the colonizer.... The first ambition of the colonized is to become equal to that splendid model and to resemble him to the point of disappearing in him.⁷⁷

Once one conceives of "Japan" as part of the Self and China/the Kuomintang/the Mainlander as external to the Self, it becomes clear that one does not condemn the use of comfort women by the Japanese army during the war period but censures the Kuomintang's operation of military paradises. Moreover, it also explains why those who were once "Japanese" like Xu said that working in a Japanese military brothel had been the "best possible thing" for many Taiwanese women.

Under this masculinist-nationalist discourse, comfort women in Taiwan have been shackled with a double burden: the virginity of a

woman and the virginity of a nation. These severe gender discriminations have been imposed on them for over 50 years. They have been denied a voice since their purities as women and as national subjects were “contaminated” by men and by “foreigners.” Hyun-Sook Kim, in her study of Korean comfort women,⁷⁸ demonstrated how the grief and suffering of the comfort women were presented in Korea as the humiliation and shame of the nation as a whole, thereby suppressing any discussion about the comfort women themselves. The survivors kept silent about their painful experiences. Kim further contended that even if the issue was discussed, the mention only of comfort women tended to arouse anti-Japanese and Korean nationalist sentiments, rather than genuine interest in the story that the survivors would want to tell. Firmly grounded in this position, as another scholar Chunghee Soh noted,⁷⁹ the refusal to accept the privately raised compensation money offered by the Asia Women’s Fund in Korea and Taiwan demonstrated that the issue of the comfort women in both societies is interpreted as one between nations,⁸⁰ rather than between individuals—a nationalist perspective. Individual survivors are therefore not allowed to make decisions for themselves, whether or not they want to accept the compensation. Soh hence concluded that the survivors’ rights to self-determination regarding the proper resolution to their victimization as comfort women have been violated.⁸¹ Survivors’ voices are accordingly silenced in the name of “national pride.” Here, we can see the overlapping effects of nationalism and masculinism.

Moreover, since masculinism and nationalism were so dominant in the debate over comfort women, many issues concerning women’s rights that needed to be addressed were easily overlooked, important issues such as demanding sufficient compensation from the Japanese government,⁸² the masculine posture treating women as sexual objects [88] whose purpose is to foster men’s psychological security, government complicity in acting as an agent to recruit women to serve the troops’ sexual needs,⁸³ sex trafficking that dupes girls and women into prostitution,⁸⁴ or issues of class in the practices of modern prostitution.⁸⁵ An intense discussion of comfort women paradoxically turned into intentionally overlooking the subject. This phenomenon was similar to the situation in Korea in the 1990s, in which the dissemination of the stories concerning comfort women simultaneously relegated comfort women to the margins. Through her studies of news reports in Korea, Hyunah Yang offered her critique of this paradox.⁸⁶ She argued that in those reports the comfort women being discussed were treated as “informants,” rather than as the main figures or “subjective agents,” so as to reinforce what is already constructed. In this way, Yang noted, pursuing the truth ironically leads to the trivialization of the comfort women’s concerns. What happened in Korea in the 1990s was replicated in Taiwan in the 21st century. Indeed, amid the controversy over Kobayashi’s manga, the voices of the real victims—comfort women—were hardly heard in Taiwanese society.

Disputes over freedom of speech—human rights as an identity marker

The government of Taiwan announced on 2 March 2001 that it would

ban Kobayashi from visiting Taiwan. The decision was made in a committee meeting reviewing the case of Kobayashi. The committee was organized by the Ministry of the Interior in accordance with the Immigration Act, which states that foreigners might be banned from entering Taiwan if they “are believed to endanger national interests, public security, public order, or the good name of the State.”⁸⁷ A storm of criticism arose immediately after the order was issued. Critics argued that the contents of the manga belonged in the realm of free speech and should not be cited as a reason for the government to ban the author’s visit.

Some pro-independence advocates, Huang Fu-San for instance, contended that the move was a step too far and could jeopardize Taiwan’s hard-won reputation as a “democratic country” in the international community. Huang said:

Kobayashi is only a cartoonist. Because of this small book, the government has decided to ban him from visiting. I think some might therefore equate Taiwan with a communist country where free speech is banned.⁸⁸

He further claimed that the government’s move was meant for domestic consumption, a response to demands made by pro-China politicians from the opposition parties. From this viewpoint, the furor over comfort women issues (and over *On Taiwan*) was shepherded by pro-China/unification politicians and the decision made by the Ministry was a concession to pro-China/unification voices. Likewise, Vice-President Annette Lu also denounced the decision. She said in the press:

The DPP has praised itself for advocating reform in the field of human rights in the past, and President Chen has also pledged to rule the country on the basis of human rights ... whether to protect freedom of speech is a very important index by which to judge the standard of human [89] rights in the country and, therefore, neither the decision [to bar the controversial cartoonist] nor to burn his comic books conforms to the principle.⁸⁹

This line of argument was not only upheld by the pro-independence camp; some notable scholars and human rights activists also proclaimed that Taiwan was overreacting to the manga. Bo Yang—the renowned author of *The Ugly Chinaman* (醜陋的中國人) and also a member of the president’s human rights advisory group—said that such a move (to ban Kobayashi from entering Taiwan) simply reminds the Taiwanese people of the authoritarian period when freedom of expression was strictly suppressed.⁹⁰ The decision to ban Kobayashi from entering Taiwan was then represented in the media of Taiwan as an affront to freedom of speech and, subsequently, as reminiscent of the repression of the martial law era.

Following a chorus of criticism from Taiwan’s public opinion, on 3 March 2001 the cabinet formally backtracked, saying that the decision to bar Kobayashi was “not definite” and should be reconsidered in order to avoid damaging “Taiwan’s democratic image.”⁹¹ The topics of the controversy over *On Taiwan* at this point diverged from the comfort

women issue, turning to the issues of the breach of freedom of speech/human rights. This metamorphosis of the nature of the controversy was reinforced and accelerated after Jin Meiling—a Japan-based national policy advisor who is also a longstanding supporter of Taiwan's independence—returned to Taiwan in early March to defend Kobayashi and his right to visit Taiwan. Public opinion during this time focused on freedom of speech and human rights issues. Those opinions can be categorized as follows.

First of all, although the manga had indeed triggered uproar and many people found it hard to accept Kobayashi's right-wing views, commentators proclaimed that Kobayashi's freedom of speech must be respected.⁹² Voltaire's renowned remark—"I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it"—was frequently quoted in the press of Taiwan during that time.⁹³ Moreover, since virtually all of the high-ranking officials in the Democratic Progressive Party-led government fought against the Kuomintang in the past to win Taiwan's democratization, commentators further urged that the Party should not be so willing to let it go now.⁹⁴ A columnist, Zheng Xiujuan, questioned whether the Party would "leave behind its human rights insinuations with which they fought the Kuomintang's authoritarian regime after it came to power."⁹⁵ If the Party-led government did not correct its own mistake, it was said, not only would Taiwan destroy its hard-won democratic image but its path of democratization also would backtrack to the level of China. For the aforementioned commentators, Taiwan and China were diametrical opposites in many aspects. Yet, it appeared to them that the two had actually integrated in at least one way when Taiwan's government decided to prohibit Kobayashi's entry. Zheng stated: "How will the government be able to argue that the two sides of the [Taiwan] Strait are different because Taiwan is a democracy and China is a totalitarian regime?"⁹⁶ This line of argument was, however, challenged by the following two alternatives.

A major competing rhetorical argument stressed the imperatives of national dignity, interest, and sovereignty.⁹⁷ This line of argument suggested that the move of the Ministry of Interior was a legitimate exercise of Taiwan's national sovereignty. It argued that, whether or not Kobayashi really loved Taiwan as he claimed, his status as a "foreigner" to Taiwan was unquestionable. Furthermore, the decision was made by government [90] agencies through a legal procedure. Moreover, it contended that international norms have never required countries to issue visas to all foreigners, just as one does not necessarily have to agree to allow into one's house all visitors who ring the doorbell. The rationale behind this line of argument is that national interests or sovereignty should take priority over considerations of human rights and freedom of speech. An alternative approach took the ideas of "ethics of speech" or "position of speech actor" into account when reviewing the controversy.⁹⁸ It suggested that ethics of speech and positions of the speech actor do matter when considering freedom of speech. One is not free to say just anything; one cannot simply speak one's mind, when one likes or where one likes. In respect of Xu's remarks on comfort women, some commentators argue that it is simply not morally right to make

such comments on the basis of his personal experiences. Even though Xu enjoys freedom of speech, it does not mean that he can legitimately say anything that might cause others offense, especially when he was a member of the government. They argued that if Xu had been an ordinary citizen, he would have been free to make such a statement. But he was not. They therefore called on Xu to either retract his statement or resign as presidential advisor.

Such concerns that lay stress on ethics of speech or position of speech actor are particularly worthy of consideration when reflecting on the whole event, though they are not the main focus of this article. The final part of this article instead argues that the turmoil over *On Taiwan* at this stage showed the significant role played by human rights in the formation of a Taiwanese national identity. Human rights in Taiwan is in fact functioning as a marker of identity, serving as a mechanism to differentiate Taiwan from China.

It has been noted that national identity in Taiwan has always been defined in terms of its relationship with mainland China. As Shih Chih-Yu argues,⁹⁹ for decades anticommunist ideology, to which the Kuomintang regime had long subscribed, played the role of laying a foundation of a distinctive (Chinese) national identity in Taiwan to differentiate it from communist China. Human rights issues seemed trivial for Taiwan at that stage of maintaining its distinctive national identity. Nevertheless, this ideology lost its function to maintain an identity distinctive from China in the aftermath of several diplomatic, political, economic, and cultural developments since the 1970s. The task of maintaining a distinctive national identity for the Taipei regime then became extremely difficult. According to Shih, Taiwan's official position on human rights issues consequently transformed. In order to redefine Taiwan's national identity vis-a-vis China, the Kuomintang under the presidency of Lee Teng-Hui began to use the concepts of democracy or human rights not only to struggle against his political rivals domestically—Mainlander politicians of the Kuomintang—but, more importantly, to further differentiate Taiwan from China “internationally.” Likewise, for the Democratic Progressive Party regime after it came to power in 2000, human rights issues also served as a differentiation of the “New Taiwan” under the Party's administration from the “Old Taiwan” under the Kuomintang's rule. Human rights under this circumstance came to be seen as an identity marker, and played a significant role in Taiwanese nationalist rhetoric.

To summarize, the debate over *On Taiwan* at this phase demonstrated how human rights issues helped to constitute a distinctive Taiwanese identity. As this section has shown, those remarks made by either politicians or commentators who appealed to freedom of speech or human rights were more concerned with Taiwan's differentiations from China. In reaction their opponents used nationalist terms, such as national dignity or [91] sovereignty. Human rights concerns, borrowing Shih's words, became “a showcase of the new identity.”¹⁰⁰ They served to draw a boundary between insider and outsider. Under this circumstance, the real issues of human rights were then easily neglected. This explains why, as commentator Wang Chien-Chuang had already pointed out,¹⁰¹

while the Democratic Progressive Party government proclaimed the importance of protecting Kobayashi's human rights, they spoke very little of their concerns about the rights of former comfort women. Hence, the discussion of Kobayashi's freedom of speech does not reflect a convergence toward universal standards such as human rights but is better viewed as a reflection of identity politics in Taiwan.

Conclusion

After a fierce three-month-long discussion over the manga, the uproar seems to have gradually receded from people's thoughts in Taiwan. On 23 March 2001, the Ministry of the Interior lifted the ban on Kobayashi from entering Taiwan. To summarize the episode of the turmoil over *On Taiwan*, when the manga was published for the first time in Japan, it drew public attention to the legacies of Japanese colonialism. Subsequently, after its Chinese version was issued in Taiwan, the controversy turned to the subject of comfort women, as women's rights groups refuted Kobayashi's remarks that Taiwanese comfort women had volunteered to become sex slaves. As the uproar continued with the decision of the Taiwanese government to bar Kobayashi from entering the country, the situation reversed dramatically. People started to attack the government's decision by appealing to human rights or freedom of speech.

On Taiwan was a bestseller in Taiwan in 2001. The publication of this manga, as an event, has in fact been profoundly inscribed in the mentality of many people in Taiwan concerning their self-identification and the country's relations with Japan. As this article argued, through the event, Taiwan's past Japanese colonial experience was discursively constituted in a certain way, with the exclusion of alternative voices. The historically closed era of Japanese colonization emerged again as an ongoing structuring force in the creation of a certain form of identity among the population in contemporary Taiwanese society. The event was a discursive realm of a political battle, in which different discourses, with different positions, forms, and organizations, mutually interacted, intersected, and competed with each other.

Notes

My sincere thanks to Jenny Edkins, Hidemi Suganami, William Calahan, Jeroen Gunning, Edmund Frettingham, Marie Suetsugu, and the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions and comments on the earlier version of this article. Any remaining errors are my own. In publishing this article I benefited greatly from the support of the Modern East Asia Research Centre, Leiden University, The Netherlands.

1

Yoshinori Kobayashi, *Taiwanlun* (On Taiwan) (Taipei: Qianwei, 2001).

2

Leo Ching, *Becoming "Japanese": Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Forma-*

tion (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Phil Deans, "Diminishing Returns? Prime Minister Koizumi's Visits to the Yasukuni Shrine in the Context of East Asian Nationalisms," *East Asia: An International Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (2007): 269–94.

3

Kuan-Hsing Chen, "Why Is 'Great Reconciliation' Im/possible? De-Cold War/Decolonization, or Modernity and Its Tears (Part I)," *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2002): 77–99; "Why Is 'Great Reconciliation' Im/possible? De-Cold War/Decolonization, or Modernity and Its Tears (Part II)," *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 235–51.

4

The terms "native Taiwanese" and "Mainlander" are commonly used concepts in Taiwan. Native Taiwanese often refer to those inhabitants whose ancestors came to Taiwan before the island's colonization by Japan in 1895. Mainlanders, in contrast, usually denote those who settled in Taiwan with Chiang Kai-Shek's regime after 1945 and their descendants.

5

Jen-To Yao, "Governing the Colonised: Governmentality in the Japanese Colonisation of Taiwan, 1895–1945" (PhD diss., University of Essex, 2002).

6

See Ching, *Becoming "Japanese,"* 34–8; Chen, "Why Is 'Great Reconciliation' Im/possible? (Part I)," 80–2; Tetsushi Marukawa, "On Kobayashi Yoshinori's *On Taiwan*," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 12, no. 1 (2004): 95–8.

7

See Mau-Kuei Chang, "On the Origins and Transformation of Taiwanese National Identity," in *Religion and the Formation of Taiwanese Identities*, ed. Paul R. Katz and Murray A. Rubinstein. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 23–58; Ming Shih, *The Four-Hundred-Year History of the Taiwanese* (Taipei: Hongrutang, 2005); Rwei-Ren Wu, "The Formosan Ideology: Oriental Colonialism and the Rise of Taiwanese Nationalism, 1895–1945" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2003).

8

See Joyce Chi-Hui Liu, "Cong 'butong' dao 'tongyi'" (From "difference" to "identity"), in *Tongshi renwen shiyijiang (Eleven Outlooks on World Literature)*, ed. Pin-chia Feng (Taipei: Rye Field, 2004), 231–67 (English version of this article is entitled "Immanentism, Double-abjection and the Politics of Psyche in (Post) Colonial Taiwan." <<http://www.srcs.nctu.edu.tw/joyceliu/mworks/difference2003E.htm>>, accessed 1 June 2009); Ching, *Becoming "Japanese."*

9

Hayden White, *Metahistory* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).

10

Yoshinori Kobayashi and Zhaotang Huang, eds, *Taiwanlun fengbao (The storm of On Taiwan)* (Taipei: Qianwei, 2001); Shoulin Li, ed., *Sanjiaozai (The three-legged person)* (Taipei: Haixiaxueshu, 2001).

11

In Japan, the principal criticism of the content of the manga was made in Higashi Ajia Bunshitetsu Nettowāku (East Asian Network of Cultural Studies), ed., *Kobayashi Yoshinori Taiwanron wo koete Taiwan eno atarashii shiza (Beyond Kobayashi Yoshinori's On Taiwan: a new perspective on Taiwan)* (Tokyo: Sakuhinsha, 2001). In Taiwan, a series of forums concerning Kobayashi's work was held by the academic journal *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies* in 2001. The forum minutes were collected in Kuan-Hsing Chen and Chao-jin Li eds, *Fansi "taiwanlun": Tairi pipanquan de neibu duihua (Critical Reflections on Thesis of Taiwan: Dialogues between Critical Circles in Taiwan and Japan)* (Taipei: Taishe, 2005).

12

Tetsushi Marukawa, "Situating Kobayashi Yoshinori's *Taiwan ron* ('The Taiwan Question') in East Asia," *Postcolonial Studies: Culture, Politics, Economy* 6, no. 2 (2003): 239–44.

13

Meiling Jin and Yingming Zhou, *Riben-a! Taiwan-a!* (Japan! Taiwan!) (Taipei: Qianwei, 2001), 152–3.

14

The Chinese version translates the term as *shesiweigong*.

15

Kobayashi, *Taiwanlun*, 39.

16

Ibid.

17

Ibid., 57.

18

Ibid., 37, 63, 205.

19

Ibid., 206.

20

Ibid., 79.

21

Yoshihiko Honda, "Taiwan de 'Taiwanron' wa dou yamareta ka" (How was *On Taiwan* read in Taiwan?), *Sekai*, no. 688 (2001): 227; Murakawa, "Situating Kobayashi Yoshinori's *Taiwan ron*."

22

Kobayashi, *Taiwanlun*, 51.

23

Honda, "Taiwan de 'Taiwanron' wa dou yamareta ka," 223.

24

Kobayashi, *Taiwanlun*, 34.

25

Ibid., 134–5.

26

Ibid., 23.

27

Ibid., 90.

28

See Rebecca Clifford, *Cleansing History, Cleansing Japan: Kobayashi Yoshinori's Analects of War and Japan's Revisionist Revival*. Nissan Institute Occasional Paper Series no. 35. Oxford: The Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies, 2004; Rumi Sakamoto, "Will You Go to War? Or Will You Stop Being Japanese?": Nationalism and History in Kobayashi Yoshinori's *Sensoron*," in *China–Japan Relations in the Twenty-First Century*:

Creating a Future Past?, ed. Michael Heazle and Nick Knight (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2007), 75–92.

29

Murakawa, “On Kobayashi Yoshinori’s *On Taiwan*,” 93.

30

Kobayashi, *Taiwanlun*, 61.

31

Ibid., 58.

32

The political ideas of communitarianism referred to here are developed in Michael Sandel’s *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Alasdair MacIntyre’s *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984); and Michael Walzer’s *Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

33

Kobayashi, *Taiwanlun*, 78.

34

Liu, “Cong ‘butong’ dao ‘tongyi.’”

35

Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, 2d ed. (London: Verso, 1991); Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983).

36

Peng-Er Lam, “Japan-Taiwan Relations: Between Affinity and Reality,” *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 30, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 251–2; Deans, “Diminishing Returns?” 290.

37

Ching, *Becoming “Japanese,”* 8.

38

Xianglong Tang, *Zhongguo shibao* (China times), 27 February 2001.

39

Honda, “Taiwan de ‘Taiwanron’ wa dou yamareta ka,” 226.

40

Those essays are collected in Higashi Ajia Bunshitetsu Nettowāku, ed., *Kobayashi Yoshinori Taiwanron wo koete Taiwan eno atarashii shiza*, and in Chen and Li, eds, *Fansi “taiwanlun”: Tairi pipanquan de neibu duihua*.

41

Honda, “Taiwan de ‘Taiwanron’ wa dou yamareta ka,” 227.

42

Takeshi Komagome, “Chaoyue ziwokending de ‘gushi’” (Beyond the “tale” of self-approval), in Chen and Li, eds, *Fansi “taiwanlun”: Tairi pipanquan de neibu duihua*, 35.

43

Kobayashi, *Taiwanlun*, 203–4.

44

Taipei Times, 22 February 2001.

45

Taipei Times, 23 February 2001.

46

Taipei Times, 24 February 2001.

47

Taipei Times, 26 February 2001.

48

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 26 February 2001.

49

These terms can be found in articles collected in a Chinese-language book *Sanjiaozai*: 69, 72, 78, 96, 115, 120, etc. The book title *Sanjiaozai* (literally meaning “the three-legged person”) is itself a derogatory term. In the prewar period of Taiwan, the term referred to those Taiwanese natives who worked for the Japanese officials. During that period, the notion of a “dog”—having four legs—was used as a degrading term for the Japanese people. A Taiwanese native who worked for the Japanese was therefore described as a “three-legged person.”

50

Zhongshi wanbao (China times evening), 26 February 2001.

51

Taipei Times, 27 February 2001.

52

Ibid.

53

Taipei Times, 28 February 2001.

54

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 25 February 2001.

55

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 25 December 2000.

56

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 25 December 2000.

57

Jianmin Zeng, “Laotaidu yu xinyouyi de dahechang” (The chorus of “old” Taiwan independence and “new” right-wing forces), in *Sanjiaozai*, 20–32.

58

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 26 December 2000.

59

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 25 December 2000.

60

The question of whether Japanese society has become more nationalistic is another issue, and it goes beyond the scope of this article. Many studies have already explored this issue. See Roman Rosenbaum, “Historical Revisionism in contemporary Manga

Culture: From Subculture to Mainstream Art” (paper presented at the 16th Biennial Conference of the Asia Studies Association of Australia, Wollongong, June 2006); Kazuhiko Togo, “Greater Self-Assertion and Nationalism in Japan,” *The Copenhagen Journal of Asia Studies* 21 (2005): 8–44.

61

See Yongmin Yang, *Zhongguo shibao* (China times), 26 February 2001. Other commentaries by Tung-Ming Hsu, 21 March 2001, and Takefumi Hayata, 28 May 2001 and 7 November 2002, were published in *Taipei Times*.

62

Phil Deans, “Taiwan in Japan’s Foreign Relations: Informal Politics and Virtual Diplomacy,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 24, no. 4 (2001): 151–76.

63

See Teng-Hui Lee, *Taiwan de zhuzhang* (Taiwan’s advocate) (Taipei: Yuanliou, 1999), 183–210; Teng-Hui Lee and Mineo Nakajima, *Yazhou de zhilue* (Asia’s wisdom and strategy) (Taipei: Yuanliou, 2000), 102–28.

64

For instance, a Japanese writer, Komori Yoshihisa, in her article “My Taiwan, My Life: An Interview with ROC President Lee Teng-Hui” described Lee as “speaking in elegant Japanese with rich vocabulary.” Quoted in Lam, “Japan-Taiwan Relations,” 265.

65

Lam, “Japan-Taiwan Relations,” 258.

66

Deans, “Taiwan in Japan’s Foreign Relations,” 171.

67

Deans, “Diminishing Returns?,” 270.

68

Ichiyo Muto, “The Cold War and Post-Cold War Dynamics of Taiwan and East Asia in People’s Security Perspective,” *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2002): 25–37.

69

See Changsong Hu, *Taiwan ribao* (Taiwan daily news), 3 and 6 March 2001.

70

Chi Yao, *Taipei Times*, 27 February 2001; Xiaofeng Li, *Zili wanbao* (Zili evening news), 26 February 2001; and *Taiwan ribao* (Taiwan daily news) published articles by Zhaoyi Lin, 24 and 26 February 2001, and Ruiming Wei, 24 February 2001.

71

See commentaries in *Taiwan ribao* (Taiwan daily news): Editorial, 27 February 2001; Meixiu Wang, 28 February 2001; Qingyu Sun, 2 March 2001; Rongbang Hou, 7 March 2001.

72

Taiwan ribao (Taiwan daily news), 23 February 2001.

73

Taiwan ribao (Taiwan daily news), 27 February 2001.

74

Ziyou shibao (The liberty times), 6 March 2001.

75

See Andrew Parker et al., eds, *Nationalisms and Sexualities* (London: Routledge, 1992); Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation* (London: Sage, 1997); Chizuko Ueno, *Nationalism and Gender* (Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press, 2004).

76

Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias, eds, *Woman-Nation-State* (London: Macmillan, 1989), 7.

77

Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1965), 120.

78

Hyun-Sook Kim, "History and Memory: The 'Comfort Women' Controversy," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 73–106.

79

Chunghee Sarah Soh, "Human Rights and the 'Comfort Women,'" *Peace Review* 12, no. 1 (2000): 127.

80

The foundation was set up by the Japanese government but funded by private donations rather than government money.

81

Soh, "Human Rights and the 'Comfort Women,'" 128.

82

Won-Soon Park, "Japanese Reparations Politics and the 'Comfort Women' Question," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 107–34.

83

Katherine Hyung-Sun Moon, *Sex among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

84

Youn-ok Song, "Japanese Colonial Rule and State-Managed Prostitution: Korean Licensed Prostitutes," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 171–218.

85

Fujime Yuki, "The Licensed Prostitution System and the Prostitution Abolition Movement in Modern Japan," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 135–70.

86

Hyunah Yang, "Revisiting the Issue of Korean 'Military Comfort Women': The Question of Truth and Positionality," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 53.

87

Immigration Act (Republic of China), Item 17, Article 13.

88

Taipei Times, 3 March 2001.

89

Taipei Times, 4 March 2001.

90

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 3 March 2001.

91

Taipei Times, 4 March 2001.

92

Zhongguo shibao (China times) published articles by Zhen Xia, 3 March 2001, and Editorial, 3 March 2001; Zheng Yu, *Zhongshi wanbao* (China times evening), 3 March 2001; Editorial, *Taipei Times*, 3 March 2001; Wenhui Hu, *Ziyou shibao* (The liberty times), 9 March 2001; Baiyue Yang, *Taiwan ribao* (Taiwan daily news), 28 February 2001.

93

E.g., Editorial, *Zhongguo shibao* (China times), 3 March 2001.

94

Xiujian Zheng, *Zhongguo shibao* (China times), 5 March 2001; Erxuan Huang, *Ziyou shibao* (The liberty times), 2 March 2001.

95

Zhongguo shibao (China times), 5 March 2001.

96

Ibid.

97

See Zhen Xia, *Zhongguo shibao* (China times), 9 March 2001; Sandy Yeh, *Taipei Times*, 11 March 2001.

98

See commentaries in *Zhongguo shibao* (China times): Zhen Xia, 9 March 2001; Jianxuan Wang, 11 March 2001; and Guanghua Liu, 11 March 2001. Also see Editorial, *Taipei Times*, 9 March 2001.

99

Chih-Yu Shih, *Reform, Identity and Chinese Foreign Policy* (Taipei: Vanguard, 2000), 227–48.

100

Ibid., 243.

101

Taipei Times, 28 March 2001.

References

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, 2d ed. London: Verso, 1991.
- Chang, Mau-Kuei. "On the Origins and Transformation of Taiwanese National Identity." In *Religion and the Formation of Taiwanese Identities*, ed. Paul R. Katz and Murray A. Rubinstein. 23–58. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Chen, Kuan-Hsing. "Why Is 'Great Reconciliation' Im/possible? De-Cold War/Decolonization, or Modernity and Its Tears (Part I)." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2002): 77–99.
- Chen, Kuan-Hsing. "Why Is 'Great Reconciliation' Im/possible? De-Cold War/Decolonization, or Modernity and Its Tears (Part II)." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 235–51.

- Chen, Kuan-Hsing, and Chao-Jin Li, eds. *Fansi "taiwanlun": Tairi pipanquan de neibu duihua* (Critical Reflections on "Thesis on Taiwan": Dialogues between Critical Circles in Taiwan and Japan). Taipei: Taishe, 2005.
- Ching, Leo. *Becoming "Japanese": Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Clifford, Rebecca. *Cleansing History, Cleansing Japan: Kobayashi Yoshinori's Analects of War and Japan's Revisionist Revival*. Nissan Institute Occasional Paper Series no. 35. Oxford: The Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies, 2004.
- Deans, Phil. "Taiwan in Japan's Foreign Relations: Informal Politics and Virtual Diplomacy." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 24, no. 4 (2001): 151–76.
- Deans, Phil. "Diminishing Returns? Prime Minister Koizumi's Visits to the Yasukuni Shrine in the Context of East Asian Nationalisms." *East Asia: An International Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (2007): 269–94.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Higashi Ajia Bunshitetsu Nettowāku (East Asian Network of Cultural Studies), ed. *Kobayashi Yoshinori Taiwanron wo koete Taiwan eno atarashii shiza* (Beyond Kobayashi Yoshinori's *On Taiwan*: A New Perspective on Taiwan). Tokyo: Sakuhinsha, 2001.
- Honda, Yoshihiko. "Taiwan de 'Taiwanron' wa dou yamareta ka" (How was *On Taiwan* read in Taiwan?). *Sekai*, no. 688 (2001): 220–8.
- Jin, Meiling, and Yingming Zhou. *Riben-a! Taiwan-a!* (Japan! Taiwan!). Taipei: Qianwei, 2001.
- Kim, Hyun-Sook. "History and Memory: The 'Comfort Women' Controversy." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 73–106.
- Kobayashi, Yoshinori. *Taiwanlun* (On Taiwan). Taipei: Qianwei, 2001.
- Kobayashi, Yoshinori, and Zhaotang Huang, eds. *Taiwanlun fengbao* (The storm of On Taiwan). Taipei: Qianwei, 2001.
- Komagome, Takeshi. "Chaoyue ziwokending de 'gushi'" (Beyond the "tale" of self-approval). In *Fansi "taiwanlun": Tairi pipanquan de neibu duihua* (Critical Reflections on "Thesis on Taiwan": Dialogues between Critical Circles in Taiwan and Japan), ed. Kuan-Hsing Chen and Chao-jin Li, 33–44. Taipei: Taishe, 2005.
- Lam, Peng-Er. "Japan-Taiwan Relations: Between Affinity and Reality." *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 30, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 251–2.
- Lee, Teng-Hui. *Taiwan de zhuzhang* (Taiwan's advocate). Taipei: Yuanliou, 1999.
- Lee, Teng-Hui, and Mineo Nakajima. *Yazhou de zhilue* (Asia's wisdom and strategy). Taipei: Yuanliou, 2000.
- Li, Shoulin, ed. *Sanjiaozai* (The three-legged person). Taipei: Haixiaxueshu, 2001.
- Liu, Joyce Chi-Hui. "Cong 'butong' dao 'tongyi'" (From "difference" to "identity"). In *Tongshi renwen shiyijiang* (Eleven Outlooks on World Literature), ed. Pin-chia Feng, 231–67. Taipei: Rye Field, 2004.
- Liu, Joyce Chi-Hui. "Immanentism, Double-abjection and the Politics of Psyche in (Post) Colonial Taiwan." <http://www.srcs.nctu.edu.tw/joyceliu/mworks/difference2003E.htm>, accessed 1 June 2009.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.
- Marukawa, Tetsushi. "Situating Kobayashi Yoshinori's Taiwan ron ('The Taiwan Question') in East Asia." *Postcolonial Studies: Culture, Politics, Economy* 6, no. 2 (2003): 239–44.
- Marukawa, Tetsushi. "On Kobayashi Yoshinori's On Taiwan." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 12, no. 1 (2004): 93–112.
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1965.
- Moon, Katherine Hyung-Sun. *Sex among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Muto, Ichiyo. "The Cold War and Post-Cold War Dynamics of Taiwan and East Asia in People's Security Perspective." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2002): 25–37.
- Park, Won-Soon. "Japanese Reparations Politics and the 'Comfort Women' Question." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 107–34.
- Parker, Andrew, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer, and Patricia Yaeger, eds. *Nationalisms and Sexualities*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Rosenbaum, Roman. "Historical Revisionism in Contemporary Manga Culture: From Subculture to Mainstream Art." Paper presented at the 16th Biennial Conference of the Asia Studies Association of Australia, Wollongong, June 2006.

- Sakamoto, Rumi. "Will You Go to War? Or Will You Stop Being Japanese?": Nationalism and History in Kobayashi Yoshinori's *Sensoron*." In *China-Japan Relations in the Twenty-First Century: Creating a Future Past?*, eds Michael Heazle and Nick Knight, 75–92. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2007.
- Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Shih, Chih-Yu. *Reform, Identity and Chinese Foreign Policy*. Taipei: Vanguard, 2000.
- Shih, Ming. *The Four-Hundred-Year History of the Taiwanese*. Taipei: Hongrutang, 2005.
- Soh, Chunghee Sarah. "Human Rights and the 'Comfort Women.'" *Peace Review* 12, no. 1 (2000): 123–9.
- Song, Youn-ok. "Japanese Colonial Rule and State-Managed Prostitution: Korean Licensed Prostitutes." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 171–218.
- 98 China Information 24(1)
- Togo, Kazuhiko. "Greater Self-Assertion and Nationalism in Japan." *The Copenhagen Journal of Asia Studies* 21 (2005): 8–44.
- Ueno, Chizuko. *Nationalism and Gender*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press, 2004.
- Walzer, Michael. *Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Wu, Rwei-Ren. "The Formosan Ideology: Oriental Colonialism and the Rise of Taiwanese Nationalism, 1895–1945." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2003.
- Yang, Hyunah. "Revisiting the Issue of Korean 'Military Comfort Women': The Question of Truth and Positionality." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 51–71.
- Yao, Jen-To. "Governing the Colonised: Governmentality in the Japanese Colonisation of Taiwan, 1895–1945." PhD diss., University of Essex, 2002.
- Yuki, Fujime. "The Licensed Prostitution System and the Prostitution Abolition Movement in Modern Japan." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 5, no. 1 (1997): 135–70.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage, 1997.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira, and Floya Anthias, eds. *Woman-Nation-State*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Zeng, Jianmin. "Laotaidu yu xinyouyi de dahechang" (The chorus of old Taiwan independence and new right-wing forces). In *Sanjiaozai* (The three-legged person), ed. Li Shoulin, 20–32. Taipei: Haixiaxueshu, 2001.