

「《數位荒原》駐站暨群島資料庫計劃」很榮幸能邀請馬來西亞藝術家林猶進帶著他的「Kanta人像攝影計劃」再度來臺。他曾經以〈Kanta Portraits: Taiwan〉參與我們在打開—當代藝術工作站進行的《邊境旅行》展覽，並與阿美族導演Posak Jodian合作拜訪並拍攝許多臺灣的原住民部落。這些田野工作於是引發了我們對於檔案工作和早期日本人類學者所建立的分類系統及觀看方式的好奇。在這篇訪談裡，藝術家首次面對類型影像與其工作手法的比較閱讀，而這些差異也帶出了原住民如何理解（自我）影像再現的意義，以及我們將來可能的群島系譜進路等討論。

NML Residency & Nusantara Archive Project is glad to invite Malaysian photographer Jeffrey Lim to revisit Taiwan with his Kanta Box camera. He had visited and photographed several indigenous tribes based on his collaboration with Amis filmmaker Posak Jodian, before he exhibited "Kanta Portraits: Taiwan" during *Petamu Project* (2018) in OCAC. Such fieldworks also piqued our curiosity about the "colonial archive", the categorization system set by Japanese anthropologists and their way of seeing. During the residency, he encountered the first comparative reading of "type photographs" and his own methodology. The difference also leads to how the representation of (self) images are meant to the subjects, and the prospective way of mapping "Nusantara archive" in the future.

CONTENTS

林猶進的Kanta人像攝影—從殖民檔案到亞洲部落	5
攝影作為民族誌方法： 日治臺灣殖民地人類學的寫真檔案（摘錄）	15
From Archive to Tribes in Taiwan and Malaysia Jeffrey Lim's Kanta Portraits	29
Photography as Ethnographic Method: The Anthropological Photographic Archives in Japanese Colonial Taiwan (Excerpt)	39

林猶進的Kanta人像攝影 從殖民檔案到亞洲部落

/ 林猶進、鄭文琦

鄭文琦：《群島資料庫》手冊總是邀請來自不同國家的藝術家。這些手冊的內容可以是已經或尚未被書寫、翻譯，或採訪過的。你來過臺灣四次，但是我們以前沒有進行過訪談。

《Kanta Portraits: Taiwan》計劃可以引發出許多提問—假如我們想在現有基礎上，再深入下一個階段的話。一方面臺灣原住民的影像—不論是流行或學術領域—都可以追溯到19世紀末至20世紀初，當最早日本人類學家如鳥居龍藏透過箱型照相機，將攝影術應用在他們的研究對象上時。另一方面也可以看到許多大眾文化中的原住民影像，例如：在商業廣告、劇場、電影或者明信片上。然而，這些形象多少再現歷史學者陳偉智在〈攝影作為民族誌方法：日治臺灣殖民地人類學的寫真檔案〉裡所說的「殖民檔案的原住民影像」。¹

林猶進 (Jeffrey Lim)：沒錯…在早些時候，人們只有箱型照相機，而且當時沖印相片的程序幾乎都和我們一樣，都必須在現場拍照，然後在玻璃片上顯影。他們沒有使用膠卷，不是在濕版 (wet plate) 就是在乾版 (dry plate) 上曝光。乾版攝影是指他們可以將玻璃片帶回別的地方的暗房，繼續沖洗成照片。至於濕板是指他們必須在現場進行處理，但通常相隔不會太遠。這也發生馬來西亞的歷史上，像是在蘇格蘭籍攝影師約翰·湯普森 (John Tompson) 旅行到遠東地區的時候。從1860年代到1870年代末，他以紀實攝影方式拍攝超過600張照片，從錫蘭、印度，穿越東南亞到中南半島、香港、澳門和中國甚至福爾摩沙。他在這趟旅途所拍攝到的影像，都是當地最早有紀錄的照片。

1. 見陳偉智, 〈攝影作為民族誌方法：日治臺灣殖民地人類學的寫真檔案(一)〉。網址: www.heath.tw/nml-article/photography-as-ethnographic-method-the-anthropological-photographic-archives-in-japanese-colonial-taiwan-part-1/

鄭：我想要從這篇文章開始討論，因為我們所見的事物取決於我們所站的位置。假如這些受過西方訓練的攝影師（或帝國的凝視）形塑了我們對於原住民的想像，那要如何發展關於原住民攝影的不同觀點？還有，你的實踐何以不同於以往這些箱型照相機的實踐者？另一個問題是，驅動你從馬來西亞來到臺灣的動機又是什麼？

林：事實上，許多在日治時代存在的照片非常不同於現今看到的，像服裝等等，而且其文化也面臨劇變。因為這就是時代的情境，文化會改變，不會一成不變。如果你看過殖民檔案，和現在的部落人們比較起來，他們看起來也不一樣。問題是，就算是對原住民而言文化總是變動的。假如你查閱200年前殖民檔案裡的半島原住民照片，它們會和你現在看到的非常不同。某方面而言，這證實了文化總是會「自我再發明」—它會隨外在而改變，例如日本殖民者或其他因素。

鄭：我想說的是，那些是我們最初認識異族的圖像記憶。我們不是直接認識這些人，而是先就從殖民檔案看見他們的形象。這正是我認為指出這點為何是重要的。假如我們不知道這件事，或許就輕易受到殖民者如何觀看原住民族的影響。你可稍微談談你如何看待箇中差異，還有你的實踐如何不同於早期實踐者（使用相同的再現技術）。當然你們的目的不同，他們服務於政府的蕃地調查—儘管他們也有自身的學術關注。要如何變得不同？

林：這嘛，我拍攝的某些照片是在不同背景下進行的。以馬太鞍大頭目為例，光是他的人像就照了三次。首先是穿一般的服裝，上教堂穿的襯衫和長褲。然後他穿著正式的、傳統

的服飾。雖然是同一個人，但照片展示出他必須與之共存的身份雙元性。而另一個操作步驟是，他們會保留原始照片，這是很不一樣的，銀鹽相紙被呈交到他們手上。我們也有錄音紀錄，我還在發展這些不同情境的各種面向。

鄭：你的藝術實踐涉及許多層次，不只是拍攝照片，還包括製作自己的照相機。你會帶箱型照相機到部落裡進行示範操作，然後你會沖洗照片，和拍攝對象聊天，並和他們交換照片與個人訊息。你也會舉辦發表或展覽，不過觀眾只會看見結果，甚至在《邊境旅行》展覽中的觀眾有時會忽略抽屜裡的相片。在這些計劃裡，你更聚焦於過程而非最後結果。

林：對我來說過程才是重點，結果只是副產品，因為它關乎體驗拍攝肖像與實地沖印過程的那個對象。當我拍攝完成時，他們會看見他們的肖像如何生成，再到他們手上，那是真實的交流。這種經驗是重要的，作品展示給觀眾看只是這過程的副產品。然而，我也在思考不只展示肖像，還有許多書寫下來的故事，這是最後的成果。我還在探索如何呈現想法或轉換人類學的觀念，以及如何研究身份認同。所以我確實是使用這些人物的肖像、他們的文化和我對他們的詮釋，作為演示變異中的傳統文化個案，這些即是關於過程中的概念探索。

鄭：看見你的作品單獨呈現時、和你與其他人合作時的方式之間差異是很有意思的。你總會找到熟悉本地原住民社群的人士合作，這肯定也關係你如何取得支持或資助。對我來說，你的實踐是非常直觀的；儘管你很擅長闡明你的方法如攝影或其他媒介，你仍然很直觀地結合多種必要步驟。

林：和別人合作是很重要的。在馬來西亞，我總會試著跟認識或來自當地社群的某個人連結或合作。我們會產生某種社會連結—這也是為了尊重對方文化。在臺灣，《邊境旅行》計劃是我第一次實際跟原住民藝術家，**Josak Jodian**，共同探索和創作，特別是與她一同踏上她的發現之旅，我也想將這種方法帶回到馬來西亞。

鄭：如果真是如此，那是否該問重要的是你和**Posak**的合作嗎？又或者說我們可以反問，為什麼非得去那個部落不可？

林：這正是為什麼我並非處理特定部落，重點是來自某個部落的藝術家的情境。這麼說吧，這計劃是關於**Posak**，它可以是阿美族、**Pangcah**或泰雅，但重點是「她」和她在馬大鞍與小碧潭的家人、社群，他們如何從花蓮來到小碧潭。它不是特別關於特定部落的攝影檔案，而是他們如何於不同的時空裡協商。它凸顯某些協商、認同變遷，或部落如何維繫於變動的社群或原生場所的生活等；即我最終在臺灣生產的內容…當然，臺灣決定了我在馬來西亞的計劃前文本，某方面來說，臺灣成為我與馬來西亞部落人們的計劃參照點—但它也只是參照點，兩者不需有直接的人類學連結。我好奇文化連結、社會情境，也想多知道他們如何協商。這樣當我在馬來西亞再次執行才有必要—為了發現兩者的相關模式。

鄭（以下為進駐對談內容）：我們看見日本人有系統地創建「蕃人」或原住民的「官方民族誌」。一方面伊能嘉矩根據「族」建構臺灣全島的八族原住民分類法，包括泰雅、布農、鄒、查利先（魯凱）、排灣、卑南、阿美、平埔—加上烏居龍藏在蘭嶼研究的雅美族就是九族（後來森丑之助提出

六族分類法)；另一方面類型影像 (type photograph) 被人類學家用來「形成當時知識建構的重要民族誌方法」。以森丑之助的《臺灣蕃族志第一卷》(1917) 為例，這種分類附上代表各族的男女正面和側面照。當我們剛好也在同樣的社群拍攝時，我們如何避免這樣傳統上未留意的原住民「觀看方法」？依據調查變異難度的程度，人類學家認為「體質特徵」被認為最不容易因時間或環境的變因而改變。因此假如我們仍然使用照相機作為認識的工具，是否表示我們不可免除各族的人類體質差異—這可能導致某種排除或對原住民的本質式理解？

林：烏居龍藏的照相機可能柯達的Box Camera 1，這台機器非常基本，因為這是當時第一台使用者能購買的相機，當時沒有人有輕便型的照相機—但是它並非專業設備，這點倒挺有趣的。

我有很多點想回應陳偉智的文章，關於身份認同的解構，還有現在人們如何引導自身的認同。(我是覺得單純作為訪談比較好，因為我們沒有時間思考太多，而且我的答案比較主觀和自發。) 我的思考在2018年的Skype訪談後又有所變化，我之後去日本的四國進駐，Posak也完成她的影像，我們共同完成一次展覽。這不是我會和大家討論的方式，因為我還在思考。最近看《京都好博學》(2018/12/15~2019/2/24) 展覽對我正如這些提問般警醒，《京都好博學》是關於他們如何養成文化的方法學和嘗試，對我來說，它相當程度回答了這個問題，因為他們使用如同西方的方法學。相機只是另一個工具，就像他們用以科學地學習和分類的所有工具。他們用相機來系統性的差異化，所以這就是這

種方法學的侷限；侷限就是衝突。當他們採用了這種西方形式，他們也犯了和西方相同的錯誤，即利用既有的工具，進行殖民、區隔和分類。

鄭：陳偉智提到，「從現在到歷史，民族誌資料的調查方向雖然有所調整，但人種分類與族群起源的問題，以及與周邊的其他島嶼原住民的比較人類學的研究傾向，則是一以貫之地延續著。」最新關於南島語族的起源地在臺灣的學說，常被許多藝術家的實踐所認知並挪用，這也就是原住民族在臺灣成為許多藝術計劃主題的原因。然而，它也提醒我們刻意闡述同化作用之必要的風險。這使我想到了1920年代，不少日本人相信「馬來人種」是日本南部與「高砂族」（即後來對「蕃人」的稱呼）的共同起源。那正是竹越與三郎在1910年的《南國記》裡主張的必須認識「南方」的理由：「他們血液的一部份混入我南方臣民的脈管之中。」²

林：雖然如此，但我來自非常不同的背景，相機對我來說並不是相同的「工具」。我在這裡的意圖非常不同於人類學的研究實踐，他們的研究方式往往受到民族誌的侷限。他們總是從自身文化去看部落，在這層意義上他們看見部落之前已經存有刻板印象，或者說某種偏見。從一開始，他們稱呼原

2.「此馬來人種居住於與大日本帝國南端相望之地，儘管他們血液的一部份混入我南方臣民的脈管之中，我國人卻把這擱置一旁，對他們馬來人的理解相當少，卻徒然談論歐美、中國為多，這豈不是求之高遠而失之卑近嗎。」見竹越與三郎，《南國記》頁2-3。亦見蔡耀緯，〈浪人游臺灣—哈利·法蘭克和他的《日本與福爾摩沙一瞥》〉。魯特(E. Owen Rutter)和法蘭克(Harry Alverson Franck)同時提及...臺灣原住民來自馬來半島。魯特引用學術研究和早期西方探險家的紀錄，指出臺灣原住民語言與婆羅洲部族語言及馬來語近似之處，並勾勒他們數千年來從上緬甸遷徙到交趾支那和馬來半島，在被當地民族驅趕而航行海上，最終來到臺灣的軌跡(Owen Rutter, *Through Formosa*; 1921)；法蘭克的旅行見聞則提及臺灣原住民的外貌與日本南方島民並無差別，連日本人都無法分辨，進而推論出臺灣原住民與日本人同樣源自馬來人(Harry A. Franck, *Glimpse of Japan and Formosa*; 1924)。」
現今人類學已推翻上述說法。

住民為「蕃人」（雖然我對這個詞有所疑惑）一而在歐洲，他們也稱之為「野蠻人」（barbarian），因為他們沒有「文明」的生活。接著又把他們叫做「高砂族」，這個詞好像展現更多尊重，但這還是某種區別的策略。

鄭：這是否表示對我們來說，不依循既有的傳承是重要的？

林：應該說我們必須質疑它。這裡的預期是，這些照相又是拍給誰呢？誰能取得這種形式的圖像？這種圖像形式只是一種再現的形式。某些原住民有自己的方式，去處理自我如何再現自身的（視覺）形式，他們通過線條描繪、通過圖騰製作，攝影只是一種形式，是一種西方的觀看形式。原住民也有自身的形式。我的計劃已經開始銜接不同的向度：錄製聲音。Luc會錄音³，Posak也會錄影。這些是另一種媒介。我們合作觀察不同的文化身份再現，而不只是通過照片。照片只是最終成品，但過程才是重要的，當我們提出問題，理解這些問題出自何種情境 即身份認同面向時。

鄭：不同的是當時人類學者沒有「輕便」錄音設備。所以最後，我們仍然要來談談技術或媒體，我的意思是技術演進會影響我們如何看待對象，而對象也適應技術。我更感興趣於你如何使這樣的相遇過程再次「神秘化」，因為你不依賴隨手可得的工具，反之，你需要許多操作步驟如擺好姿勢，調整設備，手動補光等。或者說使熟悉的事物「陌生化」。

林：是的，手工製作相機對他們很新鮮，因為他們從來沒

3.陳姿華，屏東霧台魯凱族，於臺灣自製相機進行影像拍攝。2018年與林猶進合作「Kanta Portraits：霧台」計劃，並於空場展出。

看過，所以這有助於創造某種銜接。它也是「具象化」的參照，關於我如何將他們的存有具象化在一張相紙上。這種連結是重要的，因為我給他們「可觸知的自我」。有時候，人們想要獲得肖像，這種再現形式創造出某種形式性（formality）。它是系統／官方所認可的身份識別形式，因為這就是攝影之任務。

鄭：當然，我們的探索是關於不同島嶼上的不同原住民，更指向我們所共享的地方性、攝影，以及馬來群島製圖的新敘事。我相信在攝影的身份再現，以及如你所說的官方認可之間，將來還有更多探索的空間。

攝影作為民族誌方法： 日治臺灣殖民地人類學的寫真檔案（摘錄）

/ 陳偉智

田野中的攝影

今欲攝影蕃社風俗，要蕃人男女數人集來

我聞此老人約九十歲，因欲問伊，阿眉社舊事。¹

—田代安定，1896年

人類學家如何拍攝照片呢？如果總督府留下的照片是招來從軍攝影師所拍攝的，而伊能嘉矩又只是善於使用影像資料作為民族誌方法，但自己並不操作照相機，那麼實際在田野中，帶著照相機的人類學家呢？在田野中拍攝照片如何成為可能呢？亦即，田野工作中的攝影，是如何成為田野方法呢？

1896年10月，正在臺灣東部調查的鳥居龍藏，寫信給東京地學協會，報告在臺灣東部的調查，並說明了拍攝「土人」的情況，信中寫著：

臺灣東部的土人，除了臺東附近的土人外，都沒有全盤漢化，所以今日還可以看到土人的舊態，對我們人類學研究者來說，是最能感到趣味盎然的調查對象。我發現臺灣東部的土人一點也不怕被拍照，所以攝影的工作很順利。」（底線處為筆者所加）²

由於鳥居龍藏是有意識地在田野中使用照相機，在日治初期

1. 田代安定，《臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌》，臺大圖書館「田代安定文庫」，N103，1896。

2. 鳥居龍藏，〈臺灣通信〉，《東京地學協會雜誌》8(96)(1896)，引文引自鳥居龍藏，《探險臺灣》，頁137。

拍攝了許多第一手臺灣原住民照片。接下來我以鳥居龍藏為例，說明人類學家如何在田野中拍攝照片，並討論田野影像檔案的生產方式。³鳥居來臺灣進行第一次調查前，即認知到田野攝影的重要性，數次臺灣調查期間，也有意識地在田野中拍攝照片。⁴返回日本後，在東京人類學會與東京地學協會報告臺灣調查的成果時，在演講中展示田野中的照片，以說明臺灣原住民的文化特質。⁵發表的論文中，更是擷取田野照片影像，作為比較分析素材，同時也曾針對單一族群，發表民族誌影像專著（蘭嶼雅美族）。⁶

鳥居於1896年第一次到臺灣進行調查時，正好臺灣總督府也有東部臺灣移民地（當時用語為「殖民地」）的調查計劃，負責此計劃臺灣東部調查者，是總督府殖產局技師田代安定（1857-1928）。田代安定來臺前，早在1889年已參加了東京人類學會，也曾擔任過東京地學協會的報告主任。鳥居到臺灣後，向臺灣總督府申請田野調查的許可，總督府在當時正要派遣田代安定到東部，於是鳥居龍藏的第一次臺灣調查，就與田代安定一同從臺北出發，在東部的田野調查期間，彼

3.關於鳥居龍藏的臺灣與其他亞洲各地的田野調查，見中園英助，《鳥居龍藏：アジアを走破した人類学者》（東京：岩波書店，1995），《鳥居龍藏：縱橫臺灣與東亞的人類學先驅》（臺中：晨星出版社，1998）。田畑久夫，《民族学者鳥居龍藏：アジア調の軌跡》（東京：今古書院，1997）。以及佐佐木高明，《鳥居龍藏の見たアジア：民族学の先者》（吹田：國立民族學博物館，1993）。

4.鳥居在臺灣調查期間拍攝的影像介紹，見宋文薰等編，《跨越世紀的影像：鳥居龍藏眼中的臺灣原住民》。臺北：順益臺灣原住民博物館，1994。

5.鳥居龍藏，〈東部臺灣諸蕃族に就て〉，《地學雜誌》104、105（1897）。這是鳥居龍藏第一次臺灣調查返回日本後，在東京地學協會的演講紀錄。另見《鳥居全集》第11卷，頁485-505，以及《探險臺灣》，頁191-229。

6.鳥居龍藏，《人類學寫真集 臺灣紅頭嶼之部》（東京：東京帝国大學理科大学，1899）。亦見《鳥居全集》第11卷，頁329-353。當代針對從鳥居開始的單一族群攝影史的影像分析，見董森永、馬騰嶽、李子寧，《鏡頭下的達悟族：蘭嶼、達悟族、影像特刊》（臺北：順益原住民博物館，2002），以及李子寧2001，《鏡頭下的雅美族：日治時期雅美族民族誌影像回顧》。《影像與民族誌研討會論文》，台北：中央研究院民族學研究所，2001。



(圖1)

與鳥居龍藏同行的總督府殖產局技師田代安定，在田野日記中留下了數次鳥居在田野中拍攝當地原住民各族群的紀錄。田代安定甚至在田野日記中留下了照相機的素描。在《臺灣雲林高山蕃支族語》這一本田代於1896年10月回到花蓮港，於米崙山軍營內整理田野中採集的语言調查記錄筆記簿中，留下極可能是鳥居所攜帶的攝影器材的素描。⁸田代並註明此攝影器材為「コダツク式寫真」，亦即科達箱型照相機（Kodak box camera，圖1）。

鳥居在其回憶錄《某老學徒的手記》中，回憶當時日本的考古學與人類學，總是用素描來記錄圖像，並沒有使用照相機的人。其認為到臺灣調查生蕃，只用素描的話是不行的，非使用照相機拍照不可。然而他原先也不會攝影，於是向大學借了照相機，速成地學習攝影術，帶著不完整的攝影器材前往臺灣。在回憶錄中鳥居自信地寫著：「在人類學界，應用寫真術是從我開始。」⁹鳥居並未說明的，是帶了何種攝影器

7.鳥居龍藏，〈鳥居龍藏氏の近信〉，《德島日日新聞》，1896年9月4日，收於《鳥居全集》第11卷，頁459-460。另見《探險臺灣》〈臺灣通信一致《德島日日新聞》的信〉，《探險臺灣》，頁133-136。另外，鳥居在返回日本發表第一回調查的成果的論文中，也曾感謝田代在田野中的協助，並提及許多的田野是與田代安定一同進行的。見鳥居龍藏，〈東部臺灣に於ける各蕃族及び其分布〉，《東京人類學會雜誌》136(1897):378-410。

8.田代安定，《臺灣雲林高山蕃支族語》，臺大圖書館田代安定文庫，N108，1896。

9.鳥居龍藏，《ある老學徒の手記：考古學とともに六十年》。東京：昭日新聞社，1953。

材。透過同行的田代安定的田野筆記，或許可以瞭解鳥居在田野中所使用的攝影器材。森丑之助在鳥居第四次臺灣調查（1900）期間擔任其助手，也曾在文章中回憶田野工作鳥居背著箱子的情形，應即是此箱型照相機的攜帶箱。¹⁰

鳥居在田野中的同行者田代安定，數月之前才與伊能嘉矩一同在臺北成立了臺灣人類學會，其1896年8月至12月的東部臺灣調查，雖然是執行臺灣總督府的「殖民地撰定」計劃，在田野中田代安定除了調查計劃移民地所需要的面積，臺灣東部的地理、地質、產業，與土地關係之外，同時也進行民族學、語言學的調查。¹¹田代留下的田野日記與筆記，其重要性不只在偶然間留下鳥居在田野所攜帶攝影器材的素描，更重要的是，曾數次提及在臺東、在花蓮的田野調查期間，鳥居拍攝當地原住民照片的經過。例如，1896年10月7日，在卑南，田代在田野日記中寫著：

過十時，到撫墾署，如同昨日，尋問呂家社通事生蕃事情。十二時回宿舍。

午後二時半，赴阿眉社，至頭目宅。鳥居氏亦同行。久永氏、安井氏亦同往，與呂家社通事同伴而行。拍攝頭人家族及社民照片（真影ヲ寫サル）。¹²

田代安定、鳥居龍藏、與同行的臺東撫墾署官員永井與安井，一行人前往卑南阿眉社（今臺東馬蘭阿美族），並由呂

10. 鳥居龍藏，《ある老學徒の手記：考古學とともに六十年》。東京：昭日新聞社，1953。

11. 田代安定1896年臺灣東部調查後，於1900年出版了《臺東殖民地豫察報文》。關於田代安定的東部臺灣殖民地調查的分析，見陳偉智，〈田代安定與《臺東殖民地豫察報文》：殖民主義、知識建構與東部臺灣的再現政治〉，《東臺灣研究》3(1998):103-146。

12. 田代安定，《臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌》，臺大圖書館田代安定文庫，N103，1896。

家社通事同伴。在卑南阿眉社，田代透過呂家社通事的翻譯，召集頭人家族與一些部落內的原住民，齊集拍照。田代的田野日記留下了在現場時，透過通事與當地頭人筆談記錄。田代安定寫了以下的文字給通事看，要求通事協助召集部落的人，除了拍照之外，並調查卑南阿眉的起源傳說，以及蕃社風俗：

今欲攝影蕃社風俗，要蕃人男女數人集來
 我聞此老人約九十歲，因欲問伊，阿眉社舊事。
 此阿眉社創立幾年前要問伊
 問阿眉社祖宗名叫什麼
 要詳話今所講伊
 可告此通事，此候伊所講，要詳細譯話，不論其講
 話之要不要，一一傳話是請。¹³



(圖2)

田代日記中紀錄著與卑南阿眉蕃社中耆老（鳥居照片中前排右一蹲坐者，圖2），透過通事翻譯進行筆談，採集卑南阿眉的起源傳說、遷移歷史、部落風俗與周邊卑南族的族群關係等資料。第二年鳥居龍藏在《東京人類學會雜誌》發表東臺灣蕃族的論文中，其中關於「南部阿眉」一節，即是根據此日的田野資料。¹⁴1896年11月24日，當日晴天，鳥居龍藏似乎身體不適，

13. 田代安定，《臺東殖民地豫察巡回日記》，N103。

14. 鳥居龍藏，《東部臺灣に於ける各蕃族及び其分布》。鳥居龍藏並不懂臺灣語，除了單詞外，目前也沒有鳥居熟悉清朝官話或是臺東當地阿眉或是卑南的原住民語言的紀錄。或許，田代在筆

但還是隨同一行人前往南勢部落，在花蓮的飽干社拍攝照片。田代的日記寫著：

從午後開始離開花蓮港兵營，篠崎、烏帶同伴，到南勢諸社。因烏居氏不適，他今日還要拍攝的人，是飽干社老者兩人，拍了照片。

結束後出社門，已經四時了。¹⁵

除了拍攝部落原住民的體質與文化特徵外，田代也記錄12月13日從花蓮港離開，所搭交通船沿西海岸北返途中，到打狗港時鳥居拍攝的港口風景。田代在日記中留下兩則記錄：

12月13日 晴

花蓮港出發

乘千代田丸，沿西海岸返回臺北。

12月15日 晴

午前四時三十分，到打狗港。

鳥居氏拍攝風景。¹⁶

鳥居龍藏在台灣東部調查期間寄給東京地學協會的信件中，提到「臺灣東部的土人一點也不怕被拍照，所以攝影的工作很順利」，的確也留下了不少的玻璃底片，看起來似乎在田野中一切都很順利的樣子。然而，在田代安定的日記中，卻也留下了一些耐人尋味的紀錄。例如在1896年11月17日前

談採訪的同時，也同步翻譯給鳥居。

15. 田代安定，《臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌》，臺大圖書館田代安定文庫，N104，1896。

16. 田代安定，《[明治廿九年田野筆記]》，臺大圖書館田代文庫文庫，N150，1896。

後，田代到花蓮七腳川部落調查時，當地人提出了抱怨。田代在田野日記中留下了透過同行嚮導的花蓮港人林鳳儀，與當地蕃社通事林振老之間的對話筆談：

（田代安定）伊通事心意如何，什麼事故不可送藥之言，我不曉得也。

（林鳳儀）前日本大人有學[寫]影後得病。蕃人妄言日本放鬼。通事今通知大人藥之事，不可送。¹⁷

筆談紀錄中的「日本大人」，應該就是在田野中帶著照相機到處拍照的鳥居龍藏。蕃人將拍攝之後的身體不適，歸因於「日本放鬼」，受到了詛咒，或是因為日本大人帶來的箱子（照相機）作祟，影響所致。在世界攝影史中，不乏類似的抱怨，將照相機誤認為是能吸取被拍攝者靈魂或是施放詛咒的一種魔術裝置。¹⁸當鳥居在現地正高興地寫下「臺灣東部的土人一點也不怕被拍照，所以攝影的工作很順利」時，這些在我們今日看到的當時鳥居在論文與專著中所使用的照片，以及後來在1990年代以後重新沖洗出版的玻璃版照片影像等這些在影像檔案的生產過程中，位於終端的原住民影像時，在當時田野現場的複式翻譯筆談的過程，被拍攝者對「日本放鬼」的恐懼，似乎都被人類學家的學術專名以及影像內容本身在後來的不同時代文化脈絡中再生產時，所湧現的重建

17. 田代安定，《臺東殖民地豫察巡回日記》，N104, 1896。

18. 攝影術在西方或是非西方世界使用時，被當成魔術裝置或引發攝魂恐懼的事例，幾乎到處都有。西方世界的例子，見：Lindsay Smith, *The Politics of Focus: Women Children and Nineteenth-Century Photography*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2011. 南美洲，見Deborah Poole, *Vision, Race and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997. 印度，見：Christopher Pinney, *The Coming of Photography in India*. London: The British Library, 2008.

如果殖民統治初期人類學田野中的影像檔案的生產過程，如同烏居經歷所顯示的，是在短時間內累積第一手的臺灣原住民影像資料，透過標準型的建立掌握體質與文化特徵，並藉之以進行比較民族學研究。那麼，到了殖民統治中期之後呢？特別是1928年臺北帝國大學成立之後，在臺灣建立了全日本少數的學院內的民族學研究機構時，如何進行田野調查，並在田野中拍攝影像呢？

臺北帝國大學文政學部土俗人種學教室的助手宮本延人，在其回憶錄《我的臺灣時代》中，回憶第一次到蘭嶼調查的田野攝影經驗，在1929年夏天：

調查紅頭嶼…至於我，以身為土俗人種學教室助教
的立場，包辦了所有的雜務，照片的攝影便是主要
的工作之一。當時還沒有現今已經通行的35mm的
Leica型照相機，也沒有膠卷，帶去使用的是照相師
營業用的Cabinet型玻璃底片的組合型攝影器材，還
帶了木製的三腳架。當時我是攝影初學者，所以還
準備了沖洗乾版用具一套，以及約兩公尺四方蚊帳
式繩子製攜帶式暗房。當地白天悶熱得使人睏倦難
受，但我還是努力拍了不少照片。¹⁹

在蘭嶼島上的調查，主要是到各部落設立據點，進行系譜採集、人類學體質測量，並拍攝照片。在島上的調查，透過部

19. 宮本延人，《我的臺灣紀行》，宋文薰、連照美編譯。臺北：南天書局，1998。頁160-161。

落的警察駐在所的警察協助，這一點，在前一年臺北帝大土俗學人種學教室的第一次的田野經驗中，也是如此。

1928年7月，負責臺北帝國大學的土俗學人種學教室的教授移川子之藏與助手宮本延人一同到花蓮，向當地警察機構申請進入蕃地的許可後，進入蕃界調查，並有蕃地警察協助。一行人進入立霧河流域，同行有警察帶路與搬運行李的工人。²⁰太魯閣群的Tabito社，是移川與宮本第一次人類學田野調查的目的地。在Toboko社的頭目家，透過蕃地駐在所警察苦米地巡查的翻譯，採訪頭目Umin Urai，紀錄了Umin Urai記憶中親屬系譜上的七個世代，共230個名字。隔一天在附近的Kubayan社，經由佐藤巡查的翻譯，訪問頭目Raushin Bakkule，採集其家族系譜，一共七代，382個名字。²¹在紀錄的龐大系譜資料中，關於部落的原居地、遷移、部落間的婚姻關係、親疏關係及敵對關係等，都很自然地浮現出來。1928年的初次田野，使移川子之藏與宮本延人，發展出了「臺灣高砂族系統所屬研究」的調查計劃，三年後獲得前總督上山滿之進的基金支援，進一步進行全面性的調查。最後出版了以龐大的系譜資料庫為基礎的歷史與社會民族誌《臺灣高砂族系統所屬之研究》，並於1936年獲得當時日本學術界的重要榮譽的帝國學士院賞。²²

宮本延人到臺灣的時間，已經是1920年代末了，原住民經歷了數十年的殖民統治後，已經產生不小的社會變遷。森丑之助在1912年說明調查方法時提到的調查項目，容易因為外在

20. 宮本延人,《我的臺灣紀行》,頁33。

21. 宮本延人,《我的臺灣紀行》,頁36。

22. 移川子之藏、宮本延人、馬淵東一,《臺灣高砂族系統所屬の研究》。東京:刀江書院,1935。

環境或是與族群互動過程中改變的項目，到了宮本延人進入「蕃地」時，所目擊到的已是改變中的、乃至已經變遷的原住民社會文化。比較不容易改變的，只剩下「體質」以及移川子之藏與宮本延人在田野中偶然發現的，能記憶到多代的親屬系譜。換言之，「記憶」與「體質」成為此時移川與宮本田野中的重要調查項目。移川與宮本在臺灣蕃界各部落蒐集系譜資料的同時，也拍攝各部落的影像。²³

環境的改變也反映在殖民地人類學家的田野中，在伊能嘉矩、鳥居龍藏、森丑之助的年代，總是可以看到他們在野外的部落中田野調查的紀錄或者影像。到了移川子之藏與宮本延人的時代，部落中已經有蕃地警察駐在所。田野工作往往也是在管制出入的蕃界內，透過部落駐在所警察的協助，進行體質測量、口述系譜資料蒐集，以及攝影。這一點，對照鳥居龍藏在1896年花蓮秀姑巒溪畔蹲在地上記錄的身影，與移川子之藏在1930年代在部落駐在所走廊下，坐在桌子後面，兩旁是蕃地警察與助手，對面是被調查的當地原住民，兩個時期的田野調查者在田野中的影像，馬上就對照出殖民者理蕃政策的深入程度，以及殖民地人類學在田野中的環境。（圖3）

在統治初期的人類學田野中，伊能、田代或者鳥居等人也常在撫臺署或是地方官署，透過通事召來附近蕃社頭目「詢問生蕃事情」的情況，但是到了1930年代，蕃地警察已經深入到部落中，從通事到警察，現地的語言翻譯與嚮導的協助人

23. 移川子之藏與宮本延人在臺灣各地拍攝的影像紀錄，目前留存的玻璃版底片，其拍攝日期，一大部分集中在各地進行蒐集系譜資料的田野調查期間，見連照美編，《人類學玻璃版影像選輯》。臺北：臺大出版中心，1998。



(圖3)

物角色改變了，特別是蕃界中也有蕃社出身的蕃地警察。²⁴同時，田野中的影像作為民族誌方法的使用上，臺北帝國大學土俗人種學教室也使用攝影設備，留下更多的人類學田野的影像檔案。不過，從殖民地人類學在臺灣展開初期，所提問的人種起源的問題意識，仍然繼續延續。雖然從語言與體質特徵的民族誌資料逐漸轉變成親屬系譜的民族誌資料，從自然的到社會的、從可觀察的到記憶中的、從現在到歷史，民族誌資料的調查方向雖然有所調整，但是人種分類與族群起源的問題，以及與周邊的其他島嶼原住民的比較民族學的研究傾向，則是一以貫之地延續著。

結論

臺灣原住民寫真檔案的形成，同時是殖民理蕃機構的官方民族誌，與近代人類學運用攝影作為民族學方法的產物。

影像作為田野方法，在殖民地官方的民族誌中，原先是殖民者理蕃行政展開過程的歷史事件之見證，但也在殖民者意圖之外留下以事件為中心的重要原住民影像檔案。在殖民地臺灣的人類學田野影像方法，不論是否親自攝影，或者使用影像資料，從伊能嘉矩、烏居龍藏，到森丑之助逐漸發展。更

24. 宮本延人,《我的臺灣紀行》,頁94-95。

重要的是，標榜著客觀實證的科學原則，也是從伊能嘉矩、鳥居龍藏到移川子之藏、宮本延人一直以來在田野中蒐集現地民族學資料的原則。著重現地、現場，帶著清楚的問題意識拍攝與蒐集原住民圖像，在影像與人類學知識之間，影像被當成再現的真實，能將被調查的原住民的本真性適當呈現的一種方法。

日治時期的人類學影像經驗（*photographic experiences*），除了作為原住民治理的紀實攝影記錄外，也是人類學透過民族學類型影像，建構族群分類的知識再現紀錄。這些留存下來的影像檔案，在1990年代後的新時代環境中，成為在日本與在臺灣重新挪用與再生產其影像意義的資源，展開了在不同時空脈絡下新的影像社會歷程（*social life*）。²⁵

（本文作者為美國紐約大學歷史學博士候選人、臺灣大學歷史學博士班）

25. 影像的生產、再製、及其社會性的挪用的討論，見：Christopher Pinney, *Camera Indica: The Social Life of Indian Photographs*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997. *Photography and Anthropology*. London: Reaktion Books, 2011. Deborah Poole, "An Excess of Description: Ethnography, Race, and Visual Technologies," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34(2005): 159-179。臺灣在1990年代以後，伴隨著民主化，以及社會上重新認識臺灣的歷史與文化的要求，包括原住民的正名運動等，在這樣的歷史脈絡中，日治時期的影像資料，重新獲得市民權。除了翻印出版的影像資料外，其中早期人類學家留下來的照片中，有不少被當成具有代表性的原住民圖像。殖民時期的影像檔案，以另類挪用的類型影像型式展開其意義生產的新的社會歷程。

From Archive to Tribes in Taiwan and Malaysia – Jeffrey Lim’s Kanta Portraits

/ Jeffrey Lim, Rikey Tenn Bun-Ki

Rikey Tenn: *NML Residency & Nusantara Archive Project* tends to invite artists from different countries. You have been to Taiwan four times yet this is our first interview. Many questions can be raised regarding the “Kanta Portraits: Taiwan” project, and if we want to go deeper based on these entry points. On one hand, the images of the Taiwanese indigenous people – in popular culture or the academic field – can be traced back to the turn of 20th century, when Japanese anthropologist (Torii Ryuzo) first applied box camera photography on his subjects. On the other hand, we can also see many images of indigenous peoples in popular cultures, such as in commercials, theatres, movies, or postcards. However, these images somehow represent the stereotypes of indigenous peoples mediated by the colonial documentations. This is what Chen Wei-Chi called “*photographs of aborigines as colonial archives*” in “Photography as Ethnographic Method: The Anthropological Photographic Archives in Japanese Colonial Taiwan” in 2017.¹

Jeffrey Lim: Yes... in earlier times, there were only box cameras. They were almost the same process, in which they had to do it on the spot, and processed on plates. And they didn't have films. It can be either wet or dry plates. Dry plates meant that they could bring them back to the dark room and process somewhere else. Wet plates meant that they were processed on the spot, but usually not far. It happened as well in the history of Malaysia when the Scottish photographer John Thompson traveled to the Far East. From the 1860s to late 1870s he made more than 600 plates on social documentary, from Ceylon, India, throughout Southeast Asia,

1. Chen Wei-Chi, “Photography as Ethnographic Method: The Anthropological Photographic Archives in Japanese Colonial Taiwan, 1”: www.heath.tw/nml-article/photography-as-ethnographic-method-the-anthropological-photographic-archives-in-japanese-colonial-taiwan-part-1/?lang=en

Indochina, Hong Kong, Macau, China, and even Formosa. All this works independently as his own initiatives.

RT: Yes I would like to further explore this with you, because where we stand determines how we see things. If the Western-trained photographers (even the “imperial gaze”) have shaped our imagination on the indigenous people, how can we develop a different perspective of the indigenous photography in Taiwan? And what makes your practice different from these early practitioners with box cameras? Also, what motivates and drives you to conduct your research in Taiwan?

JL: For one, a lot of photos that existed under Japanese rule were very different from current times; like the attires, even their culture has changed. Because it’s just the circumstance of time, culture changes. It would never stay the same. Looking at the colonial archive, and making a comparison with tribespeople now, they appear different. The thing is, culture always changes, even for indigenous people. If you read the colonial archive for the pictures of the Orang Asli from 200 hundred years ago, they are very different from the natives you currently encounter. In a way it proves the point that culture always reinvents itself, it changes according to circumstance, because of outside influences, e.g. the Japanese colonists and many others.

RT: Those were one of the few earliest impressions we had about ethnic identity. We never met these people directly, only through the the colonial archive. That is why it is critical to point out: If we are not aware of that we might be influenced by how the colonists saw the indigenous peoples and their way of looking. Can you talk

a little bit about how you see it differently. How your practice is different from those early practitioners who share the same photographic technique? Of course the motivations are different. They served for governmental survey on the territory of the natives, and they have their own academic interests. But how can the processes be different?

JL: Well, some of the pictures that I've taken are in different settings. Take the 'Tomu' (great leader) for instance, I took his portrait three times. First he wore his 'normal' clothes, the shirt and pants he uses in church. Then he wore his formal, 'traditional' attire. It's still the same person, but it's the duality of personality that he has to live with. Probably another practice is that they keep the original portrait print. This is very different, the silver prints are given to them. And there are also audio recordings. I'm still developing these different dimensions of the different circumstances.

RT: There are many layer processes to your practice, not only taking the photos but also constructing the cameras yourself. You will introduce the box camera and demonstrate it to the tribespeople. Then you will develop the photographs, converse with the people who you have photographed, and exchange photos and information with them. You also make presentations or exhibitions. But the audience will only see the end result – they even miss the photos in the drawers in the *PETAMU Project* sometimes. In a project like this, we see that you focus more on the process rather than the result.

JL: For me it is about the process. The result is just the by-product, because it actually involves the person to experience the whole

portrait and printmaking process. When their portraits were taken, they would see their printed portraits being made, and the print is presented to them – that is the real exchange. This experience is important, so the display of the works to an audience after is just the by-product of the process. But I am thinking of not just showing portraits, there are written stories as well. It's my end result. I'm still exploring how to present the idea or changing concept about anthropology, how I research identities. So, I actually use these portraits, their cultures, and my interpretations of the circumstances as case studies to demonstrate how our 'traditional' culture are changing. Therefore it is about exploring these concepts in my process.

RT: It's interesting to see the nuances between the ways you show your works solely and with others. You always choose to collaborate with some people from different indigenous communities. Surely it depends on how you get supported and financed. For me your practice is very intuitive; although you are good in articulating your methods such as photography or other media, you combined varied procedures intuitively when necessary.

JL: It's very important to collaborate. In Malaysia, I always try to connect and collaborate with someone who knows or is from the community. There is also a social connection between the collaborators – also in order to respect the culture. In Taiwan, *PETAMU Project* is the first time I actually explored and worked with Posak Jodian, an indigenous artist, especially in a journey of discovery with her. I wish to bring this method back to Malaysia.

RT: If it's true, then, does it matter (when we say) that is Posak

Jodian or not? I mean, isn't it necessary to visit a certain tribe?

JL: That's why I am not particular about the tribe. It is the circumstances of the artist from the tribe. Let's say this project with Posak, the community can be Amis, Pangcah or Atayal. Because the focus is on 'her' story with her family and community in Fatáan and in XiaoBitan, and how they transmigrate from Hualien to Xiao-Bitan. It's not in particular about the photography archive of certain tribe. It's how they negotiate with time and space. It highlights some ideas of the negotiation, the changes in identities, how tribes sustain their cultures in the changing circumstances or on the very site... Of course Taiwan sets the 'pretext' to my work in Malaysia. In a way, Taiwan becomes a reference point for my work with the tribespeople in Malaysia, and it will only be a reference point. It doesn't need to have the direct anthropological connection. I am interested in cultural links, social circumstances and learning more on how they negotiate. So it makes sense when I apply this again in Malaysia – to find relational patterns between them.

RT: (*The Q&As hereafter are conducted during JL's residency in Taipei*) We see how Japanese anthropologists systematically made the 'official ethnography' of 'the savages(蕃人)'. On one hand, Ino built up the Indigenous categorization using the notion of tribes and divides into Ataiya, Vonum, Tso' o, Tsarisen, Payowan, Puyuma, Amis, Peipo, eight tribes in total on the Taiwan Island – 9 tribes in total If adding Torii's research on the Yami tribe on the Orchid island. (Comparing to the six-tribe categorization later proposed by Mori Ushinosuke). On the other hand, 'type photograph' is employed by anthropologists to form "a critical ethnographic method for knowledge construction." Taking Ushinosuke's The

Book of Taiwan Savage Tribes, Volume 1 (1917) for example, the categorization is used with photograph attachments of male and female's headshot or profile from each tribe. Can we avoid such a 'way of seeing' of indigenous people when we take photos for the tribespeople? Among Ushinosuke's categories listed based on the stability and the workability of subjects, 'physical feature' is considered to be the hardest to eliminate due to variables of time and environment. If we still use the camera as an empirical tool, does it mean that we will inevitably rely on the physiognomical differences – which may lead to the discriminative or the essentialist understandings of the tribes?

JL: The camera that Torii had introduced might be Kodak box camera no.1, that was very basic. Since it was the first available for common users (at that time no one could acquire user-friendly cameras) It is not a professional equipment. That's funny.

I have a lot of to respond the translation of Chen's article. To deconstruct what makes their identities, and how they navigate their own identities in present time. (I feel better when this is an interview, because we have no time to think too much, and the answers I give are subjective and spontaneous.) My thinking has evolved ever since the last interview we did on Skype in 2018. I went to Southeast Japan island of Shikoku for residency after that, and Posak also finished her video, and we did the exhibition together. This is not what I discuss with anyone because I'm still developing my thinking. The exhibition *UNIVERSITAS* (2018/12/15 ~ 2019/2/24) directly strikes me to this question. *UNIVERSITAS* is about the methodology and attempt of how they re-culturize themselves. For me it very much answers this question, because

they use the same methodology as the westerners. The camera is just another tool, like all the tools they use for study and categorize scientifically. They use the camera to systematically differentiate. So this is the predicament of the methodology; the predicament is conflicting. When they adopt this from the west, they make the same mistake as the west. The later also colonize, discriminate and categorize using the existed tools.

RT: *“From present to historic, although there are changes in the research direction of ethnographic documents, the question of ethnic categorization and the origin of tribes and communities, and the research inclination to comparative ethnology of indigenous people in Taiwan and its peripheral islands are still continuing.”* (Chen Wei-Chi) The latest theory of the origin of Austronesian languages from Taiwan is always appropriated in many artists’ arguments (this explains why indigenous tribes have become the topics of some art projects in Taiwan). Somehow it also leads to the danger of deliberate explanation of the need to assimilate ourselves into Southeast Asia. This reminds me in 1920s, ‘Malay people’ was believed to be the origin of both inhabitants in Southern Japan and Taiwan. That is also what Takekoshi Yosaburo’s argument in his famous *Nangokuki*(南國記), when he said the Japanese should know more about ‘the South’ due to “the mix of blood of Malay people in South Japanese *people*’ vessels.” (*Nangokuki*, 1910)²

2 Takekoshi Yosaburo, *Nangokuki*, page 2-3. Also see: Tsai, Yao-wei, “浪人游臺灣—哈利·法蘭克和他的《日本與福爾摩沙一瞥》.” *Both E. Owen Rutter & Harry A. Franck have mentioned... Taiwan indigenous people are originated from Malay Peninsula. Rutter has, based on the studies and the documents of early Western explorers, pointed out the similarities among ‘Formosan Languages’, Bornean languages, and Bahasa Melayu (Owen Rutter, Through Formosa; 1921). Franck mentioned that it’s difficult to tell Formosan indigenous people from the islanders in Southern Japan, even to the Japanese. Therefore he concluded that both Taiwan indigenous people and Japanese are originat-*

JL: Since I come from a different background, the camera is not the same tool for me. What I use it for has very different intentions from the studies that they did. How they studied is the predicament of ethnography study of culture. They always viewed tribes from their own cultures. In that sense they already had a bias, a stereotype before they even started. In the beginning, they called them ‘the savages,’ (although I have an issue about this term). In Europe they called them ‘the barbarians’, because they didn’t live a ‘civilized’ life. Then they were called ‘Takasago’ which showed more respect. But it was still a strategy of differentiation”.

RT: Does it mean that’s why it makes sense for us to not follow the existing normalized convention?

JL: Well, we have to question it. The expectation is now, who then are these pictures for? Who then owns the access to this form of image? This form of image is just one form of representation. Some of the tribespeople have their ways of dealing with the (visual) image of themselves in terms of how to represent themselves, through drawing or pattern making. The photography is just another form; it is just the western form of looking. The natives have their own forms as well. In my works, I have already started to bridge other dimension: audio recording. Luc³ did the audio and Posak did the video. It’s another medium. We collaborated to look at different representations of cultural identities, not just through the pictures.

ed from Malay people (Harry A. Franck, “Glimpse of Japan and Formosa”; 1924)” – the argument had been rejected by other anthropologists.

3. Chen, Zi-Hua (Uselrepe) is a Rukai artist from Wuta, Pintung. She creates images with her hand-made cameras. In 2018, she has collaborated with Jeffrey Lim in the exhibition “Kanta Portraits: Wuta” project in Polymer, Taipei.

The pictures are just the end result, but the process was important. When we ask the questions and understand the circumstances that they've come from... and the aspects of their identities.

RT: I saw the difference since the 'light-weight' sound recording equipment didn't exist for Japanese anthropologists. After all we have to talk about the technology, or media. I mean technology will affect how we see the subject, and the tribespeople will also adopt it. It's interesting how you make these encounters 'mysterious' again, because you don't rely on the ready tools. Instead, you have a series of procedures: the posturing, the setting, the adjusting, the hand lighting, etc, to make familiar things 'unfamiliar' again.

JL: Okay. Kanta Box is very fresh and they have never seen it before mine, so it helps to create a bridge. They was a reference to 'materializing', how I materialize an image of their existence onto a piece of paper. This connection matters, because I present to them 'a tangible self'. Sometimes they want their portraits taken. This form of representation creates some sort of formality. It's a form of identity that is recognized by the system/state, because this is how photography works.

RT: Definitely it's the new narrative of our collaboration, since it's not only about the tribes in different islands, also about the locality, the photography, and the mapping of *Nusantara* that we share. I believe that there are still many to be articulated in between the representation of photography and the identity recognized by the state, like the way you described.

Photography as Ethnographic Method: The Anthropological Photography Archives in Japanese Colonial Taiwan (Excerpt)

/ Chen Wei-Chih

Photography in the Field

Today I'd like to photograph the customs of the savage community, and gather both male and female savages around. I heard this old man is in his 90s; the purpose was to ask about the old stories of the Amis community.¹

– Tashiro Anteï, 1896

How do anthropologists take photographs? If the photographs left by the Government of Formosa were taken by the military photographer, and Ino Kanori just used photographic archives as a method of ethnography without taking photos by himself, then what is the process performed by the anthropologists with their own cameras in the field? What makes photography accountable in the field? Namely, how have photography become an ethnographic method in the field?

In October 1896, Torii Ryuzo, who was conducting a field research in Eastern Taiwan had written a letter to the Tokyo Geographical Society to give a progress report with details about photographing the 'savages.' The letter goes:

The savages in Eastern Taiwan, except for those who live near Taitung, have not been entirely sinicized, hence we are allowed to discover the original appearances of the savages today. They are genuinely the research subjects which interest us anthropology researchers the most. I realized that the savages in Eastern Taiwan are not afraid of being

1. Tashiro Anteï, *The Diary of Inspection in the Colony Taitung*(臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌), National Taiwan University Library, Tashiro Anteï Archive, No.103, 1896.

photographed at all, so the photoshoot went smoothly. (The underline is stressed by the author)²

Because of Torii Ryuzo's intentional use of the camera in the field, the firsthand pictures of Taiwanese indigenous peoples taken by him in the initial years of Japanese rule could serve as an example to elucidate how anthropologists photograph in the field and to discuss archival methodology generated in photographic records during fieldwork.³ Before coming to Taiwan for his first field research, Torii had recognized the importance of field photography as archival records. As a result, he was consciously taking photographs during his fieldwork in Taiwan ever since.⁴ After going back to Japan, he also displayed the photographs taken in the field that illustrated the cultural features of Taiwanese indigenous peoples while presenting the research results of Taiwan at the Anthropological Society of Tokyo and the Tokyo Geographical Society.⁵ In his published paper, he even used the photographic records as the materials for comparison and analysis purpose. He has published a

2. Torii Ryuzo, "Taiwan Newsletter(臺灣通信)", *The Journal of the Tokyo Geographical Society*(東京地学協會雜誌)8(96)(1896), the reference is from R. Torii, *Exploring Taiwan*(探險臺灣), p137.

3. Information about Torii Ryuzo's field research in Taiwan and other Asia area, see Nakazono Eisuke, *Torii Ryuzo: The Anthropologist Who Travels All over Asia*(鳥居竜藏伝: アジアを走破した人類学者), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1995, *Torii Ryuzo: The Anthropology Pioneer that Travels across Taiwan and East Asia*(鳥居龍藏: 縦横臺灣與東亞の人類學先驅), Taichung: Morning Star Publishing, 1998. Tabata Hisao, *Ethnologist Torii Ryuzo: The Road to Researching Asia*(民族学者鳥居龍藏: アジア調査の軌跡), Tokyo: 今古書院, 1997, and Sasaki Komei, *Torii Ryuzo sees Asia: The Foreman of Ethnology*(鳥居龍藏の見たアジア: 民族学の先覺者), Suita: National Ethnographic Museum, 1993.

4. The introduction to the photographs Torii took during his exploration in Taiwan, see Wenxun Song et al, *The Image that crossover Centuries: The Taiwanese Indigenous Peoples in Torii Ryuzo's Eyes*(跨越世紀的影像: 鳥居龍藏眼中的臺灣原住民), Taipei: Shung Yi Museum of Formosa, 1994.

5. R. Torii, "Indigenous Tribes of Eastern Taiwan(東部臺灣諸蕃族に就て)", *Journal of Geography*(地學雜誌). This is the documentation of Ryuzo's speech in the Geographical Society Tokyo after he came back to Japan from his first exploration in Taiwan. Also, see *The Collection of Torii Ryuzo*(鳥居全集) Vol 11, pp485-505, and *Exploring Taiwan*(探險臺灣), pp191-229.

photo album which consists of ethnographic images related exclusively to a single community (entitled *Yami on Orchid Island*).⁶

When Torii first came to Taiwan for research in 1896, it happened that the Government of Formosa had a research plan on Eastern Taiwan's migrant area ("colony" was the term used back then) as well. The investigator who was in charge of this Eastern Taiwan research was the Department of Agricultural and Industrial Affairs technician Tashiro Antei (田代安定, 1857-1928). Before Tashiro came to Taiwan, he has already joined the Anthropological Society of Tokyo in 1889 and has taken a position as reporting director in the Tokyo Geographical Society. Upon his arrival, Torii applied for a research permit from the Government of Formosa; meanwhile, the Government of Formosa was in the process of appointing Tashiro to Eastern Taiwan. As a result, Torii and Tashiro departed from Taipei together to embark on the first field research on Taiwan. During their stay in Eastern Taiwan, they often went on exploring the tribes side by side.⁷

6. R. Torii, *Anthropology Collection: Taiwan Orchid*

Island(人類學寫真集 臺灣紅頭嶼之部), Tokyo:Imperial University of Tokyo, 1899, also see *The Collection of Torii Ryuzo*(鳥居全集), Vol 11, pp329-353. Modern photographic analysis of the history of single group photography that started by Torii, see Syapen Lamolan, Ma Tengyue, Tzu-Ning, *Tao under the Lens: Orchid Island, Tao Photography Special Issue*(鏡頭下的達悟族:蘭嶼.達悟族.影像特刊), Taipei: Shung Yi Museum of Formosa,2002, and Tzu-Ning Li 2001, *Yami under the Lens: A Retrospective of Yami Ethnographic Photography under Japanese rule*(鏡頭下的雅美族:日治時期雅美族民族誌影像回顧). *Photography and Ethnography Conference Paper*(影像與民族誌研討會論文), Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, 2001.

7. R. Torii, "Torii Ryuzo's Inquiry(鳥居龍藏氏の近信)", *Tokushima Daily News*(徳島日日新聞), Sept 4th, 1896, included in *The Collection of Torii Ryuzo*(鳥居全集), Vol 11. pp459-460, also see *Exploring Taiwan*(探險臺灣),"The Letter from Taiwan Newsletter to Tokushima Daily News(臺灣通信一致(徳島日日新聞)的信)", *Exploring Taiwan*, pp133-136. Moreover, the thesis Torii published about his first research when he came back to Japan, in which he thanked the assistance of Tashiro in the field and mentioned that most of the fieldworks were jointly done with Tashiro. See Ryuzo, "Indigenous Tribes in Eastern Taiwan and Their Distribution(東部臺灣に於ける各蕃族及び其分布)", *The Journal of Anthropological Society Tokyo*(東京人類學會雜誌) 136(1897):378-410.

Tashiro Antei, the Department of Agricultural and Industrial Affairs technician who accompanied Torii left multiple records in his field diary of Torii photographing local indigenous tribes in the field. He even left a sketch of the camera in the said diary. In *Tribal Languages Spoken by the Savages in Yunlin Mountain, Taiwan* (臺灣雲林高山蕃支族語), the language research and documentation notebook in which Tashiro retrieved from his field research and put together in a military base in Milun Mountain when he went back to Hualien Harbour in October 1896, a sketch of photography equipment was found that is highly considered to be the one carried by Torii.⁸ Tashiro noted the camera equipment as “コダツク式寫真,” which would be the Kodak box camera (fig.1).

Torii wrote in his memoir *Notes of an Old Novice of Sorts* (某老學徒の手記) that, back then, sketching was the most used method to document images instead of using cameras in the field of Archeology and Anthropology in Japan. He reckoned that sketching was not enough when doing field research on Taiwanese savages, so the recording had to be done with a camera. However, he did not know how to photograph at first; hence, he borrowed a camera from the university to quickly learned photography, and then brought an incomplete set of photography equipment to Taiwan. In the memoir, Torii said with confidence:

*In the academic field of Anthropology, applied photography begins from me.*⁹

8. A. Tashiro, *Tribal Languages Spoken by the Savages in Yunlin Mountain, Taiwan Savage* (臺灣雲林高山蕃支族語), National University Library, Tashiro Antei Archive, N108,1996.

9. R. Torii, *Notes of an Old Student: 60 Years of Archeology* (ある老學徒の手記: 考古學とともに六十年). R. Tokyo: Asahi Shimbun, 1953.



fig.1

What Torii did not mention is was the type of photography equipment that being brought along. Through his companion, Tashiro's field diary, there is a way to possibly know about the photography equipment Torii used in the field. Mori Ushinosuke was Torii's assistant on his fourth exploration in Taiwan. He

has written in remembrance of the scene where Torii was carrying a box, that was supposedly the portable storage box for the 'box camera'.¹⁰

Tashiro Antei who kept Torii's company in the field founded the Taiwan Society for Anthropology with Ino Kanori in Taipei only a few months earlier. Though his exploration in Eastern Taiwan from August to December in 1896 was to execute the Government of Formosa's plan called "The Compilation Plan of the Colony", he managed to not only investigate the required area from the planned colony as well as the geography, geology, industries, and the agrarian relations of Eastern Taiwan, but conduct ethnographic and linguistic researches.¹¹ The importance of the field notes and diary Tashiro left lies not only in the fortuitous sketches of Torii's photography equipment used in the field, but also, which is even

10. Mori Ushinosuke, *Savage Wonderer*(生蕃行腳), included in Mori Ushinosuke, translated by Nanjun Yang, *Savage Wonderer: Ushinosuke's Taiwan Exploration*(生蕃行腳:森丑之助的臺灣探險). Taipei: Yaun-Liou Publishing, 2000, p200.

11. After A. Tashiro's Eastern Taiwan exploration in 1896, he published *The Report of the Inspection in Colony Taitung*(臺東殖民地預察報文) in 1900. Analysis of A. Tashiro's colony inspection, see Wei-Chi Chen, "Tashiro Antei and The Report of the Inspection in Colony Taitung: Colonialism, Knowledge Construction and the representation Politics in Eastern Taiwan(田代安定與《臺東殖民地預察報文》:殖民主義、知識建構與東部臺灣的再現政治)", *Eastern Taiwan Studies*(東臺灣研究) 3(1998): pp103-146.

more essential, his multiple entries on the happening when Torii was photographing local indigenous peoples during his explorations in Taitung and Hualien. For example, on October 7th, 1896, in Puyuma community, Tashiro wrote in the field diary:

After ten, arrival at the Aboriginal Office, just like yesterday, asking the Rikavon communicator about the savages. I went back to the dormitory at twelve.

At half past two, going to the Amis community, to the Chief's house. Torii also came along. Towa and Yasui came together as well accompanied by the Rikavon communicator. Take photographs of his family and the community residents (真影ヲ寫サル).¹²

Tashiro Antei, Torii Ryuzo, and the Aboriginal Office officers who came along, Towa and Yasui went together to the Amis and the Puyuma community (the Malan Amis in Taitung in the present day), accompanied by the Rikavon communicator. Upon their arrival, with the translation by the Rikavon communicator, Tashiro gathered the chief's family and a few indigenous peoples in the community to take their photographs. Tashiro's field diary left the records of the written conversation with the chief assisted by the local communicator. Tashiro wrote down the words below to show the communicator and asked him to help gather people from the tribe not only for the photoshoot but also for the investigation the originating legend of the Puyuma and the Amis as well as their customs accordingly:

12. A. Tashiro, *The Diary of Inspection in the Colony Taitung* (臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌), National Taiwan University Library, Tashiro Antei Archive, N103, 1896.

Today I'd to photograph the custom in savage community and gather both male and female savages around.

I heard this old man is in his 90s; the purpose was to ask about the old stories of the Amis community.

Ask him about how many years has the Amis been founded here.

Ask the name of the ancestor of Amis.

Explain what he means in great detail.

Let him know that you can help with this. Thus, translate what he says completely, no matter what kind of contents he answered, please let me know the details.¹³

Tashiro's diary documented the written conversation with the translation by the communicator with an elderly man from the Puyuma-Amis (the squatting one, first from the right in the front row in Torii's photograph (fig. 2), retrieving the originating legend of the Puyuma-Amis, history of migration, customs of the community, and tribal relationships with the peripheral Puyumas. The section about "Southern Amis" in the thesis Torii published in *The Journal of the*



fig.2

Anthropological Society of Tokyo(東京人類學會雜誌) in the next year was based on the field notes on that day.¹⁴ On November 24th, 1896, which was a sunny day, Torii seemed to be feeling unwell physically, but still, he went with the group to Nanshi community and took photographs in Cipawkan in Hualien. In Tashiro's diary, he wrote:

13. A. Tashiro, *The Diary of Inspection in the Colony Taitung*(臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌), N103.

14. R. Torii, 《東部臺灣に於ける各蕃族及び其分布 (*Indigenous Tribes in Eastern Taiwan and Their Distribution*)》. Torii Ryuzo didn't know of any Taiwanese, other than a few vocabularies, there is currently no record of Torii being familiar with official language from Qing Dynasty or any indigenous language like Amis or Puyuma from Taitung. Perhaps when Tashiro was doing the written conversation interview, he was simultaneously translating to Torii.

*Leaving Hualien Harbor's military base in the afternoon, Shinozaki and Karasu arrive at communities in Nanshi. Torii feels unwell, so the subject he chooses to photograph today is the two elderly men from Cipawkan. Photographs have been taken. It was already four when leaving the community after finished.*¹⁵

In addition to photographing tribal indigenous peoples' physical and cultural features, Tashiro also documented how Torii photographed the Takao Harbor scenery as they took the shuttle boat from Hualien Harbor that sailed north along the west coast on 13th December. Tashiro left two entries in the diary:

13th December, sunny

Leaving from Hualien Harbor

Heading back to Taipei by taking Chiyoda Maru that sailed along the west coast

15th December, sunny

Arriving at Takao Harbor at 4:30 before noon.

*Torii is photographing the scenery.*¹⁶

In the letter which Torii Ryuzo sent to the Tokyo Geographical Society during his field observations in Eastern Taiwan, he mentioned: “*the savages in Eastern Taiwan are not afraid of being photographed at all, so the photoshoot went smoothly.*” Indeed, he left a large quantity of the glass plate negatives; it looked like things went smoothly in the field. However, in Tashiro Antei's diary, there were a few intriguing

15. A. Tashiro, *The Diary of Inspection in the Colony Taitung*(臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌), National Taiwan University Library, Tashiro Antei Archive, N103, 1896.

16. A. Tashiro, *Field Notes from Meiji 29th Year*(明治廿九年田野筆記), National Taiwan University Library, Tashiro Antei Archive, N150, 1896.

entries as well. For example, around November 17th, 1896, the locals raised complaints when Tashiro went to the Cikasuan tribe in Hualien to investigate. Tashiro left a record of the written conversation with the local savage communicator Lin Chen-Lao with the help of his tour guide who came from Hualien Harbor, Lin Feng-Yi:

(Tashiro Ante) I have no idea what the communicator was thinking about and what caused him to advise me not to deliver the medication.

(Lin Feng-Yi) The former Japanese lord had fallen ill after the photoshoot. Rumor has it, according to the savages, that Japanese has unleashed the ghosts. Thus, the communicator informed the lord of this matter that the medication is not doable.¹⁷

The “Japanese lord” mentioned in the written conversation record should be Torii Ryuzo who had been carrying the camera and taking photographs everywhere in the field. The savages put the blame for the physical unwellness after the photoshoot on “*Japanese unleashing the ghosts*”, being cursed, or the dark magic fueled by the box (the camera) brought by the Japanese lord. Throughout the world history, there are some similar complaints made against cameras for being falsely thought to be a satanic installation that would suck the soul out of the photographed subject or unleash curses.¹⁸ The moment Torii happily wrote down “*the savages in East-*

17. A. Tashiro, *The Diary of Inspection in the Colony Taitung*(臺東殖民地豫察巡回日誌), N104, 1896.

18 There are instances everywhere when photography is performing in the West or non-western countries and being treated as a magic trick or as a matter that causes the fear of souls being taken. Example from the west, see Lindsay Smith, *The Politics of Focus: Women Children and Nineteenth-Century Photography*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2011. South

ern Taiwan are not afraid of being photographed at all, so the photoshoot went smoothly” on site – with regard to the photographs we see today in Torii’s thesis and monograph as well as the glass plate photographs, later re-developed and re-published in the 1990s, of which subjects are the images of indigenous peoples that are the end products of the archival process of photographic records, the process of compound translation into the written conversation in the field. The photographed subject’s fear towards “*Japanese unleashing the ghosts*” seemed to be blocked by the auratic effect that reappears and reconstructs the history and culture resulted from the given terminology entitled by anthropologists or through the reproduction of the visual content of images under different cultural contexts in different eras.

From the view of anthropology, if the archival process of the photographic records in the field in the early years of the Japanese rule period are shown as Torii’s experience – accumulating first-hand photographic records of Taiwanese indigenous peoples in a short period and getting ahold of physical and cultural features by establishing a standard type so as to conduct comparative ethnographic researches. Then, how does the process work in the mid-to-late Japanese rule period? How does the field research go and how to photograph images accordingly especially after the Taihoku Imperial University established in 1928, showing the fact that an academic institute for Ethnography research, which is rarely seen in Japan, had been built in Taiwan?

America, see Deborah Poole, *Vision, Race and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997. India, see Christopher Pinney, *The Coming of Photography in India*. London: The British Library, 2008.

Miyamoto Nobuto, the assistant of the Institute of Aboriginal Ethnology, Department of Literatures and Politics in Taihoku Imperial University wrote about his field photography experience when he first went on exploration in the Orchid Island in his memoir *My Stay in Taiwan*(我的臺灣時代). In the summer of 1929:

Exploring the Orchid Island... for me, as the teaching assistant of the Institute of Aboriginal Ethnology, I take menial chores on my shoulder, and photography is one of my main duties. Back then, we didn't have the 35mm Leica camera that is widely used now. We didn't have films either. What we brought to use was the cabinet-type glass-plate assembled photography equipment that was normally for business use and the wooden tripod. I was a beginner photographer then, so I also prepared a set of equipment that could develop dry plates and a portable darkroom made of a roughly 2 meters long square-shaped, mosquito-net-like satin weave. The stuffiness and hotness during daytime there make people feel drowsy. Still, I managed to take quite a few photographs.¹⁹

The investigation on Orchid Island was to set up spots in different tribal communities to collect genealogical information, measure physical anthropological features and take photographs. Such investigations were carried out with the help of the assigned police from the police department stationed in the tribes, which was a shared experience in terms of the first fieldwork experience conducted by the Institute of Aboriginal Ethnology in Taihoku Imperial University one year earlier.

19. Miyamoto Nobuto, *My Travel Notes in Taiwan*(我的臺灣紀行), translated and edited by Wen-Xun Song, Chao-Mei Lien. Taipei: SMC Publishing, 1998, pp160-161.

In July 1928, Prof. Utsurikawa Nenozo and his assistant Miyamoto Nobuto who were in charge of the Institute of Aboriginal Ethnology in Taihoku Imperial University went to Hualien, and, after getting the permit to enter savage territory from local police institution, start the investigation there with the help of the assigned police. The group entered the Liwu River basin accompanied by the police who led the way and the worker who carried the luggage.²⁰ The Tabito community in Puyuma was the destination of Utsurikawa and Miyamoto's first Anthropology field exploration. In the house of the Chief of Toboko, with the help of the assigned inspector, Tomabechi's translation, they interviewed Chief Umin Urai and documented the seven generations from the Chief's genealogy in memory with a total of 230 names. The next day, with Inspector Sato's translation, they interviewed Chief Raushin Bakkule in the neighboring Kubayan community, and collected his genealogy with a total of seven generations and 382 names.²¹ Among largely documented genealogy files, information about the original place of the communities, the migration, the marital relationships between tribes, and having either close or hostile relations are revealed. The first fieldwork in 1928 inspired Utsurikawa Nenozo, and Miyamoto to develop the "Taiwanese Indigenous Peoples Familial System Research" plan which got the funding support from the Government General Kamiyama Mannoshin three year later to conduct a holistic research. In the end, they published a historical and sociological ethnography entitled *Taiwanese Indigenous Peoples Familial System Research* (臺灣高砂族系統所屬之研究) based on the massive database of genealogy and later won the significant honor in the

20. N. Miyamoto, *My Travel Notes in Taiwan*(我的臺灣紀行), p33.

21. N. Miyamoto, *My Travel Notes in Taiwan*(我的臺灣紀行), p36.

Since Miyamoto Nobuto came to Taiwan by the end of the 1920s, indigenous community had already undergone profound social changes under several decades of colonial rule. The research subject that Mori Ushinosuke had explained the research methods in 1912 would be easily changed due to the environment and the process of group interaction. As Miyamoto entered the “savage territory”, what he saw was a changing indigenous society and culture or one that has changed, to be exact. Yet, only the physical features and the coincidental result, the genealogy that can trace back to many generations, discovered by Utsurikawa and Miyamoto in the field stayed unchangeable comparatively. In other words, “memory” and “physical features” became important research subjects in Utsurikawa and Miyamoto’s fieldwork. When Utsurikawa and Miyamoto collected genealogical information in the tribes in savage territory, they also took photographs of each community.²³

The reflection of environmental change can also be seen in the fieldwork of colonial anthropologists. In the era of Ino, Torii and Mori, the documentation or images in the fields of tribes could always be found. However, going into Utsurikawa and Miyamoto’s era, Japanese police department had stationed locally in the tribes, so the fieldworks were often done with the help of the assigned

22. N. Utsurikawa, N. Miyamoto, Mabuchi Toichi, *Taiwanese Indigenous Peoples Familial System Research*(臺灣高砂族系統所屬の研究). Tokyo: 刀江書院, 1935.

23. The remaining glass plate negatives of the photographic documentation of Utsurikawa Nenozo and Miyamoto Nobuto taking photographs all over Taiwan, the dates of which are mostly in the period of doing field research on genealogy, see edited by Chao-Mei Lien, *Glass-plate images: collected materials of the Department of Anthropology*(人類學玻璃版影像選輯). Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 1998.

police in measuring physical features, collecting spoken genealogical information, and photographing within the confines of the savage territory where both the entrance and exit were controlled. If comparing the scene where Torii squatted down at the riverside of Xiuguluan River documenting what was



fig.3

happening in 1896 to the one where Utsurikawa sit behind the desk with the police and his assistant on both sides, the interviewees in front of them in the hallway of the tribal police station in 1930s, it is clear that, these two images portrayed the different situations which field researchers faced in the field in each period in term of the intensity of the colonizer's savage controlling policy and the colonial anthropology in field environments. (fig.3)

Regarding the anthropology fieldwork conducted at the early stage of Japanese rule, Ino, Tashiro or Torii often asked the tribal chief about the situation concerning the savages through the help of local communicator in the Aboriginal Office or local offices. However, in the 1930s, police assigned to the savage territory had already penetrated deeply into the tribal communities. From the communicator to the police, the person responsible for assisting onsite translation and guidance have changed, especially when there are also police officers coming from tribal community in the savage territory.²⁴ Meanwhile, in the aspect of using field image as an ethnographic method, the Institute of Aboriginal Ethnology in Taihoku Imperial University also used camera equipment and left

24. N. Miyamoto, *My Travel Notes in Taiwan*(我的臺灣紀行), pp 94-95

more archival images resulted from anthropology fieldwork. Despite that, the problematic of the origin of human race that was raised from the early stage of colonial anthropology in Taiwan remained ongoing but gradually changed from ethnographic information of lingual and physical features to that of genealogy in terms of the orientation. From natural to social, from observable to memory-related, and from the present to historic, although there are changes in the research direction regarding ethnographic information, the issues of ethnic categorization as well as the origin of tribes and communities, and the research orientation of comparative ethnology related to indigenous peoples in peripheral island remain consistently motivated.

Conclusion

The forming of the Taiwanese indigenous photographic archives can be viewed as the product resulted both from the ethnography authorized by the aboriginal management administration and the use of photography as an ethnographic method in modern Anthropology. Photography as a fieldwork method has initially been a witness to the historic events in the beginning of aboriginal management administration in the colony's official ethnography. Nonetheless, it left series of critical event-centered indigenous photographic documents beyond the colonizer's intention. The photographic method in relation to colonial anthropology in Taiwan applied in the fieldwork gradually developed through Ino, Torii, and Mori either by means of in-person photoshoots or using photographic archives. What is more crucial is that the scientific standard of the unbiased empirical method was the longstanding core value

held by Ino, Torii, Utsurikawa and Miyamoto when collecting onsite ethnographic resources in the field – focusing on the importance of being at the site and on the scene to collect and photograph images of indigenous peoples with a clear problematic; between photography and the knowledge of anthropology, the photograph becomes a representation of fact, a method that properly presents the authenticity of indigenous peoples who were being observed.

The photographic experiences under Japanese rule served not only the photographic records for the purpose of governing indigenous peoples, but also the archival sources for representing the construction of ethnic categorization in anthropology through ethnology-based photographs. After the 1990s, the retained image archives has become the resource of which photographic meaning could be reappropriated and reproduced so as to embark on a new photographic social life under different space-time contexts both in Japan and Taiwan that had entered into a new era.²⁵

(The author of this article is a doctoral candidate of the Department of History, New York University, USA, a Ph.D. student at the Department of History, National Taiwan University.)

25 Discussion regarding the production, reproduction of image and the related social reappropriation, see Christopher Pinney, *Camera Indica: The Social Life of Indian Photographs*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997. *Photography and Anthropology*. London: Reaktion Books, 2011. Deborah Poole, "An Excess of Description: Ethnography, Race, and Visual Technologies," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34(2005): 159-179. Along with democratization and the request for regaining knowledge on Taiwanese history and culture in the society, including the Names Rectification Movement of indigenous peoples in Taiwan in the 1990s, the rights to use images from the Japanese rule period have been reclaimed back to the citizens under this historical context. In addition to copying and publishing photographic archives, a few photographs left by the anthropologists from the early period are used as symbolic indigenous images. The photographic archives from the colonial period have embarked upon a new social life in terms of sense-making by means of alternative appropriation of type photographs.

群島資料庫09：人像攝影師

作者 | 林猶進、鄭文琦、陳偉智

主編 | 鄭文琦

翻譯 | 鄭文琦（英翻中）

英文審稿 | 林俊

校對 | 符芳俊（英）、鄭文琦、陳嘉壬（中）

排版 | 郭硯方

出版單位 | 數位荒原／財團法人數位藝術基金會

出版日期 | 2019年10月

電話 | +886-2-77099091

網站 | www.heath.tw

《數位荒原》駐站暨群島資料庫計劃（第二年）

主辦單位 | 數位荒原／財團法人數位藝術基金會

協辦單位 | 在地實驗、打開-當代藝術工作站

諮詢委員 | 鄭惠文、Posak Jodian、吳庭寬、Penwadee N. Manont

《群島資料庫09》由財團法人國家文化藝術基金會贊助

NUSANTARA ARCHIVE 09: a box photographer

Contributors: Jeffery Lim, Rikey Tenn Bun-ki, Chen Wei-Chih

Editor: Rikey Tenn Bun-ki

Translator: Rikey Tenn (EN to CH)

English Copy Editor: Huang Ling-Chun

Reviser: Hoo Fan Chon (EN), Rikey Tenn, Chen Chia-Jen (CH)

Designer: Kuo Yen-Fang

Publisher: *No Man's Land* / Digital Art Foundation

Printed in Taipei, October 2019

Tel: +886-2-77099091

Website: www.heath.tw

NML Residency & Nusantara Archive Project, the 2nd year

Organizer: *No Man's Land* / Digital Art Foundation

Co-organizer: ET@T, Open-Contemporary Art Center

Advisory team: Fiona Cheng, Posak Jodian, Wu Ting-Kuan, Penwadee N. Manont

Nusantara Archive 09 is supported by National Culture and Arts Foundation



THIS WORK IS LICENSED UNDER THE CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION-NONCOMMERCIAL 4.0 INTERNATIONAL (CC BY-NC 4.0)



國家文化藝術基金會
National Culture and Arts Foundation



群島
Nusantara Archive