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Introduction

Between May and August of 2018, a field practicum was undertaken in Pingtung County, the southernmost county of Taiwan. The broad goal of the field practicum was to collaborate with a local organization, Youth in Timur, to create a study abroad program that would bring non-indigenous college students to the indigenous Paiwan village of Timur. Ultimately the collaboration expanded beyond the organization to include not just community members of Timur Village, but other Paiwan villages of Pingtung County and a local university as well. The development of the curriculum of that program was guided by the desire to address issues brought forth by the community and will serve to further their goal of cultural sustainability.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework developed for this practicum is straightforward, depicting the collaboration between the two universities (UF and NPTU) that were ultimately stakeholders. As of yet it is unknown if the University of Florida will participate in the program that resulted from this field work; however, they are included as a stakeholder in collaboration as represented by the practitioner, a student of the UF MDP degree program.

Together, the collaborators created a study abroad (or service learning) program that can serve the goal of cultural sustainability in the community, as well as their desire to share their culture with others as part of that goal. The
intended impacts are meant to serve both the communities and the students that come to the communities to learn (Figure 4).

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
History in Taiwan: Demographics and Identity

Taiwan, or the Republic of China (R.O.C.), is an island in East Asia, measuring some 400 kilometers north to south by 160 kilometers east to west, and additionally lays claims to over 150 offshore islands and island groups. Currently, the main island is home to approximately 24.5 million people, 2.28 percent of that population is made up of indigenous peoples (Tung 2005). There are currently 16 indigenous groups officially recognized by the Executive Yuan in Taiwan, including the Amis, Atayal, Bunun, Kavalan, Paiwan, Puyuma, Rukai, Saisiyat, Sakizaya, Seediq (or Sediq), Thao, Truku, Tsou, Yami (or Dawu), Hlaalua and Kanakanavu. All told their collective populations stand at approximately 533,600 individuals. Three of these groups, the Amis, the Paiwan, and the Atayal, account for over 70 percent of that population. Some of the indigenous groups have blended into the majority Han society, while some others have maintained distinct communities, including language and culture (Chao 2009; Chen 2006).

Early Archaeological Evidence. Archaeological evidence of human occupation on the island dates back as far as 12 – 15,000 years before present (b.p.); cultural remains from this period are related to the modern Austronesian-speaking Malayo-Polynesian groups indigenous to the island. This implies that modern-day indigenous peoples have been living on the island for at least 15,000 years. Based on shared language traits, the ancestors of the Taiwan indigenous groups are frequently interpreted as the progenitors of people and cultures.
throughout the Pacific and Indian Oceans, from the Madagascar to Easter Island and from Taiwan to New Zealand (Executive Yuan 2014; Lo 2013).

Colonization. Taiwan has a long history of colonization beginning in at least 1624 and continuing throughout the 20th century, hosting shipping ports and extractive colonies for the Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese, and Han Chinese from both the Ming and Qing Dynasties. In 1949, the government of the Republic of China fled revolution on Mainland China, bringing 1.2 million soldiers, teachers, and civil workers to Taiwan. Today, the non-indigenous population is primarily Han Chinese, making up 95 percent of the total population.

European. In the early seventeenth century, European explorers reached the island, constructing fortified trading posts and harbors, with the Spanish at the northern end of the island and the Dutch in the south. When these explorers arrived, they found there were already approximately 25,000 Han Chinese immigrants, mostly farmers, living in Taiwan. These settlers may have started migrating as early as the twelfth century, arriving from two main regions of mainland China, Fujian (福建) and Guangdong (廣東). These distinct groups are still represented as ethnic groups in Taiwan, with immigrants from Fujian identified as Hoklo and those from Guangdong identified as Hakka (Tsai 2010; Chiang 1993).

Rivalry flared between the European outposts for two decades before the Dutch managed to drive out the Spanish (Huang and Liu 2016). The Spanish maintained control of the northern coast of Taiwan and the Taipei Basin for 16 years between 1626 to 1642, before being driven out by the Dutch. Though they
built several fortifications along the coast, their short possession left no lasting cultural or social impact on the island or the islanders (Chiang 1993). The Dutch administrated the island as an outpost of the Dutch East India Trading Company from 1624 to 1661, building schools and a loose administrative system. Though they set to converting the indigenous populations to Christianity and imposing literacy, Dutch administrators left the villages largely to themselves, ruling through local leaders. The main concern of the Dutch in Taiwan was trade, not cultural colonization (Chiang 1993; Liu and Wen Kuo 2012). Despite this fact, official Chinese government reports from the seventeenth century following the expulsion of the Dutch, reported on the brutality of Dutch traders and recorded stories of violence and massacre (Hung 2012). The trading post system established by the Dutch focused on deer hides, which were exported primarily to Japan, and rattan, which was shipped to China. Additionally, the Dutch attempted to get into the gunpowder trade through sulfur mining, without success (Hung 2012).

Contradictory impressions of Christian missions are found in the literature. Their attempts at Christianization are depicted as eagerly embraced due to free education, medical care, and other material supplies provided by missionaries. However, other accounts described the ejection or forced removal of shamans and traditional religious leaders with forced conversion (Hung 2012; Liu and Wen Kuo 2012). Though the Dutch had no direct contact with mountain indigenous groups, Christianity still managed to spread there, perhaps due to the deer hide trade between mountains and plains groups (Chiang 1993), though some scholars maintain that Christianity did not spread to the mountain groups.
until the eighteenth century (Hung 2012). Eventually, the Dutch were expelled from the island by the House of Koxinga (Ming loyalists) (Huang and Liu 2016).

**Ming.** In 1661, a force of 30,000 troops arrived from mainland China and drove out the Dutch traders. On the mainland, an uprising had ended the Ming Dynasty in favor of the Qing; this band of Ming loyalists led by Zheng Chengong, also known as Koxinga, invaded Taiwan and established the Zheng Dynasty (Tsai 2010). Also known as the House of Koxinga, the Zheng retained rule of Taiwan until 1683, when the Qing sent a naval fleet to Taiwan and the House collapsed (Hung 2012).

**Qing.** Following the defeat of the House of Koxinga in 1683, the Qing maintained control of Taiwan for over 200 years. Early in the Qing colonial era, all indigenous peoples were known as “native savages”. Over time, as some indigenous groups started to become more assimilated, or Sinicized, they were divided into the categories “cooked savages (or barbarians, depending on the source of the translation)” and “raw savages” (Hung 2012). From the point of view of the ruling Chinese, “cooked savages” were those that took on Han Chinese characteristics, including language, dress, sedentary agriculture (as opposed to traditional swidden techniques), and “proper” Han mannerisms (Huang and Liu 2016).

This distinct binary divide had a lasting impact on the cultural landscape and dictated policy regarding indigenous groups on the island. Chinese colonization was focused more on the land below the hills, distinguishing the raw versus cooked landscapes as developed versus undeveloped. Hung (2012) quotes Emma Teng’s 2004 *Taiwan’s Imagined Geography*: 
The distinction between raw and cooked territory was not only a distinction between unploughed and ploughed land but also a distinction between a domain of savagery and the domain of civilized, or semi-civilized people…the 1722 boundary policy made official the role of the Central Mountain Range as a barrier. (p. 36)

Chiang (1993) describes the policies for the mountain dwelling groups (raw savages) as falling into two distinct categories: defensive segregation and development by pacification. Under defensive segregation, the Qing government developed a series of guard posts and earthen and brick walls, called bull backs, dividing the territories of indigenous groups and Han farmers. This was done to prevent encounters between the groups. Han settlers were known to con indigenous people out of their lands, and indigenous groups had no problem in extracting a bloody toll for these tricks (Huang and Liu 2016).

Development by pacification was more akin to Dutch policies in that Chinese officials attempted to rule through local leaders and set up education facilities and government administration offices in remote locations. However, as these locations were so remote, mountain-dwelling groups were little affected by Chinese administration during this colonial period (Chiang 1993).

The designation as raw and cooked was not made based on ethnic, familial, or tribal ties, but was made instead based on willingness to comply with being Sinicized (Huang and Liu 2016); and though these designations were amended by the Japanese during their colonial rule, their legacy was maintained.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, Canadian and English missionaries took an interest in Taiwan and established churches and hospitals
on the island. These missionaries were primarily Presbyterian and they were interested in targeting the Han population; but over time they expanded their scope to the indigenous communities. This second wave of Christian proselytism brought modern medicine and education to the mountain villages, but also indirectly contributed to the survival of their language by translating English bibles into indigenous Austronesian languages (Huang and Liu 2016).

**Japan.** In 1895, China was defeated by Japan in the Sino-Japanese War. As a result, China was forced to sign the Treaty of Simonoseki, forfeiting Taiwan to Japanese authority, among other considerations (Hung 2012; Tsai 2010). The Japanese colonial government launched a wave of modernization, beginning with an extensive geographic and anthropological/linguistic survey of the island. These surveys had the goal of organizing the island into ethnic/social groups (Huang and Liu 2016). Before Japanese colonial rule, residents of Taiwan did not consider themselves a unified group; the Han in particular showed no solidarity, adhering more to a system of class (Brown 2004). With the creation of the household registration system, people were categorized into races, two distinct categories were created for the Han and two for the indigenous peoples. Han people were placed into the categories Hakka and Hoklo, and indigenous peoples were placed into the categories Pinpu (plains tribes, previously called cooked savages) and the Gaoshan (mountain tribes, previously called raw savages) (Tsai 2010; Hung 2012). It was during this time that mountain groups endured forced relocations to elevation below 1500 meters and an increased police presence was established through the creation of police stations. Once relocated and registered with the police, indigenous groups were prohibited from performing their traditional swidden forms of agriculture and their hunting
firearms were confiscated (Huang and Liu 2016). Movement was restricted and enforced through the heavy police presence and the majority of the mountain land was declared government property.

The early twentieth century saw several armed uprisings against the Japanese colonial government from both Han and indigenous segments of the population. Two of the more well-known incidents include the Tapani Incident and the Wushe Rebellion. The Tapani incident, also known as the Xilai Temple Incident, was an armed uprising of Han and indigenous people against the Japanese colonial government in 1915. Religious fervor inspired in part by the Boxer Rebellion in mainland China is thought to have played a part in the launching of this uprising. Gathering in a Buddhist temple in Tainan to challenge the Japanese authority, the rebels stormed several police stations. Almost 1,500 people were killed in the ensuing crackdown, more than 1,400 more were arrested, and eventually 200 were executed by the Japanese government (Taiwan Today 2015; Tsai 2010). Following this incident, there were no more major uprising involving the Han.

Like the Tapani Incident, the Wushe Rebellion, also known as the Musha Incident, resulted in swift and violent repercussions from the colonial government. Said to be a response to years of land-grabbing, forced labor, and mistreatment, the uprising began on October 27, 1930 when the Japanese were attacked by 300 indigenous men from six Seediq tribal communities as they gathered for a sporting event. It took nearly two months to quell the uprising, but in the end almost 600 indigenous men, women, and children were killed in instances of conflict and retaliation (Huang and Liu 2016; Heé 2014; Chuang
Huang and Liu (2016) describe the Wushe incident as the most dramatic example of indigenous revolt against the Japanese.

**R.O.C. (The Republic of China).** In 1945, following the defeat of the Japanese in World War II, Taiwan was ceded back to China. Four years later, the ruling nationalist party of China, the Guomindang (Kuomintang), fled to Taiwan after losing a civil war to the communist party. The Kuomintang (KMT) established itself in Taipei as the Republic of China and presented itself as the legitimate government of China. Meanwhile, the People’s Republic of China controlled the mainland and was considered by the world to be in a state of temporary communist rebellion against the legitimate nationalist government, the KMT. In 1971, the People’s Republic of China supplanted the Republic of China as the formal representative of China to the United Nations (Tsai 2010).

Nearly 2 million mainlanders arrived with the Kuomintang when Taiwan was ceded from Japan. The growing population added to tensions over land rights and economic mismanagement, leading to an uprising in 1947 named the 2.28 Incident, or the February 28th Massacre. The violent uprising resulted in the death of an estimated 28,000 and marked the beginning of four decades of martial law known as “the white terror” and considered the impetus for the Taiwan Independence Movement (Forsythe 2015).

Under martial law, Taiwan began to experience rapid economic growth (Brown 2004). This was dubbed “The Taiwan Miracle” and put forth as a model for economic development worldwide (Chi 1994). During this development, the government failed to place any restrictions on pollution, resulting in environmental degradation, including air pollution, water pollution, accumulations of solid and hazardous wastes, soil contamination, noise
pollution, deforestation, and endangerment to wildlife. Additionally, the population on the island more than doubled between 1952 and 1988 from 8 million to 20 million people, and today stands at the aforementioned 24.5 million (Chi 1994). The economic boom did not affect all communities equally within Taiwan. The Kuomingtang converted the economy to cash and required indigenous farmers to farm cash crops, including rice, bananas, pears, and plums. They also instituted forestry policies that promoted logging. In remote mountain villages, aboriginal communities suffered from a lack of access to adequate medical and educational facilities as well as industry that could support employment under the new cash economy (Hung 2012). For those that stayed within their ancestral villages, education beyond a vocational level was not a reality; those that left for urban areas in search of work and education faced adversity and discrimination from the majority population. Between the years of 1983 and 2009, the percentage of indigenous individuals living outside of tribal communities rose from 6 percent to 39 percent (Huang and Liu 2016).

Unchecked development and pollution in Taiwan were compounded by the fact that the island is dominated by five continuous rugged mountain ranges covering approximately two-thirds of the island. The tectonic boundaries that first formed the island remain active, causing the small island to have dozens of earthquakes of varying magnitude every year. Additionally, the island is located within the East Asian Monsoon and experiences an average of four typhoons a year (Wayne State University 2016; Executive Yuan 2014; Lo 2013). In September of 1999, central Taiwan suffered an earthquake measuring 7.3 on the Richter scale, now known as the 921 earthquake, and the resulting damage first led to a call for more environmentally-conscious approach to industry (Chen 2016).
Following the 921 earthquake, Taiwan began to curb manufacturing and sought other industries to rely on, including tourism. The Taiwan government hit upon ecotourism and indigenous or aboriginal tourism as potential solutions both to issues of indigenous livelihoods as well as to issues of environmental crises (Jung 2016). In 2005, the Executive Yuan passed The Indigenous Peoples Basic Law, which provides for generous funding to improve infrastructure (post, telecommunication, transportation, irrigation) and develop tourism (Executive Yuan 2018).

**Democratization.** Martial law was ended in 1987 and four years later the “Temporary Provisions Effective During the Period of Communist Rebellion” were lifted, giving the people of Taiwan freedom of speech, press, assembly, and association (Hung 2012). In 1996, Taiwan held the first multi-party direct presidential election, followed 4 years later by the election of a president from the Democratic Peoples’ Party (DPP). Tsai (2010) describes this as a “significant consolidation of the ‘indigenization’ or ‘Taiwanization’ of politics and culture” (440), creating a Han-centered narrative of national identity.

This narrative of national identity in Taiwan tells the story of Han fleeing famine and poverty in Fujian to bravely seek out new life in Taiwan. Histories have often claimed that Han settlers pushed plains aborigines into the mountains and that mountain people are the descendants of displaced plains peoples; ignoring the role of indigenous groups in the creation of modern Taiwan. This inevitably led to the creation of indigenous activists’ movements starting as late as the 1990s, in which indigenous peoples attempt to reassert their culture and their role in Taiwan’s history. “As part of the construction of new narratives of Taiwan’s unfolding, then, it has been necessary to reinstate Aborigines in
Taiwan’s history” (Brown 2004: 35). This is a continuing struggle for indigenous peoples in Taiwan.

**Current Landscape of Policy.** In 1996, the Executive Yuan (Taiwan’s Executive Branch of government) began working towards creating a central government organization or agency devoted to indigenous affairs in Taiwan. In November and December of that year, the Executive Yuan approved the bylaws and officially established the Council of Aboriginal Affairs, appointed to carry out coordination and planning of indigenous affairs. In 2002, the Council was renamed the Council of Indigenous People and its purview was revised to include Planning, Education and Culture, Health and Welfare, Economic and Public Construction, and Land Management Departments. The Council of Indigenous Peoples is headed by a minister or chairman appointed by the President; the current chairman is a member of the Amis tribe and succeeded the previous Puyuma chairman in 2009. All previous chairmen have come from indigenous tribes, including the Atayal, Paiwan, Bunun, and Seediq.

Currently there are over 20 laws, acts, and amendments that guide the Council of Indigenous Peoples as they plan and promote indigenous affairs and policy. During the presidency of Chen Shui Bian (2000-2008), the Executive Yuan created a “six-star action plan for healthy communities-indigenous village sustainable development project”, aimed at enhancing living standards among indigenous groups, as well as “enhancing pride” and “restoring confidence and status” (Council of Indigenous Peoples 2010). The most recent policy considerations (2018), according to the English-language website for The Executive Yuan consider road development in mountainous indigenous areas, protection of wild animals and traditional hunting rights, and the ongoing
discussion concerning indigenous autonomy (Aboriginal Autonomy Act) (Executive Yuan 2017).

Sandimen Township and Timur Village

Named “mountain gate” during the Japanese occupation, Sandimen Township is located in northern Pingtung County, southern Taiwan. During the occupation, the Japanese government relocated people and tribes throughout the mountainous area in order to better manage the population, and together with modern-day Majia and Wutai Townships, the area was classified as “savage land”. The land was governed by the Japanese Heito district (屏東郡) of Takao Prefecture. These three townships now fall within modern-day Pingtung County (屏東縣), which was established in 1950 (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Pingtung County
Sandimen (三地門) is approximately 76 square miles of mountainous territory on the western edge of the southern reaches of the central mountain range. Population stands at around 8,000, primarily Paiwan, indigenous people with a large Rukai indigenous minority.

The township is made up of ten villages, each with both a Mandarin Chinese name and an indigenous name (Figure 3) (presented here with Pinyin and Mandarin Chinese before the slash and Paiwan after the slash): 1.) Dashe Village (大社村)/Paridrayan Village; 2.) Dewen Village (德文村) Tjukuvulj Village; 3.) Dalai Village (達來村)/Tjavatjavang; Village; 4.) Sandi Village (三地村)/Timur Village; 5.) Saijia Village (賽嘉村)/Tjailjaking; Village; 6.) Koushe
Village (口社村)/ Sagaran Village; 7.) Anpo Village (安坡村)/ Djineljepan Village; 8.) Maer Village (馬兒村)/ Valjulu Village; 9.) Qingshan Village (青山村) Cavak Village; and 10.) Qingye Village (青葉村)/ Talamakau Village (Sandimen Township Office n.d.). Officially, the villages are only recognized only by their Mandarin name.

Research for this project was conducted primarily in Timur Village and the resulting educational program will spend approximately one-third (two weeks) of the program in that village, with the first two weeks spent at National Pingtung University in Pingtung City and the last two spent in one of Timur’s neighboring Paiwan villages. A tourism pamphlet obtained from the Sandimen Administrative offices (Chinese language) touted Timur Village as the administrative and economic center of Sandimen Township as well as the hub for transportation. Additionally, the village has been given national excellency awards for its scenery and tourism appeal. The village is made up of approximately 12 residential streets, three churches, small home-based business, administrative offices for the township, a medical clinic, an elementary school, a cultural center, a police bureau, and a convenience store.

Provincial Highway 24 traverses the village to the east of the tarekes, the residential part of the village, and this is where you will find the business meant to attract tourists. At the south end of the village along the highway, tourists who crossed the San Chuan glass suspension bridge from the Taiwan Indigenous Peoples Culture Park are fed through a number of stands and directly out to the highway where there are some small shops, traditional barbecue, a bead workshop, and places to sing karaoke.
Organizations

Youth in Timur. Youth in Timur (YIT) was conceptualized in 2012, when the organization’s founder realized that traditional culture within his community was being lost. Organizing a group of young people from the community, YIT set out to record the disappearing memories and customs. Initially, the organization relied heavily on social media to reach other young indigenous people from Timur who had scattered from the village for school and jobs and bring them together to participate in its mission. YIT promotes cultural sustainability by treating the entire village like a classroom. In its debut year, they held more than ten events, a range of cultural activities like weaving, chanting, storytelling, or learning traditional songs, which connect young children to village vuvus, or elders (Yingfeng 2015).

Youth in Timur provided me with an introduction into the community and included me in numerous cultural events and meetings throughout the summer. However, I ultimately had to move beyond this small organization and look for collaborators in the community at large to achieve my practicum goals.
**National Pingtung University (NPTU).** National Pingtung University was founded in 2014, when National Pingtung University of Education and National Pingtung Institute of Commerce merged. Founded during Japanese colonial rule, National Pingtung University of Education was considered to be the foremost institute for teacher education and instrumental in building a solid foundation for modern education in Taiwan. The National Pingtung Institute of Commerce was founded in 1991 and was unique as an institute primarily focused on studying business in southern Taiwan.

One focus of the newly formed university is an international outlook through global connections. To date, the university has created 150 sister school agreements with universities all over the world, conducting exchange programs with universities from the United States of America, Japan, and Korea. The Language Center at NPTU offers specialized courses in language and local culture. Towards the end of the field season, the Center agreed to host students for this program during the first two weeks, providing housing and classroom space for course seminars as well as Mandarin Chinese classes where the students could learn words and phrases that would help them throughout their stay in Taiwan. Additionally, the Center would provide logistical support and offered to pair visiting students with NPTU English majors to act as guides or translators.

**Issues and Considerations**

Every year thousands of students venture into foreign countries and communities on alternative spring breaks, gap year, backpactivism adventures, voluntourism trips, and other untrained volunteer ventures. Charging thousands
of dollars, these programs pad resumes, CVs, and college applications while promising to immerse students in culture and language and provide them with unbelievable sights and memorable experiences. Anecdotally, I have first and second-hand knowledge about several of these programs that found untrained volunteers constructing buildings, or volunteering in orphanages where volunteers outnumber orphans.

Education about and exposure to other countries and cultures is vital to creating global citizens, a goal that the United Nations has named crucial for fostering peace. As a budding development practitioner, I have often wondered how well this multitude of programs accomplished that goal and decided to create my own program. Though my goal was and is to create an educational program that fosters global citizenship, I believed the first step towards achieving that goal was to find a community not just to serve but with whom to collaborate.

My greatest fear about these programs is that they can be self-serving and extractive in nature, serving only the visiting students and/or a very small number of elite community members. For the creation of this program, I returned to Taiwan, a country that I developed a fondness for while living there between 2002 and 2004 as an English teacher. I sought out collaboration with the indigenous communities in the mountains above the city in which I had previously lived where some of my former students and friends had lived. I was lucky to be introduced to the members of Youth in Timur, and that they excitedly welcomed me to their village.

When designing this summer practicum, as well as the program that resulted from my fieldwork, several issues came into play. What was important
to this community? Could their interests be served by collaborating on this project? What was the best way to approach collaboration with them? As always, I approach modern issues through a historical perspective; understanding history is the only way forward on most social and political issues. Without historical and cultural perspective, development programs and policies only provide band-aids; therefore if I wanted this program to truly accomplish something towards sustainable development, I needed to understand and identify underlying issues that might affect it. In trying to determine the best way forward with this project, I considered those issues and considerations, I briefly discuss below.

**Identity, Marginalization, and Visibility**

Though generally attributed to the field of psychology under Erikson in the 1960s, within the field of Anthropology, the study of identity had a precursor in Culture and Personality Theory. In part, this theoretical approach examines the correlation between culture and individual personality, drawing on work of both Franz Boas and Sigmund Freud, thus merging psychological and anthropological perspectives. In the past fifty years, the term “identity” has been adopted within the field of anthropology. Modern definitions of the term are elusive and change based on a wide range of factors, including gender, religion, politics, ethnicity, and culture. Whereas in psychology, one might focus on the identity of an individual, anthropology focuses on collective identities, with an increasing concentration on the fluidity of identity and “identity-based tension”.
Griffiths (2015) created an exhaustive bibliography on the concept of identity and identified globalization, postcolonialism, transnationalism, and the creation of a diaspora as important identity-based tensions. Also, she briefly discusses how identities are created, challenged, and maintained for political, or other purposes. This definition may be better described as identity politics. Identity politics is a little more pointed in its study of concepts of identity, distinguishing the use of these categories of identity as tools to frame social or political action, especially in regards to social and environmental justice (Neofotistos 2013).

Brown (2004) explains that culture and ancestry are not what ultimately unite an ethnic group; neither are national or ethnic identities fixed or clear. Instead identity is socially constructed and based on social experience.
Because ethnic identity is based on social experience, Taiwan Aborigines in the seventeenth century and, for example, African Americans in the twentieth century both understood that being classified by these labels affected how other people treated them, their position in their local social hierarchy, and their ability (or inability) to negotiate a higher position. (pg. 14)

Identity formation can therefore, in this view, be seen as the process of social negotiation, the process of defining oneself and one’s community within a broader regime of social categories, especially within the context of shifting political regimes. Much of the discussion in recent times about New Taiwan identity in Taiwan relates solely to how the Han descendants in Taiwan distinguish themselves from mainland China and perhaps even from the “mainlanders” that have descended from those Han Chinese that came with the Kuomingtang in the mid-twentieth century (Brown 2004). This leaves indigenous Taiwan groups to negotiate a place for themselves either within the national context or without.

**Education for Sustainability**

The Cloud Institute defines education for sustainability as “a transformative learning process that equips students, teachers, and school systems with the new knowledge and ways of thinking we need to achieve economic prosperity and responsible citizenship while restoring the health of the living systems on which
our lives depend” (Cloud Institute 2018). Education is central to sustainability. As described in Chapter 35 of Agenda 21 at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, “Education, raising of public awareness and training are linked to virtually all areas in Agenda 21, and even more closely to the ones on meeting basic needs, capacity-building, data and information, science, and the role of major groups” (UN 36.1) Education for sustainability has the potential to engender understandings of global citizenship, here defined as the recognition that each individual is responsible for the sustaining future of just and equitable societies and the overall health of the global environment.

McKeowan (2002) delineates components, or priorities, under education for sustainability: 1) improving basic education, 2) reorienting existing education to address sustainable development, 3) developing public understanding and awareness, and 4) training. Her second concept suggests that moving forward, education should balance looking toward the future while also incorporating traditional knowledge and practices. The third concept emphasizes the importance of public awareness for informed decision-making for sustainable development. Much of that text emphasizes the utility of education for sustainability in achieving sustainable futures in resource management, but further emphasized is the importance of holistic approaches including the economy, society, and the environment for truly sustainable development. Holdsworth and Thomas (2015) suggest that introducing concepts of sustainability into university curriculum shapes character and strength of mind, continuing that “[Education for Sustainable Development] focuses on complex social issues, such as, the links between environmental quality, human equality, human rights, peace and their underpinning politics” (138).
When the concept of sustainable development was first introduced in the Brundtland report in 1987, the focus was on issues like global health and poverty reduction. Social sustainability was subsequently added as a concept at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 and was defined as the right to live a decent life, with considerations for issues including welfare, safety, healthy environment, access to education, opportunities to learn, sense of place, and public participation (Axelsson et al. 2013). Axelsson et al. (2013) also succinctly define cultural sustainability as: “inter- and intra- generational access to cultural resources” (217). Duxbury and Gillette (2007) provide an expanded definition:

[T]he whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only the arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs. [4]

However, the original Agenda 21 approved by UN members at that Rio conference did not include any considerations specifically for culture. The Agenda 21 for Culture was later approved in 2004, A guide created by the Committee on Culture of the world association of United Cities and Local Governments in 2017 addressing culture in development goals notes that none of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals focuses exclusively on culture, but points to several targets of note:

Target 4.7 - refers to the aim to ensuring that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for global citizenship and the
appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.

Target 8.3 - addresses the promotion of development-oriented policies that support productive activities as well as, among others, creativity and innovation. Targets 8.9 and 12.b - refer to the need to devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism, including through local culture and products, and to the need to develop suitable monitoring tools in this area.

Target 11.4 - highlights the need to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage. [UCLG 2017:3]

This same guide continually presents the question: “How is culture relevant?” and through much of the literature reviewed for this project, this was a theme. Many articles explored the question of how culture could serve the goals of sustainable development, leaving unanswered the question: in the eyes of sustainability practitioners, is cultural sustainability only valuable when there is a direct connection to an economic or ecological question or problem? For example, culture is sometimes granted value based on the presence of traditional knowledge of more sustainable farming or forestry practices. However, sustaining a culture in general can lend to a greater landscape of economic sustainability.

In recent years, there has been a call to add culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development, citing culture as a drive and enabler of sustainable development and as a driver for human rights. Slobodan Cvejić (2015) cites UNESCO as emphasizing “that all relevant data [shows] that ‘culture can be a
powerful driver for development, with community-wide social, economic and environmental impacts” (n.p.). Within development and without, there are variable definitions for both concepts, sustainability and culture. Soini and Dessein (2016) developed a conceptual framework for the relationship between culture and sustainability, articulating three approaches including culture in sustainability, culture for sustainability, and culture as sustainability. Each approach highlights a different way the two concepts can interact with each other. Under the first articulation, culture in sustainability, culture is framed as the fourth pillar of sustainability; under the second, culture mediates between the three existing pillars; and under the final articulation culture is seen as the foundation for transformation towards sustainability (Soini and Dessein 2016).

Proctor (1998) points out the danger of not explicitly considering culture in research agendas and initiatives, saying “Where not mentioned (and this is common) culture simply disappears from the human dimensions equation altogether, as if it does not matter, or perhaps even exist” (231). This is one of the conclusions that Soini and Dessein (2016) come to, and what they hope they can address with their conceptual framework. Culture can be understood in different ways within the context of sustainability and practitioners need to understand and be explicit about its role in initiatives and policy.

Methodological Approach

Fieldwork for this practicum was approached through an adaptive participatory approach termed “generative curriculum model” that was first used almost thirty years ago in cooperation between Canadian First Nation Meadow Lake Tribal Council and the University of Victoria’s School of Child
and Youth Care. The approach was developed after “mono-cultural” approaches failed to meet communities’ needs to sustain indigenous practices while ensuring that community members benefit from euro-western research and experiences (Boven and Morohashi 2002).

The model consists of four inter-related objectives:

1. To improve conditions for development of the youngest generation through organized Early Childhood Care and Development initiatives.
2. To build the community’s capacity for filling paid jobs as providers of care and other development services for young children and families.
3. To support the pursuit of income-generating employment and training among adults by providing accessible, safe, culturally consistent child care.
4. To sustain indigenous culture and traditional language by ensuring that training for community members include an enhancement of their knowledge of, and facility with, their own cultural practices and language.

While reviewing this model and considering the context of this practicum, I had to consider how this approach could be adapted in both developing this program through the summer research and in the delivery of the program in the future to visiting students. Several aspects were particularly relevant, especially those that focused on the importance of the community, and they are highlighted below.

- Community-based part of the curriculum is generated through shared knowledge and experience; each iteration of the course would be
different, reflecting the unique knowledge within the local community and the experiences of the student – highlighting collaboration and participation between students and “instructors” (here to mean members of the community that are sharing knowledge).

• As instructors, community members are encouraged to reflect on their own experiences growing up in their culture and in their community, or as members that lived away and then returned. Through teaching, reflecting, and discussing, they are encouraged to determine how traditional lifeways and practices have impacted their own lives.

• Instructors (that are not members of the community, i.e. university instructor) do not attempt to become experts in knowing; the Paiwan are the tellers of their own stories.

• The role of teacher and student are fluid.

• The model promotes the development of a socially inclusive, multi-generational community of learners.

Though this model was created to encourage the generative production of curriculum within indigenous communities for indigenous students, this model also has promising value here, both in creating collaboration in program development and continuing collaboration in program delivery. For the purposes of the summer practicum, the model informed my approach in collaborating to develop the program, and the model will continue to be important as we move into the next phase of this project together.
Methods

Though the overarching goal of the field practicum was the creation of curriculum for a field study or study abroad program for the University of Florida, it was important for the project to approach the methodology with a focus on collaboration in order to reach its other goals. Questions that might not intersect outside the structure of this one project had to be explored together, making the design of the field methods a difficult task. Through the development and implementation of a study abroad program, how can we help this indigenous organization meet its goals? What considerations need to guide our curriculum design? How do we incorporate aspects or concepts of sustainability into our program? How will this program include and benefit the greater community?

Background information on the organization was sparse, as was information on Paiwan villages in southern Taiwan in general. Therefore, a primary goal of the field work was to build an understanding of context, both as a resource for promoting the field school/study abroad in the future but also as a way to provide for myself a foundation on which to build the rest of my approach to methodology. My intention was to learn more about the specific goals of the organization by becoming acquainted with its primary members and adjusting my approach as I went. As my fieldwork progressed and my relationship with Youth in Timur changed, I expanded my focus to include other members of the Timur community, as well as the greater Paiwan community of Sandimen. Table 1 briefly illustrates who I interacted with and the type of information I was able to collect from those interactions. In the end, the most productive field methods that I used included ethnographic observation and
participant observation. Below I briefly describe each method attempted throughout my practicum.

Table 1: Methods and Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Participant Observation</th>
<th>Other Small Group/ Individual Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YIT Group</td>
<td>✔ Small group dynamics</td>
<td>✔ Tangible culture</td>
<td>✔ Group goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Intangible culture*</td>
<td>✔ Individual goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuvu</td>
<td>✔ Greater (community level) social structure</td>
<td>✔ History</td>
<td>✔ Future scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Tangible culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Intangible culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulima</td>
<td>✔ Tangible Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Community and cultural goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Officials</td>
<td>✔ Dynamics of leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Social organization/roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Member</td>
<td>✔ Familial roles and family dynamics</td>
<td>✔ Tangible Culture</td>
<td>✔ Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Social organization/roles</td>
<td>✔ Intangible Culture</td>
<td>✔ Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Group dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Economic goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Aspects of intangible culture include oral traditions, social practices, rituals, and knowledge, i.e. traditional plant cultivation and use, hunting, performing arts, etc.
Group Meeting

Youth in Timur meets on a weekly basis to socialize and discuss prospective or current projects. I attended many of these meetings during my three months, but on my first occasion, the group allowed me to take over the meeting to give a brief presentation and get feedback from them (Figure 5). The presentation included background information on me and the MDP program and practicum, including enumerating the goals of my field practicum, with special emphasis on the role of their organization both as part of my summer fieldwork and as future collaborators for an ongoing educational program.

Youth in Timur focuses broadly on cultural sustainability and the transmission of traditional practices and lifeways from the elders, or Vuvus, to young people in the village and young Paiwan individuals (over the age of 13) who live outside the village, either in another Paiwan village or in a Han city.
The main discussion point, following the initial presentation, was specific goals of the organization within the broad topic of cultural sustainability. In the end, the group produced a list of cultural aspects that they thought were important to learn and preserve; a long list that included everything from traditional pottery and knife-making to storytelling, weaving, hunting, and cooking.

**Social Transect Mapping**

In an attempt to narrow the field even further on the topic of specific organizational goals, I set up some appointments to do social transect mapping, a technique derived from resource mapping in which I could accompany an individual throughout the day to “map” their social movement. In this way, I hoped to determine what were the most important or most prevalent aspects of culture addressed in their daily routines. I attempted this only with group members that actually lived in the village. However, these exercises turned very quickly into tours, wherein the individual showed me around their workplace and introduced me around. While this proved to be an excellent source of information, it was nearly impossible for me to be unobtrusive and observe in this way. I abandoned this method after only two attempts.

**Ethnographic Observation and Participant Observation**

The majority of my context was built employing these methods. In addition to attending the weekly Youth in Timur meetings, I also attended the annual Youth in Timur Culture Camp which covered two days in June (Figure 6). *Masalut*, or harvest festival, is in late July and August and I was able to attend at two separate villages, though the township-wide (10 village) *Masalut* was the week after I departed, and I was unable to attend. I attended village meetings,
elementary school presentations, and church gatherings. Additionally, I befriended several members of the organization and spent time with them and their families in their homes or while sharing meals out.

As I had previously lived in Taiwan, I had the advantage of already knowing quite a few people. It was through both my pre-existing friendships and my new friendships that I was able to succeed in my ultimate in-country goals. When I discovered the importance of artisans, or pulimas, as “keepers of culture”, I sought to speak to important artisans from the village and the Paiwan community at large. It was through cultivating friendships that I was able to speak to many important artisans from the Paiwan community.

Additionally, I started taking Mandarin classes at National Pingtung University in Pingtung City the second week after my arrival. Each day after class I would sit with the language center director and drink coffee. Though my real goal was to improve my language capabilities and ease my way around Taiwan and in the villages, in the end this daily routine was key to the success of my project, as NPTU became a partner for the program.
Sandimen Township 2018 Timur Youth Culture Camp

Day 1 - Vuvu Chen Zhongxiang (陳重雄) spent the morning riding up and down the mountains with young Paiwan adults, tracing the trail of their ancestors during their forced relocation by the Japanese. Modern-day leaders of Timur Village come from 4 ancestral places on the mountain, Dawushan. Here, the vuvu stops to tell a story of the farting rock; as he points above us to a large boulder still standing higher up the slope (as translated by Angela Liu):

'It was here over 100 years ago that a group of headhunters saw smoke rising from the forest above and began to climb in pursuit of heads. They were seen from above and a group of warriors started to make their way down to confront the men. Outnumbered and in a bad position, the headhunters hid behind the boulder, trying to make noises that would scare the warriors away. Eventually, they settled on farting noises to frighten the men away... and lived to headhunt another day.'

While learning about the village origins, we encountered Pan Shengfu (潘勝富) on the road and he invited us to visit his traditional stone slab home. These traditional homes are built from local slate and set low with the back against the mountain. Elaborate wood carvings usually adorn the front of the house under the eaves. Vuvu Shengfu's house is located far below the highway and as we hiked down, he and vuvu Chen pointed out indigenous wildlife and cultivated plants.

Vuvu Shengfu once lived here with his family, but now he is the only family member who remains in the stone slab house.

Figure 6: Sandimen Township 2018 Timur Youth Culture Camp
Sandimen Township 2018 Timur Youth Culture Camp

Traditional tattooing - On the afternoon of the first day, we learned about traditional Paiwan tattoos. Historically, men’s tattoos are applied to their shoulders, but for women the tattoos adorn the hands.

Hand tattoos tell a story about heritage and belonging. Some of the symbols used for hand tattooing (right) include pictograms for people (top symbol), sun (second), the central blocks and wavy lines represent the mountains and river, and the diamond-shaped design represent the snake.

Day 2 –
Everyone met at Vvu Du Lanbao’s home to learn about the use of indigenous mountain plants and to cook a meal together.

Figure 6: Sandimen Township 2018 Timur Youth Culture Camp
Results

Emergent Themes

**Many Voices, One Story.** Research methods and questions utilized for this project were designed to elicit the telling of a story. This was done for two reasons, to promote collaboration by building a context that could inform how best to serve the community; and to generate contextual information to guide curriculum design and for the marketing of the study abroad program.

During my literature review and in initial conversations with Chi Ting about her home and her organization, Youth in Timur, I was introduced to the complicated history and struggle for identity and visibility for the indigenous groups and people in Taiwan. The question of cultural sustainability is vague, and its pursuit has variable goals from community to community. The broad goal of YIT is to slow down and reverse the loss of cultural traditions that young people were suffering by heading to the cities for education and employment. My broad goal was to discover what cultural sustainability meant to this particular group of people and what success in their particular pursuit looked like to them.

When we gathered together for the first time, I asked them to tell me what cultural sustainability meant to them. Together we put together a list of tangible and intangible aspects of their culture that they wanted to learn about and carry into the next generation. The exhaustive list (see Figure 5) included hunting, weaving, embroidery, bead-making, traditional music, storytelling, farming, cooking, brewing, stone slab houses, warrior’s dance, women’s dance, traditional
weddings, sculpture, and pottery. Through the use of transect walks and participant observation, I hoped to narrow this list and find a meaningful place to focus the curriculum for the program. Though I started this process by spending time specifically with members of YIT, my field of participants expanded, at first naturally, just by spending time in the community and then intentionally when I discovered that I would need to find a new place to anchor my program. Participants were chosen based primarily on their desire to participate. At the first YIT meeting, I asked who would be willing to talk to me or allow me to visit them at work or as they completed other daily activities. After that, I sought people who could fill in specific gaps in my knowledge and spoke with people at community events. Additionally, I spent time with (Han) Taiwanese and *waiguorens* (foreigners) that also added perspective to my work.

As I set about talking to people and collecting anecdotes and information to build my story, several themes beyond the broad concept of cultural sustainability began to emerge. There were over a dozen of these themes during initial analysis, but these were grouped into broader categories. It should be noted that none of the themes that emerged were subjected to in-depth analysis or follow-up fieldwork and they are only noted here as subjects that continually arose during my brief time in the field. As I was told by one community member after he asked me if I was collecting information to write a journal article or independently create a written history, “Your understanding of our culture is very basic, so we do not wish for you to tell our story, besides it is our job to tell our story.” It was during this same discussion that the community members decided that visiting students would do community service by learning about Paiwan culture from community members, staying in their homes and
participating in their cultural events. Below, I briefly discuss the themes that emerged while reviewing my ethnographic data.

Identity. Identity was a subject that came up often and in many contexts during the conduct of my fieldwork. As discussed briefly in my literature review, Taiwan has a long history of contested identities and only within the last 20 years has restoring indigenous identity been a policy focus for the Executive Yuan. Even now, the term “Taiwanese” refers not to Taiwan’s indigenous groups but instead to individuals from families whose migration to Taiwan predates the arrival of the Kuomintang in 1949.

The concepts that I grouped under this theme included Christianity, LGBTQ, the effects of indigenous tourism and aboriginal performance on cultural tradition and group self-perception, and the relationship of Paiwan indigenous communities to non-Paiwan indigenous communities in Taiwan. Many of these concepts fall under post-colonial and post-occupation cultural identity. While discussing the historic effect of the arrival of non-indigenous peoples to the island on Paiwan’s cultural development and what the future holds for the same, Paiwan artist Sakuliu sketched a simple graphic into my notebook:
At the top of the sketch is the Paiwan snake and the Han dragon (the characters above the dragon read 漢文化 – Han wen hua or Han culture); each line that continues down the page towards the bottom represents the distinct movement of each group as an autonomous culture through time. At the left side of the sketch, three distinct eras are defined: at the top, 过去 – guoqu or past; in the middle, 殖民年代 – zhi min nian dai or colonial age; and at the bottom, 现代 – xian dai or modern age. Along the right side of the sketch are the characters 文化脈絡 – wen hua mai ge, meaning the flow of culture. The break in the Paiwan line
with the arrow into the Han line is meant to convey the efforts of the Han to influence and even subsume the Paiwan culture. Many of the plains indigenous groups in Taiwan were absorbed into Han society and all Taiwan residents were required to speak Mandarin (as when the Japanese occupied, all residents had to speak Japanese). As a mountain-dwelling group, the Paiwan were not integrated into Han society the same way as the plains groups, but they were forced to migrate into more manageable groups, which included non-Paiwan indigenous peoples.

The dashed line between where the Paiwan leave their own cultural path and then later rejoin it indicates only a type of survival - a bridge from the past to the future in which Paiwan people endured, but did not thrive culturally. As the sketch continues into the modern age, the dot/dash line indicates the renegotiation of indigenous identity, with their culture continuing, though not unchanged, into the future. In speaking about the difference between cultural preservation and cultural sustainability, Sakuliu had this to say (as translated by Jason Mak):

*They go hand in hand. As an artist I am not preserving culture, I am here in the modern age. If you preserve a culture by freezing it in time, then it is dead. Changes in dress, etc. is just the normal progression of culture – we exist now in this modern Taiwan but we still hold on to our traditions.*

*Christianity.* One important change brought to indigenous peoples of Taiwan by the Dutch in the seventeenth century was Christianity. All community gatherings and meetings that I attended during fieldwork both opened and
closed with prayers. When planning Youth in Timur activities, the group always has to navigate around church activities. For example, when planning the culture camp, Vacation Bible School had to be kept in mind for scheduling. There are complicated but established rules around leadership where the church is concerned. While certain matters and activities fall under the purview and leadership of the church, there are others which fall under the community leaders. More complicated are the ceremonies or events which fall under both, during which leadership slides back and forth – changing resident to religious leader and leader to parishioner – perhaps more than once.

LGBTQ. One relevant point of intersection is that, as a whole, the community is very religious but there is simultaneously a very high number of overt members of the LGBTQ community. Some of the YIT members openly

Figure 8: "Colorful wi supports A-dju!" In Paiwan, A-dju means "girlfriend".
speak about being gay, while others simply express themselves by wearing makeup and women’s clothing or shoes. A few YIT members spoke with me about their involvement in the NGO Colorful Wi, an LGBTQ activist organization in Taiwan (Figure 8). When I spoke to one member about the apparent contradiction of church teachings or values to being part of the LGBTQ community, he gave me an answer both simple and complex. His church (there are two others in their small community) does not condone homosexuality, but neither will it condemn them because the pastor considers them important members of the community as they are young and interested in the cultural revitalization of Paiwan tradition.

*Cultural Performance.* Also falling under this theme category are cultural performances and aboriginal or indigenous tourism. Indigenous tourism is an ever-growing market and was hit upon as an aspect of the economy ripe for growth as the Executive Yuan tried to move away from manufacturing in the late twentieth century. There are many cultural centers throughout Taiwan devoted to recreating traditional life and putting on public cultural performances, primarily dancing. Two of these living museums can be accessed directly from Timur Village. The village is connected to the Indigenous Peoples’ Cultural Park by the Sanchuan Glass Bridge. The glass bridge connects Sandimen and Majia Townships, crossing the Ailiao River. Though it is in Paiwan territory, the culture park features performances by many indigenous groups. One particular performance by the Thao of Sun Moon Lake chronicles how the interaction between cultural performers and Han tourists has shaped modern indigenous dance for their community.
Indigenous Tourism. Indigenous tourism has both good and bad aspects, for many it is seen as a good way to make Paiwan (and other indigenous cultures) visible and can bring understanding about a small corner of their culture. However, some think there is also a danger in portraying such a shallow picture of their communities. Indigenous tourism was created by the Han government, who chose to recreate a frozen moment in time for tourist consumption. This time-capsule of culture is misleading and provides a misconception about traditional culture in modernity.

Relationship between Paiwan and non-Paiwan Indigenous Groups. The story of the Thao performance brings me to my final sub-category; the relationship between Paiwan and non-Paiwan indigenous groups in Taiwan. Noting that one of the development goals of the Center for Indigenous Studies at National Taiwan University is “to connect and collaborate with Austronesian research institutes worldwide to establish Taiwan as an Austronesian culture research center” (CISNTU), I sought to understand the relationship between different groups on the island. However, according to a number of sources, there is no relationship between tribes. They do not have official ceremonies, rituals, or celebrations that connect them; nor traditional rules of intermarriage. While watching the Thao performance, the Paiwan family I was with decided that we should leave because the story was not interesting. This was a notion I came up against on many occasions – a general disinterest in other Taiwan indigenous groups, regardless of their shared experiences. When I asked how many other indigenous groups were in Taiwan, I received the answer: “The Amis, the Atayal, the Paiwan, and…I don’t know, it’s not important.”
*Pulimas.* In Paiwan, pulima simply means “good hands”. I first learned this term while watching Chi Ting’s mother, Lavaus, created a traditional beaded bag and asked if there was a name for this type of embroidery or a person who does it. In northern Taiwan groups, like the Truku, female members of the tribe traditionally have a face tattoo that sweeps down along the cheekbone and over the mouth from ear to ear. These tattoos indicate that the woman is a weaver. I was curious if weaving and embroidery held the same type of importance among the Paiwan. What I learned instead is this word, *pulima*, and I heard it often throughout the summer.

There is no shortage of *pulimas* within the community; these are individuals and families creating traditional clothing, beads, and embroidery that are still used in ceremony, celebration, and in daily life throughout the year. They are also artists who seek to explore and share their history and ensure that cultural memory is preserved for the future. For many, it is also their livelihood.

During the course of fieldwork, I had the opportunity to speak with several well-known Paiwan artists from the same lineage of artisans (based on master and apprentice relationships) (Figure 9). During my discussions with these pulimas, I was introduced to concepts about pre-colonial social order in Paiwan villages and pre-Christian religious and origin beliefs. Additionally, I
learned more about local individual and group efforts in the community to address culture and language loss.
A Lineage of Artists

Sakuli Pavavalung is a well-known Paiwan artist in Taiwan, known for sculpture and pottery. He has also appeared on TV and in film. The artist also concentrates on the continuance of traditional Paiwan handcraft and culture. For the last two decades, he has been developing plans for an indigenous school that will start construction in two years time.

Lavuras Maltlan’s father was a student of Sakuli. Lavuras learned wood-carving from his father and sculpting and pottery from Sakuli. Lavuras uses his fluent Paiwan to learn history and traditional folklore from vuvus all over the township, to incorporate into his art.

The artist, the author, and the translator at “Original Object Creative Culture Studio” in Timur Village

Two of Lavuras’ apprentices learn and practice traditional pottery at Original Object Creative Culture Studio in Timur Village. So far, he has trained 5 artists in traditional handcraft.

Figure 9: A lineage of artists in Sandimen Township
Indigenous education. The National Primary School Curriculum Standards was published in 1993 and amended three years ago with Section B, Local Education Activities. According to the headmaster at Saijia (Tjailjaking) Elementary, this policy implemented indigenous learning in elementary schools within the villages. Between the grades of 3 and 6, time is devoted each school week to topics that are decided upon locally. This policy has three functions: 1) to allow local histories to gain legitimacy through formal courses, 2) to strengthen the aspirations of young indigenous people through the knowledge of ethnic history, and 3) to promote cross-cultural cognition.

In practice, these programs produce civics projects, social studies explorations of indigenous activist movements, after-school classes on different indigenous hand-crafts taught by local pulimas, and Paiwan (or Rukai) language classes. It is estimated that out of 40 weekly classes, only between three and five are culturally relevant. However, the government does currently have grant programs that provides money to schools or districts that wish to create indigenous experimental schools. Currently Saijia (Tjailjaking) Elementary is planning to convert to this format. Additionally, an all-indigenous elementary school is being built from the ground up in Laiyi (south of Sandimen) using plans created in collaboration with Sakuliu Pavavalung.

Han Resentment. Over the months of my fieldwork, I had the opportunity to discuss my project with many Taiwanese friends and acquaintances. I had heard from Chi Ting’s about her experiences in undergraduate with racism and discrimination, but I also had some firsthand experiences of resentment towards indigenous groups and individuals as I met and spoke to community members in Pingtung City throughout the summer.
Some of the many policies currently in place to benefit indigenous peoples are similar to U.S. affirmative action policies and blood quantum laws. Historically, tribal membership in Taiwan was determined by the membership of the mother, but because of the amount of intermarrying and the forced migrations and integration into Han society, the current policy is that individuals may choose to identify as indigenous and register with the Household Registry Office. Many Han Taiwanese see this as just an opportunity to take advantage of entitlements. This is sometimes the view taken of university admission and employment as well.

**Utilization of Results**

Ethnographic data was collected to create context and guide curriculum development for the study abroad program. Though Youth in Timur was ultimately determined to be an inappropriate entity for partnership in this pursuit, as members of the community actively pursuing a path for cultural sustainability, they remained the primary source of data; providing insight, direction, and guidance towards collaboration. It was through attendance of cultural events, meetings, and workshops that I was able to find a proper direction and new partners for the program. At the outset of my field practicum, it was my intention to create something meaningful and useful to the community that could serve in any way their pursuit of cultural sustainability, and if it

---

2 Blood quantum laws here refers to any number of laws enacted in the US on the state or federal level that qualify individuals as members of Native American tribes based on ancestry, for example an individual with one full-blooded Native American grandparent has a blood quantum of \(\frac{1}{4}\). Though historically blood quantum laws were created and enforced by European Americans and had no cultural bearing on how Native Americans viewed family and ancestry, blood quantum is now used in many Native American nations to determine membership.
comes to fruition through institutionalization at the University of Florida (or other institution), I believe I will have achieved that.

Ultimately, members of the Paiwan community decided they wanted a Service Learning program in which visiting university students participated in homestays and taught English at the elementary school every morning for a two-week ESL camp (each student would spend two weeks each in two separate villages). Additionally, they requested that the students do “community service”. When asked to expound on the type of service they expected, I was told that they expected the students to participate in local events, including masalut and the YIT Summer Culture Camp, and learn about Paiwan culture. For more information on the proposed summer program/study abroad curriculum please see Appendix B.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

Ultimately, the goal of this field practicum was the creation of a study abroad program in collaboration with an indigenous community that could address that community’s goals of cultural sustainability. Additionally, there was a hope that this project could address a pattern observed by this author of paternalistic education programs that travel from the global north to use indigenous communities as classrooms without an eye on the goals or desires of that community.

In preparation for this field practicum and in hopes of informing my methodology, I attended a similar field study abroad program in the summer of 2017 that claimed to study sustainable community tourism development. I was
disappointed to observe many of the issues that I had long believed plagued these kinds of programs. That program had created an environment of conflict and dependency in which there was an “elite” - those invited to cooperate as part of the homestay (money was involved). In several interactions with members from both the homestay families and the community at large, I learned that members of the community felt that they were unable to speak out about the abuses of the program because they might not only be excluded from future participation, but they would also have to deal with the consequences of being shunned by community members who also did not want to deal with the risk of losing that extra income. Additionally, the difference between the amount of money accepted by the field program versus how much was paid to the families who housed, fed, and facilitated the students research projects was extraordinary. Though it is only an example of one program, instances that were judged failures, and even abuses, of that program served to inform the development of field methodologies for this field practicum.

The development of this study abroad program was approached through different articulations of sustainability. In addition to the pursuit of service to specific development goals, including those that address concepts of education for sustainability and cultural sustainability, an attempt was made to follow the lead of community members as I pursued contextual information and found appropriate partners for the study abroad program. Once those connections were made, I continued to follow their lead and was unsurprised to discover that what I would have developed on my own was not what they were asking for in terms of curriculum content.
Recommendations

Understanding that the scope and duration of my project was limited, I have developed some recommendations intent for the diverse audience of this report, including the members of Youth in Timur, student development practitioners, new practitioners, and sustainable development practice at large.

Best Practices

During the conduct of pre-field research and the practicum itself, an effort was made to seek and employ best practices for collaboratively creating cross-cultural educational programs. Ball (2004) and Boven and Morohashi (2002) articulated an adaptive participatory approach termed the Generative Curriculum model while creating community-based approaches to building capacity for Early Childhood education in First Nations’ communities, and much of my own approach was guided by this model. My recommendations for best practices necessarily draw heavily from that pre-field research, as well as from my own experiences.

• **Context.** There is a danger to promoting prescribed best practices when they insist upon or endorse universals or generalizations. As previously mentioned, an historical perspective is an important component to creating a meaningful context, as well as an understanding of the current climate of policy and local sentiment. There is a danger here too; nascent practitioners should not mistake being armed with historical and contextual knowledge as sufficient to understanding real-life context. Practitioners must be flexible and open-minded, focusing on uncovering
new knowledge that resides within communities and placing value on multiple voices through dialogue and reflection.

- **Collaboration.** Collaboration must be truly driven by the target community. Though I had an existing idea and goal in mind, to create an educational program that would benefit both the students and the community, I came prepared to discard my own ideas out in favor of those raised in the community. This is where the idea of “generative curricula” comes in, as described by Ball (2004). I created a course curriculum with an open architecture, making it easy for the community to generate new topics and materials more suitable to them culturally and more apt to serve their needs or goals.

- **Reflection.** Though the program created during this field practicum has not yet come to fruition, an important operational step of best practices will take place after that first iteration of the program. Collaborators will need to come together and reflect on the success and failures of the program, recognizing that there will always be room for improvement. Are we properly utilizing our time and resources and has the program had the desired outcomes? This will necessarily be an ongoing part of the process as the program moves forward, collaboration must continue beyond the initial meetings of this past summer, or the first iteration of the program that will come in the summer of 2020. For the program to continue to be effective and serve the community, collaboration and learning must be on-going.
Culture in the SDGs

As previously discussed, there is a danger to leaving culture out of research agendas and initiatives. Whether viewed as the fourth pillar of sustainability, a mediator between the existing three pillars, or the foundation for transformation towards sustainability, practitioners must understand and be explicit about the its role in their initiatives and their intention for what role it plays in policy. For this particular project, culture assumes a foundational which is paramount to its success.

As a student practitioner, I frequently recall the many anecdotes about failed development initiatives\(^3\), or successes that had unintended social and cultural impacts\(^4\), and I reflect that what is frequently missing is a basic understanding of cultural and historical context. I return here to the guide created for Agenda 21 that continually asked the question: “How is culture relevant?” and suggest it is the wrong question. When you build development initiatives on a foundation of culture, you create programs and policies that are more relevant, more easily adopted, and more enduring. Instead of finding how culture is relevant and how it can serve the goals of sustainable development, we should instead look at how goals of sustainable development are relevant to culture of people in different contexts.

---

\(^3\) See Van Buren (2011), for a discussion by a former State Department employee of initiatives implemented in Iraq that did not properly consider context and failed spectacularly.

\(^4\) For example, a malaria eradication program instituted in Nepal in the 1950s successfully opened the Tarai region to people from the hill region of the country that had been displaced by flooding. The newcomers scooped up land traditionally belonging to the naturally malaria-resistant Tharu people, disenfranchising them and pressing them into debt bondage.
Student Practitioners

For those just starting out or heading out on their MDP field practicum, the most important lesson you can learn is to be flexible and adaptable. If you have never been to the region or community that you are visiting and have not worked with your organization in the past, things are unlikely to proceed the way that you expect. Be positive, patient, and respectful of local culture and custom. In my particular case, I had to switch my collaborative focus halfway through my practicum, a circumstance which was stressful but proved to be beneficial. Only through patience, persistence, and the assistance of dedicated community members did this project come to a successful conclusion. My counsel is to continually take stock of your situation, cultivate good relationships with your collaborators and dedicate yourself to carrying out high quality work.

Youth in Timur

While they did not ultimately become partners for the new program, the members of Youth in Timur were invaluable and true collaborators in the process of creating it. Though they share a passion for learning and sharing their culture, YIT is not a true organization and in some ways this limits their effectiveness in reaching their objectives. For this reason, I recommend that the membership explore the possibility of incorporating into a Civil Society Association (CSO) or Non-Governmental Organization (NGO).

The non-profit/NGO sector in Taiwan is still developing; during the reign of the Kuomingtang there were only local associations that were heavily controlled by the government, foundations run by and for the wealthy and powerful, and middle-class social clubs (Huang 2009). There is no specialized
nonprofit law in Taiwan (HO, n.d.). However, the Civil Associations Act, most recently amended in 2009, provides guidelines for creating a civil association (Ministry of the Interior, R.O.C.). Guidelines for creating civil associations are not precisely equivalent to those in the US and additionally *The Taipei Times* has reported some turmoil in the last two years as the Executive Yuan attempts to discard The Civil Association Act in favor of separate laws to regulate NGOs, political parties, and professional associations (Gerber 2017).

Though it may prove to be a challenge, there are many benefits to formalizing this organization as an CSO/NGO:

- **Leadership.** By establishing a Board of Directors (required for both CSO and NGO/nonprofits), the group will be able to expand, networking beyond the village and broadening their area of experience and influence. Further, boards lend credibility and promote accountability.

- **Fundraising.** Youth in Timur members intimated that the government grant money that they had customarily relied on to create programs like the Timur Youth Culture Camp would no longer be available. Registration as a CSO is required to fundraise.

- **Mission, Vision, Values.** Nonprofits and NGOs generally create statements for one or more of these, and even if Youth in Timur decides to remain an informal organization, creating these statements would serve them to better conceptualize who they are and how they will achieve their goals.

- **Organizational Goals.** This is a passionate group of young people that share a very broad goal of sustaining their culture through learning and
sharing; however they have no long-term plan for how to achieve this broad goal. Creating a list of organization goals for the next 2 to 5 years would serve to focus their energies and resources and allow them to grow.


http://indicators.report/targets/.


http://ted.coe.wayne.edu/sse/wq/Taiwan/geography.htm

https://www.taiwan-panorama.com/Articles/Details?Guid=8dcb6db7-baad-42a9-a516-9ee701a8456c&CatId=2.
Appendix A: Photo Narrative
Many Voices, One Story

a photo narrative from a field practicum

Christine Mavrick
All photos by author, unless otherwise indicated. Front page photo by author, artist unknown. This painting adorns a rock standing approximately 3 feet high along Provincial Highway 24.
Between May and August of 2018, ethnographic research was conducted in indigenous Paiwan communities in Pingtung County, southern Taiwan. The purpose of the research was to build a story about cultural sustainability to facilitate collaboration in the creation of an experiential learning program that would bring non-Paiwan students into the villages to do service and learn about Paiwan culture and the communities’ pursuit of sustainability.

Duo Duo’s Tea Shop

The young people of the group Youth in Timur meet once a week at Duo Duo’s tea shop (just outside his family home). The group arrive from all over the county, or from right within the village, to exchange news, gossip, plan cultural events, and sometimes to practice indigenous song.
Members of Youth in Timur support Chi Ting (center) as she presents results of her master’s research to an audience at the Indigenous Peoples’ Culture Park.

The group performs a traditional song.
In their pursuit for cultural sustainability, the members of Youth in Timur treat the village as their classroom, relying on the vuvus and each other to learn about their culture.

Takanau is a dedicated YIT member and a sixth grade teacher at Timur Elementary. Above he teaches Paiwan youth about traditional tattooing during Timur Culture Camp and below he translates from the Paiwan language to Mandarin Chinese as Vuu Du Lanbao teaches the same students about traditional plants and agriculture.

Other activities at the culture camp included singing, dancing, hunting, weaving, cooking, and a symbolic “hike” to show young community members the origin of their village (next page).
Vuvu Chen Zhongxiang (陳重雄) spent the morning riding up and down the mountains with young Paiwan adults, tracing the trail of their ancestors during their forced relocation by the Japanese. Modern-day leaders of Timur Village come from 4 ancestral places on the mountain, Dawushan. Here, the vuvu stops to tell a story of the farting rock to amuse the obviously hot and tired students, as he points above us to a large boulder still standing higher up the slope (as translated by Angela Liu):

It was here over 100 years ago that a group of headhunters saw smoke rising from the forest above and began to climb in pursuit of heads. They were seen from above and a group of warriors started to make their way down to confront the men. Outnumbered and in a bad position, the headhunters hid behind the boulder, trying to make noises that would scare the warriors away. Eventually, they settled on farting noises to frighten the men away and lived to headhunt another day.
While learning about the village origins, we encountered Pan Shengfu (潘勝富) on the road and he invited us to visit his traditional stone slab home. These traditional homes are built from local slate and set low with the back against the mountain. Elaborate wood carvings usually adorn the front of the house under the eaves.
Student receive diplomas and congratulations from the Mayor of Timur Village for completing culture camp. With the aid of Angela Liu, the author tells the group a little about her background and gives thanks for allowing her to participate (Bottom photo). (Photos by unknown)
In Paiwan, *pulima* simply means “good hands”, and the term is used to describe anyone that is versed in traditional handcraft, including glass bead making, bead embroidery, stone-working, metalworking, carving, pot-making, and painting. I sought out several well-known artists in the community to discuss cultural sustainability. One of these artists, Lavuras Maitlin, is also the founder of the group Youth in Timur. Lavuras emphasized the importance of *pulimas*, stating: *It is the pulimas’ job to keep the culture from dying.*
Traditional wood carved door, Timur Village
Paiwan artist Sakuliu Pavavalung describes his ideas for an all-Paiwan traditional elementary school to the author (this page above and below).

The social structure of traditional village design can be seen in the circle design in the upper right of the sketch, while the main sketch is a representation of the flow of Paiwan culture as it navigates hundreds of years of colonial rule (next page).
Sketch by Sakuliu Pavavlung,
photo by Jason Mak
In their old village, the residents of New Hao cha were facing a dilemma. At their elevation of 1,600 m, the village had restricted access to material goods, hospitals, and schools and the population dwindled to only 300 people in 112 households, made up mostly of the elderly, the young, and the ill. Following devastation of three major typhoons in a single decade, the villagers made the decision to relocate the village to lower elevations. With the help of a government grant, some local charities, and low-interest loans, the entire village was relocated to the north bank of the Ali-Liao River, at 230 m above sea level.
New Hao Cha, a Paiwan/Rukai village in Majia just across the river from Timur Village, attracts many tourists because of the art that adorns every part of the village, including slate engravings, graffito, pottery, wood-carvings (see photos on previous page), and even a vending machine on the corner of the street that sells hand-made post cards (top left).
Post cards from the vending machine in New Hao Che. Art by Du Hansong (杜寒松).
Friday Culture Workshops:

Students stay after regular school hours to learn about traditional culture. Community members come to the school to teach the students pottery, wood-carving, and dance.

Above: (left and right) students learn about traditional pottery from one of Lavuras’ apprentices (not pictured); (center) detail of one of the students’ completed wood-carvings.

Below: the students’ wood-carving is displayed for parents and family to see during graduation celebrations.
Language learning at Timur Elementary:

Top: English book created for beginning English class by Youth in Timur member Chi Ting Chen and friend. The book uses indigenous-style music and culturally relevant themes to teach students English.

Bottom: A Timur Elementary School teacher teaches Rukai students their traditional language. The Rukai make up a minority population in Timur Village and Sandimen in general. In this class, there were only 3 Rukai students. Elsewhere in the school, the other classes were learning Paiwan.
Outside Timur Elementary stand this archway and tree, designed by Lavuras Maitlin and installed in 2016. A descriptive plaque reads (in part):

“The big tree symbolizes the tribe, and the leaves represent the people of the tribe. After a thousand years of hard work, the trees have become the invisible hands on the land. In the wind and rain, they cling to the land and hold the nutrients. They become a big tree of culture and the children absorb the nutrients of the mother in the shade. The animals on the tree symbolize the many lives on the earth, and they are attached to the lifeblood of culture with myths and legends. On the left side of the sun, the clay pots show the birth of new life, showing the connection between the traditional life and culture of the Paiwan people. Life is the foundation of culture, the foundation of wisdom, life conveys culture, and culture continues wisdom. I hope that the school and the tribe will carry such a mission. Our children are equipped with the ancestors' souls.”
Thank you to the Youth in Timur members
Special thanks to the Tjaljialep family who fed me and taught me to cook and let me nap under their air conditioner on hot afternoons in the village. And in fond memory of 爸爸, guava farmer, retired policeman, husband, dad, and vuvu. You are missed.