主題特刊徵稿啟事
襲產製造中的「可視性」：
二十一世紀文化多樣性與公共記憶之再現政治／策

特刊客座主編

- 黃舒楣 國立台灣大學建築與城鄉研究所副教授
- 王舒俐 中央研究院民族學研究所副研究員
- 李炫錚 韓國西江大學批判全球研究中心助理教授

徵稿說明

> 可視性不只是權力的效果，同時也是可能性之前提。Gordon（2002, 132）

九零年代中，馬丁‧傑（Martin Jay 1995）批判性地檢視視覺如何主導人類歷史，近三十年後，我們所在世界仍然以「可視性」為尊，而忽略其他感官或心靈性品質。尤其在有關「過往」的領域中 – 文化認同及歷史想像之關聯 – 可視性持續鞏固了強調物質性和實證主義的特定知識方法。換句話說，「可視性」成為了襲產製造過程中的關鍵，而我們在此特輯中特別想要檢視反省這一題。我們相信此調查探尋在二十一世紀是特別重要的，在當前「文化多樣性」滿溢於政策文件（如聯合國教科文組織的永續發展教育 – ESD），或是國際大獎競賽中（例如美國影藝學院更新了其提名機制相關的平等與包容目標，以促進影業多樣性）。

襲產在此增進可見性與文化多樣性的推動中扮演獨特角色。2021 年，國際文化紀念物與歷史場所委員會 （ICOMOS） 出版了政策指引（應當是首次有此整合嘗試），提供推動襲產取向的永續發展目標指引，且呈現襲產對於永續發展的貢獻實較常識認知更為廣泛許多（Labadi et al. 2021）。襲產更被持續認為能多樣化公共記憶和公眾視野，於是能促進跨文化理解。然而，襲產的種種潛力亦有其限制，尤其是襲產推動無可避免需要面對空間政治的挑戰時。在首爾，遊人們必定造訪地標建築東大門設計廣場 – 明星建築師薩哈‧哈迪令人印象深刻的作品。然而人們一旦踏出地鐵站所映入眼簾的，其實是朝鮮時代留下的史蹟遺構，其所形成促進的歷史框架立即導引著人們去循特定路徑認識這個城市（Lee 2018）。在基隆的西班牙諸聖教堂考古遺址現場，基隆市府團隊和台、西考古專家們對於遺構有相互競爭、不同程度可視性、現地或離地的保存展示計畫 – 連結到不盡相同的議程以及可能性前提。遺構加上擴增實境技術固然

有助重新召喚「過往」，然而毗鄰遺址而居的市民或村民卻往往處於陰影之下，一如被拆除的東大門球場和相關體育記憶一般模糊。批判思考的學者很快地應會質疑提問：是誰在特定可視性展演以及相關可能性之背後？這是誰的可能性？或者，可視性展演背後的權力幾何如何操作？面對有限空間，「可視性」往往位居記憶政治的中心，當政治／政策選擇凸顯部分襲產／記憶的可視性，無可避免引發了記憶倫理的課題。

依循著「可視性政權（regime of visibility）」（De Backer 2019），以及布瑞格替（Brighenti 2007, 323）所提示：「可視性同時促成了肯認和控制這兩種相反的效果」，我們籌組這個特輯，邀請研究者們來共同反思「如控制般的可視性」（visibility-as-control，傅科式思考）以及「如肯認般的可視性」（visibility-as-recognition，帶有反抗意味的），甚至是「如挪用般的可視性」（visibility-as-appropriation 甚或是 visibility-as-(re)appropriation，後殖民意味的）。當然，（不）可視性相關討論絕對不限於考古遺址（本身其實是鑲嵌於社會脈絡的創造性實踐）。我們歡迎各種論文以檢視廣義襲產製造來探討可視性，探究襲產保存、再現、消費過程中的隱而不現的政治／政策動態。這可能是有關歷史保存如何為轉型正義動員以增加特定歷史論述的正當性基礎，也可能是電影中如何重建特定歷史現場，以助於展開另類的對話和行動路徑。

我們亦歡迎來稿探究特別針對國家扮演的角色，尤其是所謂的「新贊助者國家」（a new patron state）（Lee 2019），如何促進了特定知識生產，以及引發了（不）可視性倫理之相關議題，這尤其在後殖民主義或是移占者殖民主義（settler colonialism）脈絡中特別重要。可視性和不可視性之間的張力是重要但時時受到忽略的，如同崔西・愛爾蘭（Ireland 2015, 105）所有力指出，歷史保存可能會繼續強化加深原住民以及其他邊緣族群在都市象徵空間中的缺席、不可視性。

承上，我們希望能夠收到處理以下任一相關主題的稿件，尤其以檢視分析二十一世紀經驗（相關於文化多樣性以及公共記憶的眾多政策）為佳。

- **可視性與文化多樣性政策／治**
- **襲產、可視性、永續發展**
- **可視性政權**
- **襲產政策中的（不）可視性**
- **公共記憶形成中的（不）可視性**
- **（不）可視性的文化政治**
- **消費襲產的（不）可視性**
- **可視性、現實、超現實、可視性技術**

本刊竭誠歡迎上述主題之研究論文。研究論文稿件皆進行雙向匿名學術審查，研究論文之正文（不含摘要、關鍵字及引用書目）字數限制中文為 12,000 至 20,000 字；英文為 10,000 以下。

另本期配合「襲產製造中的『可視性』」主題特刊，歡迎相關議題之【書評、藝評、展評及政策評論】。評論類稿件由編審委員會進行內部審查，其正文字數限制中文為 1,500 至 3,000 字；英文為 1,000 至 1,500 字。

特刊投稿方式

- 「襲產製造中的『可視性』」主題特刊於 2024 年 1 月 15 日之前徵求論文摘要，2 月 15 日確認摘要徵選結果，2024 年 5 月 31 日全文截稿，預定於 2025 年 5 月發刊。欲投稿本期特刊者請將論文摘要（中文 500 字內）併同投稿作者資料表，於 2024 年 1 月 15 日之前寄至本刊聯絡信箱：cpme@tacps.tw。來稿請參考徵稿啟事註明投稿類別，參照本刊「撰稿體例」規範，並參考其字數上限，採電腦打字並以 MS Word 軟體編輯，以電子郵件附加檔案方式進行投稿。

Interrogating "Visibility" in the Production of Heritage: Politics and Policies of Cultural Diversity and Public Memory in the 21st Century

Guest-Editors for the Special Issue:

- **HUANG Shu-Mei** Associate Professor at the Graduate Institute of Building and Planning, National Taiwan University.
- **WANG Shu-Li** Associate Research Fellow, Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica.
- **LEE Hyun Kyung** Assistant Professor, Critical Global Studies Institute (CGSI), Sogang University, Seoul.

> *...visibility is not only an effect of power but also its condition of possibility.*
> Gordon (2002, 132) .

Nearly three decades after Martin Jay (1995) offered a critical survey of the operation/ domination of sight in human history, we still live in a world in which "visibility" is disproportionately prioritized over other sensual or spiritual qualities. Particularly in areas involving the past, and thereby the rearticulation of cultural identity and historic imaginaries, visibility contributed to a way of knowing that prioritized materiality and positive knowledge. In other words, "visibility" has been seen as a key throughout the production of heritage, which is exactly what this special issue would like to call into question. We believe that this investigation is particular important in the 21st century when "cultural diversity" prevails in policy documents (such as in Education for sustainable development - ESD - UNESCO's education sector or UN's SDGs) and international competitions (such as in how the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences updated its equity and inclusion initiative to encourage a more diversified representation).

Heritage plays a role in advancing visibility and cultural diversity. ICOMOS published a policy guidance for heritage and development actors in 2021 -allegedly the first of its kind–to offer heritage-based approaches sustainable development goals and to demonstrate how heritage can be instrumental much more than conventionally assumed (Labadi et al. 2021). Heritage, moreover, is seen as a key to fostering intercultural understanding by diversifying public memory and vision and yet diversity has its limit in meeting with spatial conflicts. In Seoul, many visitors checked out the iconic Dongaemun Design Plaza for its impressive architecture designed by Zaha Hadid. As soon as they stepped out from the metro station, they were then led to wonder over the archaeological remains from the Joseon dynasty, which largely enabled them to understand the city in a much more historical frame (Lee 2018). In Keelung, over the archaeological site of the Spanish Todos los Santos Church, the city officers of Keelung and the archaeologists from Taiwan and Spain competed with one another to lay out plans of varying degree of visibility of the ruins on-site or off-site for the different agendas in relations to different drafting of possibilities. While "the past " is recalled and augmented by AR technology, villagers who reside nearby the site live in the shadows, just like the rather invisible

memories of sport games at the already demolished Dongdaemun Stadium. Researchers of critical thinking would then easily raise questions in relation to the possibilities behind the particular curation of visibility: such as "possibilities for whom" or "what power geometry is behind the curation of visibility." Upon limited space, 'visibility' matters as it is located into the memory competition, and selecting visibility implies invisible parts – heritage/memory ethics, politics/policies, historical perspectives and so on.

In the light of "regime of visibility" (De Backer 2019) and following how Brighenti (2007) reminds us "recognition and control are understood and explained as two opposing outcomes of visibility" (323), we are inviting papers to reflect on visibility-as-control (largely in Foucault's sense), visibility-as-recognition (in a sense of resistance), and moreover, visibility-as-appropriation (or visibility-as-(re)appropriation, to be more explicit in postcolonial sense). Certainly, the issue of (in)visibility is not limited to the archaeological findings as a socially embedded creative practice. We welcome papers that examines visibility upon the preservation, representation, and even the consumption of heritage in a broad sense, ranging from how historical preservation is mobilized to lay claims for restorative social justice to how disappeared historical scenes are reconstructed in a film to enable alternative paths of dialogues and actions that were not possible before.

We also would like to see works that discuss how the state, most likely a new patron state (Lee 2019) is involved in the production of knowledge and at the same time the ethics of (in)visibility (as opposed to invisibility) becomes an inevitable issue, especially in the context of postcolonialism and settler colonialism. It is important to keep in mind about the often-neglected tension between visibility and invisibility, such as how Tracy Ireland (2015, 105) potently pointed out historical preservation might reinforce "the invisibility of the pasts of indigenous and other marginalised groups and perpetuates their absence from the representational and symbolic spaces of the city" in Australia.

We look forward to receiving submissions that address one of the following themes in relation to politics and policies of cultural diversity and public memory in the 21st century.

- **Visibility and Policies of cultural diversity**
- **Heritage, visibility, sustainable development**
- **Regimes of visibility**
- **(In)visibility in heritage policies**
- **(in)visibility and public memory formation**
- **Cultural politics of (in)visibility**
- **Cultural consumption of visibility**
- **Visibility, reality or hyper-reality and technology of visibility**

Summary submissions (no longer than 300 words in English, and 500 words in Chinese) with the Authors Profile for CPME should be emailed, as Microsoft Word attachments, to CPME at cpme@tacps.tw **by 15 January 2024**. After selection, which will be released by 15 Feb 2024, we are expecting to receive the full paper by 31 May 2024 (No longer than 10,000 words in English, and 12,000-20,000 words in Chinese in CMS Style). We are looking at having the Special Issue to be published in May 2025.)

References

Brighenti Andrea Mubi. 2007. "Visibility: A Category for the Social Sciences." *Current Sociology*, 55: 323-342.

De Backer, Mattias. 2019. "Regimes of Visibility: Hanging out in Brussels' Public Spaces." *Space and Culture*, 22(3): 308-320.

Gordon, Neve. 2002. "On Visibility and Power: An Arendtian Corrective of Foucault." *Human Studies*, 25, 125-145.

Hochberg, Gil Z. 2015. *Visual Occupations: Violence and Visibility in a Conflict Zone*. Duke University Press.

Ireland, Tracy. 2015. "The Ethics of Visibility: Archaeology, Conservation and Memories of Settler Colonialism," In *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage* edited by Tracy Ireland, and John Schofield, 105-125. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.

Jay, Martin. 1993. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-century French Thought*. California, US: University of California Press.

Labadi, Sophia, Francesca Giliberto, Ilaria Rosetti, Linda Shetabi, and Ege Yildirim, 2021. *Heritage and the Sustainable Development Goals: Policy Guidance for Heritage and Development Actors*. ICOMOS, 134. https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2453/.

Lee, Hyun Kyung. 2018. "Recreating Dongdaemun Stadium in South Korea: Beyond Japanese Colonial Memories and towards a Global City." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies*, 31(1): 99-128.

Lee, Hyun Kyung. 2019. "The New Patron State in South Korea: Cultural Policy, Democracy and the Market Economy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 25(1): 48-62.