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Conclusion

COLONIAL HERITAGE AND GLOBALIZATION

Heritage became a prevailing phenomenon during the formation of modern nation-states, and was institutionalised when the global order of states was reformed during and after the Second World War and Cold War. Hence, heritage is inseparable from national identity and nationalism. This intrinsic connection indicates the contested nature and power struggle underlying the heritage-making process. While UNESCO has re-tuned the ‘universal value’ of world heritage through the notion of ‘cultural diversity’ in order to reconcile conflicts, the structure of UNESCO as a state-based institution reflects the power hierarchy among nation-states and within domestic spheres, and this shows in heritage activities. This power hierarchy is often in accordance with the eco-political status of its actors. Regarding colonial heritage, an unbalanced relationship often lies beneath the diplomatic usage of the term ‘shared heritage’. This unbalance is often analogous to colonial hierarchy in the postcolonial arena, and is sustained by colonial structural remains in postcolonial societies, for instance in the academic model and institutional authority of archaeology in postcolonial Africa (Schmidt 2009).

The theme of ‘development’ has been a strong drive for claims of cultural diversity in the global sphere, whether for ‘advanced’ or ‘developing’ countries. The modernist belief, which begins with the notion of ‘progress’ and the idea of a thrust toward a sort of super-future, underlies the UNESCO model of the world heritage system. This modernist mentality can be exemplified by the ‘best practice’ in world heritage operation (Logan 2002b, 52-53); and by UNESCO’s projects combining heritage and development. The ‘world best practice’ on the one hand indicates this evolving view of an advanced future, very much determined by material standards; on the other hand, it reflects the inevitable homogeneity resulting from the practice of ‘standardisation’ while creating heritage industries (Graham et al. 2000). Aside from the example of ‘best practice’, many UNESCO projects which combine heritage and development reflect the UN’s mission of sustainable development and poverty reduction. For countries with an inferior eco-political status within the global sphere, heritage projects under the heading of sustainable development attract foreign investment and add political profile. All the mentioned cases suggest that the belief in development in relation to modernism is not deconstructed by ‘postmodern’ power discourses. Instead, this developmentist belief is strengthened when diversity is ascribed to an image of an advanced and developed locality or as a diplomatic strategy for reconciling conflicts stemming from differences.

The hierarchical power relation underneath the global heritage mechanism was constructed under colonial rule, and usually has not been decolonised in the postcolonial global and national sphere. When the hierarchical structure was built up through modernisation projects during the colonial period, the image of the modernised model was often taken by the colonised communities as equal to the image of the coloniser through colonial structural residuals, for instance, the industrial construction and social hierarchy. This image of modernity is interwoven with colonial sentiments and postcolonial negotiations associated with colonial sites. Development of the mining industry in Jinguashi and the sugar industry in Ciaotou and their postcolonial social dynamics are clear examples of this colonial modernity. With their original sense of place yielded to or replaced by colonial interventions, colonial sites are usually easier than other heritage sites to commoditise in standardising phrases. This is due to a lack of a sense of rootedness and a lack of cultural software such as
craftsmanship in association with the built structure. Sense of rootedness often motivates preservation movements; a lack of rootedness can result in ignorance or passive responses from postcolonial communities over the site of former colonial symbolism. Moreover, a split between the built structure and its cultural subject contributes to the ‘standardization’ of preservation and representation. Since the one (former colonizer) who knows best the material and cultural significance has left the site, this vacuum of local knowledge, strengthened by the ‘dual colonialism’, provides an ideal environment for ‘standardizing’ cultural performance or even ‘reinventing’ culture. The global demand of tourism and economic development further pressurizes the process of representing a cultural image for consumption. This also indicates that the ‘best practice’ of a colonial heritage site may be greatly removed from the communities of the neighbourhood. In the case of Taiwan, the ‘foreignness’ of some Japanese sites is strengthened through intentionally displaying a conventional image of Japan which often comes from the mass circulation of media and commodities.

JAPANESE COLONIAL HERITAGE

The case of Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan shows similarities and differences to the situation of colonial sites within the postcolonial metropole/colony power unbalance, as mentioned in the previous paragraph. Regarding economic status, Taiwan and Japan are relatively balanced competitors in the global market. However, the image of Japan as an advanced modernised nation is rooted within Taiwan and is represented by heritage activities associated with Japanese colonial sites. Despite the fact that this is similar to postcolonial phenomena in some of other new nations, this Japan-complex is far more than simply colonial nostalgia. The factors of dual-colonialism and refracted modernity situate Japan’s ambiguously in-between the ‘foreign’ and the ‘local’ in postcolonial Taiwan. The image of Japan as an advanced modernised nation has also been strengthened by mass circulation of Japanese commodities in Taiwan and in the global market.

Resistance against dual colonialism—Japanese colonial rule and the postwar KMT governance under Martial Law—led to the prevalence of localism in Taiwan. In accordance with economic and social changes such as fast industrialisation and urbanisation, the theme concerning land/places in Taiwan, encompassing both natural and cultural meanings, has been singled out by political figures and public groups for evoking a sense of Taiwanese identity and environmental concerns over land which has been rapidly polluted by development projects. Strong sentiments toward the locality of Taiwan and places in Taiwan—which were suppressed under the localities of Japan and China in the colonial context—have motivated and been evoked by numerous environmental, literature, political and conservationist movements since the 1970s. In the 1990s, the central government inaugurated an ‘Integrated Community-Making Programme’ and concluded the previous locality-relevant initiatives. Within this framework, the Japanese sites were re-categorised from a ‘residue of the evil colonizer’ to ‘heritage of Taiwan’. In other words, these Japanese sites officially represented ‘local’ instead of ‘foreign’ in the late 1990s and 2000s.

It is noteworthy that the relocation of Japanese sites from foreign to local is in closer relation to KMT colonialism rather than to Japanese colonialism. Shown by case studies of this thesis, the praise of the Japanese past often appeared in the oral description in the form of comparison to the discrimination and backwardness of the KMT rule. And these sentiments toward KMT colonialism, here taking the form of displays of intimacy to Japan in contrast to the KMT’s China-centered narrative, are exacerbated by the lukewarm relationship between Taiwan and China in the global arena. Historical and ethnic links between Taiwan and China was forcibly consolidated by the postwar KMT government in order to legitimise its regime in Taiwan. Both the link and resistances against the link have been intensified by political and monetary competition and military threats from the People’s Republic of China. This ambivalent, and often hostile, consciousness of China intensified after the dissolution of the Cold War alliances, when Taiwan’s status as a defensive front for the US was losing importance and when China emerged as an enormous economic entity. This cautiousness and anxiety about Taiwan’s survival under China’s suppression in international society provides space for a new national identity narrative and Taiwan-centred consciousness to mature. In the form of a mosaic model
of multiculturalism in the 1990s and 2000s, this identity narrative accentuating Taiwan’s close connection with Japan in the past and the present aids the construction of a de-sinicised identity of Taiwan. The Japanese heritage sites are a concrete example of this.

REFRACTED MODERNITY

The pro-Japan attitude in Taiwan is actually interwoven with historical, political and economic factors. Japan, the former colonizer, became a partner within the Cold War network dominated by the United States. Although the official perspective on the Japanese past under the postwar KMT government stressed the evil of Japanese imperialism and highlighted Japanese military atrocities committed against the Chinese during the war, the economic relationship between Taiwan and Japan continued both from colonial connections and within the network of Cold War alliances. Moreover, Japan’s image as an advanced model country in Asia was also noted in KMT cultural policies in the 1970s and 1980s. This model image continued in the 1990s community-building and 2000s DPP government discourses. Regarding heritage policy, Japanese sites entered heritage lists no earlier than 1991; nevertheless, the heritage legislation and conservation practices of Japan have always been important references for heritage policy-making in Taiwan. In other words, the Japanese past in Taiwan, and Japan as a contemporary political entity, were conceived differently in official discourse under KMT governance. The former, ambiguous Japanese past, was related to the embarrassing position of Japan in separating ‘us’/local and ‘them’/foreign in accordance with domestic ethnic sentiments; in the latter case, Japan, as a contemporary political entity, was no doubt a foreign country, a competitor, partner and also model country in the global economic and political arena.

The Taiwanese re-connection to the Japanese past was bridged by the discourse of modernity. As noted in section 2.3 of this thesis, the Japanese-built sites re-entered the professional field of architecture and evoked a sense of conserving Japanese buildings under the heading of ‘modern architecture’. Through categorising the colonial past as a stage in a serial progress under the header of modernisation, Taiwanese identity is a constituent of Taiwaneseness, and indicates the ‘advanced’ element in the culture of the latter. Furthermore, the conceptualisation of ‘refracted modernity’ in referring to the Japanised or Japan-translated western-modernisation in Taiwan suggests that Japanese influence is regarded as a part of localisation, and shows that Japan serves as the adjusted model of modernisation, which better fits Asian conditions. In this case, Japan becomes ‘us’ and the West are ‘them’. The image of an advanced Japan is intensified through comparisons to the KMT in the past and to China in the present. This image is reshaped in the new generation which has had no direct Japanese and postwar KMT experience, yet is intimately acquainted with the popular culture of Japan. This image of an ‘advanced’ Japan lies beneath the initiatives of ‘community building’ and beneath the merge of commoditising strength over locality pursuit in many sites investigated by this thesis, for instance the ‘Little Japan’ imagination in Jiangjunfu case.

COLONIAL AMBIGUITIES

In the 2000s, a large number of Japanese sites were designated ‘historic monuments’ or ‘historic buildings’ under the legal framework of the ‘Cultural Heritage Preservation Act’. Meanwhile, many Japanese heritage sites were renovated in this period with state community-building budgets under the popular notion of ‘revitalising unused spaces’ in the architectural and policy-making arena. Other than the factor of identity narratives, the prevalence of Japanese sites has been closely related to the rising role of municipal governments and the increasing demands of the tourist market. Many Japanese sites in the metropolitan areas, especially Taipei City, were turned into museums, art centres, café houses, boutiques etc., in tandem with the fast-rising bourgeois urban culture in Taipei. Many sites have been conserved by citizens’ movements, and were listed as heritage by the

264 The phrase ‘refracted modernity’, used by Kikuchi as a book title (Kikuchi 2007), refers to the perception of Western modernity through reinterpretation from Japan in Taiwan. As an example, the Japanese architects applied Western genre in building modern architectures in Taiwan. This reinterpretation of modern architecture has become origin of understanding the Western architectural modernity for Taiwanese in the colonial period.
municipal government later. In the counties with less financial resources and less developed citizen awareness, the top-down investment in revitalising unused Japanese buildings has been often limited to architectural renovation. Within the community-building framework, reuse of these sites was expected by policy makers and professionals to trigger a sense of community, awareness of citizenship and also local development. To the local governments, the tourist revenue and political profile which might result from these sites have been the major concern. If we look into the network of local actors directly concerning the heritage activities of a site, the affection evoked by memories of the place often became a strong motivation for grassroots conservationist movements. Civil, environmental, cultural issues were concerned by grassroots groups as well as the issue of local development, particularly in terms of tourist revenue. And because of the architectural features and historical associations of the sites, Japanese ‘nostalgia tourists’, the largest international tourist group in Taiwan in the 2000s, were the main target international tourists of heritage projects.

In order to reach the overall target of implementing Japanese colonial sites for civil, political and economic initiatives, re-interpreting the significance of these sites is crucial. This reinterpretation needs to be a persistent cultural process, reconnecting the postcolonial actors to the site through continuous negotiation. In other words, in order to turn the colonial material remains into sites of memory for postcolonial communities, connections between the site and communities—cut during dual colonialism—have to be rebuilt through continual memory activities, or the site remains an uncared-for space. However, in the process of representation in transforming colonial to local, ambiguities are inevitable.

The ambiguities lie in multiple layers. First of all, within the global heritage framework, the mechanism of colonial heritage is often analogous to the power hierarchy of the colonial period. Meanwhile, this power hierarchy is applied in the domestic sphere between the state authority and communities, since the nation-state has been the major actor in determining and participating in the international mechanism. Second, when we come back to the postcolonial society in perceiving the ‘colonial heritage’, ‘why?’ and ‘for whom?’ to conserve remains a issue. Despite the fact that some postcolonial nations are involved in projects of ‘mutual heritage’ raised by former colonizers, the gap between the different concerns of both parties is notable. Taiwan is a distinctive case in the issue of colonial heritage. Instead of being a passive ‘partner’ in this ‘mutual’ relationship, Taiwan has been an active actor in initiating ‘sharing’ activities with the former Japanese colonizer. Nevertheless, representing the colonial past remains ambiguous in postcolonial society. Three internal layers of ambiguity lie beneath heritage activities: the gap between the architectural fabric and cultural context, the absence of a direct memory owner, and the structural residue of colonialism. All these ambiguities indicate that a more nuanced operational model is required in representing colonial sites as heritage. Furthermore, the theme of economic development encompasses the global heritage sphere, including Taiwan. After the rescue of heritage sites is accomplished, this drive for development has been competing with grassroots concerns of locality in the civil, welfare and environmental dimensions. In the case of colonial heritage, the lack of a direct memory linkage between the site and postcolonial communities means that citizen initiatives based upon place-rooted affection may have less power in facing economy-centred initiatives. This is also relevant to the issue of representing Japaneseess in Taiwan.

In the era of localism in Taiwan, the bond between memory and place indeed inspired grassroots initiatives of conservation. The case of Ciaotou Sugar Factory, Qingxiu Yuan and Jiangjunfu Residences showed the haunting effects of place. These conservationists acts have triggered a sense of community and civil awareness toward a vision of a well-inhabited homeland. However, when the rescue stage was accomplished, and when faced with the need for a management programme, factors such as property ownership, bureaucratic inflexibility and development-oriented initiatives have obstructed wider grassroots participation. Under the official translation of cultural heritage in Taiwan, the concept of ‘culture as asset’, explained in section 2.2, has been characterized by this limited development up to date. When heritage sites are legally defined and categorised into official heritage institutions, the uncertainty of grassroots involvement is a poor fit with the rigidness and
It is undeniable that the creation of heritage is closely related to state initiatives state-constructed frameworks. Nevertheless, memory is an intrinsic feature of heritage-making and motivates conservationist acts. This intimate nature of heritage bonds people to place, and may contribute to the formation of subjects who produce locality. Through a memory approach that works at a deeper and more nuanced level than that of the state and government, continuously engaging multiple actors of a local network, heritage can also be a field for empowering the once silenced. In past decades, whether area heritage-oriented, or in the regions where heritage has just started to become a power, heritage has been used by people, including both those in power or subalterns. If heritage can mean more than political games, then its significance may lie in a better, equal platform open for negotiations, within which local autonomies are respected and able to penetrate the power hierarchy to create a better future and locality for them, and for us all.