

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19053> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Chiang, Min-Chin

Title: Memory contested, locality transformed : representing Japanese colonial 'heritage' in Taiwan

Issue Date: 2012-05-15

Chapter One: Introduction

Taiwan has been experiencing a ‘memory boom’ since the 1990s.² This ‘memory boom’, represented by increasing numbers of museum and heritage sites, is closely related to a new pursuit of locality after the end of Martial Law in 1987. During the periods of Japanese colonial occupation and KMT (Kuomintang 國民黨; Chinese Nationalist Party) authoritarian rule, the sense of place and memory of Taiwan was intentionally erased by the ruling party. In the 1990s, the sense of place and memory of Taiwan was accentuated and became instrumental in creating a different eco-political narrative. Since 1994, a new policy has been promoted by the central government, namely the Integrated Community-Making Programme (社區總體營造). After the Taiwan-centred DPP (Democratic Progressive Party) candidate won the presidential elections in 2000 and 2004, the community-building programme was continued to an unprecedented scale by the DPP government. Amid this grand community-building scheme, cultural heritage projects received enormous attention and government resources. Interestingly, the Japanese colonial sites were largely designated as cultural heritage within this burgeoning memory boom, and together with many Taiwanese heritage sites they represent a new political, cultural and economic politics which

differs from the previous political periods of Japanese and postwar KMT rule. In other words, the Japanese colonial sites became a constituent part of the new identity and cultural narrative of Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s. In the search for a Taiwanese identity rooted in the land of Taiwan the Japanese colonial past plays an ambiguous role.

Japanese colonial sites used to be regarded as the ‘poisonous leftovers of Japanese imperialism’ during the postwar KMT governance. The Chinese KMT government took over Taiwan after Japan’s defeat in the Second World War. In order to disconnect the Taiwanese link to Japan after 50 years of colonial rule,³ the KMT government strengthened the superior status of ‘orthodox’ Chinese culture and language with the assistance of Martial Law. Numerous Japanese sites, especially those representing rich religious or political symbolism, for instance Shinto shrines, were demolished, reconstructed or deserted. Within the hierarchy of the state heritage framework, Japanese sites were considered outside of the category of cultural heritage. Even Taiwanese vernacular architecture struggled to qualify as cultural heritage.

This situation changed in the 1990s. In 1991 the first two Japanese sites were designated as national historic monuments (*guji* 古蹟), protected by the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act implemented in 1982. In 1998 a considerable number of Japanese sites were designated by the Taipei City Government as municipal historic monuments. In the 2000s, nu-

2. The large museum construction projects of the Kuomintang (KMT) government were initiated before the 1990s, for instance the establishment of the National History Museum, the National Art Education Centre and the National Scientific Education Centre in the 1950s. A series of scientific museums and cultural centres were also planned in the 1980s (Zhang Yu-teng 2007). However, this thesis recognizes the 1990s as a major period of Taiwan’s memory boom. According to Zhang Yu-teng, from 1990 to 2000 the number of museums in Taiwan dramatically increased to from 90 to 400. Local museums mainly represent this increase (Zhang 2007, 30). This phenomenon matched a growing public awareness of cultural heritage and local history. From the late 1990s to 2000s, the number of local heritage sites also rapidly increased.

3. Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan lasted from 1895 to 1945. The Chinese KMT government took over Taiwan in 1945 and moved in its government apparatus and armies after its defeat by the Communist Party in the 1949 Chinese Civil War. A large number of political immigrants from China came along with the KMT around this time.

merous Japanese buildings were reported by county or city governments as being 'historic monuments' or 'historic buildings' and were renovated with subsidies from the central government under the funding framework of 'reutilising unused spaces' (xianzhi kongjian zailiyong 閒置空間再利用) which is closely related to the community-building programme. This shows a shift in the conception and value of what is 'historic'. Japanese sites gradually ceased to be seen as poisonous residues and became legitimate sites of memory in Taiwan. However, it is noteworthy that the Japanese sites did not become sites of memory only after the official recognition; rather, the perception of Japanese sites has long been interwoven with the image of Japan produced by remaining colonial structures, KMT neo-colonialism, the Japan-Taiwan relationship under the cold-war framework, and the Japanese mass-media commoditization in Asia. For many Taiwanese people, Japanese sites in their hometowns represent their proud past, and are their sites of memory. Thus, they can also be a place of hope for the revival of the local economy. For government officials in the 1990s and 2000s, the image of Japan was an advanced model which covered both global economic and cultural terrain. Conserving and reusing the Japanese sites not only shows the emerging multicultural narrative of a de-sinicized Taiwanese identity, but also expresses enthusiasm in building an advanced new country through utilizing heritage spaces to evoke civil awareness and a sense of community. This might even trigger local development, as in the successful *machizukuri* examples in Japan. Within this framework, Japanese colonial sites, which have long been sites of memory for different groups of Taiwanese people, are used as a locality reproduction strategy for postcolonial society in Taiwan.⁴ However, the contested nature of colonial sites, particularly salient when looking at controversial memories attached to the sites, often results in ambiguity during the process of heritage-making and interpretation.

In the 1990s, the global order was reorganised after the dissolution of the Cold War structure. New nations and area leagues formed and competed for new

political and economic terrain. Heritage, already institutionalised in the 1970s by UNESCO and always inseparable from nationalist projects, was also implemented for negotiations between nations and areas. The issue of a colonial past not only relates to diplomatic affairs between the former colonizer and colonized nations, but also concerns domestic struggles resulting from the colonial past, for instance the land claim of indigenous groups on their traditional territory in settlers' countries, or ethnic controversies resulting from migration in former colonizer societies. What were once seen as 'embarrassing' colonial sites, either sites of past 'glories' or of past 'shame', have been reinterpreted within the new world heritage framework and within the projects of global and national institutions. As a result, Asian sites and sites with multiple values have been increasingly designated as world heritage since the 1990s, following UNESCO's emphasis on cultural diversity and universal value. Intra-regional and national cooperation on heritage projects includes 'shared' heritage sites⁵; yet at the same time, armed threats to controversial sites have not disappeared. Moreover, the unbalanced relationships between postcolonial nations and the states and communities in the global heritage arena can easily become analogous to the power hierarchy of colonial periods. Within this framework, the value of colonial heritage to postcolonial communities is arguable, and this question is often answered with rhetoric of development and worked under a top-down mechanism.

Lying outside of the diplomatic sphere framed by the United Nations, sites in Taiwan are not allowed to be included in the World Heritage List⁶ and related heritage network.⁷ Yet Taiwan's heritage policies and

5. The terms 'shared' heritage, 'mutual' heritage or 'common' heritage are often used to replace 'colonial' heritage.

6. The World Heritage List is a part of the UNESCO World Heritage Programme. It is administered by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee which consists of representatives from 21 of the State Parties to the Convention. Sites included in the list are those recognised by the committee as having outstanding cultural or natural significance for humanity. The listed sites are able to obtain financing from the World Heritage Fund under certain criteria and conditions.

7. During the Second World War, the Republic of China (ROC), led by the KMT government under Chiang Kai-shek's presidency, was one of the founding countries of the United Nations. Even

4. This thesis recognizes the end of Martial Law in 1987 as the beginning of the postcolonial stage of Taiwan.

practice mostly refer to conventions and models legitimated by international institutions such as UNESCO and ICOMOS, even though Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations. It is therefore necessary to understand the global context within which Taiwan appropriates these international conventions. Taiwan's isolation is due in part to the fact that the most influential colonial experience in Taiwan was with Japan, not Western powers. Hence, in relation to heritage affairs, Taiwan has no direct connection to influential western countries in UNESCO, in contrast to, for example, the link between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

Nevertheless, since the 2000s the government of Taiwan has nominated its own 'Potential World Heritage Sites'⁸, and has invested professionally and financially in supporting the conservation work of world heritage sites. This nomination of potential world heritage sites is seen as preparation for joining in with UN and UNESCO-based international heritage affairs in the future. Stressing the locality of Taiwan in the global arena has been a strong theme within the state cultural department in implementing potential world heritage policies. This is in line with Taiwan's search for a position in the global arena

within the remapping process of a new world order, politically and economically, after the Cold War.

Although the state heritage activities of Taiwan are politically and diplomatically similar to those of many postcolonial new nations, the issue of representing Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan provides a unique angle from which to approach 'shared heritage'. Within the context of flourishing localism resulting from resistance to former colonization of KMT, Japanese colonial sites have been incorporated into local heritage not only through top-down policies but also by autonomous initiatives of social or community groups. The subjects who 'share' the site as heritage are not restricted within colonizer-colonized, state-state, state-local networks. Rather, an emphasis on the local autonomy of small-scale places by state community-building projects and privately initiated conservation movements in Taiwan has triggered an alternative means of sharing heritage. Although controversy, negotiation and ambivalence in the process of representing the colonial past are inevitable, Taiwan's case of representing Japanese heritage may contribute to an understanding of the value or impact of colonial heritage for postcolonial communities aside from tourist and diplomatic effects. Further, it contributes to the exploration of whether local autonomy can change the meaning of colonial sites and can turn colonial sites into community heritage. In this regard, 'sharing' is not always a one-way process which fits in a power hierarchy in which the former colonizer shares the techniques of preserving their architectural remains with the former colonized by training programmes and subsidies. The active role that Taiwanese heritage workers play in engaging Japanese architects and related professionals in renovating Japanese sites is different from this one-way sharing. To some degree, this active role shows that postcolonial communities in Taiwan have been empowered to break from the colonial hierarchy by sharing what is now *their* heritage, no longer the heritage of the colonizer.

This thesis presents the extreme complexity of sharing the Japanese colonial past in postcolonial Taiwanese society, and examines possibilities of decoloni-

after the KMT government was defeated by the Communist Party in the Chinese Civil War and fled to Taiwan in 1949, the ROC maintained its seat in the United Nations in the 1950s and 60s with support of the United States and allies of the United States within the Cold War framework. The situation changed in 1971, when the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution withdrawing the designation of the ROC as the legitimate government of China. Instead, it recognized the People's Republic of China as the sole legitimate government of China and the only representative for the seat of China in the United Nations. Since 1991, the ROC (now commonly known as Taiwan) has tried hard to re-apply for membership in the United Nations, representing the people of Taiwan. Yet under pressure from the People's Republic of China, all these applications have been denied. In 1972, a year after the ROC's withdrawal from the United Nations, the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World's Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO. The World Heritage Committee had its first General Assembly in 1976 and the first session in 1977. See the website of World Heritage Convention: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions> (accessed 28 July 2011)

8. Taiwan Shijieyichan Qianliidian (臺灣世界遺產潛力點). This English translation has been taken from the official website of the Headquarters Administration of Cultural Heritage: <http://twh.hach.gov.tw/TaiwanE.action> (accessed 15 August 2011)

zation⁹ through community-based heritage activities. Five Japanese colonial sites were chosen for investigation. While none shows an ideal successful outcome, all represent an ongoing process. Problems and ambiguity stemming from the tentative transformation from colonialism to locality help to trigger further thinking or warn against the ideological trap of taking mutuality in 'sharing' the past for granted.

1.1 COLONIAL HERITAGE IN THE GLOBAL SPHERE

1.1.1 Situating 'Shared Heritage': the Heritage Mechanism of UNESCO

UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), an official organization of the United Nations, was founded in 1946 and has become the leading body of the global heritage mechanism. Another leading international organization, UNESCO-affiliated, is ICOMOS (the International Council on Monuments and Sites), which was founded in 1964 at the same time as the adoption of the Venice Charter. Both the establishment of ICOMOS and the adoption of the Venice Charter concluded and institutionalised the European concern with built heritage that began in the late 18th century as a consequence of the burgeoning nationalism of the region at that time. The vital role of ICOMOS in providing consultation for UNESCO on world heritage issues is assisted by various Scientific Committees on specific professional categories. Regarding the issue of colonial built heritage, the Shared Built Heritage (ISCSBH), formerly the Shared Colonial Architecture and Town Planning, is one of these International Scientific Committees.

The Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage was legislated in 1972, stimulated by the safeguarding of the Abu Simbel temples in Egypt in 1959. This first action initiated several international campaigns, and eventually led to the adoption of the Convention.¹⁰ Among the criteria for

nominating world heritage by the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 'outstanding universal value' was a central concept. However, the definition of 'outstanding universal value' has been considered as Eurocentric by scholars (Labadi 2007, 152-3), as half of the nominated sites are located in Europe and North America.

In the 1990s, a paradigm shift seemed to occur within UNESCO World Heritage policy. Significant change was suggested by UNESCO's 'Global strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List', and by Japan's proposal of the Nara Document on Authenticity in 1994 (Willems and Comer 2011, 162). Moreover, since the 1990s an increasing number of hybrid sites from Southeast Asia began to be listed as World Heritage, including colonial sites and sites of local historical significance (Askew 2010, 30). This was in accordance with UNESCO's major focus on 'cultural diversity' in facing the challenges of global political, social and economic dynamics within a new world order after the Cold War (Logan 2002a, 2002b; Long and Labadi 2010). Within this context, UNESCO initiated a scheme in 2000 called the 'Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity'. This led to the proposal and ratification of the 'Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage' in 2003 and the 'Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions' in 2005.

As Logan (2002) suggests, the formation of international organizations such as the UN, UNESCO, ICOMOS etc. reflected the fact that a "spirit of goodwill and optimism infused twentieth-century modernism" (Logan *et al.* 2010, 4). UNESCO activities, as well as other programmes in cooperation with the UN,¹¹ which combine culture with development plans, also reflect this tendency. While it may seem strange to link modernism with claims of diversity, they are ac-

9. Decolonising the layered colonialism of both the Japanese and postwar KMT regimes.

10. Owing to the construction of the Aswan High Dam, the valley in which the Abu Simbel temples were located was due to

be flooded. The governments of Egypt and Sudan appealed to UNESCO, and an international campaign for safeguarding the site was launched in 1959. See the official website of UNESCO: www.unesco.org (accessed 13 July 2011)

11. For instance the World Bank, Asian Development Bank (ADB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF).

tually two sides of the same coin. The intention to find “universality in diversity”, alongside a “belief in humanity’s steady progress towards better things” and a tendency to apply best models of conservation and management in various world heritage sites underlies the implementation of cultural diversity projects (Logan 2002b, 52). In the 1990s, this modernist tendency was applied to the heritage field through projects of ‘development through conservation’ in various locales. Simultaneously, the “gaps, inconsistency and lack of commitment” between the targets of UNESCO and the perception of local governments and communities was salient, and led to revisions of policies (Logan et al. 2010).

In the 2000s, the terms ‘shared heritage’ and ‘mutual heritage’ became buzzwords in the global heritage arena. In May 2010, the UNESCO quarterly journal, *Museum International*, published an edition entitled ‘Shared Heritage, Shared Future’ based on an international workshop in 2009 at the University of Massachusetts in the US. Discussions in this special edition depart from two propositions: recognizing diversity, and admitting the inflexibility and conflicting nature of heritage. I suggest that this represents an extension of the aforementioned UNESCO stance on endorsing ‘cultural diversity’. In this regard, ‘shared’ and ‘mutual’ have been gradually broadened to include various regions or groups to provide an optimistic vision of dealing with conflicts in an individual context. To take examples from the edition, ‘shared heritage’ can be adopted in the context of Palestine, the indigenous issues in a settlers’ society, ethno-religious conflicts within a country, and diasporas all over the world. Lacking a clear definition, ‘shared heritage’ paradoxically highlights the discordant nature of heritage by accentuating the mutuality, and indicates that wider and deeper complexities may be awoken in further exploration of interpreting, theorising, and negotiating the subject, power balance and action strategies of ‘sharing’.

1.1.2 Situating ‘Shared Heritage’ in the Context of the Netherlands

In the case of the Netherlands, the terms ‘shared heritage’, ‘common heritage’ or ‘mutual heritage’ replaced ‘colonial heritage’ in policy and projects rather earlier than in other countries. It is for this rea-

son that the Netherlands was selected here for research and investigation of the ideological and operational framework of colonial heritage at a nation-state level. According to Roosmalen, as early as 1988 the term ‘mutual’, when defining colonial heritage as a ‘bilateral affair’, was used during a seminar entitled ‘Change and Heritage in Indonesian Cities’ in Indonesia (Jakarta, 1988), and has been used ever since (Roosmalen 2003, 123, note 1). It is interesting to note that the term ‘mutual heritage’ was suggested by the Indonesian Minister of Culture, Fuad Hassan, to replace ‘colonial heritage’ for the occasion.¹² Since the mid-1990s, the Dutch government has encouraged and funded projects concerning Dutch colonial heritage overseas (Fienieg et al. 2008, 24). In 1998, the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Shared Colonial Architecture and Town Planning was inaugurated and chaired by the Netherlands.¹³ The name of the committee was changed to the International Scientific Committee on Shared Built Heritage in 2003.

Colonial Collections and Postcolonial Connections

Other than built heritage, the terms ‘shared’ and ‘mutual’ heritage also emerged in museum collections of colonial objects. Among institutes concerned with colonial collections and knowledge genealogy, the strong tie between the Leiden-based Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde (National Museum of Ethnology) and the Jakarta-based National Museum of Indonesia have contributed to the rhetoric generation and publicity of ‘shared’ and ‘mutual’ heritage. This institutional tie is a colonial legacy and is inseparable from the context of colonial knowledge production. As indicated by Ter Keurs (2007, 5), Dutch collections of Indonesian objects represent the Enlightenment ideology of scientific knowledge. The beginnings of the collection of the Bataviaasch Genootschap (currently the National Museum of Indonesia, Indonesia and National Museum of Ethnology, the Nether-

12. According to the official website of the Centre for International Heritage Activities: <http://www.heritage-activities.nl> (accessed 19 July 2011)

13. The first chairman was Frits van Voorden from Delft University in the Netherlands. See the official website of the ISC SBH: <http://sbh.icomos.org/> (accessed 19 July 2011)

lands) lie in the eighteenth century, when scientific curiosity drove collecting activities alongside colonial expeditions. Large collections of Indonesian objects, VOC archives and maps, as well as scholarly activities, mainly anthropology and archaeology, are colonial legacies which materialise in public and research institutions in the Netherlands today.¹⁴ These institutions, with research resources and strong connections to the postcolonial partner, became the platform for developing international cooperation based on 'mutual heritage', as the idea of cultural heritage has prevailed in the Dutch diplomatic arena.

In the 2000s, a tendency within Dutch cultural policy to develop international relationships through cultural heritage was notable. For instance, in January 2004, the Museum of Ethnology in the Netherlands and the National Museum of Indonesia conducted a joint project on 'Shared Cultural Heritage' (Ter Keurs 2007, 2). This project consisted of a series of events including a conference (23, 24, 25 March 2006 in Amsterdam) and two exhibitions (August 2005 in Jakarta and December 2006 in Amsterdam). It is worth noting that while the exhibition in Jakarta was named *Warisan Budaya Bersama*, which is an Indonesian translation of 'shared cultural heritage', the exhibition and conference in Amsterdam, *Collecting Cultural Heritage in Indonesia: Ethics, Science and Politics*, did not include the word 'mutual' in the title (Ter Keurs 2007, 2). The question arises of *whose* cultural heritage this conference aimed to represent. This question can also be asked of the project 'Shared Cultural Heritage' when we look at the collection categories: scientific expeditions, archaeological sites, individual collectors, colonial exhibitions, gifts and military expeditions, all of which fall within the context of Dutch collecting activities (Ter Keurs 2007, 2). This project was financed by the Netherlands Culture Fund (HGIS), the Indonesian Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, Foundation De Nieuwe Kerk and KLM Cargo (Ter Keurs 2007, note 7), and the conference was financed by the Rijksmu-

seum voor Volkenkunde, the CNWS (School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies) of Leiden University and the International Institute of Asian Studies, Leiden (Ter Keurs 2007, note 1). The cooperation between the Museum of Ethnology in the Netherlands and National Museum of Indonesia was also approved by the Netherlands Culture Fund (HGIS) with subsidies during the period from 2007 to 2010. It is salient that the theme of shared cultural heritage attracted interest and sponsorship from the government, enterprise and research institutes in the Netherlands in the 2000s.

Common Heritage within International Cultural Policy

Since 2000, 'common cultural heritage'¹⁵ has become a priority within Dutch international cultural policy.¹⁶ In fact, as early as 1997, projects relating to the theme of colonial heritage attracted political interest and received financial support, mostly subsidized by the Dutch Cultural Fund (Fienieg et al., 25).¹⁷ This political interest reflects concern for both colonial past and contemporary multiculturalism, and reflects the influence of "specific interest groups and broader expert networks on negotiations, within heritage policy, regarding colonialism and diversity" (Fienieg et al., 37). In 2011, when cuts to cultural budgets are common in the Netherlands and around the world, the 'common heritage policy' has received approval from the Dutch government to continue. In the document *Meer dan kwaliteit, een nieuwe visie op cultuurbeleid* (More than Quality, a new vision on cultural policy), which contains the essence of new

14. For instance, both museums, the Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asia and Caribbean Studies (KITLV), the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT), Leiden University, the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS) etc.

15. According to Fienieg et al., around 2008, the Netherlands used 'common heritage' when referring to its colonial heritage overseas; yet a decade before 2008, terms such as 'shared heritage', 'mutual heritage' and 'heritage overseas' were used reciprocally in policy frameworks (2008, 25 note 2). The term 'shared cultural heritage' was used in the 2003, 2006 and 2009 editions of *Cultural Policy in the Netherlands* (2003, 200; 2006, 150; 2009: 50). As noted by the Centre for International Heritage Activities, "Mutual Cultural Heritage (or Gemeenschappelijk Cultureel Ergoed, GCE) is a policy term used by the Dutch government." See the official website of Centre for International Heritage Activities: <http://www.heritage-activities.nl/> (accessed 19 July 2011)

16. Refer to the *Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009~2012*.

17. Homogene Groep Internationale Samenwerking; HGIS.

Dutch policy in 2011, it is stated that part of Dutch “common heritage is dispersed around the globe, as remnants of a past that the Netherlands shared with other countries. Examples of this heritage are archives, buildings and shipwrecks. The *Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009-2012* is aimed at conservation and future of this heritage in eight countries. Based on the experience obtained through this programme, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and OCW (Education, Culture and Science) will set the priorities for the coming years” (OCW 2011, 5).¹⁸

Domestic Dynamics: cultural identity and cultural diversity

The emerging importance of shared cultural heritage is linked to domestic social and political dynamics, and in particular, issues of multiculturalism. Cultural identity has become a priority concern. Searching, reinforcing and branding ‘Dutchness’ is core to cultural policies, in both the domestic and international spheres. Since the mid-1990s, cultural diversity has been a topic in both political and cultural sectors. According to the 2009 *Cultural Policy in the Netherlands*, “between 2005 and 2008, the focus was on establishing ‘intercultural connections’. ‘White’, established institutions were to make efforts to attract more ethnically mixed audiences, while multicultural institutions were to cease emphasising their separate status in favour of *mutual solidarity*” (2009, 57-58; italics added for emphasis). In other words, instead of praising diversity, a convergent Dutch identity is pursued through policies which encompass all sectors. A part of identity building, the *Canon of the Netherlands*¹⁹ drew tremendous public attention in

2006 and 2007 (Oostindie 2008). Spatial planning programmes under the heading ‘A More Beautiful Country’ and the Belvedere Programme have also aimed to deploy Dutch cultural identity in spatial and architectural design. As stated in the Belvedere memorandum, “cultural-historic identity is to be seen as a determining factor in the future spatial design of the Netherlands, for which government policy shall aim to create appropriate conditions”.²⁰ This idea of cultural identity is also deployed in foreign cultural policy, including projects under the theme of ‘shared cultural heritage’.

The *Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009-2012* states that by “maintaining, managing, using and highlighting” heritage, a critical reflection on the past, as well as mutual understanding of not only the past, but also the present and future, can be fostered. The hope is that relations and cooperation between countries can be strengthened, while the “conservation of common cultural heritage can help to *strengthen cultural identity*, promote socio-economic and cultural development and raise the profile and quality of the living environment”.²¹ From this, we can take three angles when viewing the purpose of cultural heritage policies: firstly, we can focus on the diplomatic function that the common heritage is expected to serve. This converges with the policy intention of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, one of the two major partner ministries of the *Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009-2012*.²² Second, it indicates the tendency of Dutch policy to strengthen cultural identity through place and cultural heritage. This intertwines with the third angle, which concerns culture and development.

Culture and Development

The Netherlands is perhaps the only country in the world that has been planned right down to the

18. The original text is “Gemeenschappelijk cultureel erfgoed: een deel van het Nederlands erfgoed ligt wereldwijd verspreid, als overblijfsel van een verleden dat Nederland met andere landen heeft gedeeld. Voorbeelden van dit erfgoed zijn archieven, gebouwen en scheepswrakken. Het programma Gemeenschappelijk Cultureel Erfgoed 2009-2012 is gericht op behoud en toekomst van dit erfgoed in acht landen. Op basis van de ervaringen met dit programma zullen het ministerie van BZ en OCW de prioriteiten voor de komende jaren nader bezien” (OCW 2011, 5).

19. The Canon of the Netherlands was presented by the canon committee in 2006 intending to provide supplementary teaching materials concerning Dutch culture and history for schools.

20. See ‘The Belvedere Memorandum (summary)’. Official website of the Belvedere Programme: <http://www.belvedere.nu/> (accessed 20 July 2011).

21. The Common Cultural Heritage Policy Framework 2009-2012, page 1; italics added.

22. This relates to the tendency of integrating government departments’ relevant projects for efficiency and better cooperation.

last tree. The landscape is an artefact, a man-made work of art. The Netherlands is a beautiful country, and can become even more so if we respect the quality of its cities and landscapes and enhance that quality with twenty-first century architecture.²³

In the last two decades, two dimensions of the theme 'culture and development' have been merged under the framework of intra-ministries cooperation. One dimension is domestic issues and is largely concerned with spatial planning; the other is foreign policies, and the adoption of cultural strategies for aiding economic development and the human rights of developing countries. The latter is similar to UNESCO's intentions of using heritage projects as developing strategies, as noted previously in section 1.1.1.

Regarding 'culture and development' in the domestic sphere, in the document *Art for Life's Sake: Dutch Cultural Policy in Outline*, the minister of Education, Culture and Science, Dr. Plasterk states his new directions concerning cultural heritage issues: (1) "From focusing on structures to focusing on structures in their surroundings"; (2) "From conservationist to development-driven" (2008, 29). His first point indicates a change in Dutch heritage conservation from preserving a single site or building only, to including the surrounding environment. The second point shows the ambition of the government to combine spatial planning—Dutch uniqueness—and historical conservation in shaping 'a more beautiful country' with a Dutch identity. Moreover, it shows the belief of policymakers in merging heritage projects with development strategies. Both directions actually continue previous cultural policies such as the Belvedere Programme (1999-2009) and the Action Program on Spatial Planning and Culture (2005-2008).

Usually included in the International Cultural Policy section of *Cultural Policy in the Netherlands* (2003, 2006 and 2009), the projects concerning 'shared cultural heritage' reflect the domestic cultural and socio-

political tendency to pursue targets of culture, development and Dutch cultural identity. As documented by the Centre for International Heritage Activities, projects of mutual heritage often converge with projects of the Culture and Development Programme, "which focuses on the support of cultural identity in developing countries," conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.²⁴ The Culture and Development Programme was developed in 1991 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The programme aims to use culture as a development aid in order to contribute to the cultural identity of developing countries. Within the scheme, art, movie and cultural heritage are major domains. The policy document *Art without Borders*, a letter from the Minister of Education, Culture and Science and the Minister for European Affairs to the President of the House of Representatives, describes the international cultural policy of the Netherlands from 2009 up to 2012. Building stronger ties between international cultural policy and culture and development policy is accentuated in this policy document. The *Common Cultural Heritage Policy* is one cultural strategy to aid the practice of 'cultural diplomacy'.

The Belvedere Programme

The Belvedere Programme was initiated in 1999 in the Netherlands for urban development in terms of spatial planning combining cultural history. This is a long term, state-led programme, planned to last until 2010. Two-third of the cities and one-third of total land of the Netherlands had been designated as the Belvedere area.

As stated in the memorandum document of the Belvedere programme (2000, 3), its main objectives are to view cultural historic identity as "a determining factor in the future spatial design of the Netherlands, for which government policy shall aim to create appropriate conditions". The programme will "locate, label and map all those landscape regions and cities in the Netherlands which are perceived as having a clear distinctive character and which, therefore, can

23. Quoted from *Art for Life's Sake: Dutch Cultural Policy in Outline*, 27.

24. Please refer to the official website of the CIE: Themes: Culture & Development: <http://www.heritage-activities.nl/Themes/culture-development> (accessed 20 July 2011)

contribute to the creation or enhancement of a local identity” (Ashworth et al. 2007, 64). By linking ‘cultural history’ and ‘urban planning’, this programme intends to strengthen place identity as a counterpoise to economic and cultural globalization (Ashworth et al. 2007, 65). In this regard, heritage is instrumental to urban development. Locality is regarded as a crucial element in this programme. A similar strategy in Taiwan, the project *Constructing the New Urban and Rural Landscape* (chengxiang xin fengmao 城鄉新風貌), is part of the scheme of ‘community building’. In both countries, memory and locality are used as a pragmatic means to reformulate the future of a society. In the Netherlands, this is mirrored by international cultural policy, and applied to ‘Dutch heritage overseas’.

Responses to ‘Shared Heritage’

“Since these objects were all created by Indonesians, how can you call this ‘shared’?”

After a lecture addressing issues concerning the Indonesian collection in the Netherlands at the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, one Indonesian colleague raised her hand and asked the question above. This was during one section of a summer programme arranged by the International Institute for Asian Studies in June 2011, entitled *Heritage Conserved and Contested: Asian and European Perspectives*. The organiser, the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS), aimed to carry on discussions started in the ASEM (Asia-Europe Foundation) meeting in 2010.²⁵ On these two occasions and during three other previous ministries’ proceedings,²⁶ cultural heritage has been a major theme encompassing cultural issues raised by state representatives. In the 2011 programme, particular attention was paid to the issue of ‘shared heritage’.²⁷

As ASEM (Asia-Europe Meeting) is an intra-regional platform, respecting the value of ‘cultural diversity’ has always been a focus among these discussions for pre-setting an ‘equal’ framework, accommodating countries with unbalanced economic and political statuses. Since participants of ASEM are mainly government representatives of nation-states, discussions on cultural heritage are based on state initiatives and strategies regarding national heritage. The research organiser of the 2010 roundtable meeting of IIAS indicated that the intrinsic connection between heritage and nationalism underlies the claim of cultural diversity.²⁸ In this regard, domestic diversities may be excluded for selected sites or heritage models representing the legitimated national culture and national pride. It is arguable that stressing the value of ‘diversity’ and ‘sharing’ could possibly lead to reconciling conflicts, avoiding oppression and inequality, and eventually to aiding cultural identity, sustainable development and human rights. Responding to the intrinsic conflicts resulting from nationalism and imperialism in global projects of cultural diversity, leading international institutions such as UNESCO have emphasised the direct engagement of ‘communities’ and ‘civil societies’ instead of national governments in order to prevent state oppression of diversified cultural expressions. However, how this strategy can work within the structure of country-based institutions is still being experimented with. Taiwan’s heritage projects within the state community-building scheme since the 1990s represent an example of state-initiated attempts in incorporating civic and civil societies in heritage practices. Discussions of this in Taiwan have unearthed the complexities of engaging local communities in actual heritage practice, and can be a reference for other country- or UN-based projects engaging local communities.

Moreover, the link between heritage and development promoted by diplomatic strategies ironically stresses the contrast between Europe and Asia, the

25. The title of the ASEM meeting was *The Cultural Heritages of Asia and Europe: Global Challenges and Local Initiatives* (a roundtable meeting in preparation for the Fourth ASEM Cultural Ministers’ Meeting). It was held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, on 2-3 September 2010.

26. See the Chairman’s Statement of the Fourth ASEM Cultural Ministers Meeting in Poznań, Poland, on 9-10 September 2010.

27. See the programme of *The Cultural Heritages of Asia and Europe: Global Challenges and Local Initiatives*.

28. See Background Document of *The Cultural Heritages of Asia and Europe: Global Challenges and Local Initiatives*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands on 2-3 September 2010.

West and East, the former colonizer and colonized, and the advanced and developing. In the structure of colonialism, this hierarchical contrast between the West and East was internalised in either the colonizer or colonized society in projects of modernisation; and this hierarchical relation, again, copied by the aiding/ receiving relation of development projects within the postcolonial global network. For instance, the colonial construction of modern industries and the according labour structures forged an image of modernisation and hierarchy in both the colonized and colonizer societies. The rhetoric of 'development', which prevails in the postcolonial global sphere, is analogous to the colonial hierarchy. The 'advanced', in sharing the 'best practice' of conservation, is often the one who has the economic power to decide which site to invest in financially. However, when reconnecting sites with local communities, sites which represent foreignness and colonial symbols, coloniality must be transformed and the site must produce value for the postcolonial society. In this, heritage mechanisms require further effort and a more delicate model of operation. Why, and for whom, to conserve colonial heritage is still a question in many postcolonial societies.

1.2 CONCEPTUAL THREADS

1.2.1 Memory

This thesis has two conceptual threads: memory and place. In order to clarify the problems that result from interpreting colonial heritage in the postcolonial context, the approach of memory has been applied through two stages of memory activities: in the first stage, the heritage practice involves exploring and re-collecting multiple layers of memories as uncovering the postcolonial complex. These memory activities lead to the second stage—negotiating, engaging and building sites of memories of the postcolonial communities. The memory approach can help to indicate the gap between material remains and heritage value, and to reveal the actor network of heritage practice in postcolonial places. In combination with memory, particularly through the memory acts in stage two, the concept of place or locality provides access to the core issue of transferring a colonial site into a base for locality production. This section (1.2) is to be divided into two parts: the first part discusses on the

juxtaposition of memories, and can be used to identify the meanings and contributions of colonial heritage to a postcolonial society. In this regard, heritage practice can do more than display the diversity of memories and multivocality of interpretation. Its significance lies in locality reproduction, which heritage may help society to generate. The second part of this section focuses on the concept of place and locality in order to step further into the issue of community-building through cultural heritage.

Sites of Memory

Pierre Nora proposed the concept of *lieux de mémoire* (sites of memory) in *Representation* in 1989. This reflected growing interest in memory studies since the 1980s, and has intensified debates on the relationship between memory and history in the decades since. Nora presented the idea that "memories need to be actively remembered, and thus memory needs to take root in the concrete object or site, and needs to be maintained through anniversaries or celebrations, otherwise it becomes overtaken by, or lost in, the authority held by universal claims of history" (Smith and Waterton 2009, 47). In this regard, heritage is the physical embodiment of memories. The interpretation practices at heritage sites, such as educational events, exhibition projects and ritual or ceremony occasions etc., contribute to storing, maintaining and even reshaping memories.

The concept of 'sites of memory' was explained by Nora as a modern phenomenon—something that is in-between real memory and history. He suggested that real memory lies in the unconscious and spontaneous sphere of life (e.g., in customs and habits), and that sites of memory are created and maintained through material and memory tactics. Sites of memory originate from the modern fear that "there is no spontaneous memory, that we must deliberately create archives, maintain anniversaries, organize celebrations, pronounce eulogies, and notarize bills because such activities no longer occur naturally" (Nora 1989, 12). Sites of memory are produced in the sphere between the defense and resistance of memories, between the push and pull of history.

As Nora mentions, "modern memory is, above all, archival. It relies entirely on the materiality of the

trace, the immediacy of the recording, the visibility of the image” (Nora 1989, 13). The popularity of monumentalization is evident in the Western world. This phenomenon is closely related to the postmodern nostalgia toward “origin, rootedness, and belonging” (Lowenthal 1985; Butler 2006). Hence, it has become entangled with identity issues central to nationalism. Outside the Western arena, this European-derived consciousness and strategies of using past for identity building were also shared by new nations, many of whom were released from their colonial status, intending to consolidate their national identity or legitimize the government with a version of a ‘collective’ past and future. Ferdinand de Jong and Michael Rowlands note the tendency of ‘the State in Africa’ to monumentalize itself (De Jong and Rowlands 2007, 13). This tendency was reinforced by support from UNESCO and embodied in various mnemonic tactics comprising museums, monuments, artifacts, documentation, and so forth. In Taiwan, during the memory boom in the 1990s and the decade since, the number of museums and heritage sites increased remarkably. According to statistics from the Chinese Association of Museums, in 1989-1990 the total number of museums in Taiwan was 99; yet it increased to 580 in 2007.²⁹ This, too, is in accordance with the transformation of identity politics from the Chinese-centred identity narrative under the postwar KMT rule to a Taiwan-centred narrative in the 1990s and 2000s.

Prominent memory studies have responded to emerging public culture and multicultural awareness. Barbie Zelizer (1995) reviewed the development of

memory studies and noted the contested relationship between history and memory within the realm of historical studies. Although the accuracy of memory remains a matter of debate, the emergence of memory has challenged the dominant authority of history and its profession and allowed diversified versions of the past to become visible. Michael Rowlands and Christopher Tilley (2006) noted that the sphere of public memory is mainly in the cultural, rather than scholarly, arena. Many social groups have fought for their right to select and represent their own past, coupled with their desire to participate in cultural politics and the democratic process. Since the 1980s, these struggles have appeared mainly in terms of heritage (Rowlands and Tilley 2006, 502). For instance, the issues concerning indigenous rights in terms of repatriating objects and redirecting interpretation have resulted in canonical changes in academic disciplines such as archaeology (Smith 2004). In Taiwan, the variety of heritage sites and the trend of memory recollection challenged the KMT-led narrative of Chinese identity. Spanish, Dutch, and Japanese sites, as well as indigenous and Hakka places, have been increasingly nominated for conservation. All of these sites serve as components of a unique Taiwan identity.

The fear that history may devour memories implies the contested relationship between authorised and diversified discourses of the past. Zelizer (1995) reviewed the emergence of memory studies and examined the entanglement of history and memory studies. Many history researchers have expressed their worry about the inaccuracy of memory studies; yet others, for instance the oral historians and the French Annales School, used memory studies as a meeting field for bringing in other disciplines and freshness to traditional history studies (Zelizer 1995, 216). Memory studies provided groups and subjects which had been neglected by traditional historical studies with better chances to make their voices heard. The rising vogue of popular culture assisted memory studies in challenging the authorised position of history as well. Supporters claimed that ‘collective memory’ is more vibrant than history, as they viewed it as a “history-in-motion which moves at a different pace and rate than traditional history” (Zelizer 1995, 216). However, Zelizer warned that studies on collective memory are not equal to the facts of the

29. The statistic data is slightly different from what Zhang Yuteng pointed out (see note 2). For the number of museums in 2007 refer to the website of the Chinese Association of Museums (http://www.cam.org.tw/download/museum2007_2.pdf, last accessed May 2, 2011). The number of museums in 1989/90 is based on ‘The Number of Museums in Taiwan 1989/90-1997’ <http://www.cam.org.tw/3-profession/statistics-data/02total.htm> (last accessed May 26, 2009). In 1985, the official number of *guji* (historic monument; an official category defined by the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act) was 221. See, Lin (2005, 23-24). According to the statistics of The Council of Cultural Affairs, ROC, at the end of 2000, the number of *guji* was 460. By 2004, it had increased to 592 http://event.cca.gov.tw/artsquery/93_static/統計表.pdf. In 2008, the total number of *guji* was 690. <http://www.hach.gov.tw/hach/frontsite/expService/expServiceDetailAction.do?method=doViewNewsDetail>

past. We have to be aware that the important point here is not “how accurately a recollection fitted some piece of a past reality”, but rather “why historical actors constructed their memories in a particular way at a particular time” (Zelizer 1995, 217). The vibrancy of memory reminds us to be cautious about intentions to fix, manipulate and authorise the past, which may be dressed as history or collective memory. These intentions cannot be separated from political power, for instance of a national state, as Klein (2000) warned.

This caution has equal importance to both the studies and practices of heritage. Being the materialisation of memory and history, heritage has been largely used for constructing national imagination. Through heritage legislation and management regulations, it has been regarded as an embodiment of a fixed, stable and authorised past. The memory approach helps to juxtapose representations of the past, and to unearth the hidden power network of actors. “Heritage is a cultural process”, according to Smith (2006), and the practice of heritage initiates activities of memory. In the recalling and telling process, memories are reformulated, and even altered by the tellers and interpreters. Aside from the tellers and interpreters, other actors in the heritage network can influence the interpretation. Their diversified “social frameworks of memory” (Halbwachs 1992) interact and result in an unfixed face of the past. This memory version further affects the practice and representation of heritage. Heritage is actually much less tangible than it has been regarded.

Social Frameworks of Memory

The concept of ‘social frameworks of memory’ aids the examination of the contesting and tangled pasts in the dynamic process of representing colonial sites. The social framework of memory was proposed by Maurice Halbwachs in his *On Collective Memory* (1992). Individuals formulate memories through mutual initiation and confirmation. Through this process, a collective memory is generated, maintained and re-affirmed. Furthermore, groups situated in different social frameworks—whether separated by education, socioeconomic class, gender, family, or generation—have distinctive collective memories constructed by their respective members, and these

collective frameworks are “precisely the instruments used by the collective memory to reconstruct an image of the past which is in accord, in each epoch, with the predominant thoughts of the society” (Halbwachs 1992, 40). The ‘predominant thoughts’ in the cases presented in this thesis refer to the changing national narratives and ecopolitical context. This transition has allowed Japanese associations to be accepted and even welcomed in present-day Taiwanese society.

Halbwachs’ approach is present-centred, and he states that “the beliefs, interests, and aspirations of the present shape the various views of the past as they are manifested respectively in every historical epoch” (Halbwachs 1992, 29; Introduction by Kaesler, D.). He goes on to explain that it is through the participation of group members of the current generation in commemorative meetings that “we can recreate through imaginative re-enacting a past that would otherwise slowly disappear in the haze of time” (Halbwachs 1992, 28; Introduction by Kaesler, D.). This is similar to contemporary heritage discourses—the past is a product of the present mind. Yet there is still continuity of the collective memory. The perception of the past, constructed by a specific group within its own social framework, is formed and maintained through continuous mutual recognition such as commemorations and ‘physical props’ such as monuments, archives and objects. This echoes the social practices of many contemporary institutions like museums and heritage sites. Being locations of “secular ritual” (Duncan 1995), museum and heritage places often serve as an instrument to maintain a version of the past by continuous events for instance cultural activities and exhibitions.

Jan Assmann further develops the concept of collective memory proposed by Halbwachs. Although the distinction between cultural memory and history itself is questionable, Assmann elaborates on the social dimension of collective memory and offers insight into the formation of identity through memory tactics. He proposes a transition from communicative memory, characterized by its temporality, to cultural memory “the area of objectivised culture” (Assmann 1995, 128). The identity of a group of people is forged and solidified through “formative and normative impulses” from the knowledge produced by cul-

tural memory. Cultural memory, different from communicative memory, has fixed points, and these points are “figures of memory,” consisting of “fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance)” (Assmann 1995, 129). This resonates with Nora’s concept of sites of memory. A sense of identity is shaped, reinforced, and represented by sites of memory—or, to use Assmann’s words, *figures of memory*. These sites of memory are sustained only through the continuous practice of mnemonic tactics.

Ambiguities of Heritagizing Colonial Sites

When sites of multiple memories, such as colonial places, are created with the intention to produce a single locality, a transformation is necessary. This transformation needs to take into account the questions of how and to what extent a site can be commonly accepted. Heritage cannot be separated from the concepts of inheritance, volition, identification, and ownership (Howard 2003). Hence, *heritage* is legitimized and sustained by the communal recognition of a group of people. This recognition is based on their collective sense of belonging and connection to the material existence. The connection is usually in the form of memory. When a heritage site is legitimized as a place of local distinctiveness and local pride, this site is supposed to represent a local past, already collectively recognized by local people in terms of their collective memory. In the case of colonial heritage, this premise is ambiguous. Three levels of colonial ambiguity emerge in the process of ‘monumentalizing’ colonial sites: first, the gap between the material fabric of colonial remains and the cultural context of the postcolonial society; second, the difference between the subject of memory and the subject of heritage; and third, the substantial discordance between coloniality and locality. Regarding the first level of ambiguity, the material fabric of colonial remains left in the postcolonial locale is situated in a culturally diversified context. During the process of heritage interpretation for instance, by means of architectural restoration, interior display, or cultural activities, the cultural context of the heritage site is foreign to the postcolonial society. Hence interpretative activities often seem isolated, temporary and ambiva-

lent before a postcolonial audience. For example, Japanese architecture is the product of Japanese artisan craft and living customs. Thus, the renovation of a Japanese temple in Taiwan is often faced with a lack of the necessary artisan skills. The associated cultural activities in Japanese style, according to the historical and cultural background of the site, may also seem ambivalent and unfamiliar to the postcolonial Taiwanese residents and cultural workers. Moreover, this ambiguity makes the conservation principle of authenticity questionable. In the case of Taiwan, some Japanese sites endure more changes than others at the hands of later generations. If the purpose of renovating the site is to represent local memories and to catalyze community awareness, it is questionable whether it is necessary to return the site to its original Japanese condition by removing later changes. Defining whose version is authentic inevitably removes others from the recognized past.

Regarding the second level of ambiguity, the original owner of the material remains and direct memory is cut off, thus removing the strong ties connecting the place and sense of belonging. Under the new demands of heritage, these colonial sites are transformed into places of local heritage. However, considering the significance of heritage, which is usually associated with the concepts of inheritance, ownership, volition, and belonging, sites of ‘colonial heritage’ are tied only weakly to the place and to current communities who were previously the inferior group in the colonial social hierarchy and who often kept their distance from the places belonging to the superior group. For instance, many Japanese residences in Taiwan were the accommodation of Japanese officials or company administrators. Under the discriminatory treatment of the Taiwanese during colonial times, most locals were not able to live in these residences. With no living experiences or active memories connected to these residences, the postcolonial local communities have little connection to these sites.

This is also related to the third level of ambiguity: in the era of community building, heritage is a means of strengthening local identity by a sense of rootedness and belonging. However, this intention goes against the coloniality residing in the material remains in terms of the structural inequality caused by colonial

hierarchy, which often is not realized by the postcolonial communities and removed from the current society. If interpretative activities are not initiated, decolonization will not take place, as local communities would not participate in deciding on their heritage and future.

Ultimately, I would argue that a colonial site has to go through two stages of transformation when becoming a site of locality. In the first stage, the site needs to be open to the dialogue of multiple memories and to the exploration of memories that used to be marginalized. This is also what is involved in the process of decolonization. Through this open dialogue, a recognized representation of the past is gradually generated for the production of sites of memory. This awareness of community leads to the second stage, where the sites of memory are transformed into sites of locality. A collective version of the future is formulated in the long-term process of maintaining the sites of memory and transforming these sites into sites of locality. This version is anchored in the multifaceted locality, which comprises dimensions of civil awareness, social welfare, environmental concern, economic improvement, and so forth. The sites of memory, in this regard, are no longer the demonstration of a homogenizing national identity, suppressing other identities within or across the national boundary, but are rather a social agent pursuing a future with humanistic concerns.

The Future of Memory and Heritage Studies

Memory studies up to now have constituted a remarkable challenge to dominant narratives of the past. Diversified memories have been continuously unearthed within the "First World", especially memories from the previous peripheries, for instance the memories of females, labourers, indigenous and colonized people, although many of these memories continue to be ignored. This is similar to the heritage field. The claim of multiple interpretation and community participation has been pronounced in the relevant fields of anthropology, archaeology and museology. However, as Confino (1997) argued, contemporary memory studies often pay much attention to trivial, individual studies, and yet neglect their relationship with the social context. Often there seems to be a focus on political issues, while "the

effect of memory on the organization, hierarchization, and arrangements of social and cultural relationships" is ignored (Confino 1997, 1393). Moreover, representations of the past are merely discussed, with only a rare examination of how these representations are received. It is insufficient for memory studies to simply display multiplicities of memories and not try to figure out how national manipulation is internalised into personal conceptions in daily lives. Nowadays, the interpretation of heritage sites is required to address multiple voices. However, aside from the juxtaposition of diversity, is there any advancing vision of human societies that memory and heritage practices can assist? If not, the future of memory and heritage studies may be condemned within the boundaries of cultural relativism.

The core issue concerning the use of memory and that which explains the booming phenomena of memory studies is the role of the nation. As Appadurai (2008) describes, the "general business of retrieving the past, remembering, materializing that memory and commemorating it" actually "leads directly to the business of the nation" (Appadurai 2008). The construction of national imagination requires the 'signatures of the visible' (Appadurai 2008, 215), visible devices for displaying and legitimating national identity such as monuments, rituals, ceremonies, archives, museum displays and so on. In this regard, museums, heritage sites and archaeology as 'signatures of the visible' create products to stress national identity or add to the political profile of the nation-state or its political figures. The practice of recollection in many cases has led to large scale ethnic violence. Is there any form of recollection less "predatory" (Appadurai 2008), which does not exclude others? Is it possible that a representation in an exhibition hall shows multiple memories? This question was posed by Appadurai and is still awaiting an answer.

Moreover, the approach of memory reveals a profound struggle within heritage discourse and practice: although 'heritage' is gradually being recognised as a cultural process, when we get into the actual practices, for instance the designation procedure, renovation, display etc., a fixed version of representing heritage is unavoidable. To renovate a building, the version of the past needs to be decided

in advance because it affects the construction material and architectural form used by the constructor. Standardization is also required to meet the demands of management. However, who decides these criteria? Which memory are these criteria to be based on? If memory studies contribute to challenging existing authority by representing diversified pasts, how can the representation of multiplicity be put into practice when the conservation and management of heritage inevitably shows a materialised, frozen, homogenized, single past? Regarding the sites of colonial heritage, usually extremely contested sites of memories, the issue of representation is not only a process of competing and negotiating, but also process of re-awakening, re-occupying or even removing localities.

1.2.2 Place and Locality

1.2.2.1 Place, Site and Landscape

There are three terms with a spatial connotation frequently seen within the context of heritage management: place, site, and landscape. The meaning of place is differentiated from the neutral and physical term 'space'. 'Place' is not simply a physical container, as space is. It is characterised by its bond to lived experiences, and has a dialectical relationship with human perception, emotion and social reactions. Space turns into place "through traditions, memories, myths and narratives and its uniqueness confirmed and legitimated in terms of their relationship to particular representations of the past" (Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge 2007, 54). The term "sense of place" (Tuan 1977) is closely related to the identity-building of a community through its communal perception of a place. Sense of place provides a sense of rootedness and belonging for an individual or group identity to reside. At the same time, place is a contesting field for identities. One's perception and interpretation of a place may differ from other groups and individuals. The discourse of how power relationships manipulate place has emerged in the Western arena, while the conflicts between old authorities and indigenous communities have been intense during recent decades. Heritage is a place where identity is created and contested, and as Smith (2006, 75) notes, "[i]n a very real sense heritage becomes a cultural tool that nations, societies, communities and individuals use

to express, facilitate and construct a sense of identity, self and belonging in which the 'power of place' is invoked in its representational sense to give physical reality to these expressions and experiences". The issue of multivocality of place expands the boundaries constructed by attempts to fix an identity on a place.

The term 'site' is used frequently in the field of archaeology to represent the physical base for archaeologists to excavate the past materials and to construct the meaning of the 'authentic' past. The frequency of usage within the field of archaeology has been gradually replaced by 'place', as seen in the heritage charters and documents internationally circulated, for instance the Australian *Burra Charter* and the English *Power of Place*. This rhetoric change implies a transformation from traditional beliefs about a stable and fixed 'site' where 'authentic' knowledge is discovered and produced scientifically, to a less tangible 'place', connecting people through sense of identity. The meaning of a heritage place is expanded and differs depending on different groups of people. The change from site to place signifies an essential change in Western heritage discourse, particularly regarding the emerging issue of community in perceiving the heritage place.

Landscape is an issue of long-term concern in Western academic circles. It has been recognised more as a symbolic sign rather than concrete space for dwelling (Ashworth et al. 2007). Stephen Daniels (1993) sees landscape as echoing, negotiating and being "encoded" by social, political and cultural complexes. As Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007) explain, this works through two dimensions: first, landscape continuously interacts with the changes of diverse identities, reflecting the social differences represented by multiple images and representations. Second, landscape, as a huge-scale visible landmark which can be perceived by people at a distance and from different angles always invites multiple interpretations. Hence "a single landscape can be viewed simultaneously in a variety of ways, emphasising how hegemonic interpretations are always open to subversion" (Ashworth et al. 2007, 61).

In the *Burra Charter*, place is defined as a "site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include compo-

nents, spaces and views". Place seems a neutral and physical environment in which 'cultural significance' is performed. This is related to its function. Cultural significance was proposed by the Australian ICOMOS as part of the criteria for heritage management. In order to put into practice at sites, the definition has to be concrete; however, the rather ideological term 'cultural significance' has been proposed by the Australian ICOMOS to replace 'place' in order to reopen the heritage sphere to multiple communities. It is always difficult to define physical boundaries and regulations for ideological intentions. What does 'cultural significance' mean and how to put it into practice? The question is still debatable.

1.2.2.2 Meaning of Locality

In order to unearth the meaning of 'locality', three frameworks need to be reviewed: first, the definition of locality within the context of globalization; second, Japan's famous model of 'community building'—*machizukuri*. This model had a remarkable impact on the policies and practices of Taiwan's community building promoted by the state in the 1990s and 2000s. Third, we need to look at the overwhelming phenomenon of *indigenization* in Taiwan during the past decades. The indigenization phenomenon accentuates living experiences and emotional connectedness to Taiwan, and this has become a core subject in many fields, for instance literature, historical research and education.

Locality and Globalization

Localization is frequently understood as a reaction to globalization. It is related to the local reactions to resist or appropriate the exterior forces and influences brought by globalization. Aside from the 'locality' produced at actual locations, usually the peripheries, the fact that locality production lies in non-spatial spheres has also been noted by researchers. In his book *Modernity at Large*, Appadurai (1996) defines locality as "a complex phenomenological quality, constituted by a series of links between the sense of social immediacy, the technologies of interactivity, and the relativity of contexts" (Appadurai 1996, 178). He used the term 'neighbourhood' as a concept paired with locality, referring to "the actually existing social forms in which locality, as a dimension or va-

lue, is variably realized. Neighbourhoods, in this usage, are situated communities characterised by their actuality, whether spatial or virtual, and their potential for social reproduction" (Appadurai 1996, 179). Neighbourhood is a relatively concrete and spatial form, consisting of local knowledge and social links. Appadurai regards locality as existing and being maintained by constant activity, for instance ritual performance and social activity. He asserts "locality as a phenomenological property of social life, a structure of feeling that is produced by particular forms of intentional activity and that yields particular sorts of material effects" (Appadurai 1996, 182). In this regard, heritage and museums are the social practice of locality production. Furthermore, locality is not necessarily tied to a concrete location. Under the circumstances of immigration, internet communication and electronic media, the collective imagination of locality is not restricted to an actual geographical point. It can be possibly generated and maintained in hybrid locations, like the cases of 'China Towns' all over the world.

Japan's *Machizukuri* 町作

The Japanese model of *machizukuri* has been the most influential model on Taiwan's community-building. The model was brought in as part of Taiwan's policy-making framework by governor Chen Chi-nan 陳其南, a member of the central government during the transition of political ideologies from Chinese nationalist to the indigenization of Taiwan in the 1990s. In order to understand the meaning of 'locality' in contemporary Taiwan, the aims, features and practices of *machizukuri* need to be understood first.

Machizukuri is composed of two words in Japanese: *machi* (community) and *zukuri* (making). Watanabe (2007) presented the rhetorical meanings and hence the characteristics of this wide-spread phenomenon in 1990s' Japan. *Machi* has two corresponding Chinese characters: 町 (neighbourhood) or 街 (street). Both contribute to its implications: first, the scale of *machizukuri* is small. In contrast to the national and prefectural scale of urban planning, *machizukuri* relates to planning in neighbourhoods and streets. Second, *machizukuri* refers to the physical (街, street) and the non-physical (町, neighbourhood) simulta-

neously. It encompasses not only the urban infrastructure and housing environment, but also the welfare and culture of the local community. Furthermore, the word *zukuri* highlights the importance of a 'process'. Rather than creating a perfect final 'product', *machizukuri* is more concerned with a continuing process of community participation. According to Watanabe, *zukuri* also implies 'handmade'. He suggests the "surprise and joy when people began to realize that they can now create themselves something that used to be monopolized and made only by the experts of the market and government" (Watanabe 2007, 41). Although the definition and practice of *machizukuri* has diversified and not every case yields a successful result, we may understand it through its targets and orientation.

Machizukuri is an outcome of Japan's economic and political changes in recent decades. These changes were largely in response to the environmental crisis after rapid economic growth in the 1960s, a contesting relationship between the central and local governments, political transitions in the leading party, and the bursting of the bubble economy in the 1990s. These factors together stimulated *machizukuri*. Within the social context, local residents realised the need to participate in the process of creating a liveable and sustainable place. They adopted consistent and gradual changes to the existing environmental fabric rather than huge development projects and the construction of new buildings. They made efforts to create a 'shared place' based on their cultural uniqueness, lifestyles and local characters. Conserving the historical fabric is one of the core elements, consistent with environmental concerns, citizens' welfare, and civil participation, contributing to an ideal model of *machizukuri*. These concerns are aims of Taiwan's community-building as well and are the core issues of locality reproduction in this thesis. The definition of locality in this regard relates to the communal consciousness of a shared place, and the recognition of the uniqueness of this place. This consciousness is actualised by the autonomous participation in planning, the efforts in maintaining and improving the living environment, and the civil awareness of fighting for welfare and own-lifestyles in the place. Heritage has great power to mediate the production of locality.

Taiwan's Indigenization (bentuhua 本土化)

The concepts of place and locality gained particular attention in Taiwan within the trend of indigenization. This term in Taiwan's context is better seen as a contrast to Sinicization, rather than Westernization or globalization. The core consciousness of indigenization is to reconnect the people to the land of Taiwan. It is closely related to the Chinese term *xiangtu* 鄉土, which is composed of two words: 'hometown' (*xiang*) and 'soil' (*tu*). The spatial scale of *xiangtu* is relatively small, usually not larger than a county in regards to administrative area. This allows *xiangtu* to act in accordance with the national narrative. It was able to escape from the Chinese national narrative because it could be explained as the concern for rural hometowns, but still under the larger national imagination.

Indigenization was first used by the Nativist Literature movement in the 1970s in Taiwan.³⁰ Still under the oppressive Chinese nationalist ideology, many authors who wrote about subjects relating to living experiences in Taiwan became entangled in an enormous debate with other groups of writers. A-Chin Hsiao (2000) discusses the transformation of collective memory in the narration of Nativist Literature after the early 1970s. In the development of historical narratives, the history of Taiwan and the history of *xiangtu* emerged as part of the major discourses and gradually transformed and gained superior status. Knowledge of local geography and history was accentuated and became an essential subject in the obligatory education system. The place of Taiwan and local area replaced 'China' for the location of national identity. In this regard, locality (*difangxing* 地方性) is the product of indigenization, a feature of 'genuine' Taiwanese culture. It serves as a location of identity and collective imagination.

30. Nativist Literature Movement (Xiangtu Wenxue Yundong 鄉土文學運動) marked a refocus in literature on the themes of Taiwan, for instance the living experiences of common people, as opposed to the absence of Taiwan under the political propaganda of the KMT. However, this provoked fierce debate. Within the authoritarian political atmosphere under the KMT rule, Nativist Literature was attacked by other groups of writers and called 'labourers' literature' (in other words, the 'communist' literature), or as a promoter for the Taiwan separatist movement.

The conceptual content of locality was further expanded by community-building projects in the 1990s and 2000s. Against a background of a change in national narratives, the transformation of economic structures and the rise of local governments, community-building was heavily promoted by the central government. The name of this nation-wide project was the Integrated Community-Making Programme (*shequ zongti yingzao* 社區總體營造). The phrase *shequ yingzao* (社區營造) has symmetry with its Japanese counterpart: *shequ* 社區 mirrors *machi* 町, as both mean community or neighbourhood; *yingzao* 營造 parallels *zukuri* 作, as both refer to making, building and constructing. This shows the Japanese influence on Taiwan's community construction and the vision and definition of locality. Community-building in Taiwan has three targets: making landscape, making people and making industry (*zaojing, zaoren, zaochan* 造景, 造人, 造產). Hence, locality is characterised by its spatial aesthetics, citizen awareness and economic ability.

By viewing an array of concepts, from space to locality, we have seen that the meaning of locality comprises dimensions of identity building, a sense of community, citizenship, environmental care and economic purpose. A vision of the future which lies in locality is pursued through heritage places in Taiwan. This corresponds to the transformation of identity narratives. This strategy is ambiguously applied to colonial heritage, which originally was intended as a spatial device to mark the local sense of place as inferior to the imagination of a faraway home country.

1.3 TAIWAN, JAPAN AND THE NETHERLANDS: SCALE AND CRITERIA

Despite the fact that this research is mainly concerned with the representation of Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan, in order to look deeper into this theme we need a broader framework. Heritage originates from responses to the social situations of contemporary society. The past is used to deal with present issues and to plan future strategies. Hence studying a heritage site is inseparable from an understanding of its historical layers, scientific attributes, social factors, economic impact and actor network. In the case of colonial sites, historical layers are of particular importance regarding the recollection of

multiple memories. Furthermore, the concept of heritage in Taiwan is a Western import. This concept was first recognised by government officials and researchers of Taiwan in investigating its Japanese and Korean counterparts, before the official legislation of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act in 1982.³¹ The heritage legislation and policies of Taiwan refer to conventions and models approved by UNESCO and ICOMOS, even though Taiwan is not recognized as a member of the United Nations. To understand heritage development in Taiwan we have seen the operation of a global heritage mechanism in section 1.1.1. Furthermore, UNESCO is a governmental institution, and its heritage activities actually operate within state-state networks. Regarding the theme of colonial heritage, investigating the Netherlands' activities in colonial heritage in both the international and domestic spheres helps to elaborate the ideology and operation of the international mechanism as introduced in section 1.1.2.

1.3.1 Case Studies in Japanese Colonial Heritage in Taiwan

In order to appreciate the actual situation of representing Japanese sites at local places in Taiwan, this research analyses five Japanese sites in Taiwan: one in the north, one in the centre, one in the south and two in the east. The sites are: Jinguashi Mining Remains 金瓜石, Tongxiao Shinto Shrine 通霄神社, Ciaotou Sugar Factory 橋頭糖廠, Qingxiu Yuan 慶修院 and Jiangjunfu Residential Area 將軍府. The data in the case studies mainly stem from two sources. One source is reports of planning and renovation, research on local history, oral records concerning the site, publications of site managers, news reports etc. The other source is field studies, including interviews and participant observation (Jinguashi), conducted by the author from 2006 to 2011 and from 2002 to 2005 for the participant observations of Jinguashi.

31. See *Taiwan Folkways* 1982: 32: 2.



Fig. 1.3.1 Geographical Distribution of Selected Sites.
The map was created by Hsu Wei-jung 許維蓉.

This research has selected sites with as much variety as possible in order to unearth the full complexity of Taiwan's heritage practices, particularly their difficulties in interpreting and managing Japanese sites. The research period is from the 1990s until the year 2008, when the state community-building programme was shrunk to a smaller scale according to the changes of the incumbent party and policy focuses.³²

Scale of Cases: defining 'local'

These sites are relatively small if we compare them to many research titles concerning national or world heritage sites. All cases here are county-managed heritage sites. This criteria of scale aims to look into the actual complexity of heritage practice in a post-colonial locale, especially within the context of the rising importance of local governments in the 1990s and 2000s. These microscopic studies represent real actors participating in and influencing heritage-making. In the instance of a global-local nexus, the meaning of 'local' refers to the counterpart of global or international. In other words, 'local' often refers to a country government in contrast to global intra-governmental institutes, such as the UN or UNESCO when regarding the global heritage mechanism. In contrast the 'local' here does not refer to the local state government in the nexus of global-local within the international heritage arena, but it refers to a concrete geographical 'local' area in which a sense of place, bodily experiences, memory and identity of communities can root.

This is due to the intrinsic connection between heritage and the nation-state. It is agreed by researchers that the emergence of heritage is closely related to the rise of nationalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the European context, and this connection has been strengthened by most newly independent nations, particularly postcolonial ones. They implemented heritage for identity building, raising their national profiles and attracting international investment. While recognising this, the thesis defines 'local' as an actual locale where the dynamics of heritage practice is actually going on and actors are directly interacting and influencing the heritage practice at the site. The scale of 'local' in this thesis is much smaller than the nation-state and smaller even than province and county, but may equal a village or several neighbourhoods in direct relation to the heritage site studied. In this regard, I would like to explore the autonomy of individuals and communities amid the dynamics of heritage construction, seeing heritage as more than simply a vir-

32. In 2008, the incumbent party was changed from DPP

(Democratic Progressive Party) to KMT (Kuomintang; Chinese Nationalist Party).

tual product of nationalism, intra-state power play or global mechanisms. Such small-scale cases enable a better examination of 'social frameworks' and contesting memories, since memory relies on an intimacy of person(s). Through observing how local actors receive and respond to the dominant narratives of the state concerning heritage and community making, it is possible to see social agency and recognise the role of local actors as active subjects in contributing to and negotiating with the 'predominant thoughts',³³ not simply acting as an unconscious mechanical element of the state, a group or a period.

Built heritage is the main research target of this thesis. Architecture itself and the attached environment are both incorporated into the investigation. The scale of a 'neighbourhood' is considered the basic size of my research field. A 'neighbourhood' in this regard does not refer to an administration district like a *li*里 (residential unit) or *cun*村 (village) as is normal in Taiwan when talking about community. The relations between the heritage site and their neighbourhood area are paid particular attention in this research. Two points are important here: first, the concern of integrity in preserving built heritage; and second, the actor network of heritage activities relating to the site is closely associated with local actors in the neighbourhood. The definition of neighbourhood in this thesis refers to Appadurai's assertion that "neighbourhoods are situated communities characterised by their actuality, whether spatial or virtual, and their potential for social reproduction" (Appadurai 1996, 179). Even though community is always a vague concept and is difficult to define, or may even have not formed yet in the local area, it is important to identify the subjects of memories, the acts of the subjects in the heritage or sites of memory construction and the products of their acts. A neighbourhood is a reasonable size for this consideration.

Criteria of Selection

Heritage awareness and discourse in Taiwan emerged mainly from conservation issues regarding *guji* 古蹟 (historic monuments) within the professional field of

architecture. This led to the institutionalization of heritage studies in Taiwan mainly within the field of architecture. In order to present the context of heritage development in Taiwan, a selection of built heritage is taken into consideration in this research: all five sites are built and tangible heritage as UNESCO has defined it.

All five sites were constructed during the Japanese colonial period (1895-1945), and have retained most features of the Japanese building fabric. They (or partial buildings within the defined complex) are all 'historic monuments' or 'historic buildings' under the framework of the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act, and all were renovated in the 1990s and 2000s in accordance with the 'era of localism' defined by this thesis. Regarding their original functions, two are former industrial sites, two are religious sites and the other is an area for military residences. As for their current use and managing bodies: Jinguashi Mining Remains were planned as a museum park, and are managed by a museum team of county government. Ciaotou Sugar Factory is a cultural park, managed by Taiwan Sugar Cooperation, a national enterprise. Part of the park is used by a local cultural society for art and cultural activities. Qingxiu Yuan is open for visits, and currently (2011) managed by the Hualien County Bureau of Cultural Affairs. Jiangjunfu Residences are partly used as a community centre for community activities and a display of local history. Tongxiao Shinto Shrine is managed by Tongxiao Township Office. All five sites belong to public departments, including local governments, national enterprises and a national ministry.

1.4 THESIS STRUCTURE AND CHAPTER PLAN

Chapter One: Introduction

This thesis intends to explore the possibility of transforming colonial remains into postcolonial heritage. That is to say, it is an attempt to see how locality reproduction can be mediated by the practices of colonial heritage. Thus in the first chapter we began with a discussion of the major conceptual context: memory and locality. The memory approach allows an in-depth overview of colonial heritage as a contesting field of memories with diverse social frame-

33. See Section 1.2.1, Page 23.

works. When applying the memory approach to ‘colonial heritage’—the phrase itself is an ambiguous combination—memory recollection presents a fundamental gap between the material fabric and the sense of place with which a local heritage is normally endowed. This gap implies the difficulties heritage practitioners may face when dealing with colonial heritage in the postcolonial context.

The first chapter has provided a framework for this research, taking three dimensions of the framework into consideration: the global heritage mechanism of colonial built heritage, the theoretical threads of memory and locality in examining the nature and ambiguity of colonial heritage, and the scale and criteria of selecting case studies from Taiwan’s Japanese colonial sites.

Taiwan’s heritage policies and conceptualization process mainly reflect influences from international institutions. ‘Heritage’ is a new, imported concept and often shows an interpretative gap from the Chinese translation of *wenhua zichan* 文化資產. This importation was in accordance with globalising forces in the post Cold War re-composition of world order, and Taiwan’s domestic social change in the wake of fast-paced industrialisation, urbanisation and political democratization. As Taiwan’s heritage policies and practice mostly refer to conventions and models legitimated by international institutions such as UNESCO and ICOMOS—even though Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations—it is necessary to know the global context within which Taiwan appropriates these international conventions. A part of this chapter has elaborated this global framework in relation to cultural and colonial heritage.

Chapter Two: Japanese ‘Heritage’ in Postcolonial Taiwan

This section examines the ambiguity of representing Japanese colonial heritage in Taiwan. The conceptual significance of *heritage*, *memory* and *place* are explored and used to examine the general phenomena of interpreting Japanese colonial remains as local heritage. The first part discusses the gap between heritage intentions and the colonial fabric. It begins with the ambiguity of embedding *heritage*, a term closely associated with concepts of volition, identifi-

cation, people and ownership (Howard 2003), in the material remains left by people who are geographically remote and even historically antagonistic to the current local community. This section further presents the phenomenon of the memory boom in Taiwan in the 1990s and 2000s. This memory boom was a consequence of political and economic changes during the period, namely the ‘era of localism’. The latter part of this chapter presents the development of heritage discourses and practices within the context of ‘community building’. It examines how Japanese colonial remains entered the category of ‘heritage’ in Taiwan and shows the link between this ‘heritagization’ process and emerging localism, and also the pro-Japanese attitude shaped within the structure of dual colonialism.

Chapter Three: Single Case Study: Jinguashi Mining Remains

This thesis began its discussion at the scale of the global heritage arena before reducing its perspective to the nation of Taiwan. In Chapters Three and Four it then moves to concrete sites in a micro-frame. In order to reveal problematical issues of heritage practice generated in the postcolonial context, this research will focus on an in-depth single case study and a multicase study. The case studies are divided into two parts: the first part (chapter three) concentrates on a single case, the Jinguashi Mining Remains; the second part (chapter four) examines the four remaining sites as a multiple case study. The single case study aims to provide an in-depth perspective and to serve as the discussion basis for the multicase study.

This chapter on the Jinguashi Mining Remains delves further into the issues of representing Japanese colonial heritage from four dimensions: contested memories resulting from layered colonialism; issues of the top-down community approach in representing the site as an ecomuseum; colonial ambiguities which emerged from interpretative activities in the process of heritage making; and difficulties in reproducing locality within the postcolonial actor network. This case exemplifies many local heritage-building initiatives within the prevailing localism in contemporary Taiwan, as well as the role of the emerging local governments in this memory boom.

The authorised discourses of community-building and the implementation of heritage activities have been re-appropriated in the locale and revised in on-going negotiations.

Chapter Four: Multiple Case Analysis

Here four sites are analysed: Tongxiao Shinto Shrine, Ciaotou Sugar Factory, Qingxiu Yuan and Jiangjunfu Residences. The case of Tongxiao Shinto Shrine elaborates on the contested nature of Japanese colonial sites in Taiwan. Owing to the dual colonialism structure of Taiwan, interpretative activities represent the negotiation of memories of generations and social groups in connection to the site. The case of Qingxiu Yuan, also a religious site, identifies a controversial situation between different ethnic groups. However, memory activities have continued at Qingxiu Yuan, which allows the process of making *sites of memory* to continue. This process has been stopped in the case of Tongxiao Shinto Shrine, and no ongoing interpretative activities have been held since renovation was completed in 2005. In the cases of Ciaotou Sugar

Factory and Jiangjunfu Residences, community initiatives were crucial to the conservation and development of the area. Heritage activities have evoked feelings of belonging, rootedness and pride in both cases, and initiated civil awareness, strengthening the sense of community. However, the trend of heritage commoditisation in close relation to the ideology of development and global consumerism seems to underlie these autonomous acts. Regarding the case of Japanese built heritage, this underlying strength ironically links with the image of Japan in the mass-circulation of media commodities. As a result, the sense of locality and rootedness shaped by community-building heritage activities must inevitably face co-optation by commoditised Japanization. Further observation is required to see whether the grassroots initiatives may transform the colonality of the site to locality production, or whether we will witness a merger with global consumerism. Will these sites eventually become like many other exotic tourist sites representing commoditising homogeneity rather than locality?