

# 複數歷史之必要： 邁向全球藝術視角下的「臺灣展覽史」\*

The Necessity of Taiwan Exhibition Histories:  
From Global Art Perspective\*

國立臺北教育大學文化創意產業經營學系助理教授

Assistant Professor, Department of Cultural Creative Industries Management,  
National Taipei University of Education

呂佩怡

LU, Pei-Yi

國立台灣美術館  
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts

\* 此文為研討會現場發言稿6000字之整理與再增加內容而成。然而，筆者的研究主要以80年代之後的當代策展為主，對於展覽史之初步觀察還未能成為學術論文，有待未來的深入研究與繼續書寫。

## 摘要

展覽史 (Exhibition Histories) 是從全球藝術 (Global Art) 的角度，重新思考西方藝術史在1989年之後是否適用於其他地域？這個帶有複數、強調多元的展覽史，不同於以往以歐洲為中心的現代主義普世美學概念，進而重視全球南方 (Global South) 的案例，從結構性的全球變遷來思考。本文將從全球藝術之角度，複數的歷史，透過詢問展覽之意義，展覽史與藝術史之間的關係，理解展覽史之價值，思索臺灣的展覽史<sup>1</sup>之可能。本文強調展覽史可作為藝術史之批判，此一以複數形式出現的展覽史，不僅顛覆西方單一藝術史中心的藝術史書寫，也可透過展覽與歷史之間的動態關係，展開多元可能性，例如視展覽為重述歷史之方案、視展覽為反映公共文化史之可能、視展覽為對其自身機制之批判等。本文認為具複數歷史之「臺灣展覽史」必須以臺灣的多重殖民歷史，以及全球地緣政治之位置來思考，不僅處理臺灣內部之議題，也以跨國界、跨領域、跨文化之觀看，關注鄰近的亞洲地區，將「臺灣展覽史」置於更大格局的全球藝術範疇來思考。

關鍵字：展覽史、全球藝術、臺灣展覽史、公共文化史

國立台灣美術館  
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts

\* 此文為研討會現場發言稿6000字之整理與再增加內容而成。然而，筆者的研究主要以80年代之後的當代策展為主，對於展覽史之初步觀察還未能成為學術論文，有待未來的深入研究與繼續書寫。

1. 此處「臺灣展覽史」將指稱早期展覽的歷史以及80年代之後當代策展的範疇。

## 前言

展覽史 (Exhibition Histories) 此一詞彙出自於二〇一〇年Afterall出版一系列的「展覽史」叢書，<sup>2</sup>這個系列叢書是延伸兩個與展覽相關的研討會而來：二〇〇八年在泰德現代館舉辦的「里程碑展覽」研討會 (Landmark Exhibitions) 討論六十年代之後至今的重要展覽及其貢獻；二〇〇九年於泰德英國館的「展覽與無邊世界」 (Exhibition and the World at Large) 探討一九八九年之後全球化脈絡之下的展覽製作，集中以三個展覽為案例。此一系列展覽史叢書第一本討論兩個1969年的展覽，將1969年視為當代策展的開端。第二本與第三本即以「製造全球藝術」 (Making Art Global) 為主標題，一本討論1989年的「大地魔術師」 (Les Magiciens de la Terre) 展覽；另一本討論同年展出的第三屆哈瓦那雙年展，這兩個展覽見證1989年前後的全球巨變，反映世界的轉向，包括柏林圍牆的倒塌、象徵性的冷戰結束，以及各地域之間交流、互動、交換日益頻繁。1989年之前所謂的「國際」 (international)，尤其是藝術界，僅限歐美國家。1989年之後隨著國際社會政治經濟的劇烈轉變，關注的焦點不僅於歐美，而將眼光轉向全球其他地域，以上兩個展覽也標示展覽史的重要轉折階段——從歐美到全球。

從這個脈絡來看，Afterall出版的展覽史 (Exhibition Histories) —— 這個帶有複數性的展覽歷史 —— 是將1989年作為一個思考起點，並從全球藝術 (Global Art) 的角度重新思考，質問具有獨佔性質的西方藝術史是否仍適用討論當代藝術，並討論展覽史如何不同於藝術史，展覽史是否更可以回應這個全球藝術之現狀等問題。本文將以全球藝術的複數性特質，思索建構臺灣展覽史之可能。本文第一部份從全球藝術角度出發，探討當代藝術的新視野。第二部份說明藝術史與展覽史之差異。第三部份理解展覽史之價值。第四部份轉向討論臺灣狀況，從史觀轉向，文化轉向與學科轉向，來看目前既有的微量研究，試圖為空缺的臺灣展覽史提出可能。結論提出以全球藝術視野，邁向以臺灣為主體思考、具複數歷史的臺灣展覽史。

### 一、全球藝術視野

八十年代諸位藝術史學家紛紛以藝術終結為論述，試圖展現異於以往的現代主義主導的藝術世界。美國藝術哲學家與學者亞瑟·丹托 (Arthur C. Danto) 1984年的論文〈藝術終結〉 (The End of Art) 宣告藝術歷史告終，認為大論述或藝術進化觀點的終結。他在1997年的《在藝術終結之後：當代藝術與歷史藩籬》 (After The End of Art) 一書進一步闡述其觀念，認為當代藝壇的發展或許正是藝術哲學化的結果：傳統論述築起的高牆倒下，現代主義奉為主臬的純粹性消失，藝術活動不再定繪畫於一尊，連帶地美術館的定位都要重新調整，當代藝術世界所展現出來的是前所未見的多元化面貌<sup>3</sup>。

2. 展覽史系列出版網頁<https://www.afterall.org/books/exhibition.histories/> (瀏覽時間2018.04.01)。目前為止這一系列展覽史叢書已出版九本展覽史專書，案例遍及南美洲 (哈瓦那、聖保羅雙年展)、亞洲 (清邁藝術節) 等地域。

3. 亞瑟·丹托著，林雅琪、鄭惠雯譯，《在藝術終結之後：當代藝術與歷史藩籬》，臺北，麥田，2004。

大約同時，德國藝術史與當代影像與理論學者漢斯·貝爾亭（Hans Belting）1983年出版《藝術史終結了嗎？》（*Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte?*）一書，批判自文藝復興時期瓦薩里所提出的「進步觀」以來的藝術史，指出藝術史與當下環境，以及實踐的脫節已造成藝術史學科本身的侷限。1995年改以《藝術史終結：十年後的回顧》做為第二版本，2003年再以《現代主義之後的藝術史》（*Art History after Modernism*）為標題出版第三版本，貝爾亭在第三版本的中文翻譯前言提到改變標題緣由在於「當代藝術的含義正在不斷變化，無論藝術史家承認與否，這種改變都影響藝術史話語」。<sup>4</sup>「現代主義之後的藝術史」強調的不僅是當代藝術別樣的面孔，也意味著藝術論述徹底轉向。

2005年起，一系列的圓桌討論會圍繞在世界藝術史與學科領域的全球化。2007年出版書籍《藝術史是全球的嗎？》，提出藝術史作為西方概念與學科實踐，面臨全球化的年代如何回應？對於非西方各地的藝術史有參考價值嗎？幾乎在同時間，德國卡爾斯魯爾藝術與媒體科技中心（Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie; ZKM）倡議「全球藝術與美術館」（GAM-Global Art and the Museum），這個計畫在2006年由魏貝爾（Peter Weibel）與貝爾亭提出，其目標是重新思考帶有全球性與普世性意義的藝術概念、藝術的發展，以及藝術史，探討全球化進程如何改變各種藝術之間的疆界與內涵，此計畫持續十年，發展出大型研討會、全球各地的工作坊與討論會，三本書的出版《當代藝術與美術館》（*Contemporary Art and the Museum*, 2007）、《全球藝術世界》（*The Global Art World*, 2009）、《全球研究》（*Global Studies*, 2011）；2011年舉辦展覽「全球當代性：1989年之後的各種藝術世界」<sup>5</sup>（*The Global Contemporary Art worlds after, 1989*），明確以「1989年之後」與「當代性」兩個概念為主軸，反映出一連串對世界影響深遠的大事件如何改變藝術實踐與生產，這檔展覽也顯現於「西方之外」的藝術，以及它們所共享的「當代性」範疇。這個展覽、其周邊的大量討論、活動與邀約之文章集結出版為展覽畫冊《全球當代藝術與新興世界》（*The Global Contemporary Art and the Rise of New Worlds*, 2013）。

在此一系列的十年計畫當中，不僅是展現當代藝術之改變，也將使用的詞彙從「世界藝術」轉為「全球藝術」，貝爾亭在其文章〈從世界藝術到全球藝術：新的全景〉（*From World Art to Global Art: View on a New Panorama*）區分「世界藝術」與「全球藝術」之不同，他認為「世界藝術」指涉殖民概念，將其他地域之藝術視為不同的藝術而進行收集，這些藝術不在美術館裡面，也沒有藝評來討論，而是被放置在人類學博物館。全球化時代之下，藝術生產轉變帶來許多問題，例如「藝術史可以是全球的嗎？」「未來是誰在寫藝術史？它是否需要成為藝術史上的常識，以及不僅是藝術，也是歷史的共同概念？」<sup>6</sup>全球藝術不同於世界藝術之框架，認為全球藝術是由許多說著不同語言、看待藝術異質眼光的參與者們所組成的，全球藝術宣示地理與文化的相異性，見證著以複數呈現的世界新地圖，不僅是實踐上的多中心，也是多音的論述。

貝爾亭在其文章〈作為全球藝術的當代藝術：一個批判性的分析〉（2009）指出全球藝術之本質：「全球藝術明顯地與現代性不同，因為現代性自稱的普世性是建立在某種藝術霸權概念之

4. 漢斯·貝爾亭著，蘇偉譯，《現代主義之後的藝術史》，北京，金城，2013，中文版前言I。

5. 「全球當代性：1989年之後的各種藝術世界」展覽網頁<http://www.global-contemporary.de/en/exhibition>（瀏覽日期2018.04.01）

6. Hans Belting, "From World Art to Global Art: View on a New Panorama", *The Global Contemporary Art and the Rise of New Worlds*, MIT Press, 2013, pp. 178-185.

上」，全球藝術是關注那些歐美之外的藝術發展，擁有一種新的視野。然而，全球藝術並未有明確的定義，反而展現其悖論：「全球範疇的藝術並不隱含一種固有的美學本質，亦非一個某物必須被視為藝術的全球性觀點。全球藝術並未展現一個新的脈絡；反之，它顯示出脈絡或焦點的喪失，並且以國族、文化或宗教式區域主義及部落化的方式反抗全球化，因而顯現出一種自我矛盾的特徵」。<sup>7</sup>雖然全球藝術有這樣的矛盾之處，但不可否認的，「藝術的全球化代表著一個藝術從藝術史的羽翼下出走的新階段。全球藝術已在世界上從未關注藝術史的地方蓬勃發展」，<sup>8</sup>貝爾亭更進一步強調「無論從政治層面的定義或由涇渭分明的藝術分類來看，全球藝術都具有批判的特性」，且「當代美術館不再爲了呈現藝術史而建立，而是宣稱透過展示當代藝術來呈現一個不斷擴張的世界」。<sup>9</sup>當代藝術與當下社會文化之關係更爲密切，全球藝術常常呈現一種地緣政治，甚至是地緣美學的樣態，提供當代藝術更多元異質的面貌。

因此，不同於過往以歐洲爲中心的現代主義，在單一歷史脈絡之中強調普世價值與美學典範，「全球藝術」擺脫殖民概念之下的「世界藝術」，強調多元脈絡、多樣視角、多種路徑、多重聲音、多重史觀，並承認它們的流變性格，以及彼此之間的交錯關係，也就是全球藝術有其全球／在地之一體兩面特質，具有重層複數的在地歷史與彼此之間交錯的多樣化關係。

## 二、展覽史與藝術史

Afterall出版的「展覽史」叢書前言所提到：「現代藝術史是聚焦於單一藝術家工作室的藝術生產以及他的影響力，展覽史這個系列要挑戰這樣的研究路徑，要求在公共領域檢驗藝術再現的脈絡，每個選擇關於挑選與裝置作品、選擇與使用場地、行銷策略和印刷品等皆影響我們理解展示中的藝術……」。<sup>10</sup>從此角度來看，展覽不僅是作品的集結而已，包括諸多複雜交織的多重關係：作品／藝術家、時間／空間、策展意識／概念／實踐、集體協力之社群、政治—社會—經濟狀況—文化脈絡、觀眾之涉入參與等，可整體視之爲一之「複合體」（complex）。

然而，「藝術史」是將歷史中產生的「藝術作品」按某種關係，重新表述爲一種串連的敘事，以線性時間軸爲方法，強調典範傳承之重要性，<sup>11</sup>現代美術史是十九世紀末二十世紀初歐美的敘事。紐約的現代美術館（MOMA）第一任館長巴爾（Alfred H. Barr, Jr）自行設計現代藝術派別之圖表，此一著名的圖表正說明其史觀是以藝術派別之間彼此傳承與相互影響爲軸心來繪製。MOMA即此圖表爲圭臬，以流派爲單位規劃製作展覽，透過研究、展覽、收藏以及後續圖錄之製作，進而確認前衛藝術各流派之地位。八十年代之後藝術史向外開放領域：從精緻藝術至大眾藝術、從西方中心到非西方藝術、從討論作品自身到關注作品生成的社會環境、從使用藝術史方法到借用其他人文學科

7. 貝爾亭（Hans Belting）著，王聖智譯，〈作為全球藝術的當代藝術：一個批判性的分析〉，《藝外雜誌》，2012.9與2012.12。原文Hans Belting, "Contemporary Art as Global Art: A Critical Estimate", in Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg (ed.), *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets, and Museums*, Hatje Cantz, 2009, pp. 38-73.

8. 同上註。

9. 同註7。

10. Exhibition Histories Series Editors, "Exhibition Histories", *Making Art Global (Part-1) The Third Havana Biennial 1989*, London: Afterall, 2011.

11. 文藝復興時期，從無名工匠的職業類別進而確認藝術家的身分，喬治·瓦薩里（Giorgio Vasari）的《藝術家傳記》（The Lives of Artists）是西方世界有記載的第一本藝術史著作，奠定藝術史的書寫上以藝術家爲中心之傳記爲主，以其「名作」作爲對象的歷史研究。

的研究方法。雖然有這些轉變，但藝術史的關注點仍以單一「作品」（藝術家）為研究單位，以歷史為參照重心。

早期的展覽相關研究，以藝術史為主體思考：將展覽史視為藝術史內部某種獨特的研究取向，即視展覽史為藝術史的一小分支，將美術館的展覽視為書寫藝術史的方法，藝術史訓練也成為美術館人員的必備能力。在此脈絡當中，展覽史被視為書寫歷史的一種角度，一種藝術史的次類型。成立於2000年的亞洲文獻庫收藏大量與展覽相關的出版品，近年來的研究案如「未來的材料：記錄1980-1990的中國當代藝術」、「香港藝術歷史研究：先導項目」等皆將展覽所生產的相關書寫、文獻與物件視為重要的材料與研究對象，展覽作為建構藝術史的第一現場。2013年亞洲文獻庫舉辦的「建構場域：展覽與亞洲當代藝術史編寫」國際研討會即是以藝術史為主的視點，視展覽為藝術史編寫的方法，研討會手冊前言寫道：「展覽是向大眾展示藝術作品的平臺，在亞洲更不知不覺間同時負起建構地區當代藝術史的重任。亞洲區內向來缺乏有系統的當代藝術公共收藏和具規模的藝術史學系，因此區內歷來的展覽，背後的理念、籌辦機構的方針以及與展覽相關的書寫與文獻，統統成為建構藝術史的第一現場」。<sup>12</sup>由前言可以清楚看到此研討會將展覽視為一個藝術史的發生地與書寫媒介，透過研究「展覽」，觀察亞洲區域內的「藝術史」建構情況。總而言之，與會學者已關注到「展覽」之重要，但主要焦點還是「藝術史」。

2014年英國藝術史與當代藝術研究學者Claire Bishop在其Artforum的文章“Making Art Global: Shows of force: Claire Bishop on making art global”，表示「展覽史是藝術史的次領域」（Exhibition Histories as an “art-historical subgenre”）。這個看法即是將展覽史看作藝術史的應用或支流這樣看法的代表。英國展覽史研究者Lucy Steeds在2015年發表文章〈當代藝術、策展實踐與多元文化脈絡下的多重展覽史〉試圖反駁Claire Bishop的看法，並提供「展覽史」的理論基礎。Lucy Steeds針對「展覽」一詞進行研究，重新思考班雅明（Walter Benjamin）於1930年代「機械複製時代的藝術作品」一文中所提出的從「崇拜價值」（cult value）轉向「展覽價值」（exhibition value），以此作為展覽史研究之核心，突顯展覽作為公共領域之重要性。她引用班雅明的話：「對於藝術品的感受評價有各種不同的強調重點：其中兩項特別突出，剛好互成兩極。一是有關作品的崇拜儀式價值，另一是有關其展覽價值。……各種複製技術強化了藝術品的展演價值，因而藝術品的兩極價值在數量上的易動，竟成了質的改變，甚至影響其本質特性。」Lucy Steeds指出班雅明所說的「過去的人們接受某件與其同時代的藝術作品這件事，將延續成為該作品對現代人的部份影響」。這項論述可作為「展覽史」領域發展的有力支撐。

Lucy Steeds再以德勒茲（Gilles Deleuze）與瓜塔希（Félix Guattari）提出的「少數文學」（minor literature）概念對比「展覽史」之於「藝術史」的特殊位置。「少數文學」之概念提出於1975年，用以頌揚卡夫卡（Franz Kafka）著作，認為「少數文學並非少數語言的文學，而是少數族群以主要語言寫成的文學」（“A minor literature is not the literature of a minor language – but the literature a

12.「建構場域：展覽與亞洲當代藝術史編寫」研討會 2013.10/21-23 香港藝術中心，研討會手冊前言。

13.Claire Bishop, “Making Art Global: Shows of force: Claire Bishop on making art global”, Artforum, Vol.52, Issue 10, Summer 2014 (Review on line <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Shows+of+force%3A+Claire+Bishop+on+making+art+global.-a0364198982>) (瀏覽日期2018.04.01)

minority makes in a major language” )。14這種少數文學概念具有對主流文學「奇異化」(to make strange)與「去疆界化」(to deterritorialize)的作用。以此概念來說，展覽史與藝術史有差異性，展覽史有它自己發聲的方式，具有獨特的語言。展覽史之於藝術史正可提供一種陌生化的角度，鬆動學科既定規矩，模糊化明確邊界。正如Lucy Steeds所說：「展覽史這個『少數』研究領域，強而有力地穿插於藝術史範疇當中，並動搖這門佔主導地位的『主要』專業學科的語言基礎」。15

「展覽史」長期被忽略的情形在近期產生翻轉，逐漸獨立而出，具有自身價值之新興領域。2017年一月於北歐奧斯陸(Oslo)的研討會，在場講者與觀眾們對於展覽史與藝術史之間進行精彩的辯論，其中一個評論提出：「藝術史很明顯地曾是展覽史的次領域！」(Art History was clearly a sub-genre of Exhibition Histories!)。17另一個展覽史翻轉的案例是2017年11月印尼首座現當代藝術館Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art in Nusantara (Museum MACAN)開幕，開幕展標題為「藝術轉向。世界轉向」(Art Turns. World Turns)除了以時間軸與藝術史概念挑選展出的收藏品展示之外，更以印尼的展覽史為另一主軸，相互搭配。「重審印尼展覽史讓我們可以了解展覽是如何成為藝術家之創作與大眾、策展人，畫廊主、經紀人、收藏家、贊助人、主辦者與政府之間更廣泛多元化接觸的介面。當我們回顧展覽史，從實踐與藝術世界形成的權力關係將會得到更好的理解」。18此一論述明確指出展覽史映照政治—經濟—社會—文化結構，作為公共文化史之價值，得以呈現出藝術史之外的各式關係。展覽史的重要性被肯定。

筆者長期進行展覽研究與當代策展，一直視「展覽史」為一獨立領域，認為「展覽史」與「藝術史」之間應該是平行的系統，相互依賴與支持，同時「展覽史」可作為對既有「藝術史」思維的重審與批判，尤其從全球藝術視角觀看，展覽史進一步複雜化當今人們對藝術史內涵的理解，翻轉既有的思考框架。另外，「展覽史」不僅與藝術史相關，更向外連結到博物館學(Museology or Museum Studies)對於機構的思考以及展示設計之應用，近期當代策展的擴張更與文化研究、文創產業等相關領域。「展覽史」研究必須以綜合整體視之，以跨領域、跨學門、跨地域的研究方式來處理，可能牽涉到的領域，包括藝術史、哲學、文化研究、社會學、人類學、政治、經濟學、新聞學等，從這些學門之間汲取養分，並以靈活再組裝配置之方式，重新整理議題，使之成為具體、可視、可感之物。一如負責英國倫敦大學金匠學院Curatorial/Knowledge博士班課程的學者Irit Rogoff即認為「我們不去框定哪些知識可以進入策展的體系，但堅持這些知識彼此之間全新的聯繫。這些新的聯繫不會如許多學術研究般歸結到一個論點，也不會像策展活動般把某一現象歸納成視覺紀錄。……」，19「不是策展需要理論、哲學、歷史等知識學科的支持，而是反過來這些學科會大大地

14. Lucy Steeds著，王聖智譯，〈當代藝術、策展實踐與多元文化脈絡下的多重展覽史〉，《藝術觀點ACT》64期，2015年10月，頁108-115。  
15. 同上註。

16. "Of(f) Our Times: The Aftermath of the Ephemeral and other Curatorial Anachronic", part 2, Oslo National Academy of the Arts, 28 January 2017 – convened by Beatrice von Bismarck and Rike Frank (<https://www.artandeducation.net/announcements/105470/of-f-our-times-the-aftermath-of-the-ephemeral-and-other-curatorial-anachronics-two-part-public-seminar>) (瀏覽日期2018.04.01)。

17. Lucy Steeds於2017.10.27之演講：「暫止之因 展覽史與2002年第四屆光州雙年展」提出此一近期研討會討論的經驗。此演講為春之當代夜「亞洲策展史」系列講座之一。

18. Agung Hujatnika, "Seteleng to Biennial: Twists and turns in the 20th century history of art in Indonesia", *Art Turns. World Turn: Exploring the Collection of the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art in Nusantara*, Jakarta: Museum MACAN, 2017, p.37

19. Irit Rogoff, 〈不斷擴大的領域〉，《典藏國際版文選》，第十三卷，中文版第一期，2014年3月，頁13。此文章為「建構場域：展覽與亞洲當代藝術史編寫」研討會的專題演講。

得益於策展擅長的組合形式，策展為知識生產的盛宴揭幕，而不是在舉例說明那些知識」。<sup>20</sup>展覽既是藝術實踐、藝術生產，以同時是知識生產。以複數形式出現的展覽史，不僅顛覆西方單一中心的藝術史書寫，做為各自相異的全球藝術，也可向外連結成為新型態的知識生產。

### 三、展覽史之價值

Afterall出版的「展覽史」叢書採用的方法，具有從當下視野回望過去，讓過去的展覽得以某種方法回應當下。書中除了收錄過去的第一手資料，如策展論述、當年的評論、空間作品、畫冊，還包括編輯當下邀約專家學者針對此展覽撰寫研究專文，並與當年參展的藝術家進行訪談，為後續研究提供基礎資料。此叢書所提供的資料同時包括過去檔案之彙整與當下的檔案製作。另外，不同於藝術史強調時間軸，展覽史是時間軸縱向的歷時性與橫向的共時性並重，也不僅是歷史深度，更有地理空間之廣度，以及時空之中交會的芸芸眾生。再者，展覽史之回溯書寫不僅是對於歷史文獻資料之收集、整理、研究、分析與文字書寫，更可以透過多種手法去檢視、思考與再現，例如視展覽為重述歷史之方案，重製或重建里程碑式展覽、視展覽為對其自身機制之批判、視展覽為反映公共文化史之可能等。

第一，視展覽為重述歷史之方案，重製或重建里程碑式展覽。透過大量的研究、匯集文件檔案資料，以及以當代視角的再呈現，使過往展覽與議題得以顯影、可視、可感，作為重述歷史之方案。2013年威尼斯雙年展期間，Prada Foundation以重製作品方式，參考文獻檔案，重現1969年的重要里程碑展覽「當態度成為形式」（When Attitudes Become Form）。2014年法國巴黎龐畢度中心製作「大地魔術師」（Magiciens de la terre）的二十五週年文件式展覽，將當年的地圖、書信、照片、紀錄片等檔案資料一一呈現，同時間倫敦泰德美術館以放映相關電影、影片資料的方式來感受當年的氛圍，紐約的現代美術館則以閉門會議的方式邀請當年的策展人與參與者同聚一堂，以討論會的方式來紀念這個重要的里程碑展覽。位於中國北京的尤倫斯美術館（UCCA），2007年的開館展回顧中國八十年代的前衛藝術，以《85新潮：中國第一次當代藝術運動》為題，聚合當年重要作品與藝術家。這些重製過往重要的展覽正是展覽史在當代的表現。

第二，將展覽作為重新反思的契機，作為機制之批判，也重新審視藝術史觀。1992年藝術家Fred Wilson受馬里蘭歷史協會之邀，重新檢視該機構的收藏品，他以「挖掘博物館」（Mining the Museum）作為此計劃名稱，透過展覽展現該機構長期忽略的展品，重新挖掘被消音許久的黑人奴隸史與原住民歷史，以此討論工藝品與藝術品之間的認定分野，批判博物館的白人中心主義意識形態，提供另一史觀敘事。另一個例子為紐約惠特尼美術館，2015年其新館成立，舉辦一場重要的開幕展覽「難以見到的美國」（America is Hard to See），<sup>21</sup>此展覽將成立於1931年的惠特尼美術館館藏重新整理，轉移敘事軸線，以移居至美國的藝術家為主，以移民／遷徙／文化混雜等概念為主軸，為這些塵封已久的作品們重新找到位置，再定義何謂「美國」，以及何謂美國藝術家。這是惠

20. 同上註。

21. 「難以見到的美國」展覽網頁 <https://whitney.org/Exhibitions/AmericalsHardToSee>（瀏覽時間2018.04.01）。



特尼美術館的機構史，也是以展覽重新定義歷史。

第三，視展覽為反映全球概念之下區域文化之公共歷史，展覽為一文化平臺。展覽作為一複合體，既是公共文化的產物，自身也成為公共文化史的一部份，因此可以做為檢視公共歷史的切入點。例如香港Para Site畫廊跨國策畫「大新月：六十年代的藝術與激盪——日本、南韓、臺灣」<sup>22</sup>，作為一小規模的比較藝術史嘗試，這個展覽在於凸顯六十年代日本、南韓、臺灣的「反藝術」行為，也回應到冷戰時期，以及這三個東北亞國家之間的牽連糾葛。這個展覽既是藝術史的一部份，同時也反映整體區域之公共文化，得以透過跨國、跨域、跨文化來認識亞洲地域特質。另一個例子為「失調的和諧」<sup>23</sup>，此的展覽計畫由德國歌德學院發起，匯聚臺灣、日本、韓國與中國的機構、策展人、藝術家共同合作、以東北亞四區域過往糾結的歷史與冷戰時期的意識形態經歷為前提，反思對於亞洲的想像，深化今日亞洲面對的各種現象和問題。此展覽在移轉展覽地點的同時，不斷變化展覽內容，以回應不同歷史與社會狀態下的在地之脈絡，重新面對「亞洲」問題。

#### 四、空缺的臺灣展覽史

臺灣的問題可能不是前文所提到的藝術史與展覽史之爭，也非對於展覽史價值的質疑，而是此一領域處仍於蠻荒地帶。不論是從日治時期博覽會／博物館／美術展覽會的出現、國民黨專政的冷戰戒嚴時期的展覽，到解嚴前後的當代策展，此一脈絡仍未被梳理，散落不同斷代研究以及臺灣史、美術史與視覺文化等領域，為一空缺／從缺／空白的狀態。以下先從史觀轉向、文化轉向與學科轉向初步檢視既有的研究：

史觀轉向是「臺灣展覽史」研究的初步條件。戰後的長期戒嚴時期，以國民黨專政所推動的大中國意識為主體，獨尊中國藝術史，並以故宮文物作為輔佐與明證。1987年解嚴前後，臺灣主體意識之追求日益強烈。九〇年代興起的本土熱潮為史觀轉向臺灣的熱身操，倪再沁的「臺灣美術·西方製造」一文引發1991-1993年於雄獅美術上的臺灣美術論戰。九〇年代前期官方美術館舉辦多場臺灣藝術史相關之展覽，至1996年臺北雙年展以「臺灣主體性」為題，本土化論述被肯認。千禧年之後，首度政黨輪替，民進黨的臺灣主體意識透過論述打造觀看臺灣的新角度，不論是「海洋臺灣」、「南島文化」論述皆為駁斥長期壟罩的大中國意識，將注意力轉向臺灣社會文化與臺灣住民為主體的臺灣史觀，並關注自身的地緣政治現實。九〇年代興起的臺灣近現代美術史之研究即在此基礎上發展。

文化轉向讓臺灣史相關研究從政治經濟面向轉向更細緻的文化層面。「博覽會」、「博物館」、「美術展覽會」等概念與機制在日本殖民統治期間出現於臺灣，這些透過日本之眼與日本自身對新事物之消化吸收，再引介於殖民地臺灣，此一具有殖民現代性機制對「臺灣展覽史」而言極其重要，第二部份談到「展覽」一詞之轉譯即為重要例子。由於博覽會與展覽會在引入臺灣初期與

22. 「大新月：六十年代的藝術與激盪——日本、南韓、臺灣」展覽網頁：<http://www.para-site.org.hk/zh-HK/exhibitions/great-crescent-art-and-agitation-in-the-1960s-japan-south-korea-and-taiwan>（瀏覽時間2018.04.01）。

23. 失調的和諧展覽網頁：<http://www.goethe.de/ins/kr/seo/prj/har/cnindex.htm>（瀏覽時間2018.04.01）。

「展覽」研究範疇密切關係，博覽會研究也是其中探究「臺灣展覽史」的一部份。歷史學者呂紹理從臺灣史角度切入博覽會議題，《展示臺灣：權力、空間與殖民統治的形象表述》（2005）一書為代表，透過博覽會展示會場的空間特性、展示分類架構、策展者的展示意圖及觀者對展示活動的理解面向等，指出殖民者如何透過展示臺灣達到展示其治理成就，展示活動的擴延又對日常生活的消費娛樂化，觀看文化之興起等產生何種影響。博覽會研究此一面向包括空間安排、活動設計、視覺傳達、城市關係等面向，關於博覽會之研究是目前文獻較為豐富的一塊，論文產出分布於歷史、臺灣文學、藝術史、視覺傳達與設計相關研究所等。

關於展覽會之機制的探討：謝里法於七〇年代出版的《日據時代臺灣美術運動史》，<sup>24</sup>從民族運動角度觀看日本殖民時代的美術發展，將美術團體定期舉辦之展覽會以及參與官方展覽之經歷列為畫家的品評，也對於早期展覽出現的地點有稍許提示，包括文人之間交流品玩、裱畫店、憩茶店、學校等地，以及之後更具規模的「美術展覽會」、「博覽會」、「博物館」等機制的產生。九〇年代中後期顏娟英的「殿堂中的美術：臺灣早期現代美術與文化啟蒙」一文初步釐清將前人以民族運動角度將美術展覽會附會於政治運動，其臺大藝研所學生們的論文，針對日治時期臺府展及其他美術展覽活動有諸多面向的研究，並提供如何透過展覽促使美術概念的成形，從藝術史角度研究官辦美展對近代美術之形成與其周邊的影響力。戰後關於官辦美展機制之研究有黃冬富的省展國畫部門研究（1988），蕭瓊瑞討論正統國畫之爭（1988）、廿八屆省展改制的歷史檢驗（1995）、專書《臺灣美展八十年研究》等（2009）。此展覽機制之討論多聚焦於評審制度與得獎作品之風格，後續也有諸多碩士論文探討此一方向。然而，此一方向的討論仍以作品價值與藝術史的建構為中心，展覽僅被視為藝術家之作品的成功管道。

學科轉向提供更多研究路徑與方法。九〇年代中末期臺灣藝壇鼓勵藝術評論與當代藝術之研究，同時間新興研究所科系設立，在研究方法上從獨尊美術史轉向藝術評論、新博物館學、視覺文化、文化研究等跨領域之發展，帶動2000年之後出現的一波臺灣展覽機制之研究。蔣伯欣在九〇年代末以傅科之權力／知識部署為基礎，發展出「策展機器」概念用以批判1998年臺北雙年展。其2004年完成之博士論文《近代臺灣的前衛美術與博物館形構：一個視覺文化史的探討》從視覺文化角度考察臺灣美術史上各階段的展覽機制，包括故宮、國立歷史博物館、臺北市立美術館等，其中處理到五、六〇年代巴西聖保羅雙年展機制，約略可以撇見將臺灣置於國際交流的框架之下來討論。筆者的碩士論文《後九〇年代臺北市立美術館國際策展的「本土／國際」策略探討》（2000）以展覽的詩學與政治學為方法，探問臺北雙年展與威尼斯雙年展臺灣館的成立與初期發展，也是從臺灣與外部交流的觀看。以上這些以美術館、雙年展等機制為主軸，搭配其他研究方法，成為跨領域的路徑，這一批資料多為碩士論文之生產，是目前展覽史相關研究的大宗。

2000年中期之後與展覽相關課程與學院系所紛紛成立，<sup>25</sup>意味著策展從實務經驗走向學院，隨

24. 《日據時代臺灣美術運動史》首先以連載的方式刊登在1976年6月至1977年12月的《藝術家》，1978年由藝術家雜誌社出版。

25. 2006年東海大學美術系設立「藝術策劃與評論組」、國立高雄師範大學成立藝術跨領域研究所。2009年國立臺北藝術大學跨領域藝術研究所分為「跨領域創意」及「文化生產與策展」兩組，明確將策展作為系所重點。2014年國立臺北教育大學開始大學部的「策展學程」，2016年招收外籍生的碩士班「當代藝術評論與策展全英文學程」成為第一個以策展為名的科系。另外，文化創意產業相關學系也從畫廊、產業、機制等角度加入此一行列。

之興起的是策展教育、研究、歷史書寫與知識生產。近五年可以看到，策展相關領域之發展，一方面從藝術策展擴張至內容策展、文創策展、社群策展等面向；另一方面在視覺藝術範疇專業化、主題特殊化，更細緻地從不同視角為這個領域增添薪火，例如王曼華（王品驊）的博士論文《替身：我如何成為臺灣獨立策展人》（2014），從自身的策展實踐反思臺灣獨立策展人在整體結構下之困境，並以「反策展」強調重構地方性歷史脈絡的策展書寫的必要性。另外，2015年筆者策劃主編的《臺灣當代藝術策展二十年》專書正是在史料與檔案不足的狀況下，從展覽史角度出發，檢閱1992年以來「里程碑」或「地標」的當代策展案例，勾勒出臺灣當代策展史的一個面向，作為深化展覽史研究的嘗試。以上初步梳理可以看到史觀轉向發生於八十年代解嚴之後，研究的關注點由大中國意識轉向臺灣主體思考，隨後的文藝轉向與學科轉向提供展覽相關研究之基礎，包括方法與材料。

若回應前文所談到的展覽之史價值，在既有的研究之中「視展覽為重述歷史之方案」是大宗，在此路徑之中藝術史為主要概念，將展覽視為藝術史書寫的方法，展覽及其中的作品作為藝術史內容。美術館主辦的專題研究展、典藏展等也是此一路徑的展覽版本，擴充文字書寫之外的多重展現。「視展覽為機制批判之可能」可從展覽機制之權力/知識面向著手的研究，加入博物館學、視覺文化、藝術評論、政治經濟社會等學科等，在以上的研究梳理中可以看見這個路徑的研究，然而目前仍以整理為主，較少見到具顛覆性看法的提出。

至於「視展覽為反映全球概念之下區域文化之公共歷史」更是少見，目前關於展覽歷史或研究的書寫，多數僅止於臺灣島內之史料，少有亞洲區域之間的比較研究，也鮮見在方法論上的自覺與突破性的嘗試。九十年代中末期曾有從亞洲角度切入討論臺灣的位置以及生產以亞洲為範疇的相關展覽，頗具全球藝術的架式來切入，例如，1998年臺北雙年展「欲望場域」以東北亞四國為範疇，聚焦探討急速變化的城市之與藝術之發展；經歷五年跨國研究的成果「東亞油畫的誕生與開展」（2000，北美館）；學者蔣伯欣也曾於2000年所倡議：「我們需要一種策展史的歸納，將當代藝術史上各個重要的策展案例，整理成類似企業管理教學上的個案研究。……需要對亞洲鄰近各國的比較藝術研究，不僅是近現代的藝術發展，也包括亞洲的當代藝術」。<sup>26</sup>但這個倡議至今仍未實現。

近五年，臺灣藝術圈對於週邊亞洲區域之重視漸漸增加：2012年底環繞於威尼斯臺灣館藝術家國籍事件所引發的討論，龔卓軍批判臺灣具有「內在歐美性」；<sup>27</sup>黃建宏認為臺灣「殖民式的他治」已經內化；<sup>28</sup>高森信男提出「轉移參考點」等，<sup>29</sup>積極反思長期依賴歐美中心的做法，以亞洲為出發點，重新審視自己與鄰近周邊東亞區域之關係，進而付諸實踐。<sup>30</sup>筆者近期策劃的春之當代夜「亞洲。策展／史」系列講座（2017-2018）即朝這個方向努力，思考檔案闕如、變動劇烈的亞洲地區可

26. 林伯欣，〈後90年代當代藝術策展的論述形構：兼論臺灣美術主體位置的流變〉，《中外文學》，343期，頁4-40。林伯欣後改名為蔣伯欣。

27. 龔卓軍，〈我們內心那頭怪獸，歐美性：論臺北雙年展的雙年展想像如何起死回生〉，《現代美術》，165期，2012年12月，頁18-31。

28. 黃建宏，〈必須奪回生產——全球化的潛殖問題與政治經濟學〉，《重見／建社會#10 拆除前夕——論壇與跨年聲音表演》，臺北，立方計畫空間，2013，頁176-179。

29. 高森信男，〈從朝貢體系到網絡體系：重新定義「國際藝術」／邊陲聯繫工作〉，《重見／建社會#10 拆除前夕——論壇與跨年聲音表演》，臺北，立方計畫空間，2013，頁181-182。2013年底以高森信男與許家維的對談以「轉移參考點-從打開-當代與奧賽德工廠的東南亞經驗談起」為題，提出「轉移參考點」的可能。春之當代夜系列演講，整理文稿：[://springfoundation.org.tw/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/-----\\_.pdf](http://springfoundation.org.tw/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/-----_.pdf)。

30. 「打開—當代藝術工作站」（OCAC）將其空間遷往泰國曼谷（2012年8月到2013年的1月）。2012年起藝術家高俊宏獲得國藝會補助，訪問與考察東亞地區在激烈的全球化處境下，一波波新類型的藝術行動主義，三年後出版《諸眾：東亞藝術佔領行動》，並有相關作品生產。

否透過探詢策展與歷史的動態關係而有新的啓示，此一系列講座關注兩個路線：Curating History透過策展行動給予歷史議題一個新的切入點；Histories of Curating針對策展史自身的梳理、書寫與研究。邀請亞洲相關的展覽研究者、策展人等來談論，同時將邀請臺灣學者與策展人針對演講內容進行在地現狀之回應，期待以不同支線串聯與描繪可能的亞洲策展史的當代形貌。

## 結論：邁向臺灣展覽史

從全球藝術視角之下，複數的歷史來看，臺灣有屬於從自己的地方風土之中成長出來的展覽史，只是此一脈絡尚未被梳理與進一步研究，為一空缺／從缺／空白的「臺灣展覽史」。然而，不論是指涉廣泛的「展覽史」或強調八十年代之後的「當代策展」，歐美地區對於展覽之出版研究也是2008年之後才有一定量的出現，若以「當代」同在之概念，從現在開始進行「臺灣展覽史」之整理出版並無太嚴重的滯後。在此未被開發的領域裡，沒有「重建」必須針對既有的現狀做檢討，或有打掉重練的困擾，整理基本資料與建構基礎設施是邁向「臺灣展覽史」的當下任務。因此，以上所談到的展覽的特質、展覽史與藝術史之關係、展覽史之價值等可以做為基礎。

在處理「臺灣展覽史」之際，可正視臺灣的多重殖民的歷史斷裂現實，非尋找「源頭」，而以「觀點」與「過程」為重。同時，從全球範疇的地緣政治位置來思考臺灣的位置，不論是相對於大陸的海洋文化、相對於漢文化的南島文化，或是強調亞太區域，或視臺灣為東南亞與東北亞之樞紐等，透過各式交織的網狀「關係」之探尋，翻轉邊緣的宿命。這樣角度的「臺灣展覽史」，既可觀看臺灣內部自身之議題，同時也可開展跨國界、跨領域、跨文化，關注鄰近的亞洲地區之連帶關係。再者，文字書寫不再是展覽史的唯一方案，展覽史可採用多元、多層次、多面向之手法來處理，期許朝向以全球藝術為視野，具複數歷史精神的「臺灣展覽史」。

國立台灣美術館  
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts

## 引用書目

- Claire Bishop, "Making Art Global: Shows of force: Claire Bishop on making art global", *Artforum*, Vol.52, Issue 10, summer 2014.
- Hans Belting, "From World Art to Global Art: View on a New Panorama", *The Global Contemporary Art and the Rise of New Worlds*, MIT Press, 2013, pp. 178-185.
- Hans Belting著，王聖智譯，〈作為全球藝術的當代藝術：一個批判性的分析〉，《藝外雜誌》，2012年9月與2012年12月。
- Hans Belting著，蘇偉譯，《現代主義之後的藝術史》，北京，金城，2013年。
- Sebastian Conrad著，馮奕達譯，《全球史的再思考》，臺北，八旗，2016年。
- Arthur C. Danto著，林雅琪、鄭惠雯譯，《在藝術終結之後：當代藝術與歷史藩籬》，臺北，麥田，2004年。
- Charles Esche & Agung Hujatnika, *Art Turns. World Turn: Exploring the Collection of the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art in Nusantara*, Jakarta: Museum MACAN, 2017.
- Irit Rogoff, 〈不斷擴大的領域〉，《典藏國際版文選》第十三卷，中文版第一期，2014年3月，頁10-15。
- Lucy Steeds著，王聖智譯，〈當代藝術、策展實踐與多元文化脈絡下的多重展覽史〉，《藝術觀點》64期，2015年10月，頁108-115。
- 林伯欣，〈後90年代當代藝術策展的論述形構：兼論臺灣美術主體位置的流變〉，《中外文學》，343期，頁4-40。
- 呂紹理，〈展示臺灣：權力、空間與殖民的形象表述〉，臺北，麥田，2005年。
- 吉見俊哉著，蘇碩斌等譯，《博覽會政治學》，臺北，群學，2010年。
- 亞洲文獻庫，「建構場域：展覽與亞洲當代藝術史編寫」會議手冊，2013年。
- 高森信男，〈從朝貢體系到網絡體系：重新定義「國際藝術」／邊陲聯繫工作〉，《重見／建社會#10 拆除前夕—論壇與跨年聲音表演》，臺北，立方計畫空間，2013年，頁181-182。
- 黃建宏，〈必須奪回生產——全球化的潛殖問題與政治經濟學〉，《重見／建社會#10 拆除前夕—論壇與跨年聲音表演》，臺北：立方計畫空間，2013，頁176-179。
- 龔卓軍，〈我們內心那頭怪獸，歐美性：論臺北雙年展的雙年展想像如何起死回生〉，《現代美術》，165期，2012年12月，頁18-31。

## 網頁資料

- Afterall展覽史系列出版網頁：<https://www.afterall.org/books/exhibition.histories/>
- 「全球當代性：1989年之後的各種藝術世界」展覽網頁：<http://www.global-contemporary.de/en/exhibition>
- 「難以見到的美國」展覽網頁：<https://whitney.org/Exhibitions/AmericaIsHardToSee>
- 「大新月：六十年代的藝術與激盪——日本、南韓、臺灣」展覽網頁：<http://www.para-site.org.hk/zh-HK/exhibitions/great-crescent-art-and-agitation-in-the-1960s-japan-south-korea-and-taiwan>
- 「失調的和諧」展覽網頁：<http://www.goethe.de/ins/kr/seo/prj/har/cnindex.htm>
- 「亞洲。策展/史」系列講座網頁：<https://springfoundation.org.tw/sf-event/%E3%80%8C%E4%BA%9E%E6%B4%B2%EF%BC%8E%E7%AD%96%E5%B1%95%E5%8F%B2%E3%80%8D%E7%B3%BB%E5%88%97%E8%AC%9B%E5%BA%A7/>

國立台灣美術館  
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts

# The Necessity of Taiwan Exhibition Histories: From Global Art Perspective<sup>\*</sup>

Pei-Yi, LU

## Abstract

Exhibition histories, from the perspective of global art, is a notion to rethink whether Western Art history is still applicable in other regions of the world after 1989. “Exhibition histories” which is a plural term emphasizes on diversities. Different from the Eurocentric modern art aesthetic, it considers on those cases from the Global South based on the shift of global structure. By discussing the meaning of exhibitions as well as the relations between exhibition histories and art history, this article was written to understand the value of exhibition histories from the perspective of global art and propose the possibility of Taiwan exhibition histories.<sup>1</sup>The author argues that as a plural term, exhibition histories can be used in criticizing art history. Not only does it overturn the writing of art history which specifically focuses on Western contexts but also it expands the multiple possibilities in the dynamic relationships between exhibitions and histories. For example, we can take exhibitions as the way for historical re-narration, a reflection on public culture histories and an effective criticism on exhibition mechanisms. This article intends to think of “Taiwan exhibition histories,” from the multi-layered colonial histories of Taiwan and its global geopolitical position. Furthermore, by placing “Taiwan exhibition histories” within the framework of global art, we can deal with those internal issues of Taiwan and at the same time, pay attention to other Asian regions in views of cross-nation, cross-field and cross-culture.

**Keywords:** exhibition histories, global art, Taiwan exhibition histories, history of public culture

國立台灣美術館  
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts

<sup>\*</sup> This article is an extension of Lu’s 6,000-word speech in the conference. Her research mainly focuses on modern curation after the 1980s and this paper is her primary observations on exhibition histories. Further research is needed.

1. The term “Taiwan exhibition histories” here refers to the exhibition histories in the early period and contemporary curating after the 1980s.

## Introduction

The term “exhibition histories” is derived from the *Exhibition Histories* series published by Afterall in 2010.<sup>2</sup> The series is an extension of two conferences, namely *Landmark Exhibitions* conference at Tate Modern in 2008 and *Exhibitions and the World at Large* conference at Tate Britain in 2009. The former devoted to the significant exhibitions and their contributions since the 1960s. The latter discussed the exhibition practices in the context of globalization after 1989 with a focus on three exhibitions from the past. The first book of the *Exhibition Histories* series raised an intensive discussion concerning two exhibitions that happened in 1969, thinking 1969 as a momentous beginning of contemporary curating. The second and the third books were with titles *Making Art Global*. One of them discussed *Les Magiciens de la Terre*, curated by Jean-Hubert Martin in 1989; another investigated the third Havana Biennial in the same year. These two exhibitions witnessed the global dramatic changes around 1989, including the Fall of the Berlin Wall—the symbolic end of the Cold War and the increasing interactions among regions. Before 1989, especially in art world, “being international” meant to become part of or to be acknowledged by Western countries. However, due to the drastic changes in international societies, politics and economics, the Eurocentric focus has veered to other regions. These two exhibitions: *Les Magiciens de la Terre* and the third Havana Biennial hailed an important shift of exhibition histories— from Euro-American regions to the global.

Following this background, Afterall’s *Exhibition Histories* appeared to set 1989 as a beginning to reconsider exhibition histories from the perspective of global art. It questioned whether the monopolistic Western art history was still practicable for discussing contemporary art. It raised several questions regarding the differences between exhibition histories and art history, asking if exhibition histories could respond to current situations of global art better. This article attempts to explore the possibility of Taiwan exhibition histories from the standing point of global art and its multiplicity. The first chapter will look into the new implications of contemporary art from the angle of global art. The next chapter will examine the differences between art history and exhibition histories. The third part will address the values of exhibition histories. The final chapter will turn to Taiwan and examine the few existing studies through historical, cultural and disciplinary shifts to propose the idea of constructing “Taiwan exhibition histories,” which has been neglected. In conclusion, this article will suggest a road toward Taiwan exhibition histories with Taiwanese subjectivity through a global art perspective.

### I. Perspectives of Global Art

In the 1980s, many art historians declared the end of art in their discourses to present an art world that is not dominated by modernism. Arthur C. Danto, an American art philosopher, claimed that the evolution of art history had come to its end in his article “The End of Art” (1984). A further explanation was provided in his publication *After the End of Art* in 1997, saying that the development of contemporary art was the result of the philosophication of art. With the fallen of the traditional art discourses and the disappearance of the purity praised by modernism, paintings was no longer exclusive among art activities. Accordingly, art

2. See *Exhibition Histories*: <https://www.afterall.org/books/exhibition.histories/>. Accessed 1 April 2018. So far, this series has included nine monographs and covered regions such as South America (Havana Biennial and Bienal de São Paulo), Asia (Independent Art Festivals in Chiang Mai) and so on.

3. Arthur C. Danto, *After The End of Art*, translated by Lin Ya-qi and Zheng Hui-wen. Taipei: Rye Field Publishing Co., 2004.

museums should repositioned itself and the multifaceted dimensions of the contemporary art world became unprecedented.<sup>3</sup>

Around the same time, Hans Belting, the German art historian and theorist of contemporary art and image, published *The End of the History of? (Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte?)* in 1983. In Belting's book, Giorgio Vasari, the advocator of progressive art history from the Renaissance period was challenged and Belting argued the limitations of art field were caused by its discrepancy against the reality and practice. In 1995, the reformulation of *The End of the History of Art* was published with a changed title, *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History*. Then, Belting rewrote the third edition under the heading *Art History after Modernism*. He admittedly explained that the meanings of modern art were ever-changing. Whether art historians admit it or not, these changes would inevitably affect the languages and discourses of art history.<sup>4</sup> The book *Art History after Modernism* not only put the alternative forms of modern art under the lime light but also declared the turning-around of art discourses.

Ever since 2005, a serial of roundtables had circled around global art histories and the globalization in academic fields. *Is Art history Global?* (2007), asking, "how should the art history, as a Western notion and academic practice, respond to globalization?" and "whether Western art history can be a valuable reference to those non-Western regions?" In the meantime, in 2006, Peter Weibel and Belting curated the project called *GAM-Global Art and the Museum*, in Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie (ZKM) in Germany. It reassessed those notions, developments and history of art embodied by the global and universal ideas. Also it discussed how the progress of globalization had blurred the boundaries and contents of diverse art forms. The project lasted for a decade along with numerous major global conferences, workshops, discussions and publications. Three books were published, namely *Contemporary Art and the Museum* (2007), *The Global Art World* (2009) and *Global Studies* (2011). From this project, the exhibition called *The Global Contemporary Art Worlds after 1989* was realized by ZKM in 2011. With its two clear-cut concepts, "the period after 1989" and "contemporaneity," this exhibition depicted how the series of global events reshaped art practices and productions.<sup>5</sup> The art from outside Western regions and the shared contemporaneity were also embraced. Along with this exhibition, its extensive discussions, activities and articles were allocated as the catalogue named *The Global Contemporary Art and the Rise of New Worlds* (2013).

This ten-year project showcased a significant transformation of contemporary art and "global art" was no longer synonymous with "world art." Belting differentiated "global art" from "world art" in his article "From World Art to Global Art: View on a New Panorama," claiming that world art was colonial in spirit which viewed art from non-Western regions as exotic ones. They were neither treated as part of collections in art museums, nor analyzed by any art critics. Instead, they were isolated in museums of anthropology. In the phase of globalization, many art productions have been problematized, challenging, "Can art history become global at all?" and "Who writes art history in the future, and does it need to be art history in the common sense and with a command concept not only of art but also of history?"<sup>6</sup> Different from the framework of world art, global art is consist of groups of people with various mother tongues and viewpoint to perceive art. Therefore, global art acknowledges geographic and cultural diversities and witnesses the emerging new world map containing plural histories— discursive practices and voices with multiple centers.

---

4. See preface I to the Chinese Version in Hans Belting, *Art History after Modernism*, translated by Su Wei. Beijing: Gold Wall Press, 2013.

5. For Details about "The Global Contemporary. Art Worlds after 1989" exhibition, see <http://www.global-contemporary.de/en/exhibition>. Accessed 1 April 2018.

6. See Hans Belting, "From World Art to Global Art: View on a New Panorama," *The Global Contemporary Art and the Rise of New Worlds*. MIT Press, 2013, pp.183.



Belting talked about the nature of global art in his article “Contemporary Art as Global Art: A Critical Estimate” (2009). “It [Global art] clearly differs from modernity whose self-appointed universalism was based on a hegemonic notion of art,” he wrote. It pays much of its attention on new perspectives and art developments outside the Western world. Yet, since the definition of global art has been unstable, it has become a paradox. “Art on a global scale does not imply an inherent aesthetic quality which could be identified as such, nor a global concept of what has to be regarded as art. Rather than representing a new context, it indicates the loss of context or focus and includes its own contradiction by implying the counter movement of regionalism and tribalisation, whether national, cultural or religious,” he added.<sup>7</sup> Global art indeed results in some contradictions; nevertheless, “The globalization of art, in the meanwhile, represents a new stage in art’s exodus from the patronage of art history. Global art flourishes in parts of the world where art history has not been a concern at all.”<sup>8</sup> Belting defended, “Global art may be critical in political terms but it is also critical in terms of art categories that are defined by inclusion or exclusion,” and “Museums of contemporary art are no longer built with the idea of art histories but make the claim to represent an expanding world in the mirror of contemporary art.”<sup>9</sup> The connection between contemporary art and the society and culture of its time has become tighter than ever before. Global art tends draw a certain map of geopolitics and even geo-aesthetics, presenting the heterogeneity of contemporary art.

Consequently, modernism regards Europe as the center and puts emphasis on universal values and aesthetic paragon in a singular historical context whereas global art looses any ties to world art and reveals the diversities of contexts, perspectives, paths, voices and historical points. Their flexibility and intertwined threads reflect dualism of global art— being global and local.

## II. Exhibition Histories and Art History

The preface of Afterall’s *Exhibition Histories* series pointed out, “History of modern art has conventionally focused on artistic production, emphasizing the individual artist in the studio and the influences on his or her practice. *Exhibition Histories* challenge this approach by arguing for an examination of art in the context of its presentation in the public realm. Every decision about the selection and installation of work, the choice and use of the venue, the marketing strategy and the accompanying printed matter informs our understanding of the art on display....”<sup>10</sup> Here exhibitions are rather a collective presentation of artworks but the one comprise complicated relations, including work/ artist, time/ space, curatorial awareness/ concept/ practice, collective community, political/ social/ economic situations, cultural discourse, participation of audience and so on. These inter-relations can be regarded as a compound “complex.”

“Art history” is in favor of a chronological narrative of artworks and marks the importance of paragon heritage among one and another.<sup>11</sup> Modern art, for instance, refers to the narrative of Western world from the end of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century. Alfred H. Barr, Jr., the first director of The Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York City in 1929, designed a flow-chart of different modern art schools. In this famous chart, Barr’s historical viewpoint was clarified and it illustrated the inter-relations

7. See Hans Belting, “Contemporary Art as Global Art: A Critical Estimate,” in *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets, and Museums*, edited by Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg. Hatje Cantz, 2009, pp.38-73.

8. *Ibid.*, pp.40.

9. See Note 7., pp.40, pp.48.

10. See preface in *Exhibition Histories: Making Art Global (Part-1) The Third Havana Biennial 1989*. London: Afterall, 2011.

11. Giorgio Vasari was an artist in the Renaissance. He used to be an anonymous craftsman. Ever since his book of art history *The Lives of Artists* was published, the narrations of artists’ biography and their famous works became the main writing pattern of art history.

and influences among art schools. Since then, MoMA has taken this significant chart as standard, organizing exhibitions by schools. With an intensive and careful process of researches, exhibitions, collections and catalogue designs, the significance of every avant-garde art school has been determined and organized. Ever since the 1980s, the fields of art history have met its public: from fine arts to popular art, from Eurocentrism to non-Western art, from discussing artwork alone to placing in a wider social environment, and from only applying the methodologies of art history to borrow research methods from other humanities and social science. Despite these expansions and shifts, we have to admit that a certain “work” (or artist) has been still centralized along with a close references of histories.

The early researches on exhibitions took art history as its subject, regarding exhibition histories as a unique but minor branch to art history and considering exhibitions in museums as merely a way to writing art history. As a result, the training of art history became a necessary requirement for museum administrators. Under this circumstances, exhibition histories were viewed as an aspect of writing history and a subgenre. Established in 2000, Asia Art Archive has archived a large number of exhibition-related publications. Its recent research projects, including *Materials of the Future: Documenting Contemporary Chinese Art from 1980-1990* and *Hong Kong Art History Research - Pilot Project*, recognized exhibition-related writing, literature and objects as important materials and research subjects. Exhibitions have become the primary sites of art historical construction for recent art from the region. In 2013, Asia Art Archive organized an international symposium, *Sites of Construction: Exhibitions and the Making of Recent Art History in Asia* as part of this long-term engagement. Similarly, this symposium focused on art history and saw exhibitions as one of the writing methods. The preface of the symposium guide noted that “exhibitions are where artworks meet their public and they have played a leading role in constructing the regional contemporary art history. In the context of Asia, however, in the absence of systematic public collections and substantial academic art history departments dedicated to art from the region, exhibitions are more than just sites of display and interaction. Exhibitions – and by extension, curatorial strategies, institutional demands, and forms of art writing accompanying exhibitions – have become the primary sites of art historical construction for recent art from the region.”<sup>12</sup> This introduction distinguished exhibitions as the first site of historical construction as well as a writing medium. An in-depth research on “exhibitions” was an appeal to understand the current construction of art history in Asian provenance. In brief, those attending scholars and professionals noticed and acknowledged the magnitude of exhibitions but their first priority was still art history.

Claire Bishop, the researcher of British art history and contemporary art, bespoke exhibition histories as an ‘art-historical subgenre in her *Artforum* article “Making Art Global: Shows of force: Claire Bishop on making art global” in 2014.<sup>13</sup> This is exactly a representative thought explains that exhibition histories can only serve as an application or a branch of art history. Lucy Steeds, a British researcher of exhibition histories, published her article “Contemporary Art, Curating and Exhibition Histories” in 2015, to challenge Bishop’s opinions and offered theoretical basis to “exhibition histories.” She took an exploration of the term “exhibition” and lay her research on rethinking the dialectic between “exhibition value” and “cult value,” posed by Walter Benjamin in his article “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” in the 1930s. It seemed that this dialectic became the core of exhibition histories and remarks the importance of exhibitions to its public realm. “Works of art are received and valued on different planes. Two polar types

---

12. See preface in the booklet of *Sites of Construction: Exhibitions and the Making of Recent Art History in Asia*, which took place at Hong Kong Arts Centre on October 21-23, 2013.

13. Claire Bishop, “Making Art Global: Shows of Force: Claire Bishop on Making Art Global,” *Artforum*, vol. 52, issue 10, Summer, 2014. <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Shows+of+force%3A+Claire+Bishop+on+making+art+global.-a0364198982>. Accessed 1 April 2018.

stand out; with one, the accent is on the cult value; with the other, on the exhibition value of the work. [...] With the different methods of technical reproduction of a work of art, its fitness for exhibition increased to such an extent that the quantitative shift between its two poles turned into a qualitative transformation of its nature,” she quoted. Following Benjamin’s idea— “The reception of a work of art by its contemporaries is part of the effect that the work of art has on us today,” Steed precisely argued for the field of exhibition histories.

She addressed the special position of exhibition histories to art history by drawing on the understanding of “minor literature” proposed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. The concept of minor literature was proposed in the 1975 celebration of the writings of Franz Kafka and offered a statement “a minor literature is not the literature of a minor language but the literature a minority makes in a major language”<sup>14</sup> and it is effective when it comes to make strange and deterritorialize the major literature. Thus, the difference between exhibition histories and art history stands out: exhibition histories own their perspectives and language. It indeed provides art history a sense of defamiliarization to loose boundaries and rules of disciplines. As Steeds said, “the ‘minor’ mode we might call exhibition histories stutters forcefully within the registers of art history, destabilizing the language of this dominant, ‘major’ discipline.”<sup>15</sup>

The long ignorance of “exhibition histories,” has been recently subverted. The independent research field of exhibition histories comes into being and shows its great potential values. In January 2017, the lecturers and audiences in a conference in Oslo<sup>16</sup> underwent an intense debate. One of the comment noted, “Art history was clearly a subgenre of exhibition histories!”<sup>17</sup> Another case took place in the opening of the exhibition *Art Turns. World Turns*, held by the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art in Nusantara (Museum MACAN) in November, 2017. Aside from selecting works by timeline and concepts of art history, the exhibition also illustrated the exhibition histories of Indonesia, “By reviewing the exhibition histories of the Indonesia, we can understand how exhibitions become the interface for the extensive interactions among artists’ works, the public, curators, gallery owners, managers, collectors, sponsors, organizers and the government. The power structure of art practice and art world can be better interpreted if the exhibition histories are reviewed.”<sup>18</sup> The structures of politics, economics, societies and cultures were given to present different relations beyond art history. The importance of exhibition histories as public cultural properties was confirmed here.

The author has conducted a long investigation on researches of exhibition histories and contemporary curating and believed “exhibition histories” can be an independent field. Exhibition histories and art history should be two parallel systems but be supportive for each other. At the same time, exhibition histories can be a retrospective and criticism of the existing art history. From the perspective of global art, exhibition histories complicate people’s understanding to the nature of art histories and reshape the existing framework. Furthermore, not only do exhibition histories relate to art history, but also they connect extensively with museology, or museum studies. Not to mention that recently, contemporary curating expands into cultural

14. Lucy Steeds, “Contemporary Art, Curating and Exhibition Histories,” translated by Wang Shengzhi, *Art Critique of Taiwan (ACT)*, vol. 64, Oct. 2015, pp. 108-115.

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Off(f) Our Times: The Aftermath of the Ephemeral and other Curatorial Anachronic Part 2*, Oslo National Academy of the Arts, 28 January, 2017 – convened by Beatrice von Bismarck and Rike Frank <https://www.artandeducation.net/announcements/105470/of-f-our-times-the-aftermath-of-the-ephemeral-and-other-curatorial-anachronics-two-part-public-seminar>. Accessed 1 April 2018

17. Steeds also shared her experience at the speech in “Giving Cause to Pause: Exhibition Histories and the 4th Gwangju Biennale of 2002” on October 27, 2017 at Taipei MOCA for the talk series *Curating History/ Histories of Curating in Asia I*.

18. Agung Hujatmika, “Setting to Biennial: Twists and Turns in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century History of Art in Indonesia,” *Art Turns. World Turn: Exploring the Collection of the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art in Nusantara*. Jakarta: Museum MACAN, 2017, pp.37

studies as well as cultural creative industries. Exhibition histories should be treated as a complex and involve methods from cross-field, cross-discipline and cross-region, including art history, philosophy, cultural studies, sociology, anthropology, politics, economics and journalism. By absorbing these disciplines and then allocating discussed issues, exhibitions become visible and sensible. Irit Rogoff, the professor of the Curatorial/ Knowledge PhD Research Program in Goldsmiths, University of London, noted, “One in which we would not determine which knowledges went into the work of curating but would insist on a new set of relations between those knowledges—a new set of relations that would not drive home the point of an argument, as in much academic work, and would not produce a documented and visualized cohesion around a phenomenon, as in much curatorial practice,”<sup>19</sup> and “It is not that the curatorial needs bolstering by theory, philosophy, or history—but rather that these arenas could greatly benefit from the modes of assemblage that make up the curatorial at its best, when it is attempting to enact the event of knowledge rather than to illustrate those knowledges.”<sup>20</sup> Exhibitions are art practices, art production and knowledge production. The plural forms of exhibition histories has completely reversed the Eurocentric writings of art history and become a new access of knowledge production.

### III. The Values of Exhibition Histories

The implied methodologies in the serial books, *Exhibition Histories* bore a sense of retrospecting and investigating exhibitions that have shaped the way contemporary art is experienced, made and discussed, allowing the past exhibitions to respond to the present. The main collection of primary sources, including curatorial statements, art criticism, artworks, catalogues and even some interviews and written articles by experts or participants were archived and provided sufficient documentations for future research. These resources archived the past and correspondingly documented the present. A chronological timeline is emphasized by art history, whereas exhibition histories value both vertical diachronicity and horizontal synchronicity: historical depth, geographic extensiveness and encounters of people at that moment. Moreover, the retrospective writings on exhibition histories not simply include a sequent process of collecting, organizing, researching, analyzing and writing toward history but also a follow-up procedure of examining, rethinking and representing histories. Hence, exhibitions can be seen as a representation of history, a criticism of its mechanism and a possible reflection of public cultural history.

**The first method is by staging or reconstructing the landmark exhibitions, exhibitions can be seen as an approach to re-narrate history.** Showcasing considerable research, data and archival materials with a contemporary vision, previous exhibitions and their related issues are restated and become concrete again. Cases are like recreation of the milestone exhibition *When Attitudes Become Form* (1969) by Prada Foundation during Venice Biennial in 2013 with reproductions of artworks according to references to literature archives. In 2014, Centre Georges Pompidou curated a documentary exhibition in celebration of *Magiciens de la terre*'s 25th anniversary, exhibiting the original archives, including maps, letters, photos and documentaries. At the same time, Tate Modern curated film showings to create the ambiance of the original exhibition. Moving to the another side of the world, MoMA held a private session and invite the curators and participants of *Magiciens de la terre* to share their experiences in memorial of this significant milestone exhibition. Another example happened when Ullens Center for Contemporary Art (UCCA) opened in

---

19. Irit Rogoff, “The Expanding Field,” *Yishu: Journal of Contemporary Chinese Art (Chinese)*, vol. 13. issue 1, Mar. 2014, pp.13. This article was delivered in *Sites of Construction: Exhibitions and the Making of Recent Art History in Asia*, an international symposium organized by Asia Art Archive in Hong Kong.

20. *Ibid.*

Beijing and its opening exhibition, *85 New Wave: The Birth of Chinese Contemporary Art* (85新潮：中國第一次當代藝術運動), reviewed the avant-garde art of China in the 1980s and gathered many prominent artists and their artworks. The gestures of reconstructing previous exhibitions show how exhibition histories echo into the present days.

**The second method involves taking exhibitions as a chance for a retrospective, an institutional critique and a reexamination toward an existing art historical viewpoint.** Case in point: In 1992, Fred Wilson was invited by the Maryland Historical Society to look into their collections. He titled the project *Mining the Museum* and tried to offer another historical narration. By exhibiting long-ignored collections, he uncovered the muted black-slave history and aboriginal history, differentiating crafts from artworks. Of equal importance was his criticism on the ideology of white supremacy. Another example was *America is Hard to See*, an exhibition took the inauguration of the Museum's new building in 2015 as an opportunity to re-examine museum's collections since it opened its door in 1931.<sup>21</sup> The exhibition turned its focus on the Americans immigrant artists and used thematic concepts, such as immigrants, migration and cultural hybridity for reclaiming these ignored artworks back to their art history. By doing so, the definitions of "America" and "American artists" were redefined. This is the institutional history of Whitney Museum of America art and simultaneously, this is an exhibition that redefine American art history.

**The third method regards exhibitions as the platform of reflecting regional public history.** In think of exhibitions as a complex, they are both a production of public cultures and a part of public cultural history. As a result, exhibition practices gain a hold for examine public history. As proof, Para Site Gallery in Hong Kong curated the exhibition, *Great Crescent: Art and Agitation in the 1960s—Japan, South Korea and Taiwan*<sup>22</sup> was a small-scale try of comparative art history. The exhibition highlighted "anti-art" performative tendencies in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan in the 1960s. Also it intended to respond the connections among these three countries during the Cold-War period. As a part of art history, concurrently this was a reflection on the overall public culture within certain regions and allowed us to understand the regional characteristics of Asia in cross-country, cross-region and cross-culture. Another instance was *Discordant Harmony*,<sup>23</sup> a project initiated by the Goethe-Institut, in which several institutions, curators and artists from Taiwan, Japan, South Korea and China were involved. Built on the twisted histories and the ideological experiences during the Cold-War among these four Northeast Asian countries, it reflected the imagination of Asia and looked into various situations and issues that Asia confronted. While traveling among several Asian countries, the exhibition adapted its programs to specific local settings and interests, creating a discursive platform in order to review the real "Asian" issues.

#### IV. The Absent Taiwan Exhibition Histories

The issues of Taiwan exhibition histories might neither raising a debate over art history and exhibition histories, nor questioning the value of exhibition histories but a rare research subject to this day. Hardly have exhibition histories in different historical phases of Taiwan been reviewed, namely expositions, museums and art exhibitions during the Japanese governance, the exhibitions under the Kuomintang's (KMT) rule during the Cold-War and the contemporary curating around the lifting of martial law. They scattered in different fields such as Taiwanese history, art history, visual culture and so on. Researches on exhibition

21. See *America Is Hard To See* <https://whitney.org/Exhibitions/AmericaIsHardToSee>. Accessed 1 April 2018.

22. See *Great Crescent: Art and Agitation in the 1960s--Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan* <http://www.para-site.org/hk/zh-HK/exhibitions/great-crescent-art-and-agitation-in-the-1960s-japan-south-korea-and-taiwan>. Accessed 1 April 2018.

23. See *Discordant Harmony* <http://www.goethe.de/ins/kr/seo/prj/har/cnindex.htm>. Accessed 1 April 2018.

histories remains vacant, absent and blank. Henceforth, the following sections will sort out the existing researches from three aspects: the shifting of historical viewpoints, cultural turn and disciplinary turn.

**Shifting of historical viewpoints is the primary requirement as engaging in the research on Taiwan exhibition histories.** During the long period of martial law, KMT exclusively advocated Chinese art history and Chinese nationalism and used the relics in the National Palace Museum as a powerful demonstration of its rightfulness. Around the lifting of martial law in 1987, the pursuit of the Taiwanese consciousness had gradually become keen and alert. The emergence of localism in the 1990s was the warm-up of veering to Taiwan. Ni Tsai-chin's (倪再沁) article "Western Art, Made in Taiwan" (臺灣美術·西方製造) had evoked the debate over Taiwanese art in *Lion Art* (雄獅美術) from 1991 to 1993. At the beginning of the 1990s, public museums held many exhibitions concerning art history of Taiwan. However, not until the 1996 Taipei Biennial (臺北雙年展), which took Taiwanese identity as the theme, did the discourses of localization officially is approved by the authorities. The first party alternation of Taiwan took place in Millennium with the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) came into power. Associated with the strong advocacy of the Taiwanese consciousness, DPP aimed to establish a new perspective of Taiwan. Discourses like "maritime Taiwan" or "austronesian cultures" were the refutation of the long-monopolistic Grand-China ideology and turned its focus on Taiwanese culture, its subjectivity and its geo-political realities, which opening a door for the researches on modern art history of Taiwan in the 1990s.

**Cultural turn allows the research of Taiwan history from an eco-political dimensions to a more sophisticated cultural ones.** Concepts and mechanisms such as expositions, museums and art exhibitions were introduced to Taiwan during the Japanese colonial governance. Embedded with colonial modernity, this transmission was crucial for Taiwan exhibition histories, especially the translation of the concept, term and practice of exhibitions. Due to the connected relations between expositions and exhibitions, researches on exposition are also embraced as a part of Taiwan exhibition histories. Historian Lu Shao-li (呂紹理) discussed expositions from the edge of Taiwan history. His representative work, *Exhibiting Taiwan: Power, Space and Image Representation of Japanese Colonial Rule* (展示臺灣：權力、空間與殖民統治的形象表述) did a survey on characteristics of spaces, structures of exhibition classifications, intentions of curators, and the audiences' perceptions to address how the colonists displayed their governance and achievements and how exhibitions affected the entertainmentization of daily consumption and culture. Analysis of spatial arrangement, activity design, visual communication, city relations and so on were taken into consideration. Today, studies on expositions are relatively sufficient and most of them are master's theses published by graduate schools of history, Taiwanese literature, art history, visual communication and design.

Regarding the discussion of the exposition mechanism, we have the artist, Hsieh Li-fa's (謝里法) *Art Movement History of Taiwan during the Japanese Colonial Period* (日據時代臺灣美術運動史), published in 1970s.<sup>24</sup> It examined the art development during the Japanese governance through the lens of nationalist movements and the attendance of the regular exhibitions held by private associations and the official exhibitions were categorized as the evaluation of artists. Few clues of locations for the early exhibitions were listed, such as the private meeting of literati, traditional painting framing shops, tea houses, schools and even those formal and big-scale art exhibitions, expositions and museums. Similar example goes to Yen Chuan-ying's (顏娟英) article "Art in Museums: The Early Contemporary Art and Cultural Inspirations in Taiwan" (殿堂中的美術：臺灣早期現代美術與文化啓蒙). She likewise indicated that art exhibitions

24. "Art Movement History of Taiwan during the Japanese Colonial Period" was a serial published in *The Artists* (藝術家) from June 1976 to December 1977 and later published by Artist Magazine (藝術家雜誌社).

tended to be political activities under the colonial circumstance. Yen and her students also looked into art exhibitions during the period of Japanese governance, such as the Taiwan Fine Art Exhibition (臺展) and Taiwan Governor Art Exhibition (府展), offering a critical analysis toward what kind of roles of official art exhibitions took in the formation of art concepts as well as its influences. Next, the exhibition studies of post-war period include Huang Tung-fu's (黃冬富) research on the Chinese Painting Department in the Taiwan Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition (省展) (1998) and Hsiao Chon-ray's (蕭瓊瑞) discussion on the conflict over authentic Chinese paintings (1988), historical examination of the regulation changes to the 28th Taiwan Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition (1995) and his monograph *Research on the 80 Years of Taiwan Fine Art Exhibitions* (臺灣美展八十年研究) (2009). Discussions of exhibition mechanisms mostly concentrate on reviewing system and the styles of the awarded art works, so unavoidably the values of art works and the construction of art history are spotlighted. In these cases, exhibitions are merely regarded as the way to success for artists.

**The shift of discipline provides researchers considerable diverse approaches.** In the 1990s, researches on art criticism and contemporary art were sprang up across the art circle in Taiwan. With those new emerging graduate schools, the research methods were no longer constrained by art history but turn to multidisciplinary fields of art criticism, new museum studies, visual culture and cultural studies to seek more possibilities, which has initiated the studies on exhibition mechanisms in Taiwan since 2000. Based on Michel Foucault's power/ knowledge deployment, Chiang Po-shin (蔣伯欣) developed the concept called "curatorial apparatus" at the end of the 1990s to criticize 1998 Taipei Biennial. Applied with an aspect of visual culture, Chiang's doctoral dissertation "Avant-Garde Art and the Formation of Museums: A Study of Cultural History of Visuality in Modern Taiwan" (近代臺灣的前衛美術與博物館形構：一個視覺文化史的探討) reviewed the exhibition mechanisms of every stages of art history in Taiwan. In addition to museums, such as the National Palace Museum, National Museum of History and Taipei Fine Arts Museum, the mechanisms of the São Paulo Art Biennial in the 1950s and 1960s were all carefully discussed in his writing. In Chiang's article, Taiwan was reshaped with a series of international exchanges. The author's master thesis "International Exhibitions of Taipei Fine Art Museum in Post-90s: Investigation of the Strategy 'Localization/Globalization'" (後九〇年代臺北市立美術館國際策展的「本土/國際」策略探討) explored the establishment and initial development of the Taipei Biennial and Venice Biennial from the sides of poetics and politics of exhibitions. This research served the purpose of reviewing Taiwan's international exchanges in the same manner. Research studies on mechanisms of museums and biennales with the cross-disciplinary methodologies are mostly master's theses and a majority of current exhibition histories researches.

After mid 2000, academic institutions across Taiwan established numerous courses and graduate schools which viewed exhibition studies as a new field of professionalization.<sup>25</sup> It tells that curating has deviated from practical experiences into academic fields. As a result, the education, research, historical writing and knowledge production of curating have been developed extensively. Over the last five years, on the one hand, art curating has expanded its parameters to content curation, cultural and creative curation and social curation. On the other hand, the professionalization of visual art has enriched this field with many

25. In 2006, the Department of Fine Arts of Tunghai University established the Art Curation and Criticism Module. Graduate Institute of Trans-disciplinary Arts was established in National Kaohsiung Normal University the same year. In 2009, the Graduate Institute of Trans-disciplinary Arts of National Taipei University of the Arts had classified its curriculum into "cross-disciplinary creativity" and "cultural production and exhibition curating" in order to bring up the significance of curating. In 2014, the curating program started to be included in the bachelor curriculum at National Taipei University of Education. In 2016, Critical and Curatorial Studies at Contemporary Arts of National Taipei University of Education became the first program with the name of curation. Along with the curation-related academic programs, the cultural and creative departments have also been established for further engaging in academic research from the perspectives of galleries, industries and mechanisms.

creative ideas. For instance, Wang Man-hua (王曼華) was explicit about the dilemmas as an independent curator in Taiwan from her own experience. She named the term “anti-curating” to urge the necessity of writings on curating and reconstructions of the local historical context. One of the first significant books on exhibition histories in Taiwan by the author, *Contemporary Art Curating in Taiwan 1992-2012* (臺灣當代藝術策展二十年) listed the milestone or landmark contemporary curating examples since 1992 in Taiwan. Despite the lack of archival materials in history, the book exactly presented a dimension of contemporary curating histories in Taiwan as an attempt for in-depth research of its kind. These publications illustrate the shift of historical viewpoint taking place after the lifting of martial law in the 1980s and its turn from Great-China ideology to Taiwan’s subjectivity. The cultural and disciplinary shifts endeavor exhibition studies a fundamental, including methodologies and materials.

Responding to the previous discussion: the value of exhibition histories, the existing studies mainly **regard exhibitions as representation of history**. To put it in another way, art history is the main concern and exhibition is a method of writing art history. Exhibiting artworks are merely complementary elements for art history. Special research exhibitions held by museums are in a similar manner to present art history beyond writings. **What’s more, taking exhibitions as an institutional critique** can extend researches on the embedded power/ knowledge relations with an inclusion of museum studies, visual culture, art criticisms, eco-politic-social subjects. But until now there are very few of this sort of studies and most of them still deal with data. Seldom of them do propose any visionary concepts.

There is even a handful of texts **regarding exhibitions as the reflection of the regional public history**. The present writings on exhibition histories or studies are mostly limited to Taiwan while few comparative researches are carried out within Asian region, let alone any awareness or breakthrough on methodologies are realized. At the end of the 1990s, a couple of Asian-theme exhibitions inquired into the position of Taiwan and its productions, which was quite in a sense of global art. Cases are like, *Site of Desire: 1998 Taipei Biennial* (欲望場域) dugged into four Northeast Asian countries, studying their rapid-changing cities and art developments. *Oil Painting in the East Asia: Its Awakening and Development* (東亞油畫的誕生與開展) in Taipei Fine Arts Museum presented a five-year cross-country study. Chiang argued in 2000, “we need an overall survey on curating history and organize every significant curating example in contemporary art history just like case studies in business management. A comparative art studies, both the modern art development and the contemporary art in other Asian countries is definitely in need.”<sup>26</sup> Yet, this idea is not realized.

Within the recent five years, engrossing discussions across Asian neighborhood have been increased. The debate over the nationality of the invited artists of the Venice Biennial of Taiwan Pavilion in the end of 2012 was a distinct example. This incident provoked controversies and several terms came out. “Taiwan’s internal westernization” from Gong Jow-jiun (龔卓軍),<sup>27</sup> “the internalized colonial heteronomy of Taiwan” by Huang Jian-hong (黃建宏),<sup>28</sup> and “the shift of referencing point” from Takamori Nobuo (高森信男).<sup>29</sup>

26. Lin Po-shin, “The Discursive Formation of Contemporary Art Curatorship: Also on Transformations of the Subject-Position in Taiwan (1996-1999),” *Chung Wai Literary Quarterly*, Vol. 343, pp.4-40. Lin Po-shin (林伯欣) later changed his name into Chiang Po-shin (蔣伯欣)

27. Gong Jow-jiun, “The Monster Within-European and American Centrist--How to Revive a Biennial Imagination for the Taipei Biennial,” *Modern Art*, vol. 165, Dec. 2012, pp.18-31.

28. Huang Chien-hung, “Taking Back Production--Globalization’s Latent Colonialism and the Political Economy,” *Re-envisioning Society: #10 Demolition Eve: Forum and Sound Performance*. Taipei: The Cube Project Space, 2013, pp.176-179.

29. Takamori Nobuo, “From Tributary System to Networking: Redefined “International Art” / Connection Processes between Peripheral Regions,” *Re-envisioning Society: #10 Demolition Eve: Forum and Sound Performance*. Taipei: The Cube Project Space, 2013, pp.181-182. At the end of 2013, the talk between Takamori and Hsu Chia-wei (許家維) discussed the “Shift in the point of reference—from ‘We’re OPEN’ to the ‘Outsiders Factory’ Southeast Asian experience” and addressed the possibility of shifting the reference point. Records of the Spring Project lectures: [springfoundation.org.tw/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/-----\\_.pdf](http://springfoundation.org.tw/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/-----_.pdf). Accessed 1 April 2018.



Taiwan's rooted dependence on Eurocentrism was seriously criticized, which led to a serial action of inspecting the relations among neighboring countries under a umbrella of Asia.<sup>30</sup> The recent lecture series *Spring Project: Curating History/ Histories of Curating in Asia* (春之當代夜：亞洲。策展/史) was another instance followed this direction to investigate Asia. With a common circumstances that most of these Asian cities do have insufficient archives, the involved lecturers discussed whether rapid-changing Asia could offer new inspirations by reviewing the dynamic relations between curating and histories. This series was divided into two parts, namely "Curating History" and "Histories of Curating." The former took curating as a new path to view historical issues while the latter discussed the methodologies of reviewing, writing and researching on curating histories. International exhibition researchers and curators from Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Australia and England were invited to join and the organizer invited art researchers and curators from Taiwan to provide local responses to each session, hoping to link and illustrate the possible contemporary topography of curatorial histories in Asia.

### Conclusion: toward Taiwan Exhibition Histories

From the perspectives of global art and plural histories, Taiwan exhibition histories indeed exist and grow from its locality. However, this context has not been investigated in detail or studied further yet, remaining as a condition of vacancy/ absent/ blankness. The research of "exhibition histories" or "contemporary curating" have only come in an orderly fashion to Western world since 2008; therefore, it is not too late for Taiwan to do its own exhibition histories. Since the field has not been governed with any strict module, there is a high flexibility to rearrange the existing researches. The primary task for Taiwan is to prepare related archives and construct the solid and rich foundation for future research. Thus, the discussions of characteristics of exhibitions, relations between exhibition histories and art history and values of exhibition histories mentioned above can all be the research basis.

While engaging in Taiwan exhibition histories, we can also deal with the historical discrepancy from its multiple colonial phases. Rather than focusing on the original sources, the concepts and processes are the priorities. Meanwhile, we should also reconsider the position of Taiwan through the geo-political framework with a global vision, such as comparing marine culture to mainland one and Han to Austronesian cultures. We could also expand our researches broader to Asia Pacific or see Taiwan as the intersection of the Southeast and Northeast Asia. Standing on such multiple and intertwined perspectives, the construction of exhibition histories in Taiwan can not only unfold the internal issues but also set up a discursive platform among Asian countries from the cross-country, cross-field and cross-cultural perspectives. Writing will no longer be the only method to present exhibition histories but engage with multifaceted and multi-layered approaches. With the angle of global art, we are ultimately expecting an arrival at a plural exhibition histories. (Translated by WANG, Shang-Hao)

30. Open Contemporary Art Center (OCAC) moved to Bangkok, Thailand temporarily from August 2012 to January 2013. With the sponsorship of the National Culture and Arts Foundation, Kao Jun-honn (高俊宏) examined the new art activism in East Asian in the background of globalization in 2012. Three years later, he published the book *Multitude: Art and Squat action in East Asia* (諸眾：東亞藝術佔領行動) and other related publications.

## References

- Belting, Hans. "Contemporary Art as Global Art: A Critical Estimate." *The global art world: audiences, markets, and museums*, edited by Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg. Hatje Cantz, 2009, pp. 38-73.
- Belting, Hans. "From World Art to Global Art: View on a New Panorama." *The Global Contemporary Art and the Rise of New World*, edited by Hans Belting, Andrea Buddensieg and Peter Weibel. MIT Press, 2013, pp. 178-185.
- Belting, Hans. *Art History after Modernism*, translated by Su Wei. Beijing: Gold Wall Press, 2013.
- Bishop, Claire. "Making Art Global: Shows of Force: Claire Bishop on Making Art Global." *Artforum*, vol. 52, issue 10, Summer 2014.
- Conrad, Sebastian. *What is Global History?* translated by Feng Yi-da, Taipei: Gusa Publishing, 2016
- Danto, Arthur C. *After The End of Art*, translated by Lin Ya-qi and Zheng Hui-wen, Taipei: Rye Field Publishing Co, 2010.
- Esche, Charles & Agung Hujatnika. *Art Turns. World Turn: Exploring the Collection of the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art in Nusantara*. Jakarta: Museum MACAN, 2017.
- Gong, Jow-jiun. "The Monster Within-European and American Centricism--How to Revive a Biennial Imagination for the Taipei Biennial." *Modern Art*, vol. 165, Dec. 2012, pp. 18-31.
- Huang, Chien-hung. "Taking Back Production--Globalization's Latent Colonialism and the Political Economy." *Re-envisioning Society: #10 Demolition Eve: Forum and Sound Performance*. Taipei: TheCube Project Space, 2013, pp. 176-179.
- Lin, Po-shin. "The Discursive Formation of Contemporary Art Curatorship: Also on Transformations of the Subject-Position in Taiwan (1996-1999)." *Chung Wai Literary Quarterly*, vol. 343, pp. 4-40.
- Lu, Shao-li. *Exhibiting Taiwan: Power, Space and Image Representation of Japanese Colonial Rule*. Taipei: Rye Field Publishing Co, 2005.
- Rogoff, Irit. "The Expanding Field." *Yishu: Journal of Contemporary Chinese Art (Chinese)*, vol. 13, issue 1, Mar. 2014, pp. 10-15
- Steeds, Lucy. "Contemporary Art, Curating and Exhibition Histories." translated by Wang Sheng-zhi, *Art Critique of Taiwan*, vol. 64, Oct. 2015.10, pp. 108-115.
- Symposium: *Exhibitions and Making of Contemporary Asian Art History*. Asia Art Archive, 2013.
- Takamori, Nobuo. "From Tributary System to Networking: Redefined "International Art" / Connection Processes between Peripheral Regions." *Re-envisioning Society: #10 Demolition Eve: Forum and Sound Performance*. Taipei: TheCube Project Space, 2013, pp. 181-182.
- Yoshimi, Shunya. *The Politics of Exposition: Imperialism, Commercialism and Popular Entertainment*, translated by Su Shuo-bin et al., Taipei: Socio Publishing, 2010.

## Websites

- America Is Hard To See*. 1 May–27 Sep. 2015, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, <https://whitney.org/Exhibitions/AmericalsHardToSee>. Accessed 1 April 2018.
- Curating History/ Histories of Curating in Asia*, 06-27 June 2017, Spring project, Spring Foundation, Taipei, <http://springfoundation.org.tw/en/sf-event/396/>. Accessed 1 April 2018.
- Curating History/ Histories of Curating in Asia II*, 25 May-29 June 2018, Spring project, Spring Foundation, Taipei, <http://springfoundation.org.tw/en/sf-event/curating-history-histories-of-curating-in-asia-ii/>. Accessed 1 April 2018.
- Discordant Harmony*. Goethe-Institut, Seoul, <http://www.goethe.de/ins/kr/seo/prj/har/cnindex.htm>. Accessed 1 April 2018.
- Exhibition Histories*, Afterall, University of Arts London, London, <https://www.afterall.org/books/exhibition.histories/>. Accessed 1 April 2018.
- Great Crescent: Art and Agitation in the 1960s--Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan*. 22 Nov. 2013- 09 Feb. 2014, Para Site, Hong Kong, <http://www.parasite.org.hk/zh-HK/exhibitions/great-crescent-art-and-agitation-in-the-1960s-japan-south-korea-and-taiwan>. Accessed 1 April 2018.
- The Global Contemporary. Art Worlds after 1989*, 17 Sep. 2011- 5 Feb. 2012, ZKM | Museum of Contemporary Art, Karlsruhe, <http://www.global-contemporary.de/en/exhibition>. Accessed 1 April 2018.

國立台灣美術館  
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts