全球化與在地化

**David Harvey: The assertion of any place-bound identity has to rest at some point on the motivational power of tradition. It is difficult, however, to maintain any sense of historical continuity in the face of all the flux, and ephemerality of flexible accumulation... At best, historical tradition is reorganized as a museum culture, not necessarily of high modernist art, but of local history, of local production, of how things once upon a time were made, sold, consumed, and integrated into a long-lost and often romanticized daily life (one from which all trace of oppressive social relations may be expanded). Through the presentation of a partially illusory past it becomes possible to signify something of local identity and perhaps to do it profitably.**

**Arif Dirlik: Not surprisingly, under the regime of modernity, the defense of place was to come to be linked to conservative opposition to modernity—or, what amounts to the same thing politically, to a nostalgic yearning for a past lost irrevocably. From the perspective of a modernist radicalism, moreover, the concern for place appears as an impediment to the struggle against capitalism, which, in its very "realism," accepts the destruction of places as a condition of its success.**

Place as metaphor suggests groundedness from below, and a flexible and porous boundary around it, without closing out the extralocal, all the way to the global. What is important about the metaphor is that it calls for a definition of what is to be included in the place from within the place—some control over the conduct and organization of everyday life, in other words—rather than from above, from those placeless abstractions such as capital, the nation-state, and their discursive expressions in the realm of theory...the struggle for place in the concrete is a struggle against power and the hegemony of abstractions.

(二) 全球化時代的地方空間政治

**capitalism as an economic-cultural system**

**development as “social imaginary”**

John Tomlinson: The idea that modern societies are about growth and progress is one of their central imaginary significations—but what the imaginary can no longer provide are qualitative goals and visions, any sense of a completion to progress, any sense of where communities are going. So the idea of “development” is realized simply in terms of constant movement along an undefined axis; growth becomes simply the provision of “more”......

**the global city and developmentalism**

**indigenerism**

(三) 優越原鄉想像與台灣本土化論述

原鄉想像、現代性(modernity)、資本主義

原鄉與(國族、性別、族群)認同：「台灣性」是什麼？

鹿港與全球化時代地方政治的基督意義

(四) 兩部紀錄片與地方想像:

鹿港舊街

極光寶島