

## Chief Editor's Preface to the Inaugural Issue– Taiwan/Asia-Pacific – Culture as a Method: International Knowledge Regime and Network Ecology of *Culture: Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship*

LIU Jerry C. Y. \*

In November 2022, Taiwan Association of Cultural Policy Studies (TACPS) launches a new international academic journal, *Culture: Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship* (CPME). Based in Taiwan, it aims to bring about important findings locally, regionally, and globally, in order to advance critical knowledge and discourse in the area of CPME. Taking the newly started journal, which located at the Taiwan/Asia-Pacific rim as an entry point, we wish to engage in the global knowledge regime or network ecology of CPME critically, and reconsider the conditions and status of international knowledge production and publishing.

The CPME editorial office has organized two launching forums for the journal. One was held at the Huashan Creative Park in Feb. 2022,<sup>1</sup> the other was held in the International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (ICCP) at Antwerp in Nov. 2022.<sup>2</sup> Taking "Taiwan/Asia-Pacific – Culture as a Method" the Editor in Chief proposed two analytical approaches to understand the field of CPME studies today. The first is the international knowledge regime in the Foucauldian sense, which involves power, institutions, procedures, and discourses. The second is the global network ecology of knowledge production, which focuses on the creative, collaborative, and mutual nurturing relations among varied actors or agents.

The key questions asked in the forums are: 1. What knowledge disciplines does *Culture: Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship* involve, where do we draw lines when defining its scope? Can the CPME knowledge maintain its agency and reflexivity in the institutionalizing

---

\* Professor, Graduate School of Arts Management and Cultural Policy, National Taiwan University of Arts, Taiwan

1 TACPS, 2022, transcribed by Liu Yu-liang, "Notes on CPME Launching Forum: International Knowledge Regime of Cultural Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship [論壇側記] CPME 期刊創刊: 談「文化政策、管理與新創的知識生產體制」". Taipei, Huashan 1914 Creative Park. Cultural Breeze Forum, Feb. 25. Webpage: <http://cpme.tacps.tw/news02/> (Accessed on Oct. 1, 2022).

2 Jerry C. Y. Liu. 2022. "International Knowledge Regime? or Network Ecology? for Academic Publishing in Cultural Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship." Antwerp, International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, Panel Session, Sep. 22. The panel session is organized by Jerry C. Y. Liu online and chaired by Professor Ian King. Panelists attended the session on site include Professor Lluís Bonet, Annick Schramme, Richard Maloney, Hye-kyung Lee, and Marcin Poprawski, who are all editorial advisory board members of the CPME.

process? 2. How does the CPME face the power imbalance between the West and Non-West, and global North and South? And what does it really mean by "Taiwan/Asia-Pacific – Culture as a Method"? 3. Taking "culture as a method," can the CPME deal with significant issues in the contemporary daily life? Can culture keep its central position when connecting with political, economic, and social governing institutions and practical knowledge? 4. How can the concepts of knowledge regime and network ecology be collated to construe the complex relations of different agents?

### **Scoping the CPME: Institutionalization, Agency, Criticality, and Reflexivity**

Editorial and advisory board members of the CPME have jointly pointed out that cultural policy, management, and entrepreneurship study is a newly emerged research area. It needs to open up to new perspectives, topics, and approaches to allow interdisciplinary debates. The formation of a discourse and a specialized knowledge field has always involved a complex set of glossaries, principles, norms, rules, and procedures (Foucault 2002) that agents of various institutions converge on. Here CPME knowledge production also concerns academic institutions (universities, departments), art sectors, organizations, and the competition of discursive powers.

Current international journals of cultural management and cultural policy<sup>3</sup> (see Table 1) were established in the late 1960s to 1980s for the earlier, when the term "arts management" were first used in the titles. For instance, *Performing Arts Review* was published in 1969, and *The International Journal of Arts Management* started in 1998. Journals started to adopt "cultural management" in the titles after the 2010s. Cultural policy journals were established later in the 1980s or 1990s. And the terms "cultural management" and "cultural policy" are integrated only in the 2010s. The major journals are mostly published by university presses, commercial and independent publishers in the European and Anglophone regions. There are also cases of joint sponsorship by cultural institutions and organizations. The academic background of journal editors range from the field of arts administration, fine arts, cultural management, business administration, media study, economics, production engineering, cultural tourism to that of cultural policy studies.

Editorial board members of the CPME come from areas of arts management, fine arts, ethnic study, urban planning, museum studies, communications, cultural tourism, and entrepreneurship. And international advisors include distinctive scholars specialized in the above-mentioned disciplines. We set the aim of CPME to promote interdisciplinary dialogues between humanities and political, economic, and social sciences.

---

3 This is a non-exhausted list of major international journals in the areas of cultural policy and cultural management studies.

**Table 1.** Major International Journals in Cultural Policy and Cultural Management  
 Source: Official Websites of Journals listed below

***The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society***

- Published in 1992 by Taylor & Francis, UK. Known as Journal of Arts Management and Law (1982 - 1992), and Performing Arts Review (1969 - 1981).
- Editor-in-Chief, Department of Arts Administration, University of Kentucky, USA.

***The Journal of Cultural Policy***

- Launched 1988. Publisher, Korea Culture & Tourism Institute, KCTI.
- Editor, Researcher in KCTI.

***Culture Trends***

- Started 1989. Publisher, Taylor & Francis, London, UK.
- Editors, Interdisciplinary Centre for Social Inclusion and Cultural Diversity, Vice-Principal's office, University of Aberdeen, UK; & Professor in Cultural Policy, Culture, Media & Creative Industries, King's College London, UK.

***International Journal of Cultural Policy***

- Established in 1993. Publisher now, Taylor & Francis, London, UK.
- Editor, Centre for Cultural and Media Policy Studies, School of Creative Arts, Performance and Visual Cultures, Faculty of Arts, University of Warwick.

***The International Journal of Arts Management***

- First published in 1998. A non-profit project, published by HEC Montréal, the oldest business school in Canada, and is affiliated with the Université de Montréal.
- Founding Editor, HEC Montréal, Canada.

***Nordic Journal of Cultural Policy***

- Started in 2000. The Finnish Center for Cultural Policy Research Cupore holds the editorship from 2017. Publisher, Universitetsforlaget. The Journal is financed by a consortium consisting of several Nordic academic institutions.
- Editor-in-chief, Cupore's senior researcher.

***Journal of Cultural Management and Cultural Policy***

- 2021-, Formerly known as: Journal of Cultural Management: Arts, Policy, Economics, and Society (2015-2019); Yearbook for Culture Management (2009-2014). Published by transcript, an independent academic publishing.
- Editors in Chief, MFA Arts Leadership and Cultural Management, University of Connecticut, USA; Arts Management, Hochschule für Musik FRANZ LISZT Weimar/Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena; Cultural Production, Zeppelin University, Germany.

***The European Journal of Cultural Management and Policy***

- Launched in 2011, as ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy. Publisher, European Network of Cultural Policy and Cultural Management, ENCATC.
- Editor in Chief, Department of Economics and Management, University of Ferrara, Italy.

***Cultural Management: Science and Education***

- Established 2017. Published by Logos Vergag Berlin, Germany & WSB University, Poland.
- Editor in Chief, Department of Management and Production Engineering.

### ***International Journal of Cultural Management***

- Started 2022, Published by Inderscience, USA.
- Editor in Chief, School of Business, University of St. Thomas, USA.

### ***Culture: Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship***

- Launched in 2022. Published by Taiwan Association of Cultural Policy Studies.
- Editors, Graduate School of Arts Management and Cultural Policy, Faculty of Humanities, National Taiwan University of Arts & Department of Arts at the National Changhua University of Education.

Knowledge disciplines do affect the analysis of cultural management and cultural policy research. In a review of critical research on cultural strategies for urban and regional development in Taiwan, Wang (2019) shows how scholars of three Taiwanese academic institutions have adopted different framing ideas to explore the cultural strategies of development. These include the living sphere of culture, cultural planning, creative clusters, creative cities and cultural governance, ideas that are connected to a knowledge network. The institutions hold different positions yet have mutual exchanges. Indeed, the "regime of truth" is defined by who the authors are; what knowledge disciplines, approaches, methods, and languages the journal and its contributors incline to adopt; and what academic institutions, art-cultural sectors, organizations are behind the knowledge production of CPME. A newly established journal has got to be sensitive about the realities of the academic publishing environment. Factors such as the selection and peer review process, reviewers, editorial board members, advisors, readers, sponsors, subscriptions, submission and drop out rates, indexation systems, academic databanks, open access platforms, citations and impact metrics of the journal, all need to be carefully considered in its editorial policy.

We wish the journal will be humane, respectful and sympathetic to authors on the one hand, so that the paper submission process would transcend the cold system of knowledge filtration. As the Review Editor Wu Chieh-Hsiang expressed, we expect CPME to create a more humanistic space and method so that different viewpoints are able to be seen, rather than eliminated. On the other hand, the journal encourages cross-sectorial dialogues among the academia, art creators and critics, policy makers, and cultural professionals. It calls for Book Reviews, Art Critiques, Curating Critiques & Policy Reviews, and Forum Notes to stimulate reflections on contemporary cultural policy issues. We also invite analytical Case Reports in arts management and entrepreneurship to incorporate the pragmatic experiences of practitioners. In line with Hall (1996) and Chen's (2000) contemplation of the institutionalizing process of cultural studies during the 1990s, we wish the knowledge regime of CPME will maintain as a progressive, open, vigorous, creative, and critical academic field, with the capability of historic interpretation and the spirit of internationalism.

## **Taiwan/Asia-Pacific as a Method: Engaging the Imbalanced Global Knowledge Field**

In the ICCPR panel session, one of the Editors of *Cultural Trend*, Hye-Kyung Lee raised the issue of the still very western dominating knowledge field of CPME, and the imbalanced global

North and South knowledge production. The reality is that a new discursive hegemony with supporting cultural institutions (UNESCO, IFACCA), vocabulary, scholarship and post-colonial bureaucratic style seems to be taking shape in the field of CPME. The questions we ask are, is it possible to envision a distinct and localized discourse of CPME in Taiwan/Asia-Pacific region? If so, what is its content? How does it adopt and adapt from the Western discourses? And how do we take "the Rest of the West" as new referential points, and depart from the West without falling into the traps of the traditionalist, nationalist, imperialist narratives? As Professor Annick Schramme questioned critically in the ICCPR panel session, what does it mean exactly by "Taiwan/Asia-Pacific as a method?" And how does the Non-West differentiate from the Western discourses? These are the crucial questions we look for answers.

In cultural studies, Edward Said's (1978; 1993) expressed and represented a cultural and even ideological mode of European discourse with supporting institutions, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, doctrines, even colonial bureaucracies and colonial styles. Stuart Hall (1992) illustrated critically how the discourse of modernity, as a "system of representation," has represented the world as divided according to a simple dichotomy of "the West and the Rest". Japanese scholars Takeuchi Yoshimi 2007 [1960], proposed "Asia as a Method" to bring China and India reflexively back to the Japanese horizon again, rather than making the West a taken-for-granted model of development. Yuzo Mizoguchi (2011 [1989]) used *China as a Method* to set up new cultural benchmarks for Japanese modernization. Through the reinterpretation of historic encounters, he attempts to deconstruct Asia-Western power relations and reconstruct a new Asian subjectivity. Chen adopts Yoshimi's concept of *Asia as a Method* (Chen 2006), and argues it is necessary that decolonization, deimperialization, and an intellectual undoing of the cold war be proceeded simultaneously. He asserts for the increase of "inter-referencing" in East Asian and the Third World intellectual community, to chart necessary new directions for future cultural studies.

Similar novel attempts are growing in researchers of Asian cultural policy and cultural management too. Lee and Lim (2014) for instance address new dynamics between the state, arts, culture and creative industries in East Asia. They provide cultural landscape, and contextualized understanding of the conditions and operation of Asian and Southeast Asian countries, and call for both internationalizing and de-Westernizing our knowledge of CCIs (Lee and Lim 2019). Liu (2018) on the other hand takes ReOrient as a method to "reflect", "reinterpret", "restructure", and "realign" the concept of "Orient," and to look for possibilities and limits of a localized discourse of cultural policy. To Liu, the (super- or self-) imposed cultural discourses and mechanisms of cultural governance without a self-reflexive and localizing process, would keep the Non-western knowledge production trapped up.

By taking "Taiwan/Asia-Pacific as a method," it means to espouse a reflexive way of knowledge production by adopting new sets of localized vocabulary and referring to the Asia-Pacific based experiences. Such attempts convert localized discourse and practice into innovative researches and knowledge systems of the CPME. We agree with Chen (2006) that arguing for Asia or Taiwan/Asia-Pacific as a method, is not to be anti-West or even necessarily contra-West. To a great extent, the West is already inside most of us and becomes part of us. Taking Taiwan as a starting point allows us to connect its internal Aborigines geo-politically to Austronesian

and Southeast Asia, East Asia, Asia-Pacific, and even to the Indo-Pacific regions. Contemporary Taiwan has devised a peculiar mode of civil-driven cultural policy reform, and a civil-activated model of participatory cultural governance, which claims its novelties and particularities in East Asia. We wish the cultural compositions of Taiwan, a marginal, non-dominating, and sympathetic knowledge regime based on a mixed aboriginal, Sinic tradition, Japanese and Western modernity, and an emerging young cultural democracy in East Asia may shed lights to partners in the international cultural society (Liu 2022).

## **Culture as a Method: The Centrality of Culture and Action Route Maps for Practices**

Why take "culture as a method?" Foucault's (1991) historic analytics of "governmentality" inquired into the shift of different types of government, from "the art of self-government" (morality), "the art of properly governing a family" (economics), to "the science of ruling of state" (politics) in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. And recent scholarships of cultural management have emphasized dominantly on the side of the scientific management of culture, managing culture, or the economization of culture. Hall's queries are pertinent here: Are culture and cultural change determined by the economy, the market, the state, political or social power? When dealing with significant issues in contemporary social life, and facing political, economic, social governing institutions, can we plead to "place culture at the center" of governance and even to "rule by culture"? It is worth noting the centrality of culture to issues around social regulation, morality, and the governance of conduct in late modern societies (Hall 1997, 228).

The scientific management of culture has introduced the spirit of modern science, quantitative analytical methods, and skills of entrepreneurship to the terrain of cultural studies and humanities. However, the richness of cultural management and political economy cannot lie in a simple application of science to culture. Culture, economics, and politics are mutually defining. As Hall (1997) contended, the shape of culture is not determined by economic or political forces, there is at least a mutual determining process in the articulation of culture and the economy, or the state. If we still trust that the humanistic way of studying culture may as well contribute to the knowledge regime of cultural management and political economy, we need to bring culture back to the integrated ecology of knowledge (Liu 2016, 2019).

Such is the reason why the journal emphasizes the integration of thoughts, ideas, philosophy, value discourses and pragmatical knowledge of CPME. It encourages interdisciplinary dialogues between humanities and political, economic, and social sciences. We perceive culture as a deep meaning system, which encompasses arts, aesthetics, forms of folk arts and indigenized knowledge, emotions, feelings and historic memories of different ethnic groups. For us, culture also refers to experiences of mass media, sports, leisure, events, festivals, popular culture, and the accumulation of everyday routines. The CPME seeks to promote the research and applied knowledge and encourages cross-sectorial dialogues among the academia, policy makers, entrepreneurs, and the general public.

By "culture as a method", we thus mean to place culture at the center of political economy and people's social life and take humanistic values as people's ultimate concern. We aim to shift the underlying logic of political economy from that of interest, calculation, wealth and

power, and government technology to that of culture—value, aesthetics, moral-ethical ideals, and humanistic rationality. Cultural policy, management, and governance means not to police, manage, or govern culture, but to manage and govern by culture. We contend for "the centrality of culture" in its mediation with the governing institutions and social, political, and economic powers, also in international cultural relations (Liu 2022). Taking "culture as a method" re-positions culture into all political and economic policy debates and make cultural publicness, the intrinsic values of arts, human self-regulation and reflexivity the focus of the CPME international knowledge regime.

Turning to the public sphere, Jurgen Habermas distinguishes between the critical and technical intellectuals. The Habermasian public sphere relies on a refined modernist project of pure (instrumental) reason, in a separated structure of system (capitalist and authoritative power), public sphere and lifeworld. Jim McGuigan (2010) injects elements of emotion, feelings, affective elements, humanistic traits into what he labels as "cultural public sphere". Taking the Foucauldian perspective, Bennett (1998; 1999; 2001) on the other hand suggests any effective involvement of intellectuals in the cultural sphere must rest on a "politics of detail" to act effectively in relation to the governmental programs and regulations. To me, intellectuals, no matter practical or critical, inside or outside the bureaucracy and government system, need to maintain critical and practical when connecting their work to the realm of the system.

One way to bridge the gaps is the reflexivity we found in recent activities of cultural activists, and their resistances to new state cultural hegemony, fights for citizen's cultural rights, and their calls for a self-autonomous cultural public sphere in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Asia. Wu (2022) and Wang's (2022) new publications for instance, examine not only the civil societies, cultural elites, public media, social media communities and public cultural issues, but also controversial issues of ethnic minorities, non-mainstream cultures, genders, and subaltern public sphere. Even works of deliberative democracy in state cultural sectors, and strategic cultural instruments such as corporate's ESG and the evaluation of intangible cultural assets are included. It is important that "culture as a method" also provides pragmatic working methods, techniques, operational guides, and action route maps for cultural policy makers or technocrats to make such practices congruent with embedded cultural ideals and values of a glocalised network ecology of the CPME.

## **Articulating the CPME International Knowledge Regime and Network Ecology**

The field of CPME knowledge production is by no means always confrontational. In the preparatory period and inviting process of the CPME international advisors, we recognize that academic dialogues and knowledge production can be benign. There is goodwill and support from Europe and the US to Asia-Pacific regions. It turns us to think about whether can we collate the concepts of global knowledge regime and network ecology to construe the complex yet realistic relations among different actors.

Taking a cultural ecological approach leads us to emphasize on the collaborative, cooperative, coordinating, co-creative, coexisting, and cross-fertilizing roles among agents in the global network ecology. The use of ecological metaphors, such as a cycle of regeneration,





symbiosis, fragility, feedback loops, growth, evolution, variety of species, and mutual dependence, creates a rich way of perceiving the CPME knowledge field. It allows us to explore the interpenetrating connectivity among political, economic, and social sub-networks and their balance; the flow and exchanges of persons, capital, service, ideas, and values; and equally importantly, the competitive or dominated power relations between agents in the network ecology. The vitality and sustainability of the CPME network ecology depends on the number of different types of agents, their adaptivity, the increasing diversity, dynamism, and the evolving complexity of interactive patterns (Holden 2015; Liu 2015; 2021).

Mapping the network ecology of knowledge creation, production, dissemination, circulation, and consumption of the journal *Culture: Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship*, we divide and depict the field into the following analytical levels: A. Agents (individuals and institutions); B. Knowledge Disciplines; C. Scopes and Topics of CPME; D. Actions in Cultural Public Sphere; X. International Network; and Z. Outcomes and Impacts (Figure 1). First of all, there are: (A1) agents of central and local government officials, public cultural institutions (museums, galleries etc.), universities, and arms-length cultural organizations in the Network of State Cultural Policy; (A2) agents of creative and cultural industries, business and social enterprise, private donors and companies in the Network of Economic Capital; (A3) agents such as academic associations, private cultural foundations, not-for-profit art-cultural institutions, and social movement groups in the Network of Societal Communities; and (A4) agents of mass media, individual artists, freelance art and cultural critic writers, and internet communities in the Network of Media and Individuals. These varied agents, who possess different cultural, social, political and economic values, weave the multiple-leveled and multiple-centered knowledge production field into an interconnected network ecology. They co-create knowledge, and at the same time compete with one another for dominating or leading positions in the network ecology.

In the field of cultural politics, knowledge disciplines or subjects such as political sciences, law, international relations (B1), are used to analyze topics of cultural institutions, laws, administration, and public and private partnership (C1) and actions engaged in governance for the domination, regulation and empowerment (C1). It connects with the international network through state cultural diplomacy and strategy (X1). In the field of cultural economics (B2), disciplines like business administration, management, and entrepreneurship are applied to study topics of creative and cultural economy, entrepreneurship, and corporate social responsibility etc. (C2). The field engages in the cultural market through actions of sponsorship, capital production, and material progress (D2), and it reaches out to international network via multinational cultural corporations (X2). The study of cultural sociology field (B3) involves knowledge disciplines such as social sciences, humanities, and urban studies. It researches topics of contemporary cultural issues, nonprofit cultural organizations and social cohesion (C3), as well as the resisting and communicative actions in the cultural public sphere (D3). Externally, it connects to the network of international non-governmental cultural organizations (X3). In the knowledge field of cultural studies, disciplines or subjects like cultural-art critics, aesthetics, media study (B4), are utilized to explore topics of mass media, cultural forums, freedom of cultural expression, and cultural participation (C4). It intervenes the cultural public sphere through actions of appropriation and communication (D4); and it connects to the international

network via the Internet (for open access) and transnational media (X4). The potential impacts of the CPME include, discourse formation, rules setting and raising self-reflexivity of state cultural policy (Z1); sponsorship and economic sustainability of knowledge production (Z2); norm setting and upgrading expertise of researchers and civil society (Z3); and stimulation of cultural critics, creativity and dynamism of individuals and artists (Z4).

We wish *Culture: Policy, Management, and Entrepreneurship* will create an open, inviting, and sympathetic academic space and atmosphere for young cultural researchers and practitioners, and especially contributions from and about East Asia, Southeast Asia, Asia-Pacific, Indo-Pacific and the Global South regions. We hope that taking "Taiwan/Asia-Pacific – Culture as a Method" will contribute to move the imbalanced international knowledge regime of CPME towards a more open, vigorous, creative, and critical academic field. And it will help shape the field of CPME knowledge production into a decentered, participatory, and co-governing global network ecology, which puts its emphases on the collaborative, co-creative, and cross-fertilizing roles of different actors. We believe that the increasing diversity, adaptiveness, and the evolving complexity of interactive patterns among actors will be the keys to sustain the vitality and dynamism of the CPME network ecology.

## Reference

- Bennett, Tony. 1998. *Culture: A Reformer's Science*. London: Sage.
- Bennett, Tony. 1999. "Putting Policy into Cultural Studies." In *The Cultural Studies Reader* edited by Simon During, 479-491. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, Tony. 2001. "Intellectuals, Culture, Policy: The Practical and the Critical." In *A Companion to Cultural Studies* edited by Toby Miller, 357-374. London: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Chen Kuan-Hsing 陳光興, ed. 2000. *Cultural Studies in Taiwan 文化研究在臺灣*. Kaohsiung: Chuliu.
- Chen Kuan-Hsing 陳光興. 2006. *Asia As Method: Towards Deimperialization 去帝國：亞洲作為方法*. Taipei: Flâneur Culture Lab.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* edited by G. Burchill, C. Gordon and P. Miller, 87-104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2002. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, Stuart. 1992. "The West and the Rest, Discourse and Power." In *Formations of Modernity* edited by Stuart Hall and Bram Gieben, 185-227. Cambridge: The Open University.
- Hall, Stuart. 1996. "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies." In *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* edited by Stuart Hall, David Morley and Kuan Hsing Chen, 262-275. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Stuart. 1997. "The Centrality of Culture: Notes on the Cultural Revolutions of Our Time." In *Media and Cultural Regulation* edited by K. Thompson, 207-238. London: Sage.
- Lim, Lorraine, and Hye Kyung Lee, ed. 2014. *Cultural Policies in East Asia: Dynamics between the State, Arts and Creative Industries*. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Lim, Lorraine, and Hye Kyung Lee. (Eds.). 2019. "Routledge Handbook of Cultural and Creative Industries in Asia." London: Routledge.
- Liu, Jerry C. Y. 2014. "ReOrienting Cultural Policy: Cultural Statecraft and Cultural Governance in Taiwan and China." In *Cultural Policies in East Asia: Dynamics between the State, Arts and Creative Industries* edited by Lorraine Lim and Hye Kyung Lee, 120-138. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Liu, Jerry C. Y. 2015. "ReOrient: A Paradigm Shift of Teaching in Arts Management and Cultural Policy in Taiwan." In *Creating Cultural Capital: Cultural Entrepreneurship in Theory, Pedagogy and Practice* edited by Olaf Kuhlke, Annick Schramme, Rene Kooyman, 32-44. Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon Academic Publishers.
- Liu, Jerry C. Y. 2016. "The Ecology of Culture and Values: Implications for Cultural Policy and Governance." *ENCATC Scholars* 6, Sep. 5. Webpage: <http://blogs.encatc.org/encatcscholar/>.
- Liu Jerry C. Y. 劉俊裕. 2018. *ReOrient: An East Asian Approach on Cultural Governance and Cultural Policy 再東方化：文化政策與文化治理的東亞取徑*, Kaohsiung: Chuliu.
- Liu, Jerry C. Y. 2019. "Epilogue. Cultural Management: Managing Culture or Culturalizing Management?" In *Cultural Management: From Theory to Practice* edited by Łukasz Wróblewski, Zdzisława Dacko-Pikiewicz, and Jerry C. Y. Liu, 171-175. London: London Scientific.
- Liu Jerry C. Y. 劉俊裕. 2021. "Why and How to Assess the Cultural Values and Impacts of

- Cultural and Creative Parks? 為何、又如何評估文創園區的文化價值與影響力?" Cultural Impact Forum. Taipei, Huashan 1914 Creative Park 華山文創園區, November 7.
- Liu Jerry C. Y. 劉俊裕. 2022. "Introduction: Culture as a Method: The New "Alternative-Mainstream" Dialectics of Taiwan's International Cultural Relations 文化作為方法：臺灣國際文化關係的新「另類—主流」路線思辨." In *Taiwan's International Cultural Relations: Culture as a Method* 臺灣的國際文化關係：文化作為方法 edited by Liu Jerry C. Y. and Wei Chun-Ying, 3-57. Kaohsiung: Chuliu.
- McGuigan, Jim. 1996. *Culture and the Public Sphere*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Mizoguchi, Yuzo 溝口雄三. (2011 [1989]). Translated by Sun Jun-yeh. *China as a Method* 作為方法的中國. Beijing: Sanling.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Wang Chih-Hung 王志弘. 2019. "A Review of Critical Research on Cultural Strategies for Urban and Regional Development in Taiwan, 1990s-2010 臺灣都市與區域發展之文化策略批判研究回顧，1990s — 2010s." *Router: A Journal of Cultural Studies* 文化研究. 29: 13-62.
- Wang Li-Jung 王俐容, ed. 2022. *Diverse Inclusion: Passages in the Public Sphere of Taiwanese Culture* 多元的吐納：穿梭於臺灣文化公共領域. Kaohsiung: Chuliu.
- Wu Chieh-Hsiang 吳介祥, ed. 2022. *Culture Prevails: Co-Vibrating Public Sphere in Taiwan* 文化超開展：共振臺灣公共領域. Kaohsiung: Chuliu.
- Yoshimi, Takeuchi 竹內好. 2007 [1960]. Translated by Dong-Zhu Hu 胡冬竹. "Asia as a Method 作為方法的亞洲". *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies* 臺灣社會研究季刊, 66: 231-251.