

建立香港文化大都會

訂定國際文化交流政策

榮念曾

由於香港的多元文化背景和九七的契機，由於香港的地理位置和歷史背景，香港絕對可以發展成爲世界一流的文化大都會，正如香港絕對可以，甚至早已被承認爲世界金融和經濟的中心。在香港，近年香港有關文化的交流通量，和金融及經濟的交流通量，不枉多讓。但是，若要發展香港成爲世界級文化中心，除了這些客觀條件之外，更重要的還是要看我們的領導階層有沒有視野，有沒有魄力。

香港政府缺乏文化知識，將文化、社區服務和娛樂商品混而爲一，是眾所皆知的事；香港政府缺乏文化視野，因此沒有長遠政策，這亦是行內通聞的事。在過渡期間，港府更投鼠忌器，在文化政策的訂定，一直採取被動和拖怠的態度。香港本可以成爲亞洲文化中心，亦因爲政府缺乏遠見，缺乏文化長線政策，已漸被其它地區奪走領導位置。

譬如，文化交流是香港文化發展最重要的命脈，沒有文化交流，香港文化沒有發展空間，正如經濟交流是香港經濟發展最重要的命脈，沒有經濟交流，香港經濟沒有發展空間。文化和經濟一樣，應該是培育交流而不是控制交流，協助交流而不是監管交流。而文化和經濟，很明顯，有互動的關連。

文化交流對香港在國際上的形象有非常重大的影響，對香港文化工作本身的發展也有重大的影響。香港政府對於文化交流，就是缺乏主動，就是沒有長遠政策，更別說培育和協助，更別說文化交流的基建架構計劃，或文化交流軟件、硬件發展的構思。

沒有人會質疑文化交流對全球文化發展的重要性。當然，有識之外交界、政經界和藝術界對文化交流各自有不同的期待和看法。由於出發點不一樣，他們對文化交流的定義、功能和處理方法都會有差異，這些差異來自他們對國際、對文化、對交流三者的看法。這些看法亦反映了他們的價值觀和世界觀。

對於一般外交行政工作者而論，文化交流是國與國之間交接時的潤滑劑；同時文化交流也可以是在非戰時代軟性交接工作裡含蓄的武器。對他們說，文化交流工作的設計、內容、形式和方法，都是以影響對方保護己方爲大前題。就算資訊、技術和學問的交換，背後不多不少總會帶著利己的價值觀和態度。

對於跨國企業家來說，文化交流很容易被認爲只是市場策略的一個佈局。在跨國企業起步時，文化交流是市場開發的先鋒部隊，爲跨國企業營造市場開發的環境；跟著，文化交流是跨國企業保持競爭實力和培育市場穩定的配套。

對於有遠見的政治家和企業家，文化交流不僅是外交的手段，而且有和平共處的目標。文化交流常被用爲淡化國與國之間的邊緣，藉以拉近國與國之間的距離。有視野的政治家和企業家，會通過文化交流，建立來去無阻雙向性平等的橋樑。通過文化交流，互相建立更富創意長遠互惠開放的經濟、社會和基建制度，雙方豐富彼此的文化發展。

對於藝術工作者，交流本身就是文化工作的一部份。藝術工作者注重創作和辯證，創作和辯證的重要部份又包括交流。跨越任何疆界的交流都可能啓發創作和辯證。跨越的疆界可能是語言、可能是宗教、可能是國家、可能是民族、可能是職業、可能是性別、可能是不同的媒介、可能是不同的地理環境、可能是階級和背景、可能是年紀和代溝。只有跨越，才會促進新的視野、新的感覺和新的學問，才會看得更遠，才會看得更闊更寬，才會有可能建立新的關係。在推動文化交流工作時，雙方都有自信（不是自大），因此有包容，因此能容納多元，這正是文化發展必要的心態。未來跨國的文化機構會否同樣有自信，有包容和互重，有同樣的心態，這正是一個很好的考驗。

這種包容心態曾經出現於雅典、出現於長安、出現於威尼斯、出現於巴黎和出現於紐約；也因爲如此，這些地方在不同時代都成爲世界文化中心，推動世界文化思潮，對全世界政治經濟文化的發展都有一定的影響。這種心態的出現，一方面和客觀的條件，譬如穩定中

求變的政治環境，漸趨繁榮的經濟環境，開明活潑的學術環境相關；另一方面，也和主觀的條件，譬如藝術工作者、學者、政治家、外交家、商家，是否能自覺地、不懈地來共同合作追求文化理想有關。

對於藝術工作者，交流本身是人與人之間發展關係的事，是人際的事，不一定是國際的事。只因爲以「國」爲單位的機構比較有資源、有組織、有策略、有支援（香港除外）。因此文化交流每每成爲「國際」文化交流的附屬，影響並左右著文化交流的本質，藝術工作者因此處於被動的位置。當我們進入跨國世紀時，發展有跨國視野的，超越「國」這個層面的文化交流，是文化界極應關注和首要的工作。有視野的國家文化機構更應汲納文化工作者的看法，重新調整它的宗旨和活動。有視野的藝術工作者，正好盡量發揮他擁有的辯證能力，主動地、活絡地探討並推廣真正文化交流應有的功用。至於文化交流中跨國視野裡跨越的疆界應該是那一種「際」，是市際還是區際，是區際還是國際，是宗教「際」還是「代溝」際，都是可以探討的命題。

在即將進入二十一世紀的今天，社會、經濟、政治、科技正經歷著大轉移時，這正好是一個重新全面評估文化交流的時候。十九至二十世紀，歐美文化一直在世界文化發展的主導地位，目前「國際式」文化交流工作的設計一直是歐美文化的產物。相對歐美而言，亞洲各國一向對於所謂文化交流，和藝術工作者一樣，是處於被動的位置。我們都知道，以往在亞洲地區的交流活動，通常是亞洲各國各地區分別和歐美之間的國際活動，而且是單向性的；我們知道，這些活動，主權自歐美；我們亦知道，亞洲地區的名稱和劃分，東方這個字眼的存在，亦來自歐美；我們更知道，目前文化交流的設計，亦帶著歐美文化的自我中心價值觀，正如中國亦曾經歷過極端的自我中心和夜郎自大的階段。

邁入二十一世紀，亞洲地區包括香港在內，由於近年社會、經濟、政治、科技急速發展，其實已有足夠經濟能力和自信心，獨立地觀察和研究目前全球文化交流活動和發展的情況。更由於我們一向在文化交流活動上處於被動的位置，我們正可以藉此，抽離辯證地看世界文化交流發展的形勢，以備我們能客觀地和理性地評估歐洲文化和世界文化互動的關係；亦可以對「西方」文化交流現有的形式和內容，作出全面評估，並通過這些評估，探討「全新」的世界文化交流之概念。這些研究工作政府應該大力支持，學術界和文化界也應大力推動。

在進行這些工作的同時，香港政府應該配合學術界和文化界的力量進行研究，全面評估目前的文化交流政策。在評估前，首先應確認文化交流與經濟交流的互動關係，檢討目前重經濟和輕文化的態度，再分析和檢討各政府部門（文康科/工商科/新聞處）和公共機構（貿易發展局/藝術發展局/市政局/區域市政局）在文化交流工作方面的角色和功能，重新爲香港確定一套長遠的國際文化交流政策，發展一套具體、開放和有創意的文化交流工作架構與設計，爲香港、爲中國也爲世界文化作出貢獻。

（編註：本文爲榮念曾先生原先提交的講題原稿，但榮先生為強調「河流」展中「交流」與「對話」的重要性，臨時將演講改爲與香港梁文道先生同台對話，藉由雙人對談方式進行現場的激盪演練，而全部對話記錄已整理成文，並以「展覽主題標示的解讀——透視亞洲文化與藝術的交流」為題，同時刊載於專刊中。）

Establishing Hong Kong as a Global Cultural Center: On International Cultural Exchange

Danny Yung

Hong Kong could well become a major international center of culture and the arts. Historically, geographically and economically, it has been a cross-roads in Asia for more than a century. This is equally true in the sphere of culture and the arts. In the past ten years Hong Kong has mediated a tremendous volume of artistic enterprises and expressions from all over the world. Today Hong Kong stands on the verge of a peaceful political revolution hitherto unknown in history, thereby capturing the entire world's attention. Whether or not the territory will take advantage of these factors to transform itself into an international center of culture and the arts depends upon the will and vision of the leaders among its citizenry, and especially of the Hong Kong government. It is an opportunity not to be missed.

Were Hong Kong to initiate a drive towards leadership in culture and the arts, cultural exchange on an international level would be the starting point and, ultimately, the single most vital component of such a drive. In art, as in business, success today requires space for development, both literally and figuratively. International exchanges generate, stimulate, challenge and provoke, all of which are essential to growth.

Furthermore, culture and economy are clearly inter-related. A dynamic progressive culture projects an image of an equally progressive society, one which will attract business partners and business ventures.

No one doubts the significance of cultural exchange to the development and welfare of the people of all nations and cultures. But opinions understandably differ as to the nature such exchanges should take. With their different perspectives, foreign ministers, industrialist-businessmen, politicians, and artists themselves will surely differ in their definition, concept of function and approaches to the implementation of cultural exchange. These differences not only express views on notions of internationalism, culture, and exchange but also reflect different value systems. Such variety creates a dynamic tension, but only -- a caveat must be added -- when it also entails respect for alternative views.

For foreign ministers, cultural exchange serves as a lubricant to smoothly resolve international conflict and a tool for peacetime negotiations. The design, content, and method of exchanges used for these purposes are always based on a calculation of the benefits that can be brought to one's home country. National interest lies at the core of such exchanges.

For global industrialist-businessmen, cultural exchange is often used as the first tactical move towards opening up a new market. Culture serves to enhance the receptivity of an otherwise indifferent or even hostile social group toward a new product. Once the market has been opened, culture continues to play a role in securing and further developing the market.

For politicians with some vision, not only is cultural exchange a tool to serve foreign policy, it is also a powerful means to build peace among nations, to neutralize conflicts and hostility, and in general to bring people and nations closer together. The enlightened politician understands that free and bilateral cultural exchanges form the basis for building bridges to promote other kinds of exchanges - economic, social, and political - resulting in mutual benefits for all concerned. Not the least of these is the resultant flowering of cultures for all nations.

For artists, cultural exchange is almost a prerequisite for achievement. The fundamental activities of artists are to create and explore; such creative exploration profoundly benefits from interaction and exchange with other artists, often crossing metaphorical boundaries. The more boundaries such exchanges cross, the more fruitful will such creative exploration be. The boundaries may be linguistic, religious, national, ethnic and professional as well as gender-related; they may involve different media of expression and communication, different physical settings, different social classes and back-

grounds and different generations. Only by crossing such boundaries are artists able to extend their vision and increase their sensitivity. They can then see further and broader and discover new relationships between people, things and ideas.

Historically, international culture has always flourished in centers of international trade. Athens, Chang'an, Venice, Paris, and New York, at their own times, became international centers of culture, radiantly affecting other parts of the world, exerting influence not only on culture, but also on economic and political ideas and structures. The appearance of such thriving cultures was - and is - due partly to external factors such as a stable government, a robust economy and an open and lively intellectual and artistic environment. It is also due partly to deliberate efforts made by artists, scholars, politicians, and business people. Through foresight, perseverance and a collaborative spirit, they were able to envision and achieve an ideal of cultural excellence.

For individual artists, interaction and exchange are almost always personal rather than national. Nevertheless, individual and personal interactions and exchanges are often influenced, even controlled by, exchanges on national and institutional levels, arranged and administered by governments and underscored by national interests. This is so because such organizations have enormous resources, a well-established infrastructure and wide networks of contacts. Thus, artists are often relegated to a relatively passive position, serving the interests of such organizations. To ensure progress, on the one hand, artists and cultural activists must pay close attention to these organizations which exert such power in the international arena. On the other hand, these large organizations must acknowledge the critical importance of artists in such exchanges, and recruit them to help formulate the philosophy, aims and methods of exchange - as well as to execute the art work itself.

As mankind steps onto the threshold of the 21st century, at a time when political, economic, social and technological changes are occurring at lightning speed, when global communication has never been faster nor more extensive, the time is right to comprehensively re-examine and re-evaluate the issue of international cultural exchange. During the 19th and 20th centuries, the so-called Western cultures, including those of Western Europe and North America, claimed leadership in the development of mainstream global culture. They defined such culture and were mainly responsible for producing and perpetuating a world culture, built upon a Western-centric world view.

At this juncture, however, Asian regions, including Hong Kong, are ready to claim a more equitable role in the definition and future development of "global culture". Furthermore, because Asian cultures have in recent centuries served a subservient position in cultural exchanges with the West, Asian artists and scholars possess a unique perspective from which to participate in this process.

Given the critical value of cultural exchange to all nations in virtually every sphere of human activity and the growing importance of the East in world culture, the time seems ripe for a new concept of global cultural exchange to be formulated. Hong Kong with its multicultural history, its tradition of cultural tolerance and its geographical position is uniquely placed to participate in, encourage and facilitate this process. We in Hong Kong hope that in the coming decades our new government will see the tremendous opportunities that lie ahead, and thrust us from the edge, headlong into the center of a new adventure.

Editor's Note: This article is the paper originally submitted by Danny Yung. However, a decision was later taken to alter the presentation format. The new approach involved Mr. Danny Yung and Mr. Leung Man Tao discussing a range of subjects on stage in front of an audience. This format was chosen to highlight the importance of "Exchange" and "Dialogue" in the River Exhibition. A full record of the dialogue conducted is presented in this catalogue under the title "Interpreting the Expression of Exhibition Themes: Viewing Exchange in Asian Culture and Art".