

9-2014

The “June Fourth Candlelight Vigil” as Site of Subjection, Power Relations and Subjugated Knowledge

Pok Yin, Adrian CHOW

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.ln.edu.hk/mcsln>

 Part of the [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

CHOW, Pok Yin (2014). The “June Fourth Candlelight Vigil” as Site of Subjection, Power Relations and Subjugated Knowledge . Cultural Studies@Lingnan, 42. Retrieved from <http://commons.ln.edu.hk/mcsln/vol42/iss1/7/>

This 文化評論 Criticism is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Cultural Studies at Digital Commons @ Lingnan University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Cultural Studies@Lingnan 文化研究@嶺南 by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Lingnan University.

The “June Fourth Candlelight Vigil” as Site of Subjection, Power Relations and Subjugated Knowledge

Chow Pok-yin Adrian

The Arguments over Locale

In his newspaper article of 4 June 2014¹, Ng Chi Sum, a renowned Hong Kong (“HK”) current affairs commentator expressed his amazement about the binary labeling widely circulated then in the internet community: those who join the June Fourth Candlelight Vigil in Victoria Park (“VP Vigil”) are “Chinese”, and those who join that in Tsimshatsui’s Cultural Centre Piazza (“TST Vigil”) are “Hong Konger”. According to his understanding, as he wrote, this kind of labeling derived from the popular “domestic discourse” which received rising support in recent years, and which promotes, inter alia:

1. absolute segregation of HK and China (“PRC”);
2. that the democracy of HK cannot be dependent on the democracy of PRC;
3. that matters concerning the human rights of the PRC people, including those like Liao Xiaobo and Li Wangyang, are matters of the PRC people only and HK people should not get involved in them;
4. that the organizer of the VP Vigil, the HK Alliance in Support of Patriotic Democratic Movements in China (“the Alliance”), with one of its goals being “building a democratic China”², has failed in promoting the democracy of China despite 25 years of effort, and together with the reasons listed above, the Alliance should not be supported anymore.

In fact, numerous articles were published since May 2014 in the official online publication “Passion Times” of the TST Vigil’s organizer “Civic Passion”, explaining why it was time for HK people to “change venue” when doing any June Fourth memorial service. In one written in direct response to Ng’s above

¹ Ng Chi Sum, “Where will you be tonight? (今夜, 你在哪裡?)” 4 June 2014, Apple Daily.

²The 5 goals of the Alliance are listed in its official website:
http://www.alliance.org.hk/english/The_Alliance/who_we_are.html

article³, the author went further to say that for HK people, the June Fourth massacre is not about condolences, but about the brutality of the PRC government in killing its own people. It is no occasion for mourning anymore and HK people should attend the TST Vigil to pledge their determination on “domestic movement”, protecting domestic interest, fighting for HK’s democracy, and overturning the PRC regime. The author also highlighted that since some members of the Alliance made deals with the PRC government during the 2010 political reform of HK and betrayed HK people⁴, they should no longer be trusted. Moreover, in face of the “colonization” of the HK by the PRC government/people since the 1997 handover, “patriotisms” is something HK people cannot afford to embrace anymore. And since the Alliance promotes patriotisms, HK people should entirely break their tie with the Alliance⁵. All in all, the author seemed to suggest that those who opt for the TST Vigil are real true HK people subscribing to “radical domestic values”, and those attending the VP Vigil are either confused or “patriotic” like Ng.

Personally, I am no fan of the Alliance or Civic Passion. However, I have been attending the VP Vigil for at least 20 times during the last 25 years. The reasons for doing so are complex and personal, including mobilization by some first-hand knowledge and experience of myself in 1989. In the morning of 4 June 2014, I posted a photo of last year’s VP Vigil on my Facebook (“FB”) page. Immediately it attracted comments from a FB friend (John Doe, alias) saying that the moment I attended the VP Vigil, I would be “hijacked” by the

³ <http://www.passiontimes.hk/article/06-04-2014/15902>

⁴ In 2010, some members of the Democratic Party who were also backbone members of the Alliance supported the “Political Reform Bill”. The Bill was about reforming the structure of the HK Legislature effective after the 2012 election, details of which included, inter alia, raising the number of total seats from 60 to 70, 5 of which from direct election and 5 from functional constituencies. There was however no timetable for nor roadmap to universal suffrage, which was the fatal flaw of the Bill attracting the most criticisms from the pan-democrats in HK. DP once firmly warranted that they would not support any reform package without such timetable and roadmap. Nonetheless, after meeting the Liaison Office of the Central People’s Government in the HKSAR, DP voted for the Bill on the ground of the increment of the 5 direct electoral seats being “some kind of progress” for the democratic development of HK.

⁵ <http://www.passiontimes.hk/article/06-04-2014/15902>

Alliance to become a supporter of them. He advised me not to go to the VP Vigil, but to the TST Vigil instead (See Appendix I⁶).

When talking about June Fourth, one easily associates with struggles of the people against an autocratic and centralized power (the PRC government). However, the above examples just illustrate that this association is far from complete. By just looking at the arguments over the location of the Candlelight Vigil, one can see that the struggles against subjection, the exercise of power amongst the people (i.e. people vs people), and some knowledge being subjugated consequently all interplay in this “site”. The ultimate question to be asked then is: have we been examining “power” with sufficient depth and width when we talk about the June Fourth Massacre?

The Rally of HK People?

In trying to study “power”, Michel Foucault soon noted that while the human subject is placed in relations of production and of signification, he/she is equally placed in power relations. However, he also noted the inadequacy of tools in studying power relations. Not being satisfied with just looking at the “legitimacy” of power and the “nation state”, he found it necessary to expand the dimensions of a definition of power⁷. He suggested taking the forms of resistance against different forms of power as a starting point, investigating the forms of resistance and attempts made to dissociate the various power relations in order render these power relations visible. The specific sites of resistance he visited included opposition to the power of men over women, of parents over children, of psychiatry over the mentally ill, of medicine over the population, and of administration over the ways people live⁸.

Foucault summed up that the main objective of these power struggles is to attack not so much at an institution of power, or group, or elite, or class, but rather at a technique or a form of power. This form of power applies itself to

⁶ A photo capture of my FB page was included in the original paper, but is deleted intentionally here for privacy reason.

⁷ Foucault, Michel, “*The Subject and Power*”, in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, New York, the New York Press, 1994, p 327.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 329.

immediate everyday life of us. It categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him that he must recognize and others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power that makes individuals “subjects”, a word bearing 2 levels of meaning: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to⁹.

That said, this form of struggle against “subjection” is only one of the three kinds of struggles that Foucault identified, including also those against forms of domination (ethnic, social, and religious), and those against forms of exploitation that separate individuals from what they produce. In feudal societies, the struggles against the forms of ethnic or social domination were prevalent. In the 19th Century, the struggles against exploitation came into foreground. And nowadays, the struggle against the forms of subjection is becoming more and more important, even though the struggles against the other 2 forms have not disappeared. The mechanisms of subjection cannot be studied outside of their relation to the mechanisms of domination and of exploitation. They entertain complex and circular relations with each other. However, the prevalence of the kind of struggle against subjection in modern days’ society is due to the rise of “nation state” from the 16th Century, the power of which is both an individualizing and a totalizing form¹⁰.

Foucault called this form of power technique “pastoral power”, which is an integration of a new political shape and an old Christianity power technique. In short, pastoral power in Christianity designates a very special form of power which is to assure individual salvation in the next world, is one that not only commands but also prepared to sacrifice for the life and salvation of the flock, looks after each individual throughout his entire life, and is exercised with full knowledge of the people’s mind and conscience¹¹. In modern state context, this form of power becomes intertwined with the very sophisticated structure

⁹ Ibid., p. 331.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 331-332.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 332-333.

in which individuals can be integrated into the society, but with individuality shaped in a new form and submitted to a set of very specific pattern. In a way, the state becomes a modern matrix of individualization, a new form of pastoral power which ensures salvation in this present world, of which the officials increase to include not only the state apparatus, but also private ventures, welfare societies, philanthropists and family, and which focuses on developing knowledge concerning the population and the individual. All in all, this power of pastoral type which is used to be linked to a defined religious institution suddenly spreads out into the whole social body¹².

So when looking at the opening examples surrounding the June Fourth Candlelight Vigil, it is clear that we are dealing not only with an obvious power of domination exercised by a central PRC government (one which continues to dominate its people's lives, opinions, freedom, and destinies ever since its inception and especially so since the 1989 massacre), but also a power of subjection exercised by people scattered all around. As Ng in his newspaper article points out, those who attend the VP Vigil are labeled "Chinese". Only the TST Vigil represents a true rally of HK people. If I opt for the VP Vigil, I will be called a "Chinese", tied to some kind of "Chinese" identity and imposed a law of truth that I am "patriotic". And according to the logic of the Passion Times, I will be perceived to be endorsing the Alliance the members of which has betrayed HK in 2010, and by this token I am endorsing such betrayal as well. I then become one of the traitors myself. Meanwhile, as advised by my FB friend, I will be "hijacked" to become a supporter of the Alliance the moment I attend the VP Vigil. In short, once I step into the Victoria Park, I'm tied to a "Pan-China Idiot (大中華膠)" identity which CANNOT be at the same time:

1. a "Hong Konger" who supports such "domestic advocacies" as higher degree of political autonomy, prioritized allocation of resources to local residents, lesser number of PRC tourists who have created loads of social problems for HK, faster pace of democratic development as

¹² Ibid., pp. 333-335

- promised by the Basic Law, and fairer mechanisms for the Chief Executive election etc;
2. someone who has serious doubts towards the way the Alliance has been organizing the June Fourth candlelight vigils, and who is utterly dissatisfied with how some of the Alliance members made deals with the PRC government on the Political Reform Bill in 2010;
 3. someone who does care about the democratic development of China and the well-being of Chinese people but doesn't favor too close a relationship between HK and PRC when the latter's political, economic and social "invasions" of HK become more and more evident; and
 4. someone who joins the VP Vigil because of some very personal reasons and habits.

This is blatant subjection which is overly simplistic and unacceptable. This kind of subjection springs from the exchange of powers by the advocates from both the TST Vigil and VP Vigil camps, at the domain of the people. It is not just the confrontation of "the eggs and the wall"¹³, but also one amongst the "eggs" themselves. That said, I do not care at all to what identity I'm tied by the Civic Passion's supporters or my FB friend (as seen in my response in the photo of Appendix I). However, the fact that I don't care doesn't mean this kind of subjection power doesn't exist. On a contrary, the very fact I'm writing this paper, as triggered by the series of arguments regarding the locale of the Vigil, exactly shows that this power is being exercised. How so?

The Chain Reactions

To Foucault, power as such does not exist. The question that truly interests him is not what the power is, why it is legitimate or how power manifests itself, but how it is exercised. What exactly happens when individual exerts power over others is of his primary concern¹⁴. He wishes to introduce several critical shifts in relation to the supposition of a fundamental power. It is to give

¹³ The "egg vs the wall" is a common analogy used amongst the netizens community of HK, with the egg representing the people and the wall the authority. This analogy is borrowed from the writing of the Japanese novelist Haruki Murakami.

¹⁴ Foucault, Michel, *"The Subject and Power"*, in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, New York, the New York Press, 1994, pp. 336-337.

oneself as the object of analysis “power relations” and not “power” itself – power relations that are distinct from objective capacities as well as from relations of communication, that power relations can be grasped in the diversity of their linkages to these capacities and relations¹⁵.

The exercise of power is not simply a relationship between “partners”. It is rather a way in which some act on others. Power, an entity of which is illusionary, exists only as exercised by some on others, only when it is put into action (even though, of course, it is inscribed in a field of sparse available possibilities underpinned by permanent structures). Power relations do not necessarily imply a matter of consent or violence, though the establishing of power relations does involve the use of violence as much as consent. Instead, what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action that does not act directly and immediately on others, but it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on possible or actual future or present actions. Unlike a relationship of violence, which bends or breaks a body or things and closes off all possibilities, a power relationship preserves and maintains the “other” (the one over whom power is exercised) as a subject who acts to the very end, and opens up a whole field of possible responses, reactions and results¹⁶.

This means that the exercise of power operates on the field of possibilities in which the behavior of active subjects is able to inscribe itself. It is a set of actions on possible actions: it incites, induces, seduces, makes easier or more difficult, releases or contrives, but it is always a way of acting upon one or more subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action. If one uses the word “conduct” instead of “action”, the exercise of power is a “conduct of conducts” and a management of possibility. Power is hence a question of “government” in a broad sense. It designates the way in which the conduct of individuals or of groups might be directed, like the government of children, of souls, of communities, of families, of the sick etc. It covers not only the legitimately constituted forms of political or economic subjection, but also modes of action that were destined to act upon the possibilities of action

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 339.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 340.

of others. To govern, in this sense, is to structure the possible field of action of others¹⁷.

Since power relations operate on the field of possible actions, the crucial element of “freedom” must exist. Power is exercised only over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free, meaning that an individual or collective subjects who are faced with a field of possibilities in which several kinds of conduct, several ways of reacting and modes of behavior are available. Where the determining factors are exhaustive (like slavery), there is no relationship of power, but one of victory by the winning adversary. Hence, there is not a face-to-face confrontation of power and freedom as mutually exclusive facts. On a contrary, freedom may well appear as a precondition for the exercise of power. So at the very heart of the power relationship are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom. It is a relationship of “agonism”, one which is at the same time mutual incitement and struggle; less of a head-on confrontation that paralyze both sides than a permanent provocation¹⁸.

From this perspective, let’s consider the newspaper article of Ng Chi Sum in the following chain of actions:

1. Fueled by some popular “domestic discourses”, there circulated writings (especially published by Passion Times as mentioned) in the internet saying that those who join the VP Vigil are not HK people but Chinese, and only the TST Vigil is the one for real HK people. These writings and labeling efforts intended to persuade readers against joining the VP Vigil and lure them to the TST one. In short, they are efforts to direct an individual’s conduct, to structure the possible field of actions of others, sharing the traits of a “government” in broad sense.
2. In face of these efforts, Ng could have a list of possible actions opened to him, including being persuaded, deciding not to go to the VP Vigil but to the TST one, convincing others to join him at the TST Vigil etc.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 341.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 342.

Instead, by his own freedom, Ng decided to ignore such persuasions, continue going to the VP Vigil and write a newspaper article rebutting such writings. He acted on the action (the writings) of others. More importantly, by way of his article, he tried too to direct his readers' conducts and to structure their possible field of actions.

3. In response to Ng's article, the Passion Times' author wrote his/hers (as mentioned at the beginning of this paper). Again by his/her own freedom, the author could have chosen not to react at all, or continue to persuade Ng to join the TST Vigil. Instead, he/she directed his/her effort in exposing other "faults" of the Alliance and stressing the futility of "mourning" in face of a brutal PRC government, intending to marginalize Ng's argument and thereby to direct his/her readers' actions (going to the TST Vigil). He/she elected not to convince Ng anymore and sarcastically advised him "go to your VP Vigil!!"

Similar "agonistic" chain of actions is also found in the example of my FB page:

1. I posted a photo of last year's VP Vigil. Though I had no particular intent of persuading my viewers to go to this year's VP Vigil, I created an objective effect as such in the eyes of them. I structured the field of possible actions of my viewers coincidentally.
2. My FB friend John Doe (alias), out of all possible options, chose to leave a message cautioning me about my being "hijacked" once I attend the VP Vigil. By this message, he intended to talk me out of the VP Vigil and in to the TST one. And by this message, he also intended to direct the conducts of the viewers of his message and structure their possible actions.
3. Of course I replied, and briefly reiterated my reasons for attending the VP Vigil. This was my choice of not being moved by John's comment. However, the magical moment commenced when other viewers chose to start a debate with John on my wall! They acted on John's action and joined in to try structuring John's choices back. The agonistic chain of actions was no longer a 2-way one between John and me, but a

multi-directional one amongst all the viewers involved (See Appendix II¹⁹). All the parties tried to exert some influence over the others regarding the choice of the Vigil's locale.

And as noted earlier, the fact that I'm writing this paper as a result of the debates (on the Vigil's locale) exactly shows that my actions are being structured, only via my freedom I choose to do so out of a list of possible options. I act upon the actions of the participants of such debates.

From these instances, one can see how power is exercised amongst ordinary people in the context of a June Fourth candlelight vigil. They interacted with each other in a relationship of power which turns out not to be limited to one between an autocratic government and its people. Two things are of particular interest here. Firstly, while power is usually exercised by someone towards a particular target (like the author of the Passion Times' article towards Ng Chi Sum), this needs not to be so. If we see someone's action which triggers a series of subsequent chain reactions as someone firing a Remington gunshot, there can be incidental "victims" apart from the targeted one. Taking again my FB page as an example, while John Doe directed his comments to MY actions (of posting the photo of last years' VP Vigil), OTHER viewers of my FB page reacted to his comments too by starting a debate with him. They become the incidental "actees" of the actor's action. Similarly, the author of the Passion Times' article might have Ng Chi Sum as his/her primary target, I being an "unintended victim" acted on his/her action by writing this paper. An one-on-one exercise of power may sometimes lead to unintended consequence and make the resultant power relations highly complex.

The second thing of interest is the means or instruments used in the course of such power exchange. In analyzing power relations, Foucault advised us to also pay attentions to the following questions²⁰:

¹⁹ A photo capture of my FB page was included in the original paper, but is deleted intentionally here for privacy reason.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 344.

1. What is the system of differentiation that permits one to act upon the actions of others? Is it differences in status or privilege? Is it economic differences? Linguistic or cultural difference? I would also ask is it ideological differences? So on and so forth.
2. What type of objectives are pursued by those who act upon the actions of others?
3. What means or instruments are employed when power is exercised? By threat of arms? By the effects of speech? By systems of surveillance? So on and so forth.
4. What forms of institution are involved when power is exercised? Is it the institution of the family? Scholastic or military institutions?
5. What other forms of rationalization may affect whether or not / how one acts on the actions of others? Costs consideration? Certainty of results? Effectiveness of the means/instruments employed?²¹

As far as the means/instruments are concerned, in our instances (Ng's newspaper article, Passion Times' articles, my FB page) one sees only that of signification. Power was exercised just by effects of speech. There was no trace of violence or physical coercion. All exchanges were done by words, comments, or the expression of "like" or "dislike" (in the case of FB). Though Foucault has cautioned that power relations should not be confused with the relationships of communication (in which the production and circulation of elements of meaning can have their objectives outside of the realm of power²²), he admits that power relations are exercised to an exceedingly important extent through the production and exchange of signs²³. Also, if one asks the above question 2 regarding objectives, one easily finds out that the "players" in our instances rarely engaged in such chain of signification exchange merely for the sake of opinion exchange. They did so for the purpose of directing others' actions or structuring the others' field of possible action. In fact, the exercise of power by pure exchange of signs (in newspaper, online media, FB etc) short of physical actions regarding other social issues of

²¹ Ibid., pp. 344-345.

²² Ibid., p. 337.

²³ Ibid., p. 338.

HK in recent years has become a characteristic of HK-style social movement. That's why players of this kind earned themselves the "honor" of being addressed "keyboard warriors (鍵盤戰士)".

The Swire Bridge of HKU

As mentioned, despite the heat of the arguments, I decided to stick to the VP Vigil for some personal reasons and habit. The very unique personal experience of June Forth at the time of 1989, when I was already an undergraduate student at the University of HK ("HKU"), contributed very much to these reasons and habits. Hence everyone has his/her own history and stories which directly affects how he/she chooses to commemorate the June Fourth tragedy. It's not just a naive question of whether one identifies oneself as "Chinese" or "Hong Konger". I will use an extreme example of my wife to illustrate.

On the night of 4 June 1989, my wife and her hostel mates of HKU Swire Hall were furious with the June Fourth crackdown. They decided to voice out their anger by writing a Chinese couplet (對聯) on 2 huge banners and hanging them on the hostel's exterior wall²⁴. With 2 over-sized black clothes, they found it hard to write inside the hostel. Hence they laid them on the floor of an outdoor area next to the hostel called "Swire Bridge". What they didn't know when writing was that the white paint permeated the black cloth and had the words clearly marked on the Swire Bridge. The meticulously conceived banners were hung on the hostel wall, but were blown away by the strong wind shortly afterwards. The unintended words marked on the Swire Bridge however left there for 25 years to date. Every year students of HKU will repaint the couplet as part of a June Fourth memorial ritual. The story behind this renowned "Swire Bridge couplet" remains largely untold until it was reported by a local newspaper this year²⁵.

²⁴ The couplet read "Cold-blooded crackdown, long live the martyrs; Vowed to avenge, the flame of democracy never dies (冷血屠城，烈士英魂不朽；誓殲豺狼，民主星火不滅)".

²⁵ <http://hk.apple.nextmedia.com/news/art/20140605/18745592>

The June Fourth tragedy which took place during my wife's and my formative years had huge impact on our world views. This "Swire Bridge story" of my wife's and my own little stories back then²⁶ all contributed to our thick and complex "June Fourth experience". This experience in turn molds our present day treatment of the June Fourth massacre, including how we commemorate the event. However, these stories and experience are largely ignored and rendered trivial in the debates regarding the Candlelight Vigil's locale (the manifestation of power relations in the site of June Fourth, especially the power of subjection), just like Foucault's subjugated knowledges. By subjugated knowledges, Foucault refers firstly to the historical contents that have been buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systemization²⁷. They are those blocs of historical knowledge which are present but masked within the body of functionalist and systematizing theory and which criticism has been able to reveal²⁸. Foucault also refers subjugated knowledges to those knowledge which have been disqualified as inadequate or insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity, local or popular knowledge. He believes that only through rediscovering these particular, local, regional, differential knowledge can criticism (of functionalist and systematizing thoughts) perform its work²⁹. This is what he calls an insurrection of subjugated knowledges³⁰.

In the case of June Fourth, again one may easily associate those "functionalist and systematizing thoughts/theories" with such grand narratives of the PRC government as "China won't be able to develop to today's status but for the crackdown 25 years ago". This kind of faulty logic must obviously be rebutted, but scholarly work of cultural study shouldn't end just there. From the previous discussions, one should very well understand that power

²⁶ One of my own "June Fourth stories" was briefly told in my newspaper column 糊賢亂語 at the HK Economic Times on 5 June 2014. See Appendix III.

²⁷ Gordon, Colin ed "Two lectures" in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-77* by Michel Foucault. New York: Vintage Books, 1980, p. 81.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 82.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 81.

relations don't just exist between a centralized government and its people, but amongst the people themselves, within the entire social fabric. Similarly, those “functionalist and systematizing thoughts” can originate not only from a centralized government, but from amongst the people as well. In our opening instances, those “domestic discourses” and “Chinese-Hong Konger” labeling are exactly this kind of narratives. By exposing local stories like that of the Swire Bridge, one is reminded that a person's choice of attending either the VP Vigil or the TST Vigil is in fact shaped by complex, personal and historical influences, and cannot be reduced simply to a “Chinese vs Hong Konger” dichotomy. By exposing these local stories, it renders visible how lousy and loosely grounded those “domestic discourses” and labeling are.

Blurring the Target?

Scholars of cultural studies are often criticized for distraction, asking seemingly unimportant questions thereby blurring the crucial ones. In the context of June Fourth, one may quickly jump to the conclusion that a critique of power must be directed to the PRC government. Any study of power relations must be focused on that between the PRC government and its people. These are not wrong conclusions, but simply inadequate. With Foucault's inspiration, an ascending analysis of power (starting from its infinitesimal mechanisms³¹) reveals how power relations exist everywhere within the social fabric and how people may exercise power against each other. It reveals that even a minute issue of “the June Fourth Candlelight Vigil's locale” can already be a site of serious entanglement in power relations of the people. Instead of blurring the primary target of critique (the PRC government), it is my contention that these revelations can in fact open up a whole new series of investigation in relation to the PRC government. For example:

1. To what extent these local relationships of power in HK “governmentalized”, or under its state control of the PRC government³²?

³¹ Ibid., p. 99.

³² Foucault, Michel, “*The Subject and Power*”, in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, New York, the New York Press, 1994, pp. 345.

Are some of the advocates of those “domestic discourses” and labeling indeed extensions of the PRC government?

2. How do these local relationships of power in HK originate and evolve in response to PRC government’s policies of its own and on HK? To what extent are these local relationships “strategies” against those policies³³?
3. Flowing from the above, and more precisely, how does the power relationship between the PRC government and HK people (政府與人民的關係, a “vertical relationship” so to speak) affect the power relationship amongst the HK people themselves (人民與人民的關係, a “horizontal” one)? Is it the more imbalance / incompatible between the 2 “parties” within the vertical one, the more adverse the horizontal one will be? Or it is the other way round, meaning the horizontal one affecting the vertical one instead? Or the 2 relationships actually exert mutual influence in a Ping-Pong manner? Or they have no relation or correlation whatsoever? Here we are talking about an “inter-power-relationships” relationship, the relationship between the vertical one and the horizontal one. Methodologically how can this relationship be studied?
4. Within the PRC government, which itself is composed of different blocs of people, how is power exercised amongst these people? What is the power relationship among these people (of different blocs)? How do their power relationships affect the power relation between the PRC government and HK? Here, and following from (3) above, we have another layer of horizontal power relationship, an upper one though, which is that among the PRC officials of the PRC government. To make the equation even more complicated and annoying, our questions then become: how does (a) this “upper horizontal” relationship affect the (b) vertical one (the PRC government vs HK people relationship), and in turn how this affects (c) the “lower horizontal” relationship (the HK people vs HK people one)? Or the order/sequence of influence each on the others can be as random as it can be?

³³ Ibid, pp. 346-348.

5. By using Foucault's framework of "power relations", how can the agonistic status between the PRC government and HK people be re-examined? How do the PRC government conduct on our conducts and structure our field of possible actions? In return how do our reaction structure their field of possible actions? Are the PRC government trying to take whatever means to reduce us to total impotence (resulting in victory over adversary replacing the exercise of power), or they still intentionally leave some room of "freedom" for us so that a power relations between them and us can be maintained? In face of this omnipotent PRC government, how can our "dream" of confrontation strategy becoming power relationship (maintaining the potency of resistance instead of being totally won over) come true?³⁴

So on and so forth. Again, an upward search of power and getting swamped in the marsh of power-relationship matrix.

References

1. Foucault, Michel, "*The Subject and Power*", in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, New York, the New York Press, 1994.
2. Gordon, Colin ed "*Two lectures*" in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-77 by Michel Foucault*. New York: Vintage Books, 1980.
3. Passion Times references:
<http://www.passiontimes.hk/article/06-04-2014/15902>
<http://www.passiontimes.hk/article/06-02-2014/15790>
<http://www.passiontimes.hk/article/06-03-2014/15868>
4. Apple Daily references:
<http://hk.apple.nextmedia.com/news/art/20140604/18743821>
<http://hk.apple.nextmedia.com/news/art/20140605/18745592>

³⁴ Ibid, p. 347.

Appendix I

Photo intentionally deleted for privacy reason

Appendix II

Photo intentionally deleted for privacy reason

Appendix III

2014年6月5日
香港經濟日報



亂語 胡賢

六四經驗

香港大學每年也有學生替「太古橋」上一行關於六四的對聯補油，上面寫着「冷血屠城，烈士英魂不朽；誓殲豺狼，民主星火不滅」。這對聯的由來，實是我太太的故事。她在自己的blog說過，我在這裏再速說一遍。

話說 89 年發生了六四後，她和一群太古堂（宿舍）的「莊友」氣憤難平，打算用黑布和白色油漆寫下對聯，再掛在宿舍的外牆。由於黑布太長，他們將之攤在太古橋上，揮筆，但黑布太薄，油漆「過底」，印在橋面！她們苦心經營的黑布，掛上後，瞬間被強風吹走；而無心插柳的橋上對聯，卻留到今天！

六四對我們這類當時已是大學生的人來說，衝擊實在太大，給我們的感受和記憶也特別深刻。我記得當年 8 號風球的一晚（應是 5 月 20 日），隨遊行隊伍停滯在波斯富街利舞臺對面，雖披着雨衣，卻被傾盆大雨淋得全身濕透，但已豁出去在所不計。記不起要多久後才到達新華社，只知那次或許是人生第二次遊行，是第一次這樣任雨水打成「落湯雞」，還有同行的，有個是正追求我單戀對象的男生，他們後來結婚了，現聞說已離婚。

除那些正常的平反、民主、追究責任的訴求外，我們的「六四經驗」，還由無數這些小故事所交織而成，相當複雜。這個經驗，形塑了今天的我。我到維園悼念六四，起碼有 20 年，這抉擇也是因這經驗而來。在那裏，我悼念亡靈，宣示「我未忘記」的決心，絕非為某人或團體「抬轎」，更不關心被標籤成「中國人」或「香港人」；我只是個有良知的人。

撰文：周博賢（香港獨立音樂人兼填詞人）