The (Digital) Majesty of All Under Heaven: Affective Constitutive Rhetoric at the Hong Kong Museum of History's Multi-Media Exhibition of Terracotta Warriors

Rhetoric Society Quarterly
Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 148–167

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The (Digital) Majesty of All Under Heaven: Affective Constitutive Rhetoric at the Hong Kong Museum of History's Multi-Media Exhibition of Terracotta Warriors

David R. Gruber

During a series of protests in Hong Kong about a leadership transition widely perceived to give Mainland China greater political influence, the Hong Kong Museum of History held a Special Exhibition of the Terracotta Warriors of Xian, China. Sponsored by "The Leisure and Cultural Service Department," the exhibit featured the first emperor of the Qin Dynasty who ushered in "an epoch-making era in Chinese history that witnessed the unification of China" (Museum Exhibition). This essay explores the multi-media aspects of the exhibit, arguing that encounters with dramatic music and fully immersive digital experiences are examples of an embodied, affective form of constitutive rhetoric. Put differently, the museum's multi-media elements demonstrate how Maurice Charland's theory of a constitutive rhetoric can be informed by recent work on affect and can provide one point from which to engage affect theory and the "affective dimension of politics."

On July 1, 2012, Leung Chun-ying was sworn into office as the new Executive of Hong Kong, which remains one of two Special Administrative Regions of China. Leung, or "CY" as he is known locally, delivered his inauguration speech without speaking one word of Cantonese, the language used by over 80 percent of Hong Kong's citizens. Preferring to speak Mandarin Chinese while in the presence of Hu Jintao, the Chinese president at that time, CY solidified his image as Beijing's chosen leader (McDonald).[1] The following week, during CY's first day

[1]CY has also been accused of being a "secret Communist," a charge he has denied. See: http://www.wantchinatimes.com/news-subclass-cnt.aspx?cid=1103&MainCatID=&id=20120731000102 and http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/international/is-hong-kongs-new-chief-a-communist/507103.

David R. Gruber is Assistant Professor at the City University of Hong Kong, English, Run Run Shaw Creative Media Building, 8th Floor, City University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong. E-mail: Drgruber@cityu.edu.hk

ISSN 0277-3945 (print)/ISSN 1930-322X (online)
DOI: 10.1080/02773945.2014.888462

as the new Executive, he was "forced to flee from the town hall" of a local city in Hong Kong when members of the public, frustrated by encroaching influence from the mainland, high housing costs, government corruption, and environmental pollution, overwhelmed the meeting space (Jennings). These events occurred the week immediately after several hundred thousand people marched through the streets of Hong Kong in the annual pro-democracy protest set to correspond with the 15th anniversary of Hong Kong's handover to China after British colonial rule ("In Pictures"; Bradsher and Drew). Protesters, including students, artists, and the city's service workers, declared the unwanted influence of Beijing, holding signs saying, "Fuck off, Beijing!" That protest's especially sizable turnout and others in following weeks have been attributed to a number of contentious political issues, including a new government plan to institute a "National Education" program wherein students would be taught a new and revised "understanding of our country and national identity" ("National Education"; Bradsher and Drew). More to the point, the new curriculum suggests democracies are "inefficient" and Hong Kong is, historically, part and parcel of China and, therefore, culturally and civically unified (Evans; Lau).[2]

During this period of sociopolitical turmoil and leadership transition, the Hong Kong Museum of History held a Special Exhibition of the Terracotta Warriors of Xian, China. Sponsored by The Leisure and Cultural Service Department and officially named "The Majesty of All Under Heaven: The Eternal Realm of China's First Emperor" Exhibition, the museum's advertisements declared that the exhibit would feature the first emperor of the Qin Dynasty who ushered in "an epoch-making era in Chinese history that witnessed the unification of China" ("Exhibition").[3] As part of the Special Exhibition, the museum built a multi-media zone, bringing the terracotta warriors to life through various digital media engagements for visitors. In addition, the museum displayed 20 "must-see" cultural relics with a handful of original terracotta warriors and horses. The exhibit also included an "education program" for children where they could design their own terracotta warrior robots using a 3-D printer, clay, and basic electronic parts provided by the museum. Additionally, the museum sponsored a terracotta warrior–inspired fashion competition at the Hotel Icon in Hong Kong where regional designers could submit entries based on the clothing of the warriors and then be featured on the museum's website ("Interesting Sidelights").

I focus primarily on the multi-media aspects both because the museum highlighted the "innovative technology" of those elements and because the exhibit engaged multiple embodied modes of persuasion that have not been fully explored

[2]In response to protests, CY agreed to keep the National Education curriculum non-compulsory for the time being; however, protests continue throughout the city for fear of secret, internal pressure on schools to adopt it and for fear of an eventual change in policy.

[3]The king of the state of Qin began the Qin Dynasty around 221 BCE, uniting various warring states. The British Museum as well as Princeton University host websites with additional information: http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/articles/c/china_qin_dynasty_221-207bc.aspx; http://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Qin_Dynasty.html.

in the existing literature on material rhetorics of museum spaces (Armada; Blair "Contemporary"; Dickenson et al.; Hasian; Zagacki & Gallagher) or in the literature about the rhetoric of bodies (Blair "Reflections"; Gruber; Hauser; Selzer and Crowley & Selzer). One exception might be Michael Edensor's book, *National Identity, Popular Culture, and Everyday Life* wherein he examines the "affective and political responses" to the film *Braveheart* in Scotland (viii). However, Edensor's discussion did not have the opportunity to explore recent conversations about affect nor did it engage the role of digital media. Although Carol Blair ("Reflections"), Greg Dickenson et al., Marouf Hasian, and Kenneth Zagacki and Victoria Gallagher explore rhetoric's materiality by investigating how museums function "rhetorically as an experience" (Zagacki and Gallagher 171), those essays focus largely on what artifacts, as "texts," do in relation to each other or how artifacts position and inscribe the bodies of visitors. Such essays do not explore museum exhibits in an effort to understand how symbolic structures move in common with non-symbolic, biological effects. Phaedra Pezzullo's book *Toxic Tourism* does this to some extent as she investigates how the embodied rhetorics involved with taking people to experience the sights and smells of pollution might cause them to question entrenched political narratives about the environment. But the importance of the body in persuasion that she highlights can now be deepened through more recent theories of affect and extended into a broader discussion about symbols and affect in the formation of the political agent.

The interactive, multi-media aspects of the terracotta warrior exhibit seem a productive place to investigate complexities involving symbols and the affective motions of bodies. Thus, I choose to abandon the assumption that museum exhibits do much work of inscription independently on their own in a localized, situated museum space. Rather, I aim to explore exchange and interaction among bodies and exhibits, addressing how affect, sociopolitical discourses, and the constitutive "calling forth" of kinds of subjects through artifacts and material arrangements (Althusser) enfold together.

I start with the elements of the exhibit and examine how three interactive, multi-media displays positioned at the beginning of the museum's special exhibition symbolically construct a notion of Hong Kong identity either as unified with Chinese identity or as needing to unify with Chinese identity. However, these displays are not limited to verbal and symbolic messages. They encourage visitors to physically perform that unification, and they transpose, sometimes literally, the historical practices and images of the Terracotta Army onto Hong Kongers during this period of tension and further unification with Mainland China. Put differently, the exhibits reflect an existing national discourse about China's power and grandeur in its history of unification and then encourage visitors to physically move and embody that discourse. Exploring the interior, affective curve of a densely woven circle between bodies and museum exhibits proves significant and useful for thinking at the intersection of affect and Maurice Charland's theory of "constitutive rhetoric."

Specifically, I suggest that Charland's theory might be extended through Jenny Edbauer Rice's discussion of "political affect." In this regard, I aim to show that a bodily "rhetoric of *the* people" in the museum's exhibition operates much like Charland's constitutive rhetoric; however, this constitutive rhetoric is performed by museum-goers who encounter dramatic music, moving images, and fully immersive digital experiences that place them in the center of action and encourage them to act out—and feel—subject positions. These constitutive practices allow for some interrogation of the concept of "affect." Thus, in the theoretical set-up that follows, I review the literature on affect, and I suggest that an extension of Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric through the inclusion of affect highlights how affect is tied to environments and situated encounters and has a verb-like character, which may help to negotiate some confusion about what affect *is*.

Using my own personal experience of the exhibit coupled together with the published materials about the exhibit and a description of its elements, I show how the bodily performances invited by the museum space encourage Hong Kongers to adopt certain emotional stances toward unification with Mainland China. To the extent that charged discourses about China and the future of Hong Kong are already embodied, they are "hailed" anew in this exhibit in a way that performs what I am calling an affective constitutive rhetoric. Put simply, the exhibit uses physical movements and encounters with contextually charged environments, symbols, and discourses to try to "interpellate" (Althusser) visitors through performance as Chinese subjects in awe of China and intimately enjoined with Chinese unification. I conclude by proposing that an affective constitutive rhetoric may become increasingly common in sociopolitical situations where the populous must be "constituted," as Charland notes, or called out as a certain kind of subject such that she/he can then turn and see—and, indeed, feel—a national or political identity.

A Theory of Affective Constitutive Rhetoric

Wanting to problematize the notion of an "agent who is free to be persuaded," Charland's landmark essay emphasized Kenneth Burke's statement that identification can happen "spontaneously, intuitively, even unconsciously" (134). In exploring these subtle "sneaky" rhetorics, Charland posed the basic question of "how those in Athens come to experience themselves as Athenians" (138). That is, he wanted to understand the coming-into-existence of the agent in a political and historical context, an agent who is addressed but, perhaps, not entirely free and open to persuasion of any sort because of the way the agent has been constructed as an agent. Ultimately, Charland was able to theorize the agent and propose his theory of constitutive rhetoric by analyzing the independence movement in Quebec during the 1970s and 1980s. Drawing on Louis Althusser, Charland suggested that a rhetor "interpellates" a group of people as a people, a group existing outside discourse and, thereby, calls "the people" into "a discursive position." The rhetor, essentially,

forms characters in a national and political narrative, constituting agents as such, enacting a "rhetoric of socialization" (138–139).

Rice more recently set out to trouble the notion of autonomous individuals free to be persuaded, arguing that beliefs are usually not located in "statistics or evidence" and are not entirely rational (204). However, she goes further than Charland—as does recent inquiry by Diane Davis and Debra Hawhee—by turning to material environments and bodily processes, starting to think about how those shape the beliefs of an agent in tandem with symbols. Thus, as an alternative to a transcendental and rational subject, Rice draws on Sara Ahmed's and Teresa Brennan's interdisciplinary works on the production of affect in the human body and suggests "that belief is neither internally produced nor simply imposed on us from external ideological structures," but, rather, beliefs are developed among a collection of "private deliberations" and "external impositions" that accumulate in experience, involve emotions, sensations, movements of bodies, symbols, and discourses (204–206). In other words, affect—defined by Rice who draws on the work of Brian Massumi—is a kind of un-enculturated, sometimes unexpected, movement of the body like a disposition, mood or a feeling that occurs as a response to an encounter. If beliefs are accepted or formulated amid situational constraints, Rice argues, and if adopting beliefs involve gutteral responses not always narrativized and brought under "rational" consideration, then affect, so defined, certainly plays a persuasive role worth exploring in more detail.

Rice's position here is similar to that found in other recent works in rhetorical studies and critical-cultural theory. For example, in her book *Vibrant Matter*, Jane Bennett calls for a better account of the "vital materialities that flow through us," alter our actions, and enter into an on-going, ecological, entwined process of becoming, since objects in the environment have "capacities" that affect humans as well as block their ways and can rightly be said to "do things" (vii–x). Similarly, Thomas Rickert develops the notion of chora, placing concepts such as invention "concretely within material environments, informational spaces, and affective (or bodily) registers" (251). In addition, Davis has recently argued for an "affective identification" that can replace Burke's notion of identification based exclusively on discourse. In so doing Davis hopes to recuperate Freud's insight that identification happens internally "always already" before discourse. Whatever the specific theoretical design, it is clear that Rice's call to rhetorical scholars resonates with existing work in the field. But more to the point for this essay, Rice's stated hope that rhetorical scholars think jointly about the persuasions of the internal and the external and then investigate "the affective dimension of politics" and say "something about how rhetorics cohere in(to) publics" marks the theoretical aim of this essay.

Indeed, positioning an affective-constitutive rhetoric as an extension of Charland's theory means continuing the intellectual move beyond discursivity and trying to account also for how material worlds of biological bodies and environments constitute national or political subjects. This essay, thus, proposes that interpellated agents are not positioned as agents only because they are verbally

"hailed" but also because of who or what is hailed as well as when and where hailing occurs. Thinking about Charland's constitutive rhetoric as involving affect may also help scholars find ways to mobilize affect theory by negotiating existing problems with defining affect.

Thus far, defining affect has proven difficult. Definitions seek to upset the notion that "subjectivities are understood as more or less clearly defined positions in a semiotic field" but do not always know what to take into account or how to discuss non-discursive entities (Brown and Tucker 234). In rhetoric and critical cultural theory, definitions of affect seem to largely rely upon Brian Massumi's definition of the term. However, the language of "affecting bodies" and "intensities" and "pre-narrativized" emotions can seem too vague, too Deleuzian, or too inclusive to be useful. As Lawrence Grossberg notes, affect can be used as a "'magical' term" that does not "do the harder work of specifying modalities and apparatuses," and it will be important in the future to distinguish "affect from other sorts of non-semantic effects" (315). This is difficult to do. Indeed, defining affect any more narrowly proves quite problematic because affect is internal, may stir below the level of full conscious awareness, or may simply be more complex and dispersed than single definitions could inscribe (Clough and Halley, 28).

Another difficulty with affect is deciding what to locate and discuss when a rhetorical scholar investigates affect as enrolled and embedded in rhetorical action. Foucault's medical history describing how the body is segmented into discrete parts and medicalized further complicates the choices a rhetorical scholar must make. In other words, an analysis of affect risks cherry-picking physiological descriptions from circumscribed studies of oxytocin, lactobacillus rhamnosis, or mirror neurons. Affects risks becoming a means of re-writing the body in rhetoric through scientific discourses whose rigidity and rhetorical constructedness is overlooked in favor of inventiveness as the gut and the brain are increasingly prioritized in analysis. In brief, the methodological challenges of "talking body" are clear from a rhetorical perspective—yet rhetorical scholars must still talk bodies. Ignoring changes in the body would result in missed opportunities for "more complex understandings of rhetorical issues" ("The new" Rice, 209).

Despite the challenges, rhetorical scholars are not without facility when dealing with affect, and the dilemmas of affect do not preclude rhetorical inquiry. In fact, the good news about affect for rhetorical scholars is the way that "atmospheres," as Robert Seyfert argues, compose affect with bodies such that "reducing it [affect] to an individual's self-possession is not an adequate explanation" (30). Reconceptualizing affect as expression and situated becoming—with/in body and world—opens up room for rhetorical scholars to draw on their approaches and experiences to explore the complex dimensions of affect.

The terracotta warrior exhibit provides an opportunity to explore, as Edoardo Zamuner explains in his "Theory of Affect Perception," how affect is tied to encountered environments and is multiple, a complex and variable set of "felt states," which last for differing lengths of time, depending on what is perceived (438). His theory

is similar to Seyfert's, which presents affect as a "transmission" between human and non-human "bodies"—effects of interactions in time and place—not located solely or exclusively in any single body but a co-emergence among bodies that biologically *and* symbolically rely on each other; for instance, when one person sees a mournful facial expression on another what results is a chemical and electrical response that also produces understanding (28).

These theories seem to suggest that accounting for affect as a stable and strictly definable entity, or even a pre-designed set of distinct expressions, is best abandoned. For rhetorical criticism, this means considering a material organization of artifacts as *becoming affective* in an experienced relation, not considering affect as an abstract something existing on its own like a chair sitting in the corner. Put differently, affect's ontology is multiple and inextricable from the sounds, smells, material artifacts and symbols encountered. Thinking about affect in this way suggests that it can be meaningfully analyzed qualitatively through reflections on bodily states from within (or within embodied understandings of) specific situations. Or, at least, I hope to show this to be one reasonable approach—where rhetoric's propensity for discussing textual artifacts and material arrangements can be augmented by phenomenological insights.[4]

Of course, this approach may not solve every issue with deployments of the term affect, but it is, perhaps, preferable to arguing that affect is nothing, nothing significant, or arguing about what affect is exactly or how many definable categories one might draw up in an excel table.[5] As a concept, affect does not need to be stuck between "magic" and categorized rigidity. I hope to show that accounting for affect through careful reflection that attempts to make sense of internal bodily sensations at specific moments in time in relationship to specific environments does not, on the one hand, necessarily depress the significance of transforming a semiotic turn into a complex study of movement, and phenomenological inquiry into how the body is influenced in situations does not, on the other hand, over-ride rhetorical criticism or collapse the theoretical impetus of embracing dynamic bodies and materialities.

Ultimately, looking specifically at the Hong Kong Museum of History's Special Exhibition, what becomes apparent is just how a constitutive rhetoric that interpellates an audience as an audience can be performed and embodied and felt. Constitutive rhetoric is multiplied in that sense and can occur as an internal influence among and along with symbolic structures and circulating discourses. In this

[4] In my view, the narratives of scholars are valid insofar as they provide access to phenomenological insights; indeed, much of the history of phenomenology and phenomenological methods work this way. However, an ethnographic approach that collects narratives from others may also prove valuable and may be a better fit for scholars more comfortable with the social sciences.

[5] In marketing studies and mass media scholarship, scholars seem interested in developing strict scales and measures of affect (See: Patwardhan et al.; Peine et al.). Although this work clearly has its relative validity and uses, I propose affect as always multiple, ever-shifting, and entwined with the sensory complexities of the environment. In short, it seems too limiting or reductive in my view to create scales or measures in advance of situations.

way, affect is constituted as well, organized amid the complex interplay of the symbolic and non-symbolic.

Sensing and Performing The Unification of China

In conducting visual rhetorical criticism, Valerie Peterson recommends that scholars describe the sensory stimuli and the various visual elements and then explore the rhetorical function/s of those elements. Thus, in the next several paragraphs, I will first describe the museum exhibit and its multi-media elements as faithfully as possible using my own experience of the exhibit and the advertising literature produced by the museum. Then, I will explore the rhetorical functions of those elements using Charland's and Rice's theoretical concepts as a scaffold to drive discussion. Along the way, I will also offer emotional impressions, seeking to combine analysis of artifacts with phenomenological inquiry that reflects on my own embodied experience. This is an approach similar to the one used by phenomenologists such as Dietmar Lohmar who believe that reflective analysis should "pay new and conscious attention to our feelings and sensations" and that many biological processes "'show up' somehow in our consciousness" (8–9). The added "inner view" aims to "unpack and reconstruct" experience and, in so doing, to dismantle a Cartesian mind-body dichotomy by noting how moving and acting is "a constitutive condition" among sense capacities and the environment (Staudigl 193–195).

Description

Upon entering "The Majesty of All Under Heaven" Exhibit, museum-goers are ushered into a cavernous room teeming with digital media life. In the center, a newly molded mega-sized terracotta warrior, about double the average size, hovers, poised as if guarding a gate. A digital projection "paints" the warrior different colors, recreating the process of molding, firing and finishing. The projection turns the warrior from beige to red, ending with the yellows and blues of the finished exterior of the warrior's well-decorated armor. Dramatic, swirling music accompaniment soars, highlighting the finished product as a master work of art.

Simultaneously, around the walls of the room, three large screens feature digital, animated terracotta warriors and terracotta animals. What makes these screen projections compelling is how they are designed to react to the visitors who are trapped by museum staff, for the moment, and confined within this large room. Without any say in the matter, visitors are captured by hidden cameras and inserted into these unexpected scenes of action. At one point, a terracotta warrior jumps down from a chariot and offers a friendly wave to the stunned, sometimes giddy, visitors who might precariously wave back. At another moment, terracotta birds dance around the visitors, and visitors can join in the dance. At another moment, terracotta warriors—this time miniaturized like little toy army men—shoot arrows and wave swords at the visitors who are placed virtually in the digital scene. After about

fifteen minutes, large doors at the back of the room swing open, and all visitors are encouraged by museum staff to enter a fully immersive digital environment.[6]

In this room, large screens on all of the walls and the floor create a fully immersive, virtual "Journey into the Mausoleum of the First Emperor" ("Exhibition"). Loud music, very similar to the sweeping symphonic drama of the *Titanic* film score, rises as visitors find themselves flying over China and then standing in the middle of the emperor's grand mausoleum as it is digitally re-constructed around them. Soon, visitors are surrounded by hundreds of terracotta warriors. After the room of warriors is presented such that visitors can take in its immense depth and breadth, the earth covers the mausoleum and dirt dominates the scene. Then, suddenly, "in the blink of an eye, visitors are transported back to the twentieth century to relive the discovery of the terracotta warriors" ("Exhibition"). On all sides, virtual archeologists uncover the terracotta warriors, revealing their grandeur, excavating them and reclaiming them from the ground. The whole experience is sequential in this way, moving from original creation to buried secrecy to new cultural discovery. And the room where this is brought to life is big, loud, dramatic, and immersive in the sense that museum-goers are kept in the room until the show is over and in the sense that visitors are unable to see or hear much else except the virtual tour of this titanic mausoleum.

Finally, the doors open again, and the museum staff asks everyone to leave the immersive environment. At this point, Disneyland comes to mind. And this is where, prior to entering the "normal-looking" museum area where artifacts have been carefully arranged around a series of square rooms, visitors are allowed to enter a digital "play" area. The area contains three fake terracotta warriors ready for digital re-creation. According to the museum's official website, because the terracotta warriors lost their paint after being excavated, "visitors have a chance to be creative and repaint the warriors on touch screen computers" ("Exhibition"). The computers offer modern, exotic paint options such as "camo-pattern" and "neon pink," and so on. Perhaps most strikingly, part of the display includes the capability to virtually project the visitor's own face onto the face of the terracotta warrior. Thus, the remade and "individualized" warrior might end up looking camo-colored and have a new face—perhaps a Han Chinese face, perhaps a Macanese face, perhaps a Hakka face (often known as "Cantonese"), perhaps a face not identifiable by ethnicity.

Overall, these multi-media elements celebrate the artifacts and inform museum-goers about their production and preservation and, as a result, communicate the artifacts' cultural importance and "majesty"; however, the multi-media displays also compel visitors to identify the vast unification of China as a magnificent achievement—as opposed to a bloody ethnic conquest—and the display invites, often compels, visitors to perform a specifically "Mainland" Chinese identity tied to the Qin emperor and, by default, to the geo-political formation of China.

---

[6]Images of the multi-media display are available in a video about the exhibit produced by the "Now" news channel and available here: http://news.now.com/home/international/player?newsId=39506

The Three Screens. The first display resonates with Charland's discussion of constitutive rhetoric and, consequently, with Althusser's notion of "interpellation" wherein a subject is "hailed" and placed into a subject position. In this case, the museum-goers are literally placed into the screen and so situated. In the first instance, the camera organizes them as subjects now open to The Leisure and Cultural Service Department's digital media surveillance, and the positioning asks visitors to physically respond to the exhibit and demonstrate cooperation with the other visitors. How exactly the visitors are hailed, however, depends on their location in the room and the field of vision for the corresponding camera-screen combo.

Standing in front of the first screen, visitors seem to be hailed as friends or common warriors. Here, a friendly terracotta warrior displays his chariot and waves to the visitor who stands both in the museum and next to the warrior on the screen. In front of the second screen, visitors are positioned as participants in an ancient dance of tall water birds. As the museum display later explains, Chinese musicians trained these birds to dance to flute music, so here visitors can rehearse the bowing and turning dance moves or watch as the birds rotate and dance around them. In front of the third screen, visitors are shot with arrows, incorporated into a scene of war where they are, from all indications, enemies of the unification of China.

To some extent, two of the three screen projections align the visitor with a Mainland Chinese identity, and the third acts as a playful way to route any dissenters who might choose to stand in front of that screen and be shot by the toy warriors. That is, in the first screen, visitors are welcomed, asked to examine the warrior's chariot, or simply invited to meet the friendly man from the terracotta army. Visitors are, thus, engaged in a narrative of friendship, and a concrete link between the past and present is forged; the visitor can join the collective agent of the emperor's terracotta army. In the second screen, visitors are asked to watch the birds and join the dance, performing movements that the emperor enjoys while also hearing the foundations of traditional Chinese music, which developed from these bird songs ("Three Sovereigns"). Visitors are, in this case, participating in Chinese traditions and engaged in a theatrical process of becoming Chinese to the extent that they perform traditional dances or learn to appreciate the music and movements as culturally significant to their own person, now visualized up on the screen. In the third screen display, visitors are open to be shot and attacked, placing them among any outsiders who might oppose the terracotta army. Any individual who chooses to stand there will, quite clearly, face opposition. The screen positioning does not require much imagination to become a metaphor for the political positioning of the visitors. It is notable that visitors are allowed to take a stand in opposition to the warriors, but the multi-media display suggests that this position is, rather, against their bodily interests; it seems better to join the army and be a friend, to unify and not resist.

Each digital screen interpellation might be understood as "demonstrative rhetoric" and produce what Gerard Hauser calls a "fantasia of imagined seeing" ("Demonstrative" 234). As Hauser shows, rhetors incorporate spectacle or demonstration, especially in political settings, and do not always use verbal proclamation to "prove" their virtues or conduct (234–235). He put it this way:

> [In many cases] rhetorical performances must be reenactments of actions or events that the audience did not immediately witness. In that case, rhetorical displays must marshal verbal and formal resources that induce the audience to undergo the fantasia of imagined seeing. The fantasia of seeing, in which the audience is brought into the emotional ambit of eyewitnesses, then carries the emotional force of the self-evident, valid proving. (235)

In bringing to life the terracotta warriors and allowing visitors to interact with them and respond to their call, the digital screens in this multi-media exhibit produce a "fantasia of imagined seeing." They transform the audience into "eyewitnesses" to the terracotta warrior's strength and their desire (or the emperor's desire) to unify China and to bring the eyewitnesses along. If Hauser is correct, and if "seeing is believing," then the re-animated warrior exhibit at least attempts "the emotional force" of in-person evidence that might show that China does desire unification and, perhaps, prefers it to arrive by compliance and cooperation.

On a physiological level, the reaction to these screen interpellations is mostly laughter, surprise, and maybe a bit of discomfort.[7] The laughter and surprise likely result from not knowing, until entering the museum space, that one will see one's self on the big screen alongside of these animated warriors and birds. The bit of discomfort arises from the hidden cameras, the inherent surveillance, or the forced play of interacting with a warrior, entering into a dance with a bird in a public space, or absorbing virtual arrows. However, this does not preclude the digital screens from impressing the museum visitors or impressing upon them the fact that the exhibit asks them to play along and to respond to the call of the terracotta warriors.

The Digital Warrior. In regard to the over-sized terracotta warrior undergoing digital formation, it, too, stirs the museum visitor to enact a performance and may also be understood as productive of an interpellation. Its size and location—filling the center of the room—forms a relationship between the warrior and the visitor. It diminishes the size of those who gaze up and watch it glow, enhancing its own physical grandeur. This act, in and of itself, is one type of performance—that of gazing upward, being amazed or being underneath and looking up.

As curator Peter Samis points out, large museum pieces, such as Goya's massive paintings, "overtake you" through their dimensions and, through their "scale and drama," they engage bodies (191). The observation about the relationship between scale and feeling is similar to that of photographer Philip Douglis. He suggests that "incongruous juxtaposition," such as a large freighter ship placed immediately next

[7] This is a note regarding my personal experience of the exhibit and those people I observed. It is not meant to be universalized.

to a human body, magnifies scale and emphasizes, in turn, the smallness of the body; this is especially true, he says, when large objects are placed up close so that they appear much larger than anything else (32). Douglis's description of how two objects can magnify scale touches on the felt effect of the digital warrior in the closed room of the museum as the visitor walks around and beneath it. Standing close to the warrior—now magnified in size—ushers in some internal awareness of one's own size and offers the impression that the warrior stands for something much larger than itself. Consequently, if the warrior interpellates, then it does so by making the museum visitor smaller and subject to its gaze. Of course, if the warrior is reconfigured in the imagination as a permutation of one's own self, and in that way, if the warrior is taken to reinforce the interpellations from the digital video screens, then it can become one's own strength upon joining the army.

Whatever the inner response, however, the enlarged size of the digitally enhanced terracotta warrior is likely intended to impress upon visitors the magnificence of the craftsmanship that went into creating the warrior and, by default or association, the cultural magnificence of China. Put simply, the warrior is magnified to express the value of the artifact and to ask visitors to stop and look at its material complexity. As Samis explains, the "scale and drama" of museum artifacts is often communicated digitally through finding ways to compel "people to stay and look longer, and differently" (196). The size of the terracotta warrior in the center of the room certainly compels visitors to do this—visitors must navigate around it, and if they face it, then they likely see the small details of the armor and contemplate the long hours of work invested in making each individual warrior. In fact, the virtual colored projections of the sculpting and firing process facilitate this end. But the statue's size, position, and digital drama, glowing and flashing to music, seem to direct these details toward the overall superiority and importance of the warrior itself—or toward the magnificence of becoming a warrior—or toward the dynasty that unified China. As Hauser notes in his discussion of rhetorical display and Roman rhetorics, "The orator did not inspire admiration and emulation by *reasoning* about past deeds but by *exhibiting* them" (italics in original, "Demonstrative" 233). Here, the deeds of the emperor and the glory of that ancient unification are so exhibited.

In some sense, then, the warrior is confrontational. It punctuates a historical achievement as China is now accused of encroaching into the affairs of Hong Kong and eroding its status as "Special Administrative Region." But the warrior is also confrontational in the sense that it arranges the flow of the room around itself, always at the center. And the way it dominates the scene forces visitors to stand in range of the hidden cameras. Consequently, it compels engagement with the video screens, encouraging the performance that those screens initiate. Extended as a metaphoric device for the power or historical force of China, this over-sized statue communicates a message about taking detail and scale and positioning into account during unification. Constituting subjects as subjects requires a stance and location from which to say "hey, you." At the very least, the statue seems to send a message in line with what The Leisure and Cultural Service Department expressly

desires, that is, to "stimulate young people's interest in and understanding of our history and cultural heritage" ("The Leisure"). The key word is "our." That is, an encounter with this giant, lively figure contributes to a constitutive rhetoric about a mutual culture and heritage for *the* Chinese people as something that everyone, including Hong Kongers, must navigate around like the over-sized terracotta warrior, while feeling, perhaps, awed by the sheer scope of the political and material transformations on-going through its presence while also being attracted to its size and potential.

What the warrior does—or apparently aims to do—in relationship to the museum visitors can be differently articulated in relationship to the notion of "awe." Larry Williamson explores the rhetoric of "awe" from the 2003 Iraq invasion "shock and awe" campaign, stating that the two concepts are related in the sense that they are, collectively, designed "to paralyze" and produce an "'instantaneous' submission" resulting from the recognition of "our awesome scientific (and by implication cultural) superiority" (226). His depiction of awe as entwined with feelings of overwhelming paralysis points to something affective and corresponds to Glen Feighery's description from the accounts of news reporters covering nuclear weapons tests in the 1950s. Feighery notes how the reporters described a "heart-stopping feeling of awe," explaining the experience as "a strange feeling of fleeting contact with the eternal," an "almost mystical" experience (17). Likewise, recent physiological research has shown that awe initiates a conceptual expansion following confrontation with something too large or fantastical to comprehend (Keltner and Haidt) while other research shows that awe generates a subjective sense of an "expanded amount of time" (Rudd et al. 1131). These physiological observations also fit with Phil Chidester's description of awe as an "excess of experience" (98–100).

There remains little doubt that the multi-media aspects of the terracotta warrior exhibit aim to promote, at least to some extent, an "awe-inspiring" experience, engaging bodies and generating affective responses by presenting the warriors with such atmospherics that the viewer is surprised and dwarfed by their technological superiority—both past and present. Although this inclination to be "awe-inspiring" is certainly present in the looming, over-sized warrior glowing and flashing with digital color, it is probably most intensely felt in the second multi-media display: the fully immersive environment. There, digital wonder and cinematic effects combine to promote "an almost mystical experience" and "an expanded amount of time," as witnessed in the bodily sensations and the narrative progression of the immersive display.

The Immersive Environment. Next in a series of closed rooms that museum visitors must navigate, the fully immersive environment demands total attention as past and present are united in an all-encompassing, surround-sound, theatrical narrative that spans the terracotta warrior creation, discovery, and eventual re-animation. This immersive display symbolically and affectively communicates the "majesty" of the history of China and the emperor who unified it, extending its immense and culturally significant presence to the present moment. The *Titanic*-esque film score

coupled with visual scenes showing the sudden re-emergence of ancient artifacts buried along a great emperor seem designed to compel a sense of the mystical and suggest that the unification of the Qin dynasty can be re-discovered today in the lives of Chinese people as those lives intersect these cultural artifacts. Indeed, as visitors land virtually in the center of the mausoleum, they bear witness to the emperor's dedication to mold each warrior individually, bringing the individual identity into a mass collective. The virtual positioning of the visitor at that point mirrors the warriors' positioning, suggesting that the visitor, too, can be a warrior. The mystical connection across time wherein Chinese unification transcends time becomes cognizant here if it was not already apparent in the metaphysical and religious sub-text of the title, "The Majesty of All Under Heaven: The Eternal Realm of China's First Emperor."

Interestingly, feeling this grand "majesty" requires being still and passive during the cinematic theatrics in the 360-degree environment. In this way, the immersion overwhelms the body—as 360-degree environments are designed to do— as it sends the visitor soaring over the Chinese landscape and then down into the mausoleum with the emperor. Here, one's own bodily performance becomes paralyzing stillness. Visitors are subjected to a barrage of sensations and find themselves standing as a warrior and then find themselves, at least in my case, wondering what just happened. If the immersive display does not achieve a true cathartic "awe-filled" experience, then it, at least, offers an "excess of experience," which takes some time to collect and consider (Chidester 98).

In retrospect, one way to understand the immersive environment is to say that the dramatic music, historical artifacts, and historical sentimentalism make internally and externally visible a recognition of Mainland China, perhaps even a pride in Mainland China, that cannot be so visibly expressed in Hong Kong at a time when many Hong Kongers feel suspicious of the Chinese government. In other words, as Stephen Feuchtwang explained when discussing the terracotta warriors display in London, the visual impact suggests "an idea of objects and their experience, principally by the sense of sight, as witnesses to themselves—they stand as clues to what they were—and to something more that is suggested as their context and that we can somehow enter as our experiential selves, so that we can see them as both evidence and spectacle" (65–66). There is little doubt that this fully immersive experience of the terracotta warriors is meant to express "something more" than the past, but what this multi-media immersion "evidences" exactly is something of an open question.

One answer, as I have already suggested, is that it evidences the desire of The Leisure and Cultural Service Department to impress upon Hong Kongers the scale and awe of these cultural objects. The sweeping camera shots as well as the musical score make this quite incontestable, at least where the immersive environment is concerned. But another answer to what this immersion "evidences" is a bodily one, that is, it internally evidences, or makes known, emotional sensations that can or might be able to arise amid the inspirational music and the gleaming rows of warriors frozen in time, eternally ready for battle, representative of a nation state

presented as too strong and too large to oppose. It evidences, or apparently aims to evidence, how one should feel about China. And if submission or acceptance when facing the grandeur and power of China is at all a performance, then the closed immersive environment where the visitor cannot speak over the music or see anything but the 360-degree simulation compels that performance.

The Face Projection. The final multi-media display in the terracotta warrior exhibit provides an overt example of transposing identities through the use of bodies. Here, the visitor's face is, literally, projected onto the terracotta warrior. Although it might be argued that the visitor transposes her/his own identity onto the terracotta warrior, the warrior, rather, remains the central figure; the warrior is the sight of action and the point of celebration. It is likely more compelling to say that the visitor becomes the warrior. What proves interesting about this physical transformation is the placement of other kinds of faces onto a Qin Chinese body covered in elaborate armor—the spectacle is the experience of seeing one's self as an ancient Chinese warrior.

Like many ethnic groups, the majority Han Chinese people now living mostly in the Mainland—who quite clearly make strong associations with the Qin dynasty at this current historical juncture—can exemplify unique facial structures.[8] Although identifying ethnic origin through the face is not always possible since abiding by cultural behavioral norms and language use prove to be important identifying features of origin as well, there is something strikingly odd, misplaced, or forced about seeing a new face on a distinctly Qin terracotta warrior. In fact, one landmark historical feature of the terracotta warriors highlighted by museum exhibits such as this one is that each warrior's face was individually sculpted and representative of a real-life warrior (Braun; "Qin Shi"). This historical detail suggests visitors become warriors or that Chinese nationality expands to other peoples and that those peoples—whose faces now serve as a synecdoche for their affiliation and national identity—may join in that aggrandized history. Although it is certainly possible that not everyone visiting the exhibit felt a sense of unease about transposing her/his face onto the warrior's body, it is probably fair to say that the re-creation of the terracotta warrior in this special way allows Chinese history and achievement and, by default, unification, to forge closer associations with Hong Kongers and their individual faces.

This kind of individualized visualization—where Hong Kongers can, for instance, decorate warriors and transpose faces—may prove positive and fruitful, allowing Hong Kongers to bring their own creativity and individuality into an active Chinese (re)unification. Then again, it is unification and even assimilation with the warrior here in this context and with the idea—expressed emotionally and symbolically—of becoming one of *the emperor's people* that demands critical attention. Indeed,

[8] It is fair to say that some, not all, Hong Kongers and Mainlanders believe they can identify Chinese ethnic groups through facial structures. See the discussion here as a quick example: http://www.chinaculture.org/gb/en_chinaway/2006-01/20/content_78342.htm

although visitors are able to paint the warrior modern colors and express themselves, when they learn in the subsequent display of artifacts that ancient Chinese families painted the warrior's armor, the visitors almost become, by default, wrangled into a performance of Mainland Chinese identity and incorporated into Chinese history as Mainland Chinese families. Displays and situations like these crystallize Rice's statement that "rhetoric is a response to the immediate tectonics of history, embodiment, and physical shapings of materiality" ("Architectonics," 203) just as it is an expression of relationships (207).

Conclusion: Affect and Affective Constitutive Rhetoric

"The Majesty of All Under Heaven" exhibit provides an opportunity to consider Rice's notion of political affect mobilized as a kind of constitutive rhetoric of the body. Put another way, there is an immediacy to these multi-media displays that appeals to the body and builds up a "political affect," a sensation or disposition toward Mainland China that is structured and enhanced by a larger narrative being delivered about the unification of China. At the same time, these multi-media displays operate as a constitutive rhetoric in the sense that they organize visitors into a defined group by asking them to perform as that group and feel similarly to how that group might feel, can feel, or should feel. This is, of course, different from Charland's discussion of politicians declaring "the Québécois" to be Québécois, but if it is different, it is a difference of communicative mode and experience.

Ultimately, as Charland notes, a constitutive rhetoric is ideological and "triply so" because it constitutes sets of people as a defined group despite the fact that there is no "unitary body corresponding to its imputed unitary agency and consciousness" (139). The Hong Kong Museum of History's exhibit demonstrates that a constitutive rhetoric can be less to the point, less obvious than a declaration of "the people Québécois." It can be a subtle rhetoric steeped in playfulness, filled with inspiration, given life through bodies, devoid of language. Even so, its subjects "are not free" because "they are *positioned* and so constrained" (Charland 140).

Reflecting on the first-hand experience of the terracotta warrior exhibition provides a space from which to see how affect develops amid the internal and external, how it is spontaneous and shaped, how it arises from within a local situated environment blending physical response and refined message. Indeed, affect may well be promoted through well established discourses yet those discourses may not be fully defined or concretized at the moment of encountering those discourses anew. And in this case, since those discourses are blended with music and visuals and bodily performance—and since museum visitors are encouraged to take on the actions and roles of the terracotta warriors and their families in this dramatized setting—the discourses have the potential to be expressed with new affective character.

In short, if affect is action-with—a constituted happening among the interplay of body and world—then it is both able to happen and able to be encouraged to happen in specific ways in rhetorically situated social and material surroundings. Although

there is little doubt that Hong Kongers retain strong feelings about the Mainland Chinese government—as demonstrated through repeated protests and expressed concerns—the immersive multi-media experiences promoting a rhetoric of "the Chinese people" present the possibility for new feelings toward China's power and authority. Indeed, the exhibit seems to go to great lengths to make this an affective reality. Whether it does or does not, in the end, produce a desired effect may only underscore affect's weird variety and embodied particularities. However, that the museum's special exhibition encourages the performance of positive affects toward unification and situates audiences to perform a unified existence and that those performances all involve guided, if not unexpected, experiences and affects is beyond question.

Charland's constitutive rhetoric, once considered in relation to affect, brings the entwined complexity among bodies, discourses, and the calling forth of national subjects to the fore. If subjects are structured or given form as subjects through their response to a rhetorical calling, then so are they through an affective calling. This is not to overlook the existing bodily movements and patterns that form possibilities for an individual's affective responses; it is only to expand on Massumi's insistence that affect is "pre-narrativized" by suggesting that the feelings that tingle down the arms and legs prior to rational consideration or deliberation do not come out of the blue nor do they emerge solely from the past. They happen in a rhetorical moment. They burst forth from the localized and the situated as well as from patterns of past happenings. And if affect is action-with, then it is action with discursive and material worlds together.

Importantly, then, when the positioning of artifacts becomes something that bodies perform, that positioning is also forming within and through the body. And when the rhetor is simultaneously an institution, a video screen, a room, a dramatic musical score, a fun activity, as well as a government figure in an office somewhere, the politics become much more ubiquitous. Ultimately, the museum exhibit reveals that politics anywhere, but especially in China, is as much about hearts as about minds and, therefore, as much about spaces and places, sounds and images, performances and the arts, as it is about political speeches.

References

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review, 2001. Print.

Armada, Bernard. "Memorial Agon: An Interpretive Tour of the National Civil Rights Museum." *Southern Communication Journal* 63 (1998): 235–243. Print.

Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. Print.

Blair, Carole. "Contemporary US Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality." *Rhetorical Bodies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 199916–57. Print.

———. "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places." *Western Journal of Communication* 65.3 (2001): 271–294Print.

Bradsher, Keith, and Kevin Drew. "Hong Kong Sees Protest As Leader Is Sworn In." *The New York Times*. N.p., 2 July 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/02/world/asia/protesters-march-as-new-hong-kong-leader-is-sworn-in.html.

Braun, David. "Terracotta Warriors Go to Washington." *National Geographic*. N.p., 17 November 2009. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://newswatch.nationalgeographic.com/2009/11/17/523_terra_cotta_warriors/>.

Brennan, Teresa. *The Transmission of Affect*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004. Print.

Brown, Steve D., and Tucker, Ian. "Eff the Ineffable: Affect, Somatic Management, and Mental Health Service Users." In *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham, MC: Duke University Press, 2010. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1950. Print.

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Quebecois." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 133–150. Print.

Chidester, Phil. "'Open-Mouth Awe': ESPN's Streetball and the 'Transcendent Simultaneity' of the Media Sublime." *Mass Communication & Society* 15.1 (2012): 98–114. Print.

Clough, Patricia Ticineto, and Jean O'Malley Halley. *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007. Print.

Crowley, Sharon, and Jack Selzer. *Rhetorical Bodies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999. Print.

Davis, Diane. "Identification: Burke and Freud on Who You Are." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 38.2 (2008): 123–147. Print.

Dickinson, Greg, Brian L. Ott, and Aoki Eric. "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum." *Western Journal of Communication* 69.2 (2005): 85–108. Print.

Douglis, Philip N. "Making Size Count by Setting Up Scale Incongruity." *Communication World* September–October (2004): 32–33.

Edensor, Tim. *National Identity, Popular Culture, and Everyday Life*. Oxford: Berg Publishing, 2002. Print.

Evans, Rachel. "Chinese 'Patriotic' Education Draws Protesters in Hong Kong." *Bloomberg BusinessWeek*. N.p., 30 July 2012. Web. 30 August 2012.

"Exhibition—Introduction." *Hong Kong Museum of History*. The Leisure and Cultural Service Department, 14 June 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://firstemperor.lcsd.gov.hk/en/exhibition_introduction.php>.

Feighery, Glen M. "'A Light Out of This World': Awe, Anxiety, and Routinization in Early Nuclear Test Coverage, 1951–1953." *American Journalism* 28.3 (2011): 9–34. Print.

Feuchtwang, Stephen. "Exhibition and Awe: Regimes of Visibility in the Presentation of an Emperor." *Journal of Material Culture* 16.1 (2011): 64–79. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Birth of the Clinic*. New York: Routledge, 1989/2003. Print.

Grossberg, Lawrence. "Affect's Future: Rediscovering the Virtual in the Actual." In *The Affect Theory Reader*. Ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. Print.

Gruber, David. "Theatrical Bodies: Acting out Comedy and Tragedy in Two Anatomical Displays." *Visual Communication Quarterly* 18.2 (2011): 100–113. Print.

Hasian, Marouf. "Remembering and Forgetting the 'Final Solution': A Rhetorical Pilgrimage through the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21.1 (2004): 64–92.

Hauser, Gerard. "Incongruous Bodies: Arguments for Personal Sufficiency and Public Insufficiency." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36.1 (1999): 1–8. Print.

———. "Demonstrative Displays of Dissident Rhetoric." In *Rhetorics of Display* Ed. Lawrence Prelli. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006. Print.

Hawhee, Debra. *Moving Bodies: Kenneth Burke at the Edges of Language.* Columbia: University of South Carolina, 2009. Print.

"In Pictures: Hong Kong Protest." *The Guardian.* N.p., 1 July 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/travel/gallery/2012/jul/01/hong-kong-protests-in-pictures>.

"Interesting Sidelights." *Hong Kong Museum of History.* The Leisure and Cultural Service Department, 24 August 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://firstemperor.lcsd.gov.hk/en/sidelights.php>.

Jennings, Walter. "New Hong Kong Executive Forced to Flee from Town Hall Meeting." *Facing China.* N.p., 03 July 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://facingchina.me/2012/07/03/new-hong-kong-chief-executive-forced-to-flee-from-town-hall-meeting/>.

Kelter, Dacher, and Jonathan Haidt. "Approaching Awe, a Moral, Spiritual, and Aesthetic Emotion." *Cognition & Emotion* 17 (2003): 297–314. Print.

Lau, Joyce. "Thousands Protest in Hong Kong Against China's Move to Impose Curriculum." *The New York Times.* N.p., 30 July 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/30/world/asia/thousands-protest-chinas-curriculum-plans-for-hong-kong-schools.html>.

Lohmar, Dietmar. "Mirror Neurons and the Phenomenology of Intersubjectivity." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 5 (2006): 5–16.

Massumi, Brian. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002. Print.

McDonald, Mark. "A Telling Language Lesson in Hong Kong." *The New York Times.* N.p., 1 July 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://rendezvous.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/01/a-shocking-language-lesson-in-hong-kong/>.

"National Education." *Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.* N.p., 2 August 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://www.edb.gov.hk/index.aspx?nodeID=7127>.

Patwardhan, Padmini, Jin Yang, and Hemant Patwardhan. "Understanding Media Satisfaction: Development and Validation of an Affect-Based Scale." *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 19 (2011): 161–188. Print.

Peine, Klaus, Mark Heitmann, and Andreas Herrmann. "Getting a Fell for Price Affect: A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Investigation of Consumers' Emotional Responses to Price Information." *Psychology and Marketing* 26.1 (2009): 39–66. Print.

Peterson, Valerie. "The Rhetorical Criticism of Visual Elements: An Alternative to Foss's Schema." *Communication Studies* 45 (1994): 213–224. Print.

Pezzullo, Phaedra C. *Toxic Tourism: Rhetoric of Pollution, Travel, and Environmental Justice.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press. 2009.

"Qin Shi Huang Terracotta Warriors and Horses Museum." *China's Museums.* N.p., n.d. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://www.chinamuseums.com/qinshihuangt.htm>.

Rice, Jenny. "The New 'New': Making a Case for Critical Affect Studies." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 94.2 (2008): 200–212. Print.

———. "From Architectonics to Tectonics: Introducing Regional Rhetorics." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 42.3 (2012): 201–213. Print.

Rickert, Thomas J. "Toward the Chōra: Kristeva, Derrida, and Ulmer on Emplaced Invention." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 40.3 (2007): 251–273. Print.

Rudd, Melanie, Kethleen D. Vohs, and Jennifer Aaker. "Awe Expands People's Perception of Time, Alters Decision-Making, and Enhances Well-Being." *Physiological Science* 23 (2012): 1130–1136. Print.

Samis, Peter. "Artwork as Interface." *Archives and Museum Informatics* 13 (1999): 191–198. Print.

Seyfert, Robert. "Beyond Personal Feelings and Collective Emotions: Toward a Theory of Social Affect." *Theory, Culture & Society* 29 (2012): 27–46. Print.

Staudigl, Michael. "Vulnerable Embodiments: A Phenomenological Approach to the Many Faces of Violence." *At the Interface/Probing the Boundaries* 75 (2011): 191–209.

The Leisure and Cultural Service Department. *Welcome Message from Mrs Betty FUNG CHING Suk-yee JP*. Hong Kong: Leisure and Cultural Service Department, 2012. *Hong Kong Museum of History*. 27 July 2012. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://firstemperor.lcsd.gov.hk/en/welcome.php>.

"Three Sovereigns and Five Emperors." *Cultural China*. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 August 2012. <http://history.cultural-china.com/en/46History5031.html>.

Williamson, Larry A. "Bush's Mythic America: A Critique of the Rhetoric of War." *Southern Communication Journal* 75.3 (2010): 215–231. Print.

Zagacki, Kenneth, and Victoria Gallagher. "Rhetoric and Materiality in the Museum Park at the North Carolina Museum of Art." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95.2 (2009): 171–191. Print.

Zamuner, Edoardo. "Theory of Affect Perception." *Mind & Language* 26.4 (2011): 436–451. Print