


# 艺术地图

ART MAP

封面话题：什么是当代艺术？ What is Contemporary Art?

中文/English



封面人物：王度

现在的“梦游现实主义”  
Sleepwalking is a Production of  
Chinese Reality

高端对话：朱其VS汪建伟

新个人表现  
The new personal expression

文学阅读：我们究竟是谁？  
Who on earth are we?

“介于其间”通过摄影和影像作品带给我们那些来自异域的艺术家对于现实与梦幻的表达，以及他们对于全球化背景下对现实主义的期待和对图像解构的质疑。

Through photography and video works, this exhibition brings us the expressions about reality and dream from foreign artists and their expectation for realism and questioning of image interpretation against a background of globalization.

# “介于其间”

——来自欧洲及北美的摄影和影像

## “All the Things Between”

—Photography and video from Europe and North America

策展人：史蒂芬·豪斯迈斯特

Curator: Stephan Hausmeister

时间：2008.06.13—2008.6.26

地点：映艺术中心

艺术家：Alison Dalwood, Stephan Hausmeister, Sam Jury, Timothy Van Laar, Isidro L-aporicio, Stefan Sulzer, Sebastian Utzni, Michael Wright

Date: 13 - 26 June, 2008

Venue: Inter Art Center

Artists: Alison Dalwood, Stephan Hausmeister, Sam Jury, Timothy Van Laar, Isidro L-aporicio, Stefan Sulzer, Sebastian Utzni, Michael Wright



《长椅》Sebastian Utzni 2007—2008年  
Long Bench Sebastian Utzni 2007-2008

文/马尔科鲁姆·福瑞斯 Malcolm Ferris  
普利茅斯美术设计学院/赫特福德郡大学，英国

摄影的对象，不是有可能是真实的；它必须是真实的……每张照片某种程度上与它的对象是共存的。

——Roland Barthes

照片之所以具有指示性，并不只是因为光线碰巧被瞬时地记录在感光胶卷上面，最为重要的是，它们被拍摄了。

——David Green 和Joanna Lowry

这已经是陈词滥调了：东西方的交流是如何于全球化市场资本主义背景和新的传播通讯技术支持下，在类别和强度上都达到了新的层次。不过，可能不那么引人注目的是，这些交流是如何再次凸现出转译与传播问题的严峻性的——不光是在语言和文字层次上，更为广泛的是在文化、技术和视觉的行为层次上，以及在于其本身就是一种行为的转译上。Walter Benjamin和一些其他批判思想家已经提醒我们，要把转译理解成艺术—创造事物之间联系的艺术。





Sam Jury 作品图片  
Work of sam Jury

关于转译的话题一直处于视觉艺术行为前沿。空间性、瞬时性和叙事性，以及所谓的具体性、内在性和真实性，传统上被视为取决于特定的对象、地点、行为和活动，后者的转变意味着前者的改变。可能不同于其它当代行为的是，这些长久以来的顾虑有意识地和“跨视觉”概念联系在一起(套用Lydia Liu关于“跨语言”提法的一个表达)，也就是说如今的视觉艺术行为提供了一个供人思考的空间，思考这些关于空间性、瞬时性、叙事性和具体性的概念如何在跨民族、跨文化背景下的全球(艺术)市场和初生(发展迅速)的全球文化产业中运作。

八位艺术家在“介于其间”展览中所呈现给观众的，也依循着这些存疑的“跨视觉”和可译性，它们让镜头媒体(即摄影和影像)成为他们实践的关键，或者至少是这次巡回展览的关键。这样他们不仅表达了转译在艺术中的作用，更为明确的是表达了相机的象征作用。相机本身就是“真实”和它所号称的“真实性”之间的转译者。这里所指的，自然是基于镜头的成像系统不真实的指示性，它们记录下视域内物体反射回来的光线的的能力。这种保留光线的机制对于真实的处理，以及它所号称的对于真实的“捕捉”，已经把摄影器材上升到“通用视觉转译机”的高度。从北京到伦敦，从莫斯科到纽约，从东京到马德里，无数唯一的却又可以无限复制的图片狂轰滥炸似的表达着现代主题，这些图片的共性是都声称自己是某些对象、地点或事件唯一的和真实的标记，它们就像Barthes

说的那样，是“存在的证明”。

“介于其间”的艺术家们对真实的立场是讽刺的、存疑的，他们各自以不同的方式去挑战真实，真实不再是简单和安全的对象，他们拒绝固定的位置，模糊可能的涵义，包容不确定性。他们以此来强调直观的指示性之外的，强调摄影号称的真实性怎样可以和拍摄时不确定的周围环境进行调和。这是一次尝试，悄悄地以一种现代的方式，呼应着指示性和不确定性的辩证交锋，也标志着摄影在中国麻烦的开始。

中国最早的摄影器材出现在第二次鸦片战争时期，它们用来服务英法远征军。这也印证了摄影作为视觉“通用转译机”的说法，它在全球化环境中工作，与现代性的发展和认识论的产生紧密联系在一起。这几乎不可能是巧合，现代摄影流程出现在19世纪20年代，它们随后在现代市场全球化的奠定期(也就是西方19世纪帝国主义扩张的鼎盛时期)迅速发展。西方社会大力发展工业化和文化形态，贪婪地寻求既能够跨时空地进行浓缩和沟通，又能帮助他们有效地记录，记载和吸收遥远文明殖民地经验的技术。摄影完美地满足了这一要求，它能够忠实地(机械地)在一个场景中包纳时间、空间和地点，还可以把照片以工业规模复制。

Felice Beato，一名摄影记者先驱，受命参与了这场后来在西方被称为“第二次鸦片战争”的战役。正是Beato在1860年难以置信地获得了拍摄北京清朝皇家园林的机会，那里是中国物质文化和大



量外来物的巨大宝库。这发生在被控放火烧毁整个园林的英国军队开始动手之前。Beato的照片（它们存在的意义源于历史遗迹的消亡）提供给殖民主义者以想象空间。他们好像可以跨空间、跨文化地去“解码”“其他人”的文化习俗。这是一种象征性的占有，通过摄影、观看，然后将不很了解的神圣场所占为己有，实现殖民统治。

“介于其间”的艺术家们对抗镜头媒体与生俱来的“真实性”，强调转译的表达空间：物体或景象的表象环境，器材本身，拍摄行为，和那些让物体被选中和拍摄的广义诠释。（这也包括继续投入更为广阔的形象，保证镜头媒体的真实性——尽管数字技术通过模拟光学特性来产生非指示性的“照片”的做法，已经逐渐减弱了这种情形。）这些艺术家所展出的作品没有哪件可以直接地理解成是代表着原有的物体或景象的？它们甚至并非是不同的“真实”间逻辑上的对立（被拍的物体和景象，以及照片本身是人为的）。其实，“介于其间”展示的作品更类似一个视觉反馈系统，真实的东西去对抗它们本身的涵义效果，每件作品都得到特定的审美上和符号上的共鸣，都处在范式和可读性、随机性和噪音的临界点。我们作为观众，帮助“展现”这些作品，我们作为转译者进入它们的诠释空间，去理解和接受它们。

如果道德尺度存在的话，那么这就是“介于其间”的作品探讨视觉的现代性的方式，现代性早期殖民地时期的影响犹在。他们讲述的是我们如何全都成为（其实我们一直都是）转译者，以及我们如何成为更好的转译者：能够创造性地解释“真实”的双向活动，那些能说的和不能说的之间的，自我和社会之间的，当地的和跨民族之间的，生活所需和贪婪的市场消费主义所需之间的，历史后遗和书写未来之间的。最重要的是，转译者要能够包容（其实是能享受）那些不确定性、误读和误解，它们都是全球化体系下文化学习的必然后果。

'Photography's referent... is not optionally real; it is necessarily real... Every photograph is somehow co-natural with its referent.'

Roland Barthes

Photographs... are not just indexical because light happened to be recorded in an instant upon a piece of photosensitive film, but because, first and foremost, they were taken.'

David Green and Joanna Lowry

It is a platitude to note how under the rubric of 'globalisation' market capitalism, supported by new distribution and communications technologies, has led to new levels of exchange between East and West - both in kind and in intensity. But it is perhaps less commonplace to observe how these exchanges have made questions of translation and transmission once more pressing points of issue - not simply at the level of speech and writing, but more broadly in relation to wide-ranging cultural, technological and visual practices, and to translation itself as an activity. For as Walter Benjamin and other critical thinkers have sought to remind us, the act of translation should be understood as an art - the art of creating relations between things.

Issues of translation have in many ways always been to the fore of visual arts practice. Conceptions of spatiality, temporality and narrative, alongside claims to embodiment, immanence and authenticity, are conventionally seen as contingent upon specific objects, sites, acts and events, with transformations involving the latter implying modifications in the former. What is perhaps different with regards to contemporary practice is the way these long-standing concerns are now being consciously re-inscribed in relation to the concept of the 'transvisual' (to coin a phrase from Lydia Liu's notion of the 'translingual'). Which is to say that visual arts practice today provides one of the primary arenas for thinking through the ways in which notions of spatiality, temporality, narrative, and embodiment operate within the trans-national, trans-cultural contexts of a global (art) market and an embryonic (yet fast developing) global culture industry.

It is consistent with this problematic of the 'transvisual' and translatability that the eight

artists showcased in all the things between should make lens media (namely photography and video) central to their practice, or at least central to this travelling exhibition. In doing so, they not only gesture to the role of translation in art, but, more explicitly, to the emblematic role of the camera itself as a translator of the 'real' and to its claims to 'authenticity'. What is referred to here is, of course, the fabled indexical nature of lens-based imaging systems in their capacity to register light rays reflected from objects in the visual field. The apparent disposition to truth inherent in this mechanism of detaining light, and its generic claim to 'capture' reality, has elevated the photographic apparatus to the status of a universal visual translation machine. From Beijing to London, Moscow to New York, Tokyo to Madrid, modern subjects are bombarded with an infinite array of singular but endlessly reproducible images whose commonality rests in the claim of each to stand as a unique and authentic sign of some original object, scene or event; to stand, as Barthes puts it, as "a certificate of presence".

The stance of the artists in all the things between in relation to this constitutional claim on the real is ironic and problematical. In their different ways, each seeks to challenge the real as any simple and secure referent, refusing fixed positions, equivocating on possible meanings, tolerating ambiguity. In doing so they emphatically point beyond the straightforwardly indexical to underscore how photography's truth claims are mediated by the wider discursive contexts in which it is practiced. It is an exercise which, in its own quiet and contemporary manner, echoes the dialectical encounter between the indexical and the discursive which marked the troubled beginnings of photography in China.

The first use of photographic apparatus in China appears to have been in the service of the Anglo-French military expedition in the Second Opium War. As such it confirms the idea of photography as a 'universal translation machine' of the visual, operative under the conditions of globalism, and profoundly linked with the development of Modernity and the making of its epistemologies and regimes of seeing. For it is hardly coincidental that the invention of modern photographic processes in the 1820's, and their subsequent rapid development,



occurred during the founding period of modern market-based globalisation - the height of 19th century (Western) imperial expansion. Western societies, irrevocably committed to industrialisation and its cultural formations, avidly sought-out technologies that could not only condense and communicate across the dimensions of time and space, but which could also aid them to reliably document, record and assimilate the colonial experience of distant civilisations. Photography perfectly fitted this requirement, both in its apparent ability to faithfully (i.e., mechanically) incorporate the particularities of time, space and place within a scene, and in its potential for the resulting image to be copied and reproduced on almost industrial scales.

Felice Beato, a photo-journalistic pioneer, was appointed to the campaign that became known in the West as the Second Opium War. And it was Beato who, in 1860, had the dubious privilege of photographically 'capturing' parts of the vast estate of the Qing Imperial Gardens in Beijing, a truly immense treasure of Chinese material culture and of incalculable import, just shortly before the British unit charged with burning to destruction the entire site began its work. Beato's images (whose sense of presence was heightened as a direct result of the obliteration of the monument) fed the colonial imagination in a vicarious trans-spatial, trans-cultural 'decoding' of the embodied cultural practices of the 'Other'. A symbolic act of possession in which colonising domination was performed through the very acts of photographing, viewing, and thus appropriating, the otherwise incomprehensible presence of this hallowed location.

The artists in all the things between confront the 'truth status' claims that accompany lens-based media by foregrounding the performative dimensions of translation - the presentational circumstances of the object or scene, the apparatus itself, the act of taking a photograph or video, as well as the broader interpretive formations that lead to the

subject being selected and 'taken' in the first instance. (And this includes the wider popular imagination that continues to invest in lens-media as a guarantor of truth - in spite of the ways in which digital technologies, by modelling optical properties to produce non-indexical 'photographs', have progressively undermined this status). None of the encounters these artists' stage can therefore be straightforwardly understood as representations of some original object or scene. Nor necessarily even as confrontations between the logics of distinct 'realities' (the object or scene photographed and the photograph itself as artefact). Rather, the projects in all the things between resemble visual feedback systems in which the real is made to confront its own meaning-effect, with each artwork attaining a particular aesthetic and semiotic resonance at the threshold between pattern and legibility, randomness and noise. That we, as spectators, help 'perform' these works by entering into their loops as interpreters is fully understood and accepted.

If there is an ethical dimension at play here it is in the way that the artworks in all the things between explore the predicates of a visual modernity whose early colonial phase still haunts us. In doing so they speak of how we are all becoming (in fact always were) translators, and of how we must become better translators - able to creatively interpret the doubling movement of the 'real' between what can and what can't be said; between the self and the social; between the local and the trans-national; between the needs of life and the needs of a voracious market consumerism; between the effects of history and the possibilities of writing the future. Above all, translators who are able to tolerate (indeed, enjoy) the ambiguities, misapprehensions and misunderstandings that are an inevitable consequence of cultures learning to coexist within a global system.

《保加利亚》 Michael Wright 影像 2007年  
Still from Bulgaria Michael Wright Video 2007

