

保护还是袒露 ? Protect or Expose ? 纷争中的 去殖民性 Decoloniality in Times of Strife 董宇翔 Dong Yuxiang

“20 世纪在 80 年代末提前终结了，但历史依旧延续。”¹

¹ 汪晖，“中国“新自由主义”的历史根源——再谈当代中国大陆的思想状况与现代性问题”载《去政治化的政治：短 20 世纪的终结与 90 年代》，96

20 世纪晚期，随着最后一批欧洲殖民者从亚洲、非洲和加勒比海地区的殖民地中大量撤出，武力控制和劫掠式殖民主义几近终结。从那时起，去殖民性无疑开始成为艺术领域里最核心的价值、观念和方法。在肉眼可见的物质层面，从 1989 年巴黎蓬皮杜艺术中心的展览“大地魔术师”到今天大小机构对各种本土现代性的调查、梳理和展示，西方的艺术机构开始大规模展示非西方的艺术家和艺术作品。然而，战后秩序依旧以欧美为中心，其繁荣也主要源于以经济和文化等新殖民主义手段从发展中国家掠取的资源、劳力和利润。通过直接指向艺术机构中的结构性特权和偏见，去殖民性持续地审视着欧美中心主义并引入了种族、民族、性别、阶级等更多元的议题。但在战后秩序中，“多元”并非完全去中心化的异质性，而依旧是被欧美中心主义所规范了的“多元”。这就导致了去殖民性不得不进一步在知识、心智和思想层面与战后秩序直接对垒。这种对垒不像是把非西方的作品放入西方博物馆那样能够貌似达到物质层面的和谐，而是很有可能爆发出极强的破坏性和建设性。

从当下的各种困境、冲突和危机来看，我们仿佛正从所谓的第二次世界大战以后的艺术走向（甚至已经进入了）“第三次世界大战之前的艺术。”在此，我并非鼓吹战争或者认定其必然发生，因为当代战争可以在外交、经济和文化领域乃至虚拟时空中发生，从而回避短兵相接的传统战场；也不是重复诸如“当代艺术已死”这样的陈词滥调的终结论，因为如题记所示，即使当代艺术终结，艺术依旧会延续。从对今年卡塞尔文献展诸多争议的观察到我自己在教学中的切身经历来看，似乎那些曾经为这个世界带来稳定、繁荣和多元的战后秩序，如今在政治、经济、文化、宗教和伦理等各个层面都面临着彻底的崩解。

“The twentieth century prematurely ended in the late 1980s, while history continues.”¹

¹ Wang, Hui. (2008) *The Historical Roots of China's "Neoliberalism": Revisiting the State of Thought and Modernity in Contemporary Mainland China. Depoliticized Politics: The short end of the 20th century life with the nineties (Chinese Edition)* (pp. 98). 90 SDX Joint Publishing.

In the late twentieth century, following the mass withdrawal of the last European colonizers from Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean, the forceful control and plundering of colonialism came to a near end. Since then, decolonization has emerged as a core value, concept, and method in the art world. In terms of tangible reality, western art institutions have been showing non-western artists and works extensively, from the 1989 exhibition “Magiciens de la Terre,” at the Centre Pompidou in Paris, to the research, exploration, and presentation of diverse forms of localized modernity by institutions of all scales today. Yet the postwar order remains largely European-American in its rationale and thrives on resources, labor, and profits plundered from developing countries through both economic and cultural neocolonial means. In direct reference to structural privilege and prejudice in art institutions, decolonization discourses continues to interrogate European-American-centrism and introduce more pluralist issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and class. In the context of the postwar order, however, “pluralism” is not a completely decentralized heterogeneity but rather, still, a “diversity” regulated by a Euro-American outlook. This has resulted in decolonization’s further direct

罗伯特·弗拉哈迪，《北方的纳努克》（静帧），1922 年，纪录片，79 分钟

Robert J. Flaherty, *Nanook of the North* (film still), 1922, documentary, 79 minutes

稻米之牙，《人民的正义》，2022年第十五届卡塞尔文献展现场，城东室内游泳馆，卡塞尔，2022年
摄影：Frank Sperling

Taring Padi,
The Flame of Solidarity: First they came for them, then they came for us, 2022, Documenta fifteen, installation view, Hallenbad Ost, Kassel, 2022
Photo by Frank Sperling

confrontation with the postwar order on intellectual, mental, and ideological levels. Though such confrontation does not yet appear to have resulted in a new wave of placing non-western works in western museums, it is likely to be both extremely constructive and destructive.

In light of the current dilemmas, conflicts, and crises, it seems as though we are moving away from supposedly post-World War II art towards (and may even have arrived at) a “pre-World War III art.” Now, I am not advocating for war or assuming its inevitability, since contemporary wars can take place in diplomatic, economic, and cultural contexts and even in virtual space and time, obviating the traditional battlefield of close engagement; nor am I reiterating clichéd conclusions such as “contemporary art is dead,” because, as the title suggests, even if contemporary art comes to an end, art continues to exist. From my observation of the controversies at this year’s edition of documenta in Kassel to my personal experience in teaching, it seems as if the postwar order that once promised stability, prosperity, and pluralism to the world is now experiencing a total collapse on all levels: political, economic, cultural, religious, and ethical.



从“平台”到“米仓” From “Platform” to “Rice Barn”

2002年，卡塞尔文献展迎来了其历史上第一位非欧洲裔的艺术总监——奥奎·恩威佐。他为文献展精心策划了跨越亚、非、欧和加勒比地区的五个平台，以期去除卡塞尔的单一地域性，在全球化的语境中检视知识生产体系和去殖民性话语。²今年的卡塞尔文献展又迎来了其首个亚裔艺术总监——ruangrupa，一个来自印尼雅加达的艺术团体。本届展览的策展框架“Lumbung”在印尼语中意为“米仓”，意指村民共享农业丰收的可持续性收成方式。在收割完粮食之后，村民不将其带回家，而是存放在米仓之中，对其他村民开放，可以按需取用。这种来自东南亚的强调自愿、共识、集体的价值观显然与西方注重利润、效率和个人的秩序大相径庭。基于“米仓”的框架，ruangrupa进一步对艺术总监的角色去中心化，邀请了其他14个团体共同组织这届文献展。这些被称为“米仓成员”的团体再邀请其他团体和艺术家参加，最终参展艺术家名单多达数千人，遍布在卡塞尔全城的30多个空间。ruangrupa邀请观众以nongkrong（印尼文化中漫无目的的闲谈和玩耍）的方式进入展览，来“交朋友，而不是做艺术”，并“与……一起学习”。³这样一来，“米仓”削弱了由机构和市场所定义的当代艺术，把展览焦点转向永无停歇的即兴表演、讲座、工作坊、聚餐和派对等集体性活动……基于鲍里斯·格罗伊斯在《论新》中关于文化档案库与世俗世界之间价值交换的讨论，潘律很形象地概括了本届文献展的氛围：“活人在墓地里开派对”，并进一步阐述道：“米仓”把全世界各地的“土”（在地性）集中到了卡塞尔，但不一定会和卡塞尔的“土”交上朋友。⁴这在一定程度上也解释了展览的核心矛盾冲突：反对反犹太主义。

² 2002年卡塞尔文献展的五个平台分别是：平台1：民主的未实现（维也纳和柏林），平台2：为真理的实验：变化中的司法制度、真理与和解的过程（新德里），平台3：欧洲与其前殖民地的混杂和混杂化（圣卢西亚），平台4：被围攻的四个非洲城市：自由城、约翰内斯堡、金沙萨、拉哥斯（拉哥斯），平台5：展览（卡塞尔）。详见余可飞，《第十一届卡塞尔文献展研究》，中央美术学院硕士论文，2016。

³ 在技术层面，也有相当多的批评提出了这种展览方式的问题，例如这种参与对观众的知识储备提出了极高的要求，遍布卡塞尔的海报和思维导图上的有效性等。

⁴ “生滚粥20：会冲突的才是真正的国际展览-闲话卡塞尔文献展”（播客）



贾蒂旺宜艺术工厂黏土工作坊，第十五届卡塞尔文献展现场，2022年
摄影：Frank Sperling
图片致谢第十五届卡塞尔文献展

Clay workshops by Jatiwangi Art Factory on Documenta fifteen, 2022
Photo by Frank Sperling
Courtesy Documenta fifteen

如恩威佐般睿智和慷慨的人在去到慕尼黑工作和生活时，依旧会被当地的社会风气和官僚作风让所困扰：“在一个受单一文化主宰的城市中，我作为一个非洲人显得

5
黑特·史德耶尔《情境至上，德国例外》<https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/9HHwgvbXTyPCSJel4hfp2w>

6
同上

7
同上

8
关于反对反犹太主义与欧洲中心主义和欧洲白人中心主义的关系在本届文献展中的呈现，见任海，《感知审美、历史体制、星球性的未来主义：来自第15届卡塞尔文献展现场的反思》https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/M_EJtjCsYOHFs6QQy3V4Aw

尤为突兀。然后你会问自己：你觉得安全吗？如果你出了事，谁会来帮你？”⁵ 2001年左右，黑特·史德耶尔应邀向由恩威佐策划的第十一届卡塞尔文献展递交作品。史德耶尔曾提交了一段名为《巴本豪森》（1997）的短视频，记录了一场在德国黑森州小镇巴本豪森进行的反对攻击犹太家族梅林的示威游行。策展团队最终对这件作品只字未提，在那届审视知识生产体系和去殖民性话语的文献展中，德国缺席了，鲜有作品探讨德国的种族主义和移民问题。⁶ 时至今日，印尼艺术集体稻米之牙于2002年集体创作的《人民的正义》以及其它作品和活动因出现了争议性的画面和议题而导致艺术家们、ruangrupa、乃至整个本届文献展都被贴上了反犹太主义的标签。

卡塞尔的“土”显然包括了一种德国例外主义：用“黑人量子未来主义”（Black Quantum Futurism）这些相对抽象的全球化议题来取代关于德国当下与过去的具体切身的审视。⁷ 德国看似一个中立之地，实则也携带一种特权，孕育并延续着一种基于战后政治、经济、文化、宗教和伦理等各方面秩序的例外主义。不把德国、欧洲与世界其它地方的反犹太主义相区别，不把反犹太主义与反以色列霸权相区别，文献展中的反对反犹太主义就有将反犹太主义标签化和工具化，以维护欧洲中心主义和欧洲白人中心主义的危险。⁸ 恩威佐、史德耶尔和 ruangrupa 的跨国、跨文化策展、创作和写作实践并不应当被简化为“反犹”、“天真”、或“政治补偿”，而是在持续的知识、心智和思想对垒中最终揭示：企图基于秩序来图谋例外主义特权的又岂止只有德国。



黑特·史德耶尔，《巴本豪森》（静帧），1997年，纪录片，4分钟

Hito Steyerl, *Babenhäusen* (film still), 1997, documentary, 4 minutes

2
The five platforms of documenta in 2022 in Kassel are: Platform1, Democracy Unrealized (Vienna and Berlin); Platform2, Experiments with Truth: Transitional Justice and the Processes of Truth and Reconciliation (New Delhi); Platform3, Créolité and Creolization (Saint Lucia); Platform4, Under Siege: Four African Cities—Freetown, Johannesburg, Kinshasa, Lagos (Lagos); Platform5, Exhibition (Kassel). See Yu Kefei, “A Study of Documenta 11 in Kassel,” Master’s thesis, Central Academy of Fine Arts, 2016.

3
Technically, there is a considerable amount of criticism that raises issues with this approach to the exhibition, such as the extremely high demands this engagement challenges on the viewer’s knowledge base, the effectiveness on the posters and mind maps all over Kassel, etc.

4
“Rolling Congee 20: A true international exhibition is one that creates controversies—A discussion of documenta in Kassel” (podcast).

5
Steyerl, Hito. (2022, August 5). “Context is king, except the German one.” ArtChina. <https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/9HHwgvbXTyPCSJel4hfp2w>

In 2002, documenta welcomed the first non-European art director in its history, Okwui Enwezor. His elaborate curating for documenta spanned five platforms across Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Caribbean, attempting to remove the homogeneous geographical nature of Kassel and to examine systems of knowledge production and decolonization discourses in a global context. In 2002, documenta welcomed the first non-European art director in its history, Okwui Enwezor. His elaborate curation for documenta spanned five platforms across Asia, Africa, Europe and the Caribbean, attempting to remove the homogeneous geographical nature of Kassel and to examine systems of knowledge production and decolonization discourses in a global context.² This year’s edition of documenta introduced its first Asian artistic director, ruangrupa, an art collective from Jakarta, Indonesia. The curating of this edition of documenta is based upon the concept of *lumbung*, meaning “rice barn” in Indonesian, which refers to the sustainable harvest method of collectively sharing among villagers. After gathering the harvest, instead of bringing it home, the villagers store it in the rice barn, which is open to the community and can be accessed on demand. This Southeast Asian emphasis on voluntary, consensual, and collective values clearly contradicts the western order that focuses on profit, efficiency, and the individual. Based on the concept of the *lumbung*, ruangrupa further decentralized the role of the artistic director by inviting 14 other groups to co-organize this edition. These groups, known as the “lumbung inter-lokal,” invited other groups and artists to participate, ultimately including thousands of artists in the roster in more than 30 spaces throughout the city of Kassel. Ruangrupa encourages the viewer to enter the exhibition by *nongkrong*—the Indonesian word for aimless casual conversation and hanging out, to “make friends, not art”, and to “learn together.”³ In doing so, *lumbung* deemphasizes contemporary art as defined by institutions and markets, shifting the focus of the exhibition to a restless collective of improvisations, talks, workshops, gatherings, and parties... Drawing on Boris Groys’s discussion of the exchange of values between cultural archives and the secular world in “On the New” (1992), Pan Lü vividly summarized the ambiance of this year’s edition as “The living are partying in the graveyard,” and went on to elaborate: *lumbung* introduced soil (localization) from all over the world to Kassel but did not necessarily connect with the “soil” in Kassel.⁴ This explains, in part, the core conflict of the exhibition: the extent of and responsibility for the antisemitism present in works presented at documenta.

Someone as wise and generous as Enwezor was still perturbed by Munich’s social and bureaucratic climate when he was living and working there: “As an African in a mostly monocultural city, I’m one to stand out. And then you ask yourself: Can you feel safe? Who will help you if something happens to you?”⁵ Around 2001, Hito Steyerl was invited to submit work to documenta 11, which was curated by Enwezor. Steyerl had previously submitted a short video titled *Babenhäusen* (1997), documenting a demonstration against a series of attacks on a Jewish family, the Merins, in the small town of Babenhäusen in Hessen, Germany. The curatorial team ultimately said nothing at all about this work. In that edition of documenta, which examined systems of knowl-

6
Steyerl, Hito. (2022, August 5). "Context is king, except the German one." ArtChina. <https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/9HHwgvbvbx-TyPCSJel4hfp2w>

7
Ibid.

8
For a discussion of the relationship between opposition to anti-Semitism, Eurocentrism, and white supremacy in Europe as presented in this edition of documenta, see Ren Hai. *Perpetual Aesthetics, Historical Institutions, and the Futurism of Planethood: Reflections from documenta 15*. https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/M_EJtjCsYOHFs6QQy3V4Aw

edge production and decolonization discourses, Germany was absent, with very few works exploring issues of racism and immigration in Germany.⁶ It is worth considering this context when looking at the controversies of documenta 15, where *People's Justice*, created in 2002 by the Indonesian art collective Taring Padi, along with other works and events, were identified as containing problematic symbolism and other imagery, resulting in the labeling of the artists, ruangrupa, and even documenta as antisemitic.

The "localization" of Kassel clearly involves a kind of German exceptionalism: the relatively abstract globalization issues such as "Black Quantum Futurism" are used in lieu of a concrete and personal examination of Germany's past and present.⁷ Germany seems to be a place of neutrality, but in fact it also inherited a privilege that nurtures and perpetuates exceptionalism based on postwar political, economic, cultural, religious, and ethical order in all dimensions. Without distinguishing antisemitism in Germany and Europe from the rest of the world, without separating antisemitism from the rejection of Israeli hegemony, the opposition to antisemitism in documenta risks labeling and instrumentalizing antisemitism in defense of Eurocentrism and white supremacy in Europe.⁸ The transnational, intercultural curating, works, and writing of Enwezor, Steyerl, and ruangrupa should not be reduced to "antisemitism," "naïveté," or "political reparations," but rather regarded as an ultimate revelation in the ongoing intellectual, mental, and ideological confrontation: Germany is not alone in attempting to claim the privilege of exceptionalism in the name of order.

黑特·史德耶尔,《巴本豪森》(静帧), 1997年,纪录片,4分钟

Hito Steyerl, *Babenhäuser* (film still), 1997, documentary, 4 minutes



“我们应该保护彼此的感受”

“We Have to Protect Each Other's Feelings”

9
文/普里亚姆瓦达·戈帕尔(Priyamvada Gopal) 译/Aseem, 去殖民化与大学: 全盘否定“西方”是殖民心智的恶果 https://www.thepaper.cn/newsDetail_forward_13430130

10
Heider K. *Ethnographic Film*. Austin[M]. TX: University of Texas Press, 2006: 5.

在美国的艺术学院中,去殖民性进入教学课程已经数见不鲜。⁹学校开设了不少关于非西方艺术的课程,教授们也把不少非西方的艺术融入了教学大纲。今天的大学生大多为所谓的“Z世代”,他们在人口统计层面是最具多元性的一代。我曾在美国中西部的辛辛那提大学艺术学院教授过一门《艺术、流动与民族志》的课程。在日常的交流中,曾有一位教授绘画的资深白人教授对我陈述的“视觉民族志”这一研究方向表示困惑:为什么我在艺术学院任教而非人类学系?事实上,非西方艺术史的构建相当依赖于民族志方法,这一知识生产的过程近年来提供了反思新/旧、自我/他者、此地/彼地等去殖民性议题的途径。例如,民族志电影在狭义上是一种介于电影和人类学之间的方法,有特定的目标观众群体(通常是学者和人类学家),旨在“于长期田野工作的基础之上描绘和分析人类行为”并“将观察到的行为与文化传统联系起来”。¹⁰从广义上来说,以《北方的纳努克》为代表的经典民族志电影即通过解释性旁白和字幕来阐述不同的种族、环境和文化。

一个问题是,这套研究和呈现方法在西方社会中也已被商品化,以白人为主的西方观众以观看“他者”作为一种消遣娱乐的方式。我曾在教学过程中放映了一部名为《极乐森林》的影片。与经典民族志电影不同,导演罗伯特·加德纳在片中拒绝提供任何解释性字幕或画外音,而是让观众随着镜头去体验恒河畔的印度教圣城贝拿勒斯。这部影片导向了一个完全出乎我意料的小插曲:有学生提出,在影片放映前应当提供触发预警。这是一个让我费解的请求,这样一部基本无关创伤的民族志电影,为什么需要触发预警呢?

通过课内外的沟通交流,我大概了解了学生提出这一请求的一些原因:其一,这部影片描绘的是印度教的日常和仪式,不是基督教;其二,因为临近万圣节,所以有人会对葬礼仪式的内容感到不适;其三,片中有表现街头流浪狗之间争抢食物的场景。这些理由有的荒谬到让人哭笑不得,比如流浪狗,有的似乎有一定的合理性,比如印度教的葬礼仪式与万圣节这一西方鬼节的不同语境。课程教授者确实可以针对这些差异提供更多的背景信息。

我又在想,为什么加德纳拒绝了这种方式呢?就像对 ruangrupa 提出“针对作品语境提供更多策展阐述”的要求,那是否意味着策划者假定观众只能接受被动输入?那么,观众是不会、不能、不要、还是不想主动地去了解复杂语境?还有的理由着实让人感到极度不安,例如基于基督教中心主义而要把展现非基督教的影片打上触发预警,甚至将之视为“恐怖的”、“创伤的”、“黑暗的”内容。我接着问学生:如果有了触发预警,会有如何不同的观看方式?得到的回复是“会用手把眼睛挡住”或者“转移视线来避免观看一些片段”。

最后,学生用一句看似放之四海而皆准的真理来合理化其行为:“我们要保护彼此的感受。”事实上,每一个人都在企图基于政治、经济、文化、宗教和伦理等各个

层面秩序来为自己图谋例外主义的特权：我有（特）权遮住双眼不看贝拿勒斯的流浪狗，不了解印度教，不知道民族志知识的构建，因为我的感受需要被保护。在课堂上，我很清晰地告诉了学生我不会使用触发预警，但作为尚年轻的教师，我不确定是否向学生解释清楚了这个问题所涉及方方面面的复杂性。如果一旦放弃了自我反思，“我们要保护彼此的感受”看似打着“保护多元化”的幌子，实质不过就是瓷器般精致易碎的例外主义特权，而去殖民性正是要指向这种特权。观看又有何可指摘之处？



罗伯特·弗拉哈迪，《北方的纳努克》（静帧），1922年，纪录片，79分钟

Robert J. Flaherty, *Nanook of the North* (film still), 1922, documentary, 79 minutes

In American art schools it is not uncommon for decolonization to be added to the teaching curricula.⁹ Schools are offering many courses on nonwestern art, while professors are introducing nonwestern art into their syllabi. The majority of college students today are the so-called Gen Z, the most demographically diverse generation. I used to teach a course called Art, Mobility, and Ethnography at the University of Cincinnati College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning in the Midwest. In my daily interactions, a distinguished white painting professor once expressed confusion about my stated research focus of visual ethnography: why am I teaching in an art school rather than the anthropology department? Indeed, the construction of nonwestern art history has relied heavily on the ethnographic method, a process of knowledge production that, in recent years, has offered a means of reflection on decolonization issues such as new/old, self/other, and here/there. For example, ethnographic cinema is narrowly defined as a method between film and anthropology, with a specific target audience

9 Gopal, Priyamvada. (2021, May 28). "On Decolonisation and the University" (Aseem, Trans.). Peng Pai. https://www.thepaper.cn/newsDetail_forward_13430130

(usually scholars and anthropologists), that aims to “making a detailed description and analysis of human behavior based on a long-term study on the spot” and “relates specific observed behavior to cultural norms.”¹⁰ In a broader sense, classic ethnographic films, as exemplified by *Nanook of the North* (1922), address different races, environments, and cultures through explanatory narration and subtitles.

10 Heider K. *Ethnographic Film*. Austin[M]. TX: University of Texas Press, 2006: 5.

One issue is that this method of research and representation has also been commodified in western societies where predominantly white audiences watch the “other” as a recreational pastime. I showed a film called *Forest of Bliss* (1986) during a course. In contrast to classic ethnographic films, the director, Robert Gardner, refused to provide any explanatory subtitles or voiceover, instead allowing the audience to follow the lens and experience the Hindu holy city of Benares on the banks of the Ganges. Showing this film led to a hiccup that was utterly out of my expectation: a student suggested that trigger warnings should be provided before playing the film. This was a baffling request to me; why would an ethnographic film, essentially unrelated to trauma, need to have a trigger warning?

Through exchanges inside and outside the classroom, I roughly understood some of the reasons behind this request: one, the film depicts Hindu daily routines and rituals, not Christianity; two, because it was close to Halloween, some felt uncomfortable with the content of funeral rituals; and three, there are scenes in the film where stray dogs fight for food among themselves on the street. Some of these reasons are so absurd, like the one about stray



罗伯特·弗拉哈迪，《北方的纳努克》（静帧），1922年，纪录片，79分钟

Robert J. Flaherty, *Nanook of the North* (film still), 1922, documentary, 79 minutes

dogs, and some seem valid enough, such as the different contexts of Hindu funeral rituals versus Halloween, a western festival. The instructor can indeed respond to these discrepancies by offering more background information.

Again, I wonder why Gardner rejected this approach. Like the request for ruangrupa to “provide more curatorial elaboration on the context of the work,” does that mean the curators have assumed the viewers only receive passive input? Does it mean the viewers will not, cannot, do not, or choose not to understand complex contexts actively? There are also extremely disturbing reasons, for example, based on Christian centrism, for placing trigger warnings on films that show non-Christian content or even to regard them as “horrific,” “traumatic,” or “devious.” I then asked my students: How would the film be watched differently if trigger warnings were in place? Their responses were to “block their eyes with their hands” or to “shift focus and avoid watching some of the clips.”

In the end, the students rationalized their behavior with a truth that seemed universal: “We have to protect each other’s feelings.” The truth is that everyone is attempting to plot for themselves the privilege of exceptionalism on all levels of political, economic, cultural, religious, and ethical order: I have the power, or privilege, to cover my eyes to avoid seeing Benares’s stray dogs, to not learn about Hinduism, to not know about the construction of ethnographic knowledge because my feelings need to be protected. In class, I made it clear to my students that I would not use trigger warnings, but as a young teacher, I was not sure I had explained to my students the complexity of the multiple aspects of this issue. Once self-reflection is discarded, “we need to protect each other’s feelings” may seem like a way to “protect diversity,” yet it is essentially the delicate, fragile privilege of exceptionalism to which decolonization is confronting. What is wrong with watching?



罗伯特·加德纳,《极乐森林》(静帧),
1986年,纪录片,90分钟

Robert Gardner,
Forest of Bliss (film still), 1986,
documentary, 90 minutes

不确定 与 确定的未来

The Future of Uncertainty and Certainty

卡塞尔文献展是当代艺术的某一中心, 辛辛那提大学则是美国铁锈带上工业城市里的一所公立大学, 于当代艺术而言十分边缘。我虽无法对 ruangrupa 和本届文献展的诸多参展方完全感同身受, 但就自身在学术机构中的体验和思考而言, 去殖民性与秩序在知识、心智和思想层面的直接对垒是十分激烈、具体和微妙的。两者并不只是席面上的多数派或少数派, 而是互相联系, 互相渗透, 又互相排斥, 互相斗争, 从而推动事物运动和变化的辩证矛盾。当我们在讨论德国的反对反犹太主义时, 德国是什么? 是全体的德国人还是一个民族国家? 当去殖民性指向每个人内心中的例外主义特权时, 曾经带来稳定、繁荣和多元的(二)战后秩序, 在政治、经济、文化、艺术和宗教等各个层面也就面临着彻底的瓦解, 进而走向一种同时具备极强的破坏性和建设性的“第三次世界大战之前的艺术”。新的秩序也会随之产生, 虽然尚有很多不确定性; 任何理论也都无法预测新秩序, 但可以确定的是, 去殖民性永远都是过程, 一种持续的审视, 历史也由此延续。

While documenta is a particular center of contemporary art, the University of Cincinnati is a public university in an industrial city situated on the American Rust Belt, peripheral to contemporary art. Although I cannot fully empathize with ruangrupa and the many artists at this year’s edition, when considered in terms of my personal experiences and reflections in academic institutions, the direct confrontation between decolonization and order on the intellectual, mental, and ideological levels is intense, concrete, and subtle. The two are not just a superficial situation of majority and minority but a dialectical contradiction that interconnects, interpenetrates, and excludes and struggles with each other, thereby prompting the motion and change of things. When we discuss the opposition to antisemitism in Germany, what is Germany in this context? Is it all Germans or is it the nation-state? When decolonization refers to the privilege of exceptionalism within each individual, the post-WWII order, which once delivered stability, prosperity, and pluralism, faces a fundamental disintegration on all levels: political, economic, cultural, artistic, and religious, progressing to the “pre-World War III art” that is both highly destructive and constructive. A new order will follow, though with much uncertainty; no theory predicts the new order, but what is certain is that decolonization will always be a process, an ongoing scrutiny, and that history continues from there.

董宇翔, 艺术家, 美国伊利诺伊大学厄巴纳 - 香槟分校
新媒体艺术讲师。曾获第五届国际艺术评论二等奖。

Dong Yuxiang is an artist and a lecturer in new media
art at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.
He was a recipient of the Joint Second Prize in the
5th International Awards for Art Criticism.

Translated by Chloe Yang